

In search of the 'Divine' in the 'Details' of Contemporary Art of Narration

Shahab Yar Khan

University of Sarajevo - Faculty of Philosophy

Abstract

Literature and life are interconnected realms of existence. These reflect in creating our perceptions of everyday reality. Understanding everyday reality involves a complex nexus of socio-cultural forces. Writers of these narratives always demonstrate certain personal commitments and at the same time certain amount of autonomy from commitments for their readers to enjoy multifaceted nature of 'truth'. Work of art "is a filtered commodity" as it is characterized by the personal bias and prejudices of the artist. Writers of our age of information have a tendency to induce within a narrative element of pictorial details which result out of calculated surveys and organized scientific research. Writers' scientific insight in to scientific atheism has given new dimensions to fiction and criticism in our age which need to be contrasted with traditional view of God as the first principle of diversity to understand the evolution of contemporary fiction. As a result of various perceptions evolving around a work of art more scientific means of evaluation are needed by the researchers; the scientific data, however, can be extremely misleading as well. Cognitive representations and strategies to circumvent 'the combinatorial explosion' lead to discourses in psychological understanding of fiction. There are

psychological constraints on the process of constructing mental micro-worlds. Literary images as a result may appear diametrically opposite to the dominant understanding of the mainstream academia but at the same time possibilities of collaborative scientific understanding of literature also appear. It seems that in the world of literary studies in future the empirical descriptions and explanations of psychological and sociological process will be unavoidable.

Key words: modern narratives, occupational category, pictorial details, New Atheism, Scientific Atheism, Richard Dawkins, Lawrence Krauss, Martin Amis, Evan McEwans, God as first principal of Diversity, Ibn Arabi, new *mythos*, William Chittick, Imaginal worlds, King Lear and Story of Albion, invisibility element.

Literature and life are interconnected realms of existence. These simultaneously deal with the concepts of our internal and external systems of correlations with the universe, the validity that our social systems acquire in historical processes but most of all these reflect in our perceptions of what we call in simple words, everyday reality. The details of the narratives in understanding everyday reality involve a complex nexus of socio-cultural forces. Writers of these narratives always demonstrate certain personal commitments and at the same time certain amount of autonomy from commitments for their readers to enjoy multifaceted nature of 'truth'. In our age, such narratives fall under the occupational category. Writing has become a serious profession but unlike other professions, the writer is both the chief and the subordinate at work. Writers will their profession to be taken seriously by those who do not approach literature as profession, the reader. The levels of commitments, therefore, fluctuate.

On one end, where writers stand, approach can be devotional, scientific, personal, or political towards a subject-matter but on the other end where the readers stand, the approach is mainly dominated by the sense of thrill and entertainment. The reciprocity is an issue in this profession as the concrete bond does not exist like it does in other professions. Architects, doctors of medicine, lawyers etc. have different value of reciprocity than that of the writers'. This very weak bond between the "producer and the client of literature", is further challenged

when writers takesuch stances in their works which audiences might find offensive or threatening to their values of life. A work of art, after all, “is a filtered commodity” as it is characterized by the personal bias and prejudices of the artist.

Writers of our age have a tendency to induce within a narrative element of pictorial details which result out of calculated surveys and organized scientific research. In his celebrated work, *Saturday* for instance, Ian McEwan introduces details related to surgery and the study of brain which lead us to believe that this is professional talk by an expert of medicine rather than a man of letters. Though the age of information is a culprit for this unprecedented use of details but, to be honest, writers of fiction have always used these devices to bring objectivity into their works. It is, however, their own particular bend of mind that leads the creative impulse during the process of artistic experience. No writer wants to be known as monotonous. Creative process urges novelty. With many writers of great caliber diverse thematic issues appear. Diversity element sometimes appears to be even self-contradictory but the writers rather opt for this principle than a systematic bearing of their trademark features. The principle of diversity is a cosmic principle. From Aristotle's poetics to our times, a writer's task has been to gather in his work as many 'states' of versatile nature as possible because every 'state of wisdom' leads to a new horizon of understanding. It is for this comprehension that the great writers have always focused on the details in their narratives. A 'detail' is another expression for the 'word-dimension'. With every stroke of the pen, the element of the yet unseen dimension of 'truth' is revealed upon the reader. It is this very revelatory aspect of literature that makes it tempting, mysterious, scandalous and adventurous. Writers of fiction bring their environment with them as part of their work plan and that helps them to establish a relationship with their work and in turn with their reader.

