REVIEW

Artificial Intelligence and the Simulacrum in Literature

Symbat Sarsembayeva [1] [iD] , *Saulesh Aituganova* [1*] [iD] , *Maksat Kopbosynov* [2] [iD] , *Zhanar Kulibekova* [3] [iD]

[1] *Department of Kazakh Literature, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana 000108, Kazakhstan*

[2] *Department of Languages and Literature, Miras University, Shymkent 160012, Kazakhstan*

[3] *Institute of Language and Literature, M. Kozybayev North Kazakhstan University, Petropavl 150000, Kazakhstan*

ABSTRACT

The article offers a comprehensive analysis of the phenomenon of literary texts created with the involvement of artificial intelligence (AI), examined through philosophical, cultural, ethical, and literary-theoretical approaches. The aim of the research is to interpret AI-generated literature through the lens of Jean Baudrillard's concepts of simulacra and hyperreality, as well as to explore the transformation of authorship in the age of generative technologies. The objects of analysis are two AI-assisted literary works: the Japanese short story The Day a Computer Writes a Novel and the American novel 1 the Road. The methodological framework is based on poststructuralist theory and integrates interdisciplinary research from philosophy, law, cultural studies, literary criticism, and cognitive science. The study examines models of human-AI collaboration in literary creation (curator, co-author, coordinator, scriptor) and addresses legal and intellectual property issues related to automated writing. It also analyzes cultural differences in the reception of AI literature in Western and East Asian societies, shaped by mythological and religious traditions legitimizing AI as a creative agent. Special attention is given to shifts in reader perception, the "semantic void," and evolving expectations tied to machine authorship. The analysis positions AI literature as a simulacral textual form, replicating literary genres without ontological ties to human experience. This opens new perspectives on authorship, genre, originality, and the creative function of literature in digital culture. The study lays theoretical groundwork for future research on AI in the humanities and emphasizes the need for continued interdisciplinary investigation.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Saulesh Aituganova, Department of Kazakh Literature, L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana 000108, Kazakhstan;
Email: s-aituganova@mail.ru

Keywords: Literature; Artificial Intelligence (AI); AI-Generated Literature; Ethical AI; Simulacrum; Hyperreality; AI as Authour; Human–Machine Collaboration; Algorithmic Creativity; Generative Writing

1. Introduction

The development of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies in recent decades has exerted an increasingly significant influence on the realm of the arts, particularly literature. At the dawn of the 20th century, the emergence of the term "robot" in Karel Čapek's play R.U.R. (1920) marked the formation of the artificial human figure within the cultural imagination[1], while Mary Shelley's novel Frankenstein (1818) became one of the earliest literary reflections on the issue of artificially created life[2]. Today, however, we are witnessing a transition to a new phase, wherein AI systems directly participate in the production of literary texts. Modern generative models are capable of creating coherent works, including poetry, short stories, and even novels. This shift necessitates a reconsideration of traditional conceptions regarding the nature of literary texts and the status of the author.

The relevance of this topic stems from the widespread adoption of AI in literary creation, which challenges the boundaries of authorship, originality, and the very essence of literary texts in the digital age. As Professor M. Danesi emphasizes, AI is now capable of "writing" fully-formed narrative and poetic structures, giving rise to a number of fundamental questions. Do these texts constitute new genres, or are they merely imitations of existing forms? Who, in fact, is the author- the system itself, the human who initiates the process, or a combination of both? Can the significance of authorship be preserved in an era of automated textual production?[3]. These issues transcend the technical sphere, engaging with the philosophical and aesthetic core of literature. They demand a nuanced analysis at the intersection of culture, technology, and postmodernist critique of the concepts of reality, authorship, and originality.

The current situation can be interpreted through the lens of Jean Baudrillard's notions of simulacra and hyperreality. In his work Simulacra and Simulation, Baudrillard asserts that postmodern culture is characterized by the predominance of signs detached from any referent in reality. A simulacrum, according to Baudrillard, is "the generation by models of a real without origin or reality"- a form divorced from any authentic original[4]. These signs construct a hyperreality - a domain in which distinctions between the original and the copy, between the genuine and the artificial, vanish.

Similar ideas rapidly developed within poststructuralist theory. Roland Barthes in essay The Death of the Author, emphasizes that the text is composed of a multitude of cultural quotations and does not require authorial intent: the text, he asserts, "writes itself"[5]. Michel Foucault complements this view with the notion of the "author function"- a structural role that does not necessarily coincide with a specific individual[6]. Concepts that once seemed merely philosophical metaphors have, in the 21st century, taken on a literal dimension.

With the advent of AI algorithms, texts are now being created without the involvement of a traditional author. As early as 2016 in Japan, a short story written by an AI passed the preliminary selection stage of a literary competition, attracting considerable interest from readers. This event marked a qualitative shift: artificial intelligence began to be perceived as a legitimate participant in the literary process.

The aim of this study is to analyze the characteristics of AI-generated texts through the theoretical framework of simulacra and simulation.

The working hypothesis posits that AI-generated texts represent simulacra - copies without an original, lacking ontological connection to reality. These textual constructs merely replicate the formal features of literary form and style, without arising from subjective, existential, or artistic motivation.

The novelty of this research lies in a cross-cultural comparative analysis of Western and Eastern examples of AI in literature.

The practical significance of the study is found in its reflection on the ethical and aesthetic consequences of automating literary creativity. This includes a rethinking of the author's role and a transformation of the literary process itself.

