

Julian Barnes's *England, England*: A Literary Portrayal of Individual and Collective Psychosis

İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı: Bireysel ve Kolektif Psikozun Edebi Bir Portresi

Seda Arıkan

Fırat University, Turkey

Yeşim İpekçi

Middle East Technical University, Turkey

Abstract

Julian Barnes's *England, England* (1998) has been widely studied in relation to the concept of Englishness within its social, historical, political, and cultural implications regarding England of the late 20th century. As is foregrounded in this study, the novel places interwoven narratives of the individual and the national self to the centre in order to question their interrelated lack of authenticity. Focusing on the issue of authenticity from the Lacanian psychoanalytic model, this paper specifically seeks to analyse how individual and collective psychosis operate within the novel.

Keywords: Julian Barnes, *England, England*, Lacanian Psychoanalysis, Psychosis

Öz

Julian Barnes'ın *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı* (1998) romanında İngilizlik kavramı, 20. yüzyılın sonlarındaki İngiltere'ye ilişkin sosyal, tarihsel, politik ve kültürel çıkarımları ile birlikte geniş çapta çalışılmıştır. Bu çalışmada üzerinde durulan nokta ise romanın iç içe geçmiş bireysel ve milli benlikleri merkeze alarak bu benliklerin karşılıklı olarak gerçeklikten yoksun oluşlarını sorunsallaştırmasıdır. Romandaki gerçeklik sorununu Lacancı psikanalitik yöntem ile ele alan bu çalışma, bireysel ve kolektif psikozun romanda nasıl işlendiğini incelemeyi amaçlar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Julian Barnes, *İngiltere İngiltere'ye Karşı*, Lacancı Psikanaliz, Psikoz

Introduction

Julian Barnes's *England, England* opening with the authentic question of "What's your first memory?" (*EE* 3)¹ brings the importance of memory into the fore. However, the notion of memory quickly takes the reader into the realm of unconscious with the statement that "There's always a memory just behind your first memory, and you can't quite get at it" (*EE* 3). The inability to grasp the unconscious reality that is each subject's buried "*the Thing*," in Lacanian terms, leads the characters of the novel to an infinite *search* for fictional realities which is the main trope in the novel. While Barnes problematizes the

¹ Julian Barnes. *England, England*. Vintage Books, 1999.

relationship between memory and reality from the very beginning of the novel, he knits them with childhood that is the main stage of psychic development of a subject. At the opening scene of the novel, Martha's denial of her first memories stating that she *does not remember* them (EE 3) manifests clearly the subject's defence mechanism not to descend into the unconscious. Though Martha thinks it is a lie and she mistrusts "its source and its intent" (EE 3), before long the reader is introduced to her first memory that pictures her childhood listening to her mother's singing and sitting on the kitchen floor with her "Counties of England jigsaw puzzle" spread out on the matting (EE 4). Martha's lifelong search for psychic wholeness represented with her obsessive anger about the missing puzzle piece, Nottinghamshire, forgotten in the pocket of his runaway father having left her jigsaw uncompleted reflects Lacan's lacking subject. Within this context, the search of Lacan's *manqua a etre subject* – the subject that is identified with a permanent lack, in other words a lack-of-being – for wholeness initiates with Martha, who has a life-long questioning for "why Daddy had gone off" and "she had lost Nottinghamshire" (EE 5), and it diffuses into the novel via other characters. However, Barnes's main focus operates not in terms of successful psychic formations but psychologically defected subjects of the unconscious who experience individual psychosis constituting a collective one that will be the main focus of this study.

England, England, both on individual and collective levels, makes the reader familiar with the notion of psychosis engraved in the characters' lives primarily those of Sir Jack Pitman and Martha, two anti-heroes annihilating each other whenever they have the opportunity and operating as father and mother substitutes for each other within the domains of their psychic worlds. Secondly, the novel's hyperreal theme park (the replica of England) with its employees and visitors survives on the collective psychosis of people who contribute voluntarily to make this theme park named "England, England" more real than real. Taking for the main principle of psychosis that it lives not on fantasy but on "hyperreality" (Flieger 398), almost all of the characters suffer from psychosis even though they are blind to it. At that point, the novel's critical attention based on Baudrillard's theory of simulation, which reproduces the images, subjects or personas as the real and gives them precedence over the real (hyperreality), should be reconsidered in relation to the similar mechanism of the psychotic disorders. The hyperreality that is created by the simulation of England via the theme park is highly identified both by Pitman and the visitors, which puts them into the realm of psychosis. In this sense, Lacanian psychosis which operates with three main systems that are identification, foreclosure and language, going through with Lacanian three orders, would explain individual and collective psychosis in *England, England*.

In the novel, Pitman's infantile sexuality is related to his regression to the imaginary order where the self experiences an imaginary unification with the *big Other* by equating it with Englishness as a master-signifier. Identifying himself with this master-signifier to fill out his permanent lack, which Lacan insistently designates to the subject of the unconscious, Pitman creates the Theme Park – an *object petit a* both for him and the visitors. In this manner, Sir

Jack Pitman's individual psychosis is reflected on the society that submerges into the imaginary order just like him by making the Imaginary more real than the Real, in other words hyperreal. In this context, by paying attention to the production of Englishness in hyperreality – which is a psychosis in psychoanalytical terms – this paper aims to elaborate on the novel's portrayal of individual and collective psychosis induced by *foreclosure* of the master signifier.

