ELSEVIER

East spaces in West times: Deictic reference and political self-positioning in a post-socialist East German chronotope

Deanna Davidson *

*Department of Anthropology, University of Michigan, 101 West Hall, 1085 S. University Avenue,
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1107, United States*

Abstract

In post-socialist eastern Berlin, past and present state-level institutions figure importantly in spatial and temporal deixis. Post-socialist redevelopment has led to the physical transformation or eradication of socialist-era state landmarks and workplaces, yet speakers continue to rely on past official (East) spaces to make reference in the present, a 'now' that some speakers consider to be 'West-times'. In doing so, they often position themselves in latent disputes evaluating the kinds of spaces and times that fit to the categories 'here' and 'now'. This article examines indexical means of constituting post-socialist subjectivity through instances of temporal and spatial deixis, focusing in particular on the usefulness of multivocality to political ends.
© 2007 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Deixis; Self-positioning; Voice; Indexicality; Chronotope; Post-socialism

1. Introduction

Upon moving to eastern Berlin in the summer of 2001, I took over the first-floor apartment that had once belonged to Monika, a 30-year-old seamstress whose curtain business occupied the street-level shop in the building. I came home soon afterward to find her in the stairwell, peeling her name off the mailbox we shared. It wasn't necessary, she told me,

* Address: 126 Lawn Place, Rockford, IL 61103, United States. Tel.: +1 734 764 7274.
  E-mail address: dedavids@umich.edu

since the delivery woman knows where she works and where to take her mail. She explained:

> In GDR times, it was always that way. One would know the postman, everyone who one came into contact with. It is less and less like that in these so-called West times because the Westerners don't do it that way. It's a shame, really.

Her tone was more instructive than nostalgic. Comparisons between the socialist German Democratic Republic (GDR) and post-socialist unified Germany are a common topic of conversation among (former) Easterners[1] even when an outsider is not the sole addressee. A question of whether 'these so-called West times' (*diese so-genannte West-Zeiten*) are actually any better than 'GDR times' (*DDR Zeiten*) underlies exchanges on topics from the grand to the mundane, even among those whose experience of the East German state is a childhood memory. Categorizations of time and space reflect the continuing salience of the East–West German division and those states' cold war oppositional politics. As I will discuss below, use of adverbial deictics may implicate the speaker in an expression of his or her political position regarding contemporary German politics.

Use of adverbial deictic terms can be politically complicated for post-socialist East Germans. In order to talk about life 'here' and 'now', one must often make implicit reference to the contemporary German state and the past East and West German states. Because the landmark that often distinguishes temporal and spatial categories is defined by political events, because those events remain controversial among former East Germans, and because those categories oppose official German referential norms, deictic reference invites political commentary. This kind of reference often requires Easterners to take a position, in the course of everyday talk, in an ongoing debate about the relative values of the two states.

When speaking in terms of collective experience, Easterners discursively create opposed temporal categories separated by the 1989–1990 period of socialism's fall, colloquially termed the *Wende*, or 'turnaround'. The dichotomous terms commonly used are 'now' (*heute*) and 'back then' (*damals* or *früher*). Easterners also continue to segregate space into East and West territories defined by past state borders, referred to from the Eastern perspective as 'here' (*hier*) and 'over there' (*drüben*). Speakers often anchor collective experience both 'here' and 'back then', situating group experience in an immediate place and a past time. This particularly East German melding of past time and present space is a chronotope in the Bakhtinian sense, an 'intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships' that is 'always colored by emotions and values' (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 83 and p. 243). The post-socialist East German chronotope differs from a contemporary pan-German 'here' and 'now', which may also be used by speakers of Eastern background, but which entails a different evaluative and emotional positioning toward the object of reference. Discursive maintenance of a post-socialist East German chronotope and self-positioning within this chronotope enables evaluation of past

---

[1] I refer to those who had East German citizenship prior to reunification as 'East Germans' or 'Easterners' and those who had West German citizenship as 'West Germans' or 'Westerners'; these social categories persevere both in social practice and in a legal sense, for example, in laws permitting public employees of Eastern background to receive a salary less than that of their Western counterparts.

and present German states, including critique of the contemporary state's moral character.

This article examines use of the adverbial deictics 'here' and 'now' as straightforward points of departure for study of the implications of speaking about temporal order from a perspective situated in the post-socialist East German chronotope. Hanks' work on referential practice demonstrates the potential for understanding social and even political expression through analysis of deictic reference. Deixis, the use of referential terms whose meanings depend upon their use in context, such as 'here' and 'now', is often assumed to emerge naturally from a circumstance of immediate shared experience (in which case the referents of 'here' and 'now' seem transparent to all copresent interactants). Hanks' ethnographic work demonstrates that deictic reference not only relies on situatedness in a particular space and time, but is also complexly informed by aspects of social interaction by speakers' 'stock of sociocultural knowledge', 'embodied habits', 'routinized modes of expression', and the relations among participants in the interaction (Hanks, 1990, p. 15, 2005). Evidence of the social and interactive basis of deixis is provocative because it suggests that deictic reference is not only useful for pointing to objects, but also for indexing a speakers' 'self-positioning' and 'evaluative stance' relative to the object of reference (1990, p. 15; 2005, p. 211). This article draws on aspects of Hanks' work on deixis to describe the construction and interactive uses of a chronotope discursively maintained by post-socialist East Germans in Berlin.

