Journal Of the Iraqia University (75-1) December (2025)

ISSN(Print): 1813-4521 OnLine ISSN:2663-7502

Journal Of the Iraqia University

available online at

https://iasj.rdd.edu.iq/journals/journal/view/247

Linguistic Fragmentation as Political Intervention: Deconstructing Hegemonic Discourse in J.M. Coetzee's Waiting for the Barbarians and Disgrace

Teacher /Maytham Abdulrazzaq Abbas

General Directorate of Dhiqar Education, Iraq.

ORCHID NO:0009000804790712

email :maithemabass9@gmail.com

التشظي اللغوي كتدخل سياسي : تفكيك الخطاب الهيمني في روايتي ج.م. كوتزي "في نتظار البرابره" و "العار"

المدرس /ميثم عبد الرزاق عباس

المديرية العامة لتربية ذي قار

Abstract

In this paper, the author analyzes functional aspects of languages breakdown in the works of J. M. Coetzee regarding Waiting for the Barbarians (1980) and Disgrace (1999) as a reflection on colonial language and politics. With the influence of postcolonial and deconstructionist criticism, this paper shows how Coetzee intentionally disrupts the consistency of narratives, semantic integrity, and social presence of his work to disrupt the imperial voice and power regime of colonial and post-apartheid South Africa. This linguistic fragmentation of the novels in question is to be interpreted as a stylistic device, as well as a political intervention that drives the movement against the hegemonic discourses by constructing the textual spaces where the power-oriented discourses fail, and other voices emerge. This article will prove that by juxtaposing these novels in the context of Coetzee and the South African political history, spread throughout his entire storytelling The multiple types of linguistic fragmentation used by Coetzee are associated with the changes in the character of the power, however, they always question the connection between the language and the authority and opposition. To some degree, this article has also attempted to shed light on how postcolonial literature may indulge language and ethnicity to deconstruct imperial epistemologies and also create chances to comment on political and cultural identities beyond coloniality.**Keywords**: linguistic fragmentation, postcolonial literature, colonial discourse, South African literature, narrative disruption,

الملخص

في هذه الورقه ,يحلل الكاتب الجوانب الوظيفيه لإنهيار اللغات في أعمال ج.م.كوتزي بخصوص روايتي "في إنظار البرابره"(١٩٨٠) و "العار"(١٩٩٩) كإنعكاس للغه والسياسه الإستعماريه .وبتأثير النقد ما بعد الإستعماري والتفكيكي ,تظهر هذه الورقه كيف يعمد كوتزي الى تعطيل إتساق السرديات والسلامه الدلاليه والحضور الإجتماعي لعمله ليعطل الصوت الإمبراطوري ونظام السلطه في جنوب أفريقيا الإستعماريه وما بعد الفصل العنصري .ويُفهَم هذا التشظي اللغوي في الروايتين المعنيتين كأداة أسلوبيه ,وكذلك كتدخل سياسي يقود الحركه ضد الخطابات الهيمنيه عبر إنشاء الفضاءات النصيه التي يفشل فيها الخطاب الموجِه بالسلطه ,وتظهر فيها أصوات أخرى .وستثبت هذه المقاله ذلك عبر وضع هذه الروايات جنباً الى جنباً في سياق كوتزي والتاريخ السياسي لجنوب أفريقيا.الممتد عبر سردياته بأكملها .وترتبط الأنماط المتعدده من التشظي اللغوي التي يستخدمها كوتزي بالتغييرات في طبيعة السلطه ,ومع ذلك فهي دائماً تُثير التساؤل حول العلاقه بين اللغه والسلطه والمعارضه .وإلى حدٍ ما حاولت هذه المقاله أيضاً أن تلقي الضوء على كيف يمكن للأدب ما بعد الإستعماري أن يوظف اللغه والإثنيه لتفكيك المعارف الإمبراطوريه وخلق فرص للتعليق على الهويات السياسيه والثقافيه خارج حدود الإستعماريه**الكلمات المفتاحيه** : التشظي اللغوي ,الأدب ما بعد الإستعماري , الخطاب الإستعماري ,الأدب الجنوب أفريقي ,تعطيل السرد

IntroductionContext and Background J.M. Coetzee is, perhaps, the most significant South African writer and in his unremitting examination of the role of the writing and the roles of language in power-relation and morality

in general, his work has attracted attention in and out of the colonial (and post) society that is (or was) South Africa. Coetzee was born in 1940 in Cape Town thus he has been a writer during the apartheid era, their decline and the awkward post apartheid present, so he is a writer in a particularly favorable location in which to compare the linguistic acts of political force. One of the most distinctive features of Coetzee fiction is a protracted engagement with the politics of discourse, pertaining to the South African case, the colonial / postcolonial state (Attwell 1993: 3). In his two novels Waiting for the Barbarians (1980) and Disgrace (1999), he wrote, I believe, the two charms of his work, over the decades of radical political change in South Africa, and the railways of any period when a bond between language and power continues to evolve mysteriously.Written in the days of apartheid, Waiting for the Barbarians uses allegorical distancing to condemn the imperialism power relations. It is located in an unnamed frontier station in an unnamed Empire where a magistrate, who is content with his safe collaborations with colonial authority, is forced to be a witness to the brutal behavior of the Empire on the Empire-barbarian natives. The advantage of this, as Head (2009) elucidates, is that the allegorical space that is thus opened up is the one where an anatomy of imperial power can be sliced as cold and cool (p. 48). It is this strategic obscurity that helps Coetzee to experiment with the broad aspects of colonial dominance, and also the narrow politics of the South African apartheid. Disgrace - released five years after official abolishment of apartheid - yields the allegorical alienation at an essential confrontation with post-apartheid South Africa. The novel revolves around David Lurie, a white professor and his sexual misconduct is what leads to his professional downfall and his consequent escape to his daughters farm in the Eastern Cape where they are then assaulted. According to Poyner (2009), one of them is Peanut that does not want to be based on any specific historical or geographical circumstances, to create an Allegory space within which the functioning of imperial power can be analyzed with cold detachment (p. 48)The racial violence and tensions of the post-apartheid setting as organsied in the novel were highly controversial, some critics condemning Coetzee as having apparently reinforced racist stereotypes, others commending its incisive insight into the culpability and responsibility of the white South Africa. Even though they belong to different periods in history and approaches to the narration strategy, both the novels show how language is used and not used by the political power that Coetzee is always interested in. Coetzee has cared throughout his writing life about the ways in which language may be complicit with regimes of oppression and a potential location of resistance (Barnard, 2007, p. 22). This doubled ability of language to colonize and to dis-colonize colonization are digested in both novels in multiple kinds of linguistic disintegration that disrupts the integrity of canonical narratives and reveals the power relations submerged underneath them on which they are founded. 1.2 Research Problem and Significance. This essay will discuss linguistic dispersion in "Waiting for the Barbarians" and Disgrace" by J.M. Coetzee as a political commentary in the process of deconstructing the colonial discourse. The linguistic fragmentation used by the researcher means the efforts both in the two instances of the novels being studied to estrange narrative identities and linguistic practices by breaking narrative coherences, syntactic forms and communicative events. These interferences are series of narrative bursts or breaks, linguistic anomie, failure of communication between characters, bondage of a variety of languages or registers into the writing. And the main issue that we would like to address is as follows: how could linguistic disintegration be a strategy of exposing and subverting the authority of the colonial discourse of power in both of these novels, one written on the early colonial South Africa and the other on the postcolonial South Africa, by the author who wrote these novels at different periods of his writing career and South African political history? This is an important question, as the discovery is bound to leave an imprint in the postcolonial literary criticism, as a politically interventionist action, because the postcolonial literature, in this sense, engages with language. The relation of world ones. (in economic exploitation), and nation alliances (in political domination) is so macro logical that it is unable to register the micro logical texture of power, as Spivak writes: In the sensitivity it shows to the micro-logical texture of language, specifically, its fissures and voids and contradictions, Coetzee offers us a manner in which we can think about the action of the colonial power in the medium of signification, and what forms of resistance can possibly be achieved through the signifying medium. Addressing Coetzee at various points of his career and of South African pro-colonialism allows one to contrast specific works to lecture on how the linguistic strategies of postcolonial writers vary according to shifts in the political regimes. According to Durrant (2004, p. 430) Coetzee fiction witnessing signifies every impact of apartheid not through the narration of its atrocities but by mentioning the impact of the same on the form of the narration. This essay builds upon this observation of Durrant by showing how Coetzee narrations reflect an influence of the impact of apartheid in terms not only of itself but of the second effects, the spread of linguistic dislocation as a countermeasures to different forms of