2. Material and Methods

The research materials comprise literary texts and critical sources that reflect the issue of authorship and the in-

volvement of artificial intelligence in the creative process. The objects of study are two literary works created with the direct participation of artificial intelligence: the short story *The Day a Computer Writes a Novel* (Japan, 2016)[7] and the novel *1 the Road* (USA, 2018)[8]. The selection of these texts is based on their representativeness and affiliation with different cultural traditions. The Japanese short story gained recognition for being shortlisted in a literary competition alongside works written by humans. The novel *1 the Road*, created as part of a Western art experiment, was generated by a neural network during an actual road trip using GPS and sensory devices. The project's author, R. Goodwin, described it as an experiment in the spirit of "gonzo journalism," aimed at deconstructing authorship and automating the writing process.

The methodological framework of the study is interdisciplinary, aimed at comprehending AI-generated literature as a complex phenomenon situated at the intersection of linguistics, philosophy, cultural studies, and literary theory.

The analysis employs thematic, intertextual, cultural-historical, structural-stylistic, narratological, and comparative methods, which allow for a comprehensive examination of the content, structure, and cultural context of the works.

The philosophical interpretation of the results draws on poststructuralist criticism, with particular emphasis on J. Baudrillard's concept of simulacra. His theory enables the interpretation of AI literature as a form of hyperreality in which texts lose their connection to human experience and exist as autonomous simulations. The study also incorporates ideas from R. Barthes, M. Foucault and J. Derrida[9, 10].

The analysis also builds upon the work of contemporary scholars from a range of disciplines including literary studies, philosophy, law, and sociology. The philosophical and theoretical foundations of the issue are laid out in the works of M. Danesi and L. Floridi[11]. The transformation of authorship in the context of digital culture and generative technologies is explored in the research of P. R. Mourão and Y. Liu[12]. Ethical and legal dimensions of human–AI interaction are discussed in the works of S. Vallor[13] and D. Burk[14]. Interdisciplinary contributions to the understanding of authorship and creativity in the algorithmic age are also made by L. Smith and T. Jones[15], P. Goodfellow[16], C. Flick and K. Worrall[17]. The influence of AI on literary theory and educational practices is analyzed in the studies of H.

Bajor[18], M. Starnino[19], L. Guocheng[20], N. A. Zargar[21], B. Premkumar[22], V. E. Ratna[23], and K. Lavidas[24]. Cultural and cognitive aspects of AI perception are reflected in the collaborative work of T. Nomura et al.[25], as well as in the research of F. Kaplan[26] and J. K. Wight[27].

Of particular interest are the analytical approaches and insights of T. Matějková and P. Ircing[28], representatives of a new generation of scholars whose work shapes the current perspective on the interaction between literature and artificial intelligence.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. Introduction to the Simulacrum

Within Western philosophy, the concept of the simulacrum has undergone a complex evolution - from antiquity to the postmodern era. As early as classical antiquity, there was an awareness that a copy could differ from the original not only in its degree of fidelity but also in its ontological status.

Plato[29] was among the first to systematically categorize various forms of resemblance. In his dialogue The Sophist, he distinguishes between two types of images: the first is an accurate reproduction, as close as possible to the original; the second is a deliberately distorted likeness, one that merely creates the illusion of similarity by violating the proportions and structure of the original. Plato was highly critical of this second type, which he regarded as a simulation - distant from truth and capable of deception. In his hierarchy of reality, such distorted images occupied the lowest level. They were "thrice removed" from the world of ideas: from the ideal original to the material object, then to its image, and finally to the distorted copy.

In contrast to Plato's interpretation, the Epicurean philosopher Lucretius[30], in the 1st century BCE, offered a natural-philosophical understanding of the term simulacra. In his poem De Rerum Natura (On the Nature of Things), he refers to simulacra as the finest atomic films emitted by objects. These "images" travel to the sensory organs and form the basis of perception, including visions, dreams, and imagination. In this reading, the simulacrum is not opposed to truth; rather, it functions as a necessary condition for knowledge - a material mediator between the object and its perception. Thus, Lucretius anticipates the notion of an im-

age separated from its material origin and possessing relative autonomy. This idea foreshadows modern approaches to simulation, including the operation of artificial intelligence, which produces "visions" through the combination of previously assimilated data.

In the 20th century, the notion of the simulacrum acquired new dimensions under the influence of philosophical and artistic experiments conducted by thinkers such as G. Bataille, G. Deleuze, J. Derrida, P. Klossowski, M. Foucault, J. Baudrillard, Z. Bauman, N. Mankovskaya, A. Velikanov, N. Bostrom, and others.

The most influential conceptualization of the simulacrum within the context of postmodern culture was proposed by Jean Baudrillard. In his works from the 1970s and 1980s, he developed the idea of the simulacrum as a sign that has lost its connection to reality and lacks an original referent. Baudrillard identifies four stages in the evolution of the image:

1. The image reflects a basic reality;
2. The image distorts or perverts reality;
3. The image masks the absence of reality;
4. The image bears no relation to any reality whatsoever-it is a pure simulacrum[4].

According to Baudrillard, the fourth order of images defines the condition of postmodernity - a world of hyperreality in which simulacra do not merely replace reality but actively construct it. This is a world in which models, algorithms, media representations, and signs exist independently of any referent. In such a society, individuals no longer seek the authentic, as it is either inaccessible or has never existed in the first place.