Monika, in the example above, draws attention to the ties of spoken text—'West times'—to an alternate, non-immediate context. In an instance of double-voicing, she identifies a period of time about which she aims to generalize, but she also reveals biographical and political information about herself. In a post-socialist Eastern German setting, entextualized modes of temporalization index voices linked to a history of citizenship in the socialist state. The voices' indexical connections to political positions make references to 'here' and 'now' also political; instances of temporal and spatial deixis are acts of ordering space and time, but are often also evaluations of an era, a state, and a political ideology. Patterns in temporal and spatial contrasts in text each index a voice situated in a (former) East German sociopolitical group and, through these links to a common type of speaking subject, structure a particularly East German post-socialist chronotope. Thus, though they may in fact disagree in political matters, those of East German biography share a chronotopic frame as well as, over fifteen years after the dissolution of the socialist state, a shared subjectivity tied to that state.

2. 'These so-called West times'

Easterners of diverse political viewpoints share patterns of dichotomizing time into the categories 'today' and 'back then'. 'Today', *heute*, incorporates as a single era the period stretching back to the 1989 dissolution of the GDR and the 1990 inclusion of the East in West German territories. 'Before', *früher*, and 'back then', *damals*, are fixed labels for an era that stretches from the 1950s until 1989. Though speakers may differ in opinion about the key characteristics of the time periods, they nevertheless understand the division as fundamental and as built upon opposed features, as Irvine notes is common in temporal ideologies (2004). This temporalization is unlikely to be used by a non-Easterner and is not found in mainstream (that is, non-Eastern) public media. The discursive norm in mainstream settings acknowledges the East German state as a

time and place and indeed attributes to it moral characteristics, but such characterizations are linked to the state as such, rather than to a temporalization textually structured by patterns of reference.

The mainstream contemporary stance on the character of the East German state reflects the West's cold war victory. This model is dominant in mass media, stressed by Western politicians and intellectuals, and deferred to by Easterners in public fora. It opposes the West and East German states simply, as paradigms of good and evil government. This model stresses the East German state's corruption and deep distrust of its citizens—exemplified by a dictatorship oppressing its citizens through a single-party system, a sham democracy, and a pervasive secret police. Its primary concerns are the East German state's denial of freedom of movement, freedom of speech, freedom of information, and access to the wealth of material goods available in the West. This mainstream assessment of the GDR understands government corruption as infectious, tainting by association all Eastern institutions as well as the citizens who had worked within and in support of them. The Western economic victory over socialism is thereby viewed as capitalist democracy's moral victory. The 'here and now' of national politics, official histories, and mainstream news is a time of wealth and freedoms, a point of progress beyond fascism and dictatorship. At stake in adhering to this characterization of the present is not merely a question of mainstream acceptability. In post-war Germany there is a taboo against any semblance of nostalgia for those of both East and West German biographies; a looking backward that contests a mainstream ideology of temporalization could be considered revisionist in a climate where revisionism is deeply troublesome and rightly risky. The moral ranking of states, in which West is superior to East, is fundamental cultural knowledge that underlies mainstream discursive norms.

Though it may be difficult in some settings to talk about these temporal categories in a way that counters their publicly acceptable moral evaluations, in non-mainstream media, private settings, and other places where only those with Eastern biographies are present, the two temporal orders used by Easterners may be characterized according to a different (though still dichotomous) set of moral values. This view, though subversive in public spaces and national politics, is not considered radical or nostalgic in conversation among Easterners. In such circles, the GDR (that is, the past) may be characterized as a time of close relationships within families, among co-workers, and among neighbors. Remembering the reliance on personal relationships for acquisition of necessary goods and services, speakers stress the importance of social interconnection, as opposed to personal wealth. This was reportedly a time of rich cultural life, since high-quality live performances were accessible and affordable. 'Quality' (*Qualität*) is a key moral value of this past; those who hold this view consider GDR-era cultural products like books and films as well as consumer goods to be of a higher quality than those available 'today'. Services for children, including schools, sports and other activities, are especially stressed as having had a higher quality 'before' and, in general, basic needs such as housing, food, health care, and transportation were not a concern. Though consumer goods were in short supply, many remember 'GDR times' as a period of solidarity, security, and rich intellectual and cultural life.