power. It fills a gap in Coetzee scholarship, an area often subject to the temptations of the cumulative preoccupations of theme, like ethics, allegory and representation, often tends to stray into a blind unconcern towards language. Whereas critics like Attridge (2004) have explored the staging of the encounter with the different as a modern imperfection of the world, less has been said regarding how such a staging is done through the use of idiomatic disjunctorsThe linguistic fragmentation as political strategy transports us back to the question of such extremes and therefore better prepares us to respond to Coetzee literary politics, (as well as structure and content in postcolonial literature more of a general). 1.3 Theoretical Framework The article transforms the instruments of post colonialism aura and the Deconstructionist thinking to analyze linguistic dismemberment of the novels by Coetzee. The postcolonial theory offers the means of analyzing the role of language as a place of colonial power and counter powerAccording to Said, The power to tell, or to ensure that no other stories are created and manifested is quite significant to culture and imperialism, and connects the two in that way as being one of the... most charged aspects(p. xiii). The perception drives the manner in which I think Coetzee upsets narrative resolution to challenge the imperial dominance of representation and give voice to novel voices. The trope of hybridity, provided by Bhabha (1994), particularly comes in handy when one attempts to examine the linguistic fragmentation of Coetzee oevre.Discourses of colonialism in the works by Bhabha have been loaded with the trait of ambivalence and contradiction, introducing a space of hybridity where it is powerless to be a model (p._PRIV\161-62). Coetzee takes advantage of this ambivalence in his disjunctive fictions: he uses language breaks to reveal that the colonial power is founded on them. The deconstructionist theory and, more specifically, the abhorrence of logocentrism (Derrida, 1997) assist in the further tools used in the exploration of how Coetzee dismembered the language in order to effectively challenge the colonial discourse. In this way, the idea that was put forward by Derrida that there is nothing outside the text (p. 158) is reflected in Coetzee's excursion into the ways in which reality is performatively done to in and through language and how a destabilization of linguistic structures can destabilize dominant realities. According to an original deconstructionist reading of the text, Yeoh (2024) highlights that, in the text, Coetzee has created through the structural interruptions between the words, a performance of the disintegration of the binarial oppositions that the colonial thought was founded on (p. 120). It is also based on the explanation given by Foucault (1980) on the nature of power and knowledge. His words that power is the source of knowledge...power and knowledge... suggest each other...[t]here is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, and no knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations (27) are an important revelation of the method in which Coetzee puts knowledge to the task of inverting the power relation of colonial discourse, through language.Using the methods of sabotage of colonial discursivity, production and transmission, Coetzee puts the power relations that legitimize them into question. 1.4 Methodology The intensive study of the text of Waiting for the Barbarians and Disgrace concerning the aspect of the text that is slangering is connected to the political considerations. It is a comparative reading, looking at how the pages have been discontinued in various novels, and highlighting, on the one hand, how much Coetzee has been able to table flake language across the works, and on the other, the variations that appear to be following the shifts in political history. The use criteria of the passages to be analyzed are as follows: (1) inconsistencies in the narrative/point of view, where the passing of information between characters should have happened in dialogue or description or reflected things; (2) locations where the characters fail in their communication or where misunderstanding happens; (3) passages where the variety of languages is involved in the same scene and where the variety of language and power issues are also raised. Such circumstances guarantee a systematic search of the language to find fragmentation and reveal patterns which might be unique to each of the novelsThe analysis is developed in three significant steps. Next I will discuss linguistic fracture in Waiting to the Barbarians, and briefly mention to what extent it is a criticism of imperial discourse in the apartheid period. Second, I examine the linguistic fragmentation in Disgrace and how it strives to make meaning out of the uncertainty of the post-apartheid power politics. And at the end of the two novels, having read them simultaneously, I speculate on the places where the treatments of linguistic breakdown in Coetzee are identical and different and theorize on how this is an allegory of the changing political circumstances in South Africa. It is with this conceptual frame that I have outlined above that I am able to read the political referents of the Coetzee linguistic strategies This procedure gives the translator a convoluted backdoor to demonstrate how Lingui centrism functions as an aesthetic entrapment and as a politics of intervention into the narration at the aspect of the narrative at Coetzee. The article is organized in the following way: In Section 2, after this introduction, I survey the literature on work by Coetzee, which, I suggest, can be subdivided into articles about the work of Coetzee that could be

classified under so-called postcolonial readings, on the one hand, and about life and language in the novels, on the other. In more detail the linguistic fragmentation in the Waiting for the Barbarians is discussed in section 3, Disgrace in section 4. Section 5 draws a comparison between the two novels and Section 6 gives the conclusion and some final thought on the general consequences of this study to the role of linguistic experimentation in the political critique in post-colonial literary studies. Literature Review 2.1 Reception of the Coetzee works. J.M. Coetzee fiction is reviewed as a political and ethical one by means of narrative experiment. Some of these novels, especially two of them Waiting for the Barbarians, and Disgrace have been a subject of considerable scholarly discussion, and it is within one of these hypothetical frames that the work of The Life and Times of Michael K has been interpreted by critics. In this paper a survey of the most important critical responses to the novels is given, special emphasis being made on the ways in which critics have tackled the problem of Coetzee as a representer of language, of the politics of language. Waiting for the Barbarians has been interpreted in South Africa and elsewhere as an allegorical attack on apartheid, and the denial of the allegorical reading in the novel has been highlighted by critics as the novel tries to be an indictment of apartheid. It is the rejection of the consolations of allegory which are sought by the novel, in the sense that it demands allegorical reading, in other words, and herein lies the stump of the politics of Coetzee. In the same vein, the allegorical mode peculiar to the novel is unstable directly, and a fruitful tension between specific and generic is created that cannot be easily applied to the South African politics (Head 2009: 52). According to Head, this instability makes Coetzee able not only to challenge certain political regimes, but also the point at which we begin to discuss the discursive basis of imperial authority in this broader sense (53).There has been specific critique on the story-voice of the novel. As noted by Gallagher (1991), first-person narration of the Magistrate places the reader in an ambivalent ethical stance, where he or she is encouraged to both support and to dis-support his complicity with the imperial authority on the one hand, and on the other hand, to support and dis-support his identity with the Magistrate (p. 485). Gallagher says that this narrative approach would make readers acknowledge their own complicity with the systems of oppression.It is the same case of thought which Nashef (2009) follows by examining how the narration of the Magistrate, in both complicit and resisting behaviour, is demonstrated to begin the break on the side-lines so to speak as he sees it, as the imperial certainties are radicalised into (the) question (pp. 645). Since, then, the book "Disgrace" has provoked still more acrimonious critical discussion, especially about the way in which it portrays post-apartheid South Africa.Racialized violence, the novel fails to leave behind redemptive discourses of forgiveness, have caused it to be the center of controversy with regard to politics of representation in the new South Africa (Poyner, 2009:149). Other authors such as Graham (2003) say that the book perpetuates stereotypes of anti-white violence through depicting African-American violence on whites by showing black women raping her, above all (p. 438). Instead, others have enjoyed the politics of the novel. Anker (2008) makes the argument that "Disgrace" is an ambivalent attack on apartheid heritage and post-apartheid discourse of national reconciliation that eschews the comfort of nostalgic white liberalism or trendy versions of national rebirth (p. 240). Another idea that Vermeulen (2020) presents is that the perceived pessimism of the novel over the post-apartheid race relations is better redefined as a refusal of premature closure, as a refusal to work in the presence of historical injustice (p. 25). Critics also note in this regard that there are very significant differences involved in the case of narrative strategy in the two novels. This move, Wright argues, is not only an indicator of changed political conditions, but it is also an indicator of an unchanging Coetzee when it comes to his thinking on the ethics of representation and the politics of narrative form (p. Nevertheless, in spite of their differences, both novels have been hailed as the subtle manner in which they focus on the political ideology as a language battlefieldAs Clarkson (2021) has recently published in her article: in Coetzee fiction there is recurring acknowledgement that power is fixed on language and that breaking with it or disrupting it can be a way of resistance to dominant discourses (p. 22). Or, to Clarkson, it can be found in the two novels within the strategic deployments of linguistic fragmentation that reveal the contradictions and exclusions of the colonial and the postcolonial discourse (p. 23). 2.2 Coetzee in Postcolonial Situations Coetzee has assumed a certain stance in support of postcolonial struggle in some of his novels, although his writing has a down-to-earth stance on other pertinent matters. The issue of the relationship between Coetzee and language and power has been particularly fruitful in being read and contextualized through postcolonial readings. The resistance to colonial discursives and the pursuit of postcolonial lingua franca dimensions of resistance has been explored by scholars of this tradition in terms of Coetzee prose. The derivation of several postcolonial readings of Coetzee has been done on the basis of the contrapuntal reading as put forth by Said in his significant Culture and Imperialism (1993). Said claims that colonial texts need to be read, with a metropolitan history being tripped, and all those other

