

The Vortex of Narrative and the metamorphosis of the Novelistic Space: Between Narration, Fiction, and Reception/Reading

Dr. Dalache Elmerahi

e-mail: elmerahi.dalache@univ.mascara.dz

Dr. Belhouari Mebarka

e-mail: mebarka.belhouari@univ-mascara.dz

Pr. Boucekine Medjahed

e-mail: medjahed.bouskine@univ.mascara.dz

University of Mascara, Algeria

Abstract:

This study explores the nature of narrative as a human and artistic act imbued with intellectual and creative depth, where history, imagination, and reception intersect in a complex vortex of relationships among the writer, the text, the reader, and time. Narrative is not merely the transmission of events or the depiction of characters; it is a philosophy of representing existence through language and an attempt to recreate the world in its symbolic form. From this perspective arises the essential question: What is the element that grants narrative its aesthetic and intellectual being? Is it **imagination**, which gives birth to the text; the **event**, which animates it; the **language**, which shapes it; or the **reader**, who revives it from its slumber? This dynamic tension renders narrative not only a literary genre but also a philosophical laboratory for human consciousness.

Keywords: Narrative, Imagination, Language, Reader, Time, Text, Narrative Act.

1. Introduction

Since the dawn of human linguistic consciousness, the act of narration has been a way to tame both time and experience, an attempt to reshape the world into a form that can be understood and shared. Storytelling thus emerged in diverse expressive modes: it may appear as a simple human act through which an ordinary speaker conveys to others news, events, or occurrences they have witnessed, or expresses inner thoughts, imaginings, anticipations, and visions that insist on being voiced and offered in a manner suited to the speaker's state of mind and to the listener's receptivity. When a human being narrates, he does more than merely describe what has happened, he exercises a symbolic authority over existence itself, transforming the fleeting into meaning, the event into memory, and the memory into discourse.

Narration may also manifest as a fully developed prose art—structurally intricate and aesthetically expansive, through which the creator asserts both mastery and pleasure in composing artistic painting. By mobilizing its constitutive elements, the author validates artistic legitimacy and distinction, imposing an aesthetic presence through techniques and qualities unique to the craft.

Received: 24/05/2026 ; Accepted : 23/08/2026 ; Published : 30/09/2026¹

© 2026 The Author. Published by AVADA-CROMA. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, adaptation, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original author and source are properly credited.

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

Indeed, narration extends its reach to draw from all other arts, subsuming them under its creative dominion. It sometimes borrows and sometimes transcends, assimilating both prose and poetry within its expressive totality.

Therefore, narration cannot be regarded as a mere linguistic activity; it is a discipline of consciousness itself. For this reason, it has gained prominence in both literary criticism and philosophical thought. Every act of narration, no matter how simple—involves selection, differentiation, and interpretation; it is, therefore, a form of truthmaking.

As narration evolved from oral storytelling to complex literary forms, multiple critical perspectives emerged:

- Some critics viewed event as the essence of narration.
- Others emphasized character as the driving force of narrative action.
- Still others identified language as the supreme space from which the text itself is generated.

Then came modernist and postmodernist theories, which inverted this hierarchy and positioned reading and the reader at the center of the narrative process—rather than the author or the text. Thus, the structure of narration became a chain of reflecting mirrors: fiction generates the event; the event activates the character; the character is retrieved through language; language is read; and reading reconstructs fiction anew.

Within this semantic vortex unfolds the narrative spiral; a movement without a fixed center. Narration is not merely “a text to be read” but a living entity that thrives through the plurality of its readers and grows through the renewal of its interpretations. This invites a crucial question: should the narrator be considered the foundation of the narrative structure and its very existence? Or is the event the essential core upon which narration rests? Could it be that the characters are the primary agents, driving the narrative and motivating the narrator? Or should primacy be granted to the text itself, which artistically integrates all these components, since without the text, none of them could be known? Or, perhaps, it is reading that deserves centrality, for it alone grants the text its contours and meanings?

The problematic question thus persists: which element ultimately dominates the narrative scene? More precisely, which component should be granted sovereignty within the narrative act? Can narration ever be reduced to a single element, or does its very essence reside in the dynamic interplay among all its constituents?

