



P-ISSN : 2074-9554 | E-ISSN: 2663-811

Journal of Al-Farahidi's Arts

available online at : jfa.tu.edu.iq/index.php/jfa



Qusay Faris Arrak Al-Marouf

The Limits of Artificial Intelligence in the Analysis of the English Novel

E-Mail: gusai.f.arak@tu.edu.iq

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence, English Novel, Literary Analysis, Narrative Ambiguity, Sentiment Analysis, Cultural Context

Article history:

Received 7/8/2025
Received in revised form 28/9/2025
Accepted 19/10/2025
Available online 9/12/2025

E-mail Jaa@tu.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

This study explores the limitations of artificial intelligence (AI) in analyzing the English novel, highlighting both technical and philosophical challenges. While AI tools such as natural language processing models, sentiment analyzers, and transformer-based generators offer new possibilities in literary studies, they fall short in areas that require interpretive sensitivity, cultural awareness, and emotional depth. The paper examines the reasons behind AI's inability to process narrative ambiguity, irony, metaphor, all of which are essential to understanding literary texts. Through critical analysis and theoretical reflection, this research argues that literature's richness lies in its ambiguity, affective complexity, and cultural embeddedness, features that AI cannot meaningfully interpret.

©THIS AN OPEN ACCESS ARTICLE UNDER THE CC BY LICENSE

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>



حدود الذكاء الاصطناعي في تحليل الرواية الإنجليزية

قصي فارس عراك المعروف/جامعة تكريت/ كلية الآداب/ قسم اللغة الانكليزية

المستخلص:

يستكشف هذا البحث حدود الذكاء الاصطناعي في تحليل الرواية الإنجليزية، مسلطاً الضوء على التحديات التقنية والفلسفية التي تواجه هذه التقنية. فعلى الرغم من أن أدوات الذكاء الاصطناعي، مثل نماذج معالجة اللغة الطبيعية، ومحللات المشاعر، والمولدات القائمة على المحولات (Transformers)، توفر إمكانيات جديدة في دراسات الأدب، إلا أنها تقف عاجزة أمام الجوانب التي تتطلب حساً تفسيريًا، ووعيًا ثقافيًا، وعمقًا عاطفيًا. يتناول البحث أسباب عدم قدرة الذكاء الاصطناعي على معالجة الغموض السردية، والسخرية، والاستعارة، والتي تُعد عناصر أساسية لفهم النصوص الأدبية. ومن خلال التحليل النقدي والتأمل النظري، يناقش البحث الحالي بأن أهمية الأدب يكمن في غموضه، وتعقيد العاطفي، وتداخله الثقافي، وهي سمات لا يستطيع الذكاء الاصطناعي تفسيرها بشكل دقيق أو شامل.

الكلمات المفتاحية : الذكاء الاصطناعي، الرواية الإنجليزية، التحليل الأدبي، الغموض السردية، تحليل المشاعر، السياق الثقافي.

1.0 Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) increasingly transforms the landscape of the humanities, especially literary studies. Tools powered by natural language processing (NLP) and machine learning now offer scholars the ability to analyze vast textual corpora, identify linguistic patterns, and even generate literary interpretations. In the realm of the English novel, AI is used to extract themes, detect sentiment, analyze narrative structure, and classify genre. However, despite its computational power, AI often falls short in engaging with the nuanced, ambiguous, and interpretive nature of literary fiction. The human experience of reading—rich in emotion, cultural context, and symbolic inference—remains largely beyond the reach of current AI systems (Jockers, 2013). Thus, this research explores the limits of AI in analyzing the English novel, focusing on its epistemological and methodological shortcomings.

