Erothanatos
EROTHANATOS.COM
Vol. 9, Issue 4, December 2025

Author(s):

Ziani Zakariae

Corresponding Author:

Ziani Zakariae

Publication History

Received: 2025-08-21

Reviewed: 2025-09-01

Accepted: 2025-09-05

Published: 2025-10-01

DOI:

https://doi.org/10.70042/eroth/904214

The Aesthetics of Choice : Readerly Freedom and Authorial Design in Modern and Postmodern Storytelling

Abstract: This article aims to examine the paradoxically programmed freedom through participatory narratives that solicit reader agency through metafiction, ergodic structures, and digital interactivity. This study analyzes reader-response theory, focusing on the democratization of textual meaning and how authors construct systems of simulated freedom or 'choice' while maintaining aesthetic and thematic control. Through a close-reading of selected modernist and postmodernist narratives, I argue that the aesthetics of participation posits that it is not freedom for the reader, but rather a productive tension between authorial design and readerly action. The greater the complexity of choices in a text, the clearer its constraints become. The most sophisticated participatory narratives in this regard will not so much hide as emphasize this paradox, transforming the border between constraint and agency into their central aesthetic object. This signifies a distinct reframing of aesthetic form in that postmodern and transmedia textual structures rely on reader engagement for their existence and meaning. Consequently, evaluation must switch from fixed textual design to constructed systems of possibility.

Keywords: reader agency, ergodic structures, metafiction, aesthetic of participation, programmed freedom

Erothanatos
A Peer-Reviewed Quarterly Journal on Literature
https://www.erothanatos.com/journal
Volume 9 Issue 4, December 2025

The Aesthetics of Choice : Readerly Freedom and Authorial Design in Modern and Postmodern Storytelling

Ziani Zakariae[1]

Introduction

By providing readers with the choice to engage with his novel in linear progression or in a "hopscotching" manner, Cortázar performs an act that has become emblematically postmodern and narrative experimentation. "In its own way", Cortázar writes, "this book consists of many books, but two books above all" (Cortázar 3). The reader can follow either a straight path from Chapter 1 onwards through Chapter 56, or select the prescribed paths, beginning with Chapter 73 and proceeding as directed by the novel. The invitation seems to create precedence for great reader participation: you choose your path, you construct your reading experience, and you co-author the novel.

Yet, this act of liberation carries within it its own contradiction. The two pathways have been designed by Cortázar with great deliberation. They link through his architecture, traverse through his sentences and meet with his chosen characters at his own time. The reader's "freedom" is not freedom from authorship, but the freedom within authorship. Even the much-touted radical choice between the two books is in itself constructed: both choices have been constructed and anticipated by Cortázar and his channeling of the reader's journey. The participatory narrative offers the illusion of liberation, but hides a deeper treachery: reader agency has already been predetermined.

This article interrogates the paradox of programmed freedom: the basic tension between authoring and readerly action in participatory narratives. How do authors engineer systems of choice that simulate agency without disturbing their aesthetic coherence and thematic purpose? What does it mean to "participate" in a narrative when every action in that participation was anticipated, designed for, and ultimately constrained by authorial architecture? And, most vital: What kind of aesthetic object emerges when textual form becomes contingent upon reader performance?

These questions are not purely theoretical provocations without any practical substance. Rather, they have a stake in a material reality–experimental literature subsequent to high modernism into postmodernism, and then into the digital narrative of today; texts that openly solicit reader intervention through the metafictional address, ergodic structures require physical manipulation, hypertext networks demanding choice in navigation, or algorithms with input responses from readers themselves. Hence, once it collapses from the perceived imposition of this hierarchy between author and reader, it can

[1] Pursuing PhD.

democratize meaning and convert the act of passive consumption into one of active co-creation. However, the more carefully crafted choices become, the more evident their constraints. The cage is most visible when we are invited to inspect its bars.

If aesthetics is traditionally concerned with principles that govern artistic beauty and form, especially the arrangement of parts into coherent wholes, the relationship between structure and effect, what happens when form becomes unstable? When a reader actively re-forms a text with navigational choices, interpretive gaps, or outright physical interference (as in B.S. Johnson's The Unfortunates, which arrives as a box of unbound chapters to be shuffled), is there an aesthetic object prior to reading, or does it only come into existence via the performance of reading? If different readers actualize different textual configurations, are they having different experiences of art, or are they variations on one single intended system?

