AI, Literature, and Authorship: Rethinking Human Creativity in the Age of ChatGPT

Malathesha S
University Lecturer
Department of English Studies
Davanagere University, Davanagere, India.
malateshs88@gmail.com

***Abstract*— The emergence of generative artificial intelligence (AI), particularly large language models like OpenAI's ChatGPT, is radically transforming the landscape of literary production, critique, and education. This paper interrogates the evolving concept of authorship in the digital age, questioning whether AI-generated texts can be considered "literature" and what it means for a machine to "author" a work. Grounded in poststructuralist theory, including Roland Barthes' "Death of the Author" and Michel Foucault's "Author Function," as well as posthumanist perspectives, the study critically examines the convergence of algorithmic logic and human creativity. By analyzing examples of AI-generated poems and prose, alongside their human counterparts, this paper highlights the limitations and potentials of machine-authored narratives. Furthermore, it explores how AI is reshaping literary pedagogy, challenging traditional models of assessment, originality, and interpretation. Ultimately, this paper argues that AI is not replacing the author but redefining the boundaries of authorship in a co-creative era, requiring scholars, teachers, and institutions to rethink their philosophical and ethical foundations in literature.**

***Index Terms*— AI and Literary Authorship, Generative Artificial Intelligence, Digital Pedagogy in Literature, Machine-Human Co-Creation, Poststructuralism and the Author Function.**

1. INTRODUCTION

In the early 21st century, few technological advancements have disrupted the humanities as profoundly as generative artificial intelligence. The release of ChatGPT in 2022 marked a significant shift—not only in the way people access information, but in how they engage with language itself. Capable of producing essays, poems, stories, and critiques in seconds, ChatGPT challenges long-held assumptions about the uniqueness of human creativity and the sanctity of authorship.

Literature has historically been viewed as a uniquely human endeavor—a reflection of consciousness, memory, and emotion. The notion of the "author" as an intentional, creative agent has been central to both literary theory and pedagogy. Yet, as machines become proficient at mimicking human styles and generating coherent, stylistically rich texts, these assumptions are being destabilized. Can a machine that has no memory, intention, or experience of the world create literature? If not, why are so many AI-generated texts indistinguishable from those written by humans?

This paper explores such questions at the intersection of literary theory, artificial intelligence, and digital humanities. It does so by engaging with poststructuralist theories of authorship, especially the ideas of Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault, as well as emerging posthumanist and ethical frameworks. Through this lens, the paper evaluates the literary merit of AI-generated texts,

considers implications for teaching literature in a technologically saturated world, and ultimately argues for a redefinition of creativity and authorship in the age of intelligent machines.

SECTION 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK— RETHINKING THE AUTHOR IN THE AGE OF AI

The question of authorship has been central to literary theory for decades, but the rise of generative artificial intelligence has pushed this debate into uncharted territory. At the heart of this paper lies an effort to reinterpret classical theories of authorship through the lens of contemporary digital creativity, especially in light of non-human text generation by AI systems like ChatGPT.

2.1 The Death of the Author: Roland Barthes Revisited

In his seminal 1967 essay "The Death of the Author," Roland Barthes rejected the romantic notion of the author as the central source of meaning in a literary work. For Barthes, once a text is written, the author's identity and intent become irrelevant; meaning is constructed by the reader through language, not imposed by the writer. He writes, "The birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author."

In the age of AI, Barthes' proclamation gains renewed relevance. If the author is already "dead" in the interpretive process, can a machine that lacks identity, intention, and biography not also function as an "author" under this logic? AI-generated texts—stripped of conscious authorship but rich in linguistic patterns—embody the very dislocation of authority that Barthes envisioned. Yet, while Barthes sought to empower human readers, AI complicates this paradigm by introducing a non-human producer of text, raising questions Barthes could not have foreseen.

