



LITERATURES, CULTURES, AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Literature, Pedagogy, and Climate Change

Text Models for a Transcultural Ecology

Roman Bartosch

palgrave
macmillan

Literatures, Cultures, and the Environment

Series Editor
Ursula K. Heise
Department of English
University of California
Los Angeles, CA, USA

Literatures, Cultures, and the Environment focuses on new research in the Environmental Humanities, particularly work with a rhetorical or literary dimension. Books in this series explore how ideas of nature and environmental concerns are expressed in different cultural contexts and at different historical moments. They investigate how cultural assumptions and practices, as well as social structures and institutions, shape conceptions of nature, the natural, species boundaries, uses of plants, animals and natural resources, the human body in its environmental dimensions, environmental health and illness, and relations between nature and technology. In turn, the series makes visible how concepts of nature and forms of environmentalist thought and representation arise from the confluence of a community's ecological and social conditions with its cultural assumptions, perceptions, and institutions.

More information about this series at
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14818>

Roman Bartosch

Literature, Pedagogy, and Climate Change

Text Models for a Transcultural Ecology

palgrave
macmillan

Roman Bartosch
University of Cologne
Cologne, Germany

Literatures, Cultures, and the Environment

ISBN 978-3-030-33299-0

ISBN 978-3-030-33300-3 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33300-3>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer
Nature Switzerland AG 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover credit: David Fransolet/Getty

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As always, this book is as much the result of collaborative discussion and debate as of individual thinking and reading. While some of the ideas presented here have been met with critique from a number of colleagues, I have always felt gratitude for the ways in which their questions have challenged my line of argumentation and thus helped me say what I wanted to say eventually. Teaching world literature and transcultural ecology to students in Cologne and at the University of Bath has been a rewarding experience, and I thank them, too. As this book presents work in an ongoing process, some of its chapters have been published in slightly or significantly different forms in journals or conference proceedings.

The main argument informing this book has been developed over the last two years with a group of wonderful scholars and colleagues that formed the core group of the DFG research project ‘Environmental Crises and the Transnational Imagination’, founded and led by Timo Müller (Augsburg, Germany). To him and to the whole group I am more than grateful for numerous inspiring discussions and cooperative exchanges (as well as splendid pub crawls). Some parts of the introduction build on a talk given at the *Anglistentag 2016* in Hamburg, later published as ‘Anthropocene F(r)ictions: Literatures and Transcultural Ecology in an Age of Climate Change’ in the conference proceedings, edited by Barbara Schmidt-Haberkamp and Jana Gohrlich (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2017) as well as on discussions with the Frankfurt research colloquium on New English Literatures and Cultures,

hosted by Frank Schulze-Engler and Karsten Levihn-Kutzler, in 2017. Chapter 3 first appeared as ‘The Energy of Stories: Postcolonialism, the Petroleum Unconscious, and the Crude Side of Cultural Ecology’, published in a special issue of *Resilience—A Journal of the Environmental Humanities (Western American Literature)*, edited by Axel Goodbody and Bradon Smith (2019) and published by the University of Nebraska Press. Chapter 6 elaborates on ideas first sketched in ‘Framing the Alien—Teaching District 9’, published in *Framing Nature* and edited by Hannes Bergthaller and Peter Mortensen (Brill/Rodopi, 2018). I am grateful for the permission to rework and reprint these texts and, even more so, for the invaluable help that I have received from the respective editors, conference respondents, and the audience and readership that have provided stimulating feedback. Namely, I want to express my warmest gratitude to Heinz Antor, Ghassen Aroui, Hannes Bergthaller, Anne Burkard, Kylie Crane, Sonja Frenzel, Jana Gohrisch, Axel Goodbody, Sieglinde Grimm, Jens Martin Gurr, Pia Balsmeier, David Herman, Julia Hoydis, Julia Kessel, Richard Kerridge, Bettina Kümmerling-Meibauer, Karsten Levihn-Kutzler, Pavan Malreddy, Peter Mortensen, Timo Müller, Dominik Ohrem, Jochen Petzold, Kate Rigby, Ulla Schäfer, Barbara Schmidt-Haberkamp, Frank Schulze-Engler, Bradon Smith, Joe Smith, Hanna Teichler, and, of course, Hubert Zapf.