In contrast, according to this non-mainstream mapping of traits to times, 'today' is an era in which goods are in overabundance but are cheaply made. Cultural activities are expensive and inaccessible; amenities for children, including sports clubs and even preschool openings, are scarce. Relationships among co-workers and neighbors are perceived

to have deteriorated due to new forms of competition and a great decrease in economic interdependence. One must struggle to meet basic needs in 'these times', since the prices of housing, food, health care, and transportation have dramatically risen, even in comparison to rising wages; most importantly, job security is low and prospects for new work and apprenticeships are bleak. Whereas the past is represented as a time of security, quality, and solidarity, the present seems to be a time of financial insecurity, superficiality, and alienation. Though the moral ranking of states is tacitly understood and critique of the hierarchy is taboo in public settings, the material conditions of many Easterners' lives post-unification provoke resistance.

Some speakers adhering to the non-mainstream moral evaluation of the present era might refer to it as 'West times', since West German institutions are perceived to have created the conditions of social decline and, more importantly, are recognized as hegemonic. The phrase 'these West times' is used among those who view German reunification as an adoption or even colonization of the East by the West and consider themselves now to be living in a sort of foreign country. Indeed, the immediate implementation of West German institutions in the Eastern states required quick conversion to new institutional norms, rather than gradual transition, as has been the case elsewhere in post-socialist Europe. The legal steps toward unification were those of accession of the East to pre-existing Western institutional structures. Easterners sense bitterly that unification has not been the marriage of two parts that the term 'reunification' evokes (Dennis and Kolinsky, 2004; Glaeser, 2000; von Plato, 1993). This is particularly the case at the workplace, where Easterners receive disproportionately lower wages and may have been required to undergo re-certification in their fields to retain former professions. Many former East Germans consider the state in which they live to be 'West Germany' rather than 'Germany'.

Both the mainstream and the alternative evaluations of opposed time periods are based largely on moral grounds, though they do not resound squarely with the characterizations of 'before' and 'today' as 'traditional' versus 'modern' that accompany retrospection in many settings (cf. Inoue, 2004a; Inoue, 2004b; Cavanaugh, 2004). The different and often dichotomous moral and political evaluations of past and present—buoyed by ideologies of a socialist East and capitalist West—are informed by lengthy histories of East and West German propaganda, which positioned the respective other German state as shirking its accountability for the National Socialist past. Both states represented themselves as the single 'real' force for pacifism between the two German states, the 'real' success story of post-war rebuilding and reconciliation, and the 'real' supporter of personal freedom (Glaeser, 2000; von Plato, 1993). For Easterners, the shift of these sets of values from states to time periods is informed by the experience of disjuncture between expected wealth and opportunity and experienced difficulties in gaining employment and lack of access to capital since the *Wende*. A history of dichotomizing states in absolute moral terms supports a structuring of time (and states) in overt ideological difference, in contrast with an alternate mode that might structure the times in terms of stages of economic development or cultural modernization.

Despite referring to these sets of values in clear dichotomies, most Easterners, at a personal level, wholly avow neither the mainstream set of contrasting values nor the alternate set of values. They position themselves somewhere along a spectrum between the two views, agreeing at points with either and voicing skepticism at many points of both. The dichotomous eras described above are fixed, however, and function as straw figures relative to which speakers express their own points of view. In the following example of

this practice, a former Director of Economics at the Berlin Light Works (BGW),[2] a large socialist-era light bulb factory, differentiates the two systems on the basis of the locations of freedom and of oppression, rather than in terms of their absolute presence and absence:

Hennig: [. . .] *Im Osten **früher**, dürfte man ohne weiteres sagen 'der Generaldirektor ist ein Idiot'. Ganz laut.*

DD: *Dürfte man.*

Hennig: *Konnte der Generaldirektor gar nichts machen. ((laugh)) Aber wenn Sie auf den Alexanderplatz gegangen werden und hätten gerufen 'Erich Honecker ist ein Idiot,' das hätten Sie nur einmal gemacht.*

DD: *Mm.*

Hennig: ***Heute** kann ich auf den Alexanderplatz gehen, kann brüllen 'der Schröder ist ein Idiot'. Da passiert mir gar nicht. Da kommen ein Paar Leute um mich 'rum, die gerne wissen möchten warum ich das sage, gut. Erledigt. Aber, wenn ich in Betrieb gehe und sage 'der Geschäftsführer ist ein Idiot,' bin ich morgen draußen. ((laugh))*

DD: *Mm.*

Hennig: *Das ist die Freiheit, die politische Freiheit **der DDR** und die Freiheit des Geldes und des Kapitals **heute**.*

Hennig: [. . .] In the East **before**, one was allowed to say without any consequences 'the General Director is an idiot'. Good and loud.

DD: One was allowed to.

Hennig: The General Director couldn't do a thing. ((laugh)) But if you were to go to Alexanderplatz and cry 'Erich Honecker is an idiot,' you would have only done that once.

DD: Mm.