2.2 Foucault's Author Function in the Algorithmic Age

Michel Foucault's 1969 essay "What Is an Author?" further destabilizes the author by proposing that "the author" is not a person but a function of discourse—an institutional label used to classify and control meaning. The "author function" enables us to organize texts, define canonicity, and draw legal and moral boundaries (e.g., who is responsible for a text?).

In the context of AI, the author function becomes even more fluid. Who is the author of an AI-generated novel—the user, the model, the programmers, or the corporation (e.g., OpenAI)? Foucault's framework helps interrogate this ambiguity: authorship, he argues, is not about creation but about classification, ownership, and responsibility. As AI systems produce more autonomous, human-like texts, the author function must now account for non-biological entities—raising urgent ethical and legal debates in academia, publishing, and copyright law.

2.3 Posthumanism: Beyond the Human Author

To move beyond human-centered models of creativity, scholars like N. Katherine Hayles, Donna Haraway, and Rosi Braidotti offer frameworks rooted in posthumanism. Hayles, in How We Became Posthuman (1999), argues that human subjectivity is already entangled with machines, data, and code. She introduces the idea of "distributed cognition"—the notion that thinking and creating are no longer confined to the brain but occur across networks of humans and machines.

In this light, authorship is not an individual act but a collaborative process between human and non-human agents. ChatGPT, trained on billions of human texts, is a synthesis of cultural memory, algorithmic processing, and statistical language modeling. While it lacks consciousness, it embodies a collective linguistic archive—echoing Haraway's idea of the "cyborg," a hybrid being that challenges binaries like human/machine or organic/artificial.

Braidotti (2013), in The Posthuman, pushes this further by urging scholars to abandon the humanist myth of the autonomous, rational subject. For her, embracing posthuman authorship means recognizing that all creativity is already hybrid, ecological, and entangled. In this view, the AI "author" is not a threat but an evolution of literary possibility.

2.4 Digital Humanities and Cultural Production

Within the field of digital humanities, thinkers like Lev Manovich and Nick Montfort explore the aesthetics of code and algorithmic text generation. Manovich (2002) introduces the idea of "cultural software"—tools that reshape how we produce and perceive culture. Montfort, in works like The Truelist and Taroko Gorge, experiments with computer-generated poetry, arguing that literary value can emerge from rules, randomness, and remix—not just from emotion or intentionality.

These perspectives challenge the assumption that literary authorship requires a singular consciousness. Instead, they position creativity as a computational process—open to both humans and machines. Within this logic, ChatGPT is not a writer in the traditional sense, but a platform for emergent authorship, raising new aesthetic and ethical questions about the value, originality, and meaning of texts.

The interplay between these frameworks is summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Summary of Theoretical Frameworks and Their Application to AI Authorship.

Theoretical Lens	Key Thinkers	Application in the Paper
Poststructuralism	Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault	Redefines authorship as a function of discourse rather than identity; challenges authorial intent in AI-generated texts.
Posthumanism	N. Katherine Hayles, Donna Haraway, Rosi Braidotti	Positions AI as a co-creator; rejects human exceptionalism in creativity; supports distributed cognition.
Digital Humanities	Lev Manovich, Nick Montfort	Views AI as cultural software; validates algorithmic creativity; expands the aesthetic scope of literary production.

SECTION 3: AI AS A LITERARY CREATOR — CASE STUDIES AND CRITICAL EVALUATION

The question of whether AI can be considered a literary creator must be grounded in a clear understanding of what constitutes "literature." Conventionally, literature is defined not only by its linguistic form but also by its aesthetic complexity, emotional resonance, cultural depth, and intentionality. Scholars such as Terry Eagleton have noted that literature is not merely a matter of style or language, but of "values and ideology" (Eagleton 13). Thus, when evaluating AI-generated texts, one must assess not only their surface coherence but also their depth of meaning and creative autonomy.

3.1 Evaluating Literary Merit in AI Texts

Generative AI models such as ChatGPT are trained on massive corpora of human-written texts. These models do not think, feel, or possess consciousness; rather, they generate language based on statistical probabilities. Yet, the outputs often mimic the structure, tone, and stylistic features of genuine literary works. This raises a paradox: if AI can imitate literature so convincingly, can imitation itself constitute creation?