I also wish to thank the wonderful people at Palgrave Macmillan, especially Allie Bochicchio and the anonymous reviewers. Finally, thanks are due to Dominik Ohrem for his advice and careful reading of the manuscript draft. Needless to say, I remain solely responsible for any errors, inconsistencies, and logical fallacies.

CONTENTS

1	Anthropocene F(r)ictions: Transcultural Ecology and the Scaling of Perspectives	1
2	Towards Transcultural Competence: Scaling World Literature	15
3	Affirmative Paradiscourse and the Petroleum Unconscious: The Share of the Reader in the Energy of Stories	47
4	Doubling the World: Dark Cosmopolitanism and the Creative Potentials of <i>Autrediegesis</i>	69
5	Beyond Declension: Numinous Materialities and Transformative Education	99
6	Framing Framing: Aliens, Animals, and Anthropological Différance Across Media	121

7	Scaling Transcultural Ecology: Balance on the Edge of Extinction	137
	Bibliography	155
	Index	175

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 2.1	Intercultural understanding	40
Fig. 2.2	Transcultural competence?	40
Fig. 7.1	Vectorial illustration of transcultural ecological competence	150



CHAPTER 1

Anthropocene F(r)ictions: Transcultural Ecology and the Scaling of Perspectives

The Anthropocene—what a word! One of the most-discussed and widely received concepts in academia today, most of all in the environmental humanities, the Anthropocene and its many and often contradictory implications invite closer scrutiny. This is no less true for its educational implications—for the practices of reading, teaching, and making meaning of literary fiction. Originally suggested as a geochronological period to the scientific community by Paul Crutzen and Eugene Stoermer at the turn of the millennium, conceptual discussion from its beginnings has been not merely descriptive but has entailed a deliberate call for a consideration of the normative ramifications of humankind’s impact on the earth system. And it quickly came to encompass both fantasies of human exceptionalism and superiority—in the form of research on geo-engineering, say—and a critique of human cultural practices, epistemologies, and ontologies. Perhaps somewhat paradoxically, these critiques were grounded, on the one hand, in non-anthropocentrism (as in Donna Haraway’s suggestion to speak of a ‘Chthulucene’) as well as more traditional Marxist thought (Jason Moore’s ‘Capitalocene’) and called into question the onto-epistemological practices of the sciences in the Western Hemisphere, pointing to incongruities and ‘alternative modernities’ in the Global South. At the same time, however they radically generalised the idea of humanity in idealist, often even imperialist ways (‘the human’ as a global agent is a generic singular *par excellence*). In challenging scientific and academic practices of understanding the earth’s as

well as our human past, present, and possible future, the concept of the Anthropocene continues to probe the boundaries, and seeks to explore new ways, of ontological and epistemological but also political, historical, and environmentalist inquiry. And, by implication, it asks us to rethink the narratives that accompany, and with which we try to make sense of, the current situation. It thus also calls for a questioning of (the underlying premises of) educational practice: the role of storytelling, for instance, as well as the significance, fluidity and situatedness of knowledge. This book will try to embrace rather than dissolve the multiple tensions that come with Anthropocene discourse and take them as the starting point for a discussion of the role of narrative and literature pedagogies in times of uncertainty and fundamental, global change: *Anthropocene f(r)ictions*.

