

Terminology

Actual World: Ruth Ronen defines actual worlds from three different stances of narrative theorists in general, and these are the views of modal realism, moderate realism, and anti-realist. One definition cannot be highlighted as “more true” than another, simply because the actual world is measured by its counterpart, the various **possible worlds**, which are purely theoretical and their existence depends upon human perception, which is always subjective and relative to that which surrounds it. Moderate realism is the definition that I develop into a revised version of possible worlds, and Ronen defines the moderate system’s definition of actual worlds as having “possible worlds . . . within the confines of the actual world and are viewed as components of the actual world. The actual world is a complex structure that includes both its actual elements and non-actual possibilities, that is, the ways things might have been (whether these non-actual possibilities exist as *mental constructs*, as postulated by Rescher, as *non-obtaining states*, as proposed by Platinga, or as a *set of propositions* about things in our world, as suggested by Adams)” (22). I develop the moderate realist approach in its most fundamental points, that being that possible worlds exist *within* the actual, which is prior to them; that in the actual world there are non-actual possibilities that can be viewed as mental constructs; but I diverge from Ronen’s definition when she states that “Possible worlds in any case are the result of rational behaviour which only admits one world” (22). My analysis operates in opposition to this final point, and I argue that both possible and actual worlds are experienced concurrently by each individual, and that possible worlds are places with **infinite potentiality** to create new data of **consciousness**, and integrate parts of these data into the individual’s actual world. I contend that it is *most rational* for one to take advantage of possible world psychical creations and data, and use the newfound data as a means of supplementing one’s existence in the actual world. The actual world definition used by both Ronen and myself apply both to works of fiction analyzed through the lens of narrative theory, as well as the world in which we, as readers, exist in relation to each other.

Aggregate: I use the term “aggregate” to describe a unit in itself that is in constant flux as it changes and expands in space—the space that we understand as the fabric of the universe: space allows the existence and engagement of matter and energy simply by providing it *with the space*, in the literal sense. The aggregate, in the case of my argument, refers both to people—who are composed of their own experiences and who are shaped by the events of their lives—and to the collective of all individuals in the universal and infinite space (*i.e.* the universe), who continue to grow and expand as a multiplicity of beings. The aggregate is a whole in itself, but it can never be complete; it seems counter-intuitive, but it is the whole *at x-given moment*, but is prone to expansion and evolution all of the time and into **infinity**. There is no limit for the aggregate in space, because space is infinite. I refer to the parts of the aggregate as “building blocks,” and I refer to any individuated aggregate (*i.e.* and individual being) as functioning *as a building block itself*. Arthur describes the aggregate that is the whole in constant flux as “the continuous whole” (xxxix).

Brute Fact: Rhetorician John Searle explains that brute facts are “Intrinsic features of reality [that] exist independently of all mental states,” and that “Brute facts exist independently of any human institutions . . . [they] require the institution of language in order that we can *state* the facts, but brute facts *themselves* exist quite independently of language or any other institution” (14; 27). One example of a brute fact would be a mountain, which is indisputable matter in the world, and its existence is not relative to that which surrounds it; instead, it

exists in spite of subjective beings and its existence depends on nothing related to human **consciousness** and perception.

Consciousness: I define consciousness via Bergson, who explains that consciousness is characterized its “most obvious feature,” which is “before anything else, memory” (*Mind* 3). Bergson’s approach to explaining consciousness informs my usage of this term, because memory implies a cognitive being who engages with the world and experiences phenomena, and memory signifies an external event that is internalized within the mind.

Continuum: Philosopher Richard T.W. Arthur explains the continuum via Wilhelm Gottfried Leibniz’s philosophy and mathematics. Arthur states that “In order for the parts of a body to cohere together continuously through time, there needs to be a continuous sequence of endeavours propagated across it, in other words, *a continuous motion*” (xl). This continuous motion can be considered synonymous with Bergsonian **duration**, which is one unending flow of energy and matter through space. The continuum is, in its essence, akin to space, which Bergson argues is the same thing as duration; therefore, the continuum is the space or fabric of human **consciousness** upon which each individual who exists as an “event” on the continuum leaves a trace of their existence through the passage of time. The continuum is composed of **infinitesimals**; and the continuum begins with one whole number, which is akin to the one particle that gave way to the universe in which we live, and thus it divides infinitely (*i.e.* it divides with no foreseeable termination) to infinity. As a result, the continuum—and Bergsonian **duration**—are the terms with which we can understand space, which is not visible to the eye, aside from our perception of the matter that exists within space. I equate each infinitesimal upon the continuum as a life, which I consider an event, and that since each infinitesimal divides infinitely (*i.e.* each individual creates data that enters universal space, and each datum becomes in itself an autonomous unit). As such, we see that one point, or one individual, can expand as an infinite multiplicity in space, and a significant portion of the data that propels the expansion is of **possible worlds**.