1.1 Research Problem

While AI shows promise in processing surface-level textual features such as syntax, vocabulary frequency, and topic modeling, it fails to interpret abstract literary elements such as irony, metaphor, intertextuality, and unreliable narration. English novels often employ layered meanings, culturally embedded references, and complex character psychologies that require a level of interpretive engagement AI cannot achieve. Moreover, AI lacks the historical consciousness and subjective awareness essential for understanding how readers perceive, reinterpret, and respond to texts over time. As a result, there is a significant gap between the capabilities of AI and the intellectual demands of literary analysis (Underwood, 2019). This research addresses this gap by investigating the precise nature and scope of AI's limitations in this field.

1.2 Aims of the Research

This research aims to identify and explain the primary limitations of AI in analyzing the English novel. It seeks to evaluate the extent to which AI can engage with core literary features—such as narrative ambiguity, stylistic innovation, and cultural context—and determine where it fails to do so. Furthermore, the study aims to explore how AI tools currently function in literary studies, and what implications their limitations have for the future of literary scholarship. Finally, the research

aspires to promote a clearer understanding of the necessary balance between computational analysis and human interpretation in the study of literature (Leiter, 2022).

1.3 Questions of the Research

This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent can AI analyze the structural and thematic complexity of the English novel?
2. What are the specific interpretive and contextual limitations of AI in literary analysis?
3. How does the absence of cultural and emotional cognition affect AI's understanding of English fiction?
4. What ethical or philosophical concerns arise from using AI in place of human literary interpretation?

2.0 The Nature of Literary Analysis

Literary analysis involves more than the extraction of information from texts; it requires interpretation, emotional insight, historical awareness, and critical reflection. When readers engage with English novels, they do not merely decode words—they enter into imagined worlds, respond to complex human experiences, and construct meaning through active intellectual and emotional participation. This dynamic interpretive process distinguishes literature from other forms of writing and poses significant challenges for artificial intelligence (Fish, 1980).

Traditional literary criticism prioritizes close reading, a method that emphasizes detailed attention to language, structure, symbolism, and tone. Such reading strategies are grounded in the belief that the meaning of a literary work is not always explicit and must be discovered through thoughtful analysis. While AI can identify recurring patterns and quantify stylistic features, it does not understand how a sentence might carry multiple layers of meaning or how one image might echo another across chapters. AI lacks the hermeneutic capacity to interpret texts in ways that consider ambiguity, contradiction, and unresolved tensions (Gadamer, 2004).

Furthermore, the meaning of literature is not fixed; it evolves with each reader and cultural moment. English novels like *Wuthering Heights* or *Ulysses* have generated diverse interpretations over time, shaped by readers' cultural backgrounds, historical contexts, and philosophical frameworks. AI, however, relies on static training data and algorithmic rules that cannot replicate the variability and richness of human response. It cannot shift its perspective based on changing interpretive paradigms or adapt its analysis to new critical schools of thought (Iser, 1978).

Literary texts often depend on affective dimensions that AI cannot grasp. For instance, a character's silence might signal deep emotional conflict, or a seemingly minor event might carry symbolic weight. AI, operating through statistical inference, tends to overlook or misinterpret these affective and symbolic subtleties. As a result, its literary "analysis" often appears superficial or reductionist when compared with that of human scholars (Nussbaum, 1997).

In addition, the ethical and philosophical frameworks underpinning literary criticism are inaccessible to AI. Novels frequently raise moral dilemmas or explore existential questions—concerns that require philosophical reflection, emotional intuition, and cultural awareness. AI does not possess moral reasoning or lived experience and cannot engage with literature in ways that respect its humanistic core. Therefore, while AI may complement certain aspects of textual study, it remains fundamentally limited in its capacity to perform genuine literary analysis (Attridge, 2004).

3.0 Overview of AI in Literary Studies

In recent years, the field of digital humanities has welcomed artificial intelligence as a promising tool for textual analysis. AI systems—especially those based on machine learning and natural language processing—now assist scholars in identifying thematic patterns, tracking stylistic changes, and even predicting authorship. These developments have introduced new forms of literary analysis that rely on quantitative data rather than subjective interpretation, marking a significant shift in the methods used within literary studies (Jockers, 2013).