Writing on one such set of frictions—postcolonial history and climate change—Dipesh Chakrabarty notes that ‘the current conjuncture of globalization and global warming leaves us with the challenge of having to think of human agency over multiple and incommensurable scales at one’ (2012, 1). In the same vein, Timothy Clark describes current attempts to measure and overview the new reality of extensive and widely distributed human agency as an exercise in ‘scaling’ that will inevitably lead to the experience of a ‘derangement of scales’, or ‘Anthropocene disorder’ (2015, 144), in which ‘a feeling of a break-down in the senses of proportion and of propriety when making judgments’ takes a hold of, and possibly immobilises, our thinking about the world. Addressing the problems of such scale effects for reading practice, he points to the fact that ‘[n]o finite piece of writing can encompass a topic that seems to entail thinking of almost everything at one—climate, culture, politics, populations dynamics, transport infrastructure, religious attitudes’ (78). But, to paraphrase Virginia Woolf and Donna Haraway at once, ‘think we must’. How, then, are we to conceive of the role of reading and storytelling in a world that suddenly seems to be both too small—think ‘global village’—and too large, as the images and metaphors currently in use when it comes to describing the Anthropocene suggest? In this book, I will engage in what Patrick D. Murphy’s calls a ‘transversal’ reading practice: a form of reading that mobilises ‘a dialogical relationship between the abstract and the concrete, the theory and the practice, the concept and the applications’ (2013, 4). Literature pedagogy, in other words. At the same time, I want to complicate the idea that we simply move between the intellectual worlds of thought and the more hands-on aspects of educational practice because if both the conceptual and the

political worlds we find ourselves in are tension-ridden, inexplicable by any master narrative or trope and bound to lead to ‘Anthropocene disorder’, as Timothy Clark dubs it (2015, 139), a new notion of what ‘understanding’ means seems to be required. Wolfgang Iser (1995) has entertained a similar thought and suggested ‘transversal reason’ as a form of thinking that brings together seemingly disparate discourses and discourse logics. Likewise, Hubert Zapf, in his take on cultural ecology, stresses the importance of discursive plurality and of an understanding of ecology as (also) a form of thinking in connections, and he arrives at a model of literature as a form of cultural ecology that derives its power precisely from the tensions and contradictions upon which fictional discourse relies and which it brings into fruitful interplay (Zapf 2016, see also Kagan 2013).

I want to add another facet to this discussion and suggest that paying attention to the processes of scaling described by Clark and others is of invaluable importance for knowing, or getting to know, earth’s natural-cultural worlds—and for learning about them through the practice of reading and engaging with narratives. It is through the ‘scaling of perspectives’, I hold, that we can transform the notion of a cultural ecology of word and world into a ‘transcultural ecology’ of a diversity of word-and-world practices. And it is a transcultural competence in this sense towards which modern education (Education for Sustainability, Intercultural Education as well as Inclusive Teaching) should be geared. It is the aim of this book to outline some of the ways in which this could be done. For that, I will, after a brief introduction of key terms and tenets, analyse a number of contemporary, ‘world-literary’ texts and their enmeshments with and critique of the Anthropocene master narrative. Each reading will be accompanied by a section that points to central concepts and learning activities that might bring the literary potential of fiction to bear productively on the educational situation in which literature pedagogies are situated. I am not at all interested in the ‘moral’ or ‘message’ of the texts in question—a practice frowned upon for some time now in academia yet still widely employed in both secondary and tertiary education—but understand these texts as invitations to rethink thinking and refashion what it means to be reading through the very act and event of reading. This is why, instead of a gist at the end of each chapter in which I summarise my own interpretive results, I have opted for a *GIST* section: it is through some remarks on *General Implications for Studying and Teaching* that I wish to identify and discuss aspects,

elements, and potentials of the texts under discussion in a spirit of openness towards the frictions and ambiguities they produce.