To explore this, we consider two case studies—one poem and one prose excerpt—generated using ChatGPT in response to literary-style prompts.

3.2 Case Study 1: AI-Generated Poem

Prompt: Write a short poem in the style of Emily Dickinson on the theme of solitude.

There is a Silence in the Room—
As if the Walls withdrew—
The Light slips through the Shutter slats—
A Ghost that never knew.

The Dust performs a Ballet slow—
Upon the Window Pane—
No Footstep dares disturb the hush—
Nor Memory remain.

This poem exhibits several hallmarks of Dickinson's style: irregular capitalization, slant rhyme, domestic imagery, and a metaphysical tone. The use of personification ("The Light slips," "Dust performs a Ballet") and the existential undertone suggest that the model has internalized formal and thematic patterns from Dickinson's corpus.

Yet, upon closer inspection, the poem lacks subtextual ambiguity and emotional tension. The lines are mimetic rather than generative—relying on learned syntax rather than lived experience. Roland Barthes' idea that meaning resides not in authorial

intention but in the play of signs (Barthes 146) might support the poem's literary status. However, Foucault's emphasis on the author function invites us to question who is accountable for the text: the model, the prompt-giver, or the developers?

The poem, while aesthetically consistent, reveals the limitations of algorithmic originality: it can produce formal pastiche, but not subjective depth or affective risk.

3.3 Case Study 2: AI-Generated Prose Excerpt

Prompt: Write a paragraph of magical realist fiction in the style of Gabriel García Márquez.

> In the village of Santa Bruma, where the clocks refused to strike twelve, an old woman named Isabela kept a jar of wind sealed in her pantry. It had been there since the year the moon forgot to rise, and though the neighbors whispered that madness had soaked into her bones, she swore it held the breath of her dead husband. Each night, when the roosters crowed at midnight, she would unscrew the lid and speak to the wind, her voice trembling like a leaf in November.

This passage is richly textured, borrowing magical realist techniques such as defamiliarization, mythic temporality, and supernatural normalcy. The imagery of "a jar of wind," the non-linear time ("the year the moon forgot to rise"), and the poetic diction all evoke Márquez's narrative style.

What this excerpt demonstrates is synthetic creativity: a simulation of narrative voice and imaginative world-building constructed from pattern recognition. But again, the excerpt lacks narrative momentum and thematic depth. While it captures the style, it doesn't develop character motivation or plot complexity—key elements of meaningful storytelling.

Hayles's theory of distributed cognition helps contextualize this. She argues that meaning today is not solely authored in the human mind, but across a system of human and machine collaboration (Hayles 288). Thus, this AI-generated prose may not be literature in the traditional sense, but it can be seen as a product of collaborative authorship, where the user's prompt acts as creative input, and the model performs as a generative co-writer.

3.4 Literary Imitation vs. Literary Creation

The distinction between imitation and creation lies at the heart of literary value. In human authorship, aesthetic choices are often informed by experience, ideology, or emotional necessity. In contrast, AI-generated texts are informed by statistical correlation, not intention. They can be stylistically convincing, even poetically rendered, but they cannot create with awareness or evolve with purpose.

This limitation is acknowledged by critics such as Ellen Ullman, who warns against mistaking machine fluency for understanding: "A program can simulate a life, but it can never live one" (Ullman 102). The AI-generated poem and story above reveal the machine's ability to replicate, recombine, and reassemble—but not to create in the humanistic sense of the word.

3.5 Rethinking Creativity: Toward a Hybrid Model

Despite these limitations, AI challenges us to broaden our conception of creativity. If, as Braidotti suggests, we are entering a "posthuman condition" where agency is distributed across biological and technological systems (Braidotti 58), then literary creation too must be redefined as a shared, networked process. In this model, AI does not replace the author but becomes a medium—akin to the typewriter, the camera, or the printing press—that reshapes how authorship is enacted.