histories that the hegemonic discourse has been acting (and still acts) against and alongside. 51) In relation to Coetzee this is disclosed by what it recognizes Dominic Head - Problems of voice in the fiction of J.M. Coetzee 139 as problems of voice he finds in the novels that Coetzee writes, problems that are not produced by something that has been marginalized or distorted into illegibility on theARGOS chapters. Parry (1998) follows the same tactic to read Waiting for the Barbarians, and writes that the fragmented narrative structure of the novel gives ajar through which repressed aboriginal views can be perceived, even though not stated (p. 152). Spivak (1988, 271) '"Can the subaltern speak? has been defeated in postcolonial readings of Coetzee. The incontrovertibility of the subaltern [cannot] speak (1988:308) since their speech is indefinitely mediated by the discourses of domination (pp. 308-10) is herein echoed in Coetzee in investigating the problematics of representation. Durrant (2004)) relies on Spivak, who asserts that in Disgrace, the partial form of narrative, the novel both acknowledges that there is no possibility of directly representing subaltern experience, and it opens up the gaps in the text where the silence of the oppressed has a voice(p. 432). Specifically, the ideas of imitation and hybridity developed by Bhabha (1994) have illuminated the linguistic game of Coetzee. Bhabha also makes it clear that the colonial discourse is always ambivalent because the colonial presence is a dual phenomenon: [it is] in its enunciation... [its] presence is made and violated simultaneously] (p. 153). This instability is what offers points of resistance such is the case of Bhabha in his idea of mimicry where the colonised subject is unable to imitate the colonial discourse which ends up being a subtle destabilization of the latter. The same concept is utilized by Lin (2001: p.45) who tries to make use of the very concept to Waiting for the Barbarians to argue that the ever-dispersed discourse of the Magistrate is a metaphor of the imperial discourse itself and it reveals its own contradictions and limitations. Recent post-colonial readings have postulated how the Coetzee writing is rooted in actual historical and political reality in South Africa and is a commentary on postcolonial subjectivity and resistance too. According to Bernard (2007), Coetzee fiction is profound in [South African realities] and subservient to the exigences of political allegory to the peril of an interest in its plot and characters (p. 25). According to Barnard, this tension is generatively creative which enables Coetzee to ask questions of universal significance about language, power, and ethical responsibility and answer what is unique to South African experience (p. 26). Prentice (2020) uses this interpretation of Disgrace where the narrative structure of the novel is a defective gilded mirror of a broken post-apartheid South African society, where competing discourses grapple as the authoritative ones but none manages to achieve mastery (p. 42). This disjuncture of story, in the terms of Prentice, is political since it signifies the disaffection with the resolution that both apartheid ideology and post-apartheid narratives of reconciliation demand. One of the most perspectives of linguistic dismemberment within the corpus of Coetzee, which Farred (2022) considers in terms of postcolonialism, is the most extended reflection. He suggests that Coetzee is right in his systematic undermining of syntactical given and narrative unity as a kind of linguistic dispossession that bends (and makes emphasis on) material displacement of the colonised. " (p. 300). Not only does the theme of the novel revolve around that deprivation, Farred writes, but is also stipulated in the very form of the prose written by Coetzee, which, even as it practised the violence of colonialism, also opened up to the state of possible resisting (p. 301). 2.3 Aestheticism: literary analysis and language and politics. Besides the postcolonial readings Coetzee has been read within the framework of a variety of these approaches with the aim of creating awareness to the readers of the connection of language to politics in literature. These solutions give alternative entrances into how linguistic partitioning is sense-making as political comment in Coetzee. The concepts of Bakhtin (1981) dialogism and heteroglossia have been especially productive also where the wrestle with the language actions at Coetzee has been played. According to Bakhtin, this is the characteristic of the novel: it is characterized by a multiplicity of types of social speech, and by the ability of the novel to show various types of voices of individuals, which are artistically ordered (p. 262). To Bakhtin, such heteroglossia is political because it acts against monologic closure and inclusion of other voices. Gallagher (1991) writes about Coetzee: "There is hardly a voice of the author prevailing in his novels over many other voices. against that there is the challenging concept of the one authoritative voice" (p. 482). Demystifications of Coetzee linguistic politics have also been helpful to us using deconstructionist readings. According to Attridge (2004), the novels of J.M. Coetzee are said to have staged the confrontation with otherness, in ways that criticize the nearly colonialist certitude of the Western philosophical and literary traditions (p. 12). Attridge contends that this staging takes place through destabilisation of language as the one that presents the limits of representation and opens up to an ethical encounter with the other (p. 13). In new work that states, "Coetzee fractured his narratives do the deconstructive work that they thematize, its disruption of binary oppositions that structure colonialist thought is performed through a set of sheared breaks

