SPATIAL CONFIGURATIONS, DEIXIS
AND APARTMENT DESCRIPTIONS IN RUSSIAN

Lenore Grenoble

1. Introduction

The study of apartment descriptions in a number of languages has provided
interesting information for the study of both linguistic structures at a textual level
as well as for spatial semantics. Early studies of apartment descriptions (Linde and
Labov 1975) showed them to be rule-governed texts which adhere to relatively strict
set of possible structures, analogous to narrative texts both in terms of their internal
structures themselves as well as in the systemacity of these structures. Furthermore,
a number of studies have shown the role of deixis, and of transferred deixis, in such
spatial descriptions as apartment descriptions (Ullmer-Ehrich 1982) as well as route
directions (Klein 1982, 1983; Wunderlich and Reinelt 1982). The apartment texts
exemplify an adaptation of three-dimensional space into linear verbal narratives,
illustrating the use of secondary deictics in providing conceptual links between the
spatial configurations and the discourse. Previously unstudied in Russian, they pose
interesting questions in that Russian does not have deictic motion verbs. Rather,
deictic spatial relations such as *come/go* are signaled by a system of prefixed verbs
and prepositions.
   The body of the paper is divided into three main sections. The first of these
briefly introduces the notions of deixis and hidden deixis and discusses their relation
to the study of spatial semantics. It is followed by a section which considers the
linguistic encoding of spatial configurations in Russian by means of a system of
spatial prefixes, focusing on a subset of those prefixes. The final section addresses
the use of spatial prefixes and deixis in apartment descriptions.

2. Deixis and space

By deixis here I follow Fillmore's (1975: 38) definition of deixis as "the name of
those formal properties of utterances which are determined by knowing certain
aspects of the communicative acts in which the utterances in question can play a
role: Identity of interlocutors (*person* deixis); their locations (*place* deixis); time at
which the communicative act takes place (*sending and receiving time*): The matrix
of the linguistic material within which the utterance has a role (*discourse* deixis), and
the social relationships of speaker and hearer (*social* deixis)." It is important to keep
in mind that deictics can only be understood in conjunction with the speech setting.
Deixis specifically has to do with the ways sentences are anchored to their contexts

of utterance, including such information about the participants as their roles in the speech event, and their spatial, temporal and social locations.

Deictic utterances are grounded to a spatio-temporal reference point, which Lyons (1977) terms the **zero-point.** Different linguists use different terminology for this zero-point. Following Bühler (1934), Klein (1983) calls it the **origo,** while Fillmore tends to use the term **deictic center;** I will use the two interchangeably. In Russian, as in English, the unmarked spatial zero-point is the speaker's location, and the temporal zero-point is the moment of utterance, and the person zero-point the speaker him/herself. Therefore, the deictic center of any utterance will be understood to be the intersection of the temporal, spatial and person zero-points, and the unmarked deictic center is the speaker and the speaker's location at the moment of utterance. Thus one implicit and crucial claim is that the speech event is essentially egocentric.[1]

The **deictic field** is a frame of reference which includes the origo; in the study of spatial deixis it involves a spatial deictic field, where it is the physical location of the origo which is relevant. In many instances of actual language use the deictic center can be shifted: It is shifted to some point other than the default ego-center to signal what I will call *perspective*: A different perspective can be introduced by using a basically deictic expression in such a way that someone other than the speaker counts as the 'center' of the deictic field. "Canonical" or primary spatial deictics such as *here* and *there,* or *this* and *that,* constitute a special group of locating terms whose frame of reference can be determined only with regard to the speech situation. Not only is the exact physical location of that place denoted by *here* dependent on the location of the speech act, but so is the determination of the boundary between *here* and *there.* These expressions relate space to the location of the speaker or some reference point at the moment of utterance. They are used as linguistic indices to the spatial coordinates of the speech situation and may be accompanied by gestures.

In addition to such primary spatial deictic oppositions as *here* versus *there,* or *come* versus *go,* there is a range of spatial expressions which may be used deictically when their interpretation can be determined only with reference to a deictic center or origo. This group, the secondary spatial deictics (e.g. *left, right, in front of behind*) locates objects or beings with reference to the speaker's location or some established reference point. Such secondary deictics (or what Fillmore (1982: 37) calls "deictics by default" and Herskovits (1986: 3) calls "hidden indexicals") are not "defining elements of communication as such" (Ullmer-Ehrich 1982: 228). But the context is necessary in interpreting the use of these secondary deictics: They are used to locate something (a figure) with relation to something else (the ground), and it is in this relation that the position of an observer is crucial, as well as the position of other objects in the ground. (Temporal phrases which are inherently non-deictic may be used deictically as well, but their use is much more restricted in Russian.)

Accordingly, spatial deixis in particular and spatial semantics in general involve a set of coordinates and vectors as established by Talmy 1975, 1983), which include the **figure, ground** and **path** (for mobile spatial descriptions). The figure is the

---

[1] Hanks (1990) argues that deixis is essentially sociocentric, i.e., that the deictic frame of reference is a social construct.

referenced object whose location is being identified, or which is moving. The ground is the entity relative to which the figure is located. Here we are specifically interested in what Fillmore (1982) has called **locating expressions**: The expressions used to associate an object with a place. In Russian spatial prefixes in conjunction with verbs of motion or existential predicated may function as locating expression. The relative orientation points, or origos, and the position of an observer are necessary coordinates in defining the spatial relationships determined by primary deixis and hidden deixis.

In the unmarked case, the spatial deictic reference point is the location of the speaker at the time of utterance. In other words, *here* will be understood to be a subspace which includes the speaker, and *there* a subspace which does not. Not only does the speaker's physical location determine the spatial zero-point, but also the speaker's body orientation. This is of significance in such relations as *front/back* and *up/down* (Hill 1982). Certain objects, such as cars and refrigerators, have intrinsic fronts and backs, tops and bottoms, as does the human body. But others (such as trees, boxes) lack any intrinsic front/back relation, and some (such as balls) lack any intrinsic top or bottom. The position of the referenced object, or figure, with respect to such an object (here, the ground) is determined with relation to the spatial zero-point. That is to say that as speaker, whether I say that the child is in front of or behind the tree depends upon whether the child is between me and the tree, or whether the tree is between me and the child. However, it is specifically the position of the observer, and not necessarily the speaker, which is relevant. This is a fundamental point which is often overlooked in the study of hidden deixis (Apresjan 1986: 11).

Furthermore, the locations of other elements in the context can be equally important. Consider the following two sentences, taken from Herskovits (1986: 15):

(1a) Lucy is in the supermarket.
(1b) Lucy is at the supermarket.

Only (1a) is appropriate if both the speaker and the addressee are at the supermarket while speaking. Note that (1a) sounds more plausible if *here* or *right here* is added (*Lucy is right here in the supermarket*).