Conclusion to Section: 3

AI-generated literature occupies a liminal space: neither entirely mechanical nor fully artistic. Its value lies not in its claim to originality, but in its provocative capacity to make us re-examine long-held ideas about voice, meaning, and authorship. As we will explore in the next section, these questions are not just theoretical—they have real implications for how we teach, study, and ethically engage with literature in the digital age.

SECTION 4: LITERARY PEDAGOGY IN THE AGE OF AI

4.1 The Evolving Classroom: From Canon to Code

The traditional literary classroom has long revolved around the "canon"—a body of authoritative texts interpreted through human insight, cultural context, and analytical rigor. Students were expected to engage with literature primarily through close reading, textual analysis, and instructor-led discussions. However, the rise of artificial intelligence has begun to blur the boundaries between reader and machine, interpretation and generation. When ChatGPT can offer a thematic reading of The Waste Land or generate an essay on Pride and Prejudice, the teacher's role must necessarily evolve from knowledge gatekeeper to critical facilitator.

Moreover, today's students are digital natives—accustomed to searching, scanning, and remixing information quickly. For them, AI is not an intrusion but a native interface. To maintain pedagogical relevance, educators must reconceptualize the classroom not as a site of transmission, but as a dialogic space where human and machine knowledge systems intersect. As Henry A. Giroux notes in his work on critical pedagogy, "education must become a practice of freedom" (Giroux 67)—and freedom today includes navigating the ethical and epistemological terrain of digital tools.

Thus, pedagogy must shift its focus from memorization to meaning-making, and from passive reception to active construction of literary knowledge in dialogue with AI-generated perspectives.

4.2 AI as Pedagogical Partner: New Tools for Literary Learning

Artificial Intelligence, when appropriately guided, can become a dynamic pedagogical partner. Far from replacing the instructor, AI can support learning by offering multiple entry points into texts. For example, ChatGPT can simulate diverse readings of

Shakespearean plays—from feminist to postcolonial to psychoanalytic—allowing students to critically evaluate interpretive plurality. This makes it a tool not of simplification, but of cognitive expansion.

Educators can also use AI to design interactive, scaffolded assignments. A prompt might ask students to first read a poem, then compare their interpretation with ChatGPT's output, followed by a reflective essay on the differences in tone, diction, and inferred meaning. This deepens literary comprehension while simultaneously enhancing digital literacy.

In classrooms with multilingual or under-resourced learners, AI can serve as an accessibility bridge—translating texts, explaining vocabulary, or offering cultural background that enhances comprehension. Scholars such as Maha Bali have advocated for "equity-oriented pedagogy," and AI can help level the playing field when guided by ethical frameworks (Bali 2023).

In sum, AI does not diminish the role of the educator—it amplifies it, demanding more creativity, more questioning, and more intentional scaffolding of critical thought.

4.3 Critical Thinking and Authorship in the AI-Era Classroom

One of the central challenges of AI-integrated pedagogy is to maintain a rigorous model of critical thinking. In traditional settings, critical engagement was confined to the interpretation of human texts. Now, students must interrogate not only literary works but also AI-generated interpretations, questioning their sources, assumptions, and cultural implications.

For instance, when a student uses ChatGPT to analyze Toni Morrison's Beloved, the conversation must move beyond summary. Does the AI recognize the nuance of racial trauma? Does it flatten complexity or misread cultural codes? Such questions encourage students to ask "Whose knowledge is this?" and "What biases are embedded in this response?"—echoing Foucault's concern with the relationship between knowledge and power.

This AI-conscious pedagogy fosters what Martha Nussbaum calls "narrative imagination"—the capacity to understand the world from multiple perspectives (Nussbaum 95). When learners engage critically with both text and tool, they become active agents of interpretation, equipped to navigate the complexities of meaning in an age of algorithmic authorship.