I argue that the aesthetic of participation is best understood not as reader liberation, but as a well-designed interaction between constraints and agency, what we may call Choreographed Improvisation. The author designs the system; the reader actuates it; text occurs in the act of that activation. In an entangled fashion, the aesthetic object may be understood neither to be the stable text (for there exists no single stable text) nor that of reader subjective experience (anchored as it is to authorial design), but rather the very architecture of possibility, the domain of constrained choices which designs what can and cannot within that textual system.

This reframing fundamentally impacts how we assess participatory narratives. If we consider an artwork not as a fixed object, but rather a system, aesthetic judgment ought to factor in four key dimensions: the elegance of constraint (how thoughtfully boundaries are set), the meaningfulness of variation (whether genuinely different experiences arise from different pathways), reflexive awareness (whether texts acknowledge their own paradox), and experiential richness (whether the system creates worthwhile participation). These criteria will underpin the analysis that follows. Most advanced participatory narratives do not make naive proclamations of freedom, by which they will not provide. Instead, they render evident the impossibility of escaping authorial design while turning the constraint-agency boundary into their main aesthetic achievement.

This has not only been a theoretical problem for modern and postmodern authors; it has also been a material one, through experimental forms that test the very limits of reader involvement. Their solutions tell us something implicit about narrative control: authorial abdication is always theatrical; reader agency is always scripted; and this double bind does not prevent participatory aesthetic for attaining its greatest successes. Understanding how these texts work involves consideration of not merely what they say about freedom, but also how they structure it, circumscribe it, and aestheticize the mechanisms of that very circumscription.

This study employs close reading of three exemplary participatory texts: Calvino's if on a winter's night a traveler; Johnson's The Unfortunates; and the visual novel Steins;Gate, representing three distinct modalities: transparent constraint (architecture is made visible), material constraint (form can be physically manipulated), and algorithmic constraint (where systems conceal themselves computationally). Each has its distinct strategies for negotiating the paradox of programmed freedom.

II. Theorizing the Paradox: Beyond Reader-Response and Toward Ergodic Aesthetics

1. The Limits of Reader-Response Theory

Reader-response criticism fundamentally changed literary studies by shifting the focus of meaning from the text to the interaction between the text and the reader. Wolfgang Iser's phenomenological approach, articulated in The Act of Reading, posits that texts encompass "gaps" that hold indeterminacy and require the reader's active work in constructing meaning. According to Iser, the act of reading cannot simply be passive reception, but rather a dynamic co-production, furthermore, he says in "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach" that "the literary work cannot be completely identical with the text, or with the realization of the text, but in fact must lie halfway between the two" (21). The reader does not decode a message, but co-creates meaning in the text.

Similarly, Stanley Fish asserts that interpretive communities take the authority away from single authorship and lay it instead upon collective reading practices. What Fish proposes is that meaning becomes dependent upon the collective interpretive strategies that constitute communities of readers, rather than the formal characteristics of the text. Here, the reader ceases to be a passive consumer of textual meaning and rather a meaningful collaborator in creating interpretations of the text, devoid from unilateral authorial proclamations.

These interventions begin to productively challenge New Critical orthodoxy, thus opening up space for conceptualizing reader agency. Yet, Iser and Fish propose a fundamentally passive architecture–texts with gaps that readers fill or texts whose meaning is constructed by readers through shared interpretive protocols. What such frameworks do not address adequately are texts that deeply manipulate specific forms of participation; texts that embed choice mechanisms within their material and narrative structures; texts that actively solicit reader involvement as constitutive of their very textual form.

When Cortázar instructs you to read Chapter 1 after Chapter 73, or when B.S. Johnson puts together chapters in a box for you to shuffle, or when a hypertext provides clickable links that determine narrative development, you are no longer merely filling in gaps or interpretive meaning. These texts demand navigation: choosing sequences, structures, and paths that materially change the reading experience. The reader does not only interpret differently; the reader actualizes different textual configurations.

Moreover, by valorizing the productivity of the reader, reader-response theory tends toward an uncritical optimism about agency. In focusing on the positive aspect of what reader can do, it often neglects to address what readers cannot do, the boundaries, limits, and preestablished frameworks that in fact frame all readerly activity. This oversight becomes particularly problematic when stipulating an analytical framework for participatory texts that so overtly thematize choice, for such texts foreground precisely what reader-response theory tends to background: the authored architecture within which all reader agency is enacted and compromised.