In some cases not only is the reference point important, but also important is whether the presence of an observer is either implicit or explicit (Apresjan 1986; Clark 1974; Fillmore 1971; Herskovits 1986). For objects with intrinsic fronts and backs (such as houses or cars), the position of the observer may be irrelevant. Thus, sentences like (2) are true regardless of where the observer is standing:

(2) *Pered   domom   rastet   derevo.*
    in front house   grows   tree
    In front of the house [there] grows a tree.

But many objects, such as a tree, have no intrinsic front or back, and for these objects the truth of such sentences as (3) will depend upon where the observer stands:

(3)   *Za   derevom   sidit   kot.*
        behind tree   sits   cat
        'Behind the tree [there] sits a cat'

In other words, (3) will be correct only when the tree is located between the observer and the cat. This suggests a reanalysis of spatial prepositions in terms of the position of the observer. For example, in such cases as *X naxoditsja pered Y* 'X is located in front of Y', the preposition *pered* is better understood as signaling not 'in front of' but rather the relationship of 'X is located between the observer and Y' (Apresjan 1974: 110-112).[2] That is, it specifically denotes the spatial relationship with regard to those two points of reference, the location of Y and that of the observer.

3. Prefixes and spatial configurations

An intricate system of verbal prefixes works in conjunction with prepositions[3] to specify spatial configurations in Russian. These prefixes signal the way that the figure can be situated in or move through space. Because their primary spatial meanings are clearly manifested with verbs of motion, I will focus on that usage here. A core set of spatial prefixes which denote and delineate motion directed toward a goal (e.g., *pri-, po-*), motion from a source or starting point (*po-, u-, ot-*), and motion into (*v-*) and out of (*vy-*) a spatial field are frequently found in apartment and other spatial descriptions. The Russian system of spatial prefixes is complex; many studies have been devoted to individual prefixes as well as to the system in its entirety (see Andrews 1984; Boguslawski 1963; Cienki 1989; Flier 1975, 1984,1985). In what follows I will focusing on the use of certain prefixes in encoding deixis and point of view.

Flier (1975, 1985) argues for positing an underlying invariant meaning for each of the Russian prefixes from which the resulting submeanings could theoretically be derived given the lexical meaning of the verb and the inherent lexico-semantic and morphosyntactic features of the preposition. He identifies three sets of prefixal features (Flier 1985: 139-140): The **frame features**, the **operation features, and** the **perspective features**. Flier's basic hypothesis (developed in greater detail for the prefix *vz-* in Gallant 1979, for the prefix *na-* in Russell 1985, for *za-* in Janda 1985 and for *za-, pere-, do-* and *ot-* in Janda 1986) is that the addition of the prefix to a verb signals the imposition of some kind of limit on the predicate. The implication

---

[2] Apresjan (1986: 112) further specifies that "the distance from X to Y is envisoned by the speaker as not being (much) greater than the distance from Y to the observer."

[3] The prepositions are themselves, to a certain extent, redundant. With some verbs the choice of preposition will determine the interpretation of the motion's path, as in the case of *projti čerez les* 'to cross through the forest' versus *projti les* 'to pass [by] the forest'. However, in a number of cases the preposition is predictable in that use of a certain prefix will virtually require a given preposition. These include *pod- +k; ot- + ot;* and *do- + do,* as in: *podojti k stolu* 'to go up to the table', *otojti ot stola* 'to go away from the table' or *dojti do počti* 'to go as far as the post office'. This redundancy stems from the fact that the spatial prefixes are historically derived from prepositions.

of this limit is that metaphorical space is divided into what Flier calls the **domain** and the **periphery**, or the space inside and outside the limit. The frame features project onto the event at least one limit, which may be **inceptive, lateral, terminal,** or unspecified. Flier divides the operation features into two subcategories, the **trajectory features** and the **relation features.** The trajectory features are locative in nature, denoting such concepts as **origination** and **destination** and have to do with how the event progresses with relation to the domain and the periphery. The relational features are more aspectual in nature. The perspective features, a concept which Flier does not develop, "characterize the viewpoint of the observer of the narrated event as **internal** or **external** to the domain of the prefix frame" (1985: 140). As we will see below, these features can be accounted for in terms of the deictic center.

Each prefix specifies the spatial vectors involved in motion events. Flier asserts that this spatial meaning is invariant, arguing that the Russian verbal prefixes as a whole can "be analyzed in abstract spatial terms capable of metaphorical interpretation in nonspatial universes" (1985: 139). Their spatial use is most clearly manifested in combination with verbs of motion. The presence versus absence of spatial prefixes, alongside the tense/aspect of the verbs of motion, results in the fact that Russian speakers can specify exactly how a motion event progresses through time and space.

The metaphorical space is divided into a domain and periphery, which find analogues in the spatial deictic field. In both, the domain and the deictic field are that subspace which includes the deictic center. Static spatial descriptions may be deictically anchored to that origo, while motion events may be deictically directed toward or a way from it. Such relations are typically encoded in deictic motion verbs such as *come* and *go*. In Russian, these relations may be encoded in prefixed verbs of motion *pojti* 'to go', 'to set off' or *prijti* 'to arrive' in terms of hidden deixis in Russian. Also relevant are motion events which cross from the domain into the periphery, or vice versa. Thus in primary deictic relations, the position of the figure to the figure with relation to that field and its boundaries is crucial. For hidden deixis a third point, that of the observer, must be posited.

In English, the distribution of *come* and *go* is dependent upon the location of the speaker and addressee(s) at the time of utterance, as well as the location of the goal, the time of the motion event, and the participation of the speaker and addressee(s) as figures in the motion event (Fillmore 1966, 1973, 1975). In Russian, the unprefixed verbs of motion are not deictic, and can be used to signal motion directed either toward or away from the speaker (the deictic center), as in illustrated in (4):

(4) *Idi   sjuda!   Idi   tuda!*
     come   here   go   there

However, prefixation of these verbs can have an impact on the relevance of contextual features. For example, the prefix *po-* specifies the initial onset of a motion event, while *pri-* specifies its conclusion, or arrival at a goal. When either of these prefixes is used, the location of the figure in relation to the goal may be relevant (see also Grenoble 1991).

(5a) *Ja **pojdu***   *sjuda v*   *7.00 Ja*   **pridu**   *sjuda*   *v*   *7.00*
    I   will set out   here at   7:00 I   will arrive here   at   7:00

(5b) *Ja*   **pojdu**   *tuda*   *v 7.00 Ja*   **pridu**   *tuda*   *v 7.00*
    I   will set out   there   at 7:00 I   will arrive there   at 7:00

In (5a), the goal of the motion corresponds to the speaker's location at the moment of utterance. In such instances, verbs with *pridu* is strongly preferred over *pojdu*, which is grammatical but pragmatically infelicitous. Accordingly, it was rejected by native speakers. By virtue of the fact that the goal is the location of the speech event, the motion is viewed from that endpoint. Therefore, it is odd to use a verb which encodes the occurrence of motion from the other end of the event.