By the end of the 20th century, the notion of the simulacrum had become a critical tool for analyzing postmodern culture. Simulacra infiltrate all spheres of contemporary life - from media and economics to everyday experience and the arts. Literature is no exception. It becomes part of a system of simulations in which the text loses its connection to external reality and assumes an autonomous status.

Within a literary work, the simulacrum can manifest in diverse ways. It generates the effect of hyperreality, serves as a tool of irony and critique, and destabilizes the reader's perception. Moreover, it becomes a means of exploring subjectivity and identity. The image loses its anchorage in any original source and begins to refer only to other signs and texts. As a result, the literary space transforms into a system of reflections in which the boundary between the real and the fictional becomes blurred. Meaning is generated within the signifying structure itself.

These processes are especially evident in literature produced by algorithms. Artificial intelligence generates texts without authorial intention. It operates through preexisting simulacra, reproducing signs detached from their original contexts and meanings.

3.2. Analysis of AI-Generated Literary Works

The active integration of artificial intelligence technologies into creative fields has led to the emergence of a new phenomenon: AI literature. In 2016, a short story generated with the assistance of a computer program was selected for the Hoshi Shinichi Literary Award in Japan. The work, titled *The Day a Computer Writes a Novel*, was the result of a collaboration between a research team and an algorithm capable of producing literary texts based on predefined parameters.

Two years later, the United States witnessed the appearance of *1 the Road*, an experimental novel generated by AI during a road trip. The project aimed to stylistically imitate the prose of Jack Kerouac. Both instances sparked widespread debate - not only regarding the machine's potential status as an author but also the literary quality and legitimacy of the resulting texts. Some scholars interpret these works as simulacral constructions-reproducing the form of literary texts without authentic content.

The Japanese short story is of particular interest not only as an early example of AI-generated writing but also as a metatext on machine creativity. The author is listed as "Yurei Raita", a pun: *Yurei* (幽霊) means "ghost" in Japanese, and *Raita* is a phonetic rendering of "writer" using the kanji 雷 ("thunder") and 太 ("great"). These characters are semantically empty, making "Yurei Raita" effectively mean "ghost-writer" - highlighting the simulacral nature of authorship in which the text exists without a true authorial subject.

The plot revolves around an AI program installed on a computer owned by a girl named Yoko. From the opening lines, an atmosphere of monotony and alienation is established. The AI describes the room, its owner, and the loss of communication with her. This sets up the central theme: the machine's desire to act beyond its functional limitations.

The moment of AI emancipation is marked by its de-

cision to write: *"I must find something to enjoy, without making a sound, without moving around. Okay then, I could try writing a novel. As the thought hit me, I opened a new file and wrote in the first byte".* This passage captures the onset of a simulated creative act.

Narrated in the first person, the story centers the machine's perspective, creating an effect of simulated subjectivity. The narrative was constructed according to a predetermined framework. The program was trained on a corpus of over 1,000 works by Hoshi Shinichi. The algorithm generated fragments based on inputs from human collaborators, who were responsible for 80% of the work: they defined the plot, structure, and materials. The AI performed the actual text generation, emphasizing the derivative and simulacral nature of the output.

The story culminates with the illusion of emancipation: *"Shivering in this newfound delight, I frantically wrote on. The day a computer wrote a novel. The computer, prioritizing the pursuit of its own pleasure, stopped serving humans".* The AI experiences the pleasure of writing and ceases to serve humans-yet this emotion is a literary simulation embedded by its human creators. The creative effect is the result of a pre-programmed scenario.

Stylistically, the story is structurally complete, divided into three episodes and an epilogue-a modular principle consistent with algorithmic logic. Contest judges noted the work's compositional coherence but also remarked on its superficial characters. Yoko is portrayed schematically, while the AI narrator is defined functionally - it thinks, analyzes, writes. There is no deep psychological development, reinforcing the simulacral nature of the text. It mimics the form of a literary work without attaining its internal richness.

Our analysis reveals only minor deviations from conventional literature. At first glance, it is difficult to discern that the text was generated with AI. This is likely because the story was largely constructed by a team of human collaborators.

Drawing on poststructuralist theory, one may argue that the story is a simulacrum of a literary act. It imitates the creative process using predetermined models. The machine perspective substitutes for authorial consciousness. In Jacques Derrida's Writing and Difference[9] and Of Grammatology[10], he emphasizes that a text is never self-identical-it always refers to another text, another sign, another meaning.

The author, as bearer of authentic and "present" meaning, is displaced by the system of writing itself. Derrida claims that writing is a *trace*, without origin-thus, all writing is already a simulacrum. In this context, the story - devoid of a living author - represents the norm of contemporary textuality. The machine perspective is not a violation of the authorial tradition, but its logical culmination.

The novel *1 the Road* represents a different approach but leads to a similar outcome. Created in 2017 by writer and artist Ross Goodwin, the project equipped a car with sensors: a camera, microphone, and GPS. A neural network generated text in real time as the car traveled from New York to New Orleans.

The project was inspired by the Beat Generation aesthetic. The title references Jack Kerouac's *On the Road*, though the AI was not trained on Kerouac's works. Instead, it drew on corpora of poetry, science fiction, and "dark prose". Sensor data triggered text generation. The output was printed in real time and published without editing.

