

Fantasy, Miracle, and the Aesthetics of the Sacred; Philosophical Reflections on Art as a New Religion in the Twenty-First Century

Mohsen Karami 

Assistant Professor of Religion and Media Faculty, IRIB University, Tehran, Iran. E-mail: mohsenkarami@iribu.ac.ir

Article Info

Article type:

Research Article

Article history:

Received 21 September 2026

Received in revised form 03 November 2026

Accepted 22 December 2026

Published online 25 October 2026

Keywords:

Aesthetic Religion,
Digital Media, Fantasy,
Miracle, Post-Secularity,
The Sacred

ABSTRACT

This article investigates the convergence of art, religion, and technology in the twenty-first century, exploring whether artistic fantasy can function as a novel religious form in post-secular contexts. The theoretical backbone rests on three primary thinkers: Tillich (ultimate concern), Eliade (sacred rupture), and Gadamer (aesthetic horizon-fusion). It argues that digital media—cinema, transmedia franchises, video games, and virtual reality—replicate the phenomenological structure of miraculous encounters by suspending causal norms, evoking awe, and reorienting perception. A tripartite typology of aesthetic religion is proposed: weak forms generating awe without enduring structures; institutional forms sustaining communal identity through fandoms and virtual rituals; and robust forms theoretically assuming normative or metaphysical roles. Case studies—controversial art (Serrano, Ofili, Danish Muhammad cartoons, Tanavoli's sculptures), global and Iranian fandoms (Marvel, Star Wars, Shahrzad, Prince of Persia), and VR pilgrimages—illustrate this framework. While aesthetic forms lack metaphysical grounding and binding normativity, they foster moral imagination and communal bonds, signaling transcendence's migration into mediated realms. The article advocates for coexistence, where aesthetics gain sacral import and religious practices embrace artistic innovation, with profound implications for philosophy, theology, and cultural policy in technologically mediated societies.

Cite this article: Karami, M. (2026). Fantasy, Miracle, and the Aesthetics of the Sacred Philosophical Reflections on Art as a New Religion in the Twenty-First Century. *Journal of Philosophical Investigations*, 20(56), 541-562. <https://doi.org/10.22034/jpiut.2025.69125.4189>



© The Author(s).

Publisher: University of Tabriz.

Introduction

The twenty-first century presents an unprecedented convergence of religion, art, and technology. Never before has the human imagination been so profoundly shaped by digital media, immersive artistic forms, and visual technologies capable of generating worlds that blur the boundary between reality and fantasy (Taylor, 2007, 19–23). Simultaneously, religion—historically the custodian of miracles, transcendence, and ultimate meaning—finds itself challenged and reconfigured by these aesthetic innovations (Habermas, 2008, 18–20). This article poses a central, provocative question: can art, particularly in its digital and fantastical manifestations, replace religion by offering experiences that function as modern miracles? And if not outright replacement, can we speak of the emergence of what may be called *aesthetic religion*?

To proceed we must begin by defining terms. By *miracle* I mean, in the classical theological sense, an event taken to suspend ordinary natural causal orders and to signal divine agency or hierarchical disruption in the world—an occurrence that, for believers, functions as direct evidence of transcendence or of contact with the sacred (Tillich, 1957, 41–44). By *fantasy* I refer to those artistic or mediated constructions—mythic narratives, cinematic spectacles, video-game worlds, and VR environments—that deliberately stage violations or imaginative suspensions of empirical expectations so as to elicit wonder and cognitive reorientation (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, 56; Goodman, 1976, 107). The *sacred* will be used in the phenomenological sense elaborated by Eliade: that which disrupts profane time and space and establishes a *hierophany* or center of meaning (Eliade, 1959, 11). Finally, *aesthetic religion* is introduced here as a working category: cultural formations in which aesthetic media (broadly conceived) generate or mediate experiences functionally analogous to religious encounters—evoking awe, providing moral orientation, and fostering communal ritual—without necessarily advancing metaphysical or divine claims.

The analogy between miracle and fantasy is thus structural rather than ontological. A miracle is ontologically indexed to divine causality; fantasy is ontologically indexed to human creativity and technological mediation. Yet both can generate an experiential discontinuity with ordinary life: an interruption of the everyday that invites reinterpretation of meaning and value. The philosophical question is: can the experiential and normative effects of contemporary fantasy go beyond mere aesthetic spectacle? Can they assume roles traditionally occupied by religion?

Recent scholarship on post-secularity and mediated religion provides the appropriate context for this inquiry. Charles Taylor argues that modernity has not simply eliminated religion; it has transformed the conditions under which transcendence is intelligible (Taylor, 2007, 21). Media scholars and religion specialists have shown how mass and digital media reshape religious expression and collective ritual: Hoover’s account of religion in the media age traces how mediated institutions and practices reconfigure religious authority and participation (Hoover, 2006, 45); Morgan’s analysis of religious visual culture highlights the centrality of imagery to

religious experience (Morgan, 2005, 33); and Couldry's concept of media ritual helps us see how mediated events "can perform ritual-like functions in secular contexts" (Couldry, 2003, 29). Cognitive and evolutionary accounts (e.g., Boyer, 2001, 78; Barrett, 2004, 21) help explain why certain symbolic structures reliably evoke religious-like responses, and contemporary work on VR ethics (Madary & Metzinger, 2016, 12) raises novel concerns about the psychological and moral effects of immersive experiences. Taken together, these interdisciplinary resources suggest that aesthetic media are not peripheral to religious life; they are increasingly central to the form and experience of the sacred in a mediated age.

Still, rigorous philosophical distinction is required. I propose a preliminary typology of aesthetic religion to structure the analysis that follows: a. Weak aesthetic religion: aesthetic practices that reproduce the phenomenology of religious encounter (awe, awe-inspired reflection) without substantial institutional or normative consequences. b. Institutional aesthetic religion: aesthetic systems (fan communities, ritualized conventions, recurring digital liturgies) that instantiate durable collective practices and social norms resembling religious congregational life. c. Robust aesthetic religion: fully developed aesthetic formations that claim or perform the normative, metaphysical, and institutional roles of religion (a theoretical possibility to be assessed and delimited).

This typology will be developed and tested empirically in subsequent sections. In particular, the paper will integrate three case studies to ground theoretical claims: (1) contested art that explicitly invokes and troubles religious symbolism (e.g., the Serrano/Ofili controversies, Danish Muhammad cartoons, Parviz Tanavoli's sculptures), (2) large-scale cinematic and transmedia fandoms (e.g., the Marvel / Star Wars phenomena, Iranian fandoms around religious-fantasy series like *Shahzad* or video games like *Prince of Persia*) as possible instances of institutional aesthetic religion, and (3) emerging VR/AR practice in sacred space simulation (virtual pilgrimage) as an example of technology-mediated religious aestheticization. Each case will be analyzed with a modest mixed method: hermeneutic close reading of texts/images, analysis of mediated public reaction (press, social media), and reflection on the ethical and institutional implications.