2. Ergodic Literature and the Materiality of Navigation

Espen Aarseth's concept of "ergodic literature", developed in *Cybertext: Perspectives of Ergodic Literature*, offers a more fruitful approach to the study of participatory texts. Aarseth defined ergodic texts as demanding a "nontrivial effort" from the reader in moving through them; in other words, ergodic texts force their readers to undertake some acts of physical, navigational, or procedural labor. Unlike conventional linear texts where "the effort to traverse the text is trivial, with no extranoematic responsibilities placed on the reader except (for example) eye movement and the periodic or arbitrary turning of pages", ergodic texts require that readers actually make consequential decisions about textual structure itself (1-2).

Furthermore, the very word ergodic derives from the Greek words ergon (work), and hodos (path), thereby giving emphasis to the fact that these texts require work in finding one's path through them. Aarseth posits a distinction between interpretation, which he regards as the construction of meaning effected by the reader, and configuration, which he deems the production of textual sequence or structure by the reader. In ergodic texts, configuration establishes the basis for, and shapes meaning: you cannot interpret what you have not yet chosen to actualize.

This framework presents a valuable emphasis on the material and procedural aspects of participatory reading. In a sense, what you are activating or what you are putting into realization is your choice of which text elements to activate and in what order, these become your navigational choices. What emerges from your textual engagement is a materially different text from what another reader's choices would produce.

However, I want to stress this central tension which even Aarseth's sophisticated framework does not interrogate: designed choice vs. experienced freedom. He describes ergodic texts as authorial objects, the topology constraints laid down by the author are predetermined (78); he speaks then mainly in categorizing the varied forms of ergodic mechanisms and not assessing the paradox of premeditated authorship of systems of choice.

The paths through Johnson's *The Unfortunates* exist before you choose between them, Joyce has put the hyperlinks in his *afternoon, a story* . The actual navigational labor is there, and the

configurative choices have real consequences on how one reads, but the architecture in which those choices operate has been predetermined entirely. You are free to navigate the labyrinth, but you did not design it. This is not a failure of that framework; instead, his argument regarding "nontrivial effort" implies that ergodic texts are designed, but it does not touch on the way in which this paradox might have aesthetic or phenomenological consequences.

3. **Hypertext, Game Studies, and the Digital Turn of Participatory Narrative**

The transition from print ergodic texts to digital interactive narratives does not resolve but rather amplifies the paradox of programmed freedom. Hypertext theory, emerging alongside early digital literature in the 1990s, initially celebrated for the medium's ability to liberate the reader from linear reading. George P. Landow's foundational work, *Hypertext 3.0*, claimed that hypertext restructured reading by fragmenting texts into linked nodes. For Landow, hypertext realizes Barthes' writerly text in digital terms, he writes "Hypertext, in other words, provides an infinitely recenterable system whose provisional point focus depends on the reader, who becomes a truly active reader in yet another sense" (Landow 56). The reader, empowered to determine reading sequence through link selection, appears to gain unprecedented agency over textual structure.

Yet, this optimistic account requires critical scrutiny. Marie-Laure Ryan's work on "immersion versus interactivity" in *Narrative as Virtual Reality* identifies an underlying tension of digital narratives. Ryan's analysis on narrative across various media provides crucial foundations for this synthesis, positing that narrative serves as a cognitive framework that can be instantiated across different media forms while preserving medium-specific characteristics that shape how stories are told and perceived (Ryan 1-42). This framework reveals that although digital media enable newer forms of possible reader participation, they do not escape medial constraint and merely reallocate it. The navigable space remains architecturally predetermined even as navigation itself becomes interactive.

Additionally, analyzing the reading experience of hypertext fiction, J. Yellowlees Douglas identifies how authorial design operates differently in digital environments. In *The End of Books–or Books Without End?*, Douglas observes:

In hypertext fiction, unlike its print counterpart, authorial intention is palpable. Although my intentions in writing the words you read might put a certain topspin on them, might try to persuade you to assume my viewpoint on hypertext fiction, you do not need to intuit the shape of my intentions, let alone share them, to make sense of what I read. But if you were to read my hypertext fiction "I Have Said Nothing," the satisfaction you might derive from reading it is contingent to a large extent on your ability to replicate a certain approach to the text, to reach certain conclusions about the relationship between the stories it relates and the ties that bind them. (Douglas 132-133)

Douglas's insight is important: hypertext intensifies in authorial control instead of weakening it because it makes reader satisfaction dependent on replication of a certain approach to the text. The

reader must discover the author's intended navigational logic to experience a satisfying reading encounter. This freedom of navigation does not mean freedom from authorial design; rather, navigation itself becomes a kind of puzzle where the reader tries to understand and execute the designed patterns of an author.