One of the most prominent innovations is "distant reading," a term coined by Franco Moretti to describe the analysis of large text corpora using computational techniques. Instead of reading individual novels closely, distant reading uses AI tools to detect macro-level trends across thousands of texts, such as the rise and fall of genres, the evolution of narrative voice, or shifts in emotional tone. While this method enables scholars to explore literary history in new ways, it often comes at the expense of depth and nuance, which are essential to understanding individual works (Moretti, 2013).

Stylometric analysis, another widely used AI-based approach, involves measuring linguistic features—such as sentence length, vocabulary richness, and punctuation use—to attribute authorship or determine stylistic similarities. These techniques have proven effective in cases like identifying anonymous writers or verifying disputed texts. However, stylometry struggles with experimental literature or texts that deliberately defy conventional linguistic patterns. As a result, its utility is largely confined to specific questions that do not require interpretive reasoning (Hoover, 2017).

More recently, transformer-based language models like GPT have entered the field of literary analysis. These models generate text, summarize content, and provide thematic or character analyses based on their training data. Although such outputs may appear sophisticated, they are often limited by a lack of understanding of literary context and an inability to recognize ambiguity or authorial subtext. Their analyses can be formulaic, overly general, or even factually incorrect, reflecting the probabilistic rather than interpretive nature of AI reasoning (Bender et al., 2021).

Despite these limitations, some scholars advocate for integrating AI into literary research as a complementary method. AI can assist with exploratory data analysis, highlight textual features that might escape human attention, and facilitate the comparison of large corpora. However, it cannot replace the interpretive judgment of a human reader, nor can it account for the emotional, cultural, and philosophical dimensions that define the English novel. Thus, while AI reshapes how literary texts are studied, it also reveals the enduring need for human insight in understanding literature (Burrows, 2004).

4.0 Complexity and Ambiguity in Narrative Structures

One of the defining features of the English novel is its narrative complexity. Novels often unfold through multi-layered plots, shifting points of view, and ambiguous character motivations. These elements create a richness that requires interpretive engagement beyond surface-level comprehension. While AI can process linguistic data and identify narrative elements like plot progression or character mentions, it struggles with the subtleties that make literary narratives compelling and meaningful (Kellogg, 2018).

Ambiguity is central to the aesthetic and thematic structure of many English novels. Authors often use ambiguity to challenge readers, leaving open questions about characters' motivations or the moral implications of events. For instance, in Henry James's *The Turn of the Screw*, the reader is never told definitively whether the ghosts are real or hallucinated. AI models, which are trained to seek clarity and pattern recognition, often misinterpret such ambiguity or fail to register it altogether. The inability to hold multiple, conflicting interpretations simultaneously limits AI's usefulness in analyzing such texts (Ryan, 2020).

Stream-of-consciousness narration further complicates AI's task. In works by Virginia Woolf or James Joyce, the narrative flows through characters' inner thoughts, often without clear syntactic boundaries or logical progression. These texts demand an understanding of psychological nuance and linguistic innovation that current AI systems are not equipped to process. AI may identify repeated phrases or fragmented grammar but lacks the theoretical framework to interpret these stylistic choices as reflective of character consciousness or existential fragmentation (Abbott, 2008).

Moreover, English novels frequently employ nonlinear structures, including flashbacks, foreshadowing, and temporal disjunctions. These narrative techniques require readers to reconstruct chronology and meaning actively. AI, on the other hand, tends to treat text sequentially, processing it in a linear fashion that overlooks the temporal complexity embedded in narrative design. As a result, AI analyses can distort the

pacing, cause-effect relationships, or emotional trajectory of a novel (Branigan, 1992).

Even in relatively straightforward narratives, the presence of subtle character development poses a challenge. Characters in English novels often undergo gradual transformation, with internal conflicts and moral dilemmas shaping their growth. AI lacks the capacity to infer these psychological changes over time or to relate them to broader thematic structures. It may identify shifts in tone or vocabulary but cannot map these changes onto a meaningful arc of personal or ethical development (Forster, 1927).