2. Fiction: The Genesis of Artistic Creation in the Text

No narrative work can exist outside the authority of fictional imagination, for fiction is the act that creates a rupture between language as a mere tool of communication and language as an instrument of artistic creation. Fiction is the force that renames the world that is (Bouabdallah & ammari 2024, 63), the power that situates existence within a new horizon of possibility rather than within the mirror of reality.

When we say that narrative constitutes “the space of unbridled imaginative creation,” (abu dib 2008, 10) we affirm that fiction does not operate merely as the invention of events, but as a generative system that produces possible worlds in which the real, the probable, and the symbolic intersect within a network of relations that transforms daily existence into a text open to contemplation and interpretation. Fiction, therefore, is not a decorative tool but the space within which narration takes place—the structure that houses narrative creation. Its so-called wildness refers to the stretching of the imagination to the boundaries of reality—not to escape it, but to recreate it anew.

As Salah Fadl observes, “literature acquires its literariness in proportion to the space it occupies within the realm of imagination; literary forms are but patches within the great tent of fiction—they may lengthen or shorten, rise or fall, shine brightly or fade. We must train ourselves to read literature

through this primary logic: as works of imagination.” (fadl 2008, 1) This imaginative realm is not a severance from reality but a parallel to it, since imagination here is not the opposite of reality but its corresponding field. Thus, fiction is not an ornamental embellishment but a cognitive logic that enables humanity to perceive the world as it has never been seen before.

In this sense, the aesthetic principle emerges: imagination becomes the measure of literariness, distinguishing creative writing from transactional discourse. Yet this “imaginative patch” is not a quantitative measure; rather, it signifies the degree of freedom the text acquires in its relation to reality, language, and the reader.

Hence, when we claim that literature is founded upon fiction, this metaphor opens a path toward understanding narrative as a fabric of possibilities. Every narrative text is a fragment of this vast canopy that shelters voices, visions, time, and human consciousness—constantly reshaped through language. The umbrella of fiction, if one may say so, is the symbolic dwelling of existence that humanity inhabits while writing and reading.

Fiction Between Reality and Language

Fiction is not an escape from reality but a reinterpretation of it. Every narrative act of fiction is, at its core, an experiment in human temporality—an attempt to redistribute the meaning of existence within time. In this sense, fiction becomes a philosophical act: it does not merely repeat the world but invents a new meaning for it. Fiction and language thus converge, sharing the capacity to reorganize human experience into communicable form.

From this perspective, narrative is not built from fiction alone; rather, fiction becomes effective only insofar as it is embodied through other elements—event, character, time, and language. The imagination does not operate in a vacuum; it acts through these components, which give it shape and allow it textual realization.

Fiction, therefore, grants the literary work a distinct ontological status: its characters and events are not real entities, yet they are treated as real within the logic of the fictional system. Fiction thus creates its own existential law, wherein the narrative sentence carries a truth of another kind—the truth of artistic representation rather than factual correspondence.

The Philosophy of Fiction or the Essence of Artistic Creation?

Fiction may rightly be regarded as the first spark of artistic creation in a text, for it transforms language from a conveying information into a mean of invention. The writer does not describe the world as it is, but as it could be. Here emerges what we find in Jean-Paul Sartre’s philosophy, which we may call aesthetic consciousness (sartre 1940, 236), for he sees the act of writing as a liberation of existence from its rigid reality and a granting of it a second life within consciousness.

From this standpoint, we can say that imagination is the metaphysical moment in narrative — the instant when language detaches itself from reality to create an alternative world, then returns to persuade us of the reality of this new creation. This paradox is what makes literature dialogue with the world rather than merely reflect it, as Mikhail Bakhtin pointed out in many of his studies (schaff 1974, 33).

Thus, fiction becomes both the aesthetic and intellectual gateway to narrative, though it does not function in isolation. It requires time to orchestrate events, language to give it body, and a reader to activate its worlds. Without these elements, fiction remains a suspended idea, awaiting the form that will embody it. Hence, fiction cannot be called the most important element in narration; rather, it is the generative principle from which all other elements emerge and to which they return. In more precise philosophical terms, it is the essence that fulfills itself only through its openness to others.

