

Valentina Apresjan *
(Moscow)

‘HERE’ AND ‘NOW’

A b s t r a c t. While space-time metaphor is a source of regular prepositional and adverbial polysemy, in deixis, spatial words are generally not prone to evolving into temporal markers. However, Russian spatial proximity marker *tut* ‘here,’ which develops temporal proximity meanings, demonstrates a deviation from this tendency. Its meaning, though, is different from the meanings of classical deictic markers of temporal proximity, such as *sejčas* ‘now.’ *Tut* develops a synthetic meaning of *actuality*, which comprises the following semantic elements: (a) time period which includes the moment of speech, and such moments preceding and following it that are sufficiently close to the moment of speech to retain connection with it; (b) physical or mental space that includes the speaker; (c) a situation where the speaker is either a participant or an observer. Besides its special semantic properties, *tut* is characterized by communicative and prosodic peculiarities.

K e y w o r d s: spatial and temporal deixis, moment of speech, semantics, prosody, communicative function.

1. Temporal meanings of *tut* ‘here’

Space-time is one of the most universal and well-established linguistic metaphors which accounts for a considerable part of regular prepositional and adverbial polysemy. However, deixis tends to be an exception to this semantic tendency, as spacial and temporal deictic meanings normally possess independent means of expression. Use of spacial deixis to express temporality is at the very least not a widely spread tendency in European languages, thus, *here* does not mean *now*, Russian *zdes’* does not mean *sejčas*, *ici* does not mean *maintenant*, *hier* does not mean *jetzt*, etc. Situations when spacial deictic words develop temporal meanings, as it happens in Norwegian, appear rather exotic¹.

The main markers of temporal proximity in Russian are deictic adverbs *sejčas* ‘now’ and *teper’* ‘now,’ exhaustively described by the jubilarian Igor Mel’čuk in his 1995 treatise (Mel’čuk 1995: 55—79); cf. also a similar analysis in (Uryson

¹ Cf. [Fretheim 2010] on Norwegian *her* ‘here’ as a temporal proximity marker: *Jeg var i London her i oktober* ‘I was in London *here* in October’ [*this* October, which is closest to the moment of speech] vs. *Jeg var i London i oktober* ‘I was in London in October’ [the October of *any* year].

2004: 1009—1013). *Sejčas*, with its relative semantic universality, can refer both to the moment of speech, as well as to the moments immediately preceding and following it, as in (1—3).

- (1) *My sejčas čitaem «Prestuplenie i nakazanie»*
 ‘We now are reading «Crime and Punishment»’
 [at the moment of speech];
- (2) *My sejčas čitali «Prestuplenie i nakazanie»*
 ‘We now were reading «Crime and Punishment»’
 ‘We have just read «Crime and Punishment»’
 [shortly before the moment of speech];
- (3) *Sejčas my budem čitat’ «Prestuplenie i nakazanie»*
 ‘Sejčas we will read «Crime and Punishment»’
 ‘We will now be reading «Crime and Punishment»’
 [shortly after the moment of speech]

Teper’ is semantically more complex and expresses taxis, as it introduces a situation which necessarily follows another one; cf. contrastive examples in (2a-b).

- (4a) *Mne sejčas neudobno s nim razgovarivat’*
 ‘To me *sejčas* inconvenient with him to talk’
 ‘Right now it is not convenient for me to talk with him’;
- (4b) *Mne teper’ neudobno s nim razgovarivat’*
 ‘To me *teper’* inconvenient with him to talk’
 ‘After what happened, I do not feel comfortable talking with him’.

Tut ‘here’ in its temporal proximity meanings (of which we consider two) combines semantic elements of both *sejčas* and *teper’*, at the same time differing from both these items. This paper explores two temporal proximity meanings of *tut*, one, which is closer to *teper’*, as it expresses taxis, and another, which is closer to *sejčas*, as it expresses the moment of speech and moments preceding and following it.

