

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21377747

AI-GENERATED SURREALIST POETRY: TECHNOLOGY AND THE REIMAGINATION OF CREATIVITY

Lura Hadi Q. Alsaeed^{1*}

¹Department of English Language, Jouf University, College of Arts, Saudi Arabia- Sakaka.
nora.h.alsaeid@Ju.Edu.Sa, 00966553399720, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1510-2125>

Received: 20/04/2026
Accepted: 05/05/2026

Corresponding Author: Lura Hadi Q. Alsaeed
(nora.h.alsaeid@Ju.Edu.Sa)

ABSTRACT

The study investigates how artificial intelligence (AI) systems unify with surrealist poetry through their machine-generated texts which disrupt established standards for evaluating authorship and creative work and emotional display. The AI language model GPT-4 creates poems which demonstrate proper syntax and convincing writing style but its creations fall short of delivering the emotional depth and cultural memory and intentionality which define human poetic works. The research paper uses three methods of analysis which include comparative analysis and reception studies and ethical inquiry to explore the aesthetic and philosophical impact of AI-generated poetry. The study explores projects which include Pharmako-AI and Ai-Da to show how human-AI partnerships develop through their application in education and publishing and artistic innovation. The research study proposes a hybrid model through which AI functions as a creative partner who increases poetic options while human experience maintains its unique emotional impact.

KEYWORDS: Artificial Intelligence, Surrealist Poetry, Authorship, Creativity, Emotional Expression, Ethics, Human-AI Collaboration, Digital Literature.

1. INTRODUCTION

The use of artificial intelligence in literature is radically altering the way we view authorship, creativity and inspiration. This shift can be seen clearly in poetry, a genre long considered to be an expression of individual feelings, creativity and complex language. In poetry, surrealism offers the most compelling example of using AI's potential and limitations to make poetry. Surrealism is a movement based on Freudian ideas and automatic writing; its goal is to explore the subconscious, break established logic and honour places that cannot be explained by logic. Surrealist poetry has many unique features, including unusual subject matter, use of symbols, and emotional content, which present obstacles for machines to recreate.

On the other hand, the blend of surrealism and AI is more than just an artistic exploration, it is a blending of branches of philosophy, culture, and psychology. From a different perspective: Poetic creations done by AI challenges the overwhelming implications of emotional performance, action of marking a sign, and meaning of intention behind the written word. For instance, manual surrealists such as Andre began championing automatic writing believing it was a way of diving into the subconscious. As computation redacts the memory, longing, or maternal gaze, it holds no subjectivity. OpenAI's GPT-3 and GPT-4 text generation systems output words one after the other based on existing frameworks devoid of any lived reality (Floridi, 2020).

The application of AI to creative domains, particularly poetry, is now an ongoing conversation about what constitutes literary authorship. Poetry, traditionally located at the peak of human emotive and verbal expression, now is being molded and contested by neural networks, transformers, and generative algorithms. In order to appreciate the relationship between AI and the poetic form, one must first analyze the processes AIs frameworks execute language, the poetics they may mimic, and the essence of their constructions.

AI is understood as the ability to offer solutions that require human intelligence. It encompasses the creation of computer systems that simulate human cognitive functions of reasoning, learning, or decision-making. For example, GPT-3 and GPT-4 are models of AI that operate in the case of natural language processing (NLP). They are trained using extensive datasets that include texts from the internet and literature. AI does not comprehend language the same way a human would, but instead uses a statistical model to regard a set of words as input,

and determines what output or sequence is likely to come next (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020). This is not "thinking", in the human sense, but is best described as stochastic generation, or as a method of prediction of words to be placed in a high-dimensional class or order.

In the synthetic poetry these models generate, they imitate the structural aspects of poetry, including its grammar, rhythm, and nuances. Even with all of this, there is no logic behind their actions. They lack context and emotional depth which allows them to perform tasks with genuine feeling. As Campolo et al. (2017) remarks, "AI can analyze and replicate intricate patterns of language, but it is incapable of understanding the nuance of human experience that shapes art."