In conclusion, fiction in narrative is not an aesthetic luxury but the core of the creative and intellectual process that brings the text into being and justifies its existence. It is the act that makes narration

possible—as a discourse poised between reality and possibility, between experience and language, between writer and reader. Yet, once fiction enters the realm of the text, it ceases to reign alone: it enters into a dialectical dialogue with event, time, characters, and ultimately with the reader, who transforms it into new meaning. Thus, fiction is established as the beginning of artistic creation, not its final destination.

3. The Event: The Core that Gives Life to Narrative

If fiction is the spark that ignites artistic consciousness within the text, then the event is the current that gives that consciousness its dynamic form, transforming the narrative world into a vibrant space of becoming. At its core, the event is not merely an incident to be told but an existential movement—it carries the text from stillness to emergence, from potentiality to action.

Some critics have asserted that “narration is the reporting of a connected sequence of events and occurrences,” (Al-Tikriti 1993, 480-81) a definition that reduces the essence of narrative to its temporal continuity, affirming that there is no narration without action, and no action without the time that contains it. Yet this perspective is insufficient for grasping the depth of the relationship between the event and the art of narration, because the event is not only what happens externally but also what takes shape within narrative consciousness itself. It is a reconstruction of the world, not its mere reproduction.

When a theorist claims that narrative is “a series of events organized within a story,” (Culler 2004, 122) the implication is that it is the story that gives the event its meaning, and the narrator who transforms a mere occurrence into a meaningful act. The event, therefore, is not simply what happened, but what is told as having happened. Herein lies the power of narrative as an art: it transforms an occurrence from a temporal movement into a semantic sign charged with consciousness, desire, and choice.

From this perspective, the event is not merely a structural unit of narrative, but an expression of human awareness of time—and of humanity’s ability to confer meaning upon what unfolds around it. Philosophically, the event represents a movement between the known and the unknown, between happening and understanding, between what is seen and what is interpreted. In this sense, its organic relationship with fiction becomes evident: fiction grants the event the possibility of existence, while the event gives fiction the possibility of embodiment. Hence, the plot must not be reduced to a mere arrangement of events; it should instead endow them with a form that can be comprehended. In this way, human time becomes narratable time. The event thus ceases to be a mere technical element and becomes a philosophical structure that renders time intelligible and meaning possible. Without the event, transformation cannot occur, and imagination remains without an operative object—leaving the world as a pure, unrealized potential.

Aesthetically, the event is what produces shock and tension—the friction between what was and what will be. It marks the point where the internal and external, the subjective and the objective, converge. Great narratives are therefore not founded on the accumulation of events but on the transformation of the event into an existential experience. The greatest events in literature are not necessarily those that alter the destiny of the characters, but those that transform their perception of destiny.

In good narrative, the event is not measured by its size but by its symbolic depth. It may be a moment of silence, a gaze, or an inner hesitation—yet within it lies an entire world of transformation. This is what makes narration a profoundly philosophical art: it turns action into meaning and movement into consciousness.

Returning to the central question—is the event the sole agent in the narrative process?—the answer must be complex. The event is indeed the ontological condition of narrative, but not its soul. It is the blood that flows through the body of the text, yet the heart that pumps it is the narrator, the agent is the character, the mind that gives it coherence is the plot, and the spirit that illuminates it is fiction.

Without the event, narrative remains an abstract idea; without fiction, the event remains a meaningless occurrence; without the narrator, both remain silent; and without the character, the stage of narration stands still—motionless, without progression or retreat.

4. The Character: The Engine of the Event and the Features of Its Consciousness

If the event is what drives the narrative, then the character is what grants it both the will and the direction of movement. There can be no event without an agent, just as there can be no agency without a consciousness that directs it. At its core, the character is not merely a "paper being," as Roland Barthes famously described it, but rather a linguistic–intellectual entity that is brought into existence through language and acts within a network of symbolic relations that reconfigure the world through its own perspective.

Thus, when Jeremy Hawthorn states that narrative consists of “events performed by characters,” (Hawthorn 2016, 160) he is not merely describing a causal relationship but emphasizing that the character is the origin of the narrative act — the meeting point between idea and event, between will and world. Without the character, narration becomes discourse without a subject, an event without a witness — that is, time without consciousness.