At the conceptual level, the article advances two claims. First, artistic fantasy can perform many of the experiential functions traditionally associated with miracles: it suspends ordinary expectations, elicits wonder, and reorients perception. Second, art cannot simply be equated with religion: religion carries institutional, normative, and metaphysical weight—forms of continuity and accountability that aesthetic practice alone typically lacks. The analytic task is therefore to delineate where structural analogy ends and ontological or normative equivalence fails; and to identify the conditions under which aesthetic formations might assume institutional and ethical functions in ways that matter for lived religious or quasi-religious life.

Methodologically, this paper combines philosophical analysis (drawing on Tillich, Gadamer, Eliade, Taylor, Al-Ghazali, Avicenna) with media-theoretical and interdisciplinary resources

(Hoover, Morgan, Couldry, Boyer, Barrett, Madary & Metzinger). Empirical case studies will test the typology and clarify the limits and possibilities of aesthetic religion. Finally, the article will address theological and normative counterarguments—paying particular attention to objections from religious traditions that emphasize revelation, ecclesial authority, or sacramental ontology—and propose a modest framework of coexistence and mutual enrichment rather than wholesale substitution.

The structure that follows proceeds accordingly. Part I examines the concept of the miracle and its transformation in digital fantasy; Part II explores the philosophical overlap between aesthetic and religious experience; Part III develops the notion of aesthetic religion and situates it historically and digitally; Part IV canvasses limits and counterarguments, including theological critiques and concerns about ethical design; Part V outlines forms of coexistence and mutual enrichment. Throughout I aim to preserve the empirical texture of contemporary media and the conceptual rigor of philosophical analysis, so that the question “Will art become the new religion?” is treated as an interpretive challenge with normative stakes rather than as a speculative prediction.

The theoretical backbone of this article rests on three primary thinkers: Tillich for understanding religious experience as “ultimate concern”; Eliade for the phenomenological analysis of the sacred as a rupture in profane time and space; and Gadamer for interpreting aesthetic experience as a horizon-opening truth-event. All other thinkers (from Augustine and Aquinas to Al-Ghazali, Avicenna, Hume, Taylor, Hoover, and Couldry) are introduced solely for historical, comparative, or critical enrichment and play a marginal, supplementary role.

1. The Concept of the Miracle and Its Transformation

In this section, the concept of the miracle is examined primarily through Tillich’s lens of *ultimate concern* and Eliade’s notion of hierophany. References to Augustine, Aquinas, Hume, Al-Ghazali, and Avicenna serve only to provide historical context or Islamic contrast.

To understand the possible convergence of art and religion in the twenty-first century, we must begin by clarifying what we mean by miracle and then examine how aesthetic practice—particularly in digital and fantastical media—can replicate some of the structural features of miraculous experience without sharing its ontological claims. Traditionally, a miracle has been defined theologically as an event that exceeds or suspends the ordinary causal order and thereby discloses the presence or action of a divine agent. Augustine, for instance, treats miraculous occurrences not merely as extraordinary facts but as “signs that disclose God’s immanent action” and redirect the believer’s horizon of meaning (Augustine, 397/2001, 50–53). Aquinas likewise characterizes a miracle as “an effect produced by divine power that surpasses the capacity of created nature” (Aquinas, 1274/1947, I. q. 105, art. 2). From this classical vantage, miracles are both epistemic tokens (reasons for faith) and phenomenological ruptures (events that interrupt the flow of ordinary experience).

Philosophical reflection on miracles, however, is not limited to theological affirmation. David Hume's skeptical inquiry famously treats miracles as claims whose epistemic warrant is constrained by the comparative weight of empirical testimony and the regularities of nature (Hume, 1748/2000, 75–78). Hume's argument foregrounds a persistent tension: extraordinary experience may provoke strong affective conviction, but rational assessment must weigh testimony against background regularities. Paul Tillich reframes the issue at a more existential register: religious experience—miraculous or otherwise—addresses *ultimate concern*, orienting the self toward what is taken as absolute and thus reshaping existential meaning (Tillich, 1957, 41–44). Miracles, on this view, are not merely surprising events but encounters that transform the believer's interpretive horizon.

Expanding this discussion to Eastern and Islamic philosophical traditions enriches the analysis. In Islamic philosophy, Al-Ghazali, in his seminal work *The Incoherence of the Philosophers* (*Tahafut al-Falasifah*), critiques Avicenna's naturalistic explanations of causality (Avicenna, 2005, 312), arguing that “necessary connections between causes and effects are not inherent in nature but are sustained by God's continuous will” (Al-Ghazali, 1992, 170). For Al-Ghazali, miracles—such as those performed by prophets—are possible precisely because there is no intrinsic necessity in natural laws; God can intervene without contradiction, affirming divine omnipotence and the possibility of supernatural disruption. Avicenna, while offering philosophical rationalizations for Islamic tenets like prophecy, posits a more deterministic view of causality emanating from the Necessary Existent (God), which Al-Ghazali sees as limiting the scope for genuine miracles. This debate parallels Western tensions between divine agency and natural order, and highlights how miracles in Islamic thought serve to affirm *tawhid* (God's unity) and prophetic authority, much like in Christian theology. When compared to digital fantasy, these Islamic conceptions underscore how mediated disruptions (e.g., in VR worlds) can mimic the phenomenological rupture of miracles—suspending perceived necessities—without invoking divine causality.

The emergence of contemporary digital and fantastical arts invites us to ask whether analogous transformative encounters can be staged within secular, technological media. Contemporary fantasy—cinematic spectacle, transmedia franchises, immersive virtual reality (VR), and narrative-driven games—routinely depicts and realizes events that violate ordinary expectations: superheroes fly, magical rites rewrite causal trajectories, and VR environments instantiate impossible spaces (Goodman, 1976, 105–110). Structurally, these phenomena replicate three features often associated with miracles: (1) suspension or reconfiguration of ordinary causal order; (2) elicitation of affective states such as awe and wonder; and (3) a potential for reorientation of perception and meaning. In that sense, fantasy art stages experiences of the extraordinary that echo the phenomenology of religious miracles even while remaining ontologically distinct.

But this is precisely the crux: the parallel is structural and phenomenological, not necessarily ontological. Miracles are classically indexed to divine causality; fantasy's extraordinary events are indexed to human design, technological execution, and narrative convention. Nonetheless, the psychological and cultural effects on participants can be analogous. Lakoff and Johnson's work on metaphor highlights how imaginative structures shape cognition and experience; the metaphors and narrative frames of fantasy can thus cultivate dispositions and interpretive schemes that feel, subjectively, like encounters with the extraordinary (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). From a hermeneutic perspective, Gadamer insists that artworks are events that disclose truth to those who encounter them; similarly, immersive aesthetic experiences can function as truth-events for participants, restructuring horizons of understanding (Gadamer, 1989, 302). Mircea Eliade's account of "the sacred as a rupture of profane time further clarifies the analogy": aesthetic creations can produce moments in which ordinary temporality is suspended and participants confront symbolic orders that carry deep existential resonance (Eliade, 1959, 68).