This choice also explains why the present book is neither a work of literary theory nor an educational textbook but a hybrid tool for speculation and exploration. In qualitative social research, empirical data are collected in order to generate analytical categories for the sake of a flexible and circular research epistemology (Creswell 2013). I will try to adapt this process and understand the literary texts I am discussing as such generators of categories. If it is in literary texts that potential for understanding and transformation can be found, a ‘qualitative’ reading in the context of literature pedagogy might benefit from close scrutiny of the knowledge configurations that literature provides (Ette 2017, 223). In his *WeltFraktale* (‘WorldFractals’), Ottmar Ette suggests a ‘pathway through the literatures of the world’ that lets go of the idea of unity and closure and embraces the ‘polylogical’ potential of literatures instead (2017, 57, my translation). What he describes as a ‘relational philology’ (69) has at its disposal both a political and a critical potential that can and should be utilised in the present situation. There is an educational demand for reconfiguring our engagements not only with the world but with the cultural forms through which we make sense of our environments. The ‘scaling of perspectives’ tries to account for this demand and make productive use of the ongoing and increasing ambivalences inscribed into Anthropocene experiences. This is because in the end, ‘understanding’ the Anthropocene demands a heightened readiness to embrace what Keats has dubbed ‘negative capability’—the state ‘when man is capable of being in uncertainties, Mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact & reason’, a ‘competence’ as it were that modern educational methodologies still value greatly and discuss under the moniker of ‘tolerance of ambiguity’, and about which I will speak in more detail later (see Keats 2002, 41–42 as well as Bartosch 2013, 12; Hall 2016, 459). Tolerance and negotiation of ambiguity is a very apt description of the role and potential of literature pedagogies in the twenty-first century, in an age of climate change as well as other, related crises.

In order to make this case, this book needs to link such educational hopes with the more technical notion of competence acquisition. Literature pedagogies, like other subfields in language teaching and particularly in ELT/EFL (English Language Teaching/English as a Foreign Language) methodologies today, are bound up with the concept of

competences and competence acquisition.¹ Problematic and disputable as the notion of competence—and the allegedly natural implications of, for instance, measurability and applicability of a set of soft skills in the spirit of vocational training—may be, it forms part of a discourse that has to be reckoned with and, if possible, dealt with productively (see Witte 2011). Before I move on to my main argumentation in the next chapters, let me therefore sketch some of the central posits in the discussion of competences in the context of literary education and, most importantly, intercultural learning, which provide the main thrust for my case for transcultural competence and transcultural ecology.

Originating in the 1960s with the main objective of familiarising increasingly multicultural communities with ‘habits, norms, values, taboos’ (Grimm et al. 2015, 157) of what was perceived as alien cultural groups (without effectively calling into question the hegemonic values of the majority), intercultural learning and intercultural competence today refer to both global business communication and a more subtle but also much more nuanced pedagogic aim of bringing together hermeneutics and cultural difference in an ongoing negotiation of alterity (Bredella 1996; Gonçalves Matos 2012; Witte and Harden 2015). Pedagogic work in this area is extensive, and I cannot do justice to the many important contributions, especially in the context of models of ‘understanding alterity’ (*Fremdverstehen*, see Bredella and Christ 1995; Nünning 2007) in the process of literacy development and literary education. But since it is from a position within this discourse that I want to begin to assess the frictions and pedagogical implications of Anthropocene narratives, a short introduction to some of the main ideas seems in order.

¹It has been a deliberate decision not to distinguish too sharply between learners of English as a second or foreign language, native speakers in a literature class, or even members of book clubs, as one reviewer suggested. Although differences in learners and learning groups matter a great deal without any doubt, assuming generalisations about aptitude, interest, and learning outcomes is to be beside the point here. After all, I am not using texts to generate learning tasks but try to follow their potential as models for rethinking the tasks of reading and imagining across scales. It will be the teachers’ prerogative to decide which materials and methods will prove successful with a specific learning group—for now, I can happily imagine a book club of lay readers, native speakers of English and a motley crew of people who have acquired English by other, institutionalised means: their shared interest would be to learn in how far ‘literature as a foreign language’ (Hunfeldt 2004) instigates moments of transformative learning that turns derangements of scale into affordances.