Hennig: **Today** I can go to Alexanderplatz and shout 'Schröder is an idiot'. Nothing would happen to me at all. A couple people come up to me and would like to know why I'm saying that, okay. Taken care of. But, if I go into the factory and say 'the Business Director is an idiot,' tomorrow I'm standing outside. ((laugh))

DD: Mm.

Hennig: That is freedom, the political freedom of **the GDR** and the freedom of money and capital **today**.

With bitter humor, Dr. Hennig tells a joke in which the relativity of freedom provides the punch-line. He juxtaposes Alexanderplatz, the central public square in East Berlin that was designated for public demonstrations and notoriously monitored by the secret police, with the workplace. One wishing to insult the national leader—Erich Honecker in 1970's and 1980's GDR and Gerhard Schröder in 2002 unified Germany—in the most public of places can do so without fear 'today'. In contrast, in the time referred to in past tense as 'before', a worker reportedly felt the freedom to critique the factory management at the BGW, a point corroborated by many BGW workers who described their employer as a

---

[2] Field research upon which this article is based was conducted among former co-workers of the Berlin Light Works (*Berliner Glühlampenwerk*, or BGW) between August 2001 and July 2003. The BGW was an important East Berlin factory in the GDR, employing over 5000 and supplying light bulbs primarily under the brand name NARVA to all of East Germany and much of Eastern Europe. The BGW began to cease production in 1990 and ultimately closed in 1994, though many social institutions and networks rooted in the factory remain active.

'democratic workplace', where one was allowed to criticize a superior. 'Today', Dr. Hennig laughs, if a worker calls a company's business director an idiot, that person is out of a job—and unemployment is a significant impediment to freedom. He later concludes in present tense that 'today's' freedoms of movement are no great advance over 'before's' restrictions against travel in the West, since workers cannot afford such travel and are, in effect, equally restricted. Dr. Hennig positions himself at ironic remove from the values fixed to a mainstream evaluation of 'today'; however, reliance on a morally infused temporalization is fundamental to his telling of the anecdote.

If 'these West times' refers to a present considered bitterly by some to be a West-German present, the shopkeeper Monika, who talks about the present as 'these so-called West times' in the anecdote related at the beginning of this article, seems not entirely committed to these terms. Her use of 'so-called' distances her from the term 'West-times'. She implies that this is something that people say—an entextualized way of referring—rather than a position that she herself supports. The utterance is straightforwardly double-voiced, revealing the speaker's stance of remove towards the words she uses (Bakhtin, 1981). Monika, with whom I was newly acquainted at the time of our conversation at the mailbox, is now a close friend. She is an entrepreneur who doggedly sees opportunity in a new service economy and a woman with deeply mixed feelings about what kind of ideological system makes for good government. I interpret her double-voicing as evidence of non-alignment with those who view post-socialism as 'West times', those who feel excluded by the new German state. Monika's use of this text demonstrates her membership in social networks with many who consider these times to be 'West times' rather than their own; indeed, her parents and her partner have struggled to find work since unification. However, she resists an indexical function of the phrase indicating political stance by disclaiming authorship and drawing attention to the presence of a voice authored elsewhere. In referring to the present as 'these so-called West-times', Monika is in dialogue with contrasting arguments about the moral character of the present and past. Exploitation of the multiple voices available to make evaluative temporal reference allows her delicate self-positioning.

3. 'Here' in space and time

Though political unification has created a temporal boundary between 'now' and 'back then', it has not erased the spatial boundary rigorously defended by the East German state. Speakers use 'here', *hier*, to refer to the former territory of the GDR as a still-existing defined space; among speakers of common (Eastern) citizenship history, it refers by default to the geographic area of the East and its corresponding characteristics. Easterners seldom refer to the unified Germany by using the deictic 'here'; exceptions include overtly pro-unification political statements and, alternately, gestures that emphasize a relation of difference to more foreign people and places. 'Here' is a space that speakers contrast with West Germany, 'over there' (*drüben*), or 'in the West' (*im Westen*). It contrasts traits of the East and West regions, such as high unemployment versus adequate work, to give an example quite tangible to Easterners. Speakers also tie supposed traits of (former) citizens to (former) spaces, and they do so in a way that transcends the temporal boundary dividing 'now' from 'back then'. In the following example, Mr. and Mrs. Steineckert describe their political engagement as a cultural trait tied to place through time, that is, across the 'back then' and 'today' divide. Mr. Steineckert tells the story of a trip he took to the Western German Black Forest region in the early 1950s, prior to the 1961 closing of

the border. He reports his astonishment, upon meeting Westerners there, at their lack of knowledge of the political situation in Berlin:

Mr. S: […] *Dafür sind wir zu-**hier**- politisch engagiert möchte ich sagen. Ja, also=*
Mrs. S: *Wir interessieren uns* [(?)]
Mr. S: [*Wir interessieren-*] **schon von Anfang an**. *Ja. Und alle **hier***
             ***im Osten** mehr oder weniger. Ja. Wie wir- wie ich (ihnen) (?) erzählt, wir waren*
             im Schwarzwald. Das war neunzehnhundert sechsundfunfzig. Da dachte ich,
             mich tritt ein Pferd. Aber ehrlich. Die wußten ja nicht mal daß es ein Ost und
             West Berlin gibt…
DD: *Uh-huh.*
Mr. S: [*Das wußten die nicht*
Mrs. S: [(?)] *das Berlin geteilt war. Wußten die gar nicht.*
Mr. S: *Wußten die gar nicht.*
Mrs. S: *Das war ja in vier…*
Mr. S: *Sektoren*=
Mrs. S: *Sektoren geteilt.*
Mr. S: […] For that we're too- **here**- politically engaged, I'd like to say. Yes, alright=
Mrs. S: We are interested [(?)
Mr. S: [We are interested-] **even from the beginning**. Yes. And
             everyone **here in the East** more or less. Yes. Like we- Like I (?) told (you), we
             were in the Black Forest. That was nineteen fifty-six. I was shocked. Honestly.
             They didn't even know that there's an East and West Berlin…
DD: Uh-huh.
Mr. S: [They didn't know that
Mrs. S: [(?)] that Berlin was divided. They didn't know at all.
Mr. S: They didn't know at all.
Mrs. S: It was in four…
Mr. S: Sectors=
Mrs. S: divided into four sectors.

'Even from the beginning', Mr. Steineckert implicitly argues, 'we' have had a collective character. He and his wife are 'politically engaged' in the present, just like 'everyone here in the East, more or less'. He characterizes Easterners as a uniform group essentially the same 'today' as they were in the 1950s, despite the radical changes in citizenship they have experienced as a group and despite the social and political changes one could rightfully argue took place during the 40-year official existence of the GDR. 'Here' is a place whose residents share and have maintained key characteristics over time despite the official dissolution of its defining borders and despite the inappropriateness of referring to it as such in public settings.

'Here' is understood as an East German space and is infused with moral qualities like those of 'back then', such as 'quality' and strong interpersonal relations. Both East and West German states laid claim to the value of a strong work ethic in cold war competition; in post-socialist domestic politics a supposedly weak work ethic is argued by some to be an underlying cause of high unemployment rates in the Eastern region. In this excerpt from a debate among three former managers at the Berlin Light Works, the friends disagree about a common work ethic in a past-tense 'here'.

Holz: [. . .] *Doppelrolllampe, Allgebrauchslampe, wir haben ja zwei Schichten gearbeitet.*
             Da war immer Betrieb. Das war normal. Aber die im Maschinenbau und selbst die
             in der Konstruktion, die haben gewartet bis der Zeiger so weit war, rennen in's
             Auto und ab vom Hof.
Engelke: *Also war es selber.*
Holz: *Genau das gleiche. Das einzige, die ein bißchen länger da war, das war so einen*
             Hauptabteilungsleiter, et cetera, die mussten von [(?)
Engelke: *[Mm.*
Holz: *Ich sage mal Schularbeiten machen, was sie am Tag nicht geschafft haben mussten*
             sie Abends machen.
Engelke: *Das ist richtig.*
Holz: *Die waren noch da. Da brannte das Licht.*
Henke: *[. . .] Was ich nur alleine aus- aus dem Handel festgestellt habe, das sich*
             Leute eben bei Wertheim- ach- nicht Wertheim- KaDeWe eben mehr erlaubt
             *haben uh als uh **hier**- Leute **hier bei uns** in die im im im Kaufhof. Nicht?*
             Wenn der gesagt hat, 'wir machen heute länger', da gab's kein (knorren).
             *Und die andere haben- **drüben** von KaDeWe haben gesagt 'Überstunden?*
             Gibt's bei uns nicht'.
Holz: [. . .]Double-coil bulbs, all-purpose bulbs, we worked two shifts. It was always
             running. That was normal. But in the machinist's workshop and especially in
             design they waited until the hour hand was so far, ran to the car, and out of the
             lot.
Engelke: That's just how it was.
Holz: Exactly like that. The only one who was a little bit longer there, that was some
             kind of department manager, et cetera, they had to [(?)
Engelke: [Mm.
Holz: I'll just say do their homework, what they didn't get done during the day they
             had to do at night.
Engelke: That's right.
Holz: They were still there. The light was still burning there.
Henke: [. . .] What I only found out from from retail, that even people at Wertheim-
             ach- not Wertheim, KaDeWe, allowed more uh than uh **here**- than people **here**
             over **here** in the in in in Kaufhof. No? When he said 'today we work late', there
             wasn't any (complaining). And the others said- **over there** in KaDeWe said
             'Overtime? No such thing'.