Furthermore, Michael Joyce, himself a theorist and practitioner of hypertext fiction, distinguishes between modes of hypertextual engagement. In *Of Two Minds,* Joyce defines exploratory usage as follows:

4. By exploratory use, I mean to describe the increasingly familiar use of hypertext as a delivery or presentational technology, as Guide and HyperCard are currently most often used. Exploratory hypertexts encourage and enable an audience (*users* and *readers* are inadequate terms here) to control the transformation of a body of information to meet its needs and interests. This transformation should include a capability to create, change, and recover particular encounters with the body of knowledge, maintaining these encounters as versions of the material, i.e., trails, paths, webs, notebooks, etc. (Joyce 41)

This exploratory hypertext described by Joyce can also describe most literary hypertexts: "the reader controls the transformation" and creates "particular encounters" with the material but merely transforms a predetermined "body of information" authored in advance. The "trails, paths, webs" forged by readers only trace paths through pre-existing content. Joyce's framework acknowledges that reader agency within exploratory hypertexts operates within authored boundaries–the audience controls encounter but not the creation of textual elements themselves.

Game studies scholarship extends these insights by examining systems that bring the agency of a reader into action as a player within rule-bounded environments. Jesper Juul's analysis in *Half-Real* identifies crucial temporal structures in games. Juul identifies the relationship between play time being comparable to discourse time, and fictional time being comparable to story time, thus understanding gaming temporality (Juul 214). Juul's framework for understanding gaming temporality can map the experience of playing a game into two realms: the "play time" which is the player's real-time actions, and the (fictional time) which is the fictional events that accrue from those actions. These temporal layers interact dynamically rather than existing as separate analytical categories. This is illustrated by the temporal duality of games: they consist of actions eliciting authentic agency on the part of the player in that appropriate moment, while the actions themselves execute potential sequences defined and determined through prior algorithms.

In *Steins;Gate,* the hidden flag system that determines endings is a crucial part of the central theme of the game; that theme is determinism: players learn through repeated attempts to discover the futility of free choice, as it turns out, this mirrors the protagonist Okabe's realization that there are determined laws according to which these times flow alongside the semblance of being malleable.

Similarly, Calvino's systematic interruptions in *If on a winter's night a traveler* would seem to assert that narrative desire is deferred into a perpetual survival, while Johnson's shuffleable chapters would argue through their material form that memory resists linear organization. Each case thus makes an argument through the architecture of choice regarding agency, constraint, and the relationship between form and meaning.

This synthesis of hypertext theory and game studies generates a more sophisticated perspective of participatory aesthetics than was afforded by early reader-response theories. Digital, ludic scholarship suggests that the interactivity does not dissolve authorship but reconfigure it: authors set up systems; readers/players enact them; texts are generated in that activation. According to Douglas, the satisfaction of the reader often depends on the discovery of the author's intentions; according to Joyce, exploratory freedom operates within made authored informational structures; as Murray theorizes, procedural authorship creates possibilities rather than pre-scripted certainties; as Juul reveals, player agency falls within two temporalities: action and fiction. The aesthetic object is thus the architecture itself: the space of constrained possibilities that readers/players activate through configurative labor.

4. From "Writerly Text" to "Choreographed Improvisation"

Roland Barthes' distinction between readerly (lisible) and writerly (scriptible) texts represents another productive but thoroughly revised conceptual framework for the purposes of this article. In *S/Z*, Barthes defines the readerly text as one that dictates the passive consumption of it. He says "Our literature is characterized by the pitiless divorce which the literary institution maintains between the producer of the text and its user, between its owner and its customer, between its author and its reader" (4). The writerly text, on the other hand, says that "the reader no longer a consumer, but a producer of the text" (4). He associates writerly texts with plurality, open-endedness, and refusal of singularity meaning.

Barthes, thus, establishes a dichotomy: either a text allows productivity (writerly) or it imposes passivity (readerly). However, the participatory texts with which we are concerned resist such binary logic. Such a text is simultaneously writerly and readerly; on the one hand, it solicits reader productivity while, on the other, constraining the form within which such productivity can occur. It allows for the possibility of interpretation while constraining navigational selections. It gives agency within architecture.

Therefore, I propose that we need a concept that accounts for this simultaneity: what could be called choreography of improvisation. Like dance or jazz improvisation, participatory narratives allow a fix, a set of limitations, rules, and opportunities within which the reader can improvise variation. That performance is real, it separates the actualizations of each reading differently from the design of the system. But the choreography has been predetermined; the variability across possible performances has been designed.