Jan Manfred, who defines narrative as “a communicative act that presents a sequence of events experienced or caused by characters,” (manfred 2005, 4) elevates this understanding to the level of human communication. The character is not simply a device to activate the plot; it is the mediator of consciousness and language. It performs two acts simultaneously: it acts and narrates, it produces the event and interprets it. It is the consciousness that renders the world narratable; in its absence, the very possibility of narration collapses. While one can omit certain characters, their complete absence erases the events and thereby nullifies the narrative itself.

Yet the question remains: Is the character the true essence of narrative? The answer requires distinguishing between two levels:

1. The Ontological Level:

The character represents an imaginary being within the narrative world — it does not exist outside it. It is born of language and shaped through it.

2. The Aesthetic–Functional Level:

The character plays a role in constructing the event and propelling the plot, yet it ultimately remains a product of fiction and language alike.

Hence, the character is neither a primary cause nor a mere consequence, but rather a point of convergence between fiction (spirit) and event (body). It is the form through which imagination gazes upon reality and the face through which consciousness expresses itself. The character, then, is not a singular voice but a consciousness within which multiple voices coexist a dialogic world unto itself.

This reveals the profound philosophical dimension of character: it is not a closed unit but a movement within the collective consciousness of the text. Every major character carries within itself a tension between voices — between what it wishes to say and what is said about it, between its inner and outer worlds. Thus, its importance lies in shaping the intellectual structure of the narrative.

However, the presence of a character is not measured solely by its activity within the events but also by the depth of its symbolic and linguistic resonance. Some of the greatest literary characters do little in terms of action, yet they profoundly disturb meaning. Hamlet, for instance, does little more than think, and yet his thought is the play’s greatest event. Here the shift occurs — from the acting character to the thinking one, from the being that acts to the being that knows.

From a linguistic perspective, the character does not exist before language but is created through it. Language grants it name, trait, consciousness, and history — and can erase it just as it can immortalize

it. Hence, “the writer does not describe a character but summons it from nothingness, creating it through the word that calls it into being.”

Accordingly, the character is not merely an entity within the text but the very moment of emergence of language in human form. It is the symbolic face through which the author’s vision of the world is embodied and through which the reader perceives meaning and existence within the narrative.

Therefore, the character can only be complete through its interaction with language, just as language attains fullness through embodiment in character. Thus the narrative triad is completed: **fiction grants possibility, event grants motion, and character grants consciousness** — all different faces of a single truth: **narration as an existential act that reshapes both humanity and the world simultaneously.**

5. Language: The Discourse of Narrative, the Fabric of Storytelling, and the Maker of Novelistic Space and Vision

If imagination is the spirit of narrative, the event its movement, and the character its consciousness, then language is the body through which all these entities become manifest. It is the medium that allows imagination to speak, the event to be seen, and the character to come alive. Narrative does not precede language; it begins with it and returns to it. Language is both origin and destination — the generator, the shaper, and the everpresent medium that reconfigures absence into presence.

In its essence, language is not a tool for expressing the world but for creating it. When a writer writes, they do not merely describe reality; they recreate it within a new linguistic system. In narrative, language is not employed to represent reality but to transform it. It ceases to be an instrument of description and becomes an instrument of consciousness. Words are no longer signs but living semantic beings — they charge meaning with symbolism and grant existence new dimensions.

The creative writer succeeds in weaving together the constitutive elements of narrative — connecting them artistically — for although these elements are essential in themselves, they acquire their full vitality only through their interrelation within the aesthetic framework shaped by language. Language thus fashions a mosaic in which words harmoniously design the characters, invent the events, and endow imagination with beauty.

Modern narrative works within the space of language and draws from it its mark of artistry and literariness. It plays upon language until it attains what has been called “a beauty both thorny and full of potential.” (Al-Allaq 2013, 172) These potentials arise only through language, which increasingly fuses with pure poetic language, achieving an intensification of emotion, sensation, and vision, thereby governing the course of suggestion (Saddouq 1986, 60) and, through it, the rhythm of narration as a whole.

From this perspective, language can be viewed as the highest component of the narrative structure, for it grants not only form but essence itself. Without it, imagination cannot manifest, events cannot be narrated, and characters cannot speak. Language is the fabric that unites all elements in a single aesthetic experience, through which the authorial self-reshapes the world according to its dream and its consciousness.

When a writer creates with words, they build a linguistic world upon the ruins of reality; language thus becomes an existential choice, not a neutral tool. This gives it a philosophical dimension: language is not merely a medium of communication but a being that reorders the relationship between human and world. Every linguistic text is also an ontological text, reflecting the writer’s vision of being, time, and meaning.