When the goal is not the location of the speech event, the participation of the speaker and/or addressee is relevant, as in (6):

(6)   a. *Xočeš'* **pojti**   *s*   *nami*   *v*   *teatr?*
       want   to go   with   us   to theater
     b. **Xočeš'*   **prijti**   *s*   *nami*   *v*   *teatr?*
       want   to come   with us   to   theater
     'Do you want to go the theater with us?'

In (6), both the speaker and the addressee will participate in the motion, directed toward a goal which is not in the spatial domain at the time of utterance. As the versions (6a) and (6b) show, the prefixed verb in *po-* is acceptable here, while *pri-* is not. Note that this kind of speaker/addressee involvement is precisely the kind of environment where *come* is possible in English. Thus some of the same factors are relevant for both English *come/go* and Russian *pojti/prijti*, but their distribution differs.

The distribution of *po-* and *pri-* can only be accounted for with reference to the spatial coordinates of the motion event, as well as those of the participants in both the motion event and the speech event. In cases of other spatial prefixes, it is necessary to make reference to a third point, that of a potential observer. One set of spatial prefixes, *v-* and *vy-*, will serve to illustrate the use of hidden deixis and the role of the observer. These are antonyms in the sense that *v-* signals motion into a space and *vy-* motion out of a space. This space is prototypically closed or bounded, as in (7):

(7)   a. *On* **vošel**   *v*   *komnatu*   b. *On*   **vyšel**   *iz*   *komnaty.*
      he   entered   into room   He   exited   from   room
     'He went into the room'   'He went out of the room'

In (7a) the verb *vošel* signals that the figure has entered the room, while in (7b) *vyšel* signals that he has exited and is outside the room. Thus, the room is the domain and ground. The prepositions in each sentence reinforce the spatial relations encoded by the prefixes. In both cases the perfective aspect of the verbs, along with the prefixes, signals the completion of these telic events, such that in (7a) the figure is located inside the domain, while in (7b) he is located outside of it. However, the choice of these prefixes can be dependent upon the position of an

observer, or upon the location of some reference point. In English such point of view relations are often encoded through manipulation of the deictic motion verbs *come* and *go*. Because *come* is used to signal motion directed toward the origo, its use will entail motion directed toward an observer which is implicitly understood to be at the spatial origo. This is in contrast to *go*, which signals motion directed away from the observer. Example (8), an adaptation from Fillmore (1976: 102, taken from Hemingway) provides an illustration:

(8)   a. The door of Harry's lunchroom opened and two men **came in**
       b. The door of Harry's lunchroom opened and two men **went in**

Fillmore makes the point that the verb *come* in (5a) puts the reader inside the diner, if we were going to film this scene, the camera would need to be located inside the diner. But (5b) puts the reader outside the diner. A camera filming the scene would have to be located out on the street.

   A Russian translation of these sentences would not distinguish between the two versions, using *vošli* for both *came in* in (5a) and *went in* in (5b):

(9)   *Dver'*   *ot*   *kafe*   *otkkrylas'*   *i*   ***vošli***   *dvoe*   *mužčin.*
      door   to   cafe   opened   and   entered   two   men
      'The cafe door opened and two men went in/came in'

The point here is that the prefix *v-* signals motion into an enclosed space, and so is the only option here, and *vošli* may be best translated by a deictically neutral verb in English, such as *enter*. The corresponding antonym, *vyšli* 'went out', would put the two men outside of the cafe on the street. The figures, the two men, are seen as moving from an open space into an enclosed area, regardless of the position of a potential observer. The vector of the motion event leads into an enclosed domain, a configuration denoted by the spatial prefix *v-* in Russian.

   When the described motion involves movement from an enclosed space to an open area, or vice versa, the spatial configurations are unambiguous and neutral to the position of a potential observer. Accordingly, the use of *v-* (or the antonymous *vy-*) is non-deictic. However, other kinds of spatial configurations are possible, such as where two enclosed spaces are contiguous and share one side. Such a spatial configuration is commonly found in buildings with adjacent rooms, such as apartments or house. In such a situation whether a person is seen as entering one room or exiting another will depend upon the deictic center and the position of an observer. In these cases the distribution of these two prefixes depends upon (hidden) deictic relations.

   Apresjan (1986: 22-23) also points to the distinction between the deictic and non-deictic uses of the prefix *vy-*. When the described motion is neutral with regard to a potential observer, *vy-*is used non-deictically, as is *v-* in example (9) above.[4]

---

   [4] Apresjan's example is *Ivan vyšel iz domu i medlenno pobrel po ulice* 'Ivan exited from the house and slowly started to stroll down the street'. He points out that the verb here will remain the same, regardless of whether the observer is inside the house or out on the street (Apresjan 1986: 22). The movement is from an enclosed area into an open space, the opposite of the motion in (9).

(10) Aprejsan 1986: 22
    Iz   komnaty   vyšel   mal'čik.
    from   room   exited boy
    'A boy came out of the room'

In (10) the figure, *mal'čik* 'boy', is the rightmost constituent in the sentence. This is the usual position in Russian for indefinite, new information and rheme or comment. The implications of this thematic structure are that the figure is new information, and therefore has just entered the observer's field of vision. If the observer were located in the room itself, the figure would have previously been in his or her field of vision. Therefore, the position of the observer may be tied to the informational structure of the discourse.

Let us start with a relatively straightforward set of examples, taken from the Bulgakov novel *The Master and Margarita*. In both of these the figure moves on to a verandah. In (11), the verb *vyšel* puts the observer inside the room from which the figure exits or, in other words, he *goes out* onto the verandah:

(11) Bulgakov 1973: 57
    I   bylo v   polnoč'   videnie   v adu.
    and   was at   midnight   sighting   in hell
    Vyšel   na   verandu   černoglazyj   krasavec [...]
    exit   onto verandu black-eyed   handsome man
    'And at midnight there was a sighting in hell. A black-eyed handsome man walked out onto the verandah [...]'

Here the figure exits from an enclosed space out onto the verandah. As in (10), the figure here is thematically new information, and enters the observer's sight with this motion event. This is in contrast to (12), in which the verb *vxodil* puts the figure outside, *coming in* onto the verandah from the street (as opposed to exiting from the room):

(12) Bulgakov 1973: 69
    Soveršenno   bol'noj i   daže   postarevšij   poet ne   bolee   čem
    completely   sick   and even   having aged poet not   more   than

    čerez   dve   minuty   vxodil   na   verandu   Griboedova
    within two   minutes   entered   onto verandu of Griboedov
    'The completely sick and even aged poet, within no more than two minutes came onto the verandah of Griboedov'

The verb *vxodil* emphasizes that the figure enters the verandah, rather than that the poet exits a room for the verandah. Note that it would be grammatically possible to use the prefixes *vy-* or *po-* here as well, as is the case with example (11). However, a change in the spatial prefix would entail a change in the perspective from which the motion event is presented. The juxtaposition of these two examples from the same novel shows that it is not the case that movement onto a verandah requires either of these prefixes in Russian. Rather the choice depends on the point of view of the observer and the thematic role of the figure in the text.