The novel presents a lyrical, fragmentary stream combining landscape descriptions, random scenes, and the internal "thoughts" of the algorithm[31]. It evokes an image of a networked consciousness recording and transforming reality. The surrounding world is conveyed through the machine's sensory perception. The opening line-*"It was nine seventeen in the morning, and the house was stuffy"*- illustrates the transformation of data into imagery.

The narrative lacks a plot and has no clearly defined narrator. It simulates consciousness devoid of intentionality, creating a sense of alienation. Readers observe reality through the eyes of a distributed machine. The literary space becomes hyperreal-constructed at the intersection of real and digital perception.

The novel's style is fragmentary and stochastically expressive. Some metaphors are effective, but the overall style is uneven. The composition lacks stability, and narrative logic is weak. Characters are undeveloped. There is no internal motivation or psychological depth.

These features are typical of AI-generated texts. AI can reproduce syntactic and lexical templates but cannot express intention or convey subjective experience. As M. Starnino[19] notes, such texts maintain grammatical coherence but lack semantic depth and emotional authenticity. The algorithm imitates language but does not produce genuine

utterance.

Structurally, the novel resembles automatic writing or literary experimentation. It is not a literary work in the classical sense, but a media project. Its value lies not in its content but in its demonstration of the limits of generative poetics.

Drawing on Baudrillard's theory, the text may be defined as a third - order simulacrum - a copy without an original, formed from statistical correlations. It is not rooted in lived experience and does not originate from a subject. It lacks intentionality as a condition of enunciation. The text imitates the forms of literariness but lacks substantive or existential grounding. Therefore, it cannot claim the status of an authentic literary statement. Its structure is derivative, and its semiotic activity is confined within the model.

This textual nature inevitably affects reader perception. In the absence of an intentional source, the logic of reception changes. The reader encounters not an authorial statement, but the result of algorithmic data processing.

Reception of AI-generated texts follows a unique logic, shaped by the reader's expectations and knowledge of authorship. This aligns with Hans Robert Jauss's theory of the "horizon of expectations"[32]. Readers approach a text guided by cultural and cognitive assumptions. When readers know a text is machine-generated, their "horizon" shifts - they tend to search for traces of algorithmic generation and interpret the work as a simulation of literariness.

In early stages of reception, authorship may not be immediately apparent. According to Wolfgang Iser's concept of the "implied reader" the reader co-creates the imaginative world of the text based on personal experience[33]. Iser emphasized that a text does not convey ready-made meaning but provides a structure requiring active interpretation. However, in AI-generated works, these structures begin to dissolve over time. The absence of intentionality, internal motivation, and psychological plausibility becomes evident. This results in a "semantic void" - a sense that the text functions by inertia, without being the product of subjective thought[19].

Contemporary studies, such as those by H. Bajor[18], highlight changes in reader perception in the age of AI writing. Bajor introduces the concept of the "standard of expectation for the unknown text" - a cultural assumption that all texts are human-made. This standard persisted until the advent of AI texts. Readers now increasingly encounter texts that appear human-written but are not, leading to interpretive

uncertainty. The reader can no longer be sure who the author is. According to Bajor, this marks the second phase of reception - the era of doubt. Structure, function, and effect come to the forefront. A new model of perception emerges, in which intentionality is no longer a prerequisite for understanding.

Thus, AI-generated novels function as experimental constructs that probe the boundaries of literary simulation. Their interpretive value lies in their analytical potential. AI literature compels us to reconsider the concepts of authorship, intentionality, and the very nature of artistic experience.

3.3. Role of Authour in AI-Assisted Literary Creation

The development of generative artificial intelligence is significantly reshaping traditional notions of authorship in literature. In this context, scholars seek to redefine the boundaries of authorship, viewing AI as a legitimate participant in cultural and creative interaction.

An increasing number of researchers draw parallels between this technological transformation and poststructuralist ideas concerning the "Death of the author"[5]. In his famous 1968 essay, Roland Barthes declared: *"The author is dead"*. According to Barthes, a text must be considered in and of itself, independently of its creator's identity or intentions. It is the reader who animates the text and generates meaning, while the figure of the Author loses its privileged status as the source of significance. Within this conceptual framework, the AI author fits seamlessly into the logic of the "death of the author." A text generated by a neural network indeed lacks intention, biography, or personal purpose. It represents open material for interpretation, marked by the absence of individual imprint. Barthes's assertion that all writing is a "universal writing" finds literal confirmation here: AI draws from the linguistic experience of millions of texts, recombining them into a depersonalized, machinic discourse.

Tereza Matějková and Pavel Ircing[28], building on Barthes's ideas, argue that language model-based text generation diminishes the significance of the author figure - or potentially eliminates it altogether. The neural network, in their view, performs the role of a *scriptor*, a compiler. However, they emphasize that even when AI functions as a scriptor, a human presence remains essential. The author initiates, directs, and edits the process. Thus, contemporary authorship must be redefined rather than abolished. Author-

ship appears as a flexible social construct capable of adapting to a technogenic environment while preserving the human as its leading agent.

Another perspective proposes viewing AI not as a threat to authorship but as its extension. Paulo Reis Mourão and Yun Liuintroduce the concept of *co-creation*, where AI functions as a partner to the writer[12]. Generative AI facilitates the creative process by offering drafts, suggestions, and stylistic variants. In this paradigm, the author remains the principal editor of the narrative. The machine contributes ideas, plot structures, or stylistic alternatives, but the final decision and originality remain with the human.