1.1. *Tut*¹: the idea of taxis

1.1.1. Consecutive situations

In its first temporal meaning, *tut* expresses the idea of two consecutive situations. *Tut*¹ introduces the second situation, prior to which something else has happened:

- (5a) *Ja uže sobiralas uxodit’ [A1], i tut mne nakonec pozvonili [A2]*
 ‘I was just going to leave, and here they finally called’
 ‘I was just going to leave, and then they finally called’.

In this respect, it is reminiscent of *teper'*, though *teper'*, unlike *tut'*, implies that the second situation takes place at the moment of speech. *Tut'*, on the other hand, as (5a) shows, normally involves two consecutive situations in the past, in the likeness of such adverbs as *vskore* 'soon after' and *srazu že* 'right away'.

1.1.2 Immediate following of situations: the unity of time

Though *vskore* 'soon after' and *srazu že* 'right away' both refer to a *swift* change of situations A1 and A2, *tut'* appears to be even stronger in this respect. It allows for no time gap between A1 and A2, however small this gap might be. In other words, A1 is *immediately* followed by A2, or else they even overlap in time; at any rate, these situations are conceived of as parts of the *same short* time period. This temporal peculiarity of *tut'* may be a reflection of its first, locative meaning of immediate proximity. Consider the following contrastive pair, with natural (6a) and unnatural (6b):

- (6a) *Oni nanjali xorošego advokata i vskore (srazu že) vse probleme byli ulaženy*
 'They hired a good lawyer and all the problems were solved soon after (right away)';
- (6b) ^{??}*Oni nanjali xorošego advokata i tut vse probleme byli ulaženy*
 'They hired a good lawyer and *here* all the problems were solved'.

1.1.3. The unity of space

Besides implying the same time period for the two consecutive situations, *tut'* also requires that they take place in the same locus. Consider the following pair of examples, where the natural (2a) involves the same physical space for A1 and A2 and the unnatural (2b) which refers to two different physical spaces:

- (7a) *Uragan sorval kryšu saraja i tut prekratilsja*
 'The tornado tore off the roof of the shed and *here* stopped'
 'The tornado tore off the roof of the shed and then immediately stopped';
- (7b) ^{??}*Uragan sorval kryšu saraja i tut prekratilsja v Novoj Anglii*
 'The tornado tore off the roof of the shed and *here* stopped in New England'
 'The tornado tore off the roof of the shed and then immediately stopped in New England'.

However, if the physically different spaces are conceived of as parts of the same mental space, the use of *tut'* becomes possible:

- (8) *V 1830 Alžir byl zaxvačen francuzami, i tut vo Francii razrazilas’ revoliucija*
 ‘In 1830 Algeria was occupied by the French, and here in France revolution broke out’
 ‘In 1930 Algeria was occupied by the French and then immediately a revolution broke out in France’.

Thus, *tut*¹ implies an observer, a viewer of a kind (who may also be a participant), who is watching a certain chain of events, as if unwrapping onstage, where a necessary condition is the unity of time and space. This semantic feature has aspectological consequences: in the context of *tut*¹, verbs are frequently used in Praesens scenicum, thus enhancing the effect of an eye-witness running commentary: *I tut on vxodit* ‘And here he comes in’.

Another verbal combinatory consequence of this semantic feature of *tut*¹ concerns the forms of Active vs. Passive voice. *Tut*¹ tends to avoid co-occurrence with passive perfective verbs in the past (although past perfective verbs in active voice, as well as passive verbs in the present are allowed). Other markers of a swift following of situations, such as *vskore* ‘soon after’ and *srazu že* ‘right away’, do not possess a similar limitation. Consider the following possible and impossible phrases:

- (9a) *My kupili mašinu, i tut rjadom s nami postroili novuju stanciju metro*
 ‘We bought a car, and here next to us they built a new subway station’
 [possible co-occurrence of *tut* with an active verb in past perfective];
- (9b) *My kupjaem mašinu, i tut rjadom s nami stroitsja novaja stancija metro*
 ‘We are buying a car, and here next to us is being built a new subway station’
 [possible co-occurrence of *tut* with a passive verb in Praesens scenicum];
- (9c) ^{??}*My kupili mašinu, i tut rjadom s nami byla postroena novaja stancija metro*
 ‘We bought a car, and here next to us was built a new subway station’
 [impossible co-occurrence of *tut* with a passive verb in past perfective];
- (9d) *My kupili mašinu, i vskore rjadom s nami byla postroena novaja stancija metro*
 ‘We bought a car, and soon next to us was built a new subway station’
 [possible co-occurrence of *vskore* ‘soon after’ with a passive verb in past perfective].