Given this overall summary of some of the key deictic uses of spatial prefixes, let us now consider how they work in a larger context. First we will examine an excerpt from the first two pages of text from Elena Bonner's book *Dočki - materi* 'Daughters – mothers'. It is my claim that the narrator's mother is the deictic center, and the center of point of view and of empathy (as defined by Kuno 1978, 1987; Yokoyama 1988; Yokoyama and Klenin 1978).

(13) Bonnèr: 1991: 8
1 *Vspominaju   i   perebiraju v pamjati   maminy   poslednie dni [...]*
  recall   and sort over in memory mama's   last   days
2 *V   sredu   23 dekabrja   mama utrom   vstala, kak vsegda,*
  on   Wednesday 23 December   mama morning   got up as   always
3 [...] *Mama vypila   kofe   i   s"ela   kusoček   buločki   s   medm*
     Mama drank   coffee and ate   piece   of roll   with honey
4 *Potom   pošla   v   vannuju   i   ja   uslyšala,   čto   ona*
  then   went   in   washroom   and I   heard   that she
  kak-to   očen'
  sort of   very
5 *tjaželo   zakašljalas;.   Ja   vošla   k   nej: ona sidela   na*
  heavily   started coughing I   entered   to   her   she sat   on
  taburetke   i
  stool   and
6 *skazala, čto čto-to   nexorošo s   serdcem. Ja   prinesla ej*
  said   that something   not good with   heart.   I   brought her
7 *nitroglicerin. Ona vdoxnula i   čerez   paru minut   uže*
  nitroglicerin she sighed   and in   few minutes   already
8 *so   mnoj   vyšla   snova   v   kuxnju. [...]*
  with me   exited   again   to   kitchen
  [continuation, Bonnèr 1991: 9]
9 *ja vse že   rešila   spat'   leč'   zdes',   u nee*
  I nonetheless decided   to sleep   to lie down here   at her

'I'm recalling and sorting over mama's last days in my memory. [...]
On Wednesday, December 23rd, mama got up, as always, around 10:00. [...]
Mama drank some coffee and ate a piece of a roll with honey. Then she went into the bathroom and I heard her start coughing badly. I went into her: She was sitting on the stool and said that something was not right with her heart. I brought her some nitroglycerin. She sighed and in a few minutes already went out with me into the kitchen. [...]
Nonetheless I decided to go to bed here, in her room'

This example is taken from the first page of the narration; line 1 here corresponds to the first line of the entire novel. This first line, as well as the title *Dočki-materi* 'Daughters–mothers' itself, suggest that the mother is the literary theme, in the sense that the text is about the mother. Moreover, she is deictic center and center

of empathy.[5] In the next three paragraphs of the text, the narrator clearly takes the point of view of her mother. The opening action of the narrative in the second paragraph (line 2 here) takes place, most probably, in the kitchen, where the mother has eaten breakfast. The narrative backbone consists of a series temporally sequential verbs of motion (lines 4, 5, 6 and 8). In line 4, *pošla* 'went' gets the mother out of the kitchen and on her way to the washroom; the prefix *po-* signals the motion event from that initial point in the kitchen. At this point the narrator and mother are in different places; the narrator's own location and perspective are distinct from those of her mother: The verb *ja uslyšala* 'I heard' explicitly signals the disjuncture of the two locations. Note that in line 5 the narrator says *Ja vošla k nej* 'I came in to her'; the verb *vošla* here puts the motion right in the washroom with the mother. Alternatively, the verb *pošla* the prefix *po-* (instead of *v-*) would also be grammatically acceptable here, but with a change in perspective: *Po-* simply denotes the initial onset of motion, that moment when the figure starts to move. In line 6 *vošla* is analogous to the use of the prefix *v-* in example (12); in both cases the observer is at the endpoint, or the goal, of the motion. Here that puts the observer's position in with the mother. The next motion verb, *prinesla* 'brought' in line 6, again illustrates the use of the prefix *pri-* to denote the arrival at the goal of a motion event. It is not a primary deictic verb but its use here involves hidden deixis: It has the effect of focusing on that terminal point of the spatial vector, again at the mother's location. It is at this terminus that the observer is situated. In line 8 *vyšla* 'exited' signals the departure from the spatial orientation point; *vošla* 'entered' is also grammatically acceptable, but would shift the spatial center to the kitchen. The narrator explicitly establishes her mother's room as deictic center with *zdes'* 'here' in line 9.

In this way, the prefixed verbs of motion signal hidden deixis. They specify the spatial vectors of a motion event with relation to not only the domain, or spatial field, but also to one or more orientation points within that domain. The mother is established as deictic center within that domain: Her location serves as the key spatial reference point to which the narrator's own (changing) position is anchored. The daughter provides a second orientation point which only sometimes coincides with that of the mother. Paths which transverse the domain to connect these two reference points are established through prefixed verbs of motion.

4. Apartment descriptions

Apartment descriptions will provide an illustration of the complex interaction of spatial deictics in Russian. Apartment descriptions provide information about the conceptualization of space, in that they show the transformation of a physical domain into verbal narrative. Typically, the narrator describes the apartment in terms of the path which an imagined figure would take while touring the apartment. Analogous to the excerpt in (13), these texts all have a well-established deictic center, which is the front door of the apartment.

The descriptions of living spaces have been shown to follow well-formed and

---

[5] Nichols (1984) similarly points out that thematic viewpoint usually coincides with empathy.

predictable patterns in American English. In a now well-known study, Linde and Labov (1975) show how the descriptions of apartments are rule-governed discourses which transfer spatial lay-outs into temporally organized narratives. Ullmer-Ehrich (1982) conducted a similar study of German room descriptions by interviewing 20 students at the University of Düsseldorf. A study of Russian apartment descriptions shows differences that rest both on the different culture-specific points of apartments in modern day Russia as well as on the language-specific differences of existential type sentences in Russian and English and the linguistic devices for encoding spatial information. In each Russian account, the descriptive information about the layout of an individual apartment is presented in roughly the same order as in all other (Russian) accounts, and speakers use the same techniques and same syntactic structures in describing their apartments. In other words, the Russian descriptions are, like the American English counterparts, rule-governed.

The data used here were collected from a set of fifteen interviews of Moscow biology students. While the total number of Russian interviews is significantly smaller than Linde and Labov's original pool of 72 interviews, the smaller set of Russian apartment descriptions adheres to a relatively rigid format. The descriptions exhibit such striking correspondences that it is possible to speak of them as a representative corpus with a high degree of certainty, although further research in this area is clearly needed.