In sum, the complexity and ambiguity of narrative structures in the English novel demand an interpretive flexibility and philosophical sensitivity that AI does not possess. While AI can assist in organizing textual data, it cannot substitute for the critical engagement required to understand the depth and meaning of literary narratives (Culler, 1997).

4.1 Irony, Sarcasm, and Metaphor: A Linguistic Challenge

Irony, sarcasm, and metaphor are among the most intricate rhetorical devices in literature, and they are frequently employed in English novels to convey subtle meanings, critique social norms, or expose contradictions. These devices rely heavily on context, cultural understanding, and inferential reasoning—capacities that AI systems do not fully possess. While natural language processing tools can identify literal meaning with increasing accuracy, they consistently struggle to detect non-literal, layered language such as irony or metaphor (Veale & Hao, 2007).

Irony functions by stating the opposite of what is meant, often to humorous or critical effect. Its interpretation depends on tone, context, and the reader's awareness of the underlying incongruity. In Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, for example, Mr. Bennet's dry remarks often undercut the seriousness of the situation, revealing deeper critiques of social conventions. An AI system may interpret these lines at face value, missing the irony and thereby misrepresenting the character's voice and thematic intent (Attardo, 2000).

Sarcasm adds emotional intensity to irony, frequently involving ridicule or disdain. AI models, especially those trained on literal and neutral datasets, tend to misread sarcasm as genuine sentiment. This limitation is particularly problematic in novels that use sarcasm to explore power dynamics, gender roles, or moral hypocrisy. Without a sense of emotional subtext or social tension, AI cannot differentiate between sincere praise and biting mockery (Maynard & Greenwood, 2014).

Metaphor, which compares two unlike things to reveal hidden similarities, is another challenge for AI. Literary metaphors often go beyond conventional usage to create novel imagery or philosophical insight. In George Orwell's *1984*, metaphors like "a boot stamping on a human face—forever" evoke visceral responses that cannot be captured through syntactic analysis alone. While some AI models use metaphor detection algorithms, they frequently rely on established metaphor databases and cannot generate or interpret novel metaphors with originality or depth (Shutova, 2011).

Moreover, metaphor often operates at a conceptual level, as theorized by Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, where even abstract ideas like love or time are structured metaphorically. AI can detect repeated metaphorical patterns but cannot grasp how they shape worldviews or evolve within a character's psychological development. This limitation reduces AI's capacity to understand how metaphor drives meaning in the English novel.

The failure to recognize figurative language not only results in superficial analysis but can also lead to misinterpretation of the author's message. For instance, interpreting Swift's *A Modest Proposal* literally—as AI might—turns a brilliant satirical critique of British colonialism into a grotesque endorsement of cannibalism. This illustrates the ethical and interpretive dangers of applying AI to literary texts without human oversight (Wallace, 2007).

4.2 Sentiment Analysis and Emotional Depth

Sentiment analysis is one of the most commonly used natural language processing techniques in AI-driven literary studies. It seeks to classify portions of text as positive, negative, or neutral based on the emotional tone of the language. While effective in contexts like product

reviews or social media posts, sentiment analysis often falls short when applied to the emotional complexity of English novels. Literature frequently expresses emotions indirectly, through tone, imagery, or contradiction—elements that evade simplistic classification systems (Pang & Lee, 2008).

One major limitation of sentiment analysis lies in its reliance on polarity-based word associations. Words like “happy,” “love,” or “excellent” are flagged as positive, while “sad,” “angry,” or “failure” are labeled negative. However, in literature, words are often used in ironic, metaphorical, or ambiguous ways. For example, in Ernest Hemingway’s writing, emotional restraint is a hallmark style. His characters may express grief or longing through silence or sparse dialogue—modes of communication that AI tools often misinterpret as emotionally neutral (Whissell, 2013).