To make analytic progress we require a working typology that distinguishes degrees and kinds of aesthetic formations that might be called *religious* in function. I propose a preliminary threefold typology, which will be tested and refined in following sections and empirical cases:

a. **Weak Aesthetic Religion:** Instances in which aesthetic media reproduce the phenomenology of the sacred—awe, wonder, reflective dislocation—without producing durable institutional or normative effects. Examples include singular cinematic experiences or ephemeral VR artworks that move individuals but leave no lasting communal structures.

b. **Institutional Aesthetic Religion:** Cases where aesthetic systems occasion recurring, organized collective practices: fan conventions, ritualized online gatherings, or persistent participatory platforms that instantiate norms, shared narratives, and lasting communal identities. These phenomena begin to approximate the social functions of religious congregations.

c. **Robust Aesthetic Religion (theoretical):** Hypothetical or emergent formations in which aesthetic systems assume sustained normative, metaphysical, and institutional roles traditionally associated with religion—claiming authority, prescribing moral obligations, and maintaining intergenerational continuity. This category is harder to instantiate but serves as an upper bound for analysis.

This typology helps us move from mere analogy to evaluative assessment: where along this spectrum does a given instance of digital fantasy or mediated ritual fall? And what conditions (technological affordances, institutional support, ethical formation) would be necessary for movement from the weak toward the institutional or robust types?

A brief methodological note: the paper combines conceptual analysis with interdisciplinary evidence. Philosophical argumentation (Tillich, Gadamer, Eliade) will be supplemented by media-theoretical insights (Hoover, 2006; Couldry, 2003; Morgan, 2005) and cognitive

accounts explaining why symbolic structures evoke religious-like responses (Boyer, 2001; Barrett, 2004). Where appropriate, I draw on empirical indicators—media coverage, online community practices, and design features of VR systems—to test theoretical claims. Recent ethical literature on immersive media (Madary & Metzinger, 2016) also informs our evaluation of psychological and moral effects.

To illustrate the relevance of the typology, consider three brief exemplars. First, narrative fantasy such as *Harry Potter* stages repeated violations of ordinary laws (magic, flying), creating sustained awe and a moral universe that shapes readers' and viewers' imaginations; yet, on its own it remains largely in the weak category unless institutionalized through durable fan practices. Second, transmedia franchises—for example, the Marvel Cinematic Universe—exhibit many features of institutional aesthetic religion: serialized narratives, ritualized release cycles, conventions, iconography, and fan practices that form long-term communal identity and normative talk about heroism and values. Third, VR simulations of sacred spaces (virtual pilgrimage projects) instantiate powerful experiences of presence, ritual engagement, and affective transport that can function as liturgical supplements; depending on institutional adoption, such projects can gravitate toward the institutional category. Each example will be expanded into a full case study later in the paper.

Despite the suggestive parallels, we must continuously return to the ontological and normative distinctions. Aesthetic experiences can simulate the transformative potential of miracles—eliciting awe, prompting reflection, and shaping communal meaning—without invoking divine causality or producing the binding authority and historical continuity that characterize many religious traditions. The challenge of the remainder of the paper is to delineate precisely where structural analogy ends and ontological/normative equivalence fails, and to map the institutional and ethical conditions under which aesthetic formations might occupy religiously significant roles.

This examination of miracle and fantasy sets the stage for Part II, which probes the philosophical overlap between aesthetic experience and religious experience, and Part III, where we develop the concept of aesthetic religion in historical and contemporary perspective and subject the typology to empirical tests.

2. Aesthetic Experience as Religious Experience

Having reinterpreted miracle through Tillich's existential theology and Eliade's phenomenology of the sacred, we can now turn to the domain of art. If religion discloses transcendence through faith and ritual, art—especially in its digital and fantastical forms—may do so through imagination and aesthetic mediation. Here, aesthetic experience is analyzed chiefly via Gadamer's hermeneutic event of truth-disclosure and Tillich's *ultimate concern*. Therefore, Mentions of Couldry, Hoover, Morgan, Lakoff & Johnson, Goodman, and cognitive theorists are included only to illustrate media or symbolic convergence with this core framework.

The question whether art can function as a locus of transcendence in the twenty-first century requires sustained philosophical attention to the structures shared by aesthetic and religious experience. Traditionally, religious experience is characterized as the human encounter with the sacred—an event that discloses ultimate reality and reorients existential understanding (Tillich, 1957, 41–44). Aesthetic experience has classically been associated with encounters with beauty, form, or symbolic truth. Yet a plurality of theoretical traditions—from hermeneutics to cognitive science and media studies—suggests that these categories overlap and that aesthetic encounters can display the very structural features we associate with religious events.

Paul Tillich’s concept of religion as *ultimate concern* is particularly useful here. Tillich insists that “religion is defined less by doctrines than by an orienting commitment of the self toward what is considered absolute” (Tillich, 1957, 4). If an aesthetic experience captures such orientation—if it evokes sustained awe, an ethical reorientation, or a reordering of priorities—then it functions analogously to religious experience even in the absence of theological claims. Contemporary digital fantasy, immersive cinema, and virtual environments often generate precisely this kind of sustained encounter. Consider *Journey* as a paradigmatic case: its narrative architecture and embodied game design immerse players in symbolic landscapes that prompt reflection on mortality, mutual aid, and transcendence (Campbell, 2008, 12–18). The player’s journey is not merely entertainment; it is structured as a transformative, meaning-making event.

Hans-Georg Gadamer’s hermeneutics helps explain how aesthetic encounters disclose new horizons of understanding. For Gadamer, “art is not a subjective pleasure but an event in which truth is revealed”; the encounter with “the artwork extends and reshapes the participant’s horizon” (Gadamer, 1989, 102, 302). In digitally mediated fantasy, the combination of narrative, interactivity, sound, and image amplifies this event-character: immersive soundscapes and interactive affordances intensify the disclosure of symbolic meaning and thereby increase the potential for existential reorientation. In such environments, aesthetic experience acquires ritual-like properties: it structures attention, suspends ordinary time, and orients participants toward a coherent symbolic order (Goodman, 1976, 105–110).

Mircea Eliade’s phenomenology of the sacred complements this account. Eliade emphasizes that “the sacred manifests as a rupture of profane time and space,” a *hierophany* that re-centers meaning (Eliade, 1959, 11). Contemporary aesthetic worlds perform a functionally similar rupture: virtual realities, cinematic universes, and large-scale fandom gatherings remove participants from quotidian temporality and place them within symbolically charged spaces that command affective and cognitive commitment. The participant’s experience of awe and dislocation in these settings is therefore structurally analogous to religious experience, even when ontological claims differ.

Media and religion studies add an essential, empirical dimension. Hoover (2006) and Couldry (2003) show how mediated events can assume ritual functions, creating shared attention and collective meaning in secular contexts. Morgan's (2005) work on religious visual culture underscores the formative power of images in shaping religious sensibility; analogous imagery in fantasy media cultivates comparable orientations. Cognitive approaches (Boyer, 2001; Barrett, 2004) explain why certain symbolic patterns reliably elicit religious-like responses: cognitive templates predispose humans to find agency, intentionality, and moral significance in particular narrative structures. These interdisciplinary insights reveal that aesthetic media are not peripheral; they are central to contemporary meaning-making.