A possible semantic explanation for this combinatory property of *tut*¹ is that the meaning of Russian verb forms in passive past perfective includes an indication of certain objectivization and distancing, which prevents events, expressed by such forms, from being conceptualized as actually unwrapping before the observer’s real or mental eyes.

1.1.4. Suddenness

Finally, *tut*¹ contains the component of *unexpectedness* of situation A2 following situation A1; thus, *tut*¹ does not normally occur in descriptions of routine chains of actions, or else expected, natural outcomes. In this respect, it also differs from such adverbs as *potom* ‘then’, *posle etogo* ‘after that’, *vskore* ‘soon’; cf. the following natural and unnatural phrases:

- (10a) *On vključil kompjuter, i potom (posle etogo) podsoedinil ego k projektoru*
‘He turned on the computer, and then (after that) connected it to the projector’;
- (10b) ^{??}*On vključil kompjuter, i tut podsoedinil ego k projektoru*
‘He turned on the computer, and here connected it to the projector’ [expected outcome, the use of *tut* is impossible];
- (10c) *On vključil kompjuter, i tut proizošlo korotkoe zamykanie*
‘He turned on the computer, and here a short circuit happened’ [unexpected outcome, the use of *tut* is possible].

Cf. also the following triad of examples:

- (11a) *On sdelał ej predloženie, i vskore ona vyšla za nego zamuž*
‘He proposed to her, and soon she married him’;
- (11b) ^{??}*On sdelał ej predloženie, i tut ona vyšla za nego zamuž*
‘He proposed to her, and here she married him’ [expected outcome, the use of *tut* is impossible];
- (11c) *On sdelał ej predloženie, i tut ona skazala emu, čto ona ego nenavidit*
‘He proposed to her, and here she told him that she hated him’ [unexpected outcome, the use of *tut* is possible].

Because the component of unexpectedness is pragmatically marked, *tut*¹ constitutes part of the rheme and often co-occurs with a contrastive intensifying particle *-to*:

- (12) *On sdelał ej predloženie v četvertyj raz, i tut-to ona nakonec soglasilas’*
‘He proposed to her for the fourth time, and here-to she finally accepted’.

The combination of the semantic components of ‘unexpectedness’ and ‘immediate following’ creates the semantic component of ‘suddenness’ in the meaning of *tut*¹. Therefore, *tut*¹ shares a certain semantic property with the adverb *vnezapno* ‘suddenly’, absent in the adverb *neožidanno* ‘unexpectedly’. Namely, while both an event and a non-event can be *unexpected*, only events can be *sudden*. Therefore, neither *vnezapno* ‘suddenly’ nor *tut*¹ can, unlike *neožidanno* ‘unexpectedly’, introduce a non-event; cf. the following triad of examples:

- (13a) *Grabitel’ prygnul v mašinu, no ona neožidanno ne zavelas’*
 ‘The robber jumped into the car but *unexpectedly* it did not start’;
 (13b) ??*Grabitel’ prygnul v mašinu, no ona vnezapno ne zavelas’*
 ??‘The robber jumped into the car but *suddenly* it did not start’;
 (13c) ??*Grabitel’ prygnul v mašinu, no tut ona ne zavelas’*
 ‘The robber jumped into the car but *here* it did not start’.

This, the meaning of *tut*¹ can be formulated as follows:

- (14) *A1, tut A2* ‘Situation A2 started to take place unexpectedly for the observer, immediately after situation A1, and in the same physical or mental space as the situation A1’.