This concept maintains the genuine agency that ergodic texts entail for their readers, but takes into consideration the authored architecture that enables and bounds that agency. It confesses that participation does not mean complete freedom (for there is no escape from the author's design), yet nonabsolute determinism (the reader's choices actually matter): the aesthetic object thus produced is neither the reader's experience alone, nor the author's design alone, but the interface between them, the designed space of possibility activated by the work of configurative and interpretative labor by readers.

Roland Barthes' distinction between readerly (lisible) and writerly (scriptible) texts represents another productive but thoroughly revised conceptual framework for the purposes of this article. In S/Z, Barthes defines the readerly text as one that dictates the passive consumption of it. He says "Our literature is characterized by the pitiless divorce which the literary institution maintains between the producer of the text and its user, between its owner and its customer, between its author and its reader" (4). The writerly text, on the other hand, says that "the reader no longer a consumer, but a producer of the text" (4). He associates writerly texts with plurality, open-endedness, and refusal of singularity meaning.

Barthes, thus, establishes a dichotomy: either a text allows productivity (writerly) or it imposes passivity (readerly). However, the participatory texts with which we are concerned resist such binary logic. Such a text is simultaneously writerly and readerly; on the one hand, it solicits reader productivity while, on the other, constraining the form within which such productivity can occur. It allows for the possibility of interpretation while constraining navigational selections. It gives agency within architecture.

Therefore, I propose that we need a concept that accounts for this simultaneity: what could be called choreography of improvisation. Like dance or jazz improvisation, participatory narratives allow a fix, a set of limitations, rules, and opportunities within which the reader can improvise variation. That performance is real, it separates the actualizations of each reading differently from the design of the system. But the choreography has been predetermined; the variability across possible performances has been designed.

This concept maintains the genuine agency that ergodic texts entail for their readers, but takes into consideration the authored architecture that enables and bounds that agency. It confesses that participation does not mean complete freedom (for there is no escape from the author's design), yet nonabsolute determinism (the reader's choices actually matter): the aesthetic object thus produced is neither the reader's experience alone, nor the author's design alone, but the interface between them, the designed space of possibility activated by the work of configurative and interpretative labor by readers.

5. From "Writerly Text" to "Choreographed Improvisation"

Roland Barthes' distinction between readerly (lisible) and writerly (scriptible) texts represents another productive but thoroughly revised conceptual framework for the purposes of this article. In S/Z, Barthes defines the readerly text as one that dictates the passive consumption of it. He says "Our literature is characterized by the pitiless divorce which the literary institution maintains between the producer of the text and its user, between its owner and its customer, between its author and its reader" (4). The writerly text, on the other hand, says that "the reader no longer a consumer, but a producer of the text" (4). He associates writerly texts with plurality, open-endedness, and refusal of singularity meaning.

Barthes, thus, establishes a dichotomy: either a text allows productivity (writerly) or it imposes passivity (readerly). However, the participatory texts with which we are concerned resist such binary logic. Such a text is simultaneously writerly and readerly; on the one hand, it solicits reader productivity while, on the other, constraining the form within which such productivity can occur. It allows for the possibility of interpretation while constraining navigational selections. It gives agency within architecture.

Therefore, I propose that we need a concept that accounts for this simultaneity: what could be called choreography of improvisation. Like dance or jazz improvisation, participatory narratives allow a fix, a set of limitations, rules, and opportunities within which the reader can improvise variation. That performance is real, it separates the actualizations of each reading differently from the design of the system. But the choreography has been predetermined; the variability across possible performances has been designed.

This concept maintains the genuine agency that ergodic texts entail for their readers, but takes into consideration the authored architecture that enables and bounds that agency. It confesses that participation does not mean complete freedom (for there is no escape from the author's design), yet nonabsolute determinism (the reader's choices actually matter): the aesthetic object thus produced is neither the reader's experience alone, nor the author's design alone, but the interface between them, the designed space of possibility activated by the work of configurative and interpretative labor by readers.

5. The Aesthetic of Participation as Event

This reframing requires us now to reconceptualize what we mean by "the aesthetic object" in participatory texts. Conventional aesthetics accepts a relatively stable artwork: a painting on canvas, a sculpture in space, or a novel with fixed words in a fixed order. It is this stable object which is judged in aesthetic evaluation by its form, coherence, and effect.