Communal dimensions further strengthen the analogy. Ritual performs both an experiential and social function in religion: it produces shared memory, identity, and moral orientation. Participatory digital environments—massively multiplayer online games (MMOs), fan conventions, and coordinated viewing events—produce collective experiences that resemble liturgy. Smith (2014, 102–107) highlights how secular rituals can instantiate symbolic formation and ethical reflection; similarly, the collective practices of fandom often instantiate norms, shared narratives, and mutual accountability. In such contexts, aesthetic experience is not merely private but social and formative.

At the cognitive–affective level, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) demonstrate that metaphoric structures organize not just language but experience. Fantasy employs archetypal metaphors—quest, fall and redemption, the threshold—that reconfigure perception and ethical imagination. Nelson Goodman (1976) argues that symbolic systems in art shape cognition; immersive artistic environments thus provide frameworks for understanding reality and moral relations, enabling participants to rehearse ethical dispositions in imaginative contexts.

Nonetheless, important differences persist. Religion typically combines experiential intensity with normative claims, institutional continuity, and forms of accountability. Tillich's *ultimate concern* implies a binding commitment of the self to an orienting center; art can inspire but rarely commands in the same obligatory manner. The historically situated nature of religion—texts, traditions, and intergenerational transmission—gives it a continuity that many aesthetic forms lack. In addition, participants are often epistemically aware of the constructedness of aesthetic worlds, and this meta-awareness can attenuate claims to transcendence (Hume, 1748/2000). Such differences matter for normative assessment: an aesthetic event that evokes awe does not *ipso facto* constitute a religion.

Yet the post-secular condition suggests hybrid possibilities rather than simple separation. Artistic practices can supplement liturgy, inform religious imagination, and even institutionalize ritual patterns (e.g., recurring commemorative fan rituals, or church services that incorporate digital media). The preliminary typology introduced earlier helps here: many contemporary phenomena fall into the weak or institutional categories—ephemeral aesthetic awe on the one hand, and ongoing ritualized fan practices on the other. The analytical task is to

specify the institutional and ethical conditions under which a movement from weak to institutional (or hypothetically robust) aesthetic religion might occur, including factors such as institutional endorsement, intergenerational practices, normative internalization, and technological design that fosters sustained commitment.

In sum, aesthetic experience—especially when digitally mediated—can approximate several structural, affective, and communal dimensions of religious experience: suspension of ordinary time, the production of awe, ethical reflection, and communal identity formation. These convergences render plausible the claim that art can assume quasi-religious functions, but they also signal the limits: ontological authority, binding normativity, and historical continuity remain distinctive properties of many religious traditions. Part III will develop the concept of aesthetic religion further and subject the typology to empirical testing through three case studies (a contested art controversy, a transmedia franchise and its fandom, and VR pilgrimage projects).

3. The Rise of Aesthetic Religion

The notion of aesthetic religion emerges at the intersection of art, technology, and post-secular religious experience. Where traditional religion organizes life around doctrines, ritual authority, and metaphysical claims, aesthetic religion names cultural formations in which aesthetic media—cinema, transmedia franchises, immersive games, and virtual/augmented reality—mediate experiences of transcendence, moral orientation, and collective belonging without necessarily positing divine causality. The twenty-first century, with its unprecedented affordances of digital distribution, persistent online communities, and immersive technologies, provides fertile ground for these formations. To understand the rise of aesthetic religion we must situate it historically, specify its defining characteristics, and examine empirically how particular practices instantiate one or another type within the typology offered earlier.

The idea that art might perform religious functions has deep roots in European thought. Romantic and post-Romantic thinkers offered anticipatory accounts: Friedrich Schiller argued that aesthetic education cultivates moral sensibility and imaginative freedom (Schiller, 2004), while Hegel located art among the forms through which Spirit manifested to human consciousness (Hegel, 1975). Nietzsche, in his diagnosis of the *death of God*, proposed art and myth as resources for re-enchantment and communal sense-making (Nietzsche, 1999). These classical accounts gesture toward art's capacity to disclose meaning, orient collective life, and cultivate dispositions that had previously been the province of religion.

What is novel about the twenty-first century is not the basic intuition that art can be world-forming, but the scale, repeatability, and technological mediation of the experience. Digital media enable persistent, participatory worlds (MMOs, transmedia franchises) and immersive presence (VR/AR) that can sustain attention, ritualize behavior, and coordinate large-scale communal practices across geographically dispersed populations (Jenkins, 2006, 114; Hoover,

2006). Thus, philosophers must now confront whether historically speculative claims about art's sacral power become institutional and normative in contemporary cultural ecology.

Aesthetic religion can be characterized by four interlocking features:

1. **Suspension of ordinary perception:** Aesthetic systems create experiences that interrupt quotidian temporality and afford participants an altered horizon of meaning (Eliade, 1959). Immersive VR, epic cinematic spectacle, and narrative gameplay accomplish this suspension in technologically novel ways.

2. **Awe and affective orientation:** Participants undergo affective states—mystery, awe, elevation—that motivate existential reflection; these states resemble the emotional economies of religious ritual (Tillich, 1957).

3. **Ethical and narrative orientation:** Symbolic universes present moral schemata—heroism, sacrifice, redemption—that function as canons for moral imagination and situated judgment (Goodman, 1976; Campbell, 2008).

4. **Communal ritualization:** When practices become recurrent, organized, and normatively embedding (conventions, guild rituals, synchronized viewing/listening), they approximate the social integrative function of religious liturgy (Couldry, 2003; Smith, 2014).

These features are instantiated to varying degrees across the typology introduced in Part I. Movement from weak to institutional aesthetic religion typically requires (a) routinization (regular communal practices), (b) symbolic elaboration (iconography, mythic canon), and (c) mechanisms for intergenerational transmission (education, mentoring, ritual repetition). Achieving robust aesthetic religion further requires claims of authority and some form of binding normative discourse—conditions that remain rare but not logically impossible.

Digital technologies afford specific mechanisms that facilitate the rise of aesthetic religion. Transmedia storytelling (Jenkins, 2006) enables narratives to be extended, reinterpreted, and ritualized across platforms, creating long-term commitment. Persistent worlds (MMOs) sustain social structures and norms, providing opportunities for identity formation, cooperative moral practices, and durable ritualization (Hoover, 2006). VR/AR technologies increase the felt presence of sacred architectures and symbolic environments, enabling forms of mediated pilgrimage and embodied ritual that bypass geographic constraints (Madary & Metzinger, 2016). Such affordances do not guarantee religious status, but they lower technological thresholds for ritual practice and communal continuity.

The proposed typology of aesthetic religion emerges directly from the synthesis of Eliade's sacred rupture, Tillich's *ultimate concern*, and Gadamer's horizon-fusion. The case studies that follow are empirical tests of this triadic framework, not independent theoretical foundations. Aesthetic religion is globally variegated. In Japan, anime often fuses mythic motifs, ethical dilemmas, and aesthetic forms in ways that produce communal reflection and ritualized fan practices (Napier, 2001). In the Anglophone world, transmedia franchises such as *Star Wars* or the Marvel Cinematic Universe generate extended mythic worlds, ritualized release events,

iconography, and fan practices (cosplay, conventions, fan fiction) that replicate many social dimensions of congregational life (Jenkins, 2006). These fandoms produce moral talk—debates about heroism, sacrifice, culpability—those functions as ethical deliberation within a symbolic frame. The capacity of these formations to become institutional depends on their durability, internal norms, and external recognition (e.g., festivals, sponsored rituals).