1.2. *Tut*² vs. *sejčas*: the idea of actuality

1.2.1. *Tut*² and *sejčas*: general overview

In its second temporal meaning, *tut* is comparable to *sejčas* ‘now’, the main deictic marker of present-time reference in Russian. As shown in (Mel’čuk 1995: 59) and (Uryson 2004: 1009), *sejčas* can refer to the moment of speech, as well as to the moments «surrounding it», which Mel’čuk and Uryson describe, respectively, as three different meanings (‘at the moment of speech’, ‘at the closest moment after the moment of speech’ and ‘at the closest moment before the moment of speech’) or as one synthetic meaning ‘at the moment of speech or during the time interval including the moment of speech’. *Tut* has three similar usages, considered in this paper as different realizations of the same meaning; cf. the following examples, where either *tut* or *sejčas* can be used:

- (15a) *Ja tut <sejčas> zanjata nemnogo, pozvoni popožže*
 ‘I *here <now>* busy a little, call later’
 ‘I am a little busy *right now*, call later’;
 (15b) *Ja tut <sejčas> s nim pogovorila, vse v porjadke*
 ‘I *here <now>* with him talked, all in order’
 ‘I have *just* talked with him, everything is fine’;
 (15c) *Ja tut budu zanimat’sja grantom, mne ponadobjatsja finansovye dokumenty*
 ‘I *here <now>* will occupy myself with grant, to-me needed financial documents’
 ‘I am going to work on the grant *right now* and will need financial documents’.

The purpose of the following sections is to explore grammatical, communicative, and semantic differences between *tut*² and *sejčas*, which would explain the

necessity for another marker of present-time reference, and to formulate the meaning of *tut*².

1.2.2. *Tut*² and *sejčas*: grammatical differences

The first distinction between *tut*² and *sejčas* concerns their grammatical status. While *sejčas* is a full-fledged adverb, *tut*² is a particle, which is reflected in its prosodic and communicative properties. Unlike *sejčas*, it cannot bear any kind of logical or phrasal stress (or be part of a prosodic group bearing stress) — it is, in fact, a clitic, and it cannot be placed in the focus of attention, thus being unable to serve as a contrastive theme or part of the rheme. In this respect, *tut*² differs from *tut*¹, as well. Cf. the following phrases:

- (16a) — *Kogda ty eto budeš delat'?* — ↓ *Sejčas*
 ‘— When are you going to do this? — Now’;
 (16b) — **Kogda ty eto budeš delat'?* — ↓ *Tut*
 ‘— *When are you going to do this? — Here’ [*tut* is a rheme and prosodically marked, the phrase is impossible].
 (17a) *Eto nado sdelat' ne* ↑ *prosto sejčas*, a ↓ *prjamo sejčas*
 ‘This has to be done not just now, but right now’;
 (17b) *Eto nado sdelat' ne* ↑ *prosto tut*, a ↓ *prjamo tut*
 ‘This has to be done not just here, but right here’ [*tut* is part of a contrastive rheme, the phrase is impossible in the temporal interpretation]².

As the above examples demonstrate, focalizing *tut*² results either in an anomaly or in the locative interpretation: as a present-time marker, *tut* is a half-grammaticalized particle with the prosodic properties of a clitic. Interestingly, *tut*² is frequently used in conjunction with *sejčas*, which would have been impossible if these synonymous items possessed the same grammatical status. Thus, *sejčas* is impossible in combination with its synonym *v dannyj moment* ‘at this moment’, because the latter is also a regular adverb. Consider the following examples:

- (18a) *Ja tut sejčas otčet pišu.*
 ‘I here now report write’
 ‘I am writing a report right now’;
 (18b) **Ja sejčas v dannyj moment otčet pišu.*
 ‘I now at this moment report write’
 *‘I am writing a report now at this moment’.

² Note that locative interpretation is possible, since in the function of locative deictic marker, *tut* is a regular adverb and, as such, can easily be focalized.