   While Mr. Holz and Mr. Engelke remember with disdain examples of a weak work
ethic from their careers as factory managers, Mr. Henke protests that Western workers
'over there' are just as lazy as those 'here', if not worse. Even at the KaDeWe, the land-
mark West Berlin department store and overdetermined symbol of capitalist freedom
(which he briefly confuses with Wertheim, a second Western department store chain),
the workers refused to work overtime. In Kaufhof, the department store 'here', however,
workers didn't complain when the boss called for overtime hours. Mr. Henke invokes the
historical present to depict a working style 'here'; this discursive strategy enables him to
attribute a consistent character to a place (albeit a no longer existent place) over time.
An East German 'here' can no longer be delimited by national borders or represented with

a passport, but it is nevertheless meaningful as a defined space for many speakers and their addressees.

Speakers with whom I came into contact through this research seldom used 'here' to refer to the contemporary unified German state, the country one might consider most immediately available for direct reference. In fact, the only speaker whom I regularly heard use 'here' in this sense had been an activist long-opposed to the GDR, a vocal proponent of reunified Germany and the West, and even a supporter of the conservative West German Christian Democratic Party. A more common exception to this norm is in the context of talk about the presence of foreigners in Germany; in such cases, an Easterner is likely to refer to a wider Germany as 'here'. For example, a classmate in a community school Turkish language class contrasted the behavior of Turks in Turkey, who she found on her vacation to be 'very, very nice' (*sehr sehr nett*), with the Turks 'here in Germany' (*hier in Deutschland*), who she said speak loudly and do not get up from their seats when an older person gets on the bus. Unless overtly stating support of unified Germany, or, more commonly, noting foreign ways in opposition to German ways, 'here' among Easterners is fixed as an Eastern space with particularly Eastern characteristics and values.

Cross-cultural ethnographic study of the sociocentricity of deictic reference aids interpretation of how East Berliners use shifters like 'here' and 'these times' in order both to make spatial and temporal reference and to represent themselves politically. 'Here' refers to a non-place, a non-nation, drawing on the understood shared history of speaker and addressee in order to do so. Space is 'socially mediated', as Hanks (1990, p. 28) has argued, in that it is always in part ordered by ideological, political, and cultural meanings at both micro and macro levels. In the East German case, spatial borders have had a very physical presence, enforced by armed guards, dangerous dogs, scrupulous border control agents, and in Berlin, a monolithic wall. But East Germans experienced 'here' also as 'a socially mediated field of experience'—a set of norms, behaviors and social relationships that fit to the institutions rigorously promoted in shared space. The social field of experience has not disappeared with the *Wende*, allowing 'here' to continue to refer to East German spaces and ways despite the official erasure of physical borders. The East German sense of 'here' is a first-order indexical for Easterners (Silverstein, 2003); it refers to a naturalized space, or 'commonsense geography' among speakers who have a shared history of orienting themselves within this space (Schegloff, 1972, pp. 102–3). At a second order, use of 'here' indexes the speaker's membership in the category of persons who know how to use 'here' in this sense. 'Here' refers to a place about which one might want to generalize, such as the area where people are especially politically engaged, and it indexes the speaker as an Easterner, a person for whom this sense is relevant and even common sense.

As Schegloff (1972) observed, one's 'commonsense geography' may exist in hierarchical relationship to other, alternate, geographies, as is baldly the case in the East German situation. Though many Easterners refer deictically according to socialist-era spatial categories, post-socialist categories conflict with them and dominate in public spaces. The disjuncture between Easterners' and Westerners' referential practices enables a third degree of indexicality through which Eastern referential norms index—in public spaces—political affiliation with the former East. In a speech event in which Easterners are ratified participants (Goffman, 1981), use of 'here' and 'before' according to Eastern norms indexes in-group status. In a context in which participants

use Western norms, an Eastern usage would likely invoke a voice of opposition, at least to those participants aware of the alternate norms. This kind of opposition in most public settings is undesirable, since it threatens the moral ranking of states. It is thus to an Easterner's advantage to be able to employ Western norms, even when the speaker is not comfortable using deictic terms in such a way and even when the terms do not refer appropriately from the speaker's perspective. Employment of multiple voices in instances of deictic reference can be a tool with which speakers position themselves to act appropriately in a social encounter and also present their own political views accurately, if subtly.

4. Disfluency, a mode of self-positioning

During conversations with former employees of the Berlin Light Works, I was struck by a remarkable frequency of disfluency in temporal and spatial reference. Examples of disfluency I heard include hesitations, incomplete utterances, sudden changes in case or gender, restarts and circumlocutions, and also gestures like grimacing. Disfluency can neither be identified with certainty nor easily assigned a discursive function. Such an inquiry would require knowledge about a speaker's intentions that the speaker him- or herself may not possess; the discursive work done by some influences of disfluency may lie beyond, or underneath, the limits of a speaker's awareness (Silverstein, 1981; Silverstein, 1992). It is not my goal to define comprehensively disfluency in German talk or to argue that it always serves a function; rather, I propose that it is sometimes evidence of the invocation of alternate voices, aiding in a speaker's self-positioning. Speakers may demonstrate through disfluency that the words they animate have been authored elsewhere. Take, for example, the following conversation in which a former Light Works mechanic explains to me the reason for the factory's failure to survive in the market economy:

DD: *Sie hatten dann Forschungsfreiheit.* [*Genugend*] *Mittel da war* [*und die Leute-*

Kraus: [*Ja.*] [*Ja. Also Forschungsfreiheit nicht in dem Sinne, sondern man hat schon vorgegeben, was zu forschen ist. Und zwar hat sich das immer nach der westlichen Welt gerichtet. Wenn man wenn man aus Literatur gelesen hat an welchen Forschungssachen dort gearbeitet wird, das war natürlich (würde denn) vorgegeben. Das muß denn auch gemacht werden.*

DD: *Mmhm. Mmhm.*

Kraus: *Das ist es. Ist vielleicht auch natürlich. Also also man könnte nicht aus eigene Initiative sagen 'Ich mache jetzt irgendwas'.*

DD: *Mmhm.*

Kraus: *Also es war alle die-diese Richtung, die Forschungsrichtung wurde schon vorgegeben.*

DD: *Mm. Der Konkurrenz war auch dann* [(?)

Kraus: [*So ist es. Ja. Damit man also seine Produkte denn auf den anderen Markt absetzen kann.*

DD: *Mmhm.*

Kraus: *Und die große Schwierigkeit bestand ja darin nach der- nach dem Fall der Mauer, daß- also zum Beispiel, die Produkte, die aus- aus Ost Deutschland oder aus…den ehemalige DDR nach dem Westen gegangen sind nicht mit dem Namen der Firma uh verbunden waren.*

DD: So you had freedom in your research. [There] were enough materials there [and the people

Kraus: [Yes.]
[So, not exactly freedom in research; rather, one had already been assigned what was to be researched. And that was always planned according to the Western world. When one when one read in the literature what research topics were being worked on there, that was naturally (what would be) assigned. That must then also be done.

DD: Mmhm.

Kraus: That's just it. Maybe it's natural. So, so, one couldn't say on one's own initiative 'I'm now going to do something'.

DD: Mmhm. Mmhm.

Kraus: So it was all- this direction, the research direction was assigned.

DD: Mm. The competition was also then [(?)

Kraus: [That's right. Yes. So that one could also put the products on the other market.

DD: Mmhm.

Kraus: And the biggest difficulty was that after the- after the fall of the wall, that, that is, for example, the products that came from from East Germany or from… the former GDR and went to the West were not connected to the name of the company.

Mr. Kraus' major point of disfluency in this explanation comes in his final turn, at which point he aims to situate an event in the (former) East at a time after socialism's fall. The story requires reference to a space that at that point no longer existed as a state. After a restart and pause, he calls the place 'the former GDR', a term of reference that is very seldom used in spoken German text but is not uncommon in formal written texts. Participant structure plays an important role here, since I was the addressee, asking questions in a tape-recorded interview setting. I had called on him as an expert to talk to me about work at the factory, and his sense of the importance of representing the factory's history accurately and in a way appropriate for a wider audience may well have played a role in his disfluent reference.

Goffman argues that breaks in fluency are sometimes managed quite fluently (1981, p. 148). Moments of disfluency often should not be understood as mistakes or evidence of disorientation, but could in fact be tools used to demonstrate a speaker's orientation to the words used. In her discussion of Don Gabriel's heteroglossic Mexicano narrative, Hill (1995) draws on Bakhtin (1981) to make a similar point. She argues that moments of disfluency point to the presence of multiple voices (1995, p. 133). For Don Gabriel, it is a 'moral choice': disfluency demonstrates heteroglossia and permits evaluation, on what Hill and Bakhtin call moral grounds, of other voices. Disfluency can result in not only reporting the words of a second source, but also demonstrating the speaker's personal (non)alignment to those words. In the examples I have given, the second source are entextualized terms of spatial or temporal reference, terms whose use imply a particular biography and can index, at a higher order, affiliation to or disaffiliation from the

contemporary German state. Speakers' heteroglossic use of the deictics indeed reflects a position taken on moral grounds. Speakers are careful not to use terms that will index-ically situate them in a position they find politically objectionable or at least at odds with a personal position.

In Hill's example, Don Gabriel indexes 'a responsible self' through disfluency when accounting for specific dates, occurrences, and details of events, in addition to instances when he must employ a business-for-profit vocabulary at odds with the moral center of his narrative (1995, p. 137). In my data, speakers may be concerned with accuracy not only in wanting to give me a factually correct record of the factory's history, but also accurately represent their own relationships to that history. Disfluency aids in referential accuracy by displaying personal position toward referential terms. Disfluency can thus be understood as a kind of double-voicing, expressing a speaker's stance toward his or her own words. Double-voicing is effective in modes of self-positioning, as seen in the examples above, in which speakers subtly represent their own political views while using deictic terms that potentially carry (for them) undesirable indexical baggage. Discursive practices such as disfluency and double-voicing are evidence of the social embeddedness and even political complexity of deictic reference.