In brief, the model of literary understanding that goes under the name of *Fremdverstehen* posits a three-step process at the heart of reading practice that provides a somewhat technical, processual account of the development of critical empathy and the hermeneutic notion of an ‘acquisition of horizon’ and the ‘fusion of horizons’ (Gadamer 1994, 305–306). In a first step, reading literary fiction requires and engenders an awareness of the fragmented or at least partial and focalised character of a narrative’s worldview, mediated as it is through characters and points of view. This process is usually referred to as a ‘differentiation of perspectives’ (Nünning 2007, 135) and presupposes a first grasp of the variety of perspectival takes on the (narrated) world that is then negotiated in a second step, the ‘adoption of perspectives’ (ibid.). ‘Adoption’ is the most problematical and contested aspect of the model since it can easily be read as an unwarranted or unsubstantiated appropriation of otherness, which is particularly questionable in the context of radical differences in perspective—‘Ah, that’s what it’s like to be subaltern!’—and hardly does justice to the intricacies and obstacles accompanying an encounter with otherness. But we have to keep in mind two things: from a hermeneutic standpoint, ‘adoption’ does not and cannot mean complete fusion but only approximation, whether empathetic or epistemological. And this is something that every reading *nolens volens* presupposes—otherwise, we could not make sense of any third-person point of view or a character’s motivation, neither in fictional nor in real-life encounters, where such approximations are often described in terms of ‘theory of mind’ (Armstrong 2005; Zunshine 2012). We also need to be aware that such an adoption or approximation is not the terminal moment in understanding, perhaps in the sense of a full grasp of the other after which we simply stop thinking or feeling and have left our own perspective behind. Rather, understanding alterity is about the flexibility of perspectivised perception, which is foregrounded by the third and last step, the ‘coordination of perspectives’: it is at this point that a meta-knowledge of difference and diversity of points of view is brought into play in interpretive reintegration (Nünning 2007, 135). (This last step also points to central posits of cultural ecology, as I will argue below, and it explains why I have opted for the more ambiguous ‘understanding of alterity’ instead of capitalising on ‘the Other’ as in ‘understanding the other’, a popular translation of the German term.) Thus, perspectival and epistemological flexibility is the name of the game of *Fremdverstehen*, and it is the hope of literature pedagogy that it not

only supports interpretive processes when analysing fiction, but that it also influences our ways of seeing the world around us more generally—to make us, as it were, better and more conscientious ‘readers’ of life.

Let me now, however, point out two problems that come with the idea that encountering literary texts may have a beneficial effect on epistemic, affective, and social processes, and the formation of knowledge and attitudes in particular. The first is very general and far-reaching and can thus only be alluded to but not properly discussed here: if reading and understanding fiction constitutes some refined form of ‘sentimental education’, it surely demands a life-long engagement with literature and the arts and can hardly be conceived of as a mere ‘competence’ that can be acquired, tested and proven in educational settings in the context of some form of literary ‘training’ that is built upon notions of vocational instruction (Domingo 2015; Harden 2011; Nünning 2007). Literature and its contribution to individual enculturation and cultural exploration (Rosenblatt 1995 [1938]) in fact throw into sharp relief the general problem of competence orientation over and against more holistic but also less clearly measurable notions of education or character formation as emphasised, for instance, in the German concept of *Bildung*. Having said that, I also wish to point out that the concept of ‘competence’ has its advantages, especially with regard to its claims concerning learners’ intellectual and interpretive output and the modes of assessment employed by teachers. I will discuss these advantages in more detail in the chapters that follow and in the *GIST* sections in particular.

Another problem that is specific to the notion of *intercultural* competence is the very concept of ‘culture’ that underlies any pedagogic engagement with otherness as well as ‘habits, norms, values, taboos’: Whose habits, norms, values, and taboos are we talking about? Are they changeable, should they be valued as minority practices, and is a certain set of cultural practices synonymous with any national culture, or community, or else? Since in order to engage with Anglophone cultures, ELT employs objects and phenomena—fashion, music, food, and of course literary narratives—that synecdochically stand for an assumed but unrepresentable totality of ‘a culture’, certain signs have to be understood as having particular relevance or providing particular insights. This idea, which is sometimes referred to as the ‘iceberg model of culture’ (see Grimm et al. 2015, 159–160; Gibson 2000), endorses a semiotic model of cultural artefacts and practices but in the case of literary readings sometimes falls short of grasping successfully the complexity of aesthetic

discourse and its ambiguities while it also homogenises what is conceived as ‘culture’. By no means can a text, or an authorial perspective, stand for cultural totality—it might, in actual fact, more likely wilfully distort, exaggerate, or defamiliarise cultural practices and meanings in order to make its point and thus necessarily provides a sense of unreliability for readers, especially and primarily those unfamiliar with the relevant historical and social backgrounds (Donnerstag 2005). What is more, the very idea of understanding textual meaning essentially in relation to the a priori notion of a unified culture that serves as the main frame of reference also risks overemphasising the influence of, and determination by, the equivocal concept of ‘culture’ in the first place. Such ‘culturalism’ can at worst become a form of cultural racism, even if ever so mildly, because actions and plot have to be interpreted in relation to a certain cultural totality that in turn serves to explain and determine all kinds of meaning.