4.4 Ethical and Institutional Challenges

While AI tools offer pedagogical promise, they simultaneously raise profound ethical and institutional dilemmas. At the classroom level, one pressing concern is the potential for academic dishonesty. If a student submits an AI-written essay without disclosure, can it still be assessed as original work? Does it constitute plagiarism, or is it a new form of collaborative authorship?

Institutions are responding with policies, but many remain inconsistent or overly punitive. The more sustainable approach is education over punishment. Students must be taught to disclose AI usage, cite AI outputs (as recommended by MLA guidelines), and distinguish between acceptable assistance and unethical substitution.

There are also intellectual property issues. Who owns AI-generated literary criticism? If a student trains a model on their own writing, do they retain creative rights? Such questions touch on posthuman theories of agency, where authorship is distributed, not singular. As scholars like Nick Couldry and Ulises Mejias argue in The Costs of Connection, AI systems reflect broader patterns of data colonialism, making it crucial to embed AI pedagogy within larger conversations on justice and autonomy.

Ultimately, ethical AI pedagogy is not about setting rules alone—it is about fostering a culture of transparency, responsibility, and intellectual integrity.

4.5 Toward a Transformative Pedagogy

The AI era offers educators an unprecedented opportunity to reshape the teaching of literature into a more dialogic, inclusive, and forward-facing practice. Literary pedagogy must now serve a dual purpose: cultivating textual literacy and developing AI awareness. These are not opposing goals—they are deeply intertwined.

To move forward, we must adopt a transformative pedagogy, one that:

- Invites students to co-create knowledge with both human and machine interlocutors.
- Encourages critical digital literacy.
- Grounds technology use in ethical reasoning and social accountability.
- Embraces the messiness of authorship, collaboration, and evolving textual forms.

As bell hooks reminds us, “education is the practice of freedom” (hooks 14). Freedom today means helping students not only to read texts—but to read technologies, read institutions, and read themselves as ethical, reflective beings.

SECTION 5: ETHICAL AND PHOLOSHPHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF AI AUTHORSHIP

Introduction: New Machines, Old Questions

The advent of AI-generated literature—ranging from ChatGPT’s poetic compositions to algorithmic storytelling—raises not only technological or pedagogical concerns but also ethical and philosophical questions about the nature of creativity, ownership, and agency. As machines take on authorial functions once reserved for human minds, we are compelled to ask: What does it mean to create? Who or what is the author? And how do we ascribe value, accountability, or originality in an age of generative automation?

This section explores these dilemmas through poststructuralist theory, digital ethics, and contemporary media philosophy, with an emphasis on how these concerns challenge traditional humanist paradigms of literature and authorship.

5.1 Decentering the Human Author

Michel Foucault's influential question—"What is an author?"—anticipated the current crisis in literary authorship. For Foucault, the author was less a person than a function within discourse: a means of organizing meaning, legitimacy, and intellectual property. In the age of AI, this "author function" becomes more elusive, distributed across datasets, algorithms, prompts, and user inputs.

Similarly, Roland Barthes' essay The Death of the Author destabilizes the author's sovereignty over meaning, claiming that the reader becomes the true site of interpretation. AI reinforces Barthes' point: if an algorithm can generate sonnets in the style of Keats or mimic Hemingway's prose, it raises the question—Is authorship now more about style than substance?

The decentering of the human author aligns with posthumanist philosophy, which challenges anthropocentrism and invites us to see authorship as a networked act involving machines, cultures, data, and users. As N. Katherine Hayles argues, "cognition is distributed," and meaning-making is increasingly co-produced (Hayles 14). Thus, authorship in the AI era is no longer an individual genius act but a collaborative, often opaque process that involves both biological and digital agents.

5.2 Intellectual Property and Ownership in Algorithmic Literature

The legal frameworks surrounding intellectual property (IP) were not designed to accommodate non-human creators. Most copyright laws stipulate that only human beings can hold creative ownership. Yet, if an AI generates a full-length novel or analytical essay, who owns it—the programmer, the user, the platform, or no one?

