

Traumatic Spaces in Tom McCarthy's *Remainder*

M. Mirac Ceylan
Gaziantep University, Turkey

Tom McCarthy's debut novel Remainder (2005) is a unique portrayal of the relationship between space and human beings as the novel portrays an unnamed protagonist/narrator who suffers amnesia as a result of an accident, "something falling from the sky" (McCarthy 5). The exact details of the accident are not known to the narrator. The character is granted eight and a half million pounds to compensate for the damage, and he decides to spend the money to re-enact his remaining memories by reconstructing the spaces in the way he remembers them. The character's compulsion to repeat leads him to re-create space within space where he can explore and master his trauma. Through re-enacting specific memories, the character also searches for the remains of his identity within those spaces, and these spaces become, in Foucauldian terms, heterotopia of deviation as space is both a means and an end for the narrator. Over time, the re-enacted spaces exceed the simulated sphere and extend into the 'real' world, problematising the relationship between the re-enacted space and reality. This paper aims to explore the relationship between the narrator's traumatic condition within the deviant spaces he recreates after the accident, which illustrates how space is used both as a means in representing his traumatic condition, and as an end that functions to regain his authenticity.

Keywords

Heterotopia; *Remainder*; space; trauma; Tom McCarthy

Introduction

Tom McCarthy's debut novel *Remainder* (2005) begins *in medias res*: "About the accident itself I can say very little. Almost nothing. It involved something falling from the sky. Technology. Parts, bits. That's it really; all I can divulge. Not much, I know" is the first paragraph of the novel (McCarthy 5). From the beginning, it can be suggested that the novel embodies some of the

hallmarks of trauma that are specified by literary trauma scholars such as Cathy Caruth: departure, unknown and the fall. The unnamed character knows that something has fallen upon him and caused amnesia but it is not an experience that he can describe in detail. The beginning is an implied reference to *Very Little...Almost Nothing: Death, Philosophy, Literature* written by Simon Critchley, with whom McCarthy has founded a semi-fictitious society called the International Necronautical Society (the INS). With this introduction, McCarthy makes an allusion to Critchley's text, underlining a relation between the two texts. In *Remainder*, McCarthy portrays a character who, after the accident, defines himself as an inauthentic and plastic person, and who tries to feel authentic by creating space within space in order to re-enact his remaining memories. Throughout the narrative, the readerly empathy is disrupted since the repetition of the actions and re-enactments are conducted without being relatable to the readers, and the question of "why" uttered by the readers finds no sufficient answer except for the feeling of tingling felt only by the narrator. Thus, readers are left in a condition of incomprehension both throughout and at the end of the novel. The traumatised character does nothing but to repeat and re-enact his vague memories of the past within the deviant heterotopic spaces that he builds and rebuilds.

In order to adhere to the structure of the novel, the introductory paragraph of this paper follows the same path as that of the unnamed character: to start in the middle of things. This paper aims to explore the relationship between the narrator's traumatic condition within the deviant spaces he recreates after the accident, which illustrates how space is used as a means in representing his traumatic condition that is spatially-determined, and how it is used as an end that serves for him to regain his authenticity. *Remainder* is an exceptional novel about a character/a first-person narrator who experiences an accident and loses his memory and his sense of physical orientation. As a result, he becomes obliged to re-learn how to move around the space he inhabits. In other words, he re-learns how to walk or raise his hand, and in doing so, he is constantly aware of these movements. In the character's own terms, he had to be "rerouted" in order for his motor functions to be repaired. Within the narrative, there is an institution that is responsible for the accident that functions – and somehow funds – the narrative: it offers compensation in the form of the "Settlement". The amount of the Settlement is eight and a half million pounds. Readers witness a character in the novel who suddenly finds himself in a state of woundedness and enormous wealth to go along with it. Considering where to spend the money, the character suddenly has an

inclination to buy buildings, actors, and props and create the neighbourhood where he used to feel authentic. He plans to make his staff work, constantly on duty whenever he wants, repeatedly doing the same scripted actions even when no one is watching, simply for the tingling feeling he feels on his spine. In order to facilitate the re-enactments, the narrator hires an Indian man named Nazrul who works for a company called Time Control UK. The narrator depicts Nazrul as his “executor” who does not question his actions/requests as Nazrul simply facilitates whatever the narrator orders. Within the flow of the narrative, these re-enactments arrive at a point where the line between re-enactments and the real-world blurs, and borders are crossed when the narrator wants to re-enact a bank heist, but it turns into an actual heist with real people getting injured and killed. Yet, the protagonist has neither a sense of compassion nor regret for the consequences of his lavish re-enactments. The narrative ends with the character hijacking a plane, drawing a figure of eight in the sky.

Remainder

While trying to decide what to do with the money, the idea of re-enacting his memories comes to him in a specific place after seeing a crack in a bathroom mirror at a party: “The sense of *déjà vu* was very strong. I’d been in a space like this before, a place just like this, looking at the crack” (*Remainder* 58). The experience of *déjà vu* is a turning point since he makes up his mind about what to do with the money; to re-create the spaces where his memories took place. All the scenes he remembers and wants to re-enact are rooted in a place he cannot locate: “red roofs, black cats [...] the fifth or sixth or maybe even seventh floor of an old tenement-style building [...] The smell of liver cooking in a pan had been wafting to me from the floor below” (58). The remembered space has a distinctive feature for the character since “in these spaces, all [his] movements had been fluent and unforced. Not awkward, acquired, second-hand, but natural” (*Remainder* 60). Thus, he wants to return to a natural state which seems possible only through re-creating the spaces he recalls.

Although he distinctly remembers the sounds, smells and/or objects, he cannot pinpoint a place on the map regarding where exactly he witnessed the smell of liver being cooked or a pianist neighbour practising next door as he states that “I remembered it all but I couldn’t remember where I’d been in this place, this flat, this bathroom. Or when [...] I searched back further in

my past, right back to when I'd been a child. No use" (59). After experiencing the turning point, he is certain about his aim: "I wanted to reconstruct that space and enter it so that I could feel real again. I wanted to; I had to; I would. Nothing else mattered" (*Remainder* 60). This sentence acts like the thesis statement of the character's narrative, providing the readers with what the following pages will portray in the rest of the narrative. Moreover, in the sentence quoted above, the narrator also specifies the relationship between the use and significance of space and the aim of his re-enactments.

For Pieter Vermeulen, McCarthy's novels challenge the novelistic tradition's "reliance on psychological realism and feeling" since they do not rely on "plot, character, readerly empathy and sentiment, social vision, and psychological depth" ("The Critique" 549–550). Vermeulen also suggests that *Remainder* "is an attempt to debunk the customary pieties of trauma fiction" because it is "indifferent to the weighty ethical issues that normally mark our engagement with the extreme violence and the psychological suffering that characterize trauma" (550). Although the narrative is built on the main character's compulsion to re-enact and repeat, for Vermeulen, the pieties of trauma fiction are disrupted since the character lacks the psychological suffering that is expected from a narrative which is ignited by a traumatic event. According to Zekiye Antakyalýodlu, the novel is read as the literary counterpart of Giorgio Agamben's philosophical concepts. As for the genre taxonomies, Antakyalýodlu states that *Remainder* oscillates between "elements of a psychological novel, a thriller, a modernist satire, a postmodern parody, a contemporary comedy, and a slipstream fantasy fiction all at once" (111).

For McKenzie Wark,

In *Remainder*, our hero is one of the accidental "Gods" of this world, one with too much money and time on his hands. He uses money and time not to create but to recreate [...] He might be a God of noise. He does not make the world out of nothing [...] The simulation is never perfect, always in excess of the thing itself. It always leaves a remainder. The most troubling remainder is himself. He is a leftover God, a God as debris of creation. He is trying to be a master of a universe that needs no master. (x-xi)

While the novel problematises the issue of repetition, it simultaneously creates a chain of remainders that leads nowhere. The fact that the main character himself is a remainder can be taken as one of the primary results of his trauma

that is manifested through the repetition of re-enactments, which, in the end, produce nothing but more remainders.

The main character is a person who “was bored – by people, ideas, the world: everything” (*Remainder* 56). As a result of his post-traumatic stress disorder, he feels himself out of place and time, inauthentic and as an interloper who is supposed to go through a process of rerouting which causes him to “think about each movement I made, had to understand it. No Doing without Understanding: the accident bequeathed me that for ever, an eternal detour” (21). From the very beginning of his narrative, apart from his feeling of inauthenticity, the character presents himself as an unreliable narrator whose account of his own traumatic accident is to be doubted: “But who’s to say that these are genuine memories? Who’s to say my traumatized mind didn’t just make them up” (*Remainder* 5). The narrator puts his memory and his narrative reliability at stake by suggesting that “[m]inds are versatile and wily things. Real chancers” (5). In defining his amnesia, he views his memory as “pigeons and the accident a big noise that had scared them off. They fluttered back eventually – but when they did, their hierarchy had changed” (*Remainder* 82). His memory returns to him in instalments, “like a soap opera”, but this somehow alters the hierarchy of his recollections (*Remainder* 71). Therefore, he finds himself a plastic and second-hand being whose cognitive and physical faculties are somehow mechanised after the accident.

His sense of plasticity which is related to his mental and physical deficiencies causes him to find the acting of film stars, such as Robert De Niro, more authentic than his own living of “real” life. He compares himself to De Niro, stating that “[h]e doesn’t have to think about them [actions], or understand them first. He doesn’t have to think about them because he and they are one. Perfect. Real. My movements are all fake. Second-hand” (22). Thus, the main character is not only detached from the space and time he is occupying, he is also dissociated from his own actions, and he realises it after observing how film actors act. About this realisation, the narrator states that “learning to move and walk, understanding before I act – all this just made me become even more what I’d always been anyway, added another layer of distance between me and things I did” (*Remainder* 23). It can be deduced from the narrator’s portrayal of his post-traumatic condition that he was always an inauthentic human being – less authentic than a film star – and the accident simply made him realise his ontological plasticity as a “human being”.

His traumatic compulsion to repeat is seen in every part of his life; he goes to a chain coffee shop to stamp his loyalty card over and over again.

While looking out from the coffee shop, he sees other people, the locals on the street, and feels himself as an interloper: “I started thinking that *these* people, finally, were genuine. That they weren’t interlopers. That they really did possess the street, themselves, the moment they were in” (*Remainder* 50). His sense of being an interloper is directly related to his post-traumatic condition that disconnects him from the space and time he inhabits because the emergence of the awareness of his inauthenticity is one of the results of the traumatic accident. Moreover, when comparing himself with other people on the street, he pinpoints their difference with regards to their unbroken association with the space and time that they inhabit. What damns the main character – which turns into an entertainment later on – is his awareness of his self-estrangement.

Traumatic Spaces

As for the problem of healing, the novel depicts a peculiar way of handling the traumatic experience narrated directly through a first-person voice. Merve Sarýkaya Ten suggests that “the novel traces how the narrator becomes physically and psychologically vulnerable to addiction to these re-enactments and how, paradoxically, the attempt to heal his wounds turns him into a monster” (54). The novel neither represents, nor proposes, any healing through the act of re-enacting his loosely remembered memories, since on the contrary, the more he re-enacts the more he becomes a monster incapable of feeling empathy. Emma Volk also touches upon the issue of healing as she states that the re-enactments can be “connected to the traumatized individual’s need to turn experience into narrative. But the re-enactments are not healing narratives, nor are they intrusive flashbacks” (Volk 385).

Because of the feeling of inauthenticity, while the character feels himself aloof towards space and time, he simultaneously feels aloof towards others, and thus cannot feel empathy. He seeks input from his friends about how to spend the money; they advise him to help send aid to Africa, to which he cannot feel connected: “I wanted to feel some connection with these Africans [...] I wanted to feel genuinely warm towards these Africans, but I couldn’t. Not that I felt cold or hostile. I just felt neutral” (35). The narrator’s feeling of neutrality is also seen later when cats perish during each re-enactment every day as he demands that cats fall off a roof. When his facilitator Naz asks whether the death of cats upsets him, he cold-heartedly answers “‘No’

[...] ‘We can’t expect everything to work perfectly straight away. It’s a learning process’” (140). From the perspective of the narrator, the dying of the cats can be viewed as a trivial sacrifice in order to achieve his major aim, and his monstrosity doesn’t allow him to feel sympathy for others who suffer the consequences of the re-enactments.

The peculiar condition of the narrator is a significant source for literary trauma studies since *Remainder* does not represent psychological suffering portrayed through its main character. To turn back to the roots of the concept, in Freud’s *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, trauma is defined as “a consequence of an extensive breach being made in the protective shield against stimuli” (Freud 303). Following Freud, poststructuralist scholars such as Cathy Caruth and Shoshana Felman shaped literary trauma studies by viewing trauma as an unknown catastrophic event of the past that comes to haunt the person belatedly in the present. The Caruthian approach depicts trauma as an experience which stuns the sufferer, thus resulting in the catastrophe being unclaimed and unspeakable. In her *Unclaimed Experience*, Caruth elaborates on the Freudian understanding of the structure of trauma by indicating that it is “experienced too soon, too unexpectedly, to be fully known and is therefore not available to consciousness until it imposes itself, again, repeatedly [...] in the repetitive actions of the survivor” and that this experience is not simply caused by “any event but, significantly, the shocking and unexpected occurrence of an accident” (Caruth 4, 6). For Caruth, the sudden occurrence of the catastrophic event makes it unknown for the traumatised, and it is not available to consciousness until it makes its repetitive return.

The main character of *Remainder* commences his narration by pointing out that “[a]bout the accident itself [he] can say very little. Almost nothing” while he also describes the accident as “a blank: a white slate, a black hole” (*Remainder* 5). Thus, the beginning of the narrative implies that the abruptness of the accident means the character cannot fully comprehend it. Moreover, the narrator is prohibited by the Settlement to discuss the accident “in any public or recordable format” (5). Therefore, from the very beginning, the unspeakable nature of his trauma is ensured both by the law and by his amnesic mind. Contrary to Caruth’s theorisation of the catastrophe’s coming to light after its return, in the narrator’s case, the idea of re-enacting as a result of his traumatic accident does not necessarily bring the catastrophic event to complete knowledge. Moreover, the narrative does not aim to direct the readers towards knowing or understanding the real nature of the accident. Instead, the narrator is interested in what happens after the accident. With the

Caruthian approach in mind, although there is traumatic repetition, the actual accident is never perceptible to him, and the narrator has no such intention to reach a state of comprehension, nor to heal his wounds. It can also be argued that what the narrator attempts is to extend the incomprehension even further, not only for himself, but also for the re-enactors and, eventually, for the readers. Vermeulen declares that after describing the accident, “*Remainder* does not pause to assess the psychological damage the accident inflicts on its nameless narrator, nor does it qualify its representation of the traumatized mind” (*Contemporary Literature* 25). Instead, the novel focuses on the post-effects of the accident, and the narrative represents the obsessive re-enactments of the character which do not propose any sense of healing of his wound.

Freud’s observation of a baby playing with a reel attached to a string is an essential representation of the compulsion to repeat, and this paper foregrounds that what *Remainder*’s narrator does can be illustrated through the Freudian game of *fort/da*. In the observation, the child re-enacts his mother’s visits to his room and the (dis)pleasure he receives from it. In the example of *fort/da*, Freud suggests that the child “compensated for it [his mother’s going away] so to speak, by himself re-enacting this same disappearance-reappearance scenario with whatever objects fell to hand” (*Beyond* 53). When he throws the reel saying *fort* (gone), he unconsciously refers to the mother’s absence, and when he says *da* (there), he re-enacts his wish for her return. The child tries to compensate for the lack by acting as the master of the game. *Remainder*’s narrator plays the game of *fort/da* in his re-enactment zone by attempting to create a space where he plays the master over his feeling of lack that is in relation to his sense of inauthenticity. The narrator is disturbed by the fact that he feels himself as an interloper within the place and time he is situated in, and by playing the game of *fort/da* in the re-enactment area, he temporarily plays the master, and as Wark suggests, he becomes an accidental god.

In “Remembering, Repetition and Working Through”, Freud focuses on how patients’ repressed memories play a role in their repetitive actions. Freud argues that patients act out their memories instead of remembering them: “He reproduces it not as a memory but as an action; he repeats it” (*Beyond* 36). Furthermore, for Freud, the repeated is “everything deriving from the repressed element within himself [...] his pathological characteristics” (*Beyond* 37). Similarly, the character in *Remainder* attempts and manages to reproduce his memory not in the form of abstract remembrances but in the form of action – as he is a man who is obsessed with turning things into *matter* – and

what he repeats derives from his pathological condition that is rooted in the accident. Through the use of space, he reproduces and acts out his memories, turning them into action rather than recollection while the act of remembering is replaced by repetition.

The narrator disrupts the regular recording capabilities of memory since his re-enactments are pathologically designed to present his repressions, not enabling any accumulation of memory, neither for himself nor for others/re-enactors. The narrator thinks that the re-enactors should not comprehend the situation: "What was lacking, if anything, was comprehension: making them understand exactly what it was that was required of them [...] I didn't need to make them share my vision [...] It was my vision" (101). Turning memory into action is directly associated with the association of his trauma with space as the employed actors have to use space in order to re-enact his fragmented past. By ordering the re-enactors to repeat the required actions without comprehending them, he leads them to imitate the structure of trauma in their actions made within the re-enactment space. In the traditional sense of trauma, repetition in the actions of the traumatised person is conducted without having a sense of knowledge about it. Similarly, the actors in the re-enacted space are prescribed to repeat without understanding what they are actually doing. Thus, it can be suggested that as a traumatised character, he wants to create a space in which the structure of trauma is imitated and re-enacted, not only by himself but also by the actors.

Recent studies of literary trauma shift away from Caruth's theorisations of trauma narratives in which trauma is recognised as an unclaimed experience that cannot be comprehended. Michelle Balaev's works related to trauma studies deviate from the unclaimed/unspeakable perspective of the concept as she defines trauma as "a person's emotional response to an overwhelming event that disrupts previous ideas of an individual's sense of self and the standards by which one evaluates society" (Balaev 150). Trauma novel, on the other hand, "refers to a work of fiction that conveys profound loss or intense fear on individual or collective levels" (Balaev 150). Regarding Balaev's argument, trauma is an emotional reaction that one performs towards an overwhelming event that distorts one's previous sense of self, and the novels that depict this distortion are occupied with depicting a profound loss or fear.

Balaev's description of trauma concords with McCarthy's depiction in *Remainder* since the main character's perspective towards his own previous self, as well as the way he evaluates society, are totally disrupted. The main character's realisation of his inauthenticity, and other's authenticity, is a turning

point in his life that alters the way he perceives his self and others. Because of the accident, the main character's physical wound is interconnected to his mental one, and to be obliged to go through the process of physical "rerouting" is an experience that changes his ontology. For Volk, the traumatic event in *Remainder* "has no individual specificity and signifies nothing beyond itself" as he is wounded simply because of "something falling from the sky" that is left unknown in the rest of the narrative (Volk 385). He feels himself as "plastic, imperfect, unreal" and the only time he can remember when he felt the opposite adjectives was when he was in Paris, feeling "[i]nside, not outside – as though we'd penetrated something's skin: the city, perhaps" (*Remainder* 24–25). After the accident, the main character is able to feel that his current self is different from his previous one regarding his integration with space. In this sense, the last time he felt himself authentic was a time when he felt himself one in unity with the space he was inhabiting, which proves the relation between his trauma and space.

The dynamics of memory are interrelated to his traumatic condition, and for Balaev, a common denominator of trauma novels is the "transformation of the self ignited by an external, often terrifying experience, which illuminates the process of coming to terms with the dynamics of memory that inform the new perceptions of the self and world" (Balaev 150). However, even if the transformation of *Remainder*'s narrator is triggered by the accident, he receives new perceptions of his self and the world around him while he simultaneously loses his ability to come to terms with his memory. In other words, thanks to his amnesia, he falls into a condition in which he has to come to terms with what he can recall. He defines his amnesia through the analogy of the accident as a loud noise, and his memories as pigeons; when his memories come back, their hierarchy changes. This change in the hierarchy causes the narrator to remember, clearly, things that were formerly trivial for him, and vice versa: memories that had "crappy places before ended up with better ones [...] Other things became less important than they had been before. My time at university, for example, was reduced to a faded picture" (82–83). Therefore, to turn back to Balaev's argument, the accident indirectly ignites the reconciliation with this new structure of his memory that introduces new perceptions of his self and the world.

In his essay "Get Real, or What Jellyfish Have to Tell Us About Literature" Tom McCarthy discusses *the real*, *reality* and *realism* while providing various examples from J. G. Ballard. Similar to the ending of *Remainder* in which a simulated bank heist turns into a real one simply because of a kink in a carpet

that is absent in the real bank, McCarthy focuses on Ballard's novel *Crash* in which the main character Vaughan compulsively simulates car crashes and gets sexual pleasure out of it. However, Vaughan's final simulation evolves into a disastrous mistake in which he misses the car and experiences his first *real accident*. In this sense, the real accidentally occurs out of a simulation in Ballard's novel, and McCarthy states that it is "a traumatic real; a real that's linked to repetition; [...] the real that Lacan defines as 'that which always returns to the same place' and as 'that which is unassimilable by any system of representation'" (69). At this point, for McCarthy, the writer's task is not "depicting this real realistically, or even 'well'; but of approaching it in the full knowledge that, like some roving black hole, it represents [...] the point at which the writing's entire project crumples and implodes" (70). In *Remainder*, McCarthy presents a very similar portrayal of the traumatic real which cannot be represented by any system of reference, and which is linked to repetition. It can be argued that the absence of the kink in the carpet in the bank heist of *Remainder* is a reflection of the "sudden intercession of the catastrophic real" which is the point at which the entire project of re-enactment crumples and implodes ("Get Real" 68). As Ballard's Vaughan experiences his first real accident, the narrator of *Remainder* experiences his first enactment at the end, and he gets an elevated joy out of the turning of re-enactment into *real*.

For Robert T. Tally, literature functions as a map, "offering its readers descriptions of places, situating them in a kind of imaginary space, and providing points of reference by which they can orient themselves and understand the world in which they live" (Tally 2). On the contrary, what *Remainder* does is the exact opposite of creating points of references so that readers, or the re-enactors, can orient themselves. The narrator re-creates his trauma-ignited spaces in which he constantly plays his repetition game. Through re-creating spaces from his own maps, the character in the novel plays the game of *fort/da* in the narrative, trying to master his wound through repetition, putting not only the readers but also the re-enactors into his space while he enjoys the tingling he feels in his spine. In his narrative, space has a multifaceted function and position: space is the reason why he is traumatised because he was there when something fell from the sky. It is also a phenomenon that he was detached from as a result of his post-traumatic condition. Furthermore, space is devised as a tool in re-enacting his memories that is again related to his traumatic experience.

Balaev argues that the place for trauma, as well as the traumatised, is significant. For Balaev, trauma novels are occupied with representing the

disruption between the self and others by carefully describing the place of trauma because the physical environment offers the opportunity to examine both the personal and cultural histories imbedded in landscapes that define the character's identity and the meaning of the traumatic experience. (Balaev 150)

The significance of space is implied by the narrator when he states that, "[p]osition has been important to me ever since. It's not just the hospital: it's the accident as well. I was hit because I was standing where I was and not somewhere else" (*Remainder* 57). Here, the narrator roots the source of his trauma in the space he was standing on. Therefore, ironically, space is both the cause and the effect of his inauthenticity that permits him to feel *within* the space. The accident – and its inaccessible healing – is dependent on space, and as a result, his trauma is spatially determined. Space is both the precondition of the existence of trauma for the character and also the reason why he was outside of it all, watching everything like an interloper. The reaction he gives – his compulsive need to re-enact – to the catastrophic accident is again associated with space since he creates a heterotopia of re-enactment so that he can constantly be present in his pathological stream of repetition.

With its distinctive subject matter and its unique form, trauma and space are intertwined with each other in *Remainder* in a way that can be related to heterotopias. In "Of Other Places", Michel Foucault commences his argument by suggesting that it is an epoch of space. To begin with, for Foucault, heterotopias are "counter-sites [that are] outside of all places, even though it may be possible to indicate their location in reality" (24). He gives the example of a cemetery as a place "unlike ordinary cultural places" yet having a tie with everyone since each individual has a relative buried in a cemetery (25). Foucault describes heterotopias within six core principles: that they are not limited to one culture, that they can be employed in different ways, that they are able to juxtapose "a single real space [with] several places, that they are associated with time (heterochrony), and that their entrance is ensured by an obligation or permission (Foucault 24–27). For the sixth principle, Foucault states that

They have a function in relation to all the space that remains [...] Either their role is to create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned [...] Or else, their role is

to create a space that is other, another real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged as ours is messy, ill-constructed, and jumbled. (27)

After defining heterotopia as a counter-site in which these places are out of the ordinary space, he also describes “heterotopias of deviation” which used to be crisis heterotopias before: “those in which individuals whose behaviour is deviant in relation to the required mean or norm are placed. Cases of this are rest homes and psychiatric hospitals, and of course prisons; and one should perhaps add retirement homes” (Foucault 25). Foucault further asserts that retirement homes should also be included since they are “on the borderline between the heterotopia of crisis and heterotopia of deviation, since, after all, old age is a crisis, but also a deviation” (Foucault 25).

As an experience, trauma can also be situated on the borderline between heterotopia of crisis and deviation since trauma is both a crisis – an experience that comes out of an unexpected event such as “something falling from the sky” – and a deviation in one’s psychological condition since it disrupts “previous ideas of an individual’s sense of self and the standards by which one evaluates society” (Balaev 150). Although the re-enactment space can be located in reality, it deviates from the real space since as a heterotopia, the re-enactment space is designed to be “other, another, real space, as perfect, as meticulous, as well arranged” (Foucault 27). Moreover, the narrator also aims to “create a space of illusion that exposes every real space, all the sites inside of which human life is partitioned” since his re-enactment includes people who are practising some prescribed daily tasks (Foucault 27). The main character exaggerates the spatial value of the re-enactment area as he states that “[m]oving across the landing and down the staircase, I felt like an astronaut taking his first steps – humanity’s first steps – across the surface of a previously untouched planet” (*Remainder* 127). By comparing it to an untouched planet, the character implies that the re-enactment space is a deviation from all the familiar/worldly spaces while it is simultaneously *within* those real spaces.

In the manifesto of the International Necronautical Society, the first article suggests that the society, created by McCarthy and Critchley, perceives death as “a type of space in which [they] intend to map, enter, colonise, and eventually, inhabit” (“INS Founding Manifesto”). For the narrator of the *Remainder*, the deviating heterotopia functions to create a space of death in which he can meticulously map, rule as a monarch and then inhabit. It is seen when the narrator enjoys people’s actual death in the bank heist as he states

that “[t]here’s nothing to be worried about. It’s a very happy day. A beautiful day. And now we all shall go into the air” (*Remainder* 269). It is as if after conquering the ground space, the narrator aims for the sky as he wants the pilot to draw a figure of eight in the air all the while thinking that “I’d have to get the whole thing re-enacted one day” (271). The character’s compulsive desire to enter the space of death is also seen after he is immensely influenced by a biker being shot: by dying, he “merged with the space around him, sunk and flowed into it until there was no distance between it and him” (*Remainder* 177–178). Therefore, it can be argued that his deviant heterotopia aims to integrate the main character with the space from which he was detached due to the accident.

Foucault suggests that there used to be crisis heterotopias which then turned into heterotopias of deviation in which people are there because of psychological illness or old age. The re-enactment area is a deviant heterotopia in which the main character builds his own psychiatric hospital which aims not to cure but to traumatise him more, and the peculiar aspect is that he enjoys his traumatic repetitions thanks to the feeling of the tingling on his spine. For Robert J. Topinka, “[i]nstead of remaining always separate, heterotopias hold up an alternate order to the dominant order, providing glimpses of the governing principles of order” (Topinka 60). The other space in this context is employed by the character in order to explore, rule, control and madly enjoy the repetitive re-enactments of his memories. Yet, what is re-enacted in this deviant heterotopia deviates from its kick-start idea, and the character begins to re-enact his contemporary and recent experiences. At this point, the borders of the deviant heterotopia trespass the borders of the real space, resulting in the injury of the people outside the re-enactment space. Thus, his heterotopia falls apart, or presents another deviancy towards a totally different route as, in the end, re-enactments turn into an enactment.

Conclusion

For the narrator, space is a means to conduct his re-enactments since it is both the pre-condition of his traumatic accident and also the phenomenon that he was alienated to after the accident. Space is an end because his ontology is dependent on the compulsive repetitions of specific memories and moments after the traumatic accident. Through the re-enactment area, his sole aim is to reboot himself into his previous version which used to be in harmony with

space, and which is disrupted by the accident. The novel portrays a character for whom recollection is replaced by repetition and re-enactment. McCarthy positions the representation of the traumatic experience in-between heterotopia of crisis and deviation, and creates a character who is obsessed with the compulsions that his post-traumatic condition had caused.

The narrative ends in the air, suspended, as the narrator hijacks the plane. He orders the pilot to draw a figure of eight in the air, imitating the amount of money given to him by the Settlement. With no surprise, the narrator concludes with the image of repetition: "Eventually, the sun would set forever [...] Or maybe, before that, we'd just run out of fuel. For now, though, the clouds tilted and the weightlessness set in once more as we banked, turning, heading back, again" (*Remainder* 275). The absence of the kink in the carpet in the actual bank leads things to fall apart in the novel. As an accidental god, *Remainder's* inauthentic main character believes that through death, one can merge with space. The condition of the murdered biker is a point that he wishes to get to since he thinks that the dead person became one with space, no longer "separate, removed, imperfect" (178). With this approach, the narrative aligns with the INS Manifesto which views death as a space to be conquered since the main character uses the re-enactment area as a space of death in which he first maps, enters and then masters in the closure of the narrative. However, it is ironic that the narrator has to run away from the ultimate consequences of his re-enactments since he is an "accidental" god. His trauma-ignited theme park does not cause any healing for himself, instead, as a remainder, it causes trauma for other individuals who take part in re-enacting and enacting, and for the readers who find themselves puzzled about the narrator's motives.

Works Cited

- Antakyalýodlu, Zekiye. "Everything Must Leave Some Kind of Mark": An Agambenian Reading of Tom McCarthy's *Remainder*." *Litera: Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2025, pp. 109–125. Doi:10.26650/LITERA2024-1485015.
- Balaev, Michelle. "Trends in Literary Trauma Theory." *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal*, vol. 41, no. 2, (June 2008), pp. 149–166. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44029500>.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience; Trauma, Narrative and History*. John Hopkins University Press, 1996.

- Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Places." *Diacritics*, vol. 16, no. 1, 1986, pp. 22–27.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. Penguin, 2003.
- McCarthy, Tom and Simon Critchley. "INS Founding Manifesto." *The Times*, December 1999, p. 1. http://necronauts.net/manifestos/1999_times_manifesto.html.
- McCarthy, Tom. "Get Real or What Jellyfish Have to Tell Us About Literature." In *Typewriters, Bombs, Jellyfish*, New York Review Books, 2017.
- . *Remainder*. Alma Modern Classics, 2016.
- Sarikaya-Şen, Merve. "The Construction of Vulnerability and Monstrosity in Slipstream: Tom McCarthy's *Remainder*." *Victimhood and Vulnerability in 21st Century Fiction*, edited by Jean-Michel Ganteau and Susana Onega, Routledge, 2017.
- Tally, Robert T. *Spatiality*. Routledge, 2013.
- Topinka, Robert J. "Foucault, Borges, Heterotopia: Producing Knowledge in Other Spaces." *Foucault Studies*, no. 9, 2010, pp. 54–70, <https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.voi9.3059>.
- Vermeulen, Pieter. *Contemporary Literature and the End of the Novel: Creature, Affect, Form*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- . "The Critique of Trauma and the Afterlife of the Novel in Tom McCarthy's *Remainder*." *Modern Fiction Studies*, vol. 58, no. 3, 2012, pp. 549–568. [10.1353/mfs.2012.0056](https://doi.org/10.1353/mfs.2012.0056).
- Volk, Emma. "Trauma and the Science Fiction of the Interior in Tom McCarthy's *Remainder*." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 379–389. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00111619.2022.2025756>.
- Wark, McKenzie. "Preface." In *Remainder*, Alma Modern, 2016.

M. MIRAC CEYLAN is a Research Assistant at the Department of English Language and Literature, Gaziantep University, Turkey. He earned his B.A. and M.A. degrees in the same department, and he is currently a Ph.D. candidate at Atılım University, Ankara, with a dissertation based on the fiction of Julian Barnes. His latest publication presents a reading of Barnes's *Flaubert's Parrot* as a narrative of grief. His research interests include contemporary British Fiction, trauma and space studies, irony, and the visual arts.
mmiracceylan@gantep.edu.tr