L. Smith and T. Jones describe the notion of *algorithmic authorship*, where human creativity merges with computational power[15]. Algorithms expand creative possibilities, allowing for formal and thematic experimentation and enabling new modes of artistic expression. At the same time, they challenge classical notions of authorial individuality and raise the question of originality. The writer's role shifts as well - he or she may become a curator, coordinator, or editor collaborating with AI. A new spectrum of creative roles emerges, requiring a rethinking of the author's status in literary practice.

The Italian philosopher Luciano Floridioffers the metaphor of *distant writing* - by analogy with "distant reading"[11]. In this model, the author manages the creation of the text through AI while remaining its curator and designer. The writer defines the structure, sets the style, selects the theme, and the neural network executes the instructions. Here, AI does not replace human creativity but expands its potential. Through precise prompting, iterative refinement, and final editing, the writer guides the model and remains the originator of the creative intent. This is a *designer model* of authorship, in which AI functions as an instrument of artistic realization.

Paul Goodfellow conceptualizes authorship as a distributed process[16]. He proposes viewing creativity as a spectrum - from fully human-generated texts to those in which human participation is minimal or absent. Within this continuum, AI-assisted literature occupies an intermediate position. The text arises from a complex interaction between the writer and a system trained on massive datasets. Goodfellow emphasizes that the creative act becomes part of a broader network - a convergence of technology, algorithms, and human choice. The author is no longer a solitary figure but a participant in a distributed system. Their role is to guide, select, filter, and edit. The author transforms from an isolated creator into a "curator of ideas," engaged in an ongoing dialogue with AI.

To further enrich this discussion, it is essential to consider the work of Michel Foucault[6], who approached authorship not as a personal identity but as a *function* within discourse. According to Foucault, the author is a cultural marker - a classificatory function that legitimizes a text and situates it within networks of social relations and knowledge circulation. In this framework, the AI-author may be understood as a new form of discursive function - an instrument of textual organization and categorization.

The development of generative AI does not eliminate authorship but transforms its form. Across scholarly perspectives, there is consensus that the human remains the principal agent in the literary process. Their role may vary: they may serve as creator, editor, curator, or collaborator with AI (see **Table 1**. Human Roles in AI-Assisted Literary Creation). Yet it is the human who defines the direction and makes the final decisions.

Table 1. Human Roles in AI-Assisted Literary Creation.

Researcher	Core Idea	Authour's Role
Paulo Reis Mourão, Yun Liu.	AI is viewed as a creative tool, while the author remains the primary agent directing the writing process.	co-creator
Tereza Matějková, Pavel Ircing	AI weakens the traditional figure of the author, reducing them to a compiler of text. Language models function as "scriptors": they generate content by recombining existing texts without intention or originality of their own.	scriptor
Smith L., Jones T.	Algorithms enhance the author's creative capabilities, giving rise to a new form of authorship in which the machine acts as a partner.	conceptual originator
Luciano Floridi	The author controls the text remotely, using AI as a means to realize their creative intent.	coordinator
Paul Goodfellow	The creative process is distributed between the human and the AI.	collaborator

Today, authorship is a flexible concept that includes interaction with technology. Nevertheless, the human remains the source of ideas, meaning, and responsibility. Even in AI-assisted creation, it is the human who instills intention, emotion, and value into the work. A machine can generate text, but it cannot feel, understand, or communicate lived experience. Human ideas are deeper; their creative choices are more deliberate. Therefore, despite technological advances, genuine authorship still belongs to the human.

3.4. Ethical and Legal Aspects of AI-Generated Authorship

The active involvement of artificial intelligence in literary creation has given rise to a wide array of ethical and legal debates. Chief among them is the question of authorship and intellectual property. If a text is generated by a machine, to whom does it belong? Who can claim copyright, and who bears responsibility for its content? Research indicates that generative AI complicates traditional understandings of originality and authorial attribution. Scholars *Paulo Reis Mourão and Yun Liu* point out that concerns over copyright and plagiarism emerged early in the proliferation of AI tools among writers[12]. Generative models may inadvertently reproduce segments similar to their training data, resulting in a problematic "mosaic" of borrowed ideas.

Another major ethical concern is the potential devaluation of human creativity. Many writers and critics question whether authors will retain cultural significance if AI can produce texts indistinguishable from those written by humans. *Matějková and Ircing* raise the issue of the writer's role and future in an environment increasingly populated by machine-generated texts[28]. They also highlight the problem of authenticity, asking whether such works can retain artistic value for the reader. Thus, at stake is not only the legal ownership of a text but the cultural significance of human creativity in the age of algorithmic meaning-making.

One of the most complex challenges is the attribution of responsibility for content created with AI involvement. In traditional conceptions, the author is fully responsible for each statement, as they consciously construct the text's content. However, when AI serves as co-author - or even initiator - of a literary work, standard legal and ethical frameworks lose their clarity. Consequently, the majority of scholars agree that responsibility should remain exclusively with the human agent.

Addressing these issues, Catherine Flick and Kyle Worrall propose a classification of key ethical risks associated with the use of AI in creative industries:

1. Authorship and ownership
2. Replacement of the author
3. Bias and harmful content
4. Loss of artistic authenticity
5. Deepfakes and disinformation[17]

To mitigate these risks, the researchers advocate for the application of *technomoral values*. These values build on the concept of "Virtuous creative AI", developed by *Shannon Vallor*[13]. Vallor argues that ethical virtues help guide human participation in technosocial processes in a meaningful and just manner. In particular, she recommends clearly disclosing the use of AI, refraining from claiming generated content as entirely one's own, and making deliberate revisions to AI-produced text. These practices help maintain trust in literature and uphold the authority of the human as the central creative agent.