Furthermore, English novels frequently contain emotional contradictions. A scene may simultaneously evoke hope and despair, affection and resentment. In Ian McEwan’s *Atonement*, for instance, guilt and redemption unfold across layered temporalities, with shifting emotional undercurrents that demand nuanced interpretation. AI tools, trained to detect dominant sentiment, may reduce these moments to a single polarity, thereby flattening their emotional texture (Kim & Klinger, 2019).

Additionally, sarcasm and irony pose significant problems for sentiment algorithms. When a character says, “Well, that went wonderfully,” following a tragic event, AI may misclassify this as a positive sentiment due to lexical cues, missing the underlying irony. In novels where irony is pervasive—such as in the works of Oscar Wilde or Evelyn Waugh—sentiment analysis becomes not only inaccurate but misleading (Reyes, Rosso, & Veale, 2013).

Another challenge is the contextual dependency of emotional expression. The emotional weight of a phrase often depends on prior events in the narrative, character development, or thematic buildup. AI systems process text as discrete units, limiting their ability to track emotional arcs over time. This leads to fragmented readings that ignore

emotional progression and resolution—key components of narrative structure and reader engagement (Mohammad, 2016).

Moreover, literature is not merely a mirror of emotion but an exploration of how emotions are felt, concealed, or performed. Novels like Toni Morrison's *Beloved* or Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway* portray trauma, memory, and depression in ways that resist categorical labeling. These complex emotional states challenge the reductionist logic of sentiment analysis, which assumes emotions are static, binary, and universal (Nguyen, McGillivray, & Yasseri, 2020).

4.3 Human Creativity vs. Algorithmic Patterning

At the heart of literary production and analysis lies human creativity—a faculty rooted in imagination, intuition, and cultural experience. English novels, as artistic expressions, are crafted not merely through linguistic rules but through inventive narrative structures, emotional depth, and philosophical insight. Artificial intelligence, by contrast, functions through algorithmic patterning. While it can replicate stylistic features and generate text that appears creative, its output is fundamentally derivative, lacking intentionality, emotion, and original vision (Boden, 2004).

Human authors write with purpose, often motivated by personal, political, or existential concerns. Their creative choices—such as breaking narrative conventions, playing with language, or embedding hidden meanings—arise from conscious deliberation and lived experience. AI models, however, operate by detecting statistical regularities in training data and predicting the most likely continuation of a given prompt. They do not innovate; they remix. As a result, AI-generated texts may resemble literary works on the surface but lack the conceptual depth that defines true creativity (Colton & Wiggins, 2012).

The distinction becomes especially evident in the use of symbolism and metaphor. A novelist might introduce a recurring motif—such as a locked door or a decaying garden—not simply for decoration but as a metaphor for psychological repression or social decay. AI can detect repetition but does not assign thematic significance to it unless trained to associate it with fixed meanings. This limits its capacity to generate or interpret symbolic complexity in a meaningful way (Turner, 2014).

Another area where human creativity surpasses algorithmic output is in the invention of narrative form. Writers like Virginia Woolf, James Joyce, or William Faulkner introduced stream-of-consciousness techniques that disrupted linear storytelling and reflected inner consciousness. These innovations were not derived from prior patterns but from radical reimaginings of what narrative could do. AI, trained on past examples, cannot invent entirely new forms or challenge literary conventions in the same revolutionary manner (Simonton, 2012).

Even when AI models produce aesthetically pleasing prose or mimic authorial voices, they lack what philosopher Nelson Goodman called “symbolic functioning”—the ability to create expressions that mean something within a cultural or emotional context. Without this function, AI-generated literature risks being seen as stylistic pastiche rather than authentic art. It can imitate Shakespearean language or Victorian tone, but it cannot originate a worldview, critique a social order, or propose a moral vision (Goodman, 1976).