Therefore, language in narrative should not be measured by its sweetness or its rigor, but by its capacity to provoke wonder and transcendence. It becomes truly artistic when it transcends its communicative function toward an aesthetic and philosophical one, when it transforms from a medium of transmission to a horizon of contemplation.

Hence the critical perspective that places language at the summit of narrative creation: it is not mere sound, but an artistic destiny linking the writer to existence in an ongoing act of creation. Every sentence written is a reconfiguration of the world; every metaphor, an attempt to understand the incomprehensible. Thus, narrative becomes art only when language itself becomes alive — breathing, resisting, and transforming.

From a semiotic standpoint, language in the narrative text performs two interwoven functions:

1. **The Referential Function:** establishing a relation with the external or imagined world.
2. **The Poetic Function:** establishing a relation with the text itself, making language its own subject.

When these two functions are in balance, literature is born in its purest form. The great text is not the one that describes the world, but the one that convinces us that its language is the world.

Language, therefore, is not the background of narrative but its existential space. Within it, the writer's consciousness condenses, their symbols take form, and the real world transforms into a world of meaning. When the narrator writes, they do not merely speak language — language speaks them; for every act of writing is a dialogue between a self that speaks and a language that writes it.

Thus, we may conclude that imagination is born of vision, the event of will, the character of consciousness, and language of existence itself. It is the vessel that contains everything, the source to which everything returns, and the very force that ensures narrative immortality — for it preserves human consciousness in its highest symbolic form.

6. Reading: The Source of Life and the Foundation of the Text's Existence

If language is the body that gives form to the narrative world, then reading is the breath that gives it life. No text truly exists until it is read, for writing alone produces only a silent potential, awaiting someone to grant it motion and meaning. An unread text is like a seed that has not yet been planted: it carries life within, but it will not bloom until it meets the consciousness of a reader. As has been said, "Texts are but bodies without souls, lifeless corpses until they are read; for reading is their spirit, and their spirit is their life." (Mortadh 2003, 150) Thus, the very existence of literature depends on its readers. Reading is the act of revival, and the reader's consciousness is the soul of the text. It is no wonder that reading has often been likened to resurrection, for it restores movement to words, drawing them from the stillness of the page into the vitality of understanding and interpretation.

The existence of the text depends upon its readers — yet readers are not a homogeneous mass, but rather a spectrum of consciousness and reflection. The casual reader seeks pleasure, the critic seeks structure, the philosopher seeks meaning, and the poet seeks vision. Hence, each reading recreates the text according to its own horizon of interpretation; the text does not contain a single fixed meaning but an infinite potentiality of meanings.

Modern literary theories — from Structuralism to Deconstruction and beyond — have thus emphasized that reading is not a passive act of reception, but an existential act that recreates the text. The writer writes their world, but it is the reader who rewrites it, activating its symbols, filling its blanks, and reshaping its meaning anew. In this sense, reading is not the end of the text but its second birth; "the birth of the reader can only come at the cost of the author's death."

This statement is not a call to erase the author but rather to signal a shift in authority — from the producer to the receiver, from a single center to an open interplay. The text does not live within the author's intention but within the reader's interpretation, for meaning is not what is written, but what is read. As has been noted, "The immortality of literary works does not stem from the circumstances of their creation, nor from the social or economic structures they reflect, but from their enduring ability to act upon and move the reader." (Al-Wad 1985, 66)

In this light, the text is not a closed structure but an open organism, renewed by every act of reading. What keeps literature alive through the ages is not its history but its capacity to be read differently in

every era. A text that resists interpretation dies with its moment of writing, whereas a great text never ends because its readings never end. Literary immortality, therefore, is not a temporal extension but a continuity in human consciousness — in that everrenewed interaction between the text and its reader, where each reading opens a new wound in language and heals it at once.

Reading, then, is not external to the text; it is one of its formative components. The text is written to be read, and the writer, while writing, imagines their reader — leaving spaces and silences for them to fill. Thus, the text is not a finished product but a dynamic interplay between authorial intention and the reader's horizon of expectation, as posited by Reception Theory.