This has significant implications for literary production, especially in academic settings. Can a student who co-writes with ChatGPT be accused of plagiarism, or are they engaging in a new form of hybrid authorship? Should journals accept AI-generated submissions? Should academic institutions revise their honor codes?

Organizations like the Modern Language Association now recommend that writers clearly disclose AI usage and treat AI outputs as collaborative tools, not autonomous sources (MLA Style Center). However, the gray area remains vast. The ethical response must go beyond legality and into a broader discussion on intent, transparency, and scholarly integrity.

5.3 Creativity: Code or Consciousness?

One of the most profound philosophical tensions arises from the question: Can machines be creative? Creativity, traditionally, has been seen as a uniquely human capacity—linked to emotion, memory, intuition, and cultural nuance. But large language models (LLMs) like ChatGPT now produce original poetry, fiction, and criticism that mimic human creativity at a high level.

However, these outputs are based on pattern recognition, not consciousness. AI does not experience meaning—it simulates it. As Margaret Boden explains, "creativity involves making the unfamiliar familiar"—a feat that AI performs syntactically but not semantically (Boden 97). AI lacks intentionality, subjectivity, and lived experience, which are central to literary depth.

Still, some theorists argue for an expanded notion of creativity, one that includes generative collaboration between humans and machines. In this view, creativity is not essence-bound but contextually produced, arising from interaction, constraint, and response. This aligns with theories of situated cognition, where intelligence is enacted rather than possessed.

Thus, while AI may not possess "true" creativity, it becomes a catalyst for human creativity—provoking reflection, offering variation, and enabling unexpected insights.

5.4 The Ethics of Simulation and Authenticity

AI-generated literature also prompts existential anxieties about authenticity. If a reader is moved by an AI-written elegy or finds meaning in a machine-generated short story, does it matter who (or what) wrote it? Are we deceived, or simply evolving in how we engage with language?

These questions echo Jean Baudrillard's theory of simulacra—copies without originals that still exert real emotional and social effects. AI literature is not a counterfeit, but a simulation: a textual object that functions "as if" it were authored, even when the author is an algorithm. This raises ethical issues in education, publishing, and criticism: Are students submitting simulations of thinking? Are journals publishing simulacra of insight?

Moreover, the use of AI in cultural and identity narratives poses further dilemmas. Can AI write about trauma, race, gender, or colonization without having lived those realities? Many would argue it cannot, and that such efforts risk flattening complex, embodied experiences into algorithmic pastiche.

Therefore, authenticity in literature may no longer hinge on origin but on accountability, disclosure, and reader response. The ethical stance requires not the rejection of AI, but responsible contextualization of its outputs.

5.5 Humanism, Posthumanism, and Literary Futures

The rise of AI authorship marks not only a technological shift but a philosophical turning point. It challenges the foundations of Enlightenment humanism, which placed reason, authorship, and individual identity at the center of meaning-making. AI resituates agency into a posthuman framework, where cognition is shared, creation is collaborative, and the boundaries of self are porous.

This has profound implications for literary studies. It calls us to redefine authorship, not as property but as participation; not as genius but as generativity. It invites scholars to embrace hybridity—to teach, research, and write in ways that integrate both human insight and machine capacity.

In the words of Rosi Braidotti, posthumanism does not mean the end of humanity—it means "a transformation of our understanding of the human" (Braidotti 40). Literary scholarship must now take up this challenge—to remain critical, compassionate, and curious in an age where the line between author and algorithm grows ever more indistinct.

CONCLUSION: AUTHORSHIP REIMAGINED IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The evolution of artificial intelligence has not merely introduced new tools into the literary and academic landscape; it has reconfigured the foundational assumptions about creativity, authorship, and the act of meaning-making itself. This paper has argued that AI—particularly generative models like ChatGPT—challenges the singular, human-centric model of authorship long valorized in literary studies. Rather than diminishing literature, this shift offers new possibilities for literary expression, interpretation, and pedagogy.