that are their very linguistic acts, (p. 115), Yeoh (2024) expounds this analysis in a recent discussion that says, "Coetzee fractured his narratives are the deconstructive work of them thematize, their very linguistic acts are a deconstruction of binary oppositions that organize the thought of colonialism, and The Foucaultian discourse and power analysis also assisted me to demonstrate how Coetzee interferes with the popular places of power by his rhetorical tactics. It is through fiction that [Coetzee] reveals again and again how power is enacted by language, especially within the discursive group and nomenclature (Tegla 2016: 78). It is through narrative strategies, according to Tegla, that such an exposure is effected that destabilizes the appropriateness of discursive power and that create localised forms of resistance (79) The manner, in which the linguistic disintegration of Coetzee is reflected in how he depicts gendered relations of power, has been the subject of feminist and gendered readings. Narrative dissonance, in Disgrace, is a reiteration of the loss of patriarchal authority in post-apartheid South Africa (Graham, 2003, p. 440). Similarly, Mishim (2023) postulates that, the more fragmented the narrative of The Magistrate becomes, the more he recognizes how imperial power is gendered, functioning or acting differently on male and female bodies (p. 50). The problem of his linguistic disintegration in relation to his descriptions of nature and environmental ethics is now coming to environmental criticism. In the two novels there is systemic conjunction between linguistic interruptions and instances of human dominance over nature in the two novels. They both shadow a figure of colonial discourse and anthropocentrism" (Wright 2006: 12). This relation, according to Wright, offers a solution to the riddle of how Coetzee criticizes colonial power at the same time as it expands to include a larger scepticism about human exceptionalism, our exploitation of the earth (p. 13). 2.4.1 Weaknesses of the existing knowledge. Although there has been a plethora of criticism about the fiction of Coetzee, there are still blank spaces in our knowledge about where linguistic breakdown can be politically exploited in his fiction The next section identifies these gaps and places the given study into the field of academia discussion. 1) to revert to the theme of dismemberment, most critics have remarked on the fondness of J.M. Coetzee to disrupt linguistic and narrative continuity, but few have been interested in the particular way the cutting and pasting practiced by the author between and within texts. The study of literature on language has not been directed to examining close the performing routines, in other words how these routines are transformed based on new political situations This gap is occupied by quantifying linguistic fragmentation of a sample of novels that characterize various stages of the Coetzee oeuvre and South African political history. Secondly, in spite of some outstandingly elucidating postcolonial readings of Coetzee oeuvre, they have been uncharacteristically disposed to pay more attention to content rather than form. In their dispute, it is claimed that postcolonial interpretations of Coetzee have been inclined to place deeper attention on the issues of representation and identification rather than on his linguistic creativity (Clarkson 2021, pp. 20-21). This is the gap that this paper tries to rectify, in the following question: how does Coetzee intervene politically, by political meaning not only his thematic issues, but also the world that it is written in. And third, by matching the two works, Waiting for the Barbarians and Disgrace, scholars have established, mostly, thematic affinities (or the absence of them), to the exclusion of narrative form continuities (and breaksThe deeper modulations of the Coetzee narrational dynamics between these books, as Prentice (2020:40) notes, have never been contemplated, not in connection with the changing political context. To and Through vs. In and out The Traverse into Coetzee Self-invented Language This passage assists in redressing that by means of Coetzees linguistic fragmentation of the self in waiting, the face to face interaction with the contemporaneous South Africa in disgrace. Fourth, numerous debates have been done on how Coetzee represents marginal voices but little has been done on how the language fracturing presents an openness to the marginal voices. The political importance of Coetzee breaking language, as Farred (2022) states it: not the fragmentation of the master narratives, but the creation of textual spaces where other views could be articulated (p. 302). It is in this gap that we hope to contribute in this paper to investigate how the linguistic fragmentation of the novels by Coetzee gives opportunities to counter stories by the marginalized voices in response to dominant stories. Lastly, despite the fact that the scholarship of the recent years has started to frame the writing of Coetzee in terms of the contemporary theoretical perspectives, including affect theory, posthumanism, and the Anthropocene, the question of the relation of linguistic disjunction to the issues of the latter has remained unanswered. As Vermeulen (2020) notes, the linguistic experiments made by Coetzee predetermine much of the anxieties of post humanist discourse, particularly when it comes to the shortcomings of human knowability and the morality of such shortcomings (p. 30). This paper dares to begin to fill this gap by proposing the question to what degree the linguistic fragmentation of Coetzee here is applicable to the more general theoretical issue of the question of language, power and ethics at the end of history. By taking into consideration these fragments,

the article will serve to add to a subtle comprehension of how linguistic fragmentation functions as a political critique in Coetzee fiction, a critique that can also potentially be used to inform an understanding of what it is about his writing and the period in which he writes it postcolonial literature and theory. Analysis and Discussion the language division in 'Waiting for the Barbarians' is 3.1. In Waiting for the Barbarians, Coetzee resorts to different types of linguistic decomposition to delegitimize imperial discourse and to reveal the colonial space power structures. It is a part that has rather specific examples of linguistic fracturing in the novel, and how it works in politics. One of the most egregious types of linguistic fragmentation that has broken out in the novel is the unreliable and fragmented speech of the Magistrate. This development of the protagonist of the novel in complicititude with the Empire to the antagonism to it is so full of disequilibrium, weakness and inconsistency in the text of the discourse of the Magistrate here. but not in the first part of [= the novel since the voice of the Magistrate is] impregnated with the assurance of authority with such an element of the imperial discourse: I did not come to carry this burden, but I have a long time been here, I know a lot. It was I that made Colonel Joll enter the gates. I was the one who admitted him in" (Coetzee, 1980, p. 24). The declarative self-confidence and syntactic regularity of the first attaching to the imperial power of the Magistrate are seen in the sentences. His narrative voice starts disintegrating when he begins to perceive the superfluousness of the Empire and doubts his own position: And it does not, it does not to me, seem unreasonable to state that, whatever the other in the ruins in the desert the members of the Rainbow Family are doing this year or next, perhaps one thing they could work out, perhaps one thing they could do, is this why not leave something, why not leave something, something, something, some monument of the fact that we were here, as well, that we knew that this was a place where a town should be. But then what to make the token? The word here written on a slip of paperA piece of paper was lying on a rock. The wind and the rain will blow away the writings. We too are, in all probability, not very far off in our lifetimes inhabiting on these shelves of a house of the mind (Coetzee, 1980, p. 154). Most signs of linguistic fragmentation could be found in this passage: Sentence structure was lost, follows up questions and half sentences, jumps between concrete and abstract language. The Magistrates narrative unravels at the very time when it faces the complete impossibility of the imperial ideology regarding the moral responsibility of the act of colonizing d izcoursc (Nashef 2009: 647). 4 The other type of linguistic disjuncture in the novel is there is no dialogue between the colonizers and colonized. The failure of the Empire to decipher the barbarians is symbolized through the language and communication restrictions Trying to read the wooden slips they find in the desert in the language of the barbarians, the Magistrate reaches the extremity of imperial knowledge: I even have discovered myself reading the slips in a mirror, or the artifices of one upon another, of tacking them in a piece of gear, etc. I know there is, there is a plain pagi 7-but the longer I examine them the less clear they become (Coetzee, 1980, p. 110). Since Lin (2001) confirms that this passage introduces, possibly, the atrophic state of the Empire, which is unable to recognize the Otherness, but only the refractory monstrosity of its own categories (p. 47). The Magistrate has tried translation but the Metaphor is that the colonial discourse has failed to translate native knowledge and experience Fragments are also used in the novel as an opposition of various discourses and registers. This medical vocabulary of empire, in the representative case, which is the interrogations of Colonel Jill, is contrasted with the progressively poetic, uncertain analogue of the Magistrate. And what will shock Joll in his bewilderment of phrases will be his alleged objectivity and his euphemism and euphony of violence: Well, as you say,-- To start with there is lying which you see-- this ag'in so-- to start with there is lying, and then there is pressure, and then there is more lies, and then there is more pressure, and now the split, and then there is the truth-- pressure. That is the way to say the true truth" (Coetzee, 1980, p. 5). And that the mechanical pulse and the circular area of the way recall Attwells words[1993] 73) the closed circuit of imperial thought, which does not allow a view outside the circuit' the shape of this circular passage is another and more constant mnemonic of that fact. This juncture makes the prosecutor of this case more and more figurative, more uncertain, more and more haunted by doubt as he drifts away out of the imperial ideology: I was not, as an egotist might charitably imagine, the self-indulging pleasure-seeking opposite of the severe and hard-lining Colonel! I was that which the lie Empire says to health; and he that which the savager winds say when the Empire is down. Imperial rule had two forms, and no more, no less" (Coetzee (1980: 135)). This swap of discourses, according to Yeoh (2024, p. 122), reveals the contradictions within the ideologies of imperialism because it places their various articulations at the cross-purposes through dialogues. That kind of fracturing of the field of discourse is a statement of politics, which shows that the imperial force acts in and through multi or even competing individual linguistic registers. The extreme cases of language fragmentation in the novel are also torture and pain. The agony of Torturing a Magistrate solitary, is inconceivable: They