1.2.3. *Tut*² and *sejčas*: semantic differences

Despite their similarities as present-time and temporal proximity markers, *tut*² and *sejčas* also possess significant semantic differences. To elicit them, we will consider phrases where only one of these markers is possible.

1. First, we will examine phrases where *sejčas*, but not *tut*², is possible. Such phrases, where *sejčas* is communicatively and prosodically marked, are automatically impossible for *tut*², as shown in the previous section, and are not therefore analyzed. Thus, phrases that are considered below, are impossible for *tut*² for purely semantic reasons.

- (19a) *V Antarktide sejčas morozy za sorok*
 ‘In Antarctica *now* frosts below zero’
 ‘The temperatures are more than forty below zero in Antarctica *now*’;
- (19b) **V Antarktide tut morozy za sorok*
 ‘In Antarctica *here* frosts below zero’
 ‘The temperatures are below zero *here* in Antarctica’ [impossible with temporal interpretation].

The pair (19a-b) appears to suggest that *tut*² is impossible in explicitly locative contexts, but this is not the case; cf. the following locative contexts where both *sejčas* and *tut*² are equally possible:

- (20a) *V Moskve sejčas opjat’ žara pod sorok*
 ‘In Moscow *now* it is heat just under forty’;
- (20b) *V Moskve tut opjat’ žara pod sorok*
 ‘In Moscow *here* it is heat just under forty’.

One could further hypothesize that *tut*², with a trace of its original locative semantics, might require the speaker to be in the same space as the situation (s)he is describing, which is easier attained in the case of Moscow than in the case of Antarctica, but this is not entirely so, either. Thus, a Muscovite or a Saint-Petersburger can perfectly naturally utter the following phrase, where physical locations of the speaker and of the situation differ:

- (21) *V Finljandii tut v očerednoj raz povysili ceny na alkogol’, i vse stali ezdit’ za vodkoj k nam*
 ‘In Finland *here* once again they raised alcohol prices, and everyone stared coming for vodka to us’.

Thus, it seems that the actual limitation on the use of *tut*² in its temporal meaning is that the speaker be located in the same *mental* space as the situation (s)he is describing, but the actual *physical* spaces can be different. The requirement of a

single mental space for *tut*² (which *sejčas* lacks) is confirmed by the fact that one utterance with cannot reference two different locations, as the speaker cannot be in two places simultaneously, even, it seems, mentally:

(21a) *V Moskve sejčas teplo, a v Pitere sejčas xolodno*

‘In Moscow it is *now* warm, and in Saint-Petersburg it is *now* cold’;

(21b) **V Moskve tut teplo, a v Pitere tut xolodno*

‘In Moscow it is *here* warm, and in Saint-Petersburg it is *here* cold’.

One could argue that *tut* has a purely locative meaning in (21b), which explains its impossibility. However, this is not the case; the temporal proximity particle *tut* cannot be used when talking about events long past, even if they happened in the same physical space where the speaker is presently located, thus (22) is impossible:

(22) **V Rossii tut v 19 veke byla vojna s Napoleonom*

‘In Russia *here* in the 19 century there was a war with Napoleon’.

To make (22) possible with the locative interpretation, *tut* needs to be moved to the position of a sentential adverb:

(23) *Tut, v Rossii, v 19 veke byla vojna s Napoleonom*

‘*Here*, in Russia, in the 19 century there was a war with Napoleon’.

Thus, the first important semantic distinction between *sejčas* and *tut*² concerns the spatial component. *Sejčas* imposes constraints only on the time of the event, but not on its place; *tut* imposes both temporal and spatial constraints, requiring the *space of the situation be the same as the mental space where the speaker places herself*.