The interviews were taken after the students had been in the US for about five weeks during the summer of 1991, just prior to the August putsch with the subsequent overthrow of the Communist Regime in the (former) USSR. Therefore, the students refer to their country as the Soviet Union. More importantly, their descriptions are in part based on the assumption that certain Soviet laws regarding living space are in effect. Of specific relevance to this study is the fact that according to Soviet law each citizen was guaranteed a certain amount of square meters of living space; the kitchen, hallways, toilet and bathroom are not considered part of this living space. Rental fees were based, in part, on the square meterage of the living space, with the immediate result of this rule being that new apartments were constructed with very small kitchens and baths and short, narrow or even nonexistent hallways. Furthermore, every adult knows the exact size of his or her living space in square meters. Therefore, this is one of the most salient pieces of information in the description.

Such cultural background is necessary to understand the overall structure of the apartment descriptions. All but two of the speakers responded to my initial request to describe their apartments by asking which apartment they should discuss. In many cases they had as many as three apartments to choose from: Their parents apartment, the apartment where they were actually written in, and their in-laws apartment, where they were actually living. Even the unmarried students would be living in one apartment and written into another.

All but one speaker began the actual apartment description by stating the number of rooms in the apartment. This information was often followed by noting the total square meters in the apartment. Half the students mentioned the area of Moscow in which the apartment was located. This was then followed by a listing of the rooms and their general contents. Surprisingly, in response to the request to describe an apartment, only one speaker supplied a spatial description. The actual layout of the apartment was given only in response to the direct question *Kak*

komnaty raspoloženy? 'How are the rooms situated?'.

The order of the information given about the apartment corresponds to the importance given such information in Soviet society. For example, because many of the twentieth-century apartments were built according to standardized plans, their layout is largely predictable. (See line 14 of example (19), where Natasha describes her home as a "Khruschev apartment.") The speakers I interviewed make some assumptions about what is interesting to the listener. Outside confirmation of this can be found by examining the want ad sections of Russian newspapers for apartment advertisements. Even a cursory glance at the advertisement section confirms the overall importance of the number of rooms and apartment size, as illustrated in (14), taken from a special want ad newspaper:

(14) *Vse dlja vas* No 11 (November 4-10, 1991), p.8:[6]

[Menjaju]	*Otličnuju*	*2-komnatnuju*	*kvartiru*	*(34,0 kv.m)*
[I exchange]	great	2-room	apartment	(34.0 sq.m)
kuxnja	*10 kv.m,*	*bol'šoj*	*xoll,*	16	*ètaž v*	*22-ètažnom dome,*
kitchen	10 sq. m	big	hall	16	floor in	22-floor building
m.	*«Kaširskaja»*	*na*	*3-komnatnuju*	*kvartiru*	*(ot 40 kv.m),*
metro	Kaširskaja	for	3-room	apartment	(from 40 sq.m)
kuxnja	*želatel'no*	*ot*	7 *kv.m,*	*r-n*
kitchen	preferably	from	7 sq.m	area
Krasnogvardejskij,	*Proletarskij,*	*centr.*
K.	P.	center

'[I am exchanging] a wonderful 2-room apartment (34 m²), kitchen 10 m², large hall, on the 16th floor of a 22-story building, metro "Kaširskaja", for a 3-room apartment (from 40 m²), with the kitchen from 7 m², in the Krasnogvardejskij or Proletarskij region, or the center'

Almost all advertisements begin with the number of rooms in the apartment which is frequently followed by stating the total number of square meters. The majority of advertisements also include the floor of the building on which the apartment is located, total number of floors in the building, and the nearest metro station. These may or may not be followed by a description of other amenities or features (such as telephone, balcony, etc.). The number of rooms and their size are the two most important features of Russian apartments for those seeking to rent or let an apartment.

---

[6] Such postings are typically organized in the want ad section of fewspapers in column headed *menjaju* 'I exchange', *prodaju* 'I sell', *snimu* 'I will rent' or *kuplju* 'I will buy'. These are all 1st person singular verb forms; *kuplju* and *snimu* are perfective verbs, while *menjaju* and *sdaju* are imperfective. It is unclear why the aspect should vary here.

In (13), *otličnuju 2-komnatnuju kvartiru* 'great 2-room apartment' (line 1) is in the accusative case as the first complement of the column heading *menjaju*. This is the usual format for such advertisements. In contrast, *kuxnja* 'kitchen' in the beginning of line 2 is in the nominative case, which is also typical. It seems that only the apartment itself is interpreted as the complement of the verb, while the individual rooms are attributes of the apartment and listed in citation form, i.e., the nominative case.

For describing the actual layout of the apartments, several possible techniques have been identified. These can be called the *mapping technique*, the *modeling technique* and the *tour-representing technique*. In the map-style description, the speaker presents a layout of the apartment from a bird's eye view. Map descriptions account for only 3% of Linde and Labov's corpus; there are no map descriptions in my data. An excerpt from one of their map-style descriptions will illustrate this:

(15) Linde and Labov 1975: 929, ex. 8:
      I'd say it's laid out in a huge square pattern, broken down into four units.
      If you were looking down at this apartment from a height, it would be like -
      like I said before, a huge square with two lines drawn thought the center
      to make like four smaller squares.

Another possible technique is the modeling technique: The modeling technique the speaker uses the room in which the conversation takes place as the model for the room that is to be described. So in describing the room, the speaker transfers features of that room to the speech location, relying on gestures and adverbs of primary deixis, such as *here* and *there*. Ullmer-Ehrich predicted that this would be logical strategy, and yet only one of a total of 20 speakers of German adopted this strategy in describing their dormitory rooms at the University of Düsseldorf. (Linde and Labov 1974 report no descriptions of this type.) Similarly, when native Russian speakers were asked to describe their Moscow apartments while they were seated in my office, no one used this technique. (One speaker did compare his bookcases to mine, although here he was specifically interested in the height and depth of the bookcases and the number of books. One other compares the size of a room to my office; see example (16) below.)

One reason that this technique was avoided may have been that both the German and Russian speakers were aware of the tape recorder and its failure to record the hand gestures necessary to make this technique successful. It would also seem to be a technique better suited to describing individual rooms than apartment layouts: The interview takes place in a room, which could then theoretically be used as the model for the room described. However, given that the Russian apartments are often so compact that their layout can be described from one vantage point, it would certainly be possible to have some point in the interview room serve as the reference point for that layout description. This was not a technique used by any speakers. Furthermore, although most speakers gave some kind of description of the individual rooms in the apartment, no one used this modeling technique to describe the contents of a given room. Thus although it is theoretically possible to make use of the physical aspects of the room to map one set of spatial structures onto another, Russian speakers do not use this technique in apartment descriptions. Instead, they give a grocery-style list of the features of a room, as seen in example (19).