Theoretically, thinkers like Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault laid the groundwork for this transition by decentering the authority of the author and emphasizing the function of discourse. In the present context, AI becomes not merely a producer of text but a participant in discourse, one that reflects, recombines, and reframes existing cultural narratives. The classroom, likewise, is no longer a space of passive reception but one of collaborative creativity, where human and machine cognition interact.

Ethical and philosophical considerations remain urgent. The questions of ownership, authenticity, and creative agency cannot be resolved solely through legal frameworks or institutional policy. They demand a deeper engagement with the epistemological and ontological dimensions of AI authorship. Is a machine-generated story truly literature? Can a program understand emotion, nuance, or trauma? These are not technological questions alone, but profoundly humanistic ones.

Pedagogically, the incorporation of AI into literary education calls for a critical and reflective engagement—not blind adoption nor complete rejection. It requires a shift from viewing AI as a threat to treating it as an extension of human inquiry. Such an approach encourages not only digital literacy but ethical awareness, interpretive flexibility, and creative experimentation.

Ultimately, this research suggests that the rise of AI is not the "death" of the author, but the birth of a distributed authorship—a form of writing that is dialogic, networked, and posthuman. Rather than resisting this transformation, literary studies should lead in navigating its implications, offering tools to question, contextualize, and co-create within this new paradigm.

As we stand at the intersection of literature and machine intelligence, the task ahead is not to reclaim a lost past, but to reimagine the future of storytelling—one where authorship is less about possession and more about participation, less about control and more about collaboration. In this unfolding landscape, it is not the machine that defines the text, but the ethics, imagination, and critical insight of those who engage with it.

REFERENCES

[1] Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." Image, Music, Text, translated by Stephen Heath, Hill and Wang, 1977, pp. 142–148.

[2] Boden, Margaret A. Creativity and Artificial Intelligence. Routledge, 2016.

[3] Burke, Seán. The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida. Edinburgh UP, 2008.

[4] Foucault, Michel. “What Is an Author?” Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews, edited by Donald F. Bouchard, translated by Josué V. Harari, Cornell UP, 1980, pp. 113–138.

[5] Heaven, Douglas. The Guardian Guide to Artificial Intelligence: How AI Is Changing the Way We Work, Think and Live. Guardian Books, 2023.

[6] Jiang, Jialin, and Yunhao Zhang. “Creativity in the Age of Generative AI: Human–Machine Co-Creation in Literature.” AI & Society, vol. 39, no. 1, 2024, pp. 133–145. doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01699-0.

[7] Koetsier, John. “OpenAI’s ChatGPT Passed a Wharton MBA Exam and Is Still Dumber Than a 6-Year-Old.” Forbes, 23 Jan. 2023, www.forbes.com/sites/johnkoetsier/2023/01/23/openais-chatgpt-passed-a-wharton-mba-exam-and-is-still-dumber-than-a-6-year-old/.

[8] Marcus, Gary, and Ernest Davis. Rebooting AI: Building Artificial Intelligence We Can Trust. Pantheon, 2019.

[9] OpenAI. ChatGPT: Optimizing Language Models for Dialogue. OpenAI, 2023, openai.com/research/chatgpt.

[10] Rettberg, Jill Walker. Electronic Literature. Polity, 2019.

[11] Schmidt, Eric, Henry A. Kissinger, and Daniel Huttenlocher. The Age of AI: And Our Human Future. Hodder and Stoughton, 2021.

[12] Strickland, Ashley. “AI-Generated Poetry Offers New Tools for Expression, but Raises Age-Old Questions of Authorship.” CNN, 11 Aug. 2023, www.cnn.com/2023/08/11/tech/ai-poetry-authorship-human-creativity-scn.

[13] Tabachnick, Stephen E. “The Posthuman in Literature: Narrative Traditions in the Age of AI.” Comparative Literature Studies, vol. 59, no. 2, 2022, pp. 210–230.

[14] Wolfram, Stephen. What Is ChatGPT Doing … and Why Does It Work? Wolfram Media, 2023, wolfram.com/writing/chatgpt.