



Критерии оценивания заданий заключительного этапа по направлению «Лингвистика: теория языка»

Task 1

1. Number of consultants (4 points)

For this criterion it could be awarded up to 4 points.

- Full points: correct answer 6 with clear reasoning (e.g. combinations of 4 choose 2).
- Minor deductions (-1 to -2): correct answer but unclear / incorrect formula or weak explanation.
- Major deductions: wrong answer or serious misunderstanding.

2. Understanding of questions / diagnostic words (4 points)

For this criterion it could be awarded up to 4 points.

- Full points: clearly understands that unique words act as tests for knowing a language.
- Partial credit (2-3): idea is present but not clearly formulated or inconsistently used.
- Low (0-1): misunderstanding of what a question reveals.

Points could be deducted for unclear or informal explanations, but conceptual understanding matters most.

3. Theoretical lower bound (10 points)

For this criterion it could be awarded up to 10 points.

- Full points: correct argument:
 - counts possibilities (e.g. 6!),
 - and uses binary questions $\rightarrow \log_2$, concluding 10

- Minor deductions (-1 to -2): small slips in calculation or explanation, but idea clearly correct.
- 0 points: if the lower bound is missing, incorrect, or based on wrong reasoning.

4. Strategy (14 points)

For this criterion it could be awarded up to 14 points.

- Full points: a clear, correct strategy that always reconstructs the table.
- Good partial (10-13): strategy is basically correct, but not fully formal or slightly vague.
- Moderate (5-9): reasonable idea, but incomplete or with gaps.
- Low (1-4): only partial or local ideas (e.g. works for one consultant).
- 0: no meaningful strategy.

Points could be deducted for lack of clarity, missing steps, or not covering all cases.

5. Question count and comparison (8 points)

- Full points:
 - correct total for the strategy (e.g. 11), and
 - correct comparison with lower bound (difference ≤ 1).
- Partial (4-6): correct strategy count but weak or partial comparison.
- Low (1-3): only counts own questions, no proper comparison.

If 3. Theoretical lower bound is incorrect, then:

- 5. Question count and comparison is capped (max 3 points), since comparison with a wrong lower bound is not meaningful.

Task 2

Task 1a. More complex demonstrative systems — 5 points

The answer should show awareness that demonstrative systems can be more complex than a simple two-term proximal/distal opposition. Credit should be given for mentioning additional distinctions that are typologically attested, such as mediality, addressee-orientation, visibility, or other relevant categories. Since elevationality is already central to the assignment, it should not count here as an additional distinction. Points may be reduced if the answer is too vague, gives dubious examples, or does not make clear what exactly makes the system more complex.

Task 1b. Anaphoric use of distance demonstratives — up to 4 bonus points

This task may be rewarded as bonus only. Credit can be given if the student clearly explains how spatial distance may be reinterpreted in discourse terms, for instance through prominence, topicality, accessibility, or discourse distance. Bonus may be reduced if the answer is schematic, poorly explained, or conceptually confused.

Task 1c. Elevation and distance categories — 5 points

Any well-argued answer should be accepted, regardless of which distance category the student chooses as the more likely locus of elevational distinction. What matters is whether the student provides a functional motivation for their hypothesis and shows awareness that more than one motivation is possible. Additional credit should be given if the student explicitly discusses an alternative motivation rather than presenting only one side. Points may be retracted if the reasoning is weak, one-sided, or not sufficiently connected to the question.

Task 2. Gravitational adverbs vs elevational demonstratives — 15 points

This task should reward a clear explanation of the semantic difference between the two categories. A strong answer should make clear that gravitational adverbs encode vertical relation, but are not necessarily deictic, whereas elevational demonstratives belong to the demonstrative system and are interpreted relative to a deictic centre. Special weight should be given to diagnostics showing how the two can be distinguished in practice, especially tests involving deictic-centre shift and the fact that ordinary vertical adverbs can often be interpreted relative to entities other than the speaker or deictic centre. Examples are important here: answers should ideally illustrate how these tests work, rather than merely naming them. Points may be reduced if the discussion is too abstract, lacks usable diagnostics, or does not actually distinguish the two categories in a principled way.

Task 3. Anaphoric use of an elevational demonstrative — 8 points

Credit should be given if the student identifies ‘that below’ as the more likely anaphoric form and supports this hypothesis from the example and its translation. An especially important part of the answer is the contrast with ‘that above’: a strong solution should note that the anaphoric candidate is used independently rather than as a modifier, whereas ‘that above’ in the other

example modifies the noun and therefore more naturally retains its spatial meaning. Points may be reduced if the student identifies the wrong form without good argumentation or fails to relate the analysis to the data.

Task 4. Non-anaphoric use of elevational demonstratives in narrative — 15 points

A good answer should propose a plausible model that explains how elevational demonstratives can retain their primary spatial meaning in non-first person narratives. In general, credit should go to answers that capture the idea of perspective-taking, deictic-centre shift, viewpoint alignment with a protagonist, or a similar mechanism that connects the forms to the narrated scene rather than to pure discourse anaphora. The student should also make some attempt to relate the model to the two examples. Points may be retracted if the proposal is too vague, does not really explain the data, or is not applied coherently.

Task 5. Consequences for the analysis of demonstratives in narrative — 12 points

A strong answer should draw a broader theoretical conclusion from Task 4 and explain why the evidence makes a purely anaphoric treatment of demonstratives in non-first person narratives less satisfactory. Credit should be given for recognising that demonstratives in narrative may reflect not only discourse anaphora, but also a shifted internal deictic perspective. Particularly good answers may go further and suggest that the distinction between first-person and non-first-person narratives is less absolute than often assumed, since both may involve both deictic and anaphoric uses. Points may be reduced if the answer remains too general, simply repeats earlier tasks without drawing a broader conclusion, or does not clearly explain what exactly has to be reconsidered.