Conclusion

The exploration of artificial intelligence in the analysis of the English novel reveals both the capabilities and the critical limitations of current computational approaches. While AI tools such as GPT, stylometry programs, and sentiment analyzers offer efficiency, scalability, and pattern recognition, they fall short in areas that require human sensitivity—namely, interpretation, cultural awareness, emotional depth, and ethical reasoning. English novels, as rich and layered artistic expressions, demand engagement with ambiguity, irony, historical context, and symbolic meaning—dimensions that AI, constrained by its statistical and non-conscious nature, cannot adequately process.

Throughout this study, it becomes evident that AI lacks the faculties required for genuine literary understanding. It cannot recognize the psychological intricacies of unreliable narrators, the philosophical implications of metafiction, or the symbolic resonance of cultural references. Its interpretation of text remains literal, linear, and contextually shallow. The essence of literature—as an evolving dialogue between author, reader, and society—requires interpretive frameworks

grounded in human experience, emotional intelligence, and critical theory.

Furthermore, the ethical concerns surrounding the increasing use of AI in literary studies cannot be ignored. Relying too heavily on AI risks distorting literary meaning, promoting biased interpretations, and diminishing the role of critical human inquiry. It also raises questions about academic integrity, originality, and the future of humanities education if interpretive labor is offloaded to machines.

However, this research does not dismiss the potential value of AI altogether. Rather, it advocates for a hybrid approach where AI tools serve as assistants—capable of organizing data, generating hypotheses, or facilitating comparative analysis—but not as replacements for human interpretation. Literary studies must remain rooted in the nuanced, reflective, and ethical capacities of human readers who can interpret, empathize, and critique with insight and responsibility.

References

- Abbott, H. P. (2008). *The Cambridge introduction to narrative* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2002). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Attardo, S. (2000). Irony markers and functions: Towards a goal-oriented theory of irony and its processing. *Rask*, 12, 3–20.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (M. Holquist, Ed., C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). University of Texas Press.
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big?. *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623.
- Boden, M. A. (2004). *The creative mind: Myths and mechanisms* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Bommasani, R., Hudson, D. A., Adeli, E., Altman, R., Arora, S., von Arx, S., ... & Liang, P. (2021). On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*.
- Booth, W. C. (1983). *The rhetoric of fiction* (2nd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Branigan, E. (1992). *Narrative comprehension and film*. Routledge.

- Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., ... & Amodei, D. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 1877–1901.
- Burrows, J. (2004). Textual analysis. In S. Schreibman, R. Siemens, & J. Unsworth (Eds.), *A companion to digital humanities* (pp. 323–347). Blackwell.
- Cohn, D. (1978). *Transparent minds: Narrative modes for presenting consciousness in fiction*. Princeton University Press.
- Colton, S., & Wiggins, G. A. (2012). Computational creativity: The final frontier? In *Proceedings of the 20th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 21–26). IOS Press.
- Culler, J. (1997). *Literary theory: A very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Drucker, J. (2020). *Visualization and interpretation: Humanistic approaches to display*. MIT Press.
- Elliott, K. (2019). *The strange world of algorithms in literary studies*. Stanford University Press.
- Felski, R. (2008). *Uses of literature*. Blackwell.
- Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities*. Harvard University Press.
- Floridi, L., & Chiriatti, M. (2020). GPT-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines*, 30(4), 681–694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09548-1>
- Forster, E. M. (1927). *Aspects of the novel*. Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Gadamer, H. G. (2004). *Truth and method* (2nd ed., J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.). Continuum.
- Gibbs, R. W. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language, and understanding*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goodman, N. (1976). *Languages of art: An approach to a theory of symbols* (2nd ed.). Hackett Publishing.
- Hoover, D. L. (2017). Language and style in computational literary studies. In M. Burke (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of stylistics* (pp. 471–486). Routledge.
- Ingle, S. (1993). *George Orwell: A political life*. Manchester University Press.
- Iser, W. (1978). *The act of reading: A theory of aesthetic response*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jockers, M. L. (2013). *Macroanalysis: Digital methods and literary history*. University of Illinois Press.
- Johnson, C. L. (2014). *Jane Austen: Women, politics, and the novel*. University of Chicago Press.