2. Second, we will consider phrases where *tut*² is possible but *sejčas* is not. Compare the following pairs of phrases, where the phrases with *tut*² are correct, but substitution with *sejčas* renders them ungrammatical:

(24a) *Ja tut v prošlom godu byla v Londone*

‘I *here* last year was in London’;

(24b) **Ja sejčas v prošlom godu byla v Londone*

‘I *now* last year was in London’;

(25a) *Ja tut v buduščem godu budu v Londone*

‘I *here* next year will be in London’;

(25b) **Ja sejčas v buduščem godu budu v Londone*

‘I *now* next year will be in London’.

Thus, although *sejčas*, as pointed out in (Mel’čuk 1995: 59) and (Uryson 2004: 1009), can refer to moments before and after the moment of speech, *tut*² allows for a longer inclusive time period. In fact, it appears that however short the time period

before and after the moment of speech, *sejčas* prohibits any direct reference to it; cf. the following ungrammatical phrases:

- (26a) **Ja sejčas pjat minut nazad s nim govorila*
 ‘I now five minutes ago spoke to him’;
 (26b) **Ja sejčas čerez pjat minut budu s nim govorit’*
 ‘I now in five minutes will speak to him’.

Thus, definitions proposed in (Mel’čuk 1995: 59), where *sejčas* is described as referring to the moment of speech, the moment immediately preceding the moment of speech, or the the moment immediately following the moment of speech, are more precise than the ones proposed in (Uryson 2004: 1009), where *sejčas* is described as referring to the time period including the moment of speech. The latter definition does not account for the incompatibility of *sejčas* with any time modifier defining the length of the period preceding or following the moment of speech. However, if the idea of *immediate* precedence or following is accepted, this combinatory limitation makes perfect sense.

*Tut*², although it is more inclusive than *sejčas*, and allows for an actual *period*, not merely a *moment*, before and after the moment of speech, to be included in the time reference, still poses certain limitations on its length. Thus, the following phrases are impossible:

- (27a) **Ja tut tridcat’ let nazad byla v Londone*
 ‘I here thirty years ago was in London’;
 (27b) **Ja tut čerez tridcat’ let vyplaču kredit za kvartiru’*
 ‘I here in thirty years will pay my mortgage’.

Thus, the time restrictions on the use of *tut*² can be formulated as follows: *tut*² refers either to the moment of speech or to such moments before / after the moment of speech, which still retain their relevance and connection with it. Cf. a rather long inclusive time period, which is possible as time reference for *tut*² precisely for the reason that it retains connection with the present moment:

- (28a) *Ja tut god nazad byla v Londone i kupila sebe kuču odeždy*
 ‘I here a year ago was in London and bought myself plenty of clothes’
 [with the implication that I therefore do not need to buy any new clothes at the moment of speech];
 (28b) *Ja tut čerez god vyplaču kredit za kvartiru*
 ‘I here in a year will pay my mortgage’
 [with the implication that soon after the moment of speech I will be able to afford other expenses].

In this respect, *tut*² differs not only from *sejčas*, but from also from *tut*¹, which points to an immediate following of the situations.

3. The third semantic distinction between *tut*² and *sejčas* can be illustrated by the following pairs of phrases, where the former is possible, but the latter is inappropriate.

- (29a) *My tut polagaem, čto pora dejstvovat*
 ‘We *here* suppose that it is time to act’;
 (29b) **My sejčas polagaem, čto pora dejstvovat*
 ‘We *now* suppose that it is time to act’.
- (30a) *Ja tut koe-čto o njom znaju, no vam ne skažu*
 ‘I *here* know something about him, but won’t tell you’;
 (30b) **Ja sejčas koe-čto o njom znaju, no vam ne skažu*
 ‘I *now* know something about him, but won’t tell you’.

Phrases (29b) and (30b) are impossible because the ideas of a *stable opinion* (expressed by *polagat* ‘to suppose’) and especially of *knowledge* (expressed by *znat* ‘to know’) are by their very nature incompatible with the idea of a *fleeting, swift-passing* existence, as suggested by *sejčas* with its reference to the moment of speech or the short moments surrounding it. *Tut*², however, is possible in these two contexts, which means that this particle contains some other semantic components rather than a mere direct reference to a relatively short period of time.