Stability, however, dissolves in a participatory narrative. The text I realize by reading Johnson's shuffled chapters in one sequence is fundamentally different from that which you realize by reading them in a different sequence. The afternoon, a story I navigate, based upon selected hyperlinks, might

contain as little as sixty percent shared lexias with that which you navigate. Are these different artworks? Variations on the same artwork? Performances of an underlying score?

I argue that neither is the aesthetic object in participatory texts the specific instantiation (your reading vs. mine) or some platonic ideal (the text "as such"); it is rather the system of possibilities created by the author–that is, what we might conceive of as the architecture of choice itself. The artwork is the designated range of conceivable configurations and relationships among them. Aesthetic evaluation, therefore, should not concern itself with a single fixed text, but that field of possibility, examining:

- Elegance of the constraint system: How thoughtfully are boundaries drawn? Do limits feel arbitrary or inevitable?
- Meaningfulness of variation: Are the pathways distinct enough, or just slight variation, to provide a genuinely different experience?
- Reflexive awareness: Does the text take note of its own paradox, or does it blindly promise more freedom than it can deliver?
- Experiential richness: Does the system create compelling experiences of participation even without any ontological freedom?

This reorients aesthetic assessment from product to process, from text to textuality. The aesthetic of participation is not a quality of a fixed object; it is an event–a time-space unfolding where authorial design and readerly activity meet. The reader's performance does not occur outside the artwork, it becomes an essential component of it, yet that performance is nevertheless constrained by authored limitations. It is in this designed encounter that beauty, coherence, and meaning arise.

This understanding of participatory narratives can only be through rigorous attention to how specific texts architect choice, what forms of agency they propose, what restrictions they impose, and how visible they make their own architectures. The following sections provide three case studies in would-be participatory design modalities, each on revealing distinct ways of negotiating the paradox of programmed freedom.

III. Case Studies: Three Architectures of Choice

It is pertinent to make some methodological points. The main concern in this analysis is not solely with traditional media in print, but rather the interactive digital media, namely the visual novel *Steins;Gate*. This choice, far from being arbitrary, reflects the logical evolution of participatory narrative from the print experiment, through hypertext, down to contemporary game narratives. Visual novels are a developed form of ergodic storytelling whereby reader-as-player effects conscious choices that have algorithmic responses, making explicit through game mechanics what other earlier participatory media kept latent, in order to understand how authors create choice systems, we need to look into systems

most elaborately establishing choice mechanisms. The next few cases studies suggest three main modalities by which participatory texts negotiate the paradox of programmed freedom.

.1. Transparent Constraint: Calvino's If on a winter's night a traveler

Italo Calvino's novel, *If on a Winter's Night a Traveler*, begins by directly addressing the reader in the second person: "You are about to begin reading Italo Calvino's new novel" (3). This establishes self-referentiality, which functions as the basic principle of the novel, an examination of the reading experience itself. The novel consists of a story about Reader, who pursues fragments of open narratives interrupted in their engagement by another reader's character, Ludmilla. The Reader's quest for narrative closure is the story of the novel, even as Calvino systematically denies that closure.

What makes the example of Calvino's text a clear instance of transparent constraint is how open it is about its control mechanisms. The metafictional narrative keeps emphasizing that Calvino orchestrates every interruption, every deferral, every moment of readerly frustration. When a novel breaks off mid-sentence, we know Calvino engineered that rupture. When the character Reader expresses our own yearning for continuation, Calvino is ventriloquizing the readerly frustration he himself created. The text is not hiding; instead, it asserts its authored status.

Nonetheless, this transparency does not diminish but instead amplifies the participatory experience. Calvino thus explicitly thematizes reader agency, he says "Reading is going toward something that is about to be, and no one yet knows what it will be…" (72). The reader may identify with the Reader character's active pursuit of narrative, even while understanding that the pursuit is entirely scripted. Our participation is not in spite of being manipulated; rather, it is because that manipulation is aesthetically enjoyable.

The constraint here takes the form of a curated frustration. The interrupted narratives become more tantalizing by virtue of the interruption; our yearning for resolution grows stronger simply because Calvino withholds it. The architecture is clear; we see the pattern of ten beginnings and anticipate each interruption, yet this visibility does not give us authority to change the structure. We remain tied to Calvino's construction, experiencing freedom only as freedom to acknowledge our constraint. The aesthetic achievement lies in making this recognition pleasurable rather than alienating, allowing Calvino to convert readerly powerlessness into a shared joke between author and reader about the narrative desire itself.