- Kellogg, D. (2018). *Narrative and the making of US national security*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kermode, F. (1979). *The genesis of secrecy: On the interpretation of narrative*. Harvard University Press.
- Kim, E., & Klinger, R. (2019). Frowning Frodo, wincing Leia, and a seriously sarcastic Harry: Learning implicit emotion expressions in movie subtitles. *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3724–3735.
- Lanser, S. S. (1981). *The narrative act: Point of view in prose fiction*. Princeton University Press.
- Ledger, S., & Luckhurst, R. (2000). *The fin de siècle: A reader in cultural history, c. 1880–1900*. Oxford University Press.
- Liu, B. (2015). *Sentiment analysis: Mining opinions, sentiments, and emotions*. Cambridge University Press.
- Marcus, G., & Davis, E. (2019). *Rebooting AI: Building artificial intelligence we can trust*. Pantheon Books.
- Maynard, D., & Greenwood, M. A. (2014). Who cares about sarcastic tweets? Investigating the impact of sarcasm on sentiment analysis. In *LREC 2014 Proceedings* (pp. 4238–4243).
- Maynez, J., Narayan, S., Bohnet, B., & McDonald, R. (2020). On faithfulness and factuality in abstractive summarization. *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 1906–1919.
- McCormack, J., & d’Inverno, M. (2012). On the future of computers and creativity. *AISB Quarterly*, (136), 5–11.
- Mohammad, S. M. (2016). Sentiment analysis: Detecting valence, emotions, and other affectual states from text. In L. Aiello & D. McFarland (Eds.), *Social network data analytics* (pp. 201–237). Springer.
- Moretti, F. (2013). *Distant reading*. Verso.
- Nguyen, D., McGillivray, B., & Yasserli, T. (2020). Emo, love, and god: Making sense of urban dictionary, a crowdsourced online dictionary. *Royal Society Open Science*, 7(1), 191836. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.191836>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Harvard University Press.
- Pang, B., & Lee, L. (2008). Opinion mining and sentiment analysis. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval*, 2(1–2), 1–135. <https://doi.org/10.1561/15000000011>
- Phelan, J. (2005). *Living to tell about it: A rhetoric and ethics of character narration*. Cornell University Press.

- Reagan, A. J., Mitchell, L., Kiley, D., Danforth, C. M., & Dodds, P. S. (2016). The emotional arcs of stories are dominated by six basic shapes. *EPJ Data Science*, 5(1), 31.
- Reyes, A., Rosso, P., & Veale, T. (2013). A multidimensional approach for detecting irony in Twitter. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 47(1), 239–268.
- Ryan, M.-L. (2020). *Narrative as virtual reality 2: Revisiting immersion and interactivity in literature and electronic media* (2nd ed.). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. Knopf.
- Shutova, E. (2011). Design and evaluation of metaphor processing systems. *Computational Linguistics*, 39(1), 1–5.
- Simonton, D. K. (2012). Taking the U.S. Patent Office criteria seriously: A quantitative three-criterion creativity definition and its implications. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(2–3), 97–106.
- Turner, M. (2014). *The origin of ideas: Blending, creativity, and the human spark*. Oxford University Press.
- Veale, T., & Hao, Y. (2007). Making lexical ontologies functional and context-sensitive. In *Proceedings of ACL 2007 Workshop on Cognitive Aspects of Computational Language Acquisition* (pp. 57–64).
- Wallace, M. (2007). *Satire and the novel in eighteenth-century England*. Cambridge University Press.
- Whissell, C. (2013). Three decades of emotion in the short stories of Ernest Hemingway. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 116(1), 97–106.
- Yacobi, T. (1981). Fictional reliability as a communicative problem. *Poetics Today*, 2(2), 113–126.