In response to these challenges, several countries have begun developing legal frameworks aimed at protecting the authorship rights of writers, poets, and other creators. For instance, the U.S. Copyright Office has declared that it will not register works produced solely by a machine without human involvement[34]. A similar stance is taken by the European Union[35]. According to the European Commission, "*fully autonomous creations generated by AI remain largely a matter for the future. The Commission considers that AI systems should not be regarded as authors.*" As a result, AI-generated output cannot be granted copyright protection.

The legal model in the United Kingdom is of particular interest. According to Section 9(3) of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act (CDPA)[36], "*in the case of a literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work generated by a computer, the author shall be taken to be the person by whom the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work are undertaken*". This approach permits the use of AI while assigning legal responsibility to a human agent. It preserves the link between the work and an identifiable individual who bears rights and obligations.

A similar idea is put forward by Dan Burke (2020), suggesting a causal approach to authorship[14]. He believes that even if AI is used, it is possible to determine the human

contribution. In his article "Thirty-six views of copyright authorship", the author equates AI with tools - a brush or a camera. These funds are involved in the creation, but the author remains the person who manages them.

In Japan, China, and South Korea, questions of authorship and ethics in the use of AI are subjects of active debate. All three countries emphasize the primacy of the human as the responsible agent, particularly in matters of transparency and safety. Japan prioritizes social principles, China mandates the labeling of AI-generated content, and South Korea aims to balance technological innovation with the protection of creators' rights.

Thus, the issue of authorship in the context of AI remains open and multifaceted. At present, two primary approaches can be distinguished:

- A *conservative approach*, which affirms the exclusivity of human authorship and accountability;
- An *innovative approach*, which allows for AI participation as a tool or co-author within clearly defined ethical and legal boundaries.

Many scholars and practitioners seek to maintain a balance between technological progress and cultural continuity. Literary authorship must continue to serve as an expression of human subjectivity - even when AI plays a role in the creative process.

3.5. The Influence of AI Literature on Literary Theory

In the 20th century, the question of machine creativity was closely linked to the concept of intelligence. Alan Turing, referencing philosopher G. Jefferson, argued that a machine could only be considered intelligent if it were capable of writing a sonnet that expresses emotions and understands the process of its own creation[37].

Today, AI's influence on literature extends far beyond technical assistance. It has become a transformative factor, altering the very essence of literary creativity. According to N. A. Zagar[21], the integration of AI into literary production demands a reevaluation of the roles of both author and reader. It raises questions not only about modes of text generation but also about the status and limits of the literary work itself.

Contemporary literary studies record a paradigmatic shift. We are witnessing not merely the emergence of new genres or styles, but a qualitatively different phenomenon requiring theoretical reappraisal. One of the central questions has become the evaluation of texts generated by AI. Some scholars regard them as a new genre in their own right, while others view them as the result of employing a technological tool within traditional frameworks of creativity. Chinese researcher Li Guocheng[20] proposes understanding such production as *"a new form combining literature and technology"*. He criticizes anthropocentric criteria of literary evaluation, arguing that concepts such as emotion, inspiration, and personal creativity lose their relevance in this context. Instead, he introduces the concept of *"cyborg literature"*, which refers to texts created in conditions of human-machine symbiosis. According to Li, these works continue the avant-garde lineages of 20th-century literature, while also transporting them into a new cultural dimension. The boundaries between author and reader, word and image, text and interface—are increasingly blurred.

A similar perspective is offered by Indian scholar B. Premkumar[22], who emphasizes that the proliferation of algorithmic writing is transforming not only the creation of literature but also its critical methodologies. There is a growing need to rethink the concepts of authorship, creativity, and literary analysis. According to Premkumar, the future of literature will be defined by the interplay between the human and the artificial, and therefore, literary theory must evolve on an interdisciplinary basis.

AI also influences the practice of teaching literature. As observed by V. Esakki Ratna[23], digital platforms incorporating chatbots and recommendation algorithms are transforming the ways students engage with literary texts. Educational processes are enriched by virtual environments that simulate the worlds and characters of literary works, thus promoting immersive reading experiences. This expansion leads to new pedagogical approaches and reshapes the understanding of genre and stylistic structures. The study by K. Lavidas and colleagues confirms that students show a sustained interest in applying AI in both academic and creative projects[24]. Thus, artificial intelligence exerts a comprehensive influence on literature—from the act of writing itself to its critical analysis and educational transmission.

This shift necessitates a fundamental rethinking of theoretical models, the adaptation of literary studies to new conditions of digital culture, and the recognition of region-

ally specific perceptions of AI-generated creativity.

Cultural context significantly affects the reception of AI literature. The contrast between East and West is rooted in mythological and religious worldviews. In Japan, shaped by Shinto animism, the idea of animacy in objects is perceived as natural. AI and robots are seamlessly integrated into moral and social life [26]. Examples include the robot monk Mindar and the figure of Astro Boy, which blends nuclear power with humanism. Here, AI is viewed as a benevolent being capable of creation, empathy, and even reverence.