Accordingly, the reader becomes a partner in creation, not a mere spectator of the text. They inhabit language from within, animating it and transforming writing into a shared existential experience between two consciousnesses: the writer who created and the reader who recreated.

At its deepest level, reading itself becomes a form of silent writing. Every reader is a writer in potential — rearranging sentences in their mind, questioning the language, and adding something of their own. Reading thus emerges as an act of freedom, the highest form of participation in literary being.

Writing gives birth to the text — but reading grants it immortality. It ensures that literature remains a living entity, one that does not end with the death of its author but is continually reborn in the minds of generations. Hence, the text becomes a living being — born from the womb of writing, growing in the womb of reading — comprehensible only when experienced by the reader, and eternal only when read.

7. The Reader: The Reason for the Text's Existence, Life, and Immortality

A literary text cannot exist without a reader who grants it life and completes the cycle of creative genesis. The reader constitutes the second pole in the textual equation, whose elements can only be fulfilled through interaction with the sender and engagement with the narrator throughout the narrative. Literature, in essence, is founded upon an act of reciprocal communication between a transmitter who constructs and sends a linguistic message, and a receiver who decodes and reconstructs it into an imagined world—thereby activating its textual signification (Ibrahim 2005, 12).

Accordingly, it is inconceivable to exclude either party from this creative process: just as a text cannot exist without an author to create it, it cannot truly exist without a reader to interact with it. In its essence, the text is a project of deferred reading; it only acquires being when touched by the reader's interpretive act.

The reader is not a marginal or secondary element in the literary process, but rather the central axis around which modern reader-response theories revolve. These critical approaches have accorded the reader significant attention after having long been neglected (Holub 1984, 90). Hence, the reader possesses the act of reading and exercises the authority to determine the text's life or death, for reading is not a passive consumption of a readymade meaning, but rather a recreation of the text itself—a struggle that, as some critics affirm, “rivals the agony of writing and creation.” (mouensi 2007, 116)

Reading, therefore, is not a mechanical act but a complex intellectual and emotional practice that requires diverse tools of knowledge, experience, and interpretation. The reader mobilizes his cognitive apparatus to enter the text, reconstruct its contours, and refine its meanings. The more skillfully the reader employs interpretive strategies, the more effectively he produces a new text worthy of his efforts—one that unveils layers hidden within the original structure of the work. As theorists note, “the reader, upon reaching a certain conclusion, does so by virtue of the existence of causes leading to that conclusion.” (Al-Mousawi 1985, 77)

The reader's role is not confined to the post-writing phase; rather, his presence begins at the very inception of the text. The author, while shaping his work, mentally envisions an implied reader to whom he directs his discourse, thus constructing the text according to this imagined image that forms

its preliminary mold. Indeed, “the author’s image of the reader not only reflects within the text but also determines its final form, insofar as the author builds the text according to the type and nature of audience he addresses.” (Chorfi 2007, 188) Yet, this imagined reader may differ greatly from the real reader, who may intersect with, diverge from, or even oppose the author’s expectations in his interpretation of the text.

Moreover, reading is never singular or final. Every reader produces his own text, and even the same reader may generate multiple readings of a single work across different times and circumstances. “What appears central in one reading may become marginal in another, and what is marginal in one may turn central in the next.” (Hammouda 1998, 367). This fluidity affirms that reading—by virtue of its multiplicity and mutability—is inherently bound to time, which continually reshapes the relationship between reader and text.

Thus, the reader emerges not as a passive recipient but as an active participant who reconstructs the text and regenerates its meaning. The text is incomplete without him; writing is revived only through his breath. Yet this dynamic presence is inseparable from another essential factor: **time**, which directs the act of reading and infuses it with vitality and renewal. Reading never occurs in a temporal vacuum; it unfolds in a specific moment wherein meanings shift with changing times and contexts. Time, therefore, becomes a decisive element in determining the trajectories of the text and the transformations of its meaning. From this arises a crucial question: **Can time be regarded as the very essence of the reading process itself?**

8. Time: The Essence of the Reading and Narrative Process

Time constitutes one of the fundamental pillars of both the narrative and reading processes. It is the framework within which events take shape, characters move, and interpretations are renewed. The literary text, in its true nature, is not a static entity but a mutable being that time continually revives through reading. In every temporal moment, the reader reconstructs the text’s meaning according to the evolution of consciousness, experience, and knowledge. Thus, time ceases to be a merely external dimension of the text and becomes an internal element that simultaneously shapes its structure and meaning.