Duration: Bergson defines duration as “the form which the succession of our conscious states assumes when our ego lets itself *live*, when it refrains from separating the present state from its former states” (*Time* 100). Furthermore, Bergson notes that in recalling these states of **consciousness**, the mind “does not set them alongside its actual state as one point alongside another, but forms both the past and the present states into an organic whole, as happens when we recall the notes of a tune, melting, so to speak, into one another” (100). The successive states of being that melt each into another allow the nature of duration to be homogeneous in spite of the fact that all the events are separate and are not all of one source of being or consciousness.

Entelechy: There are several definitions of this term that speak to the complex nature of a philosophical principle that has existed at least since the Ancient Greeks. Aristotle understood entelechy as a process of actualization, which he describes in *De anima* (*On the Soul*); Leibniz expands upon this to say that entelechy is “the soul or principle of perfection of an object or person” (*Collins*, “Entelechy”), and he explains in the *Monadology* that each “monad” (a term that describes the essence of a unit, or the presence of one simple substance at the core of a unit, or a substance that exists *a priori* to the unit) is one indivisible substance. I branch out from Leibniz’s theory of the indivisible substance in order to argue that each monad could be considered a unit or whole-in-itself, even if it is an infinitesimal; and I will explain how an infinitesimal whose ontology is of one simple substance is not

strictly dividing infinitely, but rather expanding to infinity. I unite these definitions to create one that is designed to describe each **infinitesimal**, which I describe as a being in **consciousness** upon the **continuum**, as a unique unit that expands infinitely via the process of entelechy, where the being recognizes the **potentiality** of *x*-substance within the self and endeavours to actualize it to some effect in the **actual world**.

Infinite Progress: Infinite progress is a formula borrowed from mathematics, and formulated as follows: p^1 therefore p^2 therefore $p^3 \dots p^n$, with the last figure indicating that the process continues to **infinity**. I explain infinite progress in greater detail in the Flaubert and Carroll chapters.

Infinitesimal Regress: The equation for infinitesimal regress is drawn from mathematics, as opposed to logic, and is formulated as such: p^1 if p^2 if $p^3 \dots p^n$, with the last term indicating the process of division continues to **infinity**. I explain the conceptual framework of infinitesimal regress briefly in the Flaubert chapter, and in depth throughout the Carroll chapter.

Infinitesimals: Infinitesimals are the points that exist upon the **continuum**, and each is derived from the first number in the sequence. From a conceptual application, each infinitesimal will be considered a human being in **consciousness**, who exists in space, and is *of* space. I will offer an explanation as to why I equate the continuum with space/**duration**, so for the purpose of this thesis, the “first number” can be considered the first particle that gave way to matter and **substance** in space via energy, or motion. As such, each infinitesimal—each being—is a partial reflection of the first particle, because each being finds its ontological roots in this particle. Likewise, for each infinitesimal-being that divides to **infinity**, all matter that is of the specific infinitesimal in turn reflects the infinitesimal as its ontological genesis. In terms of **possible worlds**, each possible world that composes each **internal duration** in one being, exists as a part of the infinitesimal that initiated the possible world, which means that all possible worlds of one being in the **actual world** unite in the infinitesimal-being as the homogeneous identification of the self, known by the pronoun “I.”

Infinity/The Infinite: Infinity, or the infinite, though it is a mathematical term, does not represent a number or a composite number; in fact, it *cannot* represent a number, because a number by nature is finite (*e.g.* there are three apples means simply there are three, and only three, apples; if an apple is added, it is no longer three, but now four, but this does not change the association of the number 3 that signifies only three of any visible matter). There have existed debates between mathematicians and physicists as to whether space is truly infinite, or if it is simply our inability to “catch up” with its constant expansion. Max Tegmark explains that space is in fact infinite, as suspected by Euclid, and proved in Einstein’s *Theory of Relativity* (33). I refer to space according to the premise that it is indeed infinite.