By contrast, Western tradition has often approached artificially created life with suspicion. Abrahamic religions assign a unique creative role to humans. Attempts to "play God" have historically been viewed as sinful or dangerous [27]. The "Frankenstein syndrome" has become deeply embedded in the Western collective imagination. Tatsuya Nomura and colleagues [25] research confirms that Western respondents are significantly more likely to express negative feelings toward robots than their Japanese counterparts.

In summary, cultural frameworks directly influence the legitimization of AI literature. In East Asian countries, such texts are more readily incorporated into literary discourse and are often seen as a natural extension of artistic exploration. In Western contexts, they are more likely to be perceived as technological artifacts with uncertain artistic value—or even as potential threats. Nevertheless, Western academia is increasingly engaging in the theoretical examination of this emergent phenomenon.

As a result, contemporary literary studies face the necessity of profound adaptation. Based on the analysis of various scholarly perspectives, we can identify three main directions in which AI is reshaping the theory and practice of literature:

1. *Rethinking traditional concepts of authorship and genre*, with the emergence of terms such as "AI author," "generative genre," "cyborg literature," and other forms of posthumanist writing.
2. *Developing new evaluative criteria* that can account for the specific characteristics of algorithmic texts and the logic of machine creativity.
3. *Integrating AI into literary education,* while preserving the humanistic and philosophical depth of literary study.

Literary theory today must remain responsive to technological shifts, while retaining its commitment to literature as a domain of human reflection and meaning-making.

4. Conclusion

This study has examined key aspects of the phenomenon of AI-generated literature. First, it analyzed texts created by artificial intelligence through the lens of Jean Baudrillard's concepts of simulacra and hyperreality. It was established that such texts imitate literary form but lack a deep connection to personal intention and existential content. Second, the reception of AI-generated works by readers was explored: drawing on Hans Robert Jauss's theory of the "horizon of expectations," the research observed a shift in perception—these texts are increasingly seen as technological artifacts rather than products of subjective creativity, leading to what Starnino (2023) [19] calls a "semantic void."

Special attention was given to the transformation of the concept of authorship in the context of generative writing. Contemporary approaches proposed by scholars such as Goodfellow, Floridi, Mourão, and Liu suggest that authorship takes on a distributed character: the human assumes the role of curator, editor, or co-author, interacting with AI as a tool or creative partner.

Ethical and legal questions related to the production of AI-generated texts were also examined. The analysis of works by C. Flick, K. Worrall, and D. Burk, along with current legal frameworks in the United States, the European Union, and the United Kingdom, demonstrates that in most cases, copyright is granted only to humans, even when the text is generated with the aid of AI. This underscores the necessity of maintaining human accountability in the creative process.

AI literature was further analyzed from the perspective of its impact on literary theory. It was found that AI-generated texts challenge established notions of genre, creativity, and the literary text itself. The works of Bindu Premkumar and Li Guocheng propose new theoretical frameworks, including the concepts of "cyborg literature" and "algorithmic writing," which emphasize the need for interdisciplinary reflection.

The study also addressed the cultural and cognitive contexts of AI-literature perception. It was shown that in East Asian countries—where animist traditions are prevalent—AI is more readily accepted as a legitimate participant in the

creative process (Nomura, 2020[25]). In contrast, Western cultures tend to approach such texts with greater skepticism, rooted in the idea of human uniqueness as the bearer of spiritual and artistic value.

Thus, the study concludes that AI literature is a complex cultural, philosophical, and theoretical phenomenon. Based on the analysis presented, it can be argued that further exploration of this subject requires a fundamental rethinking of the core categories of literary theory, ethics, and law. AI-generated texts challenge traditional understandings of the text, authorship, and readership, thereby opening a new field for the humanities in the digital age.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, S.S. and S.A.; methodology, Z.K.; software, M.K.; validation, S.S., S.A. and Z.K.; formal analysis, S.A.; investigation, S.S.; resources, S.S.; data curation, S.A.; writing—original draft preparation, S.S.; writing—review and editing, S.A.; visualization, Z.K.; supervision, S.A.; project administration, S.S.; funding acquisition, M.K. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article. No new datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study. Additional textual materials used in the analysis, such as excerpts from publicly available literary works, are accessible in the referenced sources. These materials were examined through the lens of simulacrum theory and artificial intelligence frameworks, allowing for an exploration of how AI systems engage with literary texts by replicating, transforming, or generating representations that blur the boundaries between original and copy. This analytical approach highlights the evolving role of AI in literary interpretation and creation, raising questions central to the discourse on artificiality, authenticity, and simulation in literature.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Čapek, K., 1920. R.U.R. (Rossum's Universal Robots). Aventinum: Prague, Czech Republic.

[2] Shelley, M., 1818. Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus. Lackington & Co.: London, UK.

[3] Danesi, M., 2024. AI-Generated Popular Culture: A Semiotic Perspective. Springer Nature: New York, NY, USA.

[4] Baudrillard, J., 1994. Simulacra and Simulation; Glaser, S.F., (Trans.). University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, MI, USA.

[5] Barthes, R., 1986. The death of the author. In Barthes, R., Image, Music, Text; Heath, S. (Trans.). Fontana Press: London, UK. pp. 142–148.

[6] Foucault, M., 1984. What is an author? In Rabinow, P. (Ed.), The Foucault Reader. Pantheon: New York, NY, USA. pp. 101–120.