desired nothing but to experience the feeling of what it is to live in a body, in their body, I say in a body, in one that can comprehend the notion of justice only when complete and sound. It is one of the examples which Durrant (2004) employs to show that narrative is limited by the extreme physical suffering (2004, p) According to the fact that the Magistrate does not describe his torture as a coherent narrative, not only the bodies but also the linguistic systems in which the bodies could voice their sufferings and their sense are charged. The allegorical style of the novel could be perceived as such a linguistic deprivation: through the establishment of an indeterminate semiological space pervading the novel and refusing to provide a closure. Since, as Head (2009) remarks to not not establish where and when the book is being plotted is productive ambiguity, it allows the book to both have a response to apartheid South Africa and to have a response to the colonial power generally (p. 54). This indeterminacy that is allegorical competently destroys expectations to referential security of the reader and demands much more active involvement in the politics of the text (Attridge, 2004, p. 43). In all these various dismemberments of language, here, too, Waiting for the Barbarians offers a stinging critique of the imperial language. As Farred (2022) as well as other modern critics, this does the business of rendering the novel incoherent and asyntactic, and reveals the contradictions and omissions against which colonial domination keeps count and camouflage (p. 305It is a political commentary that is surely political, and that does not just operate on the motifs of power, but on the discursive ground of peripatetic power itself. 3.2 Disintegration of language in Disgrace. In Disgrace, published nearly 20 years after Waiting for the Barbarians Coetzee makes use of other, no less vital, varieties of linguistic disintegration to process the heritage of post-apartheid South Africa. The models, which are claimed to be obsolete are re-considered and re-written as models of a critique of politics in the transformed history. The most striking aspect of the Disgrace is that it uses so-called free indirect speech and forms a narrative voice that is hovering between the hero, David Lurie and an extradiegetic speaker. It produces the effect of some linguistic distance in which the character point of view is divorced of the narrational authority The following is an opening paragraph: To a fifty-two-year-old, divorced man he has fumbled (or so he prefers to believe) on a somewhat slick escape route of the sex concern. Thursday afternoons he drives out to Green Point. He presses the buzzer at the gate of Windsor Mansions, and calls his name, the gate is buzzed, he gets inside, and (Without looking back) he is walking up the stairs" (Coetzee, 1999, pp. The word to his mind gives us an indication that we are to realize the dislocation of narrated voice and character consciousness which we should expect of a fiction As Vermeulen (2020) explains it is an index of narrative, which creates a fruitful instability that disturbs the complete subscription of the reader to the point of view of Lurie since that point of view is ultimately barred at attaining closure (p. 27). These instabilities have something of a politically disillusioned feel to them that phases the insecure status (between privilege and precarity) of the white South Africans during the post-apartheid period, the enigmatic being of the nation state. Language is also turned inside out in the novel since it evokes the way that communication is lost along racial, cultural, generational lines. The apology which Lurie exercises to the father of Melanie Isaacs, only causes confusion: I'm sorry that happened. That is as far as he gets. I am very sorry about how I had treated your daughter. You have a wonderful family I am apologetic that we inconvenienced you and Mrs. Isaacs. I ask for your pardon.' Mr. Isaacs is only looking at him in disbelief. Who is talking here, it is not David Lurie anyway" (Coetzee, 1999, pp 171). This story exemplifies, as explained by Poyner (2009), "The somewhat insufficient language of apology and reconciliation to address the complicated legacies of historic injustice" (p. 153). The apology of Lurie is a farce not merely in the mere sense of the fact that it is not heartfelt, but in the fact that the language of reconciliation in the post-apartheid South Africa has been turned into meaninglessness. And when Lurie tries to find out how his daughter Lucy has reacted to being violated, he comes to the limit of his troporal instruments too: You feel that you are righting the wrongs of the past but that is not how to do it. Wanting to be the humble one you go and kneel and wash their feet. 'Why should I be humbled? I'm the one who was abused. It is regrettable, dear, I must go and have a shower wet, I simply cannot understand why people are so unreasonable (Coetzee, 1999, p. 157). According to Graham, 2003) is that incommensurability of apocalyptic to pragmatic concepts of violence and responsibility in post-apartheid South Africa (p. 442 This incommensurability-generated linguistic disjuncture represents a political remark which reveals the difficulty of creating a joint history out of an irreparably split society. Fragmentation is also applicable to language - language has strength and opposition. Lurie, a communications professor who, on being downsized in his department, is left to teach a course in Communication Skills, has an astute understanding of the political nature of language: He is no longer surprised at the degree of ignorance of his students. They are post Christians, post historical and postliterate they could have hatched out of eggs yesterday (Coetzee, 1999, p. 32). This excerpt in this manner

is symptomatic of such a feature of what Prentice (2020) terms Lurie as making a nostalgic investment in a Euro cultural tradition that is destabilizing in new South Africa (p. 45). And thus his linguistic elitism is a denial, a denial of a no to political change; a denial to be prostrate to an encounter with what could otherwise be a new discursive order. However, there is a change in the relationship of Lurie with language as the novel goes on. He relocates with his daughter to a farm in the Eastern Cape and the small of his fourth opera he can figure out into the mental life - an opera about Byron - is composed in snatches and lacks its middle; He is neither Teresa nor Byron, neither there nor there, but somewhere in the sound, in the harsh metallic clatter of banjo strings, the voice struggling to liberate itself of an absurd poor tool, the voice that has to be reined in like a hooked fish (Coetzee 1999, p. 214) According to Clarkson (2021), this procedure is an indication of the increasing acceptance of a more fragmented, contingent relationship by Lurie with a language that even acknowledges its own failure, yet simultaneously delights in its physical existence. This hug is a political hug which implies that out of 23 of the destruction of the old certainties new forms of expression and known worlds will be born. The negotiation around translation and multilingually of the novel will have to be looked to find the a quite different proliferation of languages. In the case of Petrus, who is a neighbour and would inherit the land she purchased, language asymmetries prevail during the visit of Lurie to the estate of his daughter house. /you have dogs - you why you have gun, too? Petrus is silent. He seems to have no reply. So many too many people with guns, Petrus," he continues. Draw the trigger you assassinate somebody A gun is a gun, says Petrus bitterly.' (Coetzee, 1999, p. 129) Thus, as Stoffer (2022: 85) observes, this dialogue is the testament to the fact that even language itself is made a warzone in the post-apartheid South Africa, where English could no longer be the self-evident archonexmic. His reply here is an oblique one of resistance to Lurie sucking up of language (although it could be described as refusal to battle on the ground established by the old colonizer). Last but not least, fragmentation of the self is highlighted in the unclosed ending of the novel in its incomplete narrative endingsLucy is a commodity to be traded in in return of securing: to be rounded the circle who can possess her, sexually should the desire take him (she becomes the third wife of Petrus); Lurie becomes an informer of the March dog cullers (the surplus dogs are to be destroyed in an animal clinic), the novel ends with the changed central character, the changed narrator - that at last in com medications red (Paulin), free to be a dog distruster, compelled to make the decision to have the lad as your object as he is immacu lately put down "'Yes, I am giving him up.' He picks the man as a lamb out of the cells and into the surgery. Bev Shaw says, "I supposed you were going to leave him to another week. 'No, I don't think so,' he says. 'Are you ready? Will you do it? I can't.' He opens the cage door. "Come," he says, bent, arms open. The dog wags its twisted back, snuffles on his face, licks his cheeks, its lips, its ears. He does nothing to stop it. Yes, I am selling him away' (Coetzee, 1999, p. 220). This, Anker (2008) concludes, refuses to offer so rosy (or gloomy) consoliences, and leaves one with a moral agnosticism that represents the ambivalences of post-apartheid South Africa (p. 250 The fragments which remain the relic of this outraged denial of closure are discursively politically sub-versive in that they have a chance to ridicule 52 Not about those to keep in memorial both white liberal humanist nostalgic narratives, and national metamorphosis triumphalist metanarratives. It is these multi-layered forms of linguistic Disgrace that the novel itself is engaged in a multi-layered politics of language of post-apartheid South Africa. by its disruption of narrative coherence and linguistic certitude, the work in Disgrace itself performs, or acts out the instability that Coetzee is theorizing; the instability that not only it investigates but also itself constitutes giving full visibility to the contradictions and exclusions on which post-apartheid discourses of reconciliation and transformation depend (p. 310). This acting is thus a sort of political critique which transcends the thematic because it questions the discursive assumptions of the new South Africa. 3.3 Comparative Analysis Having discussed the disintegration of language in both Waiting for the Barbarians and Disgrace separately, this section is devoted to a comparison of the Coetzee techniques in these novels and the transformation they have already experienced, which can be interpreted as the barometer of the changes in the political landscape. The narrative perspective is one of the major differences between the two novels 'Waiting for the Barbarians', is told in the first person by its narrator, who is growing more and more fractious as he alternates between complicity and opposition. In contrast to this, "Disgrace" uses free indirect discourse to build a far less resolvable and more tender relationship between the narrator and the protagonist. Since this altered form of narrative, as mentioned by Wright (2006: 10) is like the way Coetzee is constantly changing his approach to the question of collusion and responsibility in the post-apartheid South Africa. In the example of the former, then the action of the Magistrate realizing the character of his conspiracy with the imperial power is reformulated by the rupture of his narrative voice. The later one is by comparison within the more involved crosscurrents of narrative perspectives at work, the