In the Iranian context, fandoms around religious-fantasy TV series and video games illustrate similar dynamics. Series like *Shahzad* (a romantic-historical drama blending Persian folklore with moral themes) or religious epics such as *Mukhtarnameh* (depicting Islamic historical figures with elements of heroism and redemption) foster communal viewing rituals and online discussions that echo ethical and spiritual reflections. Video games like *Prince of Persia*, rooted in Persian mythology and featuring fantastical elements such as time manipulation and mythical creatures, have cultivated dedicated Iranian fandoms that engage in fan art, cosplay, and narrative reinterpretations, often intertwining cultural identity with moral imagination. These examples highlight how aesthetic religion adapts to local cultural contexts, blending global media with indigenous religious and fantastical traditions.

Another clear site of aesthetic religion is the virtualization of sacred space. Digital recreations of religious architectures (e.g., virtual Hagia Sophia tours, VR mosque experiences, or simulated pilgrimage routes) enable participants to experience spatial awe and ritual practice remotely. These simulations can either supplement traditional practice—serving as catechetical aids or accessibility tools—or, if institutionalized, constitute enduring liturgical alternatives. Madary and Metzinger (2016) caution that such immersive practices carry ethical responsibilities: designers and religious institutions must consider psychological effects, dependency, and the risk of commodifying sacred experience.

Critics will object on metaphysical and normative grounds. Traditional theological accounts emphasize revelation, sacramentality, and ecclesial authority—dimensions not reducible to aesthetic experience (Eliade, 1959). From a sacramental perspective (Catholic, Orthodox), mediated aesthetic encounters lack the ontological efficacy of sacraments; from a Protestant ethical perspective, the danger of idolatry or displacement of God with aesthetic objects is acute. Islamic critiques may focus on representation, agency, and the risk of ritual simulacra supplanting embodied worship practices. These objections are important normative constraints: even if aesthetic religion functions socially or experientially, it may be judged theologically deficient or ethically dangerous by established religious institutions.

Philosophically, aesthetic religion is best understood as a hybrid phenomenon—one that can perform many functions of religion (meaning-making, moral formation, community) without necessarily carrying metaphysical claims. Its legitimacy rests on pragmatic criteria: does it produce durable ethical formation, foster communal care, and resist commodification and manipulative design? Addressing these questions requires interdisciplinary work: philosophers,

media scholars, theologians, and designers must jointly investigate case studies, evaluate ethical design, and map institutional trajectories.

To move from conceptual claim to empirical assessment, to clarify how each tier of the proposed typology might appear in cultural practice, the following three concise examples are offered — a controversial art case, an institutional fandom case, and a technology-mediated pilgrimage case — each illustrating distinct trajectories for the emergence of an aesthetic religion.

1) Controversial art: the Serrano / Ofili cases — *sacral disruption as a critical event.*

Controversial contemporary artworks such as Andrés Serrano's *Piss Christ* and Chris Ofili's *The Holy Virgin Mary* show how artistic objects can rapidly be reconstituted as sites of religious and political contestation. By juxtaposing or recontextualizing putatively sacred imagery with materials or motifs deemed profane, these works produce what might be termed a negative *hierophany*: not merely the abolition of the sacred, but a public disclosure of tensions within sacred meaning (commercialization, indignity, identity conflict). Media coverage, public protest, and institutional responses (funding withdrawals, exhibition cancellations, municipal interventions) demonstrate that such artworks can effect a rupture of ordinary ordering — the phenomenology Mircea Eliade associates with the sacred — while simultaneously transforming public space into a field of symbolic and ethical dispute. From the standpoint of the typology, these instances ordinarily map onto the *weak / contested* pole: they generate high affective intensity and public salience but do not by themselves become stable, institutionalized forms of aesthetic religion unless subsequent institutional practices emerge to ritualize or transmit the response (Serrano, 1987; Ofili, 1996). Extending this to the Islamic world, the 2005 Danish Muhammad cartoons sparked global controversies, highlighting tensions between freedom of expression and religious sanctity, often leading to protests that disrupted social orders and prompted ethical debates on representation in Islam. Similarly, Iranian artist Parviz Tanavoli's sculptures, such as *Heech* (Nothingness), blend modernist abstraction with Islamic calligraphy and motifs, sometimes provoking debates on the boundaries of sacred art in a post-revolutionary context. These examples illustrate weak aesthetic religion in culturally diverse settings.

2) Institutional fandom: the Marvel Cinematic Universe — *ritualized release and collective symbol-work.* Large transmedia franchises such as the Marvel Cinematic Universe provide a striking example of how aesthetic systems can develop social-symbolic infrastructures that resemble liturgical practice. Serialized narratives, synchronized release events (premieres, global opening weekends), organized fan gatherings (conventions, screenings), and participatory culture (cosplay, fan fiction, online communities) establish recurring temporal markers and ritualized behaviors. These practices distribute canonical symbols and ethical motifs (responsibility, sacrifice, solidarity) that audiences rehearse, debate, and internalize through collective performance and narrative work; the interplay of industry infrastructures and fan institutions sustains durable communal identity and collective memory.

Thus, although franchises rarely assert metaphysical claims, their social architecture can approximate the *institutional* pole of the typology when durability, mechanisms of intergenerational transmission, and degrees of moral internalization extend beyond episodic consumption (Jenkins, 2006; Woo, 2022).

3) Virtual pilgrimage (VR): spatial reconstruction, presence, and ritual extension.

Virtual-reality projects that reconstruct sacred architectures or offer guided virtual pilgrimages indicate a technological vector through which aesthetic experience and ritual function may intersect. VR can simulate key elements of pilgrimage — embodied movement, staged sequences, multisensory cueing — and deliver a felt sense of presence to participants who lack physical access to a site. Reports of perceived authenticity and meaningfulness among some users suggest that virtual pilgrimage can perform genuine liturgical or pastoral work for particular populations. Yet such projects raise urgent ethical and epistemic questions about authenticity, commodification, and psychological impact; the technical and design literature stresses the responsibility of developers to avoid manipulative affective engineering. When religious institutions formally adopt VR practices as supplementary pedagogical or devotional tools, with appropriate theological framing and pastoral oversight, virtual pilgrimage may shift from the *weak* toward the *institutional* category — institutional endorsement, normative frameworks, and sustained practice being the decisive factors (Madary & Metzinger, 2016).

In sum, the rise of aesthetic religion in the twenty-first century is neither mere hype nor inevitable replacement of traditional religion. Rather, it is a complex cultural development: art and technology collaboratively produce new idioms of sacred experience that may supplement, contest, or co-exist with established religious forms. The subsequent Part IV examines limits and counterarguments in greater detail, addressing ontological, ethical, and institutional objections and assessing the normative implications of aestheticized sacredness.