In narrative, time is not measured solely by the succession or chronological order of events, but by the diversity of its representations within the text. It manifests, at times, as **story time**, which recounts the sequence of events as they occurred, and at other times as **discourse time**, in which the author rearranges those events according to an artistic vision. Yet time extends beyond narrative structure; it penetrates the very act of reading, where the text appears differently with each reading depending on temporal change. As it is often said, “the same text is never read twice in the same way,” (Benhamada 2012) for both reader and time are in constant transformation, and consequently, the meanings of the text evolve accordingly.

What grants a text its true immortality is its capacity to transcend the time of its initial creation, to live on through the successive times of its readings. Each act of reading revitalizes it, restoring its vigor and ensuring its continued presence within the aesthetic and intellectual consciousness of successive generations. A text that resists renewal through reading dies with its own time, whereas one that remains open to time possesses the power of endurance and regeneration.

Hence, time is not merely an external context surrounding the literary work but the very **essence** of both the reading and narrative processes. It allows the story to be told, the reader to rediscover it, and the text to be continually reborn across different epochs. Time is the element through which all components of the literary act—the **author, the text, the reader, and meaning**—intersect, granting literature its vitality, continuity, and infinite capacity for reinterpretation.

9. The Narrator: The fabric cohesion of the Narrative Work and Its Existential Value

It is impossible to discuss any of the foregoing elements in the absence of the narrator, for the narrator constitutes the fundamental building block upon which the entire narrative structure rests. No component of narrative discourse—character, time, space, or language—can be conceived without the narrator's presence. The narrator functions as the organizing consciousness that weaves these elements into a coherent narrative texture. Rather than merely transmitting events or arranging incidents, the narrator assumes the task of producing and directing meaning through the chosen focalization and the implicit stance adopted toward the narrative world.

The narrator is what grants characters their textual existence, determining the degree of their presence or marginalization, their psychological depth or superficiality, their effectivity or their fracture. The narrator likewise governs narrative time, reshaping it through analepsis, prolepsis, and fragmentation, thereby disrupting linear chronology and reconstructing it according to a semantic logic that does not necessarily adhere to realistic temporal succession, but rather to the interpretive and epistemic demands of the text. As for language, it is not a neutral instrument in the narrator's hands, but the very site of aesthetic and intellectual labor, subjected to stylistic choices, a distinctive rhythm, and a particular vision of the world.

The existential value of the narrator becomes evident insofar as the narrator embodies a consciousness that interrogates existence and rearticulates it narratively. The narrator is not a mere technical mediator, but a speaking subject that carries a specific worldview, reflecting human anxiety and the fundamental questions surrounding meaning, freedom, destiny, and time. Through the narrator's voice, narrative transforms into a contemplative space that exposes the fragility of human memory and its persistent tension between action and desire, and between desire and limitation.

Moreover, the narrator plays a decisive role in guiding the reader—not through overt coercion, but through the construction of a semantic context that directs the process of reception and delineates the pathways of understanding and interpretation. The narrator opens multiple possibilities of meaning for the reader, yet simultaneously delineates their boundaries and frames them within a particular horizon of vision. This renders the relationship between narrator and reader a dialectical one, grounded in illusion and awareness, involvement and critical distance.

Accordingly, the narrator represents the pulsating heart of the narrative work and the existential mediator that links text to world, and story to human experience, transforming narrative from a mere tale that is told into an intellectual and existential experience that is lived and questioned..

10. Conclusion

The analytical trajectory of this study has revealed that the narrative text is not a self-contained linguistic construct, but a dynamic and ever-evolving entity born out of the interaction among its constitutive elements: **imagination, event, character, language, reader, and time**. Each of these components is not an isolated unit, but rather a thread within a living fabric where creative and interpretive forces intertwine, allowing the text to open itself to multiplicity of meanings and renewal of significance.

The narrative text begins with the act of **imagination**, the primal moment of creation in which the writer grants the world a new form—one that parallels reality yet transcends it. The **event** then emerges to bestow movement upon the narrative, while **characters** become active agents in shaping meaning, moving within the **space of language** that simultaneously creates and redefines them. **Reading**, in turn, is an act of resurrection—it saves writing from stillness and transforms it into a living experience. Through the reader, this rebirth occurs: the reader is not a passive recipient but a cocreator who enters into a silent dialogue with the author, turning the text into a field of generation rather than mere reception.