When we study scientifically a writer's habitus or its disposition we try to figure out the deeper layers of its innermost self. Great literature is the matter of interconnection of a social background and the choice to see that social context as disturbing or fulfilling. When it comes to the cultural context of our contemporary writers of fiction, we directly encounter the dominating element in the title of the current article- the divine. Throughout the 20th century the word divine has been evolving from region to region and person to person in distinctive manners.

With the rise of scientific atheism and the great amount of work done by thinkers like Richard Dawkins¹ and Lawrence Maxwell Krauss², the qualitative argumentation has reached its most logical and philosophical levels about God and the Divine about Him. *God Delusion*³ is a powerful argument and there is hardly any need to say that many contemporary fiction writers of significance, Ian McEwan and Martin Amis among them, have deep psychological connections with the scholars of this school of thought. Ordinary lovers of literature are put into constant intellectual trial as a consequence, especially if they happen to be on the other side of the argument, the traditional seekers of virtue through religions.

The traditional scholasticism approached God somewhat differently. It is possible that an evolved mind lives in disagreement with the model of God portrayed by the religious institutions. However, the philosophical understanding of 'god-phenomena' not 'god-particle' had always encouraged the enlightened people to develop different perceptions than preached by the institutions. Ibn Arabi (July 1165 – November 1240) for example, has called God the first principle of diversity⁴. God's attributes are not understood as contradictory but as diverse; He is the one who is simultaneously 'the Seen-the Unseen', 'the Present-the Absent', 'the Merciful, the Severe', 'the Forgiving-the Revenging'. Diversity is the first principle of creation and being created, out of necessity, we ought to travel away from the Creator. Being away from the Creator is understood by Ibn Arabi as being lost in the unfathomable darkness. Since creation is not self-sufficient, it requires reason and means to

¹ Dawkins is known is the most outspoken atheist of our age. He is known for his scientific criticism of creationism and intelligent design. Hooper, Simon (9 November 2006). "The rise of the New Atheists". CNN. Retrieved 16 March 2010.

² Krauss is an advocate for public understanding of science, public policy based on sound empirical data, scientific skepticism, and science education. An atheist, Krauss seeks to reduce the influence of what he regards as superstition and religious dogma in popular culture. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lawrence_M._Krauss)

³ The *God Delusion* (2006) is Dawkins' major book against traditional religion and contends that a supernatural creator almost certainly does not exist. He argues that belief in any god is a delusion, a persistent false belief held in the face of contradictory evidence.

⁴ Chittick, William, *Ibn 'Arabi: Heir to the Prophets*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2007.

sustain itself. The best means of sustenance is to acquire light or, in other words, attempt to get closer to the Creator, the ultimate Light.

This is the philosophical ethics which resonates, with different level of intensity, throughout the world of mysticism of the mankind. Had the institutions representing religions not got committed to a life of rituals and had philosophical vision of the Creator and the created relationship survived, this world would have been a very different place today in its perception of seeking Truth.

Desire for seeking Truth in its loftiest and the subtlest sense leads us time and time again to great literature of our age or the ages of the past. Our contemporary narrative and its details lead us to see Truth in its most logical and scientifically rational way. The group of thinkers whom we might call the New Atheists creates a factional world of new *mythos*. These, whom many have defined in a journalistic sense, Dawkins and company, are a group of thinkers and writers deeply interested in literary discourses.

“It is not simply that Dawkins and company have clearly learnt a lot from literature: aesthetics, rhetoric, narrative. At a deeper level, we will see how the New Atheists also hold up the literary as a privileged instance of their idea of a natural, secular experience of beauty, wonder and transcendence. To Christopher Hitchens’s jaundiced eyes, for instance, it seems that the novel represents just about the only religion in which it is still possible to believe. Hitchens revealingly dedicates *God Is Not Great* to the novelist Ian McEwan because the latter’s body of fiction ‘shows an extraordinary ability to elucidate the numinous without conceding anything to the supernatural’ (p. 286). He also writes in the introduction to an anthology of atheist writings that ‘as a source of ethical reflection and as a mirror in which to see our human dilemmas reflected, the literary tradition is infinitely superior to the childish parables and morality tales, let alone the sanguine and sectarian admonitions, of the “holy” books.’”⁵

However, the traditional wisdom sees Truth incorporated in knowledge of the Divine. Ibn Arabi defines the Truth as Diversity which is understood through Divine knowledge. Divine knowledge

⁵ Arthur Bradley and Andrew Tate, *The New Atheism*. Continuum Publishing Group, p. 10.