4. Limits and Counterarguments

While Parts I–III have mapped structural, affective, and communal parallels between aesthetic and religious experience, philosophical rigor demands that we attend to **the limits** of aesthetic religion. Acknowledging these limits does not negate the phenomenon’s significance; rather, it places aesthetic religion within appropriate epistemic, ethical, and institutional boundaries. Below I articulate five principal constraints, relate them to theological and philosophical critiques, and propose normative criteria and practical safeguards for evaluating aesthetic formations that claim religious significance.

1. Ontological grounding: absence of metaphysical authority: A primary limitation concerns **ontological grounding**. Traditional religions typically posit a transcendent source—God, gods, or an Absolute—that anchor claims of ultimacy and provides metaphysical warrant for ritual efficacy and moral authority. Tillich’s notion of *ultimate concern* captures how religious commitment orients the self toward what is taken as absolute (Tillich, 1957, 60–63). Aesthetic experiences, by contrast, remain human-constructed and contingently mediated: their

causal production is technological, artistic, or institutional, not metaphysical. Hume's epistemological skepticism underscores the distinction: extraordinary experiences require extraordinary justificatory support, and the causal story for an aesthetic event remains natural (Hume, 1748/2000, 75–78). Thus, while aesthetic media can simulate the phenomenology of transcendence, they generally lack the ontological claims that underpin sacramental or revelatory practices.

2. Normativity and binding authority: Closely related is the problem of normative binding. Religion typically combines experiential intensity with obligations: commandments, communal responsibilities, and disciplinary practices that regulate life over time. Aesthetic religion may promote reflection and imaginative sympathy, but it seldom issues imperatives with enforceable accountability. Taylor's observation about secular symbolic orders is pertinent: they may cultivate awe and reflection but do not automatically generate the moral discipline historically associated with religious institutions (Taylor, 2007, 740–745). For an aesthetic formation to move beyond the *weak* pole of the typology it must develop mechanisms for normative internalization—ritual repetition, moral pedagogy, and institutional roles that sustain ethical formation.

3. Historical continuity and intergenerational transmission: Religion's durability depends on historical embeddedness: texts, liturgies, and traditions that carry meaning across generations (Eliade, 1959, 19–21). Aesthetic phenomena are often temporally contingent—dependent on platform economies, cultural fashion, and technological obsolescence. A VR pilgrimage or cinematic saga may deeply move participants in a particular historical moment, yet its longevity—particularly as an integrative moral formation transmitted to subsequent generations—is uncertain. Institutionalization (e.g., festivals, curricula, dedicated communities) can mitigate ephemerality, but it requires resources, coherent narrative canons, and intentional transmission practices that are not intrinsic to most aesthetic industries.

4. Epistemic awareness and the problem of authenticity: Participants' meta-cognitive awareness of fictionality constrains the epistemic depth of aesthetic transcendence. Many users consciously bracket their engagement as play, artistry, or simulation; such awareness can blunt the claim that such experiences function as ultimate concern. Goodman's analysis of symbolic systems helps explain how art shapes perception, but also suggests that participants often inhabit dual attitudes—both absorbed in the artwork and aware of its constructed status (Goodman, 1976, 105–110). Religious experiences, by contrast, commonly take place within traditions that legitimize the sacred as objectively real; this confers different existential stakes. Consequently, the intensity of affect in aesthetic events does not straightforwardly translate into metaphysical conviction or lasting existential reorientation.

5. Plurality, fragmentation, and ethical incoherence: The pluralism of aesthetic worlds can be a virtue of modern cultural life but also a liability for coherent ultimate concern. Different franchises, games, or virtual communities may advance conflicting moral schemas, cosmologies, or eschatologies. Nietzsche's reflections capture this ambivalence: art can re-enchant but also disperse

meaning when untethered from unifying metaphysical sources (Nietzsche, 1999). The result may be moral experimentation without integrative frameworks for adjudicating conflicts or grounding obligations, which risks relativism or fragmentation rather than the cohesive moral identity some religion supplies.

Religious traditions provide targeted critiques. From a sacramental perspective (prominent in Catholic, Orthodox accounts), mediated aesthetic experiences lack the ontological efficacy of sacraments that, by theological claim, effect grace *ex opere operato*; virtual simulacra cannot instantiate such metaphysical transformation. Protestant critiques might warn against the aestheticization of faith—reducing doctrine and discipleship to feeling or spectacle—thus risking superficial piety. Islamic perspectives concerned with representation and ritual integrity may critique virtual rituals that substitute formal embodied practice with simulacra. Moreover, traditions stressing revelation (e.g., classical theistic frameworks) will resist any conflation of human-created aesthetic power with divine revelation. Engaging these critiques requires humility: even if aesthetic religion functions sociologically, it may be theologically deficient or ethically hazardous.

Despite these constraints, aesthetic religion retains functional significance. As Tillich and Taylor indicate, ultimate concern can be mediated symbolically; art can shape moral imagination, provide communal scaffolding, and open spaces for reflection (Tillich, 1957; Taylor, 2007). Gadamer’s hermeneutics also reminds us that art can disclose truths in non-propositional ways (Gadamer, 1989). Thus aesthetic formations can complement religious life—offering pedagogical tools, liturgical enhancers, or spaces for spiritual imagination—even if they do not usurp doctrinal authority.

To navigate the normative terrain, I propose four **evaluative criteria** for assessing whether an aesthetic formation responsibly functions in a quasi-religious register:

1. **Durability** — presence of practices and institutions that sustain transmission beyond ephemeral cycles.
2. **Normative depth** — mechanisms for moral internalization (ritual repetition, communal accountability, moral pedagogy).
3. **Transparency and epistemic integrity** — clear demarcation between simulation and claims to ultimate truth; avoidance of deceptive design.
4. **Ethical design and care** — attention to psychological welfare, consent, and avoidance of manipulative affective engineering (Madary & Metzinger, 2016).

Designers, cultural institutions, and religious communities share responsibility for meeting these criteria. For instance, religious institutions adopting VR must ensure pastoral oversight, integrate mediated practices into broader sacramental and educational frameworks, and guard against consumerist commodification.

This part has argued that aesthetic religion—powerful as a phenomenological and social fact—operates under significant ontological, normative, historical, epistemic, and pluralistic constraints. Recognizing these limits avoids naive substitutionism while acknowledging that art

and technology can produce meaningful, communal, and ethically formative experiences. The normative task is therefore twofold: empirically to trace where particular aesthetic formations sit on the weak→institutional→robust spectrum, and normatively to cultivate institutional and design practices that promote ethical formation, durability, and transparency. Part V will explore concrete models of coexistence and mutual enrichment, articulating practical pathways by which religious institutions and aesthetic innovators might collaborate to foster humane, responsible forms of mediated transcendence.

5. Coexistence and Mutual Enrichment of Art and Religion

Having examined both the transformative potential and the limits of aesthetic religion, the final theoretical task is to articulate how art and traditional religious structures can coexist and mutually enrich each other in the twenty-first century. Instead of viewing art and religion as rivals in a zero-sum contest, we should adopt a pluralistic approach. This includes four interactional models—integrative, dialogical, parallel, and boundary-maintenance—through which they can mutually enrich meaning-making, ethical formation, and communal life.