Linde and Labov find that the overwhelming majority of subjects use an imaginary tour set up when describing their apartments. A tour is a speech act which provides a minimal set of paths by which each room could be entered (Linde and Labov 1974: 930). There are two basic kinds of vectors: Static type and mobile type. Starting at the front door, the subjects describe the apartments as if taking the interviewer on a tour. These "tours" included either static or mobile descriptions,

which correspond to Ullmer-Ehrich's findings that interviewees took the interviewers on imaginary tours of their dorm rooms by using either a "gaze" tour which relied on stationary verbs or a "walking" tour technique, which used motion verbs to move the interviewer/addressee along the imaginary path of the tour. (In Ullmer-Ehrich 1982, the speaker takes the listener on an imaginary tour around the walls of the room.)   This method relies heavily on hidden deixis, with speakers using such secondary deictics as *left, right, front, and back* relating the positions of the described objects to one another.

A prototypical tour begins at the entrance to the apartment. While the door itself is often mentioned, it may not be explicitly invoked. It is, however, inferrable, both from real-world knowledge and by the use of prefixed motion verbs which signal entrance (as in *kogda vy vxodite* 'when you enter'). This front door, and the figure's body position upon entering it, serve as the primary deictic center and viewpoint for the entire description. Consider the following example of a walking tour: The begins tour at the front door and moves the addressee down the hall through the apartment but without entering any rooms:

(16)   apartment description, Igor':

1   *Kogda*   **vy vxodite**   *v*   *moju*   *kvartiru,*   **pered**   **vami** *koridor,*
     when   you enter   into my   apartment   in front of   you   corridor

2   *sprava* *kuxnja 10 metrov (.)*   *èto* *čut'* *bol'še* *čem* *èta* *komnata.*
     to right kitchen of ten meters   this   bit   bigger   than   this   room

3   *Esli* **vy** **pojdete** **ešče**   **vpered** *(.)* *opjat'-taki* **sprava** **ot vas**   *nazyvaem*
     if   you   will go   still   ahead   again   to right of you   call

4   *my* *bol'šaja*   *komnata,* *zal,* *gostinaja (.)* *uh*   *raspoložen*
     we   big   room   hall   living room   uh   situated
     televizor,   *drugaja*
     television   another

5   *radioapparatura,*   *kresla,* *divan.* *èto* *komnata* *dlja (.)* *dlja* *gostej.*
     radio   chairs   couch   this   room   for   for   guests

6   *Uh*   *esli* *vy*   **projdete**   *ešče dal'še,*   **sleva**   *budet*   *komnata*
     Uh   if   you   will pass   still further   to left   will be   room
     moix   *roditelej*
     of my   parents

7   *Tam*   *že*   *lodža,*   *komnata* *z*   *lodžej,*   *lodža*   *prostornaja,*
     there   PART   balcony   room   with balcony   balcony   spacious,
     lodža (.)
     balcony

8   **Sprava** *byvšaja* *moja*   *komnata (.)* *Sejčas* *tam*   *živet*   *moj*   *brat (.)*
     to right former   my   room   now   there   lives   my   brother

9   *Da,*   *rjadom* *s* *moej* *komnatoj* *meždu*   *moej komnatoj*
     PART   next   to my   room   between   my   room
     moix   *roditelej*   *raspoložena* *vannaja,*   *tualet*
     of my   parents   situated   washroom   toilet

'When you enter my apartment, there is a corridor in front of you, to the right is a kitchen, ten meters in size. That's a bit bigger than this room. If you will continue going ahead, to your right is what we call the big room, or hall, or living

room, where there's a television, another radio, armchairs and a couch. This is a room for- for company. Uh- if you will pass even further [down the hall], to the left will be my parents' room. There [in this same place] there is a balcony, it's a room with a balcony, a spacious balcony, a balcony. To the right is my former room; my brother lives there now. And between my room and my parents' room there's a washroom and toilet.'

The addressee is envisioned as a figure on a tour which moves down the hall, stopping to describe the location of each room, diverging to give the contents of the large room, and always returning to the point of the tour where he left off. Motion along the path of this imaginary tour is denoted by a series of prefixed motion verbs: *Vxodite* 'you enter' (line 1) puts the figure inside the apartment at the front door; the figure's imagined position serves as origo, as seen in the phrase *pered vami* 'in front of you' in that same line, as well as *sprava* 'to the right' in line 2. Both are cases of hidden deixis, as the figure's position determines spatial relations. The postion of this origo changes as the tour moves through the apartment. Motion verbs (*pojdete* 'will go' in line 3; *projdete* 'will pass' in line 6) create the path of the tour and locate the relative position of the origo on the path with respect to the last referenced point, as shown by use of the adverbial phrases *ešče vpered* 'further ahead' (line 3) and *ešče dal'še* 'even further' (line 6). The position of the rooms continues to be determined with reference to this origo, as in *sleva* 'to the left' in line 6 and *sprava* 'to the right' in line 8. Only in line 9 is a non-deictic orientation point established, with the washroom and toilet situated between two stationary points.

The use of the front door as spatial zero-point is so common that its existence can be presupposed and treated as implicit. Evidence of its recoverability is seen in (17), where the apartment layout begins at the hall, presumably at the front door. It is mentioned for the first time only in line 9, when the speaker explicitly states this reference point to orient the figure on the path:

(17) apartment description, Natasha

1 *My*   *živem*   *na*   *vtorom*   *ètaže.*
 We   live   on   second   floor

2 *U nas*   *očen'*   *malen'kij*   *koridor*
 by us   very   small   hall

3 *Potom,*   *značit*   **napravo**   *i*   *vanna*   *i*   *tualet*   *èto*
 then   so   to right   and   washroom   and   toilet   this
 v odnoj   *komnate,*
 in one   room

4 *prjamo*   *takoj*   *ne bol'šoj*   *koridorčik i*   *kuxnja*
 straight   such   not large   hallway   and   kitchen

5 *uh*   **nalevo** –   *bol'šaja*   *komnata*   *i*   *my*   *nazyvaem* –
 uh   to left   big   room   and   we   call

6 *proxodnaja*   *komnata,*   *vot*   *èto*   *komnata*   *i*   **čerez**   **nee**
 passage   room   PART   this   room   and   through it

7 **nado projti**   *čtoby popast'*   *v*   *druguju*   *komnatu*
 must pass   in order to get   to   other   room

8 *potom   uh   esli   **povernut'   napravo***   *iz*   *malen'kogo*   *koridora,*
   then   uh   if   turn   to right   from   small   hall
9 ***gde (0.3)   kogda   my   tol'ko   vošli   v   kvartiru***
   where   when   we   only   enter   in   apartment
10   *malen'kij   koridor, **povoračivaem**   napravo*
   small   hall   turn[1st.pl.]   to right
11   *budet   ešče   raspolagaetsja   nebol'šaja,   malen'kaja   komnatka*
   will be   also   is situated   not large   small   room
12   *my   nazyvaem   kladovka*   [lists contents...]
   we   call   storage room
13   *Vot (0.3)   kvartira,   nu,   gde-to   29   kvadratnyx   metrov.*
   PART   apartment   PART   somewhere   29   square   meters
14   *Ne   očen'   bol'šaja.   My   nazyvaem   èto   xruščevskie   kvartiry,* [...]
   not   very   big   we   call   these   Khruschev   apartments

'We live on the second floor. We have a small hall. Then, to the right there's
both a washroom and a toilet. This is in one room. Straight ahead this kinda not
large hallway and the kitchen. Uh, to the left is the big room, the big room and
we call [it] the passage room. This is the room through which [lit. it] one must
pass to get to the other room. Uh if [you] turn to the right from the small hall
where ... when we had just come into the apartment, we turn to the right there
will be also is situated a not large, small room, we call [it] the storage room. [...]
So, the apartment, well, it's about 29 square meters. It's not very big. We call
these "Khruschev apartments." [...]