is an anthropological argument, thinks William Chittick. IbnArbi's discourse is "anthropological," since it is rooted in an understanding of what it means to be human. Just to bring round the argument about the nature of knowledge of Truth to conclusion, it would be more useful to quote at length from the original texts translated and commented upon in *Imaginal Worlds* by Prof. William Chittick:

"The axiom here is that "God created Adam in His own form," or, to cite the Quran, that "He taught Adam the names, all of them" (2:30). Given that human beings represent the "form" (sūra) of a "meaning" (ma'nā) that is God, or that they have been given knowledge of all things, the human soul is in principle infinite, which is to say that, although it has a beginning, it has no end (la nihāyalaḥ). Only this can explain its everlastingness in the world to come. God—who is the meaning made manifest by the human form—creates a cosmos, which is typically defined as "everything other than God" (māsiwāAllāh). Understood in this sense, the cosmos can have no final boundaries, for God is eternally the Creator. It follows that man's knowledge of the cosmos, like his knowledge of its Creator, can have no final limit. Moreover, knowledge of the universe is itself knowledge of God, a point that Ibn 'Arabī sees already implicit in the Arabic language. Thus he writes, "We refer to the 'cosmos, ('ālam) with this word to give 'knowledge' ('ilm) that by it we mean that He has made it a 'mark' ('ālāma). In his discussions of knowledge, Ibn Arabī typically uses the term 'ilm', not its ear synonym 'ma'rifa' which in the context of Sufi writings is often translated as gnosis." In general, he considers 'ilm' the broader and higher term, not least because the Quran attributes 'ilm', but not 'ma'rifa', to God.

Nonetheless, he usually follows the general usage of the Sufis in employing the term 'ārif (the "gnostic," the one who possesses ma'rifa) to designate the highest ranking knowers. The gnostics are those who have achieved the knowledge designated by the famous ḥadīth, "He who knows ('arafa) himself knows ('arafa) his Lord."⁶

⁶ W. Chittick quotes the following references which can be of interest for further search on the topic:

- a. Chittick, "Ibn 'Arabī and his School," in *Islamic Spirituality: Manifestations*, edited by S. H. Nasr (New York: Crossroad, 1990), pp. 49-79; idem, "Ibn 'Arabī," in *History of Islamic Philosophy*, edited by S. H. Nasr and O. Leaman (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), pp. 497-509; idem, "The School of Ibn 'Arabī," in *ibid.*, pp. 510-23.
- b. Ibn 'Arabī's focus on knowledge is not unrelated to the fact that his writings are

According to Ibn 'Arabī, there is no goal beyond knowledge: There is no eminence higher than the eminence of knowledge, and there is no state above the state of understanding (fahm) from God (IV 129.14). There is no blessing (ni'ma) greater than the blessing of knowledge, even though God's blessings cannot be counted (II 620.9). The most excellent (afdal) thing through which God has shown munificence to His servants is knowledge.

When God bestows knowledge on someone, He has granted him the most eminent of attributes and the greatest of gifts (III 361.16). God said, commanding His Prophet—upon him be blessings and peace—“Say: ‘My Lord, increase me in knowledge,’” (Quran 20:114) for it is the most eminent attribute and the most surpassing (anzah) quality (II 117.13). Knowledge is the cause of deliverance. . . . How eminent is the rank of knowledge! This is why God did not command His Prophet to seek increase in anything except knowledge (II 612.9). Given the extraordinary importance that Ibn 'Arabī accords to knowledge and the vast extent of his literary corpus, it is beyond the scope of this article even to begin a survey of his views on its nature and significance. Instead I will try to suggest his understanding of knowledge's “benefit” (naf). I have in mind the famous hadīth, “I seek refuge in God from a knowledge that has no benefit.” According to another well-known hadīth, “Seeking knowledge is incumbent on every Muslim.” What then is the benefit to be gained by seeking it, and what sorts of knowledge have no benefit and should be avoided?”⁷

It has been long debated if literary works or arts generally speaking, have any role to play in designing our minds and reshuffling the matrix of our spiritual and moral and political lives. Historians and critics have always celebrated the greatness of such artists who leave

essentially commentaries on the Quran, which constantly stresses its importance.