This is part of the reason why more recent research has moved on to discussing transcultural, rather than intercultural, models of interaction and, eventually, competence (Antor et al. 2010; Schulze-Engler and Doff 2011). Remarking on the fact that ‘it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to define something as complex, multilayered, dynamic and porous like “culture” for the purpose of teachability and learnability’, Arnd Witte warns that ‘[t]raditional approaches run the danger of promoting essentialist and deterministic tendencies; they homogenise the contingencies and fractures inherent in cultural practices and tend to ignore the caesuras and splits pointing to the “other” *within* a culture’ (2011, 92–93). Arguably, a transcultural understanding of the multiple connections within and across the cultural fields and subfields and an interest in the question ‘of what individuals and groups do with culture in an increasingly globalised world’ (Schulze-Engler 2007, 28) complicates matters even further. Somewhat paradoxically perhaps, this is why it has been argued that ‘intercultural competence’ might suit the educational context of schooling better—not because of the ontological validity of its concept of culture but because of its very feasibility and pedagogic appropriateness for learners as yet unable to engage with transcultural complexities on a global scale and its emphasis on the dialectical potential of the foreign language classroom as an educational ‘third space’ (Delanoy 2014; Kramsch 1997, 2009).

While this is a reasonable point with a direct bearing on actual teaching practice, transculturalism seems a promising alternative to more static models of cultural difference, and we may recall Homi Bhabha’s

assertion that ‘it is the “inter”—the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the *in-between* space’ (2002, 38) that generates cultural meaning in the sense of a third space. The question, in other words, is not so much one of cultural ontologies and of a movement between or across two distinct cultural spheres but of a hermeneutic standpoint and flexibility towards perceived otherness and what happens to it in the act of reading. Whether or not the cultural model is one of static distinctness or transcultural complexity matters less when we understand that the very event of literary reading is constituted by a sequentialised negotiation of (textual as well as cultural) complexity that requires a tolerance of ambiguity towards processes of, in Gonçalves Matos’s words, literary ‘complexifying’ (2012, 57). Conceived that way, the demand for interpretive closure, which still underlies many approaches in literature pedagogies, could be replaced by a refined understanding of experiences of complexity. While a text as such is little more than another object that is part of the tip of the iceberg and thus has a synecdochic relation to the larger, less clearly defined and opaque cultural field from which it stems, it likewise increases the difficulties in interpreting this cultural field because of its aesthetic, dialogical, and necessarily open-ended semiotic quality (see also Gonçalves Matos 2012, 129–135). It is this peculiar nature of literary understanding that is one of the cornerstones of ‘critical cultural awareness’ that can hardly be attained by any other than literary means.

If it can be said, however, that this implies we do not learn ‘from’ literary texts but ‘through’ our engagement with them, literature pedagogy must encompass more than methodologies for teaching a certain text. Negotiations of meaning in the foreign language classroom rely on an educational practice that both draws on notions of cultural difference while at the same time calling these very notions in question, which only underlines the relevance of this insight. What is needed, then, is an epistemology grounded in literary experience. Albeit in a slightly different context, the notion of ‘modelling’ has been suggested for that undertaking (Gurr 2014). Taking stock of the potential of literary fiction in making sense of complexity, Jens Martin Gurr notes that while usually, models are ‘the *result* of scientific endeavour’, in literary and cultural studies, texts themselves function as models. Taking literary strategies of representation and emplotment as central cues, he concludes that literature can enable ‘an understanding of precisely those elements of [...] complexity that cannot be measured, modelled, classified’ by any other