5. The 'here' and 'back then': a post-socialist chronotope

While other aspects of post-socialist change in the East German context occurred rap-idly and rather thoroughly, usage of referential terms in speaking practice more closely resembles the heterogeneous transitions seen elsewhere in Eastern Europe. Former East Germans need to make reference to spatial and temporal categories that may lack official names or may have official names with uncomfortable political weight. Ways of making reference, even with words like 'here' and 'now', entail that the speaker take a position rel-ative to the unified German state or to the past German states. The deictic terms have come to have several orders of indexical meaning for post-socialist Easterners because speakers situate notions of space and time that match their experience relative to official pan-German categories that are not their own but are publicly acceptable.

Glaeser's (2000) monograph on identity and identification among police officers in Ber-lin documents a sense of temporal disjuncture grounded in many East Berliners' career tra-jectories. Demotions and retraining periods after the 1990 unification of the (Western) Berlin Police and the (Eastern) People's Police caused Easterners to be placed on a posi-tion in their careers that did not match their age or experience: '[E]astern officers find themselves frequently outside of established frameworks...not so much out of place as out of time' (Glaeser, 2000, p. 167). Glaeser's observation of an experience of disjoint with time, rather than with place, is in line with my observation of the textual structuring of an East German chronotope, in which shared experience occurs 'here' but also occurs 'before' rather than 'now'. Just as the officers found their careers ill fitting to institutional frame-works, East Berlin workers at the BGW demonstrate that their entextualized modes of structuring time and space do not fit to mainstream pan-German norms. Instances of ref-erence adherent to these Eastern modes index a voice of Easternness, which is associated not only with a speaker's biography, but also with a rich complex of moral and ideological stances. Though the stances may be at odds with the position of a particular speaker, a speaker who situates himself in this post-socialist chronotope has access to additional discursive means—such as double-voicing and disfluency—for appropriate political

self-positioning. The textual structuring of a post-socialist chronotope provides one example of ways in which, despite the dissolution of the socialist state, East German post-socialist subjectivity continues to exist and even arguably to thrive.

East Berliners' use of deictic terms indexically reveals personal biographies and self-positioning in time and space; a history of states with heavy moral weights looms large in the 'stock of sociocultural knowledge' drawn upon to make deictic reference. The habits of expression solidify East Germans' shared subjectivity and reveal a common ambivalence toward post-unification official stories about German states. Despite diversity within the group of East Germans—illustrated by speakers' attempts to distinguish their own views from the indexical baggage of spatial and temporal deictic reference—common citizenship has left its mark on pragmatic aspects of speaking practice.

Acknowledgement

References

Bakhtin, M., 1981. The Dialogic Imagination (Emerson, C., Holquist, M., Trans.). University of Texas Press, Austin.

Cavanaugh, J., 2004. Remembering and forgetting: ideologies of language loss in a northern Italian town. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 14 (1), 24–38.

Dennis, M., Kolinsky, E., 2004. United and divided: Germany since 1990. In: Dennis, M., Kolinsky, E. (Eds.), United and Divided: Germany since 1990. Berghahn Books, Oxford, pp. 1–16.

Glaeser, A., 2000. Divided in Unity: Identity, Germany, and the Berlin Police. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Goffman, E., 1981. Forms of Talk. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia.

Hanks, W., 1990. Referential Practice: Language and Lived Space among the Maya. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Hanks, W., 2005. Explorations in the Deictic Field. Current Anthropology 46 (2), 191–220.

Hill, J., 1995. The voices of Don Gabriel: responsibility and self in a modern Mexicano narrative. In: Tedlock, D., Mannheim, B. (Eds.), Dialogic Emergence of Culture. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, pp. 97–147.

Inoue, M., 2004a. Introduction: temporality and historicity in and through linguistic ideology. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 14 (1), 1–5.

Inoue, M., 2004b. What does language remember? Indexical inversion and the naturalized history of Japanese women. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 14 (1), 39–56.

Irvine, J., 2004. Say when: temporalities in language ideology. Journal of Linguistic Anthropology 14 (1), 99–109.

Schegloff, E., 1972. Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place. In: Giglioli, P. (Ed.), Language and Social Context. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, pp. 95–135.

Silverstein, M., 1981. The Limits of Awareness. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin.

Silverstein, M., 1992. Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In: Lucy, J. (Ed.), Reflexive Language. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 33–58.

Silverstein, M., 2003. Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. Language and Communication 23, 193–229.

von Plato, A., 1993. The consensus against the Victors: 1945 and 1990. Oral History Review 21 (2), 73–79.

Deanna Davidson is a doctoral candidate at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. She conducted field research on language and politics at the workplace among former employees of the Berlin Light Works from August 2001 to July 2003.