TC
CELAL BAYAR ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI

MIKHAIL BAKHTIN'S CONCEPT OF POLYPHONY AND THE POLYPHONIC NOVEL AS REFLECTED IN J.M. COETZEE'S *SUMMERTIME* AND *DIARY OF A BAD YEAR*

Melike ÇELİKER

Danışman
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mahinur AKŞEHİR UYGUR

MANİSA--2015

TC
CELAL BAYAR ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
YÜKSEK LİSANS PROGRAMI

MIKHAIL BAKHTIN'S CONCEPT OF POLYPHONY AND THE POLYPHONIC NOVEL AS REFLECTED IN J.M. COETZEE'S *SUMMERTIME* AND *DIARY OF A BAD YEAR*

Melike ÇELİKER

Danışman
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mahinur AKŞEHİR UYGUR

MANİSA--2015

TEZ SAVUNMA SINAV TUTANAĞI

Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü 29/05/2015 tarih ve 16/2 toplantısında oluşturulan jürimiz tarafından Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Lisansüstü Öğretim Yönetmeliği'nin 23. Maddesi gereğince Enstitümüz İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi Melike ÇELİKER 'Mikhail Bakhtin's Concept of Polyphony and the Polyphonic Novel as reflected in J.M.Coetzee's Summertime and Diary of a Bad Year' konulu tezi incelenmiş ve aday 29/06/2015 tarihinde saat 13.00'da jüri önünde tez savunmasına alınmıştır.

Adayın kişisel çalışmaya dayanan tezini savunmasından sonra ...90... dakikalık süre içinde gerek tez konusu, gerekse tezin dayanağı olan anabilim dallarından jüri üyelerinin sorduğu sorulara verdiği cevaplar değerlendirilerek tezin,

BAŞARILI olduğuna		☒	OY BİRLİĞİ	☒
DÜZELTME yapılmasına	*	☐	OY ÇOKLUĞU	☐
RED edilmesine	**	☐	ile karar verilmiştir.	

* Bu halde adaya 3 ay süre verilir.
** Bu halde adayın tez konusu değiştirilebilir.

BAŞKAN
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mahinur AKŞEHİR UYGUR(Danışman)

ÜYE
Prof. Dr. Dilek DİRENÇ

ÜYE
Doç. Dr. B. Ayça ÜLKER ERKAN

Evet Hayır

*** Tez, burs, ödül veya Teşvik prog. (Tüba, Fullbright vb.) aday olabilir

☐ ☐
Tez, mutlaka basılmalıdır

☐ ☐
Tez, mevcut haliyle basılmalıdır

☐ ☐
Tez, gözden geçirildikten sonra basılmalıdır.

☐ ☐
Tez, basımı gereksizdir.

☐ ☑

YEMİN METNİ

Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak sunduğum "Mikhail Bakhtin's Concept of Polyphony and the Polyphonic Novel as Reflected in J.M. Coetzee's *Summertime* and *Diary of a Bad Year*" adlı çalışmamın, tarafımdan bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin bibliyografyada gösterilen eserlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanmış olduğumu belirtir ve bunu onurumla doğrularım.

23/ 07/ 2015

Melike Çeliker

ÖZET

MİKHAİL BAKHTİN'İN ÇOKSESLİLİK VE ÇOKSESLİ ROMAN KAVRAMININ J.M. COETZEE'NİN *SUMMERTIME* (YAZ ZAMANI) VE *DIARY OF A BAD YEAR* (KÖTÜ BİR YILIN GÜNLÜĞÜ) ROMANLARINDAKİ YANSIMASI

Bu çalışma, J.M. Coetzee'nin Avustralya'ya yerleşmesinin akabinde 2000'li yıllarda yayınladığı *Summertime* (*Yaz Zamanı)* ve *Diary of a Bad Year* (*Kötü Bir Yılın Günlüğü)* adlı romanlarını çoksesli roman kavramı üzerinden incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Mikhail Bakhtin'in teorik çalışmalarında ortaya koyduğu çokseslilik kavramının ne olduğunu ve bu kavramın romanlarda kullanılmasıyla nasıl çoksesli roman kavramının ortaya çıktığı araştırılmıştır. Tek bir sesin üstünlüğünü yok sayarak, birden fazla sesi içinde barındıran ve bu seslerin her birine konuşma fırsatı tanıyan çokseslilik kavramını, Bakhtin'in Dostoevsky ve onun romanları üzerine yaptığı çalışmalara nasıl dayandırdığı incelenmektedir. Bakhtin, çokseslilik kavramının ilk olarak Dostoevsky'nin kaleme aldığı romanlarda olduğunu ve çoksesli roman kavramının Dostoevsky'nin eserleriyle ortaya çıktığını nasıl savunduğu analiz edilmektedir. Bu çokseslilik kavramı, 'yazarın sesi tektir ve doğrudur' algısını kırarak, bütün karakterlerin fikirlerini özgürce, yazarın sınırlandırması olmadan, ifade etmelerine olanak sağlamaktadır. Karakterler sürekli bir diyalog halinde oldukları için, konuşma ve fikir alışverişinin romanlarda devam etmesi, ve olayların kesin bir sona bağlanmadan, açık uçlu şekilde bitirilmesinin çoksesli roman kavramına nasıl katkıda bulunduğu araştırılmıştır. Bu durumun da roman hakkında kesin bir yargıya varılamaması, ve her okuyucunun romanı kendi ideolojisi ve algısı çerçevesinde değerlendirmesini nasıl sağladığı incelenmektedir. Coetzee'nin, Bakhtin'in çokseslilik kavramı üzerine yaptığı çalışmalar sonucunda, *Summertime* (*Yaz Zamanı)* ve *Diary of a Bad Year* (*Kötü Bir Yılın Günlüğü)* adlı romanlarında, bu kavramı ve bu kavramın ortaya çıkardığı roman tekniklerini nasıl yansıttığı irdelenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çokseslilik, Çoksesli roman, Mikhail Bakhtin, Fyodor Dostoevsky, J.M.Coetzee

ABSTRACT

MIKHAIL BAKHTIN'S CONCEPT OF POLYPHONY AND THE POLYPHONIC NOVEL AS REFLECTED IN J.M. COETZEE'S *SUMMERTIME* AND *DIARY OF A BAD YEAR*

This study aims to scrutinize J.M. Coetzee's *Summertime* and *Diary of a Bad Year*, which were published in 2000s following Coetzee's relocation in Australia, in terms of the concept of polyphonic novel. Mikhail Bakhtin defines the concept of polyphony in his theoretical studies. The concept of polyphony, by destroying the superiority of the ultimate authorial voice, includes multiple voices, and enables each voice to speak, and Bakhtin bases his studies of polyphony on Dostoevsky and his novels. Bakhtin argues that Dostoevsky has been the first author who involves the concept of polyphony into his novels and who creates polyphonic works. Polyphony disregards the perception of 'the author's voice as ultimate and unique,' and provides all the characters with the freedom to speak their own ideas without the intrusion of authoritative voice. In a polyphonic novel, the characters are in continuous dialogical relations, and the novel has an open-ended plot. This open-ended closure of the novel makes it impossible to have an ultimate judgment/interpretation about the novel and it enables each reader to perceive the novel by filtering it through his/her own ideology and perception. This thesis also explores how Coetzee embodies polyphony in his own unique way in his two novels, *Summertime* and *Diary of a Bad Year.*

Keywords: Polyphony, Polyphonic Novel, Mikhail Bakhtin, Fyodor Dostoevsky, J.M. Coetzee

for Halil Çeliker

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The person whom I would like to thank is my advisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Mahinur Akşehir Uygur. Her invaluable guidance, tutorship and detailed feedback have always led me from confusion to enlightenment. This study is indebted to her respected personal skills, and I thank her for her care and friendliness. I respect her for her continuous attempts to motivate my studies and to increase the confidence in myself. Finally, I am grateful to her for making me feel special to be her student.

I also thank to the precious professors in English Language and Literature Department for their great efforts and academic skills to enable us to study and complete a master degree. I would like to express my sincere thanks notably to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Berna Ayça Ülker Erkan as the head of the department, and then Prof. Dr. Sibel Güzel, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Atalay Gündüz, Asst. Prof. Dr. Papatya Alkan Genca for their venerable contributions to my academic success.

Lastly, I wish to thank my dear husband, Halil Çeliker, for his valuable support and his confidence in my studies. His love and tolerance has made me endure this difficult and stressful period.

Melike ÇELİKER

Manisa, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

John Maxwell Coetzee, winner of the 2003 Nobel Prize, stands as a significant literary figure of the contemporary world. He was born in 1940, in Cape Town, South Africa, yet, currently he lives in Adelaide after his settlement in Australia. Coetzee witnesses the colonial process and the effects of the colonization on people's life during his South African years, and he experiences the violent and chaotic atmosphere caused by the colonialism and the apartheid. Although he is grown up in an English-speaking family, he is also influenced by the African society; and thus, this circumstance provides Coetzee with a point of view that embraces two worlds, English and African, simultaneously (Poyner, *Coetzee and The Idea* 2-3). Due to his experiences in South Africa, his first literary works include the traces of the colonial process and its outcomes. However, later in the second part of his career, especially following his relocation in Australia, his works commence to deal with the problems concerning the human condition and personal relations rather than being limited to the South African context.

In his novels, Coetzee treats distinct political, social or historical issues both in the context of South Africa and in a universal sense. While forming his style of writing, Coetzee has been affected by certain literary figures who have enabled him to shape his artistic style, and Dominic Head lists Samuel Beckett and Franz Kafka (*The Cambridge* 33) and Fyodor Dostoevsky (72) among these figures. By studying those authors and figuring out their ways of writing, Coetzee creates his unique mode of narrative structure. Coetzee is also drawn by certain theorists in order to put forward different perspectives within his texts. One of the theorists influencing Coetzee is Mikhail Bakhtin with his studies on the novel genre. Mikhail Bakhtin, as a theoretician of the twentieth century, has made contributions to the novel genre by specifying its properties and distinctions as a genre, especially, in his book, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Bakhtin includes and reflects on each critical feature that contributes to the creation of the novel genre, and he highlights that the most significant property of the novel genre is its capability to include multiple voices, and adds that the novel is

> a diversity of social speech types and a diversity of individual voices. Authorial speech, the speech of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities . . . , each

> of them permits a multiplicity of . . . voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships. (*The Dialogic* 263)

Putting weight on the plurality of voices, Bakhtin puts forward a new concept about the novel and conceptualizes this component as "polyphony."

Bakhtin uses the term of polyphony in order to reflect the multivoiced form of a text, and he defines polyphony as a "sociology of consciousness" (*Problems* 30). Bakhtin points out the necessity of polyphonic voices which provide the texts with the inclusion of multiple points of view about an issue or a problem. In a work of art, the author opens an area in which all the characters may have a right to express themselves individually without the dominance of an authorial voice. Thus, a multiplicity of points of view arises, and a reader has the opportunity to internalize these points of view on his/her terms. Based on a dialogical link between the characters, the flow of plot becomes dynamic and active in an inconclusive process (*Problems* 26). As Bakhtin formulates how to incorporate the polyphony in the novel genre, he becomes one of the building blocks in Coetzee's constitution of his narrative mode. Particularly in his later years, Coetzee tends to include the presentation of multiple voices in his novels in order to reflect multiple perspectives in his novels.

As Bakhtin specifies the use of polyphony within a novel, Coetzee primarily lowers his own authorial voice, and promotes the individual voices of his characters to reveal their own ideas or ideologies in their own voices in order to achieve the use of polyphony. With the insertion of dialogical relations among the characters, he involves an unending and unfinalizable process of speech in which a plurality of voices is heard. Thus, the novel has an open-ended plot, and Coetzee makes his readers read and internalize the novel in terms of their own ideological background. Coetzee covers many of these properties in most of his novels; however, with his two novels, *Summertime* and *Diary of a Bad Year*, Coetzee renders a clear exemplification of the incorporation of polyphony in these novels. In this sense, this thesis aims to analyze how Coetzee includes the use of Bakhtin's polyphony and the properties of a polyphonic structure in *Summertime* and *Diary of Bad Year*.

The first chapter of the thesis covers the theorist, Mikhail Bakhtin and his theoretical studies. It discusses Bakhtin's understanding of other theories and how he forms his own theory. As Bakhtin starts his studies with an engagement in the use and function of language in his early years, he focuses on Ferdinand de Saussure's

doctrines on language. Bakhtin also focuses on how speech genres are generated, and what the importance of dialogue is in these speech genres. This chapter also discusses how Bakhtin argues that the language finds its most eloquent form in literature, especially in the novel genre. Based on his concern of the novel genre, Bakhtin brings forth new terms —such as chronotope, heteroglossia, carnivalesque, and polyphony— for the conceptualization of the novel as a distinct genre. This chapter underscores the primary concept of Bakhtin, polyphony, and exhibits what polyphony means, how Bakhtin defines it, and how he exemplifies the use of other principles in connection with his new concept. This chapter covers certain examples/extracts from Dostoevsky's narrative structure in order to explain why Bakhtin promotes Dostoevsky as the primary practitioner of polyphony in his studies.

The second chapter of the thesis focuses on Coetzee's literary life and career in detail. Being both an English and a South African enables Coetzee to evaluate the events or problems from both cultural perspectives. Coetzee's career as a novelist begins with his studies on certain literary figures such as Beckett, Kafka, and Dostoevsky, and each literary figure influences and contributes to Coetzee's narrative mode. This chapter also discusses that the influence of certain theorists such as Mikhail Bakhtin, from whom Coetzee borrows the concept of polyphony for the structure of his novels. Coetzee's works are also analyzed under two categories; his post-colonial fiction and his Australian fiction. Even though the first part of his literary career deals with the colonial period and its outcomes in South Africa, his writing style changes dramatically after he moves to Australia (Marais 99). In his post-colonial fiction, Coetzee touches upon the chaos and troubles of this era, whereas his Australian fiction features the matters widely discussed in the international context. He pays attention to the universal issues, and touches upon political, social, economical or historical phenomena through daily experiences and personal perspectives (Atwell, Afterword 214). This chapter also includes Coetzee's works chronologically, and clarifies the issues covered in each.

The third chapter renders Coetzee's use of polyphony and how he applies polyphonic structure into his two novels, *Summertime* and *Diary of a Bad Year*. As Coetzee is born into a multicultural environment, he encounters with multiple voices around him. On the one hand, he grows up in a family speaking English at home and living distinct from African society, on the other hand, he is exposed to an African

life at school and among his friends. Hence, Coetzee develops a kind of hybridity which enables him to discover that nothing is absolute and there is no single truth. This property leads him to develop a way of writing in which no one is silenced, and each subject is given a chance to talk in his/her own voice. This part also explains how Coetzee embodies the features of a polyphonic structure in his two novels. Coetzee artistically enriches these two novels through the use of polyphonic structure and multiplicity of voices in their dialogical relations without the intrusion of an authorial voice. This paves the way for a plurality of ideas or points of view via which an inconclusive end appears.

The third part of the thesis also contains a detailed analysis of the two novels; *Summertime* and *Diary of a Bad Year* in terms of their compliance with the polyphonic novel structure and how Coetzee creates their form with the insertion of the notions brought about by the concept of polyphony, as Bakhtin formulates. In each novel, Coetzee puts forward multiple characters who have different perceptions and viewpoints. These characters evaluate everything in their own terms without the interference of a dominating authorial voice. This withdrawal of authority and the emergence of multivocality within the texts are clarified with examples from the texts in order to demonstrate Coetzee's ability to make each character speak in their individual voices. Coetzee also plays with the novel genre by inserting letters, essays and interviews within these two novels. Apart from those details, the dialogical links and relations among characters in *Summertime* and *Diary of a Bad Year* result in the emergence of another polyphonic dimension in which all characters ask and answer questions, and criticize their views without reaching a finalized fact or truth. This dialogy brings about certain details about the events and the characters rather than Coetzee's authorial voice. It also prepares an open-ended plot in the novel through which no ultimate conclusion may be drawn. In this sense, the readers interpret the novels in terms of their ideological perception.

In conclusion, Coetzee creates his two novels focusing on the concept of polyphony based on his studies on Bakhtin and Dostoevsky. He employs the withdrawal of authority for the involvement of multiple voices in *Summertime* and *Diary of a Bad Year.* The incorporation of dialogism enables the multiplicity of perspectives and ceaseless act of communication to prevail in each novel, and this property paves the way for unfinalizable interpretations regarding the texts. Accordingly, all the instances or information included in the detailed account of

these two novels aim to underline their accordance with the whole argument of the thesis.

CHAPTER I

1. MIKHAIL BAKHTIN AND HIS THEORETICAL STUDIES

Mikhail Bakhtin, a significant figure of the twentieth century literary criticism, has made contributions to the field of language and literature. Michael Holquist states that Bakhtin was born on 16 November 1895, in Orel into an old family of the nobility, and he spends his early years of his career in the historical and philological faculty of the local university in Orel until 1913; he then goes to the University of Petersburg and continues his studies there (Introduction, *The Dialogic* xxi-xxii). Bakhtin is a social thinker in the field of human sciences, a philosopher of language and a theoretician of literature. Holquist divides Bakhtin's studies into two phases and states that Bakhtin's "first years as a mature thinker are marked by different versions of his phenomenology of self/other relations; in the twenties, there are different books devoted to the linguistic and societal implications of such phenomenology; in the thirties we see at least six texts devoted to the novel as a genre" (Introduction, *Speech* xiii). As Holquist states, in those years, Bakhtin has had a life of hardships and he has been sent to exile after the publication of his book *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*; this book is not well-received by the Minister of Education and the leading Party intellectual Anatoly Lunacharsky (Introduction, *The Dialogic* xxiii). However, his genious has made him a source of inspiration for the later literary critics even in this deplorable period of his life, and as Holquist suggests, Bakhtin's "two most productive period occurred during the darkest years of recent Russian history: the decade following 1917, when the country reeled under the combined effects of a lost war and revolution; and the following decade, the thirties, when Bakhtin was in exile in Kazakhstan" (xv). These hardships never hinder Bakhtin from being productive, and he writes crucial books and essays on Formalism, Marxism, the philosophy of language and the novel genre.

Bakhtin's first text "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity," is concerned with the aesthetics and relations of the self and the other with regard to the author and the hero. This influential essay is also published as an episode of *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays* that involves Bakhtin's early philosophical essays, such as "Art and Answerability" in which Bakhtin underlines the importance of the concept of answerability (it anticipates a response from

someone to whom a word/utterance is addressed), and "Supplement: The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Art" in which Bakhtin proposes his ideas about the principal concepts and questions of poetics. In his other influential book, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin compares Tolstoy's finalizing authorial vision with Dostoevsky's non-finalizing polyphonic discourse; and he argues that with this polyphonic discourse, Dostoevsky brings a new understanding of the relations between the author and the characters. Following these publications, Bakhtin writes *Rabelais and His World* discussing his views on Rabelais' works and his style of writing, and he relays how the concepts of laughter, parody and carnival pave the way for the appearance of the grotesque imagery and grotesque realism. In his later book, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, Bakhtin focuses on language, dialogue, dialogical relations, and the function of discourse in the novel. After the publication of this book, Bakhtin refers to language in detail, and conceptualizes the speech genres in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (1979). In this book, there is Bakhtin's one of the final writings "Notes Made in 1970-71," in which he emphasizes the negative aspects of what he calls the authoritarian word, and upholds dialogic perspectives.

Bakhtin's works are marked by a kind of eclecticism, and they carry the traces of distinct movements and theories because they are shaped by various influences such as the conditions of Russia and philosophical ideas from Western Europe (Brandist 90). Bakhtin deals with social and political issues, and he includes sociology, idealist philosophy and the phenomena of hegemony in his studies, and for this reason, he is labelled as a Marxist. Nevertheless, Frank Farmer highlights that Bakhtin "has been claimed not only by Marxists but also by structuralists, feminists, social constructionists, neo-formalists, cultural critics, and traditional humanists" (xii). Thus, Bakhtin's ideas are utilized in literary history and other certain fields such as philosophy, cultural studies, Marxism and Formalism (Morris 1). This is partly the consequence of the fact that Bakhtin prefers to conduct his studies in different fields and as a result, his early works are considered as philosophical, whereas his later works emphasize language and the theory of the novel genre.

Bakhtin, with his multi-disciplinary and multi-faceted theoretical frame, may be evaluated both as a Formalist and a Marxist. However, although he embraces certain aspects of both Formalism and Marxism, he never fully internalizes any of

these theories in his works. To begin with Formalism, it is a field of study which focuses only on form in any given literary work or verbal art without paying attention to the content or social contexts. Formalism is highly influential in Russia during Bakhtin's time, and its effects are prevailing throughout the country. As a natural consequence of this circumstance, Bakhtin inherently carries the traces of this movement. Nevertheless, Bakhtin diverts from Formalism in his later years, because the formalists undervalue content and social context, and overemphasize structure and form. They are also unable to see the fact that form is indeed the product of the social context and that these two cannot be evaluated separately. In this respect, Bakhtin expresses his attitude towards formalism saying that Formalists ignore the social context, and this leads to only material aesthetics in a text in which there is the lack of understanding of historicity and change (*Speech* 169); however, Bakhtin is against limiting literary analysis of a text to formal and finalizing methods by dismissing the socio-historical context; because in his opinion, each text can be perceived differently by each person with regards to the social context (Craig 17).

Formalism never pays attention to the ideological or historical/social discourse. It does not show any interest in the social or ideological aspect of a text and as Michael Bernard Donalds refers that this is that deficiency that causes Formalism to lose its popularity among the world of theory:

> Formalism, having concentrated on the 'device' which would make a work 'literary,' overlooks what kind of ideological material was used to construct it in the first place . . . . To put it simply, what is missing from the Formalists' conception of language is history, a way to discuss how concrete social conditions construct the work at the time and place of the unique act of its realization. (67)

By not promoting social and ideological aspects, formalists try to analyze a literary work only based on it formal qualities; however, that attempt fails as literature is considered as the expression of concrete social conditions. Hence, Bakhtin criticizes Formalists' concerns, and Kenneth Craig underlines that Bakhtin "[u]nlike formalists who remove texts from their socio-historical context, stresses the relationship between text and audience, articulating a connection between words and specific social contexts" (17). Accordingly, as Bakhtin's interest on socio-historical and ideological contexts increases, this leads him to free himself from the boundaries of

Formalism, and even though Bakhtin bears the traces of Formalism, he certainly opposes to restrict his literary perspective to the laws of Formalism.

Marxism, on the other hand, flourishes as a form of literary criticism that highlights economic and social-historical background of a literary text. Marxism prevails in Russia especially after the Bolsheviks' success in the political arena. Bakhtin's association with Marxism results from his concern about social and historical aspects of literature. Bakhtin believes in the importance of the historical, economic and social facts in shaping a work of art. V. N. Voloshinov points out that any ideological product is not only a part of a reality (natural or social), it also reflects another reality in itself; in other words, every ideological sign possesses a covert meaning: it represents, depicts or stands for something lying outside of itself and it is constructed within the interaction of the subjects of a social organization (50). In this respect, Bakhtin abandons the Formalist approach, and focuses on the social contexts. Galin Tihanov explains this change by stating that Bakhtin's "early career ends with the abandonment of the attempts at a systematic philosophy of art in favour of an interest in the social aspects of literature" (43). The abandonment of the purely formalist approach to consider social aspects in a literary text becomes Bakhtin's literary attitude.

Marxism also enables Bakhtin to generate certain concepts partly taking their source from Marxist roots. His concepts of "heteroglossia" and "carnivalesque" carry the traces of the Marxist theory. Simon Dentith proposes that Bakhtin "acknowledges the class and makes it indeed the ground of his account of language through the notion of heteroglossia" (14). With heteroglossia, Bakhtin draws attention to the fact that the same person can use different modes of speech under different circumstances. As for carnival, Dentith also refers to the idea of carnival arguing that "[t]he account of carnival he [Bakhtin] provides in the book on Rabelais is dependent on a notion of the social division of society" (14). This property coincides with the view of anti-capitalism that Bakhtin shares with Marxism. Furthermore, although Bakhtin agrees with most of the Marxist principles, there are also certain disassociations he has with the Marxists. Craig summarizes these disassociations by revealing that "[u]nlike strict Marxists, for Bakhtin, 'artistic discourse is not a simple, direct reflection of economic life" (17). In contrast to strict Marxists, Bakhtin believes that literature is not a mirror that reflects the life as it is. Even a realistic

work presents not the direct reflection of real world but the world shaped by the author's points of view and ideologies.

1.1. BAKHTIN AND LANGUAGE

Bakhtin, with his studies, also brings about a new understanding of language distinct from the earlier formalist approaches which were barely systematic studies. In his opinion, language is an unfinalizable changing concept stratified in diversities. Holquist states that

> [l]anguage is stratified not only into dialects in the strict sense . . . , but it also stratified as well into languages that are socio-ideological: languages belonging to professions, to genres . . . . This stratification and diversity of speech will spread wider and penetrate to ever deeper levels so long as a language is alive and still in the process of becoming. (Introduction, *The Dialogic* xix)

As these lines suggest, Bakhtin deals with the production of meaning in language based on the social and historical perspective. He stresses that individuals use language in social contexts which, for the most part, determine the meaning (Harris 15). Bakhtin utters that "[l]anguage is not a neutral medium that passes freely and easily into the private property of the speaker's intentions; it is populated-overpopulated- with the intention of others" (*The Dialogic* 294). In this respect, what is said can be understood and interpreted in various ways in various circumstances, since language is a phenomenon which may not be restricted to certain rigid terms. In addition, Allen Harris explains that Bakhtin reconsiders language by dividing it into two forces, and puts forward the perception of centripetal and centrifugal forces in language in order to explain how the language is perceived. According to Bakhtin, the centripetal forces in language make the word centralized and unified, whereas the latter keeps things apart (18). In brief, centripetal discourse upholds monology without any speech variety, on the other hand, centrifugal discourse promotes polyphonic universe. In this sense, Bakhtin favours centrifugal forces because he believes that language may never be a unitary thing. It evolves within a social context, and thus it inevitably bears centrifugal forces.

It is this concern of Bakhtin which makes him criticize the complete and mechanical understanding of language by the Formalists, as well. In Formalist's

point of view, language disregards the social contexts in which it is produced. However, the Marxist view focuses on the social aspect of speech performances and underlines that an uttered word in language may bear various meanings in various times and places. Due to his opposition to the Formalist understanding of language, Bakhtin develops a critical perspective towards the centralizing and formalizing theories of language by Ferdinand de Saussure. While Saussure regards the language with regulating structures, Bakhtin stresses the social side of speech performances, and suggests that language may not be handled as a complete, mechanical entity, it is rather an organic body. Hence, Bakhtin's argument poses a criticism of monologic perception of language. Thomas Kent highlights that because the conception of meaning and language includes the internal business of a perceiving mind that also includes the minds of others, there is always the problems of scepticism and relativism about the meaning (34). As Kent suggests, language cannot be a monologic system since the word never pertains only to an individual speaker, rather, it is allocated between the addresser and the addressee generating various interpretations in various utterances.

However, as Holquist underlines, Saussure fails to acknowledge the dialogic relation between the self/other as the central aspect of language, and he deals with the language only through systematic and organizing regulations (Introduction, *The Dialogic* xvii). In Bakhtin's opinion, language refuses all kinds of linguistic standardization. The aspects of plurality and ambiguity rather than the singularity make language a living system, and in this sense, Farmer asserts that in Bakhtin's point of view, all words respond and seek response, and hence they remain unfinished, since a word is neither a first nor a last word (xiii). Thus, Bakhtin conceptualizes language as a living system which also includes speech genres and dialogical relations.

1.2. BAKHTIN AND SPEECH GENRES/ DIALOGUE/ DIALOGICAL RELATIONS

Bakhtin regards language as the combination of speech genres —modes of speech— that are used by a single person under different circumstances and that are constantly exhibited in communication. Bakhtin himself defines speech genres arguing that "each separate utterance is individual, of course, but each sphere in

which language is used develops its own relatively stable types of these utterances. These we may call speech genres" (*Speech* 60). These speech genres give a kind of freedom to the speaker in his/her speech, and Holquist indicates that "[s]peech genres provide a good example of the relative degree of freedom: the better we know possible variants of the genres that are appropriate to a given situation, the more choice we have among them" (Introduction, *Speech* xix). In order to exemplify those speech genres, Bakhtin gives the example of a peasant to illustrate how the context in which one speaks determines what one says and how one says it. In Bakhtin elucidates that

> an illiterate peasant, miles away from any urban center, naively immersed in an unmoving and for him unshakable everyday world, nevertheless lived in several language systems: he prayed to God in one language, sang songs in another, spoke to his family in a third and, when he began to dictate petitions to the local authorities through a scribe, he tried yet speaking a fourth language. (*The Dialogic* 295-296)

That illiterate peasant has the chance of using certain speech genres in certain situations, and these genres change according to the addressee's social status and importance.

Bakhtin separates speech genres into two categories; first and second speech genres. The first speech genres are simple and found in everyday dialogues or letters. Bakhtin suggests that

> these primary genres are altered and assume a special character when they enter into complex one. They lose their immediate relation to actual reality to the real utterances of others. For example, rejoinders of everyday dialogue or letters found in a novel retain their form and their everyday significance only on the plane of the novel's content. (*Speech* 62)

While primary genres are basic and found in everyday dialogues, Bakhtin states that secondary speech genres are complex, and they consist of organized written communication including novels, dramas, scientific researches, and so on (62). Upon secondary speech genres, Bakhtin also suggests that "[d]uring the process of their formation, they absorb and digest various primary genres that have taken form in unmediated speech communion" (62). For Bakhtin, the most important secondary genre appears to be the novel since it is a unique umbrella genre that can include the

other primary and secondary genres within itself. The existence of these speech genres may only be possible through dialogical relations among the characters in a novel. Therefore, literary discourses and their link with the social everyday language in a novel pave the way for the dialogic production of the meaning.

Dialogue is a conventional form of speech communication, and it forms a basis for the change of speaking subjects. Bakhtin takes the source of this dialogism from the antiquity, from the Socratic Dialogue. Julia Kristeva asserts that

> Socratic dialogue was originally a kind of memoir . . . retaining only the Socratic process of . . . revealing the truth, as well as the structure of a recorded dialogue framed by narrative, and . . . according to Bakhtin, Socratic dialogues are characterized by opposition to any official monologism claiming to possess a ready-made truth. ("Word" 51)

Thus, in these lines, Kristeva states that Bakhtin renders the concept of dialogism based on Socratic dialogue, and adapts the same principles of opposition towards monologic authority, and defies the final and ultimate word by an author. Holquist states that "[d]ialogism is based on otherness . . . and dialogism argues that all meaning is relative in the sense that it comes about only as a result of the relation between two bodies" (*Dialogism* 19). Thus, for Bakhtin, dialogues are crucial in order to defy monologic authority. Michael Gardiner also maintains that "[t]he dialogical exchanges that occur within the realm of everyday language prove that real dialogue is ultimately open-ended and unfinalizable" (124). Thus, this double-sided answerability generates a multi-voiced discourse in which the communication activity becomes an unending process.

Bakhtin includes his concept of dialogue in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, and he explains that dialogue "is not the threshold to action, it is the action itself. . . . In dialogue a person not only shows himself outwardly, but he becomes for the first time that which he is . . . . When dialogue ends, everything ends" (*Problems* 115). Therefore, there is always an unfinalizability in dialogic relationships which include at least two voices for its continuation. Bakhtin states that in a literary text, including dialogic line, "there is an intersection, consonance, or interruption of rejoinders in the open dialogue by the rejoinders . . . . The object is precisely passing of a theme through many and various voices" (119). In this sense, the novel becomes an important genre for Bakhtin in his studies on dialogism, because the novel

involves multiple voices whose mutual act of speaking make those voices relay their ideas freely in a dialogic relation.

1.3. BAKHTIN AND NOVEL

In Bakhtin's point of view, the novel struggles to abolish the dominance of classical genres. Bakhtin defines the novel as free and flexible, and it incorporates its language with extraliterary heteroglossia; it becomes dialogized, permeated with laughter and parody including an openended, living reality (*The Dialogic* 7). Bakhtin also utters that the characteristics of the novel genre have been affected by the European civilization:

> its emergence from a socially alienated and culturally deaf semipatriarchal society and its entrance into an international and interlingual contacts and relationships. A multitude of different languages, cultures and times became available to Europe and this became a decisive factor in its life and thought . . . . Polyglossia had always existed, but it had not been a factor in literary creation. (11)

In these lines, Bakhtin suggests that in this multi-voiced world, previous genres which have been covered with monoglossia start to be overturned by the appearance of the novel; because the novel involves multiple external and internal voices, and it undertakes the control of developing and renewing literature in its linguistic and stylistic aspects. In this respect, the novel stands as a contrast genre to the dominant classical genre; epic, in certain perspectives. Bakhtin elucidates the characteristics of epic saying: "[t]he epic as a genre . . . may be characterized by three constitutive features; 1- a national epic past . . . , 2- national tradition (not personal experience and the free thought that grows out of it) . . . 3- an absolute epic distance separates epic world from contemporary reality" (13). The epic has a confined and well-organized world surrounded by completeness, consistency and absolute beginnings or ends. It has an official, hierarchical authority embedded in it, which is closed to interpretation. Graham Pechey makes a comparison between epic and novel by resembling them to Nietzsche's concepts of the Apollonian and the Dionysian by underlining that Bakhtin follows Nietzsche in his conception of epic as a "wholly Apollonian" genre, and he would not dissent with the latter's identification of its perennial Dionysian other in the "uneven and irregular imagery of folk songs" (111).

On the epic's part, there is order, organized forms and concepts, while there is a disordered and multi-formed and multi-voiced world on the novel's part.

The language of the novel, especially the dialogic novel, emerges quite distinct from the unitary, finished and finalizable language used by the epic genre, and this kind of novel endeavours to enrich itself with the speech diversity leaving the generic monologue outside of itself (*The Dialogic* 7). Moreover, the discursive gaps within the narrative structure of a novel makes it possible to interpret what is told in various ways depending on both sociocultural and historical parameters and individual perspectives. Therefore, the novel genre makes difficult to deduce certain and direct meanings, by its very nature unlike the epic does. Pechey explains this issue by saying that "[e]very word in poetry strives ideally towards the status of first word ever uttered, uniquely and primarily naming alien things while acknowledging no alien words. The epic thematizes this putative condition of the poetic word by encoding the values of 'best' and 'highest' in the 'first' in a narrative of beginnings" (106). For this reason, Bakhtin strictly separates the novel from epic poetry by accentuating that a prose text does not put forth a direct meaning, on the other hand, a poetic word can seek a direct and full relation between what is said and what is meant in a poem.

The novel, distinct from the epic, consists of a language which is bound to be interpreted differently. This circumstance provides speech diversity for the novel. Bakhtin clarifies this diversity by stating that it is "a variety of individual voices and speech types in an interrelated dialogues" (*The Dialogic* 263), and this diversity of speech also separates the novel from the majority of other poetic genres as well. The novel arises as a dialogized representation of several ideologically loaded discourses. Therefore, in a novel, the author creates a world in which he lets the characters speak through their own speech genres, and through the dialogues, a mutual act of speaking occurs. This continuous act of speech leads to a never-ending communication process within the text which underlines an open-ended closure of the novel. Additionally, Bakhtin suggests that the novel consists of the extra-literary, low genres taken from everyday life with the contribution of language diversities. Bakhtin adds that "[e]xtraliterary genres (the everyday genres, for example) are incorporated into the novel not in order to ennoble them, to literalize them, but for . . . the sake of their potential for introducing nonliterary language" (410-411). Therefore, the novel includes various voices, and with the help of these diverse

speeches, one may witness different perspectives and perceptions of nonliterary language. In this world including multiple consciousnesses, Bakhtin attempts to define the novel genre via certain concepts —chronotope, heteroglossia, carnival and polyphony— in order to portray its distinction.

1.4. BAKHTIN'S CONCEPTS: CHRONOTOPE, HETEROGLOSSIA, CARNIVAL AND POLYPHONY

Bakhtin contributes to the literary world with certain concepts in order to clarify certain aspects of the novel. He specifies the distinction of the novel genre by studying it through the concepts he has put forward. With these concepts Bakhtin includes in his studies of the novel genre, he reveals the difference of the novel from other genres. The first one of these concepts, chronotope, is defined by Bakhtin as "a temporal and spatial relationship that is artistically expressed in literature. Although this term is employed in mathematics, and was introduced as part of Einstein's Theory of Relativity . . . we are borrowing it for literary criticism" (*The Dialogic* 84). Chronotope requires a network between time and space. Bakhtin continues to argue that

> [c]hronotopes are the organizing centers for the fundamental narrative events in the novel. The chronotope is the place where the knots of narrative are tied and untied . . . It serves as the primary point from which scenes in a novel unfold, while at the same time other binding events located far from the chronotope, appear as mere information and communicated facts. (250)

As Bakhtin suggests, chronotopes are the key elements that contribute to the portrayal of events throughout a novel. To put it in another way, for Bakhtin, characters' spatial and temporal conditions in a novel procure his notion of chronotope; because in a work of art, the readers should imagine a character as concretely positioned in a location within a specific time.

Beside chronotope, heteroglossia also has a certain importance for Bakhtin in his conception of the novel. Heteroglossia, in fact, means a variety of speech or discourses in a language. Bakhtin defines heteroglossia as "another's speech in another language, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way. Such speech constitutes a special type of double-voiced discourse. It serves two speakers

at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions" (*The Dialogic* 324). This definition points out that what is said in a heteroglot novel emerges as not the author's but someone else's discourse. Language becomes heteroglot in the novel thanks to various speech types, and hence, a social and ideological space opens up to the representation of each perspective. Thence, when heteroglossia takes part in the novel, it makes several consciousnesses free through a liberated atmosphere. This plurality of social languages provided by heteroglossia leads the novel's discourse to devoid itself of the domination of a single perspective, point of view, form of thought or language.

With regards to the concept of carnival, Bakhtin bases his opinions on the French writer, Francois Rabelais. Holquist proposes that Rabelais integrates carnivalistic atmosphere and features it into his works, particulary in *Gargantua and Pantagruel* in which he explicitly opposes the official world of the medieval period (Prologue, *Rabelais* xvi). Carnival, in a general sense, is a festive form which disregards the boundaries between social groups and creates a possibility of the inversion of social roles for a short time. Bakhtin states that "[t]he carnivalesque crowd in the marketplace or in the streets is not merely a crowd. It is the people as a whole, but organized in their own way, the way of people. It is outside of and contrary to all existing forms of the coercive socioeconomic and political organization" (*Rabelais* 255). The disorganization found in carnival brings about a possibility for a different social order and the dissolution of authorial voice. Bakhtin also discusses the concept of carnival suggesting that Rabelais "presents the Saint as a fool . . . . In Rabelais' mind, this actually implies the rejection of the official world with its philosophy, system of values and seriousness" (261). Thus, in such an environment, the official world formed by certain regulations becomes upside down, and everyone has a chance to speak and express themselves. In other words, carnival provides a kind of multi-voicedness within the given culture.

As Rabelais defies the official world, he does that defiance by employing two notions; laughter and parody. Bakhtin specifies laughter as "a concept which gives form to carnival rituals frees them from all religious and ecclesiastic dogmatism from all mysticism and piety" (*Rabelais* 7). Laughter encircles all human beings, because the people from each class participates in a carnival. This feature of laughter symbolizes its universality and its embracing quality. According to Bakhtin, Rabelais, by using laughter in his works, enables a sort of relief for the medieval

people. When Rabelais presents an official figure as a fool, it arouses laughter, and this laughter becomes people's only way to relieve from their suppression by the authority. In addition to the laughter, parody also emerges as a means to undermine fixed forms and notions. Bakhtin defines parody as "inseparably linked to a carnival sense of the world. Parodying is the creation of a decrowning double; it is that same 'world turned inside out" (*Problems* 67). As the language parodies itself, it generates laughter that liberates any sort of official representations. In Bakhtin's opinion, these concepts enable the novel to become a space of freedom with multiple voices and dialogical relations. In brief, carnivalistic discourse bears various people from various classes with various speech genres, and this kind of discourse increases the effective uses of Bakhtin's prominent concept, polyphony.

Polyphony appears as a concept used by Bakhtin to describe multivoiced nature of a text. Polyphony means a plurality of conflicting consciousnesses in a novel, and it promotes the inclusion of multiple consciousnesses. Bakhtin further claims that the novel can exist only through the concept of polyphony, and he states that "[p]olyglossia and the interanimation of languages . . . made possible the genre of novel (*The Dialogic* 51)" and he bases this claim by highlighting that "[o]nly polyglossia fully frees consciousness from the tyranny of its own language and its own myth of language" (61). As Bakhtin emphasizes, this multivoicedness makes the others' voices and discourses prevail in the novel, and thereupon, this process establishes a ground for a dialogic essence in which an interchanging discourse requires the act of speaking and responding to the discourse of the other.

Bakhtin's association with polyphony actually rises from his obsession about the necessity of multiple voices in the novel. Bakhtin continuously questions to whom these voices belong. Harris reveals that "[t]he obssessive question at the heart of Bakhtin's thought is always 'Who's talking?' . . . and Mikhail Bakhtin, then has something to tell us: listen. Listen and you will hear a verbal carnival of such depth and diversity, of such extravagance and exuberance, that your ears will never be the same again" (15). It is this obsession that leads Bakhtin to focus on the concept of polyphony, and to signify that within a polyphonic discourse, each speaker has equal right to speak without any sort of discrimination. The concept of polyphony also refers to the issue of narration in a novel, and questions the authorial voice. Dentith maintains that polyphony "addresses the fundamental question of narrative authority . . . in the discussions of 'showing' rather than 'telling,' and discussions over the

discursive hierarchy" (41). Thus, the polyphony questions the validity of authorial voice, and it does this by eliciting the independent individuals' voices without the intrusion of an author. The narrator does not explain anything about the flow of events, he or she only releases the plot to flow, and lets the characters speak and act in their own ways.

Giving an equal chance of speaking to each character makes an unfinalizable act of speaking possible in contrast to monologic discourse, and in this respect, Dentith compares polyphonic and monologic discourse in a novel suggesting that the first disourse "is celebrated for the way it grants a voice to the characters of equal status to that of the voice of the narrator who claims no final word for him or her self. In the monologic discourse, by contrast, such a final word is indeed claimed by the narrator, so that the voices of the characters are subordinated to it" (98). This situation created by polyphonic discourse constitutes sympathy, admission, opposition or confirmation of each voice rather than the dictations and judgements of a narrative authority. No single voice dictates, but a polyphony of voices are there to be heard in a novel, and the best way to spread these voices throughout a whole work is to contain dialogical relations within that literary work. By elevating dialogism, the authorial voice loses its dominant position procuring differing perspectives of characters. Qian Zhongwen emphasizes that "[i]t is through 'polyphony' that the writer can perceive a man's heart of hearts and make his creative method become 'realism in the highest sense" (784). This inclusion of multiple voices and dialogism between these voices make the novel end without a finalizing judgment. Therefore, the novel has an open-ended plot, and this property prevents the emergence of an ultimate interpretation of a text. The author enables his readers to interpret the novel in terms of their own ideological perception, and as the author employs this technique of polyphony, he makes his novel become polyphonic. As polyphony enters into the novel, it prepares a new structure —the polyphonic novel— to emerge.

1.5. POLYPHONIC NOVEL AND FYODOR DOSTOEVSKY

The polyphonic novel alters the position of the characters and the relationship between the author and the characters in fiction. As polyphony comes into being in a novel, the author lowers his voice and lets the characters express everything with their own voices. Like a carnival, the characters enjoy freedom above and beyond any hierarchical authority. This mode of polyphonic artistic thinking opens the way for the characters' consciousnesses to take part in the novel with their mode of thinking and dialogical existence. Bakhtin reports that "[t]he thinking human consciousness and the dialogic sphere in which this consciousness exists, in all its depth and specificity, cannot be reached by any artistic approach, except polyphony" (*Problems* 125). The ongoing process of the dialogue between the characters is the quality that endorses the use of polyphonic approach in a novel.

For Bakhtin, even though the author lowers his dominating voice in a polyphonic novel, the position of an author is not fully disregarded, but the ultimate authority is restricted. Gary Morson and Carly Emerson signify that "[i]n a polyphonic work the form-shaping ideology itself demands that the author cease to exercise monologic control . . . . Characters must be not only the objects of authorial discourse but also subjects of their own directly signifying discourse" (238). The polyphonic novel rejects the ultimate dominance of a single consciousness, and claims a diversity of voices and consciousnesses. Ann Rosalind Jones evinces that "[t]hese texts are not constructed as the entity of a single consciousness which absorbs other consciousnesses as objects, but rather as the entirety of the interaction of several consciousnesses" (68). Thus, with this interaction of several consciousnesses, the polyphonic novel restricts the control of an author over a text.

The polyphonic novel puts forth its difference as it is compared with its opposite, the monologic novel. In a polyphonic novel, there is the refusal of authorial knowledge which limits characters' viewpoints and social world according to an authorial word, because in a polar artistic design, the author says the final word about everything in a novel. This artistic design is labelled as monologic, since only one voice is heard creating a finalized meaning. Bakhtin defines monologism as a denial of "[t]he existence of outside itself of another consciousness with equal rights, and equal responsibilities, another 'I' with equal rights. The monologue is finalized and deaf to the other's response, does not expect it and does not acknowledge in it any

decisive force" (*Problems* 141). In contrast to a monologic novel, the polyphonic novel celebrates each of the individual voices which act and speak in their own terms. Bakhtin relays that in a polyphonic novel "the character is a carrier of fully valid word and not the mute, voiceless object of the author's words" (43). Therefore, the author creates a character as someone who exists in the novel, hears and responds to the author without being subjected to any authorial voice. This process can only be achieved by the polyphonic novel, because it gives equal opportunity for the characters and the ideologies they represent to be heard.

Bakhtin purports how a polyphonic prose writer differs from a monologic one stating that for the polyphonic prose writer "the object is a focal point for heteroglot voices among which his own voice must also sound; these voices create the background necessary for his own voice, outside of which his artistic prose nuances cannot be perceived, and without which they do not sound" (*The Dialogic* 278). However, a monologic prose writer gives priority to a single voice, the authorial voice, ignoring others. Kay Halasek highlights that "[a]uthoritative model . . . valorizes the text and the author and establishes a seemingly objective truth about the meaning of that text" (57). As Halasek states, Bakhtin strictly refuses this model and promotes unauthoritative narrative system in which the characters' speech penetrate within each other. Only by the penetration of the words into the others' speech, the discourses become polyphonic; otherwise, this dialogism remains superficial without the internalization of other discourses. Bakhtin further compares monologic and polyhonic novel and conveys that

> this is not a matter only of length; epics have all the space in the world but they still tend to be monologic . . . . In various kinds of indirect discourse, novelists can maintain a kind of choral vitality, the very same words conveying two or more speaking voices. They can, but of course many actual novelists do not. Turgenev, Tolstoy, indeed most who are called novelists, never release their characters from a dominating monologue conducted by the author; in their works, characters seldom escape to become full subjects, telling their own tales. (*Problems* 10)

As Bakhtin argues, Tolstoy mostly leaves heteroglot components outside of his novels, and therefore abolishes the reader's active understanding. Tolstoy's novels are formed in a monologic manner in which authoritative domination prevails.

Bakhtin gives an example about Tolstoy and his style in order to relay how a work can be labelled as monologic. Bakhtin exemplifies Leo Tolstoy's *Three Deaths* (1858) by marking that in these three deaths —the death of a rich noblewoman, a coachman and a tree— Tolstoy portrays three lives in their meaning and value with a finalizing narration; their lives are enclosed and they do not know one another (*Problems* 45). As Bakhtin indicates, Tolstoy, while presenting his story, never associates these three lives with each other. Each stands individually without penetrating into one another. Accordingly, Bakhtin argues that

> [t]here is no more than a purely external pragmatic connection between them, necessary for the compositional and thematic unity of the story: the coachman Seryoga, transporting the ailing noblewoman, removes the boots from a coachman who is dying in a roadside station (the dying man no longer has any need for boots) and then, after the death of the coachman, cuts down a tree in the forest to make a cross for the man's grave. In this way three lives and three deaths come to be externally connected. But an internal connection, a connection between consciousness is not present here. (*Problems* 45)

The specification of monology in a text manifests itself by precluding any link between the voices. Since there is no relation (dialogical or other) between the characters, polyphony cannot arise in the text, and each character remains enclosed in his own world. Bakhtin adds that neither the noblewoman nor the tree enter the consciousness of the dying coachman, and they do not know anything about each other; thus, dialogic relationships among the characters may not exist (45). This monologic relation leads the voice of author to have a hegemony over the text. Only the author talks and only he directs the other voices. The author's position becomes the dominant one which enables him/her to have the last word about everything, and everything is revealed through the author's field of vision. Bakhtin emphasizes this issue by suggesting that "[a]ll three personages, with their self-enclosed worlds, are united, juxtaposed and made meaningful to one another in the author's unified field of vision and consciousness that encompasses them. He, the author, knows everything about them, he juxtaposes, contrats, and evaluates all three lives and all three deaths" (45). Therefore, it becomes the author who give them a finalized meaning. In other words, the characters become the puppets of the author, and are reflected through the author's perception; hence this situation paves the way for the

monologic organization of the text which provides the author with the opportunity to control each character. Moreover, it is clear that Tolstoy does not encourage/create dialogical relations between his characters. He cannot trespass the boundaries of the framework of the author's finalizing perspective. Bakhtin maintains that "[t]he author's attitude encounters no internal dialogic resistance on the part of the character. The words and consciousness of the author, Leo Tolstoy, are nowhere addressed to the hero, do not question him, and expect no response from him. He neither argues with his hero nor agrees with him" (*Problems* 45). Nevertheless, in a polyphonic work of art, Bakhtin underscores that the author should make his characters' worlds inter-related and juxtaposed in many ways. The characters should argue and express themselves by means of dialogic relations.

Based on Tolstoy's monologic position, Bakhtin deals with Dostoevsky, and questions what would happen if Dostoevsky wrote *Three Deaths* with his polyphonic discourse. Bakhtin states that "[f]irst of all, Dostoevsky would have forced these three planes to be reflected in one another, he would have bound them together with dialogic relationships. He would have introduced the life and death of the coachman and the tree into the field of vision and consciousness of the noblewoman" (*Problems* 46). Thus, in Bakhtin's opinion, a polyphonic novel requires the text to be a face-to-face dialogic communication between the characters, and in this dialogic contact, each character has the equal right to speak without any priority. Bakhtin also underlines that in Dostoevskian version of three deaths "not only the pure intonations of the author would be heard, but also the intonations of the noblewoman and the coachman . . . . Dostoevsky would have not depicted the death of his heroes, but the crises and turning points in their lives." (46). Hence, the characters can be connected with each other and each one becomes significant. Such treatment emerges as the application of polyphony in a work of art.

The reason why Bakhtin intensifies his studies on Dostoevsky is that he thinks polyphony finds its best expression in Dostoevsky's novels. Dostoevsky deals with not a single but multiple consciousnesses, and Bakhtin clarifies that in Dostoevsky, "consciousness never gravitates toward itself but is always found in intense relationship with another consciousness. . . . It could be said that Dostoevsky offers, in artistic form, something like a sociology of consciousness" (*Problems* 30). This circumstance removes the obstacle that hinders the characters to speak in their own ways. Thus, the characters are granted with their individualities without being

restricted to the control mechanism of the author. Dostoevsky does this by bringing about the repudiation of authorial finalization, and by promoting a dialogical struggle in his works. Dostoevsky's incorporation of multiple social voices brings out an artistic unity which has developed a new style of prose narration. The characters do away with the author by fully integrating into infinite dialogical relations that enable them to express themselves with their own words as an author. Bakhtin summarizes this point of view by underlining that "[w]here the author loses this stable position, . . . , as in Dostoevsky . . . , he lets the hero take possession of the author" ("Author" 17). Thence, the character's voice emerges exactly like the voice of the author, and each character has a significance as the author himself.

Unlike other novelists, Dostoevsky embodies a distinct dramatic form which is never compatible with the monologic novel. Bakhtin explains this dramatic form indicating that the conventional form of plot plays a secondary role in Dostoevsky's novels, and the story must be oriented in a new world- a world of autonomous subjects, and "[a]ll the elements of novelistic structure in Dostoevsky is profoundly original; all are determined by that new task . . . : the task of constructing a polyphonic world and destroying the established forms of the fundamentally monologic European novel" (*Problems* 22). Thus, the consistent order and organization of monologic world is abolished with Dostoevsky's chaotic, complex world including idiosyncratic principles shaping the structure of his polyphonic novels. As it is possible to hear different voices, the form of multivoicedness gains an exceptional importance. Bakhtin points out that in a given form of dialogue between the characters, the different points of view come to surface, and these points of view mirror different principles and beliefs; therefore each opinion or word becomes a living creature, and it stands along the author's word while uniting with other valid voices (25). There is a continuous dialogism in which no one emerges as superior to the other. Bakhtin clarifies this issue by remarking that Dostoevsky's novel "is constructed not as the whole of a single consciousness, absorbing other consciousnesses as objects into itself, but as a whole formed by the interaction of several consciousnesses, none of which entirely becomes an object for the other" (26). This interaction removes any monologic category, and therefore "[e]verything in the novel is structured to make dialogic opposition inescapable" (26). In such a sphere of dialogic interaction, multiple voices speak and interact with each other without being dominant.

In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin exemplifies this inclusion of multiple voices and dialogic interaction through Dostoevsky's novel, *Crime and Punishment*. In this novel, a plurality of voices is there, and thus, the readers have the opportunity to hear various voices and discourses. Rather than only Raskolnikov's voice, the narration also includes the perspective of other characters such as Svidrigailov, Razumikhin, or Peter Petrovich. This technique juxtaposes various consciousnesses and points of view through dialogical relations, and hence the dominance of a single voice or perspective cannot exist in the novel. Bakhtin argues that in Dostoevsky "almost no word is without its intense sideward glance at someone else's word . . . . Sharp and unexpected transitions from parody to internal polemic, from polemic to hidden dialogue, from hidden dialogue to sylization in serene hagiographic tones, then back again to parodistic narration . . . is the verbal surface of his works" (*Problems* 96). As a result of the change in discourses, even a monologic discourse of a speaker becomes an internal dialogization. Bakhtin claims that in *Crime and Punishment*, this dialogization is given through the character, Raskolnikov. Bakhtin suggests that when Raskolnikov talks to himself, he addresses himself, he also tries to persuade himself, he taunts, exposes, and ridicules himself:

> It shall not be? But what are you going to do to prevent it? You'll forbid it? And what right have you? What can you promise them on your side to give you such a right? . . . Yes, we have heard all that before, and that's all words, but now? Now something must be done, now, do you understand that? . . . (qtd. in Bakhtin, *Problems* 109)

Although Raskolnikov is in a monologic dialogue, his words carry the traces of other people's words or discourses. As an instance, Bakhtin suggests that in the novel, Raskolnikov recognizes Sonya's voice from Marmeladov's stories and immediately decides to go to her. From the very beginning, her voice and her world enter Raskolnikov's field of vision, and are attached to his interior dialogue:

> Then, Sonya, [Raskolnikov says after his final confession to her] when I used to lie there in the dark and all this became clear to me, was it a temptation of the devil, eh?
>
> Hush, don't laugh, blasphemer! You don't understand, you don't understand! Oh God! . . . Hush, Sonya! I am not laughing. I know myself that it was the devil leading me. Hush, Sonya, hush! (qtd in Bakhtin, *Problems* 110)

Even though Raskolnikov talks to himself, his world does not belong to only him, but he is surrounded by other worlds, voices or speeches which make the novel to take shape in a multiplicity of voices and points of view.

The characters are also connected to each other with dialogical relations, and Bakhtin puts forward that this dialogism makes the inclusion of multiple voices possible in the novel, and presents a continuous act of speech. Bakhtin states that the characters and their lives coincide with each other through dialogues, and this is the indispensable element in all Dostoevsky's dialogues (*Problems* 116). This dialogism also makes the details about the characters or the events become obvious via the characters' own speech. To exemplify this dialogism, Bakhtin renders another instance from *The Brothers Karamazov* by giving the example of Ivan and Alyosha's dialogues. In these dialogues, the detail about the murder of the father is revealed:

> Ivan. Who is the murderer then, according to you?
>
> Alyosha. You know who . . .
>
> Ivan. Who? You mean the myth about that crazy idiot, the epileptic, Smerdyakov? . . . Who? Who?
>
> Alyosha. I only know one thing, it wasn't you who killed father.
>
> Ivan. Not you! What do you mean by 'not you'?
>
> Alyosha. It was not you who killed father, not you! (qtd in Bakhtin's *Problems,* 116)

Obviously, if a truth is presented in a Dostoevsky novel, this is done by integrating it into the dialogic field equally shared by other characters.

The characteristics of genre found in Dostoevsky's polyphonic works stand as distinct from other pieces of art; since Dostoevsky adds generic combinations into his polyphonic works as well. He inserts letters, poems, or any other genres into his novels, and the novel bears artistic styles such as serio-comical, multi-styled and multi-formed filled with multiple voices. For instance, in *Crime and Punishment*, Dostoevsky inserts letter to make his novel multiple in terms of its genres rather than only voices. Bakhtin adds that the existence of inserted genres makes the texts enable a multi-toned narration by mixing high and low, serious and comic (*Problems* 61). Therefore, according to Bakhtin, the use of multiple genres inevitably makes a text include different points of view or ideologies, because each generic form is the representation of a certain ideology. Dostoevsky also never finishes his novels without a conclusive judgment about anything, and thus, the novel ends as open-

ended which makes the readers take the text into account in terms of their own ideology and perception.

To conclude, Dostoevsky brings about a new type of style in his works in which he includes the concept of polyphony. Zhongwen indicates that Dostoevsky "blazed new trails. It was by applying 'polyphony' that he enriched nineteenth century fiction and strengthened, with psychological analysis closer to the forms of life, the subjective introversion of characters as well as the openness of fictional form" (782). For this reason, Bakhtin chooses Dostoevsky to describe the basic tenets of polyphonic form of writing. In this polyphonic narration, Dostoevsky presents multiple voices in dialogical relations, and Bakhtin underlines the necessity of this dialogy saying that "[t]he idea lives not in one person's isolated individual consciousness –if it remains there only, it degenerates and dies. The idea begins to live, that is, to take shape, to develop, . . . only when it enters into genuine dialogic relationships with other ideas" (*Problems* 53). This continuous act of mutual interaction of several consciousnesses enables Dostoevsky to finish his polyphonic novels with an unfinalized conclusion by taking the subjective nature of the characters into account. Therefore, this situation makes the reader consider multiple interpretations regarding the ending of a novel.

1.6. THE ORIGINS OF POLYPHONIC NOVEL

While Bakhtin deals with this question of authority and the relations between the author and the characters in a polyphonic novel, he also puts forward certain reasons which ensures the existence of polyphony in a novel. In this respect, Bakhtin underlines certain causes that trigger the emergence of polyphonic quality in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Bakhtin believes that capitalism is the primary reason for the inclusion of multiple voices in a work of art, because before the arrival of capitalism, the social, cultural or ideological spheres of life are self-sufficient; however, Bakhtin claims that "[c]apitalism destroyed the isolation of these worlds, broke down the seclusion and inner ideological self-sufficiency of these social spheres . . . . Their blind co-existence and their peaceful and trusting ideological ignorance of one another came to an end" (*Problems* 26). Thus, capitalism brings multiple diverse worlds and voices together and breaks monologic unity and consciousness. It is this concern which leads Dostoevsky to deal with the polyphony.

Craig Brandist connects this issue with the period in which Dostoevsky lives and capitalism spreads around the world by arguing that

> the contradictory essence of the becoming of social life, not fitting into the frames of a confident and serenely contemplative monologic consciousness, had to appear particularly sharp, and at the same time the individuality of ideologically destabilised and colliding social worlds had to be especially full and clear. Such were the objective preconditions for the multileveledness and multivoicedness of the polyphonic novel created. (84)

Accordingly, Bakhtin also maintains that especially in Russia, the contradictory nature of evolving social life, not fitting within the framework of a confident and calmly meditative monologic consciousness, was bound to appear particularly abrupt (*Problems* 26). In other words, an era has made a new sort of novel -polyphonic novel- to come out, since the new social order requires the inclusion of multiple voices who have different ideological perceptions.

Apart from capitalism, Bakhtin stresses a second reason about Dostoevsky's polyphonic novel. Bakhtin maintains that Dostoevsky's own life has made him include polyphony in his works by relaying that Dostoevsky

> changed camps, moved from one to another, and in this respect the planes existing in objective social life were for him stages along the path of his own life . . . . This experience only helped him to understand more deeply the extensive and well-developed contradictions which coexisted among people -not among ideas in a single consciousness. (*Problems* 29)

These experiences that Dostoevsky has acquired during his camp years enables him to see everything in a coexistence and makes him hear each voice around himself, just like Bakhtin.

Kristeva, on the other hand, brings a linguistic understanding related to why the authors integrate polyphony into their works. Kristeva divides the process of language acquisition into two categories; semiotic and symbolic. She emphasizes that in semiotic period, there is no language, and thus no system of values based on language exists in this period. Kristeva says that "[t]here are nonverbal signifying systems that are constructed exclusively on the basis of the semiotic" (*Revolution* 24), and since the baby is dependent on the mother, she/he feels herself/himself dependent on the world. No individuality arises in that era, and thus, no individual

voice appears. Kristeva labels this phase as "chora." The chora period disregards hierarchial social structures, and puts forward equality between all voices. Kristeva defines the chora by stating that

> [t]he chora is not yet a position that represents something for someone (i.e., it is not a sign); nor is it a position that represents someone for another position (i.e., it is not yet a signifier either); it is, however, generated in order to attain to this signifying position. Neither model nor copy, the chora precedes and underlies figuration and thus specularization, and is analogous only to vocal or kinetic rhythm. (*Revolution* 26)

Kristeva also adds that this preverbal state is deprived of unity, identity or deity (26). That it to say, the chora era involves a preverbal stage in which the baby has no linguistic acquisition, and as he/she regards all the voices around him/her as equal, no dominating voice emerges as prominent.

Nevertheless, in the symbolic era, the period of language acquisition begins, and the baby realizes the different or prevalent voices around him/her, and tries to make sense of and interpret the meaning of the world. Kristeva highlights that "symbolic operations that depend on language as a sign system" (27) enter the process of language acquisition. Thus, individuality arises, and the child becomes an 'I.' The individual voices start to cover the individual's perception in that verbal environment. In this sense, Kristeva adds that the symbolic period "is a social effect of the relation to the other, established through the objective constraints of biological (including sexual) differences and concrete, historical family structures" (29). Accordingly, Kristeva associates the distinction she has made between semiotic and symbolic with her distinction between the texts. She divides the texts into two categories; genotext and phenotext, and connects genotexts with the semiotic era, or the chora phase and phenotexts with the symbolic era. Kristeva explains their function by relaying that

> [a] genotext will include semiotic processes but also the advent of the symbolic. The former includes drives, their position and their division of the body, plus the ecological and social system surrounding the body such as objects and pre-Oedipal relations with parents. The latter encompasses the emergence of object and subject, and the constitution of

nuclei of meaning involving categories: semantic and categorical fields. (86)

Kristeva points out that a genotext becomes a process which "tends to articulate structures that are ephemeral (unstable, threatened by drive charges, "quanta" rather than "marks") and non signifying . . . by including the various arrangements of participants in the speech event" (87). A phenotext, on the other hand, is "a structure (which can be generated, in generative grammar's sense); it obeys rules of communication and presupposes a subject of enunciation and an addressee" (*Revolution* 87). Therefore, polyphonic texts can be correlated with the concept of genotexts, since they do not obey the linguistic rules, and cover multiple voices. While monologic texts are limited to the linguistic framework, and everything exists in a hierarchial structure by obeying the rules of communication, polyphonic texts destroy this hierarchial order. Correspondingly, according to Kristeva, the authors who take their artistic inspirations from the chora phase tend to create genotexts, or polyphonic narrative structures.

CHAPTER II

2. J.M. COETZEE AS A LITERARY FIGURE

J.M. Coetzee is an author of English literature who has been read for so many years. As the winner of the Nobel Prize in literature in 2003, Coetzee has been one of the most important novelists whose books are widely known both in South Africa and in the international field. Coetzee has been the author of several outstanding novels and essays on various issues, and he has also been rewarded by the Man Booker Prize twice —for *Life and Times of Michael K* in 1983 and for *Disgrace* in 1999 (Head 2).

Born in 1940 in Cape Town, and grown up in an environment, both English and Afrikan, Coetzee has the chance of internalizing both cultures. Thus, his social and cultural background enables him to understand the conditions of South Africa and other issues concerning the human condition. Jane Poyner states that Coetzee's "sociocultural heritage, his positioning on the peripheries of the Afrikaner community and, despite his sympathies with the Left, his profound suspicion of political rhetoric per se, have led to his sense of marginalization within South Africa and have, in turn, informed his ethics of intellectualism" (*Coetzee and The Idea* 3). As Poyner clarifies, although Coetzee is born in Cape Town which harbors an African society, his family speaks English at home and this situation paves the way to his disassociation from the society he lives in; so, he gains a kind of hybridity in terms of identity.

Even though Coetzee is a novelist, he actually starts his career in the literary field after working as a computer programmer. Brian Shaffer clarifies that Coetzee

> attended the University of Cape Town, graduating in 1961, after which he worked in London as a computer programmer. While in England he also writes his master's thesis, on the work of novelist Ford Madox Ford, for the University of Cape Town. In 1965 Coetzee began doctoral work in linguistics and literature at the University of Texas at Austin. His doctoral thesis, a stylistic analysis of Beckett's English-language novels, was completed in 1969. (122)

Coetzee's interest in being a novelist begins with this doctoral work on Samuel Beckett. Coetzee has been so affected by Beckett's style that he has started writing novels and essays. From the beginning of his career, Coetzee treats distinct issues

such as self and the other; individual and institutional relations; political, social and historical problems. Derek Attridge suggests that "[t]he formal properties of Coetzee's novels enable them to engage with -to stage, confront, apprehend, explore- otherness, and in this engagement to broach the most fundamental and widely significant issues involved in any consideration of ethics and politics" ("Literary" 244). Therefore, Coetzee touches upon various aspects of the human condition in his own unique way.

Coetzee's novels have been one of the most respected and studied works in the twenty-first century. Head highlights this issue by stating that "[h]is novels occupy a special place in South African literature, and in the development of the twentieth and twenty-first century novel more generally. They are widely taught, internationally, on undergraduate modules" (ix). In his first works, due to his African bond, Coetzee reflects African society with its problems and troubles during and after the colonialism and its consequent issues. Yet, this early phase of writing has been followed by a concern about international, public and personal matters. In other words, Coetzee's style of writing can be analyzed in two phases. The first one is basically related to South Africa in a post-colonial context, whereas the second is related to the new directions distinct from the first one, which may be thought to have been triggered by his new life in Australia, where he has been living since 2002.

Coetzee has travelled a lot and lived in different countries attending or lecturing at universities, however, he has preferred Australia to settle down when he is in his sixties. This new environment has affected his way of writing in certain ways. In the first phase of his career, Coetzee portrays his observations about South Africa in a conventional realistic way. Nevertheless, in his later phase, he abandons apartheid problems, and as Head says that Coetzee reflects public morality and personal responsibility, the problems of regulated society, mortality, and the function of the reader (xi), rather than the post-colonial South Africa. Sue Kossew underlines that this shift of his style stems from Coetzee's new environment and she says that Coetzee's "personal and literary migration from South Africa to Australia in 2002 and the implications of this relocation for his fiction" (113) may easily be figured out in his recent novels. He leaves the realist tradition of post-colonial world, and focuses on current issues and personal reflections of daily life in this more comprehensive world.

Coetzee's works, in general terms, put forward challenging and open-ended interpretations about the issues they discuss. His works also unveil the transitivity between identities and a sense of hybridity. Head signifies that

> [t]he question of identity, as a literary as well as ethnic matter, has proved problematic for many white South African writers, especially those, who, like Coetzee, have been based in South Africa. Coetzee is not an Afrikaner, but a white South African . . . , since his background partly distances him from both Afrikaner as well as English affiliations. (3)

This hybridity may be taken as the reason why Coetzee never explicitly condemns or defends any political or social position in his works. Elleke Boehmer, Robert Eaglestone and Katy Idiols underscore this property of Coetzee by stating that "[t]he novels and non-fiction of Nobel-laurate J. M. Coetzee are characterized by an intense though oblique involvement with the political, intellectual and philosophical issues of our times" (1). Furthermore, in Coetzee's narration, there is a questioning of authority, authenticity, truth, and Anne Haeming states that "as part of this preoccupation, his fiction also explores what might be called master plots and ideologies which themselves examine the existence of so-called truths as no more than artifical constructions" (173). Hence, Coetzee disregards the necessity of the absolute plot or the dominance of certain ideologies in his novels.

2.1. COETZEE AND THE NOVEL

In his studies on the novel genre, Coetzee defines novel as a world in which a reader spends the most important moments of his/her life by saying that the novel is "as less a thing and more a place where one goes everyday for several hours a day for years on end. What happens in that place has less and less discernable relation to the daily life one lives or the lives people are living around one. Other forces, another dynamic, take over" (*Doubling* 205). As an author, Coeetzee is also aware that writing a novel needs hard work. In one of his novels, *Diary of a Bad Year*, he shows this awareness saying that "[t]o write a novel you have to be like Atlas, holding up the whole world on your shoulders and supporting it there for months and years while its affairs work themselves out" (54). In this respect, Coetzee believes that the novel, as a genre, has passed certain stages to strengthen its existence, and its spirit

always tries to reveal the multiple perspectives. Milan Kundera clarifies these stages in which the novel has evolved and become a concept uttering that

> with Cervantes and his contemporaries, it (the novel) inquires into the nature of adventure; with Richardon, it begins to examine "that happens inside," to unmask the secret life of the feelings; with Balzac, it discovers man's rootedness in history; . . . with Tolstoy, it focuses on the intrusion of the irrational in human behaviour and decisions . . . . It was then the "passion to know," which Husserl considered the essence of European spirituality, seized the novel and led it to scrutinize man's concrete life and protect it against "the forgetting of being; to hold "the world of life" under a permanent light. (6)

Obviously, in each stage, the novel genre creates its own ways and terms. Accordingly, Coetzee takes a step further, and makes his own contribution to the novel genre by creating his unique way of writing.

Coetzee, in his style of narration, has been influenced by a certain group of novelists or theorists. Coetzee has started his career as a novelist after he has studied Beckett for his doctoral thesis. Being affected by Samuel Beckett's narration, Coetzee begins to engage into the novel genre. Head highlights this impact of Beckett saying: "[i]t is possible to see the influence of Samuel Beckett on Coetzee –. . . – as having a crucial bearing on his technique and the related ethical effects. It is Beckett's exploration of the exhaustion of language, discernible in his obsession with language permutation and word games, that is pertinent" (33). Beckett's prose ignores the principles of traditional development of plot and characters, and includes complicated narrative construction. Coetzee comments on this issue, suggesting that "[i]t is unlikely that Beckett would have gripped me if there hadn't been in him that unbroken concern with rationality, that string of leading men savagely or crazily pushing reason beyond its limits" (*Doubling* 26). This complex and unusual mode of writing in Beckett's works stimulates Coetzee to focus on the novel genre.

Beckett's prose has been a step for Coetzee, especially with his use of English language. Attridge points out that "[i]t was the Irish author's handling of language, specifically the English language, that [Coetzee] found irresistible; the ability to portray indigence, physical distress, boredom, the pursuit of unattainable goals, and many other features what Coetzee terms 'a sensous delight" ("Sex" 74). Otherwise, the idea of writing a novel can never capture a man like Coetzee who has no

intention of narration until he becomes thirty years old. It is Beckett's prose that unfolds the secret power in Coetzee. Coetzee clarifies this impact:

> As for Beckett, I had read *Waiting for Godot* in the 1950s when it was talking-point all over the world, but the encounter that meant more to me was with *Watt*, and after that with *Molly* and, to a lesser extent, the other novels. Beckett's prose, up to and including *The Unnamable*, has given me a sensuous delight that hasn't dimmed over the years. (*Doubling* 20)

As mentioned before, it is clearly the impact of Beckett that leads Coetzee to make a beginning in his career as a novelist.

Apart from Beckett, Franz Kafka has quite an influence on Coetzee in order to create his narrative style, and the traces of Kafka's artistic tendencies can be found in Coetzee's novels. Head, in his book on Coetzee, remarks that "[t]he echo of Josef K (The protagonist of Kafka's *The Trial*) in Michael K, and the influence of Kafka's unpleasant story *In the Penal Colony* on *Waiting for the Barbarians*. It is the combined sense of nightmare and inscrutable authority in Kafka that Coetzee appropriates" (33). Coetzee also accepts the impact of Kafka on himself by stating that "[i]n a more general sense, I work on a writer like Kafka because he opens for me, or opens me to, moments of analytic intensity. . . . I acknowledge it (impact of Kafka) . . . . As a writer, I am not worthy to loose the latchet of Kafka's shoe" (*Doubling* 198-200). Obviously, Coetzee's narrative skills take inspiration from Kafka, and Kafka has been one of the crucial novelists that help Coetzee to form his narrative system.

In addition to Kafka, Fyodor Dostoevsky stands as another literary figure shaping the narrative world of Coetzee. Coetzee proves this impact by writing a novel on him, called *The Master of Petersburg*. Head explains that "he problems about authorship and responsibility explored in *The Master of Petersburg* derive from problems in Dostoevsky's poetics . . . . The book begins with the turn of this fictionalized 'Dostoevsky' to St. Petersburg in October in 1869" (72) and goes on his adventures to find his son. This novel, in fact, is a clear indication of cause-effect relationship. Moreover, Coetzee puts certain principles of Dostoevsky into his works. Patrick Hayes emphasizes that Dostoevsky's effect on Coetzee by comparing *Crime and Punishment* by Dostoevsky and *Foe* by Coetzee:

> As in *Crime and Punishment*, this is a place where there is a mystical unity between the body and its meaning, and where Friday appears to

> find a voice distinctively his own. . . . Like Dostoevsky, he breaks decisively with the corrosive impasse of the novel, whose method of representation is inadequate to tell the truth of distinctively 'other' Friday. Like Dostoevsky, Coetzee is breaking with his enlightenment inheritance -an inheritance as alien to South African soil as to Russian- with a faith in the hermetic difference of the other. (115)

Furthermore, like Dostoevsky, Coetzee lets the characters speak freely, and express themselves individually. Including multiple voices, dialogical relations and nonfinalization technique in his novels, Coetzee reflects priorities and principles which are characteristics of Dostoevsky's works. With the use of dialogical relations and multiple voices in his narrative structure, Dostoevsky becomes a unique model for Coetzee. Julian Murphet describes Dostoevsky's uniqueness and difference from other novelists, especially from Tolstoy stating that "[a]s distinct from the extraordinary richness and polyphony of Dostoevsky's dialogical art form, Tolstoy's stands high and aloof. Tolstoy's world is monolithically monologic (73). Coetzee, as inspired by Dostoevsky, dismisses the monologic world of the author, and admits Dostoevskian polyphonic style of narration which promotes multiple voices, dialogism and nonfinalization technique without the intrusion of an author.

Among the studies on Dostoevsky, one of the most significant commentators on Dostoevsky has been Mikhail Bakhtin. Joan Geertsema asserts that Bakhtin "pays particular attention to this staging of ideas in the dialogues of characters, arguing that their 'world views' must be understood 'as unresolved and unresolvable dialogues" (216). It is this reason why Bakhtin intensifies his studies of the novel genre on Dostoevsky. According to Bakhtin, not a single but a multiplicity of interpretations is there in Dostoevsky's novels, and this feature of his novels fits into Coetzee's writing style. As Bakhtin points out, this style of writing is only possible with the novel, because the novel as a parodic genre, a genre-in-the-making (*The Dialogic* 11), always open-ended, incomplete and unable to congeal due to its contact with the spontaneity of the inconclusive present (27). Based on his awareness about this conceptualization of the novel genre, Coetzee adopts the principles put by Dostoevsky and supported by Bakhtin in his novels.

Bakhtin accentuates unfinalizable property of a novel stressing its inconclusiveness ending and its multiple voices. Bakhtin highlights that

> [t]he novel —because it is oriented toward the here and now and is characterized by an'evolutionary nature,' by 'spontaneity, incompletedness and inconclusiveness,' and by an 'ability and commitment ro rethink and reevaluate'— . . . is not unitary but polyphonic, a system of languages that mutually and ideologically interanimate each other. (*The Dialogic* 47)

Thus, in Bakhtin's opinion, the novel includes a multiplicity of voices and it has an open-ended structure. Shaffer also adds that "to put simply, for Bakhtin, life is dialogical by its very nature. To live means to engage in dialogue, to question, to listen, to answer, to agree. Self means nothing without other, and the truth of any matter lies somewhere in between" (137). These features constitute the general structure of Dostoevsky's works, and accordingly, Coetzee's novels reflect the best exemplaries of this narrative system and structure. In the light of these, Coetzee creates his style inspired by many figures that range from Beckett and Kafka to Dostoevsky and Bakhtin.

2.2. COETZEE AND HIS STYLE: POST-COLONIAL AND AUSTRALIAN

As a novelist, Coetzee reflects historical, social, political and personal realities while presenting a world of fiction. In his mode of writing, Coetzee includes each issue he considers crucial and discusses them in his novels, and he leads his readers to read and interpret everything in their own terms. Dolors Collellmir Morales expresses that as a novelist Coetzee "has always wanted to remain independent and use his freedom to say what he wants to say about any subject and do it in the way he considers most appropriate" (45). Therefore, it is quite obvious that why he would want to create the same independence for his readers. This property becomes the distinctive feature of Coetzee's writing in which readers feel the freedom of interpretation without the dominace of a narrative voice.

Coetzee advocates the challenge towards authority in most of his novels. He disregards authors as the masters of narrative, and promotes the presence of multiple selves in a piece of writing. Instead of saying everything in a direct way, he designs the narrative process to let the problems come to surface by themselves and conceived by the readers. Hayes sheds light on this matter uttering that Coetzee "refuses to position himself as a herald of community, but wishes to retain an

awareness of the transcendental imperative; he distinguishes between the particularist and the universalist ideal of community, and with a tiny demurral refuses to chooose the one over the other" (29). By doing so, Coetzee includes each standing, position, idea or thought without upholding any of them over another. Instead of talking alone as a master-author, Coetzee allows his characters to talk in their own voice to explain the details.

In his first years of narration, Coetzee favours conventional mode of writing, however, later, he abandons this mode, and Kundera associates this abandonment with the deficiency of the conventional form by saying that "the conventional form (grounded exclusively in a character's adventure, and content with a mere narration of that adventure) limits the novel, reduces its cognitive capacities." (33). It is this concern which leads Coetzee to challenge the conventional forms to create a liberal fictional atmosphere. In order to create such an atmosphere, Coetzee includes parody as one of his efficient literary tools. Parody stands as a part of Coetzee's writing practice. James Aubrey signifies that

> [p]arody has played a significant part in Coetzee's work throughout his career. His novels, *In the Heart of the Country* (1977) and *Life and Times of Michael K* (1983) parody of Beckett and Kafka respectively; moreover *Foe* (1986) and *The Master of Petersburg* (1994) not only rewrite Defoe and Dostoevsky but also feature the novelists as characters. (2)

In addition, the use of parody may not be limited only around Coetzee's use of specific authors, since he also poses his own self as his parodying tool in his novels. Aubrey indicates that Coetzee "is not above self-parody: the collection of Coetzees in *Dusklands* (1974), the near-namesake JC in *Diary of a Bad Year* (2007), and the triology of autrebiographical texts -*Boyhood* (1997), *Youth* (2002) and *Summertime* (2009)- all show Coetzee confusing and questioning the role of writer" (2). In this sense, these certain examples underline the importance of parody in Coetzee's creative writing process.

Regarding the properties of Coetzee's writing style, Attridge summarizes Coetzee's works under three categories:

> First, [the works] locate themselves within an established literary culture . . . . Second, Coetzee's writing invites the reader to savour it, sentence by sentence, word by word . . . . A third feature of Coetzee's fiction

> which is interpretable as consistent with the traditional humanist concerns of the canon is its thematic focus. ("Oppressive" 190)

These properties make Coetzee's novels unique, and he has become one of the great novelists in twenty-first century. After a general overview about Coetzee's syle, it is required here to divide his style and his works into two parts so as to comprehend Coetzee's works in a better way. These two categories consist of his early phase; post-colonial fiction and his later phase, Australian fiction.

2.2.1. Coetzee's Postcolonial Fiction

Coetzee's post-colonial style covers the period from the publication of *Dusklands* in 1974 to his settlement in Australia in 2002. Coetzee, as an African in Cape Town, carries the responsibility and accountability of a white intellectual to represent the others' stories during the colonial and apartheid era. The necessity to reflect colonial deeds into his texts stems from Coetzee's African ties. Poyner states that "[t]he egregious oppression of South Africa's black peoples and the responsibilities felt by oppositional South African writers, black and white, were the driving force behind the movement for committed literature" (*Coetzee and The Idea* 8). Hence, the suffering during the colonial oppression in South Africa undoubtly triggers the writers to touch upon this issue. The realist mode of writing emerges to portray that oppression, and the writers focus on actual conditions of life.

Coetzee, in his early fiction, deals with the reflection of the violence that takes hold of in black people's lives. Poyner explains Coetzee's early fiction by uttering that "[t]he issues [Coetzee] scrutinizes -selection of the modes of writing and standpoints from which to approach brutality, examination of ways of representing the victims, finding positions from which to pass moral judgment of perpetrators- appear as of seminal importance also for his own writing" (*Coetzee and The Idea* 46). Poyner also reveals that Coetzee's later novels especially after *Dusklands* (1974) and *Waiting for the Barbarians* (1980), *Age of Iron* (1990) marks another shift that relies on his departure from the aggressive mode of writing and ostensible literary stylizations of the early novels towards more realistic narration that responds directly to the actual situation in South Africa (46). Although Coetzee makes realistic descriptions of the colonial South Africa, he never does in a very explicit way. He also includes allegory and stays away from being a direct judge in any issue. Shaffer

highlights that "[i]n eschewing realism for allegory, Coetzee, as novelist, can free himself from being viewed as a mere commentator on the political situation in South Africa" (125). This mode of writing differentiates Coetzee from other black prose authors who explicitly share their ideas within their novels.

In post-colonial works of Coetzee, the oppression of black people, the master-slave relationship, and the colonialism appear as recurring themes. In fact, many authors, who have witnessed the apartheid years, feel the responsibility to reflect the pain and suffering in that period. Andre Brink states that during the apartheid years, many writers "have been prompted to choose between the telling of a simple love story, and a story with a recognizable social and political resonance. More often than not it was the latter option we chose" (12). Understanding the social, political and historical process of South Africa, Coetzee bases his first novels on distinct aspects of the colonialism. However, in his first novels, Coetzee has a kind of dilemma between being a coloniser or not. As a white man, he never feels himself bound to Africa completely, yet, he also regards the responsibility to portray the colonial process inevitable. Stephen Watson suggests that "[t]o write as Coetzee does, acutely conscious of both dilemmas, is to inherit a twofold displacement. To be in a position like this, one suspects, to be deprived of responsibility while continuing to feel a responsibility which is as boundless in its guilt" ("Colonialism" 28). This dilemma paves the way for Coetzee to present the divided mind of a colonial intellectual. On the one hand, Coetzee wants to stay away from a full engagement into colonial affairs, on the other hand, he feels the obligation to describe the effects of colonialism in South Africa.

Benita Parry utters that Coetzee's "first novels are directed at understanding the conditions —linguistic, formal, historical and political— governing the writing of fiction in South Africa" (40). As Atwell highlights, Coetzee brings his work a unique combination of intellectual power, stylistic prose, historical vision and ethical penetration (Introduction, *Doubling* 1). In his prolific career, Coetzee has released a great number of works based on South African context. Coetzee's first novel, *Dusklands* (1974), depicts colonial brutality and the problems occuring in that era. This novel consists of two parts; the first part deals with Vietnam project of the USA, and the second part is based on the narrative of Jacobus Coetzee in South Africa. Anna Izabella Cichon mentions that Coetzee "scrutinizes here the analogy between brutality that characterized the Dutch colonization of South Africa in the eighteenth

century and the aggressive spirit of the American invasion in Vietnam in the 1960s and 1970s" (48). Thus, in *Dusklands*, while Coetzee depicts the colonial violence and aggressiveness of the colonial period, he also puts emphasis on the US imperialism in Vietnam. Thus, he expands his focus to discuss the colonial issue in a larger scale by addressing it as a universal problem.

In his second novel, *In the Heart of the Country* (1977), Coetzee characterizes a white woman, Magda, living with his father in an isolated farm in South Africa. The complexities of the novel increases when his father brings an African woman to the farm. Moreover, in his third novel, *Waiting for the Barbarians* (1980), Coetzee again relays the colonial violence, and how black people are humiliated and violated during the colonial process. The novel is about a Magistrate of a small town who maintains tranquility in that town until the arrival of special forces of Empire. These forces attack, capture and torture local people depending on a rumour about a number of barbarians who are expected to come and invade the town. Cichon indicates that Coetzee changes his treatment of violence and "[h]ere, Coetzee directs his attention from the perpetrators to the victims of torture and to the witnesses of atrocities who do not suffer themselves but who are demoralized by the violence of others" (53). However, this violence really disturbs the Magistrate, and this, for the first time, manifests the glimpses of personal awakening with which a man of conscience tries to oppose the imperial regime.

Coetzee's fourth novel, *Life and Times of Michael K* (1983), displays the victims' struggle towards the oppression of the colonial powers rather than depicting only their victimization. The protagonist Michael K makes a travel starting from Cape Town to his mother's birthplace during the apartheid era. Michael K makes this journey because he wants to be outside of the troublesome world. Cichon states that Michael K "finds for himself a mode of existence and a space where aggressors will not turn him into a predictable subject whose life and suffering might be controlled by them" (65). Thus, Michael K resists the breakdown and turmoil caused by colonialism.

Coetzee's fifth novel, *Foe* (1986), appears as a rewriting of Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, which is written from the point of view of Susan Barton. Barton emerges as a person who lands on the same island with Crusoe and Friday. Shaffer expresses that this metafictional and allegorical work

> retells Robinson Crusoe as an account of the relations between the literary establishment, *Foe* (based on Defoe), a colonial storyteller, Susan Barton, and the silenced voice of a colonized manservant, Friday. The 1720 narration is told largely by Barton, who seeks Foe's help in getting the story of Crusoe's island to readers. (124)

As the plot thickens, the most significant detail in the novel comes out, and it is revealed that Friday's tongue has been cut. This clarifies that the most important person who should talk about his experience on the island cannot say anything because he is mute. This symbolic muteness underlines the oppression of the other in the colonial world. After *Foe*, Coetzee publishes *Age of Iron* (1990) in which he directly addresses the actual political situation in South Africa for the first time. The novel is set in Cape Town in the 1980s, during the years of the States of Emergency, and it explores the turbulent years of apartheid and young native Africans' opposition to this discrimination. During that opposition, thousands of natives die in the cities. The protagonist, Elizabeth Curren criticizes the apartheid state for its wrong regulations, but she also thinks using African children to resist this state is a wrong attitude by bringing another point of view to this common discussion.

In the following years, Coetzee writes a different novel, *The Master of Petersburg* (1994), which coincides with Coetzee's transition period of writing and in which Fyodor Dostoevsky appears as the protagonist with his life and history of Russia. Richard Locke, in "Senor C," explains that this novel "narrates a two month journey to Saint Petersburg by Dostoevsky, who is attempting to discover the meaning of his stepson's sudden death" (15). *The Master of Petersburg* also reflects certain implications about the theme of authorship based on Dostoevsky's poetics. Then, after a few years, Coetzee publishes *Disgrace* (1999) which describes a South African professor's failures in the life. David Lurie, the South African professor, is fired from his position at university due to his sexual affair with a student, and goes to his daughter's farm as a space to escape. However, this short tranquility is destroyed when his daughter is raped by three Africans. Coetzee raises a lot of harsh criticism due to his reference to the issue of rape. Poyner clarifies this criticism saying that

> *Disgrace* received damning criticism from sections of its South African readership for its stark portrayal of the rape of a whitewoman at the hands of three black intruders. Chosing to address the subject of rape,

> particularly that of a white woman by black men, is deeply troubling for many readers and critics at this moment in South African history, when the incidence of rape, particularly of black women, is endemic. (*Coetzee and The Idea* 12)

The renewal of racist stereotypes which regard black men as rapists causes Coetzee to be criticized as a racist.

Even though *Disgrace* enables Coetzee to become a well-known author in the world, his reception in South Africa does not match with his worldwide reputation. Head explains that "[t]he treatment of the gang rape of a white woman by black men, as a figure for an aspect of post-colonial historical process, caused a furore, and this seems to have had a bearing on Coetzee's decision to turn his back on South Africa" (2), and this paves the way to his movement to Australia. Thus, Coetzee's sudden decision to move to Australia turns over a new leaf in his style of writing. Rather than only referring to history, Coetzee begins to deal with other issues such as the problems of the present world and the integration of distinct literary styles in his novels. Cichon adds that Coetzee's "preoccupation with late modernist concerns, his interrogation of language, discourses, textuality and narrative, his use of parody, pastiche, allegory and literary stylizations are supposed to attest his insensitivity to the exigencies of life under apartheid" (47). As a result, these new perspectives provide Coetzee with a different style of writing.

2.2.2. Coetzee's Australian Fiction

The impact of Australia in Coetzee's writing becomes explicit following his relocation there. Elleke Boehmer remarks that "beginning to write Australia, first in *Elizabeth Costello*, then in *Slow Man* and *Diary of a Bad Year*, Coetzee laid out the basic intellectual schemas, the furniture of the settled Australian mind" ("J.M. Coetzee's" 14). Australia, as a country, enables Coetzee to deal with the issues which he has neglected due to the troublesome nature of South Africa. As a result, his late novels cause a kind of cleaning of his mind off the brutality he has experienced as Melinda Harvey suggests in "In Australia You Start Zero: The Escape from Place in J.M. Coetzee's Late Novels" (32).

This change in Coetzee's style makes evident that Coetzee severs his connection with the sense of obligation to reflect history and reality in South Africa.

Mike Marais sheds light on this matter saying that during the apartheid period, Coetzee "frequently articulated his reluctance to follow history by treating it as a priori structure that a writer has no choice but to represent and so supplement . . . . If his writing has changed radically, it must surely evince a departure of some sort from the obssession with the limits of culture and history in the South African corpus" (99). Coetzee's sense of freedom demonstrates itself in his speech in the ceremony of having Australian citizenship, and Kossew manifests this sense of freedom by including Coetzee's speech about Australia:

> I was attracted by the free and generous spirit of the people, by the beauty of the land itself and -when I first saw Adelaide- by the grace of the city that I now have the honour to call my home. In becoming a citizen one undertakes certain duties and responsibilities. One of the more tangible of those duties and responsibilities is no matter what one's birth and background, to accept historical past of the new country as one's own. [1] (114)

Apparently, Australia has affected Coetzee a great deal, and consequently, as a writer in a new country, Coetzee gives a new impulse to his style. Even in his political criticism, Coetzee's Australian fiction harbors a different type of writing from the previous colonial context.

In his late works, Coetzee deals with the universal matters such as morality, rights of animals, liberalism, and political injustice. He tries to give voice to each character he creates about everything he considers crucial. Coetzee also brings formal innovations to his fiction. The main difference in his style is the withdrawal of authority, and this becomes maybe the most significant feature of Coetzee's Australian novels. He allows his characters to speak, and frees them from being suppressed under the voice of an author. Chris Danta suggests that Coetzee, based on Roland Barthes' concept of the death of the author (displacement of the writer as the primary agent of writing), tries to put forward a new understanding of authority (xiii). The question of authorship leads Coetzee to involve the use of multiple voices in his works. By staying outside of the conventional narrative structure, Coetzee brings the characters into the forefront. He makes use of various genres such as letters, interviews, novellas, chronicles, poetic speech within the novel genre. He also

[1] The speech can also be found in www.citizenship.gov.au/should_become/personal-stories/coetzee.htm/

plays with the form of the novel by dividing the pages into sections, or by involving lectures, letters or interviews in his works. The unfinalizable ending and the polyphonic structure of his novels pervade Coetzee's style in his Australian fiction, which make impossible to reach an ultimate conclusion or interpretation about the novels. Katy Iddiols underlines that with Coetzee's "characters and his novels, we are constantly made aware of the harm that can be inflicted through singular interpretations. Throughout his oeuvre, we have seen a wide range of interpretative projects attempted with differing degrees of commitment and intention" (195). This use of nonfinalizability through the introduction of multiple voices under the framework of polyphony forms the basis of Coetzee's latest works.

As Poyner states, Coetzee leaves behind the themes and issues related to post-colonialism, racial segregation, censorship, banning and exile, brutality and the issue of liberalism (*Coetzee and the Paradox* 1), and he takes aim at the universal and personal issues via the integration of multiple voices, dialogical relations and open-ended structure. Instead of a realist fiction in which there is only one narrator, and no voice of other character can be heard, Coetzee creates a mediation between the voices to render distinct perspectives. Accordingly, the relocation of Coetzee opens a different site of enunciation in his writing, giving a new historical relevance to the postmodern turn in Coetzee as David Atwell states in his afterword (*Critical* 214).

The traces of Coetzee's latest style begins with the publication of *The Lives of Animals* (1999). It is difficult to define its genre because Coetzee arranges this work as a collection of the essays about animal rights. The work includes the novelist Elizabeth Costello and also covers a certain reflection of the relation between her son John and herself. Poyner explains that Costello "seems as a device -as an alter ego- put into play by the author to convey those feelings or sentiments that Coetzee himself finds difficult to express" (*Coetzee and the Idea* 14). Coetzee, via his character Costello, relays certain ideas about his own perception of the animal rights. In addition, there are also other voices in the novel who talk about animal rights rather than only Costello, and thus this inclusion of multiple voices in the novel makes it a polyphonic work in which various voices are heard in a non-authorial and non-finalizable structure.

These essays included in *The Lives of Animals* are incorporated in Coetzee's following work, *Elizabeth Costello* (2003). The character Elizabeth Costello, who is presented for the first time in *The Lives of Animals*, emerges here again as an aging

Australian writer. Coetzee creates her in this novel in order to say what he cannot explicitly say. In this work, Costello travels around the world and gives lectures that are also covered in the previous book. The method used by Coetzee is accepted as lecture-as-fiction, and this leads to a problematization of fiction and nonfiction. The differentiation of Costello's ideas from Coetzee's can sometimes be very difficult, nevertheless, Coetzee distances himself from being an authority figure in the fiction, and relates everything he wants to say with Elizabeth Costello.

Following *Elizabeth Costello*, Coetzee publishes *Slow Man* (2005), and propounds a metafictional discourse in which the relations between its author and the characters meddle fact and fiction. In this work, Paul Rayment, as the protagonist, has an accident and gets stuck at home under the care of nurses. When Paul falls in love with his nurse, Marijana Jokic, a Croatian woman, he has to face some problems with Marijana's family and husband. In the meantime, unexpectedly, Elizabeth Costello, becomes a part of the book and starts to interfere in Paul's life and his relation with his nurse. Elizabeth also declares that she is going to put Paul as a character in her next novel. Aubrey states that "Costello, it seems, is intent on writing a book about Paul, she spends the rest of the novel trying to convince him to behave in a manner worthy of a literary hero, and in particular, Don Quixote" (4). By bringing Costello back in his narrative in a different novel, Coetzee offers a new style in which it becomes hard to detect what is real or not. Moreover, Coetzee also publishes his latest novel, *The Children of Jesus Christ* in 2013, in which he tells the story of an older man, Simon and a boy, David who have moved to a new utopic land to start a new life by washing off their old memories. Since the book has been currently released, there are no further academic studies conducted on it yet.

According to the information given about Coetzee's latest works, Coetzee, as a South African writer, adopts a new style when he moves to Australia. This adoption brings innovations to the content and the structure of his novels. Including various and free voices, Coetzee lets the characters speak individually expressing their own ideologies and views. He refers to each issue by establishing dialogical relations between his characters, and puts forth an infinite plurality of interpretations. Thus, the novel ends without a finalizing judgment by the author. This makes the readers not to have a certain judgment about the novel, and each reader internalizes the given message depending on their own ideological perception.

CHAPTER III

3.COETZEE AND THE USE OF POLYPHONY IN HIS NOVELS

Most works of Coetzee, especially his Australian fiction, are marked by polyphony. Coetzee has a bilingual status as both African and English which causes a kind of hybridity in his identity. This hybridity may be taken as one of the reasons why Coetzee prefers not to use a single voice in his fiction. He refuses to give a dominant position to one voice regarding the issues he discusses. His position as a bilingual and bicultural writer enables him to have a sense of discerning diverse perspectives to the problems or events around him. Thus, Coetzee employs polyphony in his fiction which makes him reflect a variety of points of view and interpretations. In order to employ polyphony in his novels, Coetzee adds certain properties such as giving voice to each character —especially through self-parody of the author— to speak without the dominance of an author, including never-ending dialogical relations, and unfinalizable ending which leads to open-endedness and various interpretations.

Bakhtin highlights that polyphony enables the readers to recognize that each speech of the characters stands on the border of someone else's thought or speech (*Problems* 30). Like a carnival, in a polyphonic text, everyone talks but no dominant voice is heard. The author never uses his characters as mute objects on whom he has absolute authority. Rather than the judgement of a narrative authority, each voice is accepted as independent, and these voices are engaged in a dialogical relationship. What enables this dialogy is the inclusion of multi-voiced form into a text. With this plurality of conflicting consciousnesses, an author has the chance to relate everything without making anything explicitly said. This property makes the novel end open-ended. As Coetzee does in his novels, the author never dictates anything but provides an awareness to the readers about the issues discussed. Morales emphasizes that "[t]he apparently paradoxical nature of Coetzee's work -his insistence of fleshing out debates while at the same time refusing to make his politics explicitly or publicly known- constitutes his scrupulously orchestrated ethical position" (49). This seemingly contradictory ethical position is a result of the polyphonic nature of his works, and Coetzee's way of dealing with topics and the frame within which he presents them is shaped by his polyphonic narrative style.

Bill Aschroft argues that the eschewal of the narrative voice, the voice of the author, prevails in Coetzee's novels; Coetzee remains silent and the disruption of the authority of the text paves the way for the characters to speak individually (142), and he suggests alternative voices. Hayes underlines that Coetzee, in his novels, "invites readerly judgement through the control of tone: most especially, he uses irony and parody to help the reader identify the right way to interpret a particular character or scene and meaning emerges through a modulation of the relations between straight and parodic representation" (47). This new artistic position of the author creates internal freedom of the characters. As a result of this freedom, the characters have the chance to talk to each other. Hence, dialogism becomes a crucial aspect of his polyphonic novels. Hayes expresses that Coetzee places "[d]ialogism as the guarantor of a non-objectifying engagement with otherness, through which both author and character experience a process of becoming free" (172). Therefore, Coetzee inflicts dialogism and dialogical relations into his novels in order to render various consciousnesses in the act of communication.

This mode of dialogic form provides Coetzee with the opportunity to present the relations between multiple speakers. Richard Alan Northover underscores that by allowing several conflicting perspectives to be expressed in their own complexity, Coetzee "stages situations in which ideas can be debated. It allows various voices, both complementary and contradictory, to express various views, without any single one dominating: the result is a Bakhtinian polyphony" (41). Hence, Bakhtin's concept of dialogism and polyphony come into existence into Coetzee's polyphonic novels. Northover adds that "this seems evident in the dialogic structure of *The Lives of Animals*, the authorial intervention of Costello in *Slow Man*, the tripartite page division in *Diary of a Bad Year* and the interview structure of *Summertime*" (46). Coetzee also uses this dialogism to make the details about the characters or events come out in his novels. Rather than giving the details about the characters or events from the authorial point of view, he allows his characters to express the details about themselves or events in these dialogues. This polyphony of independent voices can only be provided by the existence of dialogism within the novels.

Coetzee integrates non-novelistic genres into his novels such as a short story, a letter, a poem or an essay, and thus, the novel enables the characters to engage in distinct points of view represented by these genres. Coetzee also uses multi-layered composition in his fiction and each of these layers proceed simultaneously within the

narrative, without intruding one another. Coetzee gives weight to each voice he hears and the relation between the self and the other like Bakhtin. Kundera states that "one of the most fundamental principles of the polyphonic composers was the equality of voices . . . . The novel is the imaginary paradise of individuals. It is the territory where no one possesses the truth" (75). In Coetzee's novels, there is no single opinion or truth but a diversity of multiple meanings and linguistic plurality. As Murphet states, a great novel never says anything at all, it nonetheless dissolves the suture binding together an enclosed situation, and a social horizon, by dissociating that situation's network of opinions from itself (67). In other words, a polyphonic novel avoids dictating an absolute truth; it just presents multiple perspectives and lets the readers interpret everything in their own perception.

Carrol Clarkson emphasizes that Coetzee "raises countervoices, . . . so that each word that he writes becomes dialogic in Bakhtin's specific sense of the term . . . A serious author, playing up this dialogic potential of writing, instead of trying to suppress it, raises a countervoice" (8). Hence, Coetzee's works become full of multiple voices instead of a single narrator. Coetzee remarks that "a dialogical novel is one in which there is no central claim to truth or authority since there is no dominating authorial consciousness; instead the reader is presented with a number of competing voices and discourses" (*Stranger* 9). These features pave the way for Coetzee's novel to have an open-ended closure; since there is a non-ending act of asking and answering, the novel finishes without presenting a final judgment. It is this aim which provides Coetzee to let his reader to think and reach a conclusion about the issues discussed in the novel with their ideological perspective. Clarkson also states that if the outcome of the novel is decided and given at the very beginning, it just becomes an ethical prescription of the author, and "what is demanded on the part of the writer, though, is a responsiveness to other voices, a willingness to be incorporated with them" (100). Coetzee never declares his own opinions, and refuses any absolute or certain paradigm uttered by only one person including himself, and leaves everything to his readers.

Coetzee presents a number of opinions or events in his polyphonic novels, and each one is interrogated by critical voices, and therefore this questioning mode ensures dialogue and brings about various alternative voices to interpret the opinions or events within the novel in diverse perspectives. This multiplicity arises a non-ending process of interpretations and unfinalizable deductions making the novel ends

without an aultimate truth. As a result, the readers also become the part of this polyphonic structure and add their own opinions, ideologies, or truth to the novel. Graham Huggan and Stephen Watson explain Coetzee's use of polyphony saying that

> Coetzee is well aware of the multiple ironies involved in the struggle for interpretive authority. . . . In this estranged, often violent world, there is little room for compromise . . . . Few writers are more acute than Coetzee in their perception of the materiality of language, or of the suspectibility of words and stories to ideological manipulations. (Introduction, *Critical* 7)

In his polyphonic world, no ultimate/absolute opinion, ideology or truth can have an opportunity to exist. In the light of these, Coetzee's two novels, *Summertime* and *Diary of a Bad Year*, set good examples to scrutinize Coetzee's use of polyphony in his fictions.

3.1. J.M. COETZEE'S *SUMMERTIME* AND POLYPHONY

Summertime, which was released in 2009, unveils Coetzee's private life although he is an author who does not give details about his life even in his interviews. In the novel, after Coetzee's death, Mr.Vincent, an admirer of him, decides to write a biography of Coetzee and chooses five people to interview whom, he believes, have influence on Coetzee's life. In Mr. Vincent's interviews, each character offers a different depiction of Coetzee. However, the most interesting fact about the novel is that these voices talk about a dead man, and that Coetzee lowers his voice by presenting himself as a dead man. This death is both literary within the action of the novel, and symbolic in terms of Coetzee's intention to fade out his own presence as an authorial figure in his text. *Summertime* is a fiction, yet, it also covers facts about Coetzee even though it is not known whether those facts presented in the novel are true or not. Those facts come out via dialogical relations between the characters rather than a single authoritative narrative voice. Nevertheless, Coetzee, as an author, neither accepts nor refuses any facts about him, and leaves the interpretation of his life to his readers.

Summertime emerges as a mix of fact and fiction, and this makes that work a kind of a mixture of fiction and autobiography. Jan Tlusty emphasizes that

> [i]n the case of factual autobiography, the author is identical with the narrator and at the same time with the main character . . . . But what happens if the author is narrating about his or her own life, yet chooses not to be identical with the narrator? This situation arises when the autobiography is written in the third person . . . . This kind of narrative is necessarily fictional . . . . The author cannot guarantee the veracity of what is said in the text; the whole of the responsibility rests on the shoulders of the narrator. . . . It also suggest certain interpretative strategies on the part of the reader. (180-181)

While Coetzee informs his reader about his private life, the readers can never be sure whether what is said about him is true or not. Coetzee arouses such uncertainty by distorting the truths or not confirming anything written in the text. As a result of this, the readers are made to question and comment on the given details.

Coetzee recreates himself in this novel with the integration of his past, and James Meek, in his review, accentuates that "[b]ooks, like people, must be judged for what they are, not what they do, and *Summertime* is a sincere, unsparing attempt by a writer in his late 60s to imagine how a man like him would have appeared, in his early 30s" (1). Coetzee recounts his story not in the first-person narrative, but he uses a third person narrator and as a writer, he becomes the "he" creating a form that appears distinct from the conventional narrative structure. With the interruption of the text through interviews and fragmented entries from Coetzee's journal included in the text, Coetzee brings forth a system of narration in which there are inserted genres enabling a multiplicity of voices. Thus, this plurality also leads to an unfinalizable flow, because no absolute ending or opinion is given regarding Coetzee's life. In his fictional world, Coetzee involves dialogues in the interaction of the characters both with the interviewer and Coetzee, himself. Based on these characteristics, the employment of polyphony manifests itself in *Summertime*, and Coetzee incorporates the dismissal of authorial voice, multivocality in a distorted genre, dialogical relations and open-ended plot into his work that promotes the effectiveness of polyphony.

As the main principle of a polyphonic novel, the retreat of dominant authorial voice is evident in *Summertime*. Danta discloses that "[t]he central conceit of Coetzee's *Summertime* is that the author is literally dead. An English academic, Mr. Vincent, is writing a biography of the deceased author . . . and interviewing

some of those who knew him between the years 1972 and 1975" (xvi). Coetzee excludes himself from the text both in terms of voice and actual existence, and he also renders himself as an ordinary man with his defects and failures in this work which contradicts with the image of an author that has been granted the Nobel Prize. In various descriptions of Coetzee in *Summertime*, he appears as an incapable man having failures in his personal and working life. By adopting such a narrative strategy, Coetzee excludes himself from being a significant part of the novel as an author and makes his readers to value other voices over his own.

Justin Neuman says that Coetzee presents himself as an ordinary man in a modesty and "[t]his modesty erupts in repeated narrative acts of selfabasement, generally centering around reported failures as a lover, . . . and in a scrupulous underreporting of his success as an author taking the form of claims that Coetzee was never a popular writer" (130). The fact that the author stays outside of the flow paves the way for the emergence of other voices to talk. Neuman asserts that because this novel contains a set of interviews and undated fragments, and each voice contributes to Coetzee's life with a specific point of view (128). Thus, it becomes the reader's responsibility to follow and question Coetzee's life story in South African context. In this game of finding the real Coetzee, Mr. Vincent proposes various voices to portray him in their own voices, yet, it becomes difficult to decide who is telling the truth.

This plurality of voices is ensured with the help of the form/traits Coetzee has applied in *Summertime*. The distortion of the novel genre with the inclusion of interviews and undated fragments from his own journals enable Coetzee to put multiple voices in his work. As Tlusty notifies in his article, *Summertime* "does not contain a classical reminiscent narration, but loosely arranged scenes which are narrated in the present tense and in which the narrator mediates an insight into the mind of the character called John Coetzee" (182). Within the interviews, the characters, individually, speak about Coetzee regarding their relationship with him and their perception about his life. Thanks to the active participation of several voices, Coetzee erases any trace of an authorial voice, and he assigns Mr. Vincent to conduct the interviews and write a biography about Coetzee. The interviews involved in the novel cover the years 2007 and 2008, and during these dates Mr. Vincent has interviews with five interviewees, with four women and one man. In the first interview, an unhappily married woman Julia tells her story with Coetzee; in the second, Coetzee's cousin Margot comments on her relation with him; in the third, a

Brazilian woman, Adriana recounts her own account of Coetzee; in the fourth, the only male interviewee, Martin appears to describe how he perceives Coetzee; and in the fifth interview, Sophie, who is Coetzee's lover and colleague at University of Cape Town, conveys her personal relationship with him. As Coetzee promotes the voice of his characters to recount his life story, these voices function as pillars of a polyphonic structure in which each voice creates its own version of Coetzee.

Mr. Vincent, as the interviewer in the novel, visits different people and asks about the details of Coetzee's life. However, Neuman describes Mr. Vincent as "an academic of mediocre creativity, a younger man who has never met Coetzee" (131), and for this reason, his work arouses a kind of reliability problem, because there is a man with no acquitance of Coetzee, and rather than writing a formal life story, he just includes mere gossip or personal comments on Coetzee. Nevertheless, Neuman also asserts that Coetzee's use of Mr. Vincent "as a farming device is deft . . . especially when it comes to mapping mobility. Vincent traverses the globe from Northern England to Paris, Sao Paolo, Ontario, South Africa and back, gathering material and interviewing Coetzee's sexual partners, a female cousin, and two academic colleagues" (132). This enables the readers to experience the geographic movement which provides them with the perspectives of various speakers from various parts of the world.

The reason why Mr. Vincent as an academic wants to write a biography of Coetzee is clarified in his own words while he is interviewing Sophie, in Paris, in 2008. When Sophie asks Martin why he puts so much emphasis on the interviews, he answers:

> Mme Denoël, I have been through the letters and diaries. What Coetzee writes there cannot be trusted, not as a factual record –not because he was a liar but because he was a fictioneer. In his letters he is making up a fiction of himself for his correspondents; in his diaries he is doing much the same for his own eyes, or perhaps for posterity. . . . but if you want the truth you have to go behind the fictions they elaborate and hear from people who knew him directly, in the flesh. (Coetzee, *Summertime* 95)

Vincent explicitly explains his distrust in Coetzee in writing about the truths, and he explains that he wants to hear multiple voices freely speaking about him rather than an authorial voice of Coetzee. Therefore, Vincent reveals the traces of Coetzee's life not from his own perception but from other speakers' points of view. Moreover,

Sophie is also curious about how Vincent decides to choose people for his project. Vincent replies : "Of the people he had been closest to, many had left the country or died or both. His whole generation was in fact on the point of dying out. The upshot is, the core of the biography will come from a handful of friends and colleagues who are prepared to share their memories" (Coetzee, *Summertime* 95). Since most of Coetzee's relatives are on the edge of their last years or they are dead, Vincent claims that interviewing the friends or colleagues may be more useful rather than unreliable informants.

There is also another detail that confuses Martin, one of interviewees, and he asks how many people Vincent has chosen to conduct these interviews. Mr. Vincent says that he has five people, and states how he has chosen them upon the insistent questions of Martin: "Basically I let Coetzee himself do the choosing. I simply followed up on clues he dropped in his notebooks –clues as to who was important to him at the time. The other criterion you had to meet was to be alive. Most of the people who knew him well are, as you must know, dead by now" (88). Mr. Vincent discloses that the main impulse to choose Julia, Margot, Adriana, Martin and Sophie is that they have a kind of importance in Coetzee's life, and that Coetzee indicates this importance in his notebooks. In his interviews with Julia, Mr. Vincent also reveals that he has never met Coetzee face to face before: "I have sought him out, I never even corresponded with him. I thought it would be better if I had no sense of obligation toward him. It would leave me free to write what I wished" (16). Mr. Vincent never meets Coetzee since he does not want to feel any domination or any effect of Coetzee on himself. Only by doing so, he can be free to express his opinions and to write what he wants about Coetzee.

In *Summertime,* to conduct his first interview, Mr. Vincent meets Julia who is one of Coetzee's sexual partners in the novel. Julia appears as an unhappily married therapist who is interviewed in Kingston, Ontario, May 2008. Their first encounter happens in a supermarket, and Julia gives the first description of Coetzee here:

> He was scrawny, he had a beard, he wore horn-rimmed glasses and sandals. He looked out of place, like a bird, one of those flightless birds; or like an abstracted scientist who had wandered by mistake out of his laboratory. There was an air of seediness about him too, an air of failure. I guessed there was no woman in his life, and it turned out I was right. (11)

In this first description of Coetzee, he is being portrayed through the eyes of a woman who mirrors him as an ordinary, dull man who is lonely, asocial and repressed. Although Julia and Coetzee have a sexual affair later in the book, Julia asserts that she is not impressed by him when she first sees him. Julia says: "You must believe me when I tell you that nothing –nothing!– could have been further from my mind than flirting with this man. For he had no sexual presence whatsoever. It was as though he had been sprayed from head to toe with a neutralizing spray, a neutering spray" (Coetzee, *Summertime* 13). In these lines, Coetzee is depicted as a man who has no sexual charm. This description of Coetzee implies that Coetzee lets his characters make a fool of himself by reflecting his appearance and personality in a humiliating way. These reflections are the glimpses of polyphony in which the characters are free from the boundaries of an author, and they create a different identity of Coetzee.

In addition to her first impression of Coetzee, Julia then goes on to clarify the details of her relationship with him. Julia is married to a man, called, Mark, and they have two children, nevertheless, Julia has a dull marriage and the cynical mores of middle class white Cape Town in the 1970s, where husbands want their woman to be chaste while they are free to be together with other women (Meek 2). Hence, Mark betrays Julia with various women in their marriage, and Julia pays him back by having an affair with Coetzee. Coetzee emerges here as a man who commits adultery which is a detail that may negatively affect the readers' perception of him. One day while Mark is away for business, Julia invites Coetzee and his father to a dinner, yet Coetzee comes alone. However, that first dinner does not lead to the affair, because after that occasion, Coetzee goes into silence and never replies to Julia's letters until suddenly he invites her for dinner one day. About the dinner, Julia says that she "has not expected much from the evening, but the flatness of the conversation, the long silences, and something else in the air too, discord or bad temper between the two of them" (Coetzee, *Summertime* 19). In her confession, Julia enlightens the relation between the father and the son.

The relation and communication between the father and the son is so uninteresting and drab that it seems they live together just as an obligation, because of the family ties. When Mr. Vincent asks about whether Coetzee loves his father or not, Julia explains that "boys hate their fathers and want to supplant them in their mothers' affections. No, of course John did not love his father, he did not love

anybody, he was not built for love. But he did feel guilty about his father. He felt guilty and therefore behaved dutifully. With certain lapses" (Coetzee, *Summertime* 21). Julia pictures Coetzee as a man not made for love, who is inept and incapable of loving somebody. Following that dinner, Julia's relation to him becomes subtler and they start to meet frequently. Nonetheless, even in their sexual relation, Julia relays that Coetzee never fully engages himself into the sexual mode, and says that "I never had the feeling that he was with me, me in all my reality. Rather, it was as if he was engaged with some erotic image of me inside his head; perhaps even with some image of Woman with a capital W" (22). Coetzee destroys all the assumptions about himself being a well-known author who has a reputation in the society, and he allows his character to present himself as sexually incompetent.

Furthermore, Julia talks about how Coetzee covers just a small part of her life, and how he has never had any importance for her. In other words, Julia positions Coetzee as a secondary character in her life by repeatedly uttering that

> while from my point of view the story of John may have been just one episode among many in the long narrative of my marriage, nevertheless, by dint of a quick flip, a quick manipulation of perspective, followed by some clever editing, you can transform it into a story about John . . . I *really* was the main character. John *really* was a minor character. (19)

Julia, with these sentences, tries to lower the importance of John in her story, and Coetzee, ironically, becomes the stock character of his own novel. This fact can be associated with the withdrawal of authority in a polyphonic novel. The author carries no importance, whereas the characters form the building stones of the polyphonic structure. Furthermore, when Coetzee brings Julia a copy of *Dusklands* to read and comment on it, the significance of the characters as readers of his novels gains importance once more. In this respect, Julia includes her criticism of the novel: "I can't say I like *Dusklands*. I know it sounds old-fashioned, but I prefer my books to have proper heroes and heroines, characters you can admire" (24). The inclusion of this criticism in *Summertime* proves that Coetzee always gives priority to his readers' opinions, and he enables his characters and readers to speak out their opinions freely without the repression of Coetzee, as the author. Based on the description of Coetzee in Julia's recounts, Coetzee appears as an unmarried man living with his father, physically unattractive, socially inept, sexually inadequate, and as an author writing in an old-fashioned way.

After Julia, Mr. Vincent goes to Margot to make his second interview. Margot is a cousin of Coetzee with whom Mr. Vincent actually meets in December, in 2007, and they reunite again one year after in South Africa to revise the interview. During that period, Vincent checks the spelling of African words in the interview, and makes it a degressive narrative in which other voices can also speak. They start to read the story prepared in a narrative structure by Vincent. Thus, Mr. Vincent promotes the speakers to talk in their own voices without interrupting them, like Coetzee does to his characters in his polyphonic works. Even if Mr. Vincent attempts to direct the story told by Margot, she immediately opposes him and says: "Now I must protest. You are really going too far. I said nothing remotely like that. You are putting words of your own in my mouth" (Coetzee, *Summertime* 49). As these lines suggest, the character does not accept the intrusion of any didacting voices which would hinder her from speaking of her own accord. This opposition of Margot indicates the polyphonic use within the novel, since as a character, she wants no intervention in her speech.

Margot relays certain background information about Coetzee's earlier life and gives details about his family ties. She depicts John as a man that has spent many years in jail in America, and highlights how his sudden return to Cape Town makes the family uneasy:

> John's presence on the farm is a source of unease. After years spent overseas –so many years it was concluded he was gone for good– he has suddenly reappeared among them under some cloud or other, some disgrace. One story being whispered about is that he has been in an American jail. The family simply does not know how to behave toward him. (38)

Hence, at the very beginning of Margot's story, Coetzee is reflected as a figure coming out of the prison and creating a sense of disturbance. Although Coetzee is not welcomed by other members of the family, Margot is the one whose sincere feelings towards Coetzee has never changed since their childhood. Margot also presents a physical depiction of Coetzee which is quite different from Julia's. She says that "[s]he could not help smiling when he made his arrival on the farm behind the wheel of this selfsame truck, he with his beard and his unkempt hair and his owl-glasses, his father beside him like a mummy, stiff and embarrassed" (39). As Margot continues to portray Coetzee, she involves certain clues about his personality as well.

She recounts how they go to catch locusts when they are children. Yet, this adventure puts forth the traces of cruelty in Coetzee's personality:

> Out of the bottle in which they had trapped it John took the insect and, while she watched, pulled steadily at a long rear leg until it came off the body, dryly, without blood or whatever counts as blood among locusts. Then he released it and they watched. Each time it tried to launch itself into flight it toppled to one side, its wings scrabbling in the dust, the remaining rear leg jerking ineffectually. . . . But he did not kill it, just walked away, looking disgusted. (Coetzee, *Summertime* 41)

This recount brings forth a cruel and violent Coetzee rather than a literal one. Subsequent to the information about Coetzee's personality, Margot's sister Carol reveals her opinions about Coetzee. This feature paves the way for a second voice in Margot's interview. Carol, unlike Margot, has no soft feelings towards him, and bitterly criticizes him: "He thinks too much of himself. He can't bear to lower himself to talk to ordinary people. . . . He is flirting with you. Anyone can see it. And you are flirting back. You, his cousin! You should be ashamed of yourself. Why isn't he married? Is he homosexual, do you think? Is he a moffie?" (42). Carol thinks that Coetzee is socially incapable man, and his inability to have a relationship with women stems from his different sexual preference. Yet, Margot defends Coetzee uttering that he is not a moffie (43). The lines of Carol and Margot indicate that Coetzee appears again as an inept person who cannot communicate with people, particularly with women.

The clashing of opinions about Coetzee between Carol and Margot manifests not only about Coetzee's love affairs but also about Coetzee's relation with his father. Coetzee's communication with his family, principally with his father, seems again a hopeless case. Father and son are not fond of each other, and Margot elucidates this break of ties: "The pair used to be the worst of enemies. The bad blood between Jack and his elder son was the subject of much head-shaking" (53). This enmity between the father and the son begins with Coetzee's departure for America leaving his family and country behind him. Although Coetzee is back now, this does not make their relation any better. Consequently, in Margot's portrayal, Coetzee is presented as a man who is released from prison and thrown out of America. Being pyhsically scruf, unable to love anybody, and isolated from women, Coetzee again emerges as an incompetent figure. Thus, the author Coetzee, in a self-

parodic fashion, makes himself to be presented as a fool again in the social sense which does not accord with his reputation as a prominent writer.

Following Margot's interview, Mr.Vincent renders his interview with Adriana whom he meets in San Paulo, Brazil, in December 2007, and in her story, Adriana begins with why she has been in Cape Town in the first place. Adriana comes to Cape Town because of her husband's job, but when her husband dies in an accident, she is left alone with her two daughters. As a ballerina, she works at a dance studio, and Coetzee appears in her story as a teacher at the school where one of her daughters, Marina Regina attends. Coetzee gives extra English lessons to Marina, however, this situation irritates Adriana, and in order to observe him, Adriana invites Coetzee for a dinner at home. Anthony Uhlman accentuates this issue by saying that Coetzee "is tutoring the recently widowed Adriana's attractive young daughter, and having invited him to their house to better judge his character, his qualifications as a teacher of English, and his intentions towards her daughter" (752). In that dinner, the first physical description of Coetzee is given by Adriana:

> He was in his early thirties . . . badly dressed, with badly cut hair and a beard when he shouldn't have worn a beard, his beard was too thin. Also he struck me at once, I can't say why, as célibataire. I mean not just unmarried but also not suited to marriage, like a man who has spent his life in the priesthood and lost his manhood and become incompetent with women. . . . He had not learned to hide his feelings, which is the first step toward civilized manners. (Coetzee, *Summertime* 67)

In her description, Adriana makes the reader feel a sense of disapproval for Coetzee. He is portrayed as a shabby man whose uncivilized manners arouse an antipathy.

After their first encounter, Adriana thinks that Coetzee carries pedophilic intentions towards her daughter Marina. She expresses this saying: "It was easy enough to guess what a lonely célibataire might see in my daughter, who was turning into a real dark-eyed beauty though she was still only a child, . . . Had he perhaps been whispering words to her that had turned her head?" (68). Adriana also cannot comprehend why Marina likes him so much, because she sees nothing favourable in Coetzee. In the following pages, Coetzee responds to Adriana's invitation by inviting the family to a picnic where Adriana meets his father. She depicts his father in the following words: "That was the only time I met his father. His father was quite old already, and unsteady, with hands that trembled . . . . All the time we drove he did

not speak, not to me, not his son either. A very quiet man, very humble, or perhaps just frightened of everything" (Coetzee, *Summertime* 69). Adriana realizes that Coetzee struggles to leave a good impression on her, nevertheless, even that picnic does not help, since it rains a lot and they have to discontinue the picnic. Uhlman underlines in his article by uttering that Coetzee "seems to fall haplessly in love with Adriana, whom he woos with comic ineptitude. Adriana, at least, suspects the shadow of a dubious principle in his advances . . . : she believes that he believes her daughter is too young for him, and so he will channel his desire towards a more proper object: her mother" (752). Nevertheless, Coetzee seems to have no chance to be together with Adriana, because she manifests her dislike of him on all occasions.

Adriana also comments on Coetzee's relationship with women, and draws a picture of Coetzee who has no sort of charisma or charming quality in the eyes of women: "But there was a quality he did not have that a woman looks for in a man, a quality of strength, of manliness. . . . That is why I say he was soft. He was not a man, he was still a boy" (Coetzee, *Summertime* 71). Coetzee, having no manly qualifications, is again reflected as a man inept in his tie with women. Meek discloses this tension suggesting that: "Adriana, the dancer, has a more visceral reaction to John's attempts to woo her and to his intellectual seduction of her daughter. John's hopeless courtship includes an abortive barbecue —it rains— and efforts in Adriana's dance classes" (2). Although Coetzee tries to woo Adriana by writing her letters and by going to her dance course, he again gains no sympathy of her, and his insistence disturbs her a lot, and she files a complaint about him to the director of the dance studio to be dismissed from the dance school. After all these events, Coetzee bites himself back and gets out of their lives. Hence, Adriana deduces that she has been right about Coetzee by saying that he is a weak man.

Towards the conclusion of her interview, Mr. Vincent reveals the impact of Adriana on Coetzee's life by reconciling the character, Brasileira in Coetzee's novel *Foe* with Adriana herself, and suggests her to read the novel; since in the novel, the character Brasileira, by overcoming all difficulties, tries to recover her lost daughter like Adriana tries to recover her daughter Marina from Coetzee's affection. To sum up, in Adriana's depiction of Coetzee, she generally makes a negative account of Coetzee and humiliates him at every turn. Coetzee is mirrorred as an unsophisticated man, dressing badly and teaching English without a teaching certificate. Being a man untalented in his relations with women, Adriana blames him to have pedophilic

intentions towards her daughter, and stultifies Coetzee by presenting him as a castaway.

In his fourth interview, Mr. Vincent talks to a man called Martin this time in his biography. The interview is conducted in Sheffield, England, in September 2007. Martin meets Coetzee at a job interview when they both apply to be teachers at a university and which ends with Martin's appointment for the position. Uhlman describes Martin as "[t]he only character interviewed who does not have any sexualised relation with Coetzee" (752), and Neuman defines Martin as a "double of Coetzee" (134) because they share mostly the same properties. Mr. Vincent suggests that in Martin, Coetzee has found a new friend, and in his diary, he writes the things they have in common. Martin associates this affinity with his and Coetzee's same background:

> John left South Africa in the 1960s, came back in the 1970s, for decades hovered between South Africa and the United States, then finally decamped to Australia and died there. I left South Africa in the 1970s and never returned. Broadly speaking, he and I shared an attitude toward South Africa and our continued presence there. . . . Our presence was grounded in a crime, namely colonial conquest, perpetuated by apartheid. (Coetzee, *Summertime* 86)

Rather than encountering with Coetzee's physical or personal characteristics, Martin makes the reader get to know Coetzee as an intellectual man. Apart from his past, Martin also includes his views about Coetzee's teaching skills by expressing that "John knew a fair amount about a range of things, but not a great deal about anything in particular. . . . John was a perfectly adequate academic" (87). As Martin underlines, Coetzee has academic qualities even though he knows Coetzee has no talent of teaching at all. In addition, Martin suggests that writing suits Coetzee more than teaching, however, he is aware of the fact that he has no right to say this to Coetzee in their relationship. In conclusion, Coetzee is depicted not physically or personally but academically in the fourth interview, and this new account of Coetzee by Martin enriches the polyphony of the text by contributing to the representation of him as an intellectual.

Lastly, Mr. Vincent conducts his interview with Sophie in Paris, in January 2008. Sophie appears as a colleague of Coetzee, like Martin, at the University of Cape Town where John teaches the Anglophone writers, whereas Sophie teaches the

Francophone. Before focusing on Coetzee, Sophie tells her own story in which she underlines she has come to Cape Town for her husband's job, but then the two get divorced, and Sophie starts to feel an intimacy towards Coetzee which is turned down by him. As Uhlman enunciates in his article, Sophie is "tight-lipped about their personal relations, but offers many insights into her understanding of Coetzee's intellectual make-up" (753). Therefore, at first, Sophie, like Martin, begins to reflect Coetzee's qualifications as a teacher. She says that Coetzee

> had no formal training in the field. But he had a good general knowledge of Africa, . . . He knew the anthropological literature better than I did, including the francophone materials. He had a grasp of the history, the politics. He had read the important writers working in English and in French. (Coetzee, *Summertime* 94)

After a brief commentary on Coetzee's intellectualism, Sophie also involves his political views: "He was not a militant. His politics were too idealistic, too Utopian for that. In fact he was not political at all. He looked down on politics. He didn't like political writers, writers who espoused a political programme" (96). Sophie clarifies Coetzee's interest in politics and what politics mean for him in this quotation. Furthermore, in her interview, Sophie enables the reader to witness Coetzee's personality as well, uttering that "[h]e was by nature very cautious, very much the tortoise. When he sensed danger, he would withdraw into his shell. He had been rebuffed by the Afrikaners too often, rebuffed and humiliated . . . . So he preferred to remain an outsider. I think he was happiest in the role of outsider" (100). Hence, Coetzee is described again as a man who cannot succeed in being a social person; a man who never has open and sincere relations with people around him. He always remains an outsider without being close to any one.

In addition to his personal traits, Coetzee's authorship is included in Sophie's interview, too. She mentions that when they meet, Coetzee is writing *In the Heart of the Country*, and even when the breach occur in their relations, Coetzee goes on to send his book to Sophie. In this point, Sophie adopts the role of a critic who criticizes Coetzee's writing style and his book. She points out that even though Coetzee has a certain style and form, his work carries no insight into the human condition suggesting that "[h]e had no special sensitivity that I could detect, no original insight into the human condition. He was just a man, a man of his time, talented, maybe even gifted, but, frankly, not a giant" (101). Sophie also criticizes Coetzee's works

with lack of ambition, and she adds that "[t]he control of the elements is too tight. Nowhere do you get a feeling of a writer deforming his medium in order to say what has never been said before, which is to me the mark of great writing. Too cool, too neat . . . . Too easy. Too lacking in passion" (Coetzee, *Summertime* 101). Sophie criticizes Coetzee's books severely by speaking freely beyond the dominance or threat of an authorial voice. Coetzee concedes his characters to speak in their own voice talking about their opinions on Coetzee's life and his authorship. As a result, in Sophie's depiction of Coetzee, his personal traits and his social relations are highlighted, whereas she remains silent in their mutual affinity or Coetzee's ties with other women. No traces about Coetzee's family or his father are there in her interview. However, the criticism of Coetzee's authorship comes to surface and Sophie relays her opinions on Coetzee's writing style and his books. She also says that she finds his authorship dull and lacking in passion. Coetzee does self-parody here by letting his character to criticize his style of writing.

In the accounts of multiple characters and their function in the description of Coetzee, Coetzee never intervenes in their speech or opinions, neither directs nor dominates them. Hence, each character creates a different Coetzee, and Coetzee, as an author, fulfills the main principle of the polyphonic novel; multivocality. This plurality of voices leads to the withdrawal of authorial voice in *Summertime*. The dismissal of an authorization is clarified in Sophie's interview when she asks whether Mr. Vincent has authorization in the book or not, Vincent replies that "[d]oes one need authorization to write a book? From whom would one seek it? I certainly don't know. But I can give you my assurance, it is a serious book, a seriously intended biography" (Coetzee, *Summertime* 95). This answer clarifies the aim of Coetzee by which he makes his readers understand that a polyphonic novel without an authorial voice can be achieved by the inclusion of various voices. Coetzee kills himself both physically and metaphorically in the novel, and induces his characters to fabricate his self again.

Beside the eschewal of authorization and the inclusion of multiple voices in this polyphonic novel, another prominent strategy of the polyphony —dialogical relation— covers most parts of the text in order to constitute an ongoing active communication. This dialogical progress is ensured especially via the form of the novel which consists of interviews. In each interview, the characters are in process of asking and answering. In Julia's part, for instance, Mr. Vincent asks Julia about his

father, and this exemplifies the use of dialogues in an effective way in the novel. It also makes clear that rather than telling the story in his own voice, Mr. Vincent prefers to conserve the dialogue form:

> Mr. Vincent. And what of Coetzee's relations with his father? He and his father lived together for some while after his mother's death. Did you ever meet his father? . . . Did you see the father in the son?
>
> Julia. Do you mean, was John like his father? Physically no. His father was smaller and slighter: a neat little man, handsome in his way, though plainly not well. . . .
>
> Mr. Vincent. And in other respects? Were they alike in other respects?
>
> Julia. They were both loners. Socially inept. Repressed, in the wider sense of the word. (Coetzee, *Summertime* 11)

This active communication keeps the reading dynamic and moving. Apart from Julia's part, Margot's section also involves dialogism in which there is a three-partite dialogic relation between Margot and Mr. Vincent, Carol and John. When Mr. Vincent wants to write about Carol, Margot warns him saying that

> Margot. I won't you to write that. You can't write about Carol.
>
> Mr. Vincent. It's what you told me.
>
> Margot. Yes, but you can't write down every word I say and broadcast it to the world. I never agreed to that. Carol will never speak to me again.
>
> Mr. Vincent. All right, I'll cut it out or tone it down, I promise. (43)

This dialogical relation also puts forward certain information about the events and relations, and it indicates that Margot also includes his sister, Carol, into her story, however, Carol has no idea about it. Beyond her interview with Mr. Vincent, Margot's dialogues with Carol demonstrate how the two differ in their opinions towards Coetzee, and this clash of opinions between the two sisters creates an ambiguity about Coetzee in reality. On the one hand, Margot says that Coetzee plans to move to Merveille to reunite with his father; on the other hand, Carol asserts that this is just a plan of Coetzee to get rid of his father:

> Carol. IT'S A SCHEME to get rid of his father, . . . He wants to dump him in the middle of the Karoo and wash his hands of him.

Margot. Poor old John! . . . You always believe the worst of him. What if he is telling the truth? he promises he will visit his father in Merveille every weekend . . . . Why not give him the benefit of the doubt?

Carol. Because I don't believe a word he says. The whole plan sounds fishy to me. He has never got on with his father. . . . He lives with his father, but only because he has no money. He is thirty-something years old with no prospects. (Coetzee, *Summertime* 52)

In these lines, Carol criticizes Coetzee in cold blood while Margot tries to sympathize with him, and as it is observed in the dialogues, instead of an authorial voice, the characters express the facts or details about themselves by having direct dialogical intercourse with other voices. The presentation of the details from the different characters' perspectives enriches the use of polyphony in *Summertime*.

In Adriana's part, there is a dialogism between herself and Mr. Vincent and herself and John. First of all, Adriana recounts her story in her own voice while she is talking to Mr. Vincent. When Mr. Vincent inquires her about the reason why she has been in South Africa, Adriana clarifies that they leave their home town, Angola due to the shutdown of the newspaper where her husband works, and they take the boat to South Africa with no special reason, just to find a new job in there. Secondly, Adriana engages into dialogy with John to find out who the real Coetzee is. This dialogy arises that John Coetzee is not of English descent, even though he teaches English at school:

Adriana. You are not English.

John. I agree I am not of English descent. Nevertheless I have spoken English from an early age and have passed university examinations in English, therefore I believe I can teach English. There is nothing special about English. It is just one language among many.

Adriana. My daughter is not going to be like a parrot that mixes up languages, Mr. Coetzee. (68)

With these dialogues, Adriana informs the readers about Coetzee's teaching skills, and she criticizes him for being incapable of teaching English properly without a certificate or an English descent.

Later in Martin's interview, Mr. Vincent endeavours to find out the details about Coetzee in a dialogic process. As the biographer asks Martin about Coetzee's teaching ability, Martin explains how he is inadequate to be a notable teacher:

> Martin. I would say that one teaches best what ne knows best and feels most strongly about it. John knew a fair amount about a range of things, but not a great deal about anything in particular. . . .
>
> Mr. Vincent. Do you feel then that he spent his life in a profession for which he had no talent?
>
> Martin. That is a little too sweeping. John was a perfectly adequate academic. A perfectly adequate academic but not a notable teacher. (Coetzee, *Summertime* 87)

By talking about Coetzee, Martin discloses the facts about teaching abilites of Coetzee in this dynamic dialogic interaction.

Lastly, in Sophie's interview, the dialogical ties between Sophie and Mr. Vincent come to daylight in order to reach the details about her relation with Coetzee. Although Mr. Vincent struggles to learn the reality behind their affinity, Sophie never explains anything with all her heart and soul. Mr. Vincent enquires what they talk about in their relation, Sophie replies that the main topics include teaching, colleagues, students, shopping and themselves. However, the important thing Mr. Vincent tries to figure out is whether Sophie finds herself in Coetzee's writings, since during that time, Coetzee was writing *In the Heart of the Country.* Mr. Vincent gets a negative answer to his question, and he asks that

> Mr. Vincent. Were you upset?
>
> Sophie. What do you mean-was I upset not to find myself in his book?
>
> Mr. Vincent. Were you upset to find yourself excluded from his imaginative universe?
>
> Sophie. No. . . . Shall we leave it at that? I think I have given you enough. (98-99)

It is these dialogical relations which keep the flow moving, and enables the readers to hear each detail from the character's own voice.

The dialogical relations certify the inclusion of multiple voices through which a plurality of details can be heard. In the multiple descriptions of Coetzee, each character provides certain details about him, however, these details do not sometimes accord with each other and the real life of Coetzee. This circumstance

leads the readers to be sceptical about who is telling the truth, because there are specific distortion of time and events in *Summertime.* Uhlman clarifies that "[b]y using error and anachrony as a formal strategy for generating the truth, . . . Coetzee's understanding of writing . . . is based on an ongoing relation between truth and lies" (747). Uhlman, for example, expresses that the main device of distortion in the novel is its anachronistic premise that presents Coetzee as a dead man. The second involves the association of Coetzee with Tolstoy who has a series called *Childhood, Boyhood* and *Youth* like Coetzee himself; nevertheless, the error in this association is that *Childhood* can not be found in Coetzee's series (758). Another discrepancy is the imprisonment of Coetzee in America as told in Margot's account, because Coetzee has never been into the prison in his life. Coetzee generates these errors intentionally which confuse the reader about the real life presented and the lies told in the novel. Moreover, Coetzee is not a man living with his father without a wife and children. In his real life, he is married with two children (Head 2). In fact, these discrepancies enable the characters to mirror their own Coetzee being independent of any restricting criteria. In other words, this multivocality in the novel adds a kind of inconsistency and uncertainty which hinder the readers from having an absolute/final judgment about anything.

The uncertainties and inconsistencies in the novel make this polyphonic work consist of an open-ended and unfinalizable conclusion, because although Coetzee, as an author, gives voice to various speakers, he never confirms the things they say as true or not. He neither manipulates nor disregards his characters. By doing so, the characters create different Coetzees, and the readers are left free to choose among them. Sophie expresses this fictionalization by saying that

> [o]f course we are all fictioneers. I do not deny that. But which would you rather have: a set of independent reports from a range of independent perspectives, from which you can then try to synthesize a whole; or the massive, unitary self-projection comprised by his oeuvre? I know which I would prefer. (Coetzee, *Summertime* 95)

However, coming to a final judgment on Coetzee is not possible in *Summertime*, and Coetzee relays this notion by making Mr. Vincent talk about how difficult and unnecessary it is to deal with a finalizing attitude on Coetzee. He justifies this by saying: "But I am not interested in coming to a final judgment on Coetzee. I leave that to history. What I am doing is telling the story of a stage in his life, or if we can't

have a single story then several stories from several perspectives" (Coetzee, *Summertime* 89). This inability to have a final verdict on Coetzee makes the novel end in an open-ended closure, since after the interviews, the novel ends with undated fragments as it starts leaving no trace of a final judgment.

To conclude, in *Summertime*, Coetzee brings out a space in which a plurality of voices can be heard, and with this multi-vocality, he endorses his characters to put forth their own Coetzee. The characters relay certain information about Coetzee's life on the basis of Mr. Vincent's interviews to write a biography of J.M. Coetzee. In this process, the readers witness the abandonment of a dominating authorial voice through which each speaker becomes independent from the finalizing voice of an authority figure. The destruction of the conventional framework of the novel genre with the insertion of interviews and undated fragments secures the involvement of multiple voices. These various voices have a continuous dialogical relation by which the author lets the speakers tell the details themselves rather than representing them through the eyes of a single narrator. This multiplicity of points of view increases the uncertainty and unfinalizable interpretations as well; therefore, it makes the ending open without an ultimate judgment on Coetzee. All these properties raise the effectiveness of polyphony in *Summertime*, and Coetzee wants his readers to be a part of this polyphonic structure and evaluate every detail depending on their own judgment.

3.2. COETZEE'S *DIARY OF A BAD YEAR* AND POLYPHONY

Diary of a Bad Year, which was published in 2007, has become one of the most groundbreaking novels of Coetzee in which he includes polyphonic structure and presents multiple issues both universal and personal. Morales indicates that "[t]he design of *Diary of a Bad Year* renders a book that is paradigmatic and all embracing. In this book, we find J.M. Coezee the novelist, the intellectual, the critic and the human being in a kind of synthesis of the multi-faceted figure Coetzee" (43). Coetzee combines two worlds in this novel; the world at large, the issues happenings in this world, and the small world of a professor, Senor C. The full name of the professor is never given in the book, he is sometimes referred to as Senor C, El Senior or Senior Juan. This professor's life intersects with his neighbours Anya and her boyfriend, Alan; Anya is a typist hired by Senior C to make a fair copy of his

essays, and Alan is described as a crook who deals with finance affairs in a company, and who tries to steal the professor's money by spying on his bank accounts. Coetzee divides a page into three sections, and each section includes separate narrative lines. The relationship between the professor, Anya and Alan is revealed through these sections, and the plot propounds the reader to have a critical view of social matters and personal reflections.

Coetzee divides the novel into two parts; 'Strong Opinions' and 'Second Diary.' In the first part, it is said that this book will be a collection of the essays about the problems of today's world, and for this reason, a German publishing company asks six writers to contribute to the book in a discussion about what is wrong with today's world. Senor C becomes one of these contributors and writes about several issues of his concern. Senor includes thirty-one issues in his essays; ranging from the origins of the state, anarchism, democracy, Machiavelli, terrorism, guidance system, Al Qaida, universities, Guantanamo Bay, national shame, the curse, paedophilia, the body, the slaughter of animals, avian influenza, competition to intelligent design, zeno, probability, raiding, apology, asylum in Australia, political life in Australia, left and right, Tony Blair, Harold Pinter, music, tourism, English usage, authority in fiction, and the afterlife. Senor puts forth his ideas, oppositions or supports in this multiplicity of topics, and dictates them to Anya -his neighbour and his typist- who makes a neat duplicate for him. In the second part of the novel, labelled as 'Second Diary,' Senor touches upon soft opinions and personal matters including dreams, fan mails, his father, the meaning of insh'Allah, mass emotion, hurly-burly of politics, the kiss, erotic life, ageing, idea for a story, the beauties of France, the Classics, writing life, the mother tongue, Antjie Krog, being photographed, having thoughts, the birds of the air, compassion, water and fire, boredom, and J. S. Bach. Morales explains that this is

> a crucial moment in the relationship between the novel and the reader. The upper text, the essays which started as strong opinions and in the second part become a gentler set of opinions, are in a sense fading in the mind of the reader, who now is more interested in the denouement of the story-in the fate of a weak, marginalized character who is close to his death. (50)

The division of the novel into two parts constitutes the turning point of the story. While the readers encounter the discussion of social, historical, political issues and

the contentious relation of Senor, Anya and Alan in the first part, the second part engages the reader into a soft environment in which ideas become softer and sincere enabling polyphony in a larger frame.

In the narrative structure of *Diary of a Bad Year*, Coetzee employs a polyphonic narration which upholds the withdrawal of the authorial voice with the emergence of multiple voices and dialogism. These properties require the inclusion of an open-ended closure. Iddiols highlights that Coetzee "employs various textual devices to complicate and subvert the hermeneutic mastery of his texts, including his apparent disinclination to speak publicly as J.M.Coetzee, the writer and academic" (191). As Iddiols states, in this novel, Coetzee never appears with his real name, yet, he creates a professor who both resembles and differs from Coetzee. Iddiols also argues that Coetzee "uses strategies in his fiction to limit the threat of a singular interpretation by his readers, he is equally determined to avoid this danger himself by refusing to illuminate his texts further" (191). Accordingly, while Coetzee gives voice to all his characters in *Diary of a Bad Year*, he never makes a judgment about the opinions of these three characters. Instead of speaking himself, Coetzee makes three major characters speak individually to express their own ideologies or feelings. The split sections of the novel enable these three voices to speak about their ideas and feelings.

In *Diary of a Bad Year*, Senor C (Mister C, El Senor or Senior Juan) appears as the author of the opinions on the top section of the novel. Coetzee, as an author, uses Senor C to express his own ideas about certain topics in the novel. While Coetzee criticizes the universal matters via the professor, he also covers daily life and its problems on the personal level as Paul Putton says in "Coetzee's Opinions" (58). Senor C emerges as a reflection of J.M. Coetzee, and Head supports the idea arguing that

> [t]his is not just a thinly veiled portrait of Coetzee, but an explicit projection of himself: JC's initials (and first name 'John') are Coetzee's, both are white South African writers, newly resident in Australia, and Senior's books are also Coetzee's: he mentions 'a collection of essays on censorship' published in the 1990s, and mentions *Waiting for the Barbarians* as his novel. (90)

Especially, the political issues discussed by the professor mirror Coetzee's interpretations about each subject. On the one hand, there are certain similarities

between Senor C and Coetzee himself, on the other hand, specific differences are also highlighted in the text in order to prevent the reader from associating Senor C with Coetzee. For instance, Senor is revealed to be born in 1934 on page fifty, the first difference emerges here since Coetzee was born in 1940. Furthermore, while Coetzee the writer has children, Anya says that Senor "did not merit the gift of children" (Coetzee, *Diary* 57). This distancing strategy enables Coetzee to protect himself from being subjected to certain inauthentic hermeneutic attempts as Iddiols says (194), and lead his readers not to realize his presence as the authorial voice in the text.

Anya is the second voice that the reader hears within the split pages of the novel. She tells her relationship with the professor and Alan, finishing her story with the appreciation of Senor C and her break-up with Alan. At first, there seems to be a kind of flirtatious act by the professor's towards Anya, and it is clear to notice this game makes her happy to see someone notice her sexuality. Yet, then, their relations evolve, and they serve as saviours of each other. On the one hand, Senor C awakens Anya towards mundane realities and personal relations, and on the other hand, Anya saves him from the malicious plans of Alan to steal his money, and becomes an invisible protector of the professor after she moves to Brisbane leaving Alan behind her. Although Anya shares certain affinities with Alan regarding Senor C's opinions and his personality, she later realizes Alan's plans when Alan talks about the writings which Anya has never mentioned before. After she becomes aware of this situation, she loses her trust in Alan. The novel subsequently displays that rather than only reading the writings sneakingly, Alan also tries to obtain the information of the professor's bank accounts.

In the sincere relation between Anya and Senor C, Alan seems a character who remains completely as an outsider. Morales describes Alan "as Senor C's foe in the narrative" (49), because in conversation with his partner Anya, Alan always says that Senor is outdated, and "accuses him of being a schemer of pretending to be what he is not" (49). Alan never believes in Senor C's sincerity in his writings about universal matters, and says to Anya that "[y]ou put yourself forward as a lone voice of conscience speaking up for human rights and so forth, but I ask myself, if he really believes in these human rights, why isn't he out in the real world fighting for them? What is his track record?" (Coetzee, *Diary* 197). Alan also claims that the real aim of the professor in working with Anya is to be close to her, rather than his efforts to be

accepted as a literary figure. Putton states that "[i]t is Alan who offers the harshest assessment of Senor C's opinions, suggesting that these are . . . no more than a kind of devious courtship of Anya" (58). Hence, as Putton underlines, Alan exists as a character who has the role to criticize, oppose and assess Senor C's opinions and actions.

Based on the information given about the characters, each character has an active function, and Coetzee makes use of his characters to employ polyphony in his novel. However, rather than only releasing his multiple voices to talk freely, he also designs the form of the novel to match its content and to contribute to the polyphony. The form Coetzee applies in *Diary of a Bad Year* emerges as the most prominent property of the novel which paves the way to label this novel as polyphonic, because with this form, the voice of the author decreases whereas a plurality of voices increases. This non-sequential writing, as Morales calls it, offers three texts visually separated on the pages but with a dynamic organization of topics (44). Even though it seems that these three texts are split with the lines, they also share an integration between themselves. Boyd Tonkin, in his review, refers to the form of the novel saying that "[t]his hypertextual polyphony becomes a source of poignancy, even pleasure, as human factors messily revise all the dogmas booming out above" (2). Therefore, while the series of the opinions cover the upper part of the novel, they are also accompanied by another part of continuous narration at the bottom of the page, and this part contradicts with the top line.

The form, used in *Diary of a Bad Year,* at first, enables Coetzee to destroy the authority, dominance of a single voice in his novel. This structure also destroys the dominance of Senor as a professor of science disrupting the social hierarchy, because opinions are questioned by the other characters, and this makes Senor's ideas not to be accepted as ultimate or unique. Hayes supports this property by stressing that

> for every attempt made by the voice at the top of the page to homogenize, diagnose, and denounce modernity in general as instrumental, valueless, and Machiaevallian, there is a countervoice at the bottom holding it back, complicating its diagnosis, diverting its denunciation, and reminding us of the heterogeneity of values. (243)

By doing so, Coetzee purges the authorial persona from a central focus. In addition, along with the destruction of the conventional structure via split sections in *Diary of a Bad Year*, the insertion of other genres, such as letters and essays, also help its

polyphonic form to dominate the narration. The two letters found in the text (the first from Senor to Anya to convince her to turn back her typing job; the second is from Anya to Coetzee after she moves to Brisbane) help the novel to mirror its polyphonic quality in terms of the multiplicity of genres that are being used.

In *Diary of a Bad Year*, the flow of the plot causes a confusion in the concepts of time and space. Due to the absence of a linear narrative and the insertion of other genres such as letters and essays, it becomes hard to follow each split line, and it disturbs the act of reading within the novel. Hence, the novel emerges as including a kind of multiplicity in each way. In addition, the comments of Alan and Anya on Senor's works creates this multiplicity within the plot of the novel. Kossew remarks that the comments of Alan and Anya on Senor's works

> make the reader flip backwards and forwards, checking and rereading, rewriting the text, as do his comments on their responses. Thus the most obvious borderline of the linear narrative (the page) is disrupted and undermined, its fixity in time and space disturbed by the act of reading, by the rewritings of the text and by implication the provisionality of textuality itself. (122)

This situation of split pages creates the inclusion of different time, space and voices in each text, and Kossew classifies that fact by specifying that each section covers a different time and space with different voices talking to each other, and "[t]he model of talkback radio, where strong opinions are expressed and commentary from listeners is invited, could indeed be seen as analogous to the structure of this text" (122). This democratization ensures the use of multivocality of the form which prevails the importance of polyphony in the novel. It also leads to the abolition of the authorial voice in the structure of the text.

Eric Paul Meljac draws a similarity between the form Coetzee uses and the nature of striptease. He underscores that

> [w]ith help from Roland Barthes' comments on the nature of sexiness and the striptease, the nature of these horizontal lines becomes clearer: these horizontal bars represent the 'unseen' narrative behind the visible narrative, seductive underlying stories that tempt the reader to piece together the separate narrative veins. (93)

While the readers engage into three different lines to read and understand them, they also imagine and try to figure out their true intentions. In other words, they focus on

the meaning what they cannot see in the multiplicity of voices, since although each line stands as separate, all the bars of narrative have a connection and integration in which the lives of the characters juxtapose. Hence, as Geertsema states, this miscellany of opinions and narrative voices become the real motive to label this novel as polyphonic (211). As this form empowers the questioning of the authority, it covers diverse and divergent voices, with clashing of opinions, responses and points of view.

The eschewal of the authorial voice with the emergence multiple voices may be exemplified through the interpretations of Senor's opinions by the other voices. At the very beginning, Senor writes on the origins of the state (Coetzee, *Diary* 3-9), and says that a state is born because of the necessity to be 'we.' The laws have been enforced to regulate the order, and it is believed that if there is a state, there is order and peace, otherwise, violence prevails. Senor explains this fact by giving the instance of a film, *Seven Samurai*, in which the bandits invade a village until the villagers choose seven people, samurai, to save themselves from this violence. After the salvation of the village from the bandits, these seven samurai want to become the guardian of the village, but the villagers refuse this offer. Senor associates this story with the current condition of South Africa where gangs are growing in the absence of a powerful state, creating a real danger for the country.

After Anya reads these lines, she opposes Senor's opinions about the samurai by saying nobody believes in such ideas: "*The Seven Samurai* . . . Who is going to believe that? I remember seeing The Seven Samurai in Taiwan . . . The only image that has stayed with me is of the . . . armour-plated shins, naked thighs, bare bottom: . . . Enough to drive a girl wild" (Coetzee, *Diary* 33). Anya finds these opinions nonsense, and she suggests Senor to give up on writing these matters by saying that "[w]rite about cricket . . . . Write your memoirs. Anything but not politics . . . . Write about the world around you. Write about birds" (35). These lines indicate that although Anya's foremost important duty is to type the professor's writings, she also thinks about and criticizes his opinions. In addition to Anya, Alan also comments on his writings. While Anya is typing Senor's opinions, Alan comes into the room and starts to read them over her shoulder by revealing his own ideas about Senor's writings on the animal rights in the part of origins of the state. Regarding the state regulations, Senor underscores that all human beings are born or dead as objects of the state with their birth and death certificates, however, the human beings are not as

free as even animals. Nevertheless, Alan opposes: "[b]irth certificates for animals . . . Is he crazy? Does he want to give them all names? Clifford John Rat. Susan Annabel Rat. What about death certificates too, while he is about it?" (Coetzee, *Diary* 36). Alan, like Anya, regards Senor's opinions nonsense, and he takes a step further in his criticism. He underscores that Senor never understands what the real state means, because he always regards each state in terms of the state in South Africa:

> [e]verywhere he looks he sees Africa, he sees banditry. . . . He doesn't understand modernity. He doesn't understand the managerial state . . . The state is brought into being to protect its citizens. That is why it exists: to provide security while we get on with our life-activities, which taken all together and aufgehoben constitute the economy. (95-96)

Anya and Alan fulfill the duty of interpreting the professor's opinions as ordinary readers. This property of the novel indicates that Coetzee provides an opportunity by which he makes his opinions to be read and put into question by another people.

Alan and Anya also question the validity of the professor's opinions or refuse them for being unsubstantial. When Senor writes his ideas on paedophilia in which he underlines that filming a man having sex with a real child should be prohibited. However, when a sex scene is done with adults actors pretending to be a child, it becomes art in Senor's opinion. Anya again brings forward her own interpretation: "It is about sex with children. He doesn't exactly come out in favour of it, but he doesn't come out against it either. . . . I can understand that he should have the hots for a petite number like me" (88). Following her views on paedophilia, Alan adds his own and underlines that Senor tries to differentiate realities and perception in his writings about paedophilia. Alan believes that Senor forgets that everything is a perception:

> If the audience in a theatre perceives a child being raped, then it is a child being raped, period, social consensus, end of story. And if it is a child being raped, then boom!, you go to the slammer, you and your financial backers and your director and your whole crew, all the participants in the crime . . . Whereas if the audience isn't taken in, if the actress has big tits and is clearly a grown-up faking it, then it is a different story, then it is just a failed movie. (90)

Alan emphasizes the inability of Senor in his distinction between reality and perception in his views on paedophilia. Moreover, Alan criticizes Senor's opinions

by connecting their absurdity and outdated sides to Senor's African identity, and accuses Senor and his friends of not adapting to a new century: "They prefer to get together and drink pilsener and wave the red flag and sing the Internationale and reminisce about the good old days . . . You should tell him that. The world moves on. A new century" (Coetzee, *Diary* 93). As these extracts from the text indicate, *Diary of a Bad Year* represents these three characters always in a connection questioning each other. No voice is superior to another, because they question the authorial voice, and put forward their own individual points of view, and find Senor's writings inappropriate or irrelevant. They also propose alternative perspectives to the issues discussed by Senor. When Anya asks his opinions about the issue of the probability, another topic Senor writes about, Alan opposes to the opinions of the professor by calling them nonsense again. Alan says that

> [i]gnorant bullshit . . . if you stand outside probabilistic discourse then probability statements make no sense. . . . But what he forgets is that in a probabilistic universe there is nowhere to stand outside probability. . . . The fact is, numbers are just numbers. They don't stand for anything. They are nuts and bolts, the nuts and bolts of mathematics. . . . Numbers work. Mathematics works. Probabilities work. That is all we need to know. (111)

As Alan confronts to Senor's ideas by explaining his worldview, he strengthens the property of polyphony within the novel like Anya; since they exist as the other voices different from Senor's and they are free to express their opinions about what Senor writes in each section.

Anya, as an alternative voice in the novel, enables the professor to rethink and reevaluate his ideas rather than only opposing them behind Senor's back. Morales explains the function of Anya as a character by disclosing that Senor C, "in his conversation with Anya, the typist of his 'opinions,' has the chance to talk about, expand and even defend some of his most controversial comments. Senor C, like Coetzee, does not approve of being identified with his writings" (47). For instance, Senor writes about terrorism, and he claims that muslim people are mostly associated with terrorism which is unfair, and Anya opposes his views by saying that "[w]hen you write about the terrorists, I think . . . you are a bit up in the clouds. A bit idealistic. A bit unrealistic. My guess is you have never in your life come face to face with a real Muslim fundamentalist" (Coetzee, *Diary* 73). Anya emphasizes that these

Muslim terrorists kill people in front of their wives and children in the name of Allah, in the name of Prophet. She warns the professor by saying: "You are wasting your pity on the fundamentalist, Mister C. They despise your pity . . . They prefer to be stupid, deliberately stupid. . . . They don't mind dying if it helps to bring the day of reckoning nearer" (Coetzee, *Diary* 75). Nonetheless, this time, Senor C rejects Anya's opinions and explains that "[y]ou are confusing Muslims with Christians. It is the Christians who look forward to the battle to end all battles. They call it Armageddon . . . That is why they are so indifferent to the future of the planet" (76). These lines highlight that Anya is the figure who questions and challenges Senor's ideas on anything, and this feature of narrative system correlates with Coetzee's insistence on the validation of his writings in the perspectives of ordinary readers. Morales concludes that Anya

> the first reader of the writer's 'opinions,' at some moments reacts almost as a censor, at other moments, as an ordinary reader, but she always shows that critical independence of her nature. Anya has the privilege not only of reading the opinions first, but also of confronting the author directly and frankly. (47)

As a consequence, *Diary of a Bad Year* presents a narrative structure in which any authorial voice may not prevail by dominating other voices. A multiplicity of voices is there in order to break the final and ultimate word of the author.

As mentioned earlier, Coetzee owes this quality of polyphonic structure to Bakhtin and Dostoevsky, and the impetus which triggers Coetzee to write in a polyphonic narrative form is disclosed in the twenty-fourth segment of the second part of the novel:

> I read again last night the fifth chapter of the second part of *The Brothers Karamazov*, the chapter in which Ivan hands back his ticket of admission to the universe God has created, and found myself sobbing uncontrollably. These are pages I have read innumerable times before, yet instead of becoming inured to their foce I find myself more and more vulnerable before them. Why? . . . . The answer has nothing to do with ethics or politics, everything to do with rhetoric . . . . It is the voice of Ivan, as realized by Dostoevsky, not his reasoning, that sweeps me along. (Coetzee, *Diary* 224-225)

Coetzee conveys his views using Senor C as a mouthpiece, nevertheless, he does this in an invisible way, and the readers never feel his dominant voice as an author. The on-going expression of opinions by the individual voices proves how the absolutes of a dominant voice are teared down, and how it enables the novel to include the concept of polyphony. In all these examples from the novel, as Putton states, "the opinions are . . . expressed and recounted by the two narrative voices below: opinions of the putative author of the strong and weak opinions, but also opinions of Anya and her partner, Alan" (57). Hence, the ideas become free-floating and detached from each other, and that property of giving a chance to talk to each character makes *Diary of a Bad Year* a good sample for the concept of polyphony.

Apart from the lowering of authorial voice and the inclusion of a multiplicity of voices, there is also another property of polyphony which is given utmost importance in this novel; dialogues and dialogical relations. Coetzee's writing in plurivocality overlaps the Bakhtinian theory of dialogism. Bakhtin states that "[t]he novel requires speaking persons bringing with them their own unique ideological discourse, their own language" (*The Dialogic* 332). In other words, Bakhtin gives priority to the dialogic interaction of multiple voices, and polyphonic novel covers a dialogical world in which characters are in the act of asking and answering among each other. Accordingly, *Diary of a Bad Year* mirrors this dialogic nature by embodying its characters in an active discourse. In this dialogic nature, nothing is accepted as eternal truth, and in the process of dialogic interaction via the different ideas of the speakers, the truth is left to the reader to be determined.

Coetzee accepts the inevitability of dialogues by marking that "[w]riting is not free expression. There is a true sense in which writing is dialogic: a matter of awakening the countervoices in oneself and embarking upon speech with them" (*Doubling* 65). Thus, Coetzee includes dialogical relations in his novel. Poyner clarifies this dialogism by uttering that "[i]n Bakhtinian sense, [in which he] refuses to claim the narrative position of the monologic insider, the textual presence has access to the answers, or access to contested notions of the truth" (*Coetzee and the Paradox* 177). In so doing, Coetzee arouses a kind of debate rather than imposing truths on the readers, so the process of dialogic interaction occupies a crucial place in the form of the text. In *Diary of a Bad Year*, the dialogical relations between characters form a basis to destroy the monological voice of Senor C. Via the interaction among the voices, various points of view are unfurled in the split sections

of the novel. In the dialogue between multiple ideologies, and a polyphony of voices, Senor, in fact, helps his readers to question his opinions without accepting them as absolute facts.

In the dialogical relations between Anya and the professor, the two can ask and answer question and comment on each other's opinions. Anya explicitly criticizes his opinions face to face rather than only talking and criticizing his opinions behind his back:

> Anya. Seriously, can I tell you what I think about your opinions?
>
> Senor. Let me have your thoughts.
>
> Anya. OK. This may sound brutal, but it isn't meant that way. . . . I know that isn't how you are in real life, but that is how you come across, and it is not what you want. I wish you would cut it out. If you positively have to write about the world and how you see it, I wish you could find a better way. (Coetzee, *Diary* 70)

After Anya states her real opinions about the professor's writings, he defends himself: "[t]hese are dark times. You can't expect me to write about them in a light manner. Not when what I have to say is heartfelt" (73). However, Anya again repudiates his idea by saying that "[c]an't I? . . . And why are times so dark anyway? I don't think these are dark times" (73). The dialogism here puts forward the face-to-face interaction between the characters which not only enables an exchange of ideas but also helps the evolution and the development of these ideas.

As Anya reads Senor's writing while typing them, she bravely expresses her opinions to the writer by making him speak about the issue in detail in a dialogical relation. Senor C writes about the inappropriate things done by nations or political world on the part of national shame (Coetzee, *Diary* 40-45), and he asserts that the shame caused by the incorrect actions become a burden for the next generations, and they will carry the responsibility of that shame by saying that "[d]ishonour descends upon one's shoulders, and once it has descended no amount of clever pleading will dispel it" (40). Anya is influenced by these lines and tries to further the topic suggesting that "[d]ishonour descends upon one's shoulders. . . . That sounds like the inmost depths to me. I sat shaken, speechless. So, what is going to save from dishonour?" (41). Yet, Senor does not want to talk about it, and answers that if he knew, he wouldn't be so lost. In this point, Senor's reluctance to answer the question makes Anya angry, and she says that Senor looks down on her as he thinks her as an

empty head. Then Anya recounts a story of her in which she aims to clarify that the shame of someone belongs to its perpetrator who does it, not on a nation or all people as Senor claims. In her story, Anya tells how she and one of her friends undergo a sexual harassment by three American boys in Cancun. When the girls save themselves from these boys, they immediately go to the police, and lodge a complaint about them. Then Anya repudiates Senor C's thesis by emphasizing that

> [i]n the twentieth century, when a man rapes a woman it is man's dishonour. The dishonour sticks to the man, not to the woman. . . . You have got it wrong, Mister C. Old thinking. Wrong analysis, as Alan would say. Abuse, rape, torture, it doesn't matter what: the news is, as long as it is not your fault, as long as you are not responsible, the dishonour doesn't stick to you. (Coetzee, *Diary* 101-105)

However, Senor advocates his opinions by saying that "[t]hings have changed, mistress Anya. Dishonour won't be washed away. Won't be wished away: Still has its old power to stick" (107-108). As demonstrated in these dialogues between Anya and Senor, the dialogical tie leads to the branching out of the issues in diverse ways. Therefore, this dialogism removes any prominence of a single opinion or voice.

Jonathan Lear asserts that dialogism "is not simply a literary device to sustain the reader's interest; it is an ethical strategy, an attempt to provoke thought in the reader" (72). The dialogic interaction exists as one of the particular property of polyphony which lowers the authorial voice in the text. As Maria Lopez points out, *Diary of a Bad Year* disrupts the idea of an original father of the text, undermining the concept of the author as master (301), and Coetzee does this by turning the volume of the characters up in a dialogical base. Aside from the clashing of opposing views between the characters, most details about the characters come to surface in these dialogical relationships; for instance, the readers are able to learn the details about Anya's boyfriend, what he does, and how her relation is with Alan in her dialogues with Senor. Senor asks her about what Alan does and the dialogue pervades:

> Anya. Alan is an investment consultant. . . . He is in a partnership, but he is pretty independent, all the partners are pretty inependent, it is that kind of partnership.
>
> Senor. Might Alan be prepared to offer me advise on investments?
>
> Anya. . . . he doesn't like to work with friend. (Coetzee, *Diary* 47-48)

Coetzee includes the information about Alan and his job in these dialogical relations which keeps the reader's interest active in the flow. Senor further learns that Anya and Alan are not married, and they have no plans for children as Alan does not want to have children. Without being interrupted by any authorial voice, Anya and Senor C ask and answer questions, and the details are presented through that dialogism within the novel.

Anya's dialogical affairs with Alan also reveals certain information about what they each think and want to say. Alan is never fond of Anya's secretarial job for Senor C, and claims that Senor has offered her a job not because he needs a secretary, but because he has fantasies about Anya. For this reason, Alan struggles to convince Anya to sue Senor:

> Alan. Wake up. He can't just do what he likes with you. He can't pick on you and have obscene fantasies about you and then sell them to the public for profit. Also, he can't take down your words and publish them without your permission. That is plagiarism . . .
>
> Anya. Don't be silly, Alan. he is not going to give me his fantasies to type if it is me he is having fantasies about.
>
> Alan. Why not? Maybe that is how he gets his kicks: making the woman read his fantasies about her. (Coetzee, *Diary* 59-60)

As this dialogism indicates, Anya and Alan engages into a deep dialogical communication in which they negotiate and contemplate both Senor's and their opinions. Alan also furthers his claim and says that Senor's act of having fantasies about Anya is a real crime, and it is even worse than 'crimen injuria' (which is a regulation in South Africa used to convict the rapists who commits a psychological or sexual abuse) (63). Nevertheless, Anya responds by saying that the book Senor is writing is about politics, John Howard, and George Bush, and there is no trace of sex (64). Alan and Anya clearly explain what they think, in fact, about Senor C, and this interaction ensures the details to come out. Therefore, the details are revealed through the characters' own statements.

Rather than Anya being the center of dialogical relations, Alan and Senor have a dialogical bond in *Diary of a Bad Year* as well. Especially at the dinner invitation to celebrate the ending of typing job, Alan and Senor C get lost in dialogues, trying to have the upper hand. When Alan inquires about Senor's future plans, Senor says to him that he has no plan for a next book. However, in this point,

Alan ironises Senor by responding that it is a pity for Anya and himself, because they are getting along so well. This sincere tie between Anya and Senor actually hinders Anya from helping Alan to rob the professor. In his plans to steal the money from Senor's bank accounts, Anya refuses to help Alan, and tries to dissuade him from taking action. Alan discloses the realities in his dialogues with Senor:

> Alan. So you should, so you should . . . trust her. Do you know why? Because unknown to you, she has saved you. She has saved you from the depredations . . . of an unnamed malefactor. Who shall remain nameless. Who was going to rob you blind."
>
> Senor. Really? (Coetzee, *Diary* 170-171)
>
> Alan. You know who the nameless malefactor was who nearly divested you of your capital? . . . Want to guess?
>
> Senor. You told me, . . . you. (185)

These dialogues prepare a ground in which characters express themselves individually, and whereas everything can be told by an authorial voice, the readers have the alternative to hear each detail or event from the characters in their dialogues with the other voices. This property adds a dynamism in the narrative structure of the novel in which nothing proceeds in a linear way, but in which there are ups and downs that keeps the reading gripping.

In the dialogical bond between Alan and Senor C, Coetzee also reveals his real target to create such a form in *Diary of a Bad Year*. Coetzee wants his readers to question the opinions in their own perception. Alan says that they —Anya and Alan— read the essays as the real and ordinary readers of the professor's opinions, and they come to a verdict: "We discussed it chapter by chapter, Anya and I, section by section, opinion by opinion. Took it apart. I made some observations to her and she made some observations to me" (Coetzee, *Diary* 192) and the verdict comes in two parts. Firstly, Alan utters that they think Senor has an "over-optimistic view of human nature. Contrary to what he prefers to believe, life really is a struggle" (195). As for the second verdict, Alan highlights that it is nonsense to write a book in English but aimed at a German public, and accuses Senor trying to make himself known as a master of opinions saying: "You have decided to try your hand at being a guru . . . Wanted: Senior Guru. Must have a lifetime of experience, wise words for all occasions. Long white beard a plus" (209). This confession of Alan puts forth that Coetzee, as an author, employs self-parody here again, and makes his words to be

regarded as worthless by the other voices. The duty, which Anya and Alan have, to question or interpret Senor's opinions is the thing that Coetzee wants his readers to make. Coetzee provokes his readers to understand the hidden details through his/her perception, and filters each idea according to his/her ideological background before coming to a verdict. This exemplifies the ideal reading experience which consists of not only receiving but also questioning and interpreting.

This detail emphasizes the possibility of unfinalizable interpretations of any idea and the destruction of definitive meanings of the text which accord with the concepts put by Bakhtin to define a polyphonic novel. Iddiols also purports that "[r]ather than being injured by the oppressive, reductive type of reading that his characters regularly fall victim to, . . . Coetzee is instead determined to recognize and preserve its multiplicities and contingencies" (196). In this sense, Iddiols also adds that Coetzee disrupts the linear reading, and he "refuses to allow his fiction to be reduced to inauthentic, singular interpretations by making it virtually impossible to read . . . . Instead, he repeatedly uses these kinds of strategies to complicate and disrupt our hermeneutic attempts, causing us, as readers, to rethink the ethics of interpretation" (196). Coetzee does this mostly with the help of the distortion of the novel genre. As he divides the page into separate lines, and as he inserts different genres within the novel —letters, academic essays, everyday life dialogues— and, in each page, the readers encounter the hesitation of which line they are going to follow and which voice they are going to listen or which one to hear first. This property encompasses the primary principle of polyphony in the novel, and it interrelates what Bakhtin underlines in Dostoevsky's art by stating that "[t]he object is precisely the passing of a theme through many and various voices, its rigorous, and so to speak, irrecovable multivoicedness and vari-voicedness. The very distribution of voices and their interaction is what matters to Dostoevsky" (*Problems* 265). Like Dostoevsky, Coetzee gives prominence to the raising of the countervoices in *Diary of a Bad Year*, and promotes the characters to talk about the same issues by evaluating each one within their own perception. Therefore, as Maria J. Lopez says, "*Diary* can be defined, to borrow Bakhtin's words, as 'plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousness, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices" (301) which evokes plural and unceasing questioning of opinions underlining an unfinalizable ending.

The ending of *Diary of a Bad Year* also complies with another feature of the polyphonic novel which prevails the inconclusive and open-ended closing of the narration. Although the information about the subsequent life of the characters is included towards the end of the novel, nothing certain can be deduced as to what will happen to each voice. Especially, Anya's last sentences about Senor adds an ambiguity to the ending, and everything becomes blurry: "All that I will promise him, and hold his hand tight and give him a kiss on the brow, a proper kiss, just to remind him of what he is leaving behind. Good night, Senor C, I will whisper in his ear: sweet dreams, and flights of angels, and all the rest" (Coetzee, *Diary* 227). It becomes hard to comprehend whether these lines are what Anya will do after Senor's death, or just good wishes for the professor by Anya. Thus, this feeling of uncertainty strengthens the property of unfinalizability. Coetzee leaves the ending to his readers, and makes them interpret the closing in their own terms and points of views which creates the opportunity for an endless number of different interpretations. Coetzee's use of open-ended style of narration provides him with the use of polyphony even while he writes the final part of his novel.

In conclusion, Coetzee, with *Diary of a Bad Year*, mirrors an example of a polyphonic novel in which he embodies certain notions such as the withdrawal of the authorial voice, inclusion of multiple voices, use of dialogism and dialogical relations and the open-ended narrative structure. By doing so, Coetzee empowers the readers to hear multiple voices, each expressing their own ideas or ideologies without being dictated by a dominant authorial voice. Coetzee stays outside of the narrative structure, and makes his characters speak instead of him. He puts Senor C to talk about the current issues on the top of the page, while his relation with Anya covers the second split and Anya's narration about Senor C and Alan at the bottom. The author never directs the characters according to his/her own terms, and thus each voice feels the freedom. In each line, characters have the chance to express their opinions and ideologies. Furthermore, the addition of dialogism leads an ongoing asking and answering process. The characters express what they think or feel about anything and the detailed information comes on the surface straight from the first hand. As a last thing, leaving the ending unfinalized procures the basis of polyphony in which the reader can fill the gaps regarding to the end of the novel. This feature provides the reader with a variety of points of view through which he/she can internalize anything in the book by filtering them in their perception. By doing so,

the readers become the part of this polyphonic circle and contribute to the novel with their own opinions or interpretations.

CONCLUSION

In this analysis of the polyphonic structure of Coetzee's later works, Mikhail Bakhtin and his works dealing with the concept of polyphony are regarded as the fundamental theoretical base. Depending on his studies about language and speech genres, Bakhtin puts forward that the novel genre is the most proper genre to include a variety of speech and dialogical relations. In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin clarifies that the use of polyphony is embodied in Dostoevsky's novels, and this concept designates the relation between the author, the characters and the readers. Pam Morris states that Bakhtin emphasizes that Dostoevsky forms a new kind of relation between authors and characters in which the authorial voice lowers, whereas the voices of the characters rise in an open-ended flow (7). In this sense, the requirement of a multiplicity of voices and the dialogical relations between these voices appear within the novel which promote the polyphonic structure.

According to Bakhtin, Dostoevksy is one of the greatest artists employing such criteria in his novels. By making his characters express themselves in their individual voices beyond an author's dominance, Dostoevsky enables his characters to have continuous dialogical ties within which no one stands as superior to another. In Dostoevsky's novels, the author shows, rather than dictating, and makes his readers think, question and criticize what is told. Basing his studies on Dostoevsky, Bakhtin indicates the necessary principles which should be involved in a text in order to make it a polyphonic work. These properties include the eschewal of authorial voice, the proliferation of multiple voices with the inclusion of dialogical relations in an unceasing flow of plot which leads multiple interpretations in the readers' mind.

J.M. Coetzee, as a significant author of contemporary literary world, develops a different style of writing, especially subsequent to his settlement in Australia, and as a result of his studies on the novel genre. He tends to involve the concept of polyphony and its requirements into his novels, and creates his own mode of writing. In his polyphonic works, he avoids talking authoritatively and raises the voice of his characters. Coetzee disrupts the linear composition of a plot and inserts other genres within the novel. He also promotes dialogism between his characters in order to sustain their freedom of speaking individually. Moreover, Coetzee never finishes his novel with an absolute windup, and never dictates an absolute truth. He only puts

forward that he wants his reader to contemplate and criticize without imposing his point of view on them or dominating them.

This thesis proposes to elaborate on two of his novels, *Summertime* and *Diary of a Bad Year* in terms of their polyphonic structure. *Summertime* reveals that this time Coetzee kills the author not only symbolically but also literally. Through the inclusion of interviews made with the people Coetzee is somehow related to, five different Coetzees emerge in the novel. Mr. Vincent, as the interviewer of the novel, meets five acquaintances of Coetzee after his death, to write a biography of him whom he really admires. Thanks to the interview form inserted in the novel, a multivocality arises and each of the voices can project a different Coetzee which enables the readers to choose their own Coetzee among them. Each character speaks about Coetzee both his negative and positive aspects, and Coetzee leads the readers to witness a number of different sides of his. Via the help of dialogism maintained among the characters, the polyphonic structure enables the interviewees to express themselves without the restriction of an author. The novel also starts and ends with undated fragments which leave the plot split and open-ended.

In *Diary of a Bad Year*, Coetzee embodies three split lines in each page, and each line includes another version of the same story. There is a professor, Senor C, on the top section, writing about the problems of today's world for a book. In the middle line, he recounts his relationship with his typist, Anya, and the last section covers Anya's story from her own voice in order to tell her relation with Senor C and her boyfriend, Alan. This technique of fragmentation provides the text with an obvious plurality of voices. The presentation of different ideas by the professor, and the clashing of voices in the discussion of these opinions make the readers a participant of an endless process of interpretation. The withdrawal of the author as an ultimate and absolute voice lets the characters speak freely. Thanks to this freedom, each character becomes an individual.

As a result, this thesis aims to exemplify the inclusion of polyphony in these novels and indicate how the polyphonic structure insures diverse voices to appear individually. Based on the specific dialogic examples, the unceasing expression of opinions tries come out, and these instances underline the existence of an open-ended closure in a polyphonic novel which hinders the last word of an author. This property underscores the active participation of the readers in the interpretation process of the

novel. The readers comment on the opinions or cases by filtering them through their own sense. Hence, the readers become the part of this polyphonic chain.

REFERENCES

Ashcroft, Bill. "Silence as Heterotopia in Coetzee's Fiction." *Strong Opinions: J. M. Coetzee and the Authority of Contemporary Fiction.* Ed. Chris Danta, Sue Kossew and Julian Murphet. New York: Continuum, 2011. 141-158. Print.

Attridge, Derek. "Literary Forms and the Demands of Politics: Otherness in J. M. Coetzee's *Age of Iron*."*Aesthetic and Ideology*. Ed. George Levine. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1994. 243-263. Print.

- - -. "Oppressive Silence: J.M. Coetzee's *Foe* and the Politics of Canonisation." *Critical Perspectives on J.M. Coetzee*. Ed. Graham Huggan and Stephen Watson. London: Macmillan, 1996. 168-191. Print.

- - -. "Sex, Comedy and Influence: Coetzee's Beckett." *J.M. Coetzee in Context and Theory*. Ed. Elleke Boehmer et al. London: Continuum, 2009. 71-93. Print.

Atwell, David. Afterword. *Critical Perspectives on J.M. Coetzee*. Ed. Graham Huggan and Stephen Watson. London: Macmillan, 1996. 213-216. Print.

- - -. Introduction. *Doubling the Point: Essays and Interviews*. Ed. David Atwell. London: Harvard UP, 1992.

Aubrey, James. "For me Alone Paul Rayment was born: Coetzee's *Slow Man, Don Quixote*, and the Literature of Replenishment." *Peer English* 6 (2011): 94-106. Print.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity." *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*. Trans. and ed. Vadim Liapunov. Austin: Texas UP, 1990. Print.

- - -. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. Michael Holquist and Carly Emerson. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: Texas UP, 1981. Print.

- - -. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans and Ed. Carly Emerson. London: Minnesota UP, 1984. Print.

- - -. *Rabelais and His World.* Tran. Helene Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984. Print.

- - -. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: Texas UP, 1986. Print.

Boehmer, Elleke, Katy Iddiols and Robert Eaglestone. Introduction. *J.M. Coetzee in Context and Theory*. Ed. Elleke Boehmer et al. London: Continuum, 2009. 1-10. Print.

Boehmer, Elleke. "J.M. Coetzee's Australian Realism." *Strong Opinions: J. M. Coetzee and the Authority of Contemporary Fiction.* Ed. Chris Danta et al. New York: Continuum, 2011. 3-19. Print.

Brandist, Craig. "Bakhtin, Marxism and Russian Populism." *Materializing Bakhtin: The Bakhtin Circle and Social Theory.* Ed. Craig Brandist and Galin Tihanov. London: Macmillan, 2000. 70-94. Print.

Brink, Andre." Post-Apartheid Literature: A Personal View." *J.M. Coetzee in Context and Theory*. Ed. Elleke Boehmer et al. London: Continuum, 2009. 11-19. Print.

Cichon, Anna Izabella. "Violence and Complicity in J. M. Coetzee's Works." *Werkwinkel: A Journal of Low Countries and South African Studies* 5.2 (2010): 43-72. Print.

Clarkson, Carrol. *J.M. Coetzee: Countervoices*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.

Coetzee, J.M. *Diary of a Bad Year*. London: Vintage, 2007. Print.

- - -. *Doubling the Point: Essays and Interviews*. Ed. David Atwell. London: Harvard UP, 1992. Print.

- - -. *Stranger Shores: Literary Essays*. USA: Penguin Books, 2001. Print.

- - -. *Summertime*. London: Harvill Secker, 2009. Print.

Craig, Kenneth. *Reading Esther: A Case of the Literary Carnivalesque.* Lousville: Westminster John, 1995. Print.

Danta, Chris. Introduction. *Strong Opinions: J. M. Coetzee and the Authority of Contemporary Fiction.* Ed. Chris Danta et al. New York: Continuum, 2011. xi-xix. Print.

Dentith, Simon. *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Donalds, Michael Bernard. "Mikhail Bakhtin: Between Phenomenology and Marxism." *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric and Writing*. Ed. Frank Farmer. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998. 63-81. Print.

Farmer, Frank. Introduction. *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric and Writing*. Ed. Frank Farmer. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998. xi-xxiii. Print.

Gardiner, Michael. "A Very Understandable Horror of Dialectics: Bakhtin and Marxist Phenomenology." *Materializing Bakhtin: The Bakhtin Circle and Social Theory.* Ed. Craig Brandist and Galin Tihanov. London: Macmillan, 2000. 119-141. Print.

Geertsema, John. "*Diary of a Bad Year*." *A Companion to the Works of J.M.Coetzee*. Ed. Tim Mehigan. New York: Camden House, 2011. 208-219. Print.

Haeming, Anne. "Authenticity: Diaries, Chronicles, Records as Index-Simulations." *J.M. Coetzee in Context and Theory*. Ed. Elleke Boehmer et al. London: Continuum, 2009. 173-184. Print.

Halasek, Kay. "Feminism and Bakhtin: Dialogic Reading in the Academy." *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric and Writing*. Ed. Frank Farmer. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998. 51-62. Print.

Harris, R. Allen. "Bakhtin, Phaedrus, and the Geometry of Rhetoric." *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric and Writing*. Ed. Frank Farmer. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998. 15-22. Print.

Harvey, Melinda. "In Australia You Start Zero: The Escape from Place in J. M. Coetzee's Late Novels." *Strong Opinions:J. M. Coetzee and the Authority of Contemporary Fiction.* Ed. Chris Danta et al. New York: Continuum, 2011. 19-34. Print.

Hayes, Patrick. *J.M. Coetzee and the Novel- Writing and Politics after Beckett.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010. Print.

Head, Dominic, ed. *The Cambridge Introduction to J.M. Coetzee*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.

Holquist, Michael. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. London: Routledge, 2002. Print.

- - -. Introduction. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. By Mikhail Bakhtin. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: Texas UP, 1986. xv-xxxiii. Print.

- - -. Introduction. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. By Mikhail Bakhtin. Trans. Carly Emerson and Michael Holquist. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: Texas UP, 1981. xv- xxxiii. Print.

- - -. Prologue. *Rabelais and His World.* Tran. Helene Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984. Print.

Huggan, Graham and Stephen Watson. Introduction. *Critical Perspectives on J.M. Coetzee*. Ed. Graham Huggan and Stephen Watson. London: Macmillan, 1996. 1-12. Print.

Iddiols, Katy. "Disrupting Inauthentic Readings: Coetzee's Strategies." *J.M. Coetzee in Context and Theory*. Ed. Elleke Boehmer et al. London: Continuum, 2009. 185-198. Print.

Jones, Ann Rosalind. "Inside the Outsider: Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller* and Bakhtin's Polyphonic Novel." *EHL* 50.1 (1983): 61-81. *JSTOR*. Web. 11 September 2014.

Kent, Thomas. "Hermeneutics and Genre: Bakhtin and the Problem of Communicative Interaction." *Landmark Essays on Bakhtin, Rhetoric and Writing*. Ed. Frank Farmer. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998. 33-51. Print.

Kossew, Sue. "Literary Migration: Shifting Borders in Coetzee's Australian Novels." *Strong Opinions: J. M. Coetzee and the Authorityof Contemporary Fiction.* Ed. Chris Danta et al. New York: Continuum, 2011. 113-124. Print.

Kristeva, Julia. "Word, Dialogue and Novel." *The Kristeva Reader*. Ed. Toril Moi. New York: Columbia UP, 1986. 34-62. Print.

- - -. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia UP, 1984. Print.

Kundera, Milan. *The Art of the Novel*. New York: Grove, 1988. Print.

Lear, Jonathan. "The Ethical Thought of J.M. Coetzee." *Raritan: A Quarterly Review* 28.1 (2015): 68-97. *JSTOR*. Web. 04 January 2015.

Locke, Richard. "Senior C." Rev of *Diary of a Bad Year*, by J.M. Coetzee. *The Threepenny Review* 114 (2008): 14-16. *JSTOR*. Web. 27 August 2014.

Lopez, Maria J. *Acts of Visitation: The Narrative of J. M. Coetzee*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011. Print.

Marais, Mike. "The Trope of Following in J. M. Coetzee's *Slow Man." Strong Opinions: J.M. Coetzee and the Authority of Contemporary Fiction.* Ed. Chris Danta et al. New York: Continuum, 2011. 99-112. Print.

Meek, James. "The Many Faces of J.M. Coetzee." *The Guardian* 5 September 2009: n.i. *The Guardian*. Web. 09 September 2014.

Meljac, Eric Paul. "Seductive Lines: The Use of Horizontal Bars by Josipovici and Coetzee, and the Art of Seduction." *Journal of Modern Literature* 33. 1 (2009): 92-101. *JSTOR*. Web. 02 January 2015.

Morales, Dolors Collellmir. "J.M. Coetzee's *Diary of a Bad Year:* Ethical and Novelistic Awareness." *Miscelanea: A Journal of English and American Studies* 40 (2009): 43-52. *Miscelanea Journal*. Web. 24 January 2015.

Morris, Pam, ed. *The Bakhtin Reader: Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev and Voloshinov*. London: Arnold, 1994. Print.

Morson, Gary and Carly Emerson. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaic*. Redwood: Stanford UP, 1990. Print.

Murphet, Julian. "*Diary of a Bad Year*: Parrhesia, Opinion and Novelistic Form." *Strong Opinions: J.M. Coetzee and the Authority of Contemporary Fiction.* Ed. Chris Danta et al. New York: Continuum, 2011. 63-80. Print.

Neuman, Justin. "Unexpected Cosmopolitans: Media and Diaspora in J. M. Coetzee's *Summertime*." *Criticism* 53. 1 (2011): 127-136. *Digital Commons*. Web. 25

September 2014.

Northover, Richard Alan. "Elizabeth Costello as a Socratic Figure."*English in Africa* 39. 1 (2012): 37–55. *JSTOR*. Web. 13 August 2014.

Parry, Benita. "Speech and Silence in the Fictions of J. M. Coetzee." *Critical Perspectives on J.M. Coetzee*. Ed Graham Huggan and Stephen Watson. London: Macmillan, 1996. 37- 65. Print.

Pechey, Graham. *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Word in the World.* London: Routledge, 2007. Print.

Poyner, Jane, ed. *J.M Coetzee and the Idea of Public Intellectual*. Ohio: Ohio UP, 2006. 1-20. Print.

- - -. *J.M. Coetzee and the Paradox of Postcolonial Authority.* England: Ashgate, 2009. Print.

Putton, Paul. "Coetzee's Opinions." *Strong Opinions: J. M. Coetzee and the Authority of Contemporary Fiction.* Ed. Chris Danta et al. New York: Continuum, 2011. 53-63. Print.

Shaffer, Brian W. *Reading the Novel in English: 1950-2000*. New Jersey: Blackwell, 2006. Print.

Tihanov, Galin. "Culture, Form, Life: The Early Lukacs and the Early Bakhtin." *Materializing Bakhtin: The Bakhtin Circle and Social Theory*. Ed. Craig Brandist and Galin Tihanov. London: Macmillan, 2000. 43-70. Print.

Tlusty, Jan. "Fictional and Factual Autobiography from the Perspective of Speech Act Theory." *Organon F* 19 (2012): 179-185. *Philpapers.* Web. 14 October 2014.

Tonkin, Boyd. "*Diary of a Bad Year* by J.M. Coetzee." *The Independent* 31 August

2007: n.i. *Independent*.Web. 03 February 2015.

Uhlman, Anthony. "J.M. Coetzee and the Uses of Anachronism in *Summertime*." *Textual Practice* 26. 4 (2012): 747–761. *JSTOR*. Web. 30 December 2014.

Voloshinov, V. N. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. Ladislav Matejka. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1986. Print.

Watson, Stephen. "Colonialism and the Novels of J.M. Coetzee." *Critical Perspectives on J.M. Coetzee*. Ed Graham Huggan and Stephen Watson. London: Macmillan, 1996. 13-36. Print.

Zhongwen, Qian. "Problems of Bakhtin's Theory about Polyphony." *New Literary History* 28.4 (1997): 779-790. *JSTOR.* Web. 17 July 2014.