It appears that *tut*² expresses a more complex idea of *actuality*, which combines different semantic components: (a) the period of time, which includes the moment of speech and such moments in the past and in the future that retain connection with it; (b) the space which includes the situation and the speaker; (c) the situation, of which the speaker is either a participant or an observer (which logically follows from (a) and (b)). In this respect, *tut*² is similar to *tut*¹, as both imply the presence (at least mental presence) of the speaker on the scene, which creates the effect of evidentiality, of a broadcast.

Thus, though temporality is incorporated in the meaning of *tut*², it does not exhaust its meaning. Phrases (29a) and (30a) are made possible by this component of evidentiality contained in *tut*², as opposed to the more objective *sejčas*. In phrases (29a) and (30a), the speaker reports on his/her mental state to which (s)he is privy, rather than objectively describes the present state of affairs.

This special role of the speaker in the situation (s)he describes is confirmed by combinatory properties of *tut*², especially its co-occurrence with mental predicates. In the Russian National Corpus, out of 53 total occurrences of *tut*² with mental predicates, 49 are with the verbs in the 1-st person (as in *Ja tut podumal* ‘It *here* came to my mind’), indicating the active role of the speaker in the situation.

Even when the speaker is not a participant in the situation, (s)he is usually an observer; cf. the following phrases:

- (31a) *On tut kričit na svoego rebenka*
 ‘He here is yelling at his child’ [the speaker is an observer of a situation, which is unfolding before her eyes as she speaks];
- (31b) *Vasja tut nogu slomal*
 ‘Vasja here has broken his leg’ [the speaker is an indirect participant of the situation; the phrase is natural when Vasja is part of the speaker’s personal world, and when this event somehow concerns the speaker — e.g., (s)he has to drive Vasja to hospital].
4. Thus, the meaning of *tut*² can be formulated as follows:
- (32) *Tut A1* ‘Situation A1, of which the speaker is usually a participant or an observer, takes place in the same real or mental space where the speaker is located, during the period of time which includes the moment of speech and such moments before and after it when the situation A1 retains connection with it’.

Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by the following grants: grant of the Program for Fundamental Research OIFN RAN «Language and Literature in the context of Cultural Dynamics», grant of the Russian State Humanities Fund No 10-04-00273a, grant NSH-6577.2012.6 for the support of research conducted by the leading scientific schools, grant of the Scientific Fund of the Higher School of Economics.

Bibliography

- Borisova, Ovchinnikova 2011 — *Borisova E. G., Ovchinnikova T. E.* Parameter of nearness in metaphorical space [Parametr blizosti v metaforicheskom prostranstve] // Computational linguistics and intellectual technologies. Papers from the annual international conference Dialogue’2011. Moscow: RGGU, 2011. P. 153—158.
- Fretheim 2010 — *Fretheim T.* Reference to the near past by means of the Norwegian «spatial» term ‘her’ (here). Unpublished paper presented at Space and Time across Language, Disciplines and Cultures conference. Cambridge (UK), 2010.
- Mel’čuk 1995 — *Mel’čuk I. A.* ‘SEJCHAS’ and ‘TEPER’ in contemporary Russian [‘SEJCHAS’ i ‘TEPER’ v sovremennom russkom jazyke’] // Russian Language in «Meaning — Text» model. M.; Vienna, 1995. P. 55—79.
- Uryson 2004 — *Uryson E. U.* Synonymic entry SEJCHAS 1 [Sinonimicheskii riad SEJCHAS 1] // New Explanatory Dictionary of Russian Language Synonyms. Second edition, revised and updated. Under the guidance of Iu. D. Apresian. Iu. D. Apresian, V. Iu. Apresian, E. E. Babaeva, O. Iu. Boguslavskaja, I. V. Galaktionova, S. A. Grigorieva, B. L. Iomdin, T. V. Krylova, I. B. Levontina, A. V. Ptentsova, A. V. Sannikov, E. V. Uryson. M., 2004. P. 1009—1013.