performance of those more involved forms of complicity that characterize the post-apartheid era The novels are also different, though, concerning allegorical distance. Waiting for the Barbarians has a kind of allegorical mode with a tendency to generate a tactical indeterminacy whereas Disgrace has a more openly confrontational attitude to the more local history and politics, post-apartheid South Africa. This is the value of allegorical distance: it allowed Coetzee in Waiting for the Barbarians to express an anti-apartheid feeling and not to be asked to write politically relevant literature to which so much influence was given by South African literature in the 1970s (Attwell 1993, 75). In its turn, "Disgrace" looks in the face of the knotty South Africa of the post-apartheid era-- although with an excessive amount of uncertainties and oppositions. According to Poyner (2009): This change is due to the shifting role of South African writers during the decades of the waning apartheid and the infantile democracy, [the] It is the role of resisting an expressively identified oppressive force that is replaced by the greater challenge of writing about a society that is in transition. Although there are such disparities in the works, the two utilize linguistic fragmentation as a means of disrupting the master narratives and providing platforms of voices in the periphery. I will give an instance of 'Waiting For the Barbarians', where even the imperial discourse is dismembered in its intemperance, that it be able to let itself be swept away by the exterior views of the natives, which in the last resort can never be more than partially expressed. Disgrace carves up these post-apartheid histories of reconciliation and redemption and in so doing, it invalidates them making way to more complex ideas about historical responsibility and social change Linguistic disturbance is also successfully employed in both novels in scenes that testify to some kind of violence and dispossession which have eluded any effort of direct representation and which officially establish on the text what can be called textual spaces in which silence of the dispossessed is eloquently articulated. (Durrant 2004:445) Each narrative employs the concept of linguistic dislocation to convey the ways of relationship between language and body as well as how they render torture and sexual violence In 'Waiting for the Barbarians', the torture of the Magistrate has taken place too deep into language, a dismantling of language in a text, which shows how colonial violence dismantles bodies and histories. The unyielding silence of Lucy in Disgrace toward the narrative of her rape can also be said to be some form of linguistic disjuncture, although it is the reverse of the tends of patriarchal and colonial modes of the female body and the trauma of sexual violence. In the case of the novels, every one of them is subject to evaluation regarding how such a physical violence, in its extreme form, dismantles, not only bodies of individuals, but also the structures of language within which experience is produced, and which produce experience (Graham, 2003, p. 443). The novels are different though in their (mis)representation of the power of the word. It is Waiting for the Barbarians, a story by the Magistrate. And the story told by the voice of the Magistrate'\{ In a way, as the Magistrate himself more and more loses the characteristics of a fragmented character, the impression of an authority is present The power of language in "Disgrace" has still more been disseminated, and there are more than one of the characters who set himself in opposition to what Mr. Lurie sees things, and the novel itself rejects the primacy of any of them, either logical or literary. And, according to Farred (2022), this transformation of centralized to decentralized model of linguistic authority resembles a political transformation of the brutally repressive institutions of apartheid, to that of more complicated power relations of post-apartheid South Africa (p. 312). The two novels also contrast on how they come to work towards a narrative end. Rather, Waiting to the Barbarians concludes with the Magistrate completing his term and returning to his own life and his own existence in the border town that he used to rule, awaiting the barbarians that are not expected to come, an open and, in a way, circle-shaped conclusion of the story. Even more ajarly "Disgrace" ends, in which case I mean the decision of Lurie to have his beloved pet euthanized is not redemption any more than it is an act of despair; it is the rejection of any destination reached by the ethical knowing process. It is symptomatic, as Vermeulen (2020) contends, - "This disparity in the closure of the narratives is symptomatic of the change in Coetzee's relationship to the political provocation of his historical conjuncture: the urgency of thinking alternative to apartheid, through in the previous novel, and the resistance to closure a outrance, here (p. 31). It is on the basis of such interpretation that we can acknowledge how Coetzee realises his practice of linguistic fragmentation as it makes progress in the context of evolving political circumstances and which, at the same time, constitutes and is (at all times and ever) involved in discussions of the dynamics of power in and through language. Clarkson (2021) argues that in both novels, Reading, Coetzee articulated narratives can also be described as the politics of resistance, but is not the politics of the simple opposition but of naming and shaming contradictions and open up spaces where other voices and positions can happen, (p. 32Coetzee is an original contributor to the postcolonial genre and theory through this politics of resistance, of dismembering linguistically, that Coetzee provides is but one of the ways amongst others that