2. Material Constraint: Johnson's *The Unfortunates*

B.S. Johnson's *The Unfortunates* does not arrive as a bound book but as a box containing twenty-seven unbound sections. The first and last sections are marked; the middle twenty-five may be read in any order the reader chooses. This material form literalizes reader agency, physically organizing your reader

sequence, shuffling sections like cards, deciding which to read next. The ergodic labor here is unavoidable and meaningful; no two readings need go the same path.

The content reinforces this formal choice. Johnson recounts memories of a dead friend, Tony, during a return to the city where he and Tony once spent time. Memory, grief, and friendship resist linear chronology; they recur, loop, fragment, come back unexpectedly. The shuffled structure enacts the non-linearity of mourning. Johnson's sections revolve around the impossibility of giving a full account of his relationship with Tony, repeatedly returning to moments of intimacy that refuse to surrender to linear organizational rules.

Furthermore, what distinguishes Johnson's architecture from Calvino's is the transfer of configurative authority to the reader. Calvino's interruptions are invariable; Johnson's sequence is indeterminate. Yet this seeming freedom is still constrained; every section of Johnson's writing is built to suit different contexts, being neither dependent on the preceding section nor determinant of the subsequent one. Johnson's construction is sufficiently modular that any ordering gives way to a coherent (though different) reading experience. The reader's choice in sequencing makes no difference to Johnson's prose, memories, or grief, whereas it personalizes the experience of navigating through them.

The constraint operates through what could be described as distributed authorship. Johnson relinquishes control over sequence yet exerts total control over meaning and content. The reader thus becomes a co-architect of form, but not of meaning. We experience real agency in crafting our path, but that agency furthers Johnson's thematic objective: to show how grief and memory defy imposed order, how each person's encounter with loss follows its distinctive non-linear course. Our freedom to shuffle gains significance precisely because Johnson designed sections that render shuffling significant. The box itself–physical, tactile, requiring human manipulation–then makes the architecture visible and active. We see all twenty-five middle sections before we make a choice, but we cannot read them all at once. The constraint is transparent (we have all the pieces) yet operational (we have to make a choice of sequence).

3. Algorithmic Constraint: *Steins;Gate* and Procedural Determinism

Steins;Gate, a Japanese visual novel that was subsequently adapted into anime and other media, heightens the programmed freedom paradox present in its game mechanics. You play as Okabe Rintaro, a self-proclaimed "mad scientist" who accidentally finds that he can send messages to the past to change timelines and create divergent realities. The player makes choices at specific instances, that is, answering phone calls and sending or not sending messages; these choices determine the timeline branch on which the narrative is played out, and eventually lead to one of several possible endings.

The game's brilliance lies in its procedural architecture mirroring its thematic concerns. *Steins;Gate* engages with determinism versus free will, fate versus choice, the burden of knowledge of alternate timelines. Okabe finds himself trapped in a loop of causality where each decision to save one person dooms another, and instead of liberating, his knowledge of possible futures restrains his choices. Players face the same kind of constraint: you are free to choose what messages to send, but you are unable to prevent the consequences those choices engender. The algorithm conclusively determines all endings, and your job is to see which predetermined outcome your choices actualize.

Additionally, it's that contrast of opacity and procedural openness that makes *Steins;Gate* a prime example of algorithmic constraint. The player sees the choice points: dialogue options appear on-screen, answer phone calls or ignore them, etc.. But the flagging mechanics that undergirds it remains secret. Certain endings will need particular sequences of choices across multiple playthroughs; setting the flags in a given order matters. No single playthrough reveals the entire architecture. You experience choice without any understanding of the system regulating it.

This opacity generates what Ian Bogost terms "procedural rhetoric", the game pursues its arguments through mechanics not exposition. With the dictum that the path to the "true ending" includes repeated failures and restarts with different choices, *Steins;Gate* processes its theme: that change requires innumerable attempts, and even then agency functions under predetermined limits. Okabe's quest for that one timeline where everybody lives is analogous to the player's path searching through the decision tree for the best ending. Both are fundamentally the investigations of possibility rather than acts of creation.

The constraint in question is systematically obscured while remaining an immediate experience. With all the choices made, agency was felt, but the consequences could not be checked against the algorithm that defined them. The game regains its procedural freedom (you clicked the options; you activated the events) while maintaining narrative determinism (all outcomes exist in pre-scripted and pre-calculated form). Unlike Calvino's transparent manipulation or Johnson's overt modularity, *Steins;Gate* simulates freedom through concealment, making its design most powerful when least visible. The aesthetic triumph lies in how the constraint is discovered, your realization that your choices were always bounded, reinforces rather than undermines the thematic statement of the game regarding determinism. You were never free, but the game needed you to feel free so that the moment you recognized your constraint had meaningful emotional and philosophical weight.