Institutional Fact: Searle defines institutional facts as a “subclass” of “social facts,” and he explains that this subclass is governed by human institutions (*i.e.* manmade realities). Institutional facts “can exist only within human institutions,” and Searle uses the example, “Clinton is president” to differentiate institutional facts from **brute facts**, where the former exist only *through and in* human **consciousness**, and cannot exist independently of the “collective” mind (26-7).

Internal Duration: Bergson explains that there is in each individual an internal duration, which “grasps a succession which is not juxtaposition, a growth from within, the

uninterrupted prolongation of the past into a present which is already blending into the future. It is the direct vision of the mind by the mind” (*Creative* 20).

Intuition: Bergsonian **duration** and internal duration exists relative to intuition. Intuition is the realization of the conscious self and its presence in space. It is intuition that allows “the direct vision of the mind by the mind” (*Creative* 20).

Merism: This is a term that dates back to Ancient Greek philosophy and rhetoric, and the *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology* explains that a merism is a whole, or an **aggregate**, that is a united whole, although it is composed of seemingly opposing parts.

Mind-Space: I combine the terms “mind” and “space,” akin to the formulation of **space-time**, to create one unified concept, which describes a quasi-Cartesian explanation of the body occupying space, and the mind giving the body (a type of matter) form. Where the body is the corporeal portion of the dualism, the mind crafts an identity for the body via experiential data in universal space, and in the **actual world**. Therefore, the mind-space is quite similar to the Cartesian mind-body dualism, but I simply reconfigure the idea in order to match the given context of the individual being in space.

Possible Worlds: Ruth Ronen defines possible worlds in the context of narrative theory as spaces that “legitimize an interest in referential problems and in everything that concerns the relations between literature and the actual world” (20). I expand upon this definition slightly to argue that possible worlds are subjective spaces within the mind of the conscious being that assist the individual in sorting the data of consciousness from the **actual world**; they are spaces of **potentiality** for the data of the **mind-space** to be actualized and brought into one’s actual world in the form best suited to the individual’s best interests.

Potentiality: I use this term to describe one’s recognition of that which *could be* if *x* action is taken. It is to recognize something in oneself and to act, which is the initial stage of **entelechy**. Potentiality is a quality within the begin that can assist one in one’s process of self-amelioration.

Space-Time: Space-Time is a term developed to describe the four dimensions of matter in space (*i.e.* extensity); it is a concept derived from applied mathematics, and it combines the length, width, and height of matter with the additional fourth dimension of time; thus together, matter and the system of time are understood as space-time.

Substance: Christian Moevs describes the Aristotelean-Ptolemaic system of substantial forms, which are “material,” and “invariant (apparently self-subsistent) things of which changing attributes (accidents) are predicated, as ‘fat’ or ‘old’ is predicated of Socrates, who can be more or less fat, but not more or less Socrates” (79). I use this term to signify the presence of matter that occupies a dimension of **space-time**, and whose substance—that which is unique to that being, or essential to that being, and that which is at the very core of a being—informs the nature of the being and its form in “spatiotemporal identities” (39). Moevs elaborates on matter and its relation to form, the latter of which is that which “gives being to matter,” or that which defines matter as one specific thing, as opposed to another; the form allows matter to be identified, but it is the substance that is integral to that specific matter that defines its nature. I use “substance” in reference to human beings, and that which is within the individual, but must be recognized in order to take form, which is the end-process of **entelechy** in that given evolution.

Worlds within Worlds: This is a phrase developed by Leibniz that describes the nature of expansion of **infinitesimals** upon the **continuum**. Due to the fact that each infinitesimal can itself divide infinitely, the division creates a multiplicity, and from each new product of the division of the infinitesimal, there is a new “world,” or new source of **potentiality** that will, in turn, divide infinitely itself. I equate this with possible worlds to support my claim that the **mind-space**—in which the possible world exists—is infinite in potentiality, because it is a mirror image of infinite space that is specific to the individual. Therefore, each individual is a fragment of infinite space—each being is an infinitesimal—that has the possibility to create new experiential data in the mind-space of the individual, and which can enter the process of **entelechy**, which creates new worlds, or realities, that are transferred from the **possible world** to the actual, and are integrated into the **actual-world** modes of being.