To create poetry, AI models operate within set boundaries that replicate conventional poetry styles. This includes the incorporation of rhyme, specific syllable counts, thematic metaphors, and other devices. Take Poem Portraits for example, users are able to enter a word and the program generates text that combines the word alongside fragments taken from thousands of 19-century poems. Another example is Pharmako-AI, which involves a collaboration between a human and the AI. A human poet curates and arranges phrases generated by the machine into a cohesive story (Prabowo & Asmarani, 2025). Although some results feature bizarre visuals and striking imagery, they almost always lack a coherent theme. Many others rely too heavily on clichés, superficial plausibility, and no logic behind narrative continuity. Some believe AI-generated poetry can only go so far in replicating language. Montfort sees creativity differently; he views it not just as creating texts, but as creating text representations of life's experiences, one's own life story, and his/her sociocultural context.

Surrealist poets have often been able to value the irrational aspect of thoughts—a quality that is inherently non-logical or rational—in their poetic style, making them a prime candidate for creating AI poetry. Surrealist poets have created works that challenge our normal perceptions by combining contradictory images with one another and following the style of automatic writing, similar to the way that random processes are created through neural networks. According to Breton in the "Manifesto of Surrealism" (1924), the purpose of automatic writing is to break the constraints of reason and to free the truths buried deep in our unconscious minds. Therefore, poetry produced by AI can, in essence, be viewed as existing surreally.

An example of this would be GPT-3's poem in

which it states, "The moon weeps into a glass of neglected coffee". The idea of the moon weeping is absurd, but at the same time, it is a dreamlike thought (Breton, 1924). However, while surrealist poets have often attempted to explore the various psychological depths that exist within themselves, AI functions as a simulator; that is, that it simulates the contours of the imagination without any type of psychical or symbolic depths to explore. Therefore, while AI can re-arrange information, it is not capable of dreaming.

The surrealism of digital art, as well as AI-generated verses, becomes 'post-human' surrealism, suggests Froushan (2024), marking a new shift of detachment from neurotic rhythms of reverie and surrender to the cold world of computation. This shift invites a rethinking of what "automatism" means in a world where machines write faster and with more syntactic control than human poets ever could.

Unlike the case of poetry written by humans, which an AI can only imitate, the experienced-based emotional creativity remains absent from the work of an AI. While a human constructs metaphors based on grief, ecstasy, trauma, culture, and deep self-reflection, an AI lacks intuition, empathy, and self-awareness. The "emotionally charged" language AI uses falls flat as it fails to evoke any sentiment.

Omnipresent experiences evoked through metaphors, blended with emotions, create a form of poetic emptiness, what might be viewed as technically correct. Stanko-Kaczmarek *et al.* (2024) noted that in audience reception studies, poems generated by AI are viewed to lack emotion and authenticity, especially when authorship becomes known. Evidence suggests that machine authorship alters perceived depth within the text. Absence of emotion can yield unique artistic results. The cold strangeness of AI poetry gives birth to a new genre altogether. Unlike Dada, which birthed the post-human poetics, centered on estrangement and computational beauty, AI poetry operates free from the bounds of traditional aesthetics. Automated programming opens a whole new frontier and contradicts any inherited sense of beauty.

AI poetry requires a recalibration of the markers of literary merit. Traditional poetics considers voice, originality, and intention of a work, none of which exist in an AI or is impersonated. Interpreting machine poetry will require more than not viewing it simply as a mockery of human art, but rather, viewing it as a distinct yet parallel aesthetic expression. Equally, the history of poetry is rich in formal and systematic improvisation, rule-breaking, and technology-aided art-making processes, from

the Oulipo constraints to William S. Burroughs' cut-up techniques. In this regard, AI becomes another tool; provocative, generative, unsettling, maddening even. The does not abandon the emotional and ethical contours of humanity creativity but rather capturing in the act of loosening. The simulation of language also creates an emotional-descriptive-enacted-on reality dichotomy. Hayles (1999) and Matsu (2023) assert that in the post-human age, biology may no longer define intelligence and creativity. Machine generated content, as pointed out by David Levy (2018) and many others, not only alters the conventional understanding of authorship, but calls into question the value of art and truth and necessitates