Conclusion

The paradox of programmed freedom is not a failure of participatory aesthetics but, quite the contrary, a defining feature. We see authors constructing systems of choice that in granting and constraining reader agency show us the three modalities discussed: Calvino's transparently metafictional control,

Johnson's material distribution of sequence, and Steins;Gate's algorithmic concealment. The reader is never wholly free; still, the simulation of freedom distinguishes much, aesthetically and experientially, from the standard linear narrative.

What binds these texts together is not the amount of freedom they offer, but how they aestheticize the interrelationship between freedom and constraint. Calvino renders his architecture visible, a sense of enjoyment arises in seeing the elegance of his manipulation. Johnson transfers configurative authority while maintaining semantic control, a demonstration that agency over form need not entail agency over meaning. Steins;Gate hides its deterministic algorithm from players so that, through repeated interactions, they can discover their constraint and transform that realization into thematic revelation. In each case, the intersection of authorial design and readerly action becomes the focal point of aesthetic interest.

This reframing raises important questions about how we assess participatory narratives. If it is not fixed text but an architecture of possibility, then we must investigate how the aesthetic principles operate in the system. Therefore, we must ask: How well are those constraints designed? Do different paths produce meaningfully different experiences or are they just superficial differences? Does the text itself embrace its paradox or does it naively promise freedom it cannot deliver? Is the limitation arbitrary or does it actually serve a purpose in the context of the theme?

The most sophisticated participatory texts do not conceal their architectures or pretend reader agency dissolves authorial control. Rather, they foreground the impossibility of escape, making the tension between freedom and constraint an object of contemplation. They reveal that constraint and creativity are not oppositional, but co-constitutive: design and spontaneity generate each other; the most elegant systems of choice are those that acknowledge–even celebrate–the boundaries permitting that choice.

This choreography of free play is an aesthetic extending beyond the three modalities examined. Contemporary interactive fiction, branching narrative games, procedurally generated stories, and even social media narratives that algorithmically respond to user input are negotiating their own versions of this paradox. As narrative travels more and more into interactive realms, understanding how authors design systems of programmed freedom becomes an integral component of understanding narrative itself.

Thus, the cage, we might say, has become the art. Not because we glorify constraint for its sake, but because some of the most honest and aesthetically rich participatory narratives recognize what reader-response theory often elides: that readerly productivity always works within authored boundaries; participation is always scripted; and recognition here does not diminish experience but enriches it. It is not about beauty found in liberation, but in the rhythm within that space–the dance between agency and architecture–where each reader's performance varies even while the choreography

remains constant. This is the achievement of programmed freedom; it does not rid itself of authorial constraint, but rather makes control visible, negotiable, and beautiful.

Work Cited

Aarseth, Espen J. *Cybertext: Perspectives on Ergodic Literature*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1997.

Barthes, Roland. *S/Z: An Essay*. Translated by Richard Miller, Hill and Wang, 1974.

Bogost, Ian. *Persuasive Games: The Expressive Power of Videogames*. MIT Press, 2007.

Calvino, Italo. *If on a Winter's Night a Traveler*. Translated by William Weaver, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981.

Cortázar, Julio. *Hopscotch*. Translated by Gregory Rabassa, Pantheon Books, 1966.

Douglas, J. Yellowlees. *The End of Books—Or Books Without End? Reading Interactive Narratives*. University of Michigan Press, 2000.

Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Harvard UP, 1980.

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1978.

---. "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach." *New Directions in Literary History*, 1st ed., Routledge, 1974, pp. 125-46.

Johnson, B. S. *The Unfortunates*. Panther Books, 1969.

Joyce, Michael. *afternoon, a story*. Eastgate Systems, 1987.

Joyce, Michael. *Of Two Minds: Hypertext Pedagogy and Poetics*. University of Michigan P, 1995.

Juul, Jesper. *Half-Real: Video Games between Real Rules and Fictional Worlds*. MIT Press, 2005.

Landow, George P. *Hypertext 3.0: Critical Theory and New Media in an Era of Globalization*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2006.

Murray, Janet H. *Hamlet on the Holodeck: The Future of Narrative in Cyberspace*. MIT Press, 1997.

Ryan, Marie-Laure. *Narrative as Virtual Reality: Immersion and Interactivity in Literature and Electronic Media*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2001.

Steins;Gate. 5pb. and Nitroplus, 2009. Visual novel.