This tour shows an interesting combination of mobile and stationary vectors. The
front door as deictic center is implicit and treated as inferrable (as defined by Prince
1981). Directions are indicated with reference to its location, as in *napravo* 'to the
right' (line 3) and *nalevo* 'to the left' (line 5). This origo is overtly mentioned only
in line 9, following a pause. Here its mention seems to be a repair, a recognition
of the potential need to reestablish the orientation point for the addressee. Two
points are interesting here: The way the motion verbs create the path of the tour,
and the recoverability of the reference points along that path.
    But this is not typical of the descriptions in the corpus, which contains only these
two mobile tours. The remaining descriptions consist of static vectors, with rooms
situated along a path by existential predicates. This may in part simply reflect the
relatively small size of the sample. An additional explanation may lie in the
relatively simple and predictable floor plans; in (16) the tour consists of a straight
line down the hall. Most frequently, the description begins at the front door, but
the observer remains stationary. Verbs of motion are used in the description only
in an existential sense: They indicate how the various rooms are situated with
respect to each other, as illustrated in (18):

(18) *Mmm,   značit,   kogda   vy   vxodite   v   kvartiru*
    mmm   so   when   you   enter   in   apartment
    *sprava   ot vas   nebol'šoj   nebol'šoj   koridorčik **idet**   na   kuxnju*
    to right   of you   not large   not large   hallway   goes   to   kitchen

'mm, so when you go in the apartment
to your right a not large- not large hallway *goes* to the kitchen'

In these descriptions the front door acts as the deictic center and reference point; rooms are located in relation to that door from the point of view of the imaginary speaker standing there. But the addressee does take a tour of the apartment, as was seen in example (16). Instead, *idet* 'goes' is a stationary vector, signaling how the hallway is located in space. It does not denote a motion event, with a figure moving along a path.

In contrast, room descriptions in the corpus can be divided into two categories dependent upon whether the room is "entered" on the imaginary tour. Rooms that are not entered are described in terms of size (in square meters) and/or in terms of occupants. Rooms that are entered are described in terms of their contents, following more a listing technique than a tour. As shown in the following example, a typical room description, the speaker inventories the contents of each room in the apartment without firmly establishing one fixed point of reference. Objects are located non-deictically relative to one another, beginning with the window as reference point in line 3:

(19) kitchen description, Volodja

1 *kuxnja, kuxnja   metrov vosem' kvadratnyx   i   potolki tam*
  kitchen kitchen   meters   8   square   and   ceilings there
  dva   pjat'desjat
  2   50
2 *est'   xolodil'nik   stoit   okolo   okna,   kuxonnyj garnitur,*
  there is refrigerator   stands near   window   kitchen   cabinet set
3 *s   drugoj storony, belogo   sveta   plita   vdelana [??] v garnitur*
  on   other   side   of white color   stove   built in   in cabinet
4 *i   mojka   tože vdelana   v garnitur   stol   naprotiv,   s*
  and   basin   also built in   in cabinet   table   opposite   on
  drugoj   storon
  other   side
5 *mmm   u   toj   že   steny,   gde i   xolodil'nik,   časy,   stolovye,*
  mmm   on   that same   wall   where also refrigerator   clock,   table_[ADJ]
6 *n-na podokonnike stojat   cvety   na   xolodil'nike tože,   vot.*
  on   windowsill   stand   floors   on   refrigerator also   PART
7 *pro   kuxnju   vse, da, dver' so   steklom   tam   ešče.*
  about   kitchen   all   yes   door with glass   there   also

'The kitchen, the kitchen is about 8 square meters and the ceilings there are two and half meters. There's a refrigerator which stands near the window, a white kitchen cabinet, on the other side, with a built-in stove and the basin (sink) is also built into the cabinet. The table is opposite, on the other side, mmm, on the same wall as the refrigerator. There's a table clock and on the windowsill are some flowers, and on the refrigerator as well. That's it for the kitchen, well yes, there's also a door with a glass window there.'

This room description is representative of the corpus. There is no single fixed origo in this description, and the spatial configurations rely minimally on deictic relations, consisting primarily of non-deictic stationary vectors. The spatial orientation point shifts throughout, but note that none of the description depends on the location of an observer. Rather, objects are located relative to one another, regardless of any deictic reference point. For example, the first orientation point is established in line 2, with the refrigerator located next to the window. In line 4 the kitchen cabinet is identified as standing opposite it. At this point there is a brief shift, with the cabinet serving as central to the spatial domain: The stove and sink are built into it. Similar anchorings are seen in lines 4 and 6.

Thus, while the room descriptions are characterized by a listing technique with stative predicates, the apartment descriptions are categorized either as walking tours or gaze tours with active predicates. This predicate distribution is typical for lists versus narratives (Schiffrin 1994: 304). The active predicates in the apartment descriptions entail imagined or visual movement along a path. This illustrates the role of paths in establishing coherence in the text: The paths represent a structure around which the description is built.

5. Conclusion

It can now be seen that the apartment descriptions resemble narratives, but with an underlying difference in their spatial versus temporal relationships. A narrative is characterized by sequentially ordered event clauses which constitute its temporal backbone. As the narrative progresses, so too does narrative time: The event clauses advance the reference time. In a narrative time is represented as a linear string of events, and backgrounded, non-plot-advancing information can be seen as offshoots along that time line.

Analogously, an apartment description consists of a linear path through the apartment. The path advances as the imagined figure moves along it from room to room. The front door serves as a the primary spatial orientation point, and the position of a figure with reference to that origo may be presupposed or may be explicitly invoked. The location of individual rooms serve as intermediary points along that path, and are situated with reference to the figure's body position and the front door. The rooms serve as subsequent reference points along the path which, along with the front door, can be reinvoked in order to reestablish deictic orientation. (Such spatial backtracks may be similar to temporal backtracks in narrative, after which one returns to the last predicated event in the narrative.) In this way the paths provide a superordinate structure for the apartment descriptions and help to establish coherence in the text.