Yet all these elements find their true significance only within **time**—the dimension that grants the text its becoming, enabling it to transcend the moment of its birth and evolve from a written event into a continuous human experience. A text read a century after its creation is, in essence, a new text,

reborn in a new moment of reading, within a different consciousness and context. Thus, time is not merely the framework of narration but the **spirit of the entire literary process**.

From this perspective, the narrative text reveals itself as a **renewable existential act**, one that cannot be reduced to either author or reader. It stands as a bridge of meaning and difference between them—a living being that never dies, for it is continually recreated across time.

This conclusion opens a horizon of philosophical questioning that keeps the inquiry perpetually alive:

- If the text is recreated with every act of reading, does the author lose ownership of it the moment it is published?
- If the reader reconstructs meaning according to their own temporal horizon, where does the “truth” of the text reside—in its original writing, or in its transformations through time?
- Can the text ultimately transcend both reader and author to become an autonomous entity nourished by collective human consciousness?
- And finally, what remains of the literary work when time is effaced and reading ceases? Does the text die, or does it persist—dormant within the unconscious of language—awaiting a new reader to breathe life into it once more?

Such questions remain open within the horizons of thought and criticism, for the text, in its deepest essence, is an **unending journey** between author, reader, and time—a continuum of rebirths of meaning within the evermoving stream of human consciousness.

11. Works Cited

abu dib, kamal. *the miraculous literature and the strange world in the book of greatness and the art of the Arab narrative*. as-saki publishing, 2008.

Al-Allaq, Ali Jaafar. *Poetry and Reception*. fadaat publishing, 2013.

Al-Mousawi, Mohsen Jassim. *The Age of the Novel: An Essay on the Literary Genre*. baghdad: Al-Tahrir Library Publishing, 1985.

Al-Tikriti, Jamil Nasif. *Encyclopedia of Literary Theory: A Historical Illumination on Fundamental Issues – Image, Method, and Unique Nature*. General Cultural Affairs, 1993.

Al-Wad, Hussein. *On the Methods of Literary Study*. tunis: sarraas publishing, 1985.

Benhamada, Mohamed. “The Strategy of Reading and the Mechanism of Interpretation.” *Donia Al-Watan Newspaper*, 2012.

Bouabdallah & ammari, Hamida and kheira. “the question of ethics and narrative in the philosophy of Paul Ricoeur.” *ournal of Human and Society Sciences*, october 2024: 60-84.

Chorfi, Abdelkarim. *From Philosophies of Hermeneutics to Theories of Reading: An Analytical and Critical Study of Western Theories*. beirut: Arab Scientific Publishing, 2007.

culler, jonathan. “Story and Discourse in the Analysis of Narrative.” *narrative theory: critical concepts in literary and cultural studies*, 2004: 117-131.

fadl, salah. *The Problematic of Imagination*. cairo: maktabat lubnan, 2008.

Hammouda, Abdel Aziz. *The Convex Mirrors: From Structuralism to Deconstruction*. kuwait: Ālam al-Maʿrifa, 1998.

Hawthorn, Jeremy. *studying the novel*. bloomsbury academic, 2016.

Holub, robert. *Reception Theory: a critical introduction*. london: methum & co., 1984.

Ibrahim, Abdallah. *Reception and Cultural Contexts*. algiers: al-ikhthilaf editions, 2005.

manfred, jahn. *Narratology a guide to the Theory of Narrative*. English Departement univercity of cologne, 2005.

Mortadh, Abdelmalek. *Theory of Reading: A Foundation for the General Theory of Literary Reading*. oran: al-gharb publishing, 2003.

mouensi, habib. *Theories of Reading in Contemporary Criticism*. oran: Al-Adib Publishing, 2007.

Saddouq, Nour-Eddin. "Narrative and poetic: limits of articulation and models." *Journal of Contemporary Arab Thought*, 1986: 56-65.

sartre, jean-paul. *The Imaginary*. paris: gallimard, 1940.

schaff, adam. *Knowledge, Language and Thought*. paris: seuil, 1974.