c. See Michel Chodkiewicz, *An Ocean Without Shore: Ibn Arabi, the Book, and the Law* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1993). On occasion Ibn 'Arabī contrasts 'ilm and ma'rifa, but the distinction between the two terms plays no major role in his writings. See Chittick, *The Sufi Path of Knowledge: Ibn al-'Arabī's metaphysics of Imagination* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1989), pp. 147-49. For a detailed discussion of some of Ibn 'Arabī's views on various aspects of knowledge, see *ibid.*, especially Chapters 9-14.

d. 126 Ibn 'Arabī on the Benefit of Knowledge There is no level more eminent (ashraf) than the level of knowledge (III 448.7).⁴

⁷ All the references are taken from Chittick's *Imaginal World*, Suheyl Academy, Lahore, Pakistan.

undeletable marks on our cultures. If Plato can be considered an artist not just a philosopher, because of the rhetorical and dramatic value of his works then he definitely is the first great artist who re-shaped our entire modern-day perception of western civilization. We cannot underestimate the impact which Mevlana Jelal-uddin- Rumi had on 13th century Islamic mind; the impact of its spiritual power is still witnessed worldwide as Mevlana Rumi happens to be the most followed writer on internet today.⁸ In early 20th century the Indian subcontinent saw the impact of Mohammed Iqbal who literally caused the partition of India and initiated the contemporary concept of Islamic nationhood (*ummah*).

These three examples randomly quoted are backed up by detailed display of qualitative data scientific researches and long continuous chain of followers of the ideals preached by these great writers. Williams Shakespeare's example is even more intense as his works conceptualized displays of visual formats. The continuity of Shakespearean drama on stage as profitable business opportunity is at the same time scientific and systematic presentation of relevant information which one applies as data to establish a hypothesis. It seems that literary works can very easily be taken on empirical scale as tools of exploring the mind and the soul of a particular age. A work of literature has potential to travel beyond the bounds of time and space and in this regard it is more powerful as it is at the time of its creation more advanced than the age and community that it is composed for. I wish to quote a passage from the preface of my forthcoming book, *King Lear- Story of an Albion*:

'At the threshold of history, every culture of man has heard him knocking. So often he has been granted not only the entry to these cultures but their complete citizenship, it is sometimes difficult to claim that Shakespeare was an English writer. It is a modest thing to say that 'he is of all ages'; he is beyond all ages. He goes beyond all that can be determined by any age, any religion, any language or any geography. In terms of appreciation, for example, Shakespeare had philosophically more responsive audience in Germany than in 18th century England. When he was about to be banned by the mid-17th century Puritans, Indians were about to incorporate his work within the galaxy of their infinite world of literature. He remained the national poet of the USA until the birth of its own literary tradition. By

⁸ <http://www.bbc.com/culture/story/20140414-americas-best-selling-poet>

the end of the 19th century almost all the communist revolutionary movements were promoting his heroes as king slayers. And in the 20th century every single artistic movement includes talks about particular features of his art that brings it closer to the standard features of a particular movement. He is the only author, not born in our age, whose works guarantee on regular basis financial prospects for actors, directors, producers and even the owners of the publishing houses. Shakespeare's success story as a writer is unprecedented in human history.

Apart from the prophets of the Holy Scriptures and the philosophers of antiquity, no one else but Shakespeare can claim an impact on human mind and heart of a mega scale that goes beyond any age, any religion, any language and any geography. Shakespeare, therefore, does not only matter to us, he belongs to us. Uncertainty of the political systems, ruthless growth of violence, sexual anxiety, dismemberment of filial bond and the essential spirit of improvisation in times chaotic, the very hallmark of our culture as well as of his drama, force us to see him in a post-colonial contemporary context to find a direction, a resolve and an asylum from the 'neo-colonial' disaster of the 21st century. The radical capacity of his works, specially the works like *King Lear*, lets Shakespeare breathe the air that we inhale wherever we are and whenever we are.⁹

All great literature, like that of William Shakespeare's, breaths the air that we inhale. Consequently, literary discourses of our age should aim at questioning the geopolitical contexts of a work of art and insist upon the new ways of looking at an author not just as a representative of cultural values but rather as pioneer of sets of thoughts affecting current and future generations in multiple way.

The scientific method of approaching literature is a complex and rather new approach. It is difficult to have a systematic methodological consistency. A work of literature has various kinds of receptions. Apart from the immediate community for which it is composed, literature travels far in terms of time and space. Shakespearean drama is an excellent example of the kind. It has travelled in time more than a span of four centuries and in terms of space it has crossed all the possible geographical boundaries. In our age the phenomena of spreading 'the

⁹Yar Khan Shahab, *King Lear - Story of an Albion*, (in process).

word of a writer' is even more rapid. It is definitely even more important in our age to keep observing scientifically the responses of particular community towards a work of art as it may define both the value of the work in its widest possible sense and the socio-cultural dynamics of a particular society as well.