Coetzee is a distinctive contributor in the field of postcolonial literature and theory. 3.4 Decolonizing and de-colonial Contestations of Colonial Discourse The practice to deconstruct colonial discourse with the representations of post-colonial critique as things and beings, to say, as Kambayashi as objects of Western Orientalism (1998: 72) - as representations with which we know post-colonial critique. After analyzing the linguistic fragmentation in the two books, and comparing the way Coetzee uses them in the two hundred years, the following section will take a look at how (in a more general sense) the methods change to construct the discourse of colonialism According to Bhabha (1994), the colonial discourse is:... an ambivalent signifying structure [and] [a]n apparatus of power that at once both establishes the colonized as a definite reality [that] is a visible and knowable other] (70). These discourses are binary (civilized/primitive, rational/irrational, self/other) which defends imperial domination by making the colonized appear inferior to the colonizer. Language loss of Coetzee is used to dismantle these binaries and to show the contradictions of the colonial discourse. The narrative of Waiting for the Barbarians the Magistrate proposes a challenge to the structuring binary of civilisation/barbarism of the imperialist rule of law in the arm forcibly fragmented and fragmenting narrative. When he looks back at the Imperial attitude to the "barbarians" he thinks: I believe: I have had an active year, and am aware of it as truly as of the unborn child. I am unworthy to write a Memorium more than any man in the village. Give me the smith and his "Outraged dark wailout" (Coetzee 1980: 169). The passage according to Yeoh (2024) is also a deconstruction of the civilization/barbarism dichotomy since in this case the one who is civilized (narrator) is not the one who knows and possesses the barbaric (crying of the blacksmith" (p.120 This Magistrate even owns to his own confusion, with the solemnity of diminishing the imperial presupposition of the possession of knowledge into the sporadic and vapid system of discourse beneath such a pretence. 4 In another act that resembles the one of "Disgrace," an experience by Lurie with Petrus invert the binary opposition of power that the colonizer exhibited through his command of language and the absence of discourse that the colonized had no. Lurie is left, when Petrus utter his mysterious A gun is a gun, with nothing to reply, his linguistic power stymied to the moment. This communicative failure, which Stoffer (2022) posits, endeavors to disturb colonial prescripts where the language of the colonizers was privileged as being more advanced in expressing themselves seeks to demonstrate how power creates articulate and inarticulate speakers instead of incoherent ones. Linguistic dissection has been used in these two novels, as well, to unveil the violence hidden under the discourse of colonialism. The euphemistic rhetoric of pressure and of truth that Joll uses in Waiting for the Barbarians can never be brought to the same level of bloody language of torture used by Magistrate, and a tearing of discourse begins to open up revealing the brute truths that are covered by the imperial rhetoric. Similarly, in Disgrace the rhetoric of redemption and regeneration is equally being shattered by its closeness to violence and dispossession to the same degree that it is also shattered by the inadequacies that still plague the power device in the post-apartheid language. The language disintegration by Coetzee also contributes to the formation of counter-marginalised narrative spaces in the style of allowing the voice of the Other to be heard. The silence of the barbarian girl can also be interpreted here as a form of the strategic essentialism (Spivak, 1988) as far as the barbarian girl cannot be reclaimed through the imperial discursive. That is, her silence is not not, but presence that interferes with the need of the Magistrate as a will to represent her (Parry 1998, p. 158). On the same note, the act of not reporting her rape is a form of resistance or even denial of the dominant discourses on sexual violence and racial hostility as portrayed by Lucy in a different play, Disgrace. Graham (2003), goes on to say that her silence is the rejection of the openings that are available and known to exist to her. Coetzee defragmented stories also act out what is known by Derrida (1997) as the trace, the silhouette of absence which haunts all the linguistic systems. The unsaid, that which cannot be spoken in the colonial discourse, in both novels has a very strong power on the said. Of what Attridge (2004) speaks of as these ghostly voices--the ghosts in the murmur--unheard voices in the screams01', I should go one step further than Attridge, and suggest that the meanings which Coetzee seems to give them are in the constant search of the missing centre, of the attempt to cross the judgment in the absence of the truth...[and that his] tales must be structurally disjunctive in terms of truth, ethics without this recourse to incoherence'(p.18). The language dismemberment technique Coetzee uses in this drama of negative operations can be taken as a deconstructive way of subverting colonial discourse. The disjointed stories Coetzee tells do not intervene in the colonial discourse by highlighting its contradictions, but by cutting inside its framework, Coetzee documents its internal inconsistencies and creates new points of departure that would allow a different way of thinking other than the binary codes (Farred, 227 2022: 315). It is a very specific form of irreverent political commentary, not articulating itself in straight dissent register, but through the revelation of contradictions, the establishment of

spaces in which other voices and moralisms can be dismissed. 4.1 Summary of Key Findings In this article, the analysis of the participation of linguistic disruption as political remark in a de constructivist scheme in two novels, the Waiting for the Barbarians and the Disgrace by J.M. Coetzee, two distinct time frames of history including the de construction of the discourse of colonization, has been addressed. Nevertheless, there are some important conclusions that can be made concerning this associations based on the case study of the disintegration of language as one of the strategic aspects of Coetzee discourse. The linguistics of Waiting for the Barbarians First, the linguistics in WFTB is undermined, first, with regard to its narrative, first, in Magistrate, with his more and more duplicitous and dismembered narration, in the image of communication between colonizers and colonized, with competing discourses and registers, in the allegorical ambiguity of the text. It is this collective un-doing that is to put into crisis the dominion of imperial discourse in disintegrating the logic of consistency that works invisibly in the text and that the discourses that are alternatives may arise. If not spoken, if not spoken. Second, Disgrace provides linguistic dissolution in other (but no less compelling) ways, including the free indirect discourse which makes even less clear differentiation between the authorial voice and subjective point of view, the reflection on the abys of communication between various racial and cultural groups, stolen layers upon layers of language as the seat of authority and pushback, and, beyond all of this, that open mouth of the title which cannot be closed in narrative. Such reading habits are disruptive, as well, of nostalgic constructions of white (Western) liberal humanism and triumphant images of post-apartheid change, and they are disruptive of the continuing imbalances in - and the discomposure of - South Africa. And to conclude; on comparing the two novels we can say that Coetzee does actually employ linguistic fragmentation in both - but in two senses. Although with dissimilar narrative positions and amounts of allegorical detachment, they both employ linguistic rupture to challenge official discourses, to dig space around the unspeakable, to vocularize the language/body interface, and to oppose closure as a rhetorical method of closure. Its consistencies are indicative of a politics in the most minor of the side tracks, a political agenda running under the style of all the works of Coetzee, of all the modulations of style as changes of history. In conclusion, the discussion has proven the language disintegration employed by Coetzee to serve the purpose of the novel in a broader way to deconstruct colonial discourse such that it brings out the violence of colonial languages, to stage within which subaltern voices may be given voice, and to perform the trace of that which cannot be captured in the process of representation in master discursive formations. This is political commentary, which is not with denial, but with exposure of lies and spaces where we can start to generate and think differently. 4.2 Theoretical Implications The findings of this study have various implications concerning the dynamic between literary innovation and commitment in the postcolonial writing. On one hand, they would like us to think the so-called formal innovation, is not an aesthetic decision only, but also can be a political action per se. Although the political power literature possesses cannot be attributed to content, yet, (that is, that which lies outside of its thematic content) but to its formal properties that may rival the established forms of representation alongside produce new affects and thinking (p. 120). Coetzee aesthetic disorder is its manifestation of this political possibility of the literary form, where narrative technology may be understood not merely to achieve in the direction of criticism of a certain power formation, but also in the direction of the creation of alternatives. Secondly, we would like to believe that this paper managed to show in one example how postcolonial literature can attain peace with the legacies of colonialism without the repetition of colonial discourse. By definition, as Spivak (1988) says, the project of speaking the colonized is fraught with the danger of repeating the same colonial power relations because we do not speak with but speak on behalf of the subaltern subjects. The linguistic dismemberment of the self as practiced by Coetzee could provide a resolution to this dilemma in accepting the constraints of representation and in establishing a textual environment where even the silent of the silenced have a voice that speaks volumes. 37 This would mean that the postcolonial text can not necessarily best overcome colonialist discourse by trying to give voice to the subaltern on his behalf, but through demonstrating the insensibility and inconsistency of dominant discourses, in revealing gaps and contradictions between languages of different social groups, in showing how languages overdetermine the colonizer Third, the findings of the current research can be reflective of the literary responsiveness to the contemporary politics. It is that I know, I am idealist to the last. Coetzee (his move towards allegorical pseudohistorical to baldly contemporizing engagement with the SA present, between Waiting for the Barbarians and Disgrace) is a good example of how one can make literary devices address different periods in history, though it does not change the political project in the slightest. This plasticity implies that the political usefulness of literature is not in its ideological adherence, or in the subject matter of its works, but in its ability to be responsive to new