To make the argument concrete, I propose four ideal-typical models for coexistence, each with different institutional and ethical implications:

1. **Integrative Model (Religion adopts aesthetic media):** Religious institutions incorporate artistic and digital media into liturgy, catechesis, and pastoral care (e.g., VR meditations as devotional aids; multimedia in worship). Integration can deepen accessibility and sensorial participation but requires theological reflection to avoid reducing doctrine to spectacle (Smith, 2014; Madary & Metzinger, 2016).

2. **Dialogical Model (Reciprocal exchange):** Artists and religious communities enter dialogical partnerships—co-producing works that neither merely evangelize nor merely aestheticize religion but foster joint inquiry into ethical and existential themes (Gadamerian hermeneutics of shared meaning; Gadamer, 1989).

3. **Parallel Institutional Model (Distinct but overlapping spheres):** Aesthetic communities (fandoms, VR collectives) and religious congregations maintain distinct normative foundations but coordinate on shared civic and ethical projects—charitable work, public commemorations, arts education—thus generating social cohesion without ontological conflation (Couldry, 2003; Hoover, 2006).

4. **Boundary-Maintenance Model (Critical separation):** Religious traditions preserve sacramental and doctrinal boundaries while selectively adopting aesthetic tools under strict theological or pastoral criteria; this model responds to theological objections about sacramentality, idolatry, or commodification (Eliade, 1959; Tillich, 1957).

Each model has strengths and risks; different communities may legitimately prefer different configurations. The relevant normative question is not which model is metaphysically truer, but which model—given a community's theological commitments, institutional capacities, and ethical aims—best fosters human flourishing.

A principal avenue for mutual enrichment is ritual and symbolic mediation. Traditional rituals are designed to foster collective attention, moral reflection, and identity (Eliade, 1959). Art—especially immersive digital art, cinema, and interactive media—can mediate these functions in ethically constructive ways. Concretely:

a. **Supplementary liturgies:** VR reconstructions of sacred sites can be used as pedagogical supplements (e.g., architecture, sacred calendar, and ritual choreography) when framed theologically as aids rather than replacements. Pastoral frameworks and consent protocols are essential (Madary & Metzinger, 2016).

b. **Aesthetic liturgies:** Curated, arts-integrated worship (visual projections, narrative dramas, sacred music designed with immersive audio) can heighten attentional focus and moral imagination while retaining doctrinal scaffolding.

c. **Public arts as civic liturgy:** Festivals, processions, and public art installations that draw on religious motifs can cultivate civic virtues and cross-communal solidarity when designed with inclusivity and interpretive framing (Coudry, 2003).

Art and religion jointly cultivate moral imagination: narrative worlds provide scenarios for ethical deliberation, ritual embeds virtues in practice, and communal artistic projects train cooperative dispositions. When religious educators integrate secular or transmedia narratives (e.g., *Lord of the Rings*, *Star Wars*, narrative games) into reflective curricula, they can harness imaginative engagement to deepen concepts such as sacrificial love, stewardship, and communal responsibility (Campbell, 2008; Smith, 2014). Two cautions are necessary: (1) narratives should be read hermeneutically, not simply consumed; and (2) ethical internalization requires practices of repetition and accountability, not one-off aesthetic encounter.

Art offers avenues for reinterpreting sacred stories and renewing ritual imagination. Digital media permit interactive hermeneutics: participants can inhabit story worlds, test moral choices, and thus actively construct meaning (Gadamerian fusion of horizons). These creative hermeneutics can renew traditions, making them intelligible to new publics—provided that interpretive communities preserve dialogical accountability to historical texts and theological critique.

Aesthetic communities (fandoms, gaming collectives, VR groups) supply social formats for belonging and creative cooperation (Napier, 2001). Religious institutions can learn from these formats in fostering youth engagement, collaborative liturgy design, and participatory education. Educational initiatives that pair digital arts practice with religious studies can promote imaginative empathy, critical literacy, and ethical discernment. At the same time, pluralism demands pedagogies that cultivate comparative sensibility—teaching participants to navigate multiple symbolic universes without collapsing them.

Technological mediation enables personalized encounters with transcendence—interactive mythic narratives and VR meditations adapt to user agency. Pastoral deployment of these tools must balance personalization with communal norms: spiritual formation that is overly

individualized risks atomizing belief; but when guided by catechesis and communal practice, personalization can deepen commitment and spiritual maturity.

To realize mutually enriching coexistence without ethical harm, I propose three pragmatic safeguards:

1. **Design ethics and transparency:** Developers and religious practitioners must disclose aims, algorithms, and affective design choices; avoid manipulative affect engineering and ensure informed consent (Madary & Metzinger, 2016).

2. **Institutional governance:** Religious bodies adopting aesthetic media should establish oversight committees (theological, psychological, technical) to assess pastoral efficacy and risk.

3. **Educational scaffolding:** Arts-informed religious education should include critical media literacy, hermeneutic skills, and pastoral accompaniment to translate aesthetic experience into durable moral formation.

Finally, building robust coexistence requires empirical and normative work: ethnographic studies of integrated liturgies; longitudinal research on VR pilgrimage's pastoral outcomes; design research exploring participatory liturgical tools; and policy frameworks addressing access, equity, and commodification of sacred aesthetic experiences.

The coexistence of art and religion in the twenty-first century is best framed as a plurality of practices through which aesthetic and sacred life can mutually inform and strengthen each other. When pursued with theological seriousness, hermeneutic openness, and ethical design, art can amplify religious imagination, broaden access, and cultivate moral formation—without usurping doctrinal authority. The normative task for scholars, designers, and religious leaders alike is to develop institutional, pedagogical, and design practices that honor both the experiential power of aesthetic media and the normative depth of religious traditions.

6. Synthesis and Final Reflections

The twenty-first century presents a distinctive cultural and technological context in which art and religion intersect in novel and institutionally consequential ways. The preceding parts have mapped conceptual terrain (miracle ↔ fantasy), probed phenomenology (aesthetic events as truth-disclosing experiences), developed a typology (weak — institutional — robust aesthetic religion), and tested that typology through case studies (contested art, transmedia fandom, VR pilgrimage). This final analytic chapter synthesizes the principal insights, draws out normative implications, and proposes a research-and-policy agenda for responsible co-development of aesthetic and religious practices.

Across a range of contemporary practices, we find recurrent structural features that realign aesthetic experience with functions traditionally associated with religion: 1. interruption of ordinary temporality (suspension), 2. elicitation of affective states (awe, elevation), 3. narrative frameworks that organize meaning, and 4. recurring collective practices that instantiate communal identity (Eliade, 1959, 19–21; Tillich, 1957, 41–44). Yet this convergence is structural and functional, not straightforward ontological equivalence. The dispositive

difference is metaphysical anchoring: traditional religious claims carry ontological commitments and institutional claims to ultimacy that most aesthetic formations do not (Hume, 1748/2000, 75–78). Recognizing this difference preserves conceptual clarity while allowing us to assess meaningful overlap.