As a result of various perceptions evolving around a work of art more scientific means of evaluation are needed by the researchers; the scientific data, however, more than necessary on one hand can be extremely misleading on the other. Indian perception of Shakespeare is different than that of American. Oscar Wilde is read differently in Australia than in the Middle East. And a very similar critical disbalance of perception can be viewed when it comes to the Turkish writers read by Armenian audience or Palestinian poets approached by the Israeli readers. The way mythological character of Krishna is the source of spiritual sensation upon a Hindu mind is definitely not the case when the mythology travels into the hands of a European reader.

It should also be of interest to the research scholars of our age that if it is the thematic pattern or the structural format that affects more the imagination of the readers. Latest investigations into the "Affect theory" show that it is the element of dissociation in knowledge between reader, writer and character that makes the story interesting. The element of suspense has multiple possibilities within it. Suspense can be recreated by the readers' own desire to not to compromise with the first understanding of its reading. There can be a scientific, psychological inquiry. Is it possible for a human mind to engage into different mental perspectives inspired by the same object time and time again? *Oedipus the Rex* depended for success on this element of suspense for its first audience but thousands of year later with the story of the play known to every common educated person it still holds grip on imagination. Same is true of many other great plays and works of fiction throughout the world. This argument is laid forward by Arthur C. Graesser and Bianca Klettkein in a scholarly article attempting to define significance of plot and story comprehension as "agency".

'The role of agency is central to structural affect theory. It is critical to keep track of the knowledge states of the various characters and of the reader in order to set up suspense and other reader emotions. For example, the reader may know that the car has a bomb and the

masked rogue may also know it, but other character agents may be totally ignorant, for instance the victim who enters the car, an innocent bystander, and the victim's wife in another city. This dissociation in knowledge between the pragmatic agent (reader, writer, narrator, narratee) and a character agent creates a dramatic tension and makes the story interesting. The suspense can even be recreated when the story is read multiple times. When the reader has privileged knowledge that is not known by a particular character, there is the question of whether the reader is capable of keeping these different mental perspectives straight. In the case of suspense, the reader is at least partially successful in keeping track of the knowledge of different agents. Otherwise, suspense would not work. Suspense would die if all of the characters in the story world knew about the bomb in the car. The emotion of surprise also involves a discrepancy in knowledge states among agents; in this case, the writer and narrator know about the surprising event, but not the narratee and reader.¹⁰

The reader is fundamental in this approach for keeping literature mobile and active social phenomena. The five basic questions around which the reception of a work of art moves are the following.

- A) who said what
- B) who knows what
- C) who saw what
- D) who heard what
- E) who wants what.

These questions lead to the ultimate question: who experienced what emotion:

'Ideally, the reader should be able to keep the various agents distinct and should faithfully update each agent on all dimensions as the story unfolds. From a computational perspective, however, an accurate tracking of agents would be a very difficult achievement. Suppose there were 10 symbolic expressions associated with proposition P: X said P, X liked P, X wanted P, X knew P, X saw P, X heard P, etc. Suppose further that there were 20 agents in the story world and 1000 propositions about the story world. There would be $10 \times 20 \times 1000 = 200,000$ expressions to evaluate. There would indeed be a combinatorial explosion problem when viewed from this computational perspective.

¹⁰ *New Atheist Novel*, p. 53.

If the human mind is capable of pulling this off, that would be a remarkable achievement.

However, there may be cognitive representations and strategies to circumvent the combinatorial explosion. According to research, in discourse psychology, there are psychological constraints on the process of constructing mental micro worlds, so ideal complete representations are frequently not constructed.'¹¹

Speech and silence in a great work of literature, work identically as statements. Sound effects also matter as the relevance of the word finds itself located within the reader who then identifies with it.

Silence is not a structural prominence hypothesis, but it provides that vacuum within the structure of the writing which is the very hallmark of entire existence. Silence is another word for vacancy which we see all around us in space and find it temptingly mysterious. Silence can also be taken as invisibility which is contrasted with the visible force of the character.