circumstances, to confront hegemonic narratives, and to create new arenas of thought about the political and ethical issues. Last but not least, the paper adds to our knowledge of the issue of aesthetics and ethics of postcolonial fiction. According to Vermeulen (2020), this can be characterized as the degree-zero ethics of Coetzee and how the fragmented, loosely framed narratives perform an ethical stand that does not uphold the absolutes of moral judgment and does not subscribe to the relativism(s) of moral indifference. It is this ethical orientation by linguistic disenchantment that takes the possibility to obscure rather than illuminate ethical issues, and the possibility to make space to more differentiated and responsive modes of moral participation, the major value added to political discourse, at least, in the context of literature. 4.3 Limitations & Future Work Although this question provided a comprehensive discussion of linguistic internal conflict in two Coetzee novels, there were qualifications to do so. First is, that, out of practical reasons, the choice to examine only two of the numerous novels of Coetzee would necessarily narrow the interpretation process. Coetzee might have applied such an approach to his other works (e.g. in his later novels) also. Elizabeth Costello (2003), Slow Man (2005)," and the Jesus trilogy, to consider how his linguistic fragmentation and its consequent themes are evolving in ReSponse to new political and personal conditions. Second, it is possible that this book has become too narrow of focus on the linguistic fragmentation of colonial and postcolonial discourses at the expense of other aspects of Coetzee writing. Additional effort must also require the question of what linguistic fragmentation in Coetzee fictions may be required to do with other things, such as animal ethics, ecology, and authorial ethics. We could find out something we could not know of the formal experiments that Coetzee makes in his particular political and ethical questions in their insularity to postcolonialism. Third, though we have tried to re-conceive the means by which Coetzee is using linguistic fragmentation, and found that postcolonial theory, deconstruction and narrative theory influences could provide us with suggestive options on where to do so, there may be other theoretical ions, where we can learn something about linguistic sundering Coetzee. Future criticism could apply to it, e.g. affect theory, posthumanism or ecocriticism, to interrogate how the practices of the narratives Coetzee presents respond to the extant theoretical debate on embodiment, non-human agency and environmental ethics. And finally, we have in this article also attempted a close reading of Coetzee fiction, instead of a detailed description of its reception or its influence. Further comparative studies can be conducted into the responses of the readers in other markets to the linguistic disintegration of Coetzee, and how his processes of narration have impacted upon other South African and international authors. It is also through this work that we would be able to discern more clearly the wider cultural and political meaning of the formal experimentations of Coetzee. 4.4 Concluding Reflections To recap it all, I have shown how the linguistic division in Coetzee Waiting for the barbarians and Disgrace serves as a political dissection of the cause of the colonies in the various periods of history. Coetzee disrupts the logic of narrative coherence and syntax and process of communication and constructs a set of textual locations where grand narratives are upset and oppositional voices of subaltern challenge imperial discourses and subsequent post-apartheid discourses of reconciliation and transformation. What is impressive about this is that it is a mode of thinking concerning political in the form of the questions it poses instead of the answers it offers compared to literature which marginalizes literature as either pure politics (propagandizing) or aesthetic subtlety in place of political subtlety. As Attwell (1993: 120) rightly argues, the novels by Coetzee would tend to imply that in the event literature can contribute anything at all, it is probably because it would be an aversion to providing comforting answers or comforter theses. Such rejection, in the disintegration of language, is a rhetoric of political criticism, which does not manifest itself as an antagonism, but still tears in the airspace of contradictions and in the premises created in relation to it, of which new figures of thought and speech open up These are disjointed accounts by Coetzee in an age of acute political division and a return to nationalist and strongman ideology, which demand that we remember what the purpose of literature is not to affirm or give strength to the existing system of things, but to disrupt it; not to respond, but to ask questions; not to stop, but to sink the prevailing system of looking at and using words. According to Farred (2022), the linguistic interventions of Coetzee make evanescent holes in the apparently closed circuitries of power and fragments and auras of what might occur beyond or and outside the definitions of a present political imagina tion. However transient are these however, the peculiar contributions of the medium, as not answering, but posing new questions, challenging questions. Language, as it is employed by Coetzee through the use of a vulgarism, can never be viewed as politically neutral at the limit, but it always carries power and resistance. In thus division of the content of the notions of politics Coetzee is asking his readers to reflect not on what is said and done in a work of political theory but on how things are said and done, and not to the content but to the form of political speech or action. It is a desperate appeal at taking the challenge of a more self-

conscious, more contrived language to comprehend ourselves and the world, and this challenge is as irrelevant now as it was when Coetzee first suggested it.

References

Anker, E. S. (2008). Human rights, social justice, and J. M. Coetzee's Disgrace. Modern Fiction Studies, 54(2), 233-267.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2002). The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Attridge, D. (2004). J.M. Coetzee and the ethics of reading: Literature in the event. University of Chicago Press.

Attwell, D. (1993). J.M. Coetzee: South Africa and the politics of writing. University of California Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The dialogic imagination: Four essays (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.

Barnard, R. (2007). Apartheid and beyond: South African writers and the politics of place. Oxford University

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). The location of culture. Routledge.

Clarkson, C. (2021). The grammar of waiting: J. M. Coetzee and the linguistics of trauma. Journal of Literary Studies, 37(1), 19-35.

Coetzee, J. M. (1980). Waiting for the barbarians. Penguin Books.

Coetzee, J. M. (1999). Disgrace. Penguin Books.

Coetzee, J. M. (2003). Elizabeth Costello. Viking.

Coetzee, J. M. (2005). Slow man. Secker & Warburg.

Derrida, J. (1997). Of grammatology (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press.

Durrant, S. (2004). Bearing witness to apartheid: J. M. Coetzee's inconsolable works of mourning. Contemporary Literature, 45(3), 421-450.

Farred, G. (2022). Linguistic dispossession: Coetzee's postcolonial syntax. Modern, 68(2), 295-319.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977 (C. Gordon, Ed.). Pantheon Books.

Gallagher, S. V. (1991). The dialogic imagination of J. M. Coetzee. Contemporary Literature, 32(4), 480-506.

Graham, L. V. (2003). Reading the unspeakable: Rape in J. M. Coetzee's Disgrace. Journal of Southern African Studies, 29(2), 433-444.

Head, D. (2009). The Cambridge introduction to J.M. Coetzee. Cambridge University Press.

Lin, L. (2001). J. M. Coetzee and the postcolonial rhetoric of simultaneity., 28(1), 42-53.

Marais, M. (2000). The possibility of ethical action: J. M. Coetzee's Disgrace. Scrutiny2, 5(1), 57-63.

Mehmi, S. S. (2023). Imperialism and gender in J. M. Coetzee's Waiting for the Barbarians. Literature and Linguistics, 4(1), 45-62.

Nashef, H. A. (2009). Becomings in J. M. Coetzee's Waiting for the Barbarians and José Saramago's Blindness. Comparative Literature Studies, 46(4), 638-666.

Parry, B. (1998). Speech and silence in the fictions of J. M. Coetzee. In D. Attridge & R. Jolly (Eds.), Writing South Africa: Literature, apartheid, and democracy, 1970-1995 (pp. 149-165). Cambridge University Press.

Poyner, J. (2009). J.M. Coetzee and the paradox of postcolonial authorship. Ashgate.

Prentice, C. (2020). Narrating postcolonial precarity: J. M. Coetzee's Slow Man and Disgrace. Journal of Postcolonial Writing, 56(1), 39-53.

Said, E. W. (1993). Culture and imperialism. Vintage.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), Marxism and the interpretation of culture (pp. 271-313). University of Illinois Press.

Stoffer, H. (2022). Language and liberation: A study of J.M. Coetzee's postcolonial writing. Research in African Literatures, 53(2), 78-96.

Tegla, E. (2016). J. M. Coetzee and the ethics of power: Unsettling complicity, complacency, and confession.

Vermeulen, P. (2020). The affective fallacy: J. M. Coetzee's Disgrace and the ethics of reading. English Studies in Africa, 63(1), 20-33.

Wright, L. (2006). Writing "out of all the camps": J. M. Coetzee's narratives of displacement. Research in African Literatures, 37(2), 1-19.

Yeoh, G. (2024). A deconstructionist interpretation of J. M. Coetzee's Waiting for the Barbarians. Contemporary Literature, 65(1), 112-138.