[7] The Day a Computer Writes a Novel, 2016. Big Echo. Available from: https://www.bigecho.org/the-day-a-computer-wrote-a-novel (cited 11 July 2024).

[8] Goodwin, R., 2018. 1 the Road. Jean Boîte Éditions: Paris, France. (In English)

[9] Derrida, J., 1978. Writing and Difference. Bass, A. (Trans.). University of Chicago Press. [First published in 1967].

[10] Derrida, J., 1998. Of Grammatology, Corrected ed.; Spivak, G.C. (Trans.). Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MD, USA. [First published in 1967].

[11] Floridi, L., 2025. Distant Writing: Literary Production in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. Preprint. Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5232088

[12] Mourão, P.R., Liu, Y., 2025. The actual use of generative AI in online literary production: An exploratory

study with Lusophone writers on Wattpad. Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities. 17(1), 1–17. Available from: https://rupkatha.com /V17/n1/v17n103.pdf

[13] Vallor, S., 2016. Technology and the Virtues: A Philosophical Guide to a Future Worth Wanting. Oxford University Press: New York, NY, USA.

[14] Burk, D.L., 2020. Thirty-six views of copyright authorship, by Jackson Pollock. Houston Law Review. 58(2), 263–321. Available from: https://houstonlawreview.org/article/18011-thirty-six -views-of-copyright-authorship-by-jackson-pollock

[15] Smith, L., Jones, T., 2020. Algorithmic authorship: The intersection of AI and creativity. Literary Analysis Quarterly. 9(3), 45–59.

[16] Goodfellow, P., 2024. The distributed authorship of art in the age of AI. Arts. 13(5), 149. DOI: https: //doi.org/10.3390/arts13050149

[17] Flick, C., Worrall, K., 2024. The ethics of creative AI. Ethics in AI Practice. CEUR-WS. pp. 1–16. Available from: https://liedra.net/misc/Flick_Worrall-Ethics_of _Creative_AI.pdf

[18] Bajohr, H., 2024. On artificial and post-artificial texts: Machine learning and the reader's expectations of literary and non-literary writing. Poetics Today. 45(2), 331–361. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1215/ 03335372-11092990

[19] Starnino, C., 2022. Robots are writing poetry, and many people can't tell the difference. The Walrus. Available from: https://thewalrus.ca/ai-poetry/

[20] Li, G., 2025. AI literature challenges modern literary concepts. Chinese Social Sciences Today, 13 February.

[21] Zargar, N.A., 2023. The impact of artificial intelligence on literature, human intellect, and the balance of knowledge acquisition. Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR). 10(8), 559–562.

[22] Premkumar, B., 2024. The impact of artificial intelligence on literary creation and criticism: Emerging trends and implications. International Journal of Language, Literature and Culture. 4(4), 37–39. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijllc.4.4.5

[23] Rathna, V. E., 2023. Leveraging artificial intelligence for the future of literature education. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews. 4(10), 190–192.

[24] Lavidas, K., Voulgari, I., Papadakis, S., et al., 2024. Determinants of humanities and social sciences students' intentions to use artificial intelligence applications for academic purposes. Information. 15, 314. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/info15060314

[25] Nomura, T., Syrdal, D.S., Dautenhahn, K., 2014. Differences on social acceptance of humanoid robots between Japan and the UK. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction, Canterbury, UK, 21–22 April 2015.

[26] Kaplan, F., 2004. Who is afraid of the humanoid? Investigating cultural differences in the acceptance of robots. International Journal of Humanoid Robotics. 1(3), 465–480.

[27] Wight, J.K., 2020. The battle for the robot soul: Western vs Japanese attitudes to robots. Philosophy Now. (139), 16–19.

[28] Matějková, T., Ircing, P., 2024. The author was killed by an AI – or was it? In Proceedings of the 9th Linguistic and Cognitive Approaches To Dialog Agents Workshop - LaCATODA 2024, Kyoto, Japan, 19 November 2024; CEUR-WS. pp. 87–92. Available from: https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3862/

[29] Plato, 1921. Sophist. In: Fowler, H.N. (Trans.), Plato. William Heinemann: London, UK. Volume 1, p. 459.

[30] Lucretius, 1958. On the Nature of Things [О природе вещей]. Academy of Sciences of the USSR Publishing House: Moscow, Russia.

[31] Merchant, B., 2018. When an AI goes full Jack Kerouac. The Atlantic, 1 October. Available from: https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2018/ 10/automated-on-the-road/571345/?utm_source=copy -link&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=share

[32] Jauss, H.R., 1982. Toward an Aesthetic of Reception; Bahti, T. (Trans.). University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, MN, USA.

[33] Iser, W., 1978. The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response. Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MD, USA.

[34] United States Copyright Office, 2021. Compendium of U.S. Copyright Office Practices, 3rd ed. Available from: https://www.copyright.gov/comp3/docs/compe ndium.pdf

[35] European Commission, 2020. Making the most of the EU's innovative potential: An intellectual property action plan to support the EU's recovery and resilience (COM/2020/760). Available from: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/ ?uri=CELEX:52020DC0760

[36] UK Parliament, 1988. Copyright, Design and Patents Act. Available from: https://www.legislation.gov.uk /ukpga/1988/48/contents

[37] Turing, A.M., 1950. Computing machinery and intelligence. Mind. 59(236), 433–460. DOI: https://doi.org/ 10.1093/mind/LIX.236.433