Appendix

Transcription conventions
.　　sentence final falling intonation
,　　clause final intonation
(.)　　brief unmeasured pause
0.3　　measured pause (minutes.seconds)
[???]　unintelligible syllables
[...]　my ellipsis
PART　particle
ADJ　adjectival

References

Andrews, Edna (1984) A semantic analysis of Russian prepositions/preverbs *O(-)* and *OB*. *Slavic and East European Journal* 28.4: 477-492.

Apresjan, Ju.D. (1974) *Leksičeskaja semantika. Sinonimičeskie sredstva jazyka*. Moscow: Nauka.

Apresjan, Ju.D. (1986) Dejksis v leksike i grammatike i naivnaja model'mira. In A.I. Mixajlov (ed.), *Semiotika i informatika. Sbornik naučnyx statej*, vyp. 28. Moscow: AN SSSR, pp. 5-33.

Bogusławski, Andrzej (1963) *Prefiksacija czasownika we współczesnym języku rosyjskim.* Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Bonnèr, Elena (1991) *Dočki–materi.* New York: Izdatel'stvo imeni Cexova.

Bühler, Karl (1934) *Sprachteorie: Die Darstellungfunktion der Sprache.* Jena: Fischer.

Bulgakov, Mixail (1973) *Master i Margarita.* Ann Arbor: Ardis.

Cienki, Alan J. (1989) *Spatial cognition and the semantics of prepositions in English, Polish, and Russian.* Slavistische Beiträge, Band 237. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Clark, Eve (1974) Normal states and evaluative viewpoints. *Language* 50: 316-332.

Fillmore, Charles J. (1966) Deictic categories in the semantics of 'come'. *Word* 19: 208-231.

Fillmore, Charles J. (1973) May we come in? *Semiotika* IX: 97-115.

Fillmore, Charles J. (1975) *Santa Cruz lectures on deixis 1971.* Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Fillmore, Charles J. (1976) Pragmatics and the description of discourse. In S. Schmidt (ed.), *Pragmatik II*: Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, pp. 84-104.

Fillmore, Charles J. (1982) Towards a descriptive framework for spatial deixis. In Robert J. Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein (eds.), *Speech, place and actions: Studies in deixis and related topics*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, pp. 31-59.

Flier, Michael S. (1975) Remarks on Russian verbal prefixation. *Slavic and East European Journal* 19: 218-229.

Flier, Michael S. (1984) Syntagmatic constraints on the Russian prefix *pere-*. In Michael S. Flier and Richard D. Brecht (eds.), *Issues in Russian morphosyntax*. UCLA Slavic Studies, vol. 10. Columbus, OH: Slavica, pp. 13-154.

Flier, Michael S. (1985) The scope of prefixal delimitation in Russian. In Michael S. Flier and Alan Timberlake (eds.), *The Scope of Slavic aspect*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, pp. 41-58.

Gallant, James (1979) *Russian verbal prefixation and semantic features: An analysis of the prefix VZ-*. Slavistische Beiträge, no. 135. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Grenoble, Lenore (1991) Deixis, point of view, and the prefixes *po-* and *pri-* in Russian. *Die Welt der Slaven* XXXVI/1:254-270.

Hanks, William (1990) *Referential practics. Language and lived space among the Maya*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Herskovits, Annette (1986) *Language and spatial cognition. An interdisciplinary study of the prepositions in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, Clifford (1982) Up/down, front/back, left/right. A contrastive study of Hausa and English. In Jürgen Weissenborn and Wolfgang Klein (eds.), *Here & there. Cross-linguistic studies on deixis and demonstration*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 13-42.

Janda, Laura (1985) The meanings of Russian verbal prefixes: Semantics and grammar. Michael S. Flier and Alan Timberlake (eds.), *The scope of Slavic aspect*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, pp. 26-40.

Janda, Laura (1986) *A Semantic analysis of the Russian verbal prefixes ZA-, PERE-, DO-, and OT-*. Slavistische Beiträge, no. 192. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Klein, Wolfgang (1982) Local deixis in route directions. In Robert J. Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein (eds.), *Speech, place and action. Studies in deixis and related topics*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 161-182.

Klein, Wolfgang (1983) Deixis and spatial orientation in route directions. In H.L. Pick Jr. and L.P. Acredolo, *Spatial orientation: Theory, research and application*. New York: Plenum Press, pp. 283-311.

Kuno, Susumu (1978) Three perspectives in the functional approach to syntax. In Ladislav Matejka (ed.), *Sound, sign and meaning. Quinquagenary of the Prague Linguistic Circle*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, pp. 119-190.

Kuno, Susumu (1987) *Functional syntax. Anaphora, discourse, and empathy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Linde, Charlotte and William Labov (1975) Spatial networks as a site for the study of language and thought. *Language* 51: 924-939.

Lyons, John (1977) *Semantics I and II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nichols, Johanna (1984) The grammatical marking of theme in literary Russian. In Michael S. Flier and Richard D. Brecht, (eds.), *Issues in Russian morphosyntax*. Columbus: Slavica, pp. 170-186.

Prince, Ellen (1981) Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In P. Cole, *Radical pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 233-256.

Russell, Pamela (1985) Aspectual properties of the Russian verbal prefix *na-*. In Michael S. Flier

and Alan Timberlake (eds.), *The scope of Slavic aspect*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, pp. 59-75.

Schiffrin, Deborah (1994) Approaches to Discourse. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Talmy, Leonard (1975) Semantics and syntax of motion. In John Kimball (ed.), *Syntax and semantics. Vol. 4.* New York: Academic Press, pp. 181-238.

Talmy, Leonard (1983) How language structures space. In H.L. Pick Jr. and L.P. Acredolo, *Spatial orientation: Theory, research and application*. New York: Plenum Press, pp. 225-282.

Timberlake, Alan (1982) Invariance and and the syntax of Russian aspect. In Paul Hopper (ed.), *Tense-aspect: Between semantics & pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 305-331.

Ullmer-Ehrich, Veronika (1982) The structure of living space descriptions. In Robert J. Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein (eds.), *Speech, place and action. Studies in deixis and related topics*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 219-250.

Wunderlich, Dieter and Rudolf Reinelt (1982) How to get there from here. In Robert J. Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein (eds.), *Speech, place and action. Studies in deixis and related topics*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 183-201.

Yokoyama, Olga and Emily Klenin (1978) The semantics of 'optional' rules: Russian personal and reflexive pronouns. In Ladislav Matejka (ed.), *Sound, sign and meaning. Quinquagenary of the Prague Linguistic Circle*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, pp. 249-270.

Yokoyama, Olga (1988) *Shifters and non-verbal categories of Russian*. In Linda Waugh and Stephen Rudy (eds.), *New vistas in grammar: Invariance and variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 363-386.