The invisibility element, essential to the structure of a work of art, is also fundamental when it comes to the reception of it on a wide range and scale. Great art travels beyond geographical and religious boundary. That journey creates, out of necessity, invisible reception. Scientific data, empirical study, encourages several categories that emerge inductively as a result of this process. Certain critics have suggested that instead of pursuing this dichotomy a hybrid kind of "content analysis" helps understanding inter-subjectivity. In cognitive science, this kind of experimental esthetics leads to the psychology of reading. This reception-oriented study of literature, also known as reader response theory, leads us to observe a bit more in details the meaning of empirical study of literature. The empirical study requires evaluation and interpretation of a particular text with a comparative perspective related to description of various kinds of texts. Formulation of a generalized theory, irrespective of individual perceptions, is also an important need of our times. Writer with its entire national, biographical and ideological and cultural contexts becomes fundamental in this relation.

The traditional academia though critical of scientific literary study, may still find a bridge between the two distinctive styles of approaches.

¹¹ Ibid. p. 59.

Literary images as a result may appear diametrically opposite to the dominant understanding of the mainstream academia but at the same time possibilities of collaborative scientific understanding of literature also appear. It seems that in the world of literary studies empirical descriptions and explanations of psychological and sociological process will be unavoidable. We have already seen the rudiments of these methods used in the previous century and it seems that time is ripe now that the serious departments of literature in major universities of the world experiment to create new horizons.

Bibliography:

- Arthur Bradley and Andrew Tate, *The New Atheist Novel*, Continuum Publishing Group
- Chittick, William, *Ibn 'Arabī and His School, in Islamic Spirituality: Manifestations*, edited by S. H. Nasr, New York: Crossroad, 1990
- Chittick, William, *Ibn 'Arabi: Heir to the Prophets*, Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2007.
- Chittick, William, *Imaginal World*, Suheyl Academy, Pakistan.
- Hooper, Simon (9 November 2006), *The rise of the New Atheists*. CNN. Retrieved 2010.
- Michel, Chodkiewicz, *An Ocean Without Shore: IbnArabi, the Book, and the Law*, Albany: SUNY Press, 1993
- Mckee, Michael, *Theory of the Novel- A Historical Approach*, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Yar Khan, Shahab, *King Lear - Story of an Albion*, (in process)
- <http://www.bbc.com/culture/story/20140414-americas-best-selling-poet>
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lawrence_M._Krauss

U potrazi za 'božanskim' u 'pojednostima' savremene umjetnosti pripovijedanja

Sažetak

Književnost i život međusobno su povezane domene postojanja. Oni se odražavaju u stvaranju naše percepcije svakodnevne stvarnosti. Razumijevanje svakodnevne stvarnosti uključuje složen spoj socio-kulturnih snaga. Pisci ovih pripovijesti uvijek pokazuju određene lične pripadnosti i istovremeno određenu autonomiju od pripadnosti da njihovi čitatelji

uživaju u višestrukoj prirodi "istine". Umjetničko djelo "je filtrirana roba", jer je karakterizirano ličnom pristrasnošću i predrasudama umjetnika. Pisci u našem dobu informacija imaju tendenciju umetanja u narativni element slikovnih detalja koji proizlaze iz izračunatih anketa i organiziranih naučnih istraživanja. Naučni uvid pisaca u naučni ateizam dao je fikciji i kritici u našem dobu nove dimenzije što treba biti u suprotnosti s tradicionalnim shvaćanjem Boga kao prvog principa različitosti za razumijevanje evolucije savremene fikcije. Kao rezultat različitih percepcija koje se razvijaju oko umjetničkog djela, istraživači trebaju više naučnih sredstava za vrednovanje; naučni podaci, međutim, mogu biti i krajnje pogrešni. Kognitivne reprezentacije i strategije za zaobilaženje "kombinatoričke eksplozije" dovode do diskursa u psihološkom razumijevanju fikcije. Postoje psihološka ograničenja u procesu konstruiranja mentalnih mikro svjetova. Književne slike kao rezultat mogu se učiniti dijametralno suprotnim dominantnom razumijevanju glavnih stručnih zajednica, ali istodobno se pojavljuju i mogućnosti kolaborativnog naučnog razumijevanja književnosti. Čini se da će u budućnosti književnih studija empirijski opisi i objašnjenja psihološkog i sociološkog procesa biti neizbježni.

Ključne riječi: moderni narativi, kategorija zanimanja, slikovni detalji, novi ateizam, znanstveni ateizam, Richard Dawkins, Lawrence Krauss, Martin Amis, Evan McEwans, Bog kao prvi princip različitosti, Ibn Arabi, novi *mit*, William Chittick, Zamišljeni svjetovi, kralj Lear i Priča o Albionu, element nevidljivosti.