Digital platforms, transmedia architectures, and immersive technologies multiply opportunities for sustained ritualization and distributed communal life (Jenkins, 2006; Campbell, 2008, 25–30). Technology amplifies affective engagement and enables personalized, embodied encounters (VR presence) that can be integrated into pastoral, pedagogical, or civic practice. But technological mediation also introduces new vectors of ethical risk—affective engineering, commodification, algorithmic design—that demand governance and transparency (Madary & Metzinger, 2016).

The case studies illustrate that institutional scaffolding (ritual repetition, canonical narrative, mechanisms for transmission) is decisive. Contested avant-garde art often produces powerful ruptures but does not by itself institutionalize; transmedia franchises can and do produce durable social formations approximating congregational life; VR pilgrimage exhibits clear institutional potential when adopted and framed by religious authorities. Thus, movement toward institutional aesthetic religion depends on routinization, normative pedagogy, and intentional governance.

If aesthetic formations can shape ultimate concern or moral imagination, designers, cultural producers, and religious leaders bear ethical responsibility. Four normative requirements follow: (a) transparency about aims and limits of mediated sacredness; (b) durability—practices must be embedded in pedagogies that support long-term formation; (c) normative depth—rituals and narratives should be coupled with mechanisms of accountability; (d) psychological safeguarding—attending to consent, vulnerability, and potential manipulation (Madary & Metzinger, 2016). Gadamer’s hermeneutic ideal also recommends dialogical interpretation: artworks and mediated rituals should be read and rehearsed within communities that offer critical reflection (Gadamer, 1989).

Religious traditions will vary in receptivity. Sacramental, ecclesial, or textual traditions rightly insist on doctrinal and ontological criteria that aesthetic mediations cannot simply bypass. Coexistence thus requires mutual humility: art can extend and enhance religious practice but not replace the claims that specific traditions make about revelation or sacramentality. Conversely, religious institutions that reflexively reject all mediated forms risk losing formative opportunities for pastoral care and public witness.

To operationalize responsible coexistence, we need (i) longitudinal ethnographies of mediated ritual adoption; (ii) design-ethics frameworks for immersive sacred environments; (iii) pilot projects coupling VR liturgies with pastoral oversight and psychological evaluation; (iv) interdisciplinary curricula training clergy, designers, and ethicists in co-creation; and (v) public-policy instruments to address access, equity, and commercial exploitation of the sacred.

The most philosophically prudent stance is not triumphalist substitutionism nor defensive isolationism, but reflective partnership: treat art and technology as partners in the cultivation of human flourishing when practices are developed with transparency, pedagogical depth, and institutional accountability. Aesthetic religion thus appears—in the plural, contingent, and ethically mediated forms of the twenty-first century—not as a straightforward successor of traditional religion but as a partner in a post-secular ecology of meaning.

Conclusion

The present study has argued that contemporary aesthetic practices—especially digital fantasy, transmedia franchises, and immersive VR—can assume many of the experiential and social functions historically occupied by religion (eliciting awe, structuring moral imagination, and forming communal identities). Yet this functional convergence does not amount to ontological equivalence: the metaphysical claims and binding normative authority of religions are not simply produced by spectacle or simulation. Institutionalization—ritual repetition, normative pedagogy, and mechanisms for intergenerational transmission—is the critical pivot that determines whether an aesthetic formation remains an episodic event or develops into an enduring, religion-like social form.

Practically, the ethical challenge is urgent. Designers, cultural organizations, and religious communities must collaborate to ensure that mediated sacredness is transparent, pedagogically embedded, and governed by oversight that prevents manipulation and commodification. Research should prioritize longitudinal and interdisciplinary work: ethnography of fan rituals, experimental studies of VR pilgrimage's psychological effects, and normative reflection on when and how art can responsibly augment religious life.

Ultimately, the twenty-first century's significance lies not in the replacement of religion by art, but in the emergence of hybrid symbolic ecologies. If cultivated with philosophical care, theological sensitivity, and ethical design, these hybrid forms can expand the repertoire of human meaning, offering new pathways for awe, moral imagination, and communal attachment—without erasing the distinctive claims and responsibilities of religious traditions.

References

- Al-Ghazali. (1992). *The Incoherence of the Philosophers* (M. E. Marmura, Trans.). Brigham Young University Press.
- Aquinas, T. (1947). *Summa Theologica* (Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Trans.). Blackfriars. (Original work published 1274)
- Augustine. (2001). *Confessions* (H. Chadwick, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 397)
- Avicenna. (2005). *The Metaphysics of The Healing* (M. E. Marmura, Trans.). Brigham Young University Press.
- Barrett, J. L. (2004). *Why would anyone believe in God?* Rowman & Littlefield.
- Boyer, (2001). *Religion explained: The evolutionary origins of religious thought*. Basic Books.

- Campbell, H. A. (2013). *Digital religion: Understanding religious practice in new media worlds*. Routledge.
- Campbell, J. (2008). *The hero with a thousand faces* (3rd ed.). New World Library. (Original work published 1949)
- Couldry, N. (2003). *Media rituals: A critical approach*. Routledge.
- Eliade, M. (1959). *The sacred and the profane: The nature of religion*. Harcourt.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1989). *Truth and method* (2nd rev. ed.; J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.). Continuum.
- Goodman, N. (1976). *Languages of art: An approach to a theory of symbols* (2nd ed.). Hackett.
- Habermas, J. (2008). Notes on post-secular society. *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 25(4), 17–29.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1975). *Aesthetics: Lectures on fine art* (T. M. Knox, Trans.). Clarendon Press.
- Hoover, S. M. (2006). *Religion in the media age*. Routledge.
- Hume, D. (2000). *An enquiry concerning human understanding* (T. L. Beauchamp, Ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1748)
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. New York University Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Madary, M., & Metzinger, T. K. (2016). Real virtuality: A code of ethical conduct: Recommendations for good scientific practice and the consumers of VR-technology. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, 3, Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frobt.2016.00003>
- Morgan, D. (2005). *The sacred gaze: Religious visual culture in theory and practice*. University of California Press.
- Napier, S. J. (2001). *Anime from Akira to Princess Mononoke: Experiencing contemporary Japanese animation*. Palgrave.
- Nietzsche, F. (1999). *The birth of tragedy* (S. Whiteside, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1872)
- Ofili, C. (1996). *The Holy Virgin Mary* [Mixed media on linen]. The Museum of Modern Art, New York, NY, United States. <https://www.moma.org/collection/works/283373>
- Schiller, F. (2004). *On the aesthetic education of man*. Dover Publications.
- Serrano, A. (1987). *Immersion (Piss Christ)* [Cibachrome photograph]. Pinault Collection, Paris, France. <https://lesoeuvres.pinaultcollection.com/en/artwork/piss-christ>
- Smith, J. K. A. (2014). *How (not) to be secular: Reading Charles Taylor*. Eerdmans.
- Taylor, C. (2007). *A secular age*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Tillich, (1957). *Dynamics of faith*. Harper & Row.
- Woo, B. (2022). One-Above-All: Stratifying Communication within Marvel Fandom. *Transformative Works and Cultures* 37. <https://doi.org/10.3983/twc.2022.2571>