Individual and Collective Psychosis

In Lacanian theory of the unconscious, the subject's passing through imaginary order to the symbolic is the vital step that would create I/Thou dialectic; thus, would help the "ego" to become the "subject". To Lacan, the subject should come through the imaginary order which includes the mirror stage and should step into the realm of the symbolic, or in other words the realm of the language, resulting in the experience of separation and alienation. If the subject is able to separate from *the big Other*, which is mostly the care-giver s/he identifies with in infancy, it would result in being a "subject" in spite of the experience of alienation. This is the way for the formation of the subject of the unconscious. However, in the realm of psychosis, the subject is stuck in the imaginary order with an imaginary identification: "[T]he ego is captured by an ideal image, from which it is not well differentiated. This results in confusion and suspicion" (Ribolsi, Feyaerts and Vanheule 2015). As the ongoing identification with an ideal image – let it be the care-giver or another ideal subject – precedes a welcomed separation, the ego strongly identifies with *the big Other* which disguises itself in various ideal images. In the novel, the ideal image many characters identify with is maternal both on an individual and collective level; especially in the case of Sir Jack Pitman, who is both the project-coordinator of the theme park which makes the phantasies of the visitors real and an "adult baby" performing his own phantasies at *Auntie May's*, a paid phantasy house. While Sir Pitman's obsessive identification with Englishness and England, as *the big Other* – which has been a matriarchy more than a patriarchy throughout history, the motherland² – keeps him in an illusionary world which he projects onto the theme park, his identification with the "mother image" manifesting itself at *Auntie May's* as an adult baby designates him a real psychotic. In that respect, the inability of Sir Jack, or "Baby Victor [who] took being a Baby seriously" at *Auntie May's* (EE 160), to separate himself from the imaginary order hanging on the maternal essentially results from a false identification. Suffering from adult baby syndrome, he situates himself unconsciously within the realm of the Imaginary. In accordance with his inability to get rid of the identification with the maternal image as an adult baby, he cannot separate from the idea of England and Englishness either. Sir Jack wears only "made in England" items and he "is a

² Pitman openly and persistently defines England as a "she" in his statements such as: "So England comes to me, and what do I say to her? I say, 'Listen, baby, face facts. We're in the third millennium and your tits have dropped. The solution is not a push-up bra'" (EE 38).

patriot in his private moments too," in his "deerstalker, hunter's jacket, cavalry twills, gaiters, hand-crafted doe-skin boots, and fell-walker's stave" (*EE* 43). Moreover, "the pram's hood (of Baby Victor) [which] was fringed with Union Jack bunting" at *Auntie May's*, is the obvious signifier for his colluded maternal and national identification (*EE* 158). As the founder of the theme park, his motive in this business cannot be explained only in terms of his will for economic growth. His passionate will to make "England, England" more real than real for both himself and other people can be comprehended better in terms of Lacanian theory of psychosis which is fuelled by false imaginary identifications.

Lacanian psychosis sheds light on a signifying mechanism in which *point-de-capiton* (*nodal point*), namely the central signifier constructing the meaning with temporary fixations, functions as the main signifier. The nodal point forms the meaning for the subject of the unconscious such as in the example of Englishness. Namely, Englishness functions as the nodal point of English nationalism and English nationalist discourses, and it requires identifying with the country England in the novel. As Stavrakakis emphasizes, identifying with socio-political objects is inevitable for Lacanian incomplete, lacking subjects because this socio-political object covenants to fulfil the lack in the subject ("Interview by Y. Keskin and V. Çelebi" 743).³ In this identification mechanism that requires nodal points of signification, the place of *jouissance* is also vital. The ideal object that is identified with gives the subject a pledge of an imaginary opportunity to follow *jouissance*. Thus, the discourses on Englishness and England capture the *manque a être* subjects who have the illusion to get *jouissance* by identifying with those semiotic nodal points. As the semi-anti-hero of the novel searching for *jouissance* by identifying with England as a semiotic nodal point, Sir Jack tells the consultant Jerry, "I bow to no-one in my love of this country. It's a question of placing the product correctly, that's all" (*EE* 41), which discloses his desire to build on this nodal point by maximizing a collective identification with it. Bentley, pointing out the construction of Englishness as an *imagined community*,⁴ focuses on "imaginative representations of the nation" (485) by which Englishness is constructed. To Bentley, Englishness and England do not exist in reality but in "fantasy space," "an imaginary body onto which individuals can project their desires of wholeness, completeness and belonging; a space that *momentarily* [emphasize added] removes the lack with which individuals are burdened by their move into the symbolic world of adulthood" (486). In this sense, all of the subjects in the theme park – the employers, employees and visitors, in other

³ This interview with Stavrakakis was conducted by Y. Keskin and V. Çelebi in English. However, the English version could not be accessed. The references to this work have been taken from the Turkish version of the interview and translated into English by the article writers.

⁴ "Imagined Community" is a concept theorized by Benedict Anderson in his seminal work *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (1983). While Anderson does not build his concept on the Lacanian Imaginary order, Bentley reformulates it in relation to the Lacanian Imaginary.

words actors and spectators – become the actants of a false identification experiencing Lacanian imaginary order (fantasy space) which operates with established nodal points in the semiotic chain and within the search for *jouissance* or desire of wholeness, all of which support their psychosis.

As *jouissance* (and wholeness) is an ideal that is pursued but not achieved, the participants of the theme park revolve around desire and pleasure temporarily satisfied with *objet petit a's*. In the novel, not only Sir Jack and Martha but also the other subjects who follow the idea of “England, England” as a replica are explicitly the followers of *jouissance*. The satisfaction that is achieved with the idea of replica rather than the authentic is explained in the novel being “like the discovery that masturbation with pornographic material is more fun than sex” (EE 55). Thus, their desire turns around the *jouissance* within this theme park though this fun does not present a total satisfaction. This idea is supported by the ongoing novelties continuously added to the theme park. At the beginning of the novel, the narrator states that “you know what children are like with jigsaws, they just pick up any old piece and try to force it into a hole” (EE 4). This expression is interpreted by Peter Childs by taking the jigsaw as a metonym in Part Two of the book, in which the pieces of England are assembled and forced into place to provide a potted toytown version of the country” (110). In this sense, just like the toys (the replicas of the real world) in childhood, this “toytown version of the country” (the replica of England) functions as a pleasure-giver, or more precisely *jouissance*-promiser, for the adult-children of the novel.

This imaginary-hyperreality and the imaginary *jouissance* it proposes is apparent in the relationship between Paul and Martha as well as among the theme park visitors. Their relationship is mostly hyperreal as they search for unattainable *jouissance*; their “words, gestures, ideas, are largely mimicry” as much as their sexuality is constructed “out of replicas and imitations” in John Carey’s words (qtd. in Guignery, *The Fiction* 113). To further elaborate on this point, Guignery’s following comment is noteworthy:

Paul discovered ‘girls in magazines’ (p. 98) and, rather than having sex with real girls, found it ‘much easier to be alone with magazine women’ (p. 99). Martha, while making love, prefers concentrating on her dream of an ideal man to thinking of her real partner: ‘The reality of that dream. Another might be there and helping, his own contingent presence adding to a supposedly shared reality. But you detached yourself from his reality’ (p. 50). (*The Fiction* 113)

In this sense, the function of “England, England” to promise *jouissance* for the visitors resembles to the function of the toys in childhood as well sexuality in adult life. The problematic point is that neither of those replicas could ensure *jouissance* for the subjects according to Lacanian theory.

At that point, the main question comes from the novel itself. While the necessity and the validity of the theme park is discussed among the project members, they try to answer why the replica is preferred to the real by asking

“Why does it give us the greater *frisson*?” (EE 56) Though Barnes uses the word, “*frisson*” by italicizing, it is not hard to replace it with *jouissance* when the context is reconsidered. In this context, the French intellectual answers this question with a totally Lacanian tone as follows: “We must demand the replica, since the reality, the truth, the authenticity of the replica is the one we can possess, colonize, reorder, find *jouissance* in, and finally, if and when we decide, it is the reality which, since it is our destiny, we may meet, confront, and destroy” (EE 57). In this regard, Barnes clearly gets closer to a Lacanian reading of imaginary and real orders, signifying the Real with the authentic and the Imaginary with the replica with which they aim to “offer far more than words such as Entertainment can possibly imply; even the phrase Quality Leisure [...] falls short” as they are “offering *the thing itself. Der Ding an sich*” (EE 61). In this respect, the French intellectual or the implied author, the voice behind the following passage, designates the Lacanian *manque à être* subject as lacking and insecure but still looking for *jouissance*:

To understand this, we must understand and confront our insecurity, our existential indecision, the profound atavistic fear we experience when we are face to face with the original. We have nowhere to hide when we are presented with an alternative reality to our own, a reality which appears more powerful and therefore threatens us. (EE 56)

The French intellectual focuses on how “existential indecision” leads the subjects to search for alternative realities when a more powerful one is faced. That is the mechanism of psychosis which constructs a hyperreality by rejecting the existing one. The psychotic subject who is defined with her/his own hyperreality is embodied within the characters of the theme park visitors as well as its founder Jack Pitman. In this sense, they want to destroy reality by identifying with an imaginary reality, “out of existential terror and the human instinct for self-preservation” (EE 56). Thus, trapped in the Imaginary, in Lacanian mirror stage, the “psychotic characters” in the novel identify with the reflection of England, which is constructed as “England, England”. This theme park with its fictional characters, spaces, and even narrations becomes the hyperreality of the visitors who disregard England as real.

However, “England, England” is a pseudo reflection of England in which the collective subject tries to identify with and form its lost wholeness. It is stated in the novel that “the number of visitor minutes spent in front of the replica exceeds by any manner of calculation the number of visitor minutes spent in front of the original” (EE 55). On the psychoanalytical level, the visitors try to identify with the replica in the imaginary order. However, in Lacanian theory, it is a futile effort because any identification in the imaginary order would involve the subject in psychosis. As it is revealed in the novel, the ideal England and Englishness is nowhere; not in “England,” or in “England, England,” or even in “Anglia”. The psychosis starts when the team presents “England, England” as “the thing in itself,” *das Ding* or Lacanian Real, since the Real is not possible to be signified and symbolized. When they try to signify Englishness within fifty quintessences, – none of which fully evokes the wholeness of Englishness

(Bentley 486) – by limiting it into the signifying chain, they create their own Englishness, not the Real one. Moreover, there is not such a thing as “real” Englishness because any symbolic representation is not possible to grasp the Real in Lacanian theory. That’s why, identification with the created image of Englishness as self-sufficient “the thing in itself” results in individual and collective psychosis in the novel.

Foreclosure and Individual Psychosis

Whilst false identification with an ideal image operates in the imaginary order, it works with the mechanism of *foreclosure* in Lacanian psychoanalytical theory. Lacan rereads Freud putting the Freudian term *Verwerfung* into the centre of psychosis – firstly in his 1955-1956 seminar *The Psychoses* – and he states that he takes “*Verwerfung* to be ‘foreclosure’ of the signifier” (465). As a different mechanism from repression, which is accepted as the main core in neurosis, Lacan designates *Verwerfung* as “the defect that gives psychosis its essential condition” (479) – when something is not accepted in the symbolic order and rejected unconsciously. While repression tries to keep an image, a memory, a signifier, or thought within the realm of unconscious, foreclosure attempts to put it out of the unconscious; thus, it rejects symbolization strictly and results inevitably in psychosis (Bowie 106). Foreclosure, to Lacan, is a function of the unconscious, different from repression. In that respect, *the Thing* that resists being symbolized and leaving a hole in the unconscious is the main determiner of psychosis. As the authentic signifier is foreclosed, the subject of the unconscious cannot step into the symbolic order and faces the unbearable burden of the Real; thus, s/he prefers to create her/his own reality in the imaginary order. This is the mechanism that results in creating hyperrealities going through with individual and collective psychosis in the novel. While Sir Jack Pitman moves on as an adult baby creating his own reality and keeping the master signifier out of his unconscious, the icon he creates operates not in symbolic but in a hyperreal imaginary order for the other characters.

Lacan defines the master signifier that is foreclosed from the symbolic order as the Name-of-the-Father. Namely, the exclusion of the symbolic father captures the subject in the imaginary order where identification with the mother image is inevitable. As the paternal signifier is foreclosed, the subject is attached to the Imaginary with an image of the Real. In that situation, when identification with the mother image does not permit the subject the opportunity for a healing separation (even though it creates alienation), the Borromean knot which unifies the Imaginary, the Symbolic, and the Real (all create a consequential symbolization process) is undone and the subject suffers from psychosis. On the individual level, Sir Jack pretending to be a baby at *Auntie May’s* house clearly forecloses the master signifier, the Name-of-the-Father. In Lacanian theory, the lack of the Name-of-the-Father shows itself in proposing the body in terms of imaginary corporeality. By creating his own real, which is not real in itself but rather imaginary, Sir Jack gets pleasure propounding his

body infantilised by the nurses who function as substitute mothers. Under the pram surrounded with the flag of England, "Baby Victor was a true Baby" (*EE* 162) putting a diaper on, enjoying being breastfed and pooping. The impossibility of achieving Lacanian Real is parallel to the impossibility of achieving *jouissance*. That's why the hyperreal world of *Auntie May's* service where *jouissance* is followed but not fully grasped gives the opportunity to Sir Jack to disclose his individual psychosis. Sir Jack, an actor of paraphilic infantilism, who is unable to adapt to the rules of the symbolic cannot exchange his maternal commitment and desire with the Name-of-the-Father; thus, he remains foreclosed in the novel both literally and symbolically.

Throughout the novel, the reader is not given any clue about the parental background of Sir Jack Pitman. After he returns as the governor of the island following Martha's withdrawal, Houses of Parliament "creates him first Baron Pitman of Fortuibus" and Dr Max elaborates "a plausible family tree for the new baron whose mansion beg[ins] to rival Buckingham Palace in both splendour and Visitor throughput" (*EE* 256-257). The fictional family tree and the title of *Baron* bestowed upon Pitman are clear attempts to place him into the symbolic order by establishing a bond with the Name-of-the-Father. However, this attempt is fallacious as his title and family background are not inherited but fictionally created, just like everything in the theme park, and Sir Pitman cannot embrace it. To Lacan, when the subject is unable to embrace the Name-of-the-Father, the psychosis going through hallucinations and/or delusions appears as a result of the clash between the subject and the master signifier, namely the Name-of-the-father. In the case of Sir Pitman, after taking the title, his delusion continues within the realm of the theme park where he organizes his own pseudo funeral testifying the reader to his psychosis once again. The foreclosed Name-of-the-Father shows itself in Sir Pitman's struggle to find a name for himself. Thus, "bestowing upon Sir Jack Pitman the title of Island Governor" makes his position "purely honorific, even if technically endowed with the residual authority" (*EE* 176). In the case of the subject's inability to accept the Name-of-the-Father psychologically, the subject tries to create her/his own name with extraordinary achievements. "Creating a name for oneself has a narcissistic and grandiose dimension" (Ver Eecke 86), and Sir Pitman's lifelong effort to entitle himself is a kind of reflection of that motive.

Not only Sir Jack but also Martha clearly shows the symptoms of foreclosing the father signifier and living with a hole, "a pure and simple hole" (Lacan 465), which she can never compensate. In the case of Sir Jack and Martha, both literally and symbolically the Name-of-the-Father is non-existent. Whilst Martha's childhood memoirs take the reader to her unconscious, it is openly stated that "Damage is a normal part of childhood" (*EE* 24). Her damage, the ambivalent feelings towards her father, shows itself in terms of her feeling of hatred projected to herself – she thinks "she was the cause of her father's disappearance and her mother's misery" (*EE* 15) – as well as projected to her father having left them. When Martha is over twenty-five, she meets her father, whose name appears to be Phil having made his second marriage and got a son. In this meeting, Martha's focus is on the missing part of the jigsaw and she says

to her father he took Nottinghamshire with him when he left (*EE* 26). However, to her surprise, Phil does not even remember that Martha was doing jigsaws when she was a kid. Frustrated with her father's ignorance, Martha realizes 'his inexistence' in her life which is represented with the missing part and which has created the feeling of "lack" for Martha. Thus, her blame on the father survives on his inability to remember the missing part of the jigsaw: "She was over twenty-five, and she would go on getting older than twenty-five, older and older and older than twenty-five, and she would be on her own; but she would always blame him for that" (*EE* 26). At that point, while the wholeness of her jigsaw represents her own hypothetic wholeness, the missing part represents the "pure and simple" Lacanian hole in the unconscious. In this sense, Martha's many attempts should be evaluated in terms of her being a lacking subject as she cannot place the Name-of-the-Father in the symbolic order.

In "A BRIEF HISTORY of sexuality in the case of Martha Cochrane," the sixth entry states "Pursuit of the Ideal" (*EE* 50-51), which sounds mostly Lacanian. This entry proposes "[t]he assumption that completeness was possible, desirable, essential – and attainable only in the presence and with the assistance of Another" (*EE* 51). This "Another" is the Lacanian *big Other* that sets up the symbolic chain. However, the absence of the *big Other* puts Martha in an infinite search for the master signifier that is the Name-of-the-Father again. Her motive for her ambitious rise to take the place of Sir Jack by becoming the CEO and governing the working of the Island is defined as parricide's guilt by Paul in the novel (*EE* 209). After taking his place, Sir Jack is only "allowed his uniform, his title, and certain ritual appearances. That was enough in her view" (*EE* 196). Martha is clearly punishing Jack, "a substitute for a lost father" (*EE* 92), and unconsciously her own father whom she cannot place in the symbolic order. Throughout the novel she is designated with a lack, something missing which places her as Lacanian *manque à être* subject "seeking happiness as best she could" without understanding why it did not come (*EE* 198). However, the missing part, the Lacanian hole, the Name-of-the-Father, or the foreclosed ring in the signifying chain is manifested at the end of the novel. Martha, at last, confesses herself that there is "an old man" she fell in love with: "I won't tell you his name, you'd laugh. It's ridiculous in a way, but no more ridiculous than some of the men I've tried to love. The problem is, you see, that he doesn't exist. Or he did, but he died a couple of centuries ago" (*EE* 227). Her ambiguous statements about the unnamed "he" shows Martha's struggle to place the Name-of-the-Father in the symbolic order; thus, her inability to found a well-balanced psychic operation.

Foreclosure and Collective Psychosis

While Sir Pitman's and Martha's psychic attitudes on the individual level work with the mechanism of foreclosure, in a similar way, on the collective level the identification with England as the maternal substitute captures the characters in the borders of the "imaginary" which is ascribed to the Island Project by

many critics⁵ of the novel such as Patrick Parrinder, Richard Eder, and Valentine Cunningham. In this “imaginary world,” without adapting to the rules of the symbolic, in other words to the Name-of-the-Father, the characters foreclose the legislator and authoritative signifier. In Lacanian psychoanalysis, the Name-of-the-Father represents all agents that castrate the desire of the child for the maternal (Bowie 107). This figurative mother shows itself as England, and Englishness promises people a pleasure undisturbed by the Name-of-the-Father. In this sense, although the collective psychosis of actors and spectators of the island seems like operating in “a pure market state,” (*EE* 187) which is “destabilized [...] by the shifting sands of the neoliberal market” (Nitsch 47), the unconscious mechanism lying underneath is *desire*, mostly, the desire for the mother signifier; in other words, desiring the unlimited pleasure which is not put aside by the Name-of-the-Father.

The novel ascertains this fact, the motive behind the people’s attachment, first to England then to the Island as a replica, with the following statement by Richard Poborsky, the so-called analyst for the United Bank of Switzerland in the novel, who explains why all those Hippie communes were not successful as they failed to understand two things; first human nature, second how the market works: “What’s happening on the Island is a recognition that man is a market-driven animal, that he swims in the market like a fish in the sea” (*EE* 188). This market-driven animal should be conceived as desire-driven at the same time. Stavrakakis, who comments on the relationship of *jouissance* with politics and globalized consumerism, states that the superego “can control us better not by forbidding but by conditioning and channeling our desire, by commanding our enjoyment” (“Psychoanalysis and Politics” 24). In this sense, the desire of the theme park visitors is challenged with a commandment of enjoyment that is supported with *object petit a*’s. Jerry, who is aware of the mechanism behind consumerism, explains to Pitman enthusiastically how their clients will be driven to the theme park with England’s national *object petit a*’s:

‘You – we – England – my client – is – are – a nation of great age, great history, great accumulated wisdom. Social and cultural history – stacks of it, reams of it – eminently marketable, never more so than in the current climate. Shakespeare, Queen Victoria, Industrial Revolution, gardening, that sort of thing. If I may coin, no, copyright, a phrase, *We are already what others may hope to become*. [...] this is [...] our product placement. [...] We must sell our past to other nations as their future!’ (*EE* 41)

Stavrakakis, in “Symbolic Authority, Fantasmatic Enjoyment and the Spirits of Capitalism” explains that the reliance on consumerism of late capitalism is not only related to economics, and it cannot be separated from desire since unconscious symptomatic *jouissance* is behind the collective behaviours of a society:

⁵ For further reference to the critics, see Guignery, *The Fiction* 108.

In late capitalist consumer society this is how a symbolic command and a fantasy regulating/manipulating the pursuit of our lacking enjoyment [jouissance] attempt to construct us as social subjects, a process revealing – once more – the extricable dialectic between symbolic authority and fantasmatic enjoyment [jouissance]. (76-77)

In this sense, the capitalist authority that uses Englishness as a tool for desire and enjoyment proposes a permanent *jouissance* for the visitors, which is not possible; and thus, leads them into psychosis. As is seen, the human nature as a desiring machine works not only in terms of Sir Pitman's adult baby syndrome, but also on the collective level, in relation to the people trying to consume England and Englishness following their appetite for a hypothetic *jouissance* by using *objet petit a's* and annihilating any limit and law.

Based on the idea that Lacan relates psychosis to the full dependence on the maternal, the collective psychosis in the novel shows itself as a full dependence on England and Englishness negating the father signifier which “prohibits, forbids, thwarts, and protects” (Fink 80). In this respect, Sir Jack Pitman's status in “England, England,” upon whom the parliament bestows the title of Island Governor at the beginning of its foundation and makes it stronger with the title of “first Baron Pitman of Fortuibus” later on, works on imaginary level and designates him as an *imaginary father signifier*. He is not only “endowed with the residual authority [...] to suspend Parliament and the constitution in case of national emergency and rule in his own person” (EE 176), but also, following his death a new Pitman is found to substitute for him. It is not surprising that “[t]he replacement Sir Jack swiftly became a popular figure: descending from his landau to plunge into the crowds, lecturing on the history of the Island, and showing key leisure-industry executives round his mansion” (EE 258). In this sense, the replica of Pitman who “was as good as new” (EE 258) appears as another *imaginary father signifier*, and to most people he gives “dubious taste to smile at a man in the morning and attend his grave in the afternoon” (EE 258). While the visitors spend time with the replica of Sir Jack in the morning, they come “to pay their homage at the mausoleum, to read [original] Sir Jack's wall-wisdom, and depart thoughtfully [...] to tour the Pitman mansion at the end of the Mall” in the afternoon (EE 258). It is clear, the attachment to the father signifier who establishes itself not as symbolic but as imaginary fortifies the collective psychosis. Based on “the foreclosure of the Name-of-the-Father in the place of the Other” (Lacan 479); in particular, the subject (Sir Pitman and Martha) is taken out of symbolic chain by placing the father signifier in the Imaginary; and in general, the subjects (the theme park visitors) are trapped in their hyperreal worlds.

In Lacanian theory, related to the imaginary or hyperreal status of psychosis supported with foreclosure of the master signifier, the absence of the metaphorization mechanism should be considered as well. Whilst Lacan mostly focuses on the importance of the symbolic after 1950s, he supports the idea that the subject of the unconscious is formed by language and especially by metaphorization. In his seminar on psychosis, Lacan relates psychosis to

“the lack of the metaphoric effect” (465-466). Similar to Freud’s idea that psychosis takes literal what is figurative – thus metaphorization is left out, Lacan places psychosis in the context of disorder of the symbolic which preferably requires a semiotic order (Ribolsi, Feyaerts and Vanheule 2015). Especially the collective psychosis in the novel operates with that kind of semiotic disorder. First of all, Englishness is accepted not as a metaphor or symbolization, but as Real, *the thing in itself* by the collective. While the duplication of the word of England in the name of the Isle tries to announce the victory of “England, England” over “England,” it tries to place itself into the realm of the Real order, which is a hypothetical achievement in Lacanian theory. The Isle of Wight, “[t]he little cutie. The little beauty. [...] A pure diamond. Little jewel” (*EE* 64) is expected to create an illusion, and all of the things related to England are presented as much more real than the real to strengthen this illusion. It is claimed that “after you’ve visited [them], you don’t need to see Old England” (*EE* 184).

It is apparent that the fuelling mechanism behind the theme park is mostly based on psychotic delusions and hallucinations as the subjects cannot make a distinction between the symbolic and the real. Since no symbolic acknowledgement is adopted, the non-literal meaning of metaphoric discourse escapes in the signifying chain. In Lacanian theory of psychosis, “the understanding of metaphor requires the ability to symbolize, i.e., to use and understand figurative speech” (Ribolsi, Feyaerts and Vanheule 2015). However, the attitude of the employees and spectators in the novel works in opposition to metaphorization. Whilst the visitors pursue to take pleasure from the hyperreality of “England, England,” the employees start to “over-identify with the characters they were engaged to represent” (*EE* 256), which blurs the borders between identification and representation:

Groups of threshers and shepherds – and even some lobstermen – became increasingly reluctant to use company accommodation. They said they preferred to sleep in their tumbledown cottages, despite the absence of modern facilities available at the converted prisons. Some were even asking to be paid in Island currency, having apparently grown attached to the heavy copper coins they played with all day. [...] ‘Johnnie’ Johnson and his Battle of Britain squadron more problematic. They claimed that since the Tannoy might honk at any moment and the cry of ‘Scramble!’ go up, it made sense for them to bunk down in Nissen huts beside the runway. (*EE* 203)

The chaotic atmosphere clearly announces itself in which the smugglers start smuggling, threshers and shepherds want to have “the real” life of “the real” threshers and shepherds, Robin Hood and his gang steal in rebellion, the troop of the Battle of Britain is prepared for any attack, the actor playing Dr Johnson changes his original name to Samuel Johnson. Not surprisingly, the result of this hyperreality had been predicted long before in the novel by “the pseudonymous author of Nature Notes,” who states,

R–eality is r–ather like a r–abbit [...]. The great public – our distant, happily distant paymasters – want reality to be like a pet bunny. They want it to lollop along and thump its foot picturesquely in its home-made hutch and eat lettuce out of their hand. If you gave them the real thing, something wild that bit, and, if you’ll pardon me, shat, they wouldn’t know what to do with it. Except strangle it and cook it. (*EE* 136)

In this respect, the employees do not know what to do with this hyperreality and they live in a kind of psychosis which does not refer to the loss of reality but to the acceptance of their made-up story much more Real than reality. At that point, their delusion springs from the inability to accept their must-be symbolic status.

In Lacanian psychosis, as Jirgens states, when the Borromean knot unifying the Real, the Symbolic and the Imaginary unwinds, the psychotic is captured by the language (34). Unable to place itself in the symbolization, the psychotic subject embraces language and representation in literal meaning such as in the example of the collective psychosis of the employees in the theme park who accept their fictional roles, names, and titles literally. Žižek explains the defect of symbolization mechanism in psychosis with the metaphor of aquarium:

It would be difficult to invent a better metaphor for psychosis: in contrast to the “normal” state of things in which the real is a lack, a hole in the midst of the symbolic order (like the central black spot in Rothko’s paintings), we have here the “aquarium” of the real surrounding isolated islands of the symbolic. (40)

In this sense, the aquarium of the real corresponds to each individual’s delusion that reality could be created by her/his own reality. However, the operating mechanism is totally imaginary because “paternal metaphor fails to function and the structure of language (allowing for the possibility of metaphorical substitution) is not assimilated” in psychosis (Fink 94).

Towards the Consensus

Julian Barnes’s *England, England*, from the beginning to the end, problematizes the place of the subject in a symbolical chain just like the Lacanian subject of the unconscious who is expected to construct herself/himself within the presence of the other – in Lacanian terms “the locus from which the question of his [the subject’s] existence may arise” (Lacan 459). In that sense, to make a bond with the other on the symbolic level, not to get stuck in the Imaginary, and not to establish her/his own imaginary reality as the Real are crucial; and the opposite of those tendencies would inevitably place the subject in psychosis. In psychosis, when reality is foreclosed and the position of the symbolic other crushes, it is not possible to talk about a real subject. At the end of the novel, the significant place of the symbolic other is apprehended by Martha, contrary to Sir Jack, and her coming of age is given in a kind of epiphany. Her statement that “you were finally no more than what *others*

[emphasis added] saw you as. That was your nature, whether you liked it or not" (*EE* 268) sounds mostly Lacanian in terms of the subject's formation within the discourse of the other. Thus, the novel clearly gives the idea that, not only the royal family that is defined to be what others decide and whose "existential reality" depends on the whole mythmaking (*EE* 222), but also each subject is constructed by the existence of the other. Acknowledging that Martha, no more running after Lacanian *objet petit a*'s, such as "career, money, sex, heart-trouble, appearance, anxiety, fear, yearning" (*EE* 270), takes a step toward a new spirit that "should divide itself, between the entirely local and the nearly eternal" (*EE* 270), in her own words at the end of the novel.

This new spirit is parallel to Old England's declaration of its "separateness from the rest of the globe and from the Third Millennium by changing its name to Anglia" (*EE* 262). It is like a new beginning because "[a]ll the inhabitants of Anglia have changed their names, professions and location in an attempt to start anew" (Guignery, *The Fiction* 113) in a society which has an interaction among its members. In that sense, Martha and some other residents of the village Fête perceive that the reality of the subject depends on the presence of *the other*. Towards the end, it is mentioned as follows: "Some said you were real only if someone had seen you; some that you were real only if you were in a book; some that you were real if enough people believed in you. Opinions were offered at length, fuelled by scrumpy and ignorant certainty" (*EE* 273). One certain thing is that all of those opinions require the testimony of the other even though it is in vision, in discourse, or in belief. Martha's descent into her unconscious realizing that she has always kept in her unconscious the existence of the other, the unnamed *big Other*, brings her to an ascent which is symbolized with her climbing to Gibbet Hill "with a patience discovered late in life" (*EE* 267).

In contrast to the ongoing psychosis of "England, England," Anglia is pictured within a subjectification process when it abandons its "long-agreed goals," "economic growth, political influence, military capacity, and moral superiority" (*EE* 261). England's stripping away its imaginary representation as "England, England," and becoming Anglia – or at least its intention to do it – reflects the Lacanian subject which experiences the separation from the imaginary order at the cost of alienation. The end of the book, which is claimed by Miracky to be "positioned somewhere between homage and parody of the dominance of the 'hyperreal'" (qtd. in Guignery, *The Fiction* 112), negates both England and "England, England" but still does not propose Anglia as the absolute victor or the Real. Nünning affirms that Anglia is not "an idealized version of authentic rural Englishness" (70); however, it is not an imaginary world – like "England, England" – either. At the end of the novel, Barnes's staging another "fake" and "bogus village" – in his own words (Guignery, "History in Question(s)" 63), which he calls Anglia, is mostly equivalent to Lacan's claim that neither the Imaginary nor the Real could be permanent orders for the subject. As the imaginary order is the domain of psychosis and the Real is hypothetical as well as unattainable, the safest order is the Symbolic. Thus, Anglia – as a symbolic space – is neither Real nor Imaginary, but mostly Symbolic. While the new

residents of this symbolic space including Martha are not attached to the Imaginary like the visitors of “England, England,” it does not mean that their search for *jouissance* is surrendered; contrarily, what is proposed is to go after the Real with a certain awareness of its non-existent ontology. In this way, the trap of the Imaginary would be avoided by the subject, and by the residents of Anglia.

Martha’s limited epiphany at the end, her new understanding about life that “happiness was dependent upon your nature,” that “the problem was to find out what your nature is,” that “searching for happiness was a lower form of salvation,” and that “she had made so little progress towards even the lowest form of salvation” (*EE* 233) is much more understandable when we put *jouissance* in the place of *happiness*; the two concepts to explain what human beings search for according to Lacan and Freud, respectively. Human beings search for *jouissance*, but there is no such thing as a complete or ideal subject endowed with archaic *jouissance*. In this respect, the people establishing Anglia realize the incapacity and the impossibility of being an ideal country and nation, as well as an ideal subject. While the replica is a futile attempt to substitute for the Real/ideal, and people supporting it are experiencing psychosis, Anglia is a representative of the consensus between the Imaginary and the Real where people, at least, attempt to move themselves away from the earlier collective psychosis. It is stated that “[t]he village was neither idyllic nor dystopic. There were no outstanding idiots, despite the best mimicry of Jez Harris. If there was stupidity, as *The Times of London* insisted, then it was of the old kind, based on ignorance, rather than the new, based on knowledge” (*EE* 265).

Julian Barnes defines Anglia as “fabulation all over again – convincing ourselves of a coherence between things that are largely true and things that are wholly imagined” (Guignery, “History in Question(s)” 63), namely the domain of the Symbolic. This is the point where the Lacanian subject has to stand throughout her/his life, at the point where the Imaginary, the Symbolic and the Real intersect, realizing its lack but still struggling for ideal or *jouissance*.

At that point, Lacan’s concept of the *sinthome*, which he introduces after his revision of the three orders and his inclusion of it as the fourth ring to the triple Borromean Knot, is similar to the function of Anglia when its status is considered at the end of the novel. Lacan designates the *sinthome* as the fourth ring that ties the three orders which constitute the psychic knot but constantly hang by a thread of being untied. The function of *sinthome* is to allow the subject, a psychotic, “to cohere,” “to live”: When the subject loses touch with reality or regresses to the Imaginary, *sinthome* offers a coping mechanism, “a supplementary cord” (Evans 191-192). In this sense, though it is still not the Real, Anglia functions as the *sinthome* of people who are aware of the imaginary status of “England, England”. Those people realizing that neither national nor religious identity could propose the feeling of an absolute wholeness still constitute a new society including a “religious” entity. “But

when they came to church on Sunday it was more from a need for regular society and a taste for tuneful hymns than in order to receive spiritual advice and the promise of eternal life from the pulpit" (*EE* 271). In this respect, Anglia is the *sinthome* of this society; namely, it is a solution – though temporary – which ties all of the other rings of the psychic structure together. Anglia is a way to construct a temporary social structure with *the other* for the subject of the unconscious who knows the search for *jouissance* is an endless process. In this sense, Barnes's call reminds the call for the Lacanian subject: Search for your *jouissance*, but do not think you will attain it; follow the ideal, but do not fall into the hole of the Imaginary; beware that "Once a psychotic, always a psychotic" (Fink 82).

Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso, 1983.
- Barnes, Julian. *England, England*. Vintage Books, 1999.
- Bentley, Nick. "Re-writing Englishness: Imagining the Nation in Julian Barnes's *England, England* and Zadie Smith's *White Teeth*." *Textual Practice*, vol. 21, no. 3, 2007, pp. 483-504.
- Bowie, Malcolm. *Lacan*. Dost Bookstore Publishing, 1997.
- Childs, Peter. *Julian Barnes*. Manchester University Press, 2011.
- Evans, Dylan. *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. Routledge, 1996.
- Fink, Bruce. *A Clinical Introduction to Lacanian Psychoanalysis-Theory and Technique*. Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Flieger, Jerry Aline. "Is Oedipus on-line?" *Jacques Lacan: Critical Evaluations in Cultural Theory, Vol III: Society, Politics, Ideology*, edited by Slavoj Žižek. Routledge, 2003, pp. 394-402.
- Guignery, Vanessa. "'History in Question(s)': An Interview with Julian Barnes," *Conversations with Julian Barnes*, edited by Vanessa Guignery and Ryan Roberts. University Press of Mississippi, 2009.
- . *The Fiction of Julian Barnes*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Jirgens, Karl Edward, "Jacques (Marie Emile) Lacan," *Dictionary of Literary Biography: 20th Century European Cultural Theorists*, eds. Matthew J. Bruccoli, Richard Layman, and Paul Hansom. Gale, 2004.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*. Translated by Bruce Fink, W. W. Norton & Company, 2006.
- Nitsch, Judi. "Like Nowhere Else: Tourism and the Remaking of Place in Julian Barnes' *England, England*." *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, vol. 48, no. 1, 2015, pp. 45-65.
- Nünning, Vera. "The Invention of Cultural Traditions: The Construction and Deconstruction of Englishness and Authenticity in Julian Barnes' *England, England*." *Anglia* vol. 119, no. 1, 2001. pp. 58-76.
- Ribolsi, Michele, Jasper Feyaerts and Stijn Vanheule. "Metaphor in Psychosis: On the Possible Convergence of Lacanian Theory and Neuro-Scientific Research." *Front Psychol*, vol. 6, no. 664, e-collection 2015, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00664, Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4452801/>
- Stavrakakis, Yannis. "An Interview with Yannis Stavrakakis by Yeşim Keskin and Volkan Çelebi." *MonoKL Lacan Special Issue*, vol. VI-VII, 2009, pp. 742-748.

- . "Symbolic Authority, Fantasmatic Enjoyment and the Spirits of Capitalism: Genealogies of Mutual Enjoyment," *Lacan and Organization*, eds. Carl Cederström and Casper Hoedemaekers, MayFly Books, 2010, pp. 59-100.
- . "Psychoanalysis and Politics: An interview to Yannis Stavrakakis by Felice Cimatti and Fabrizio Palombi." *L'inconscio. Rivista Italiana di Filosofia e Psicoanalisi*, N. 2, L'inconscio politico, 2016, pp. 21-29.
- Ver Eecke, Wilfried. *Breaking through Schizophrenia: Lacan and Hegel for Talk Therapy*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2019.
- Žižek, Slavoj. *Looking Awry: An Introduction to Jacques Lacan Through Popular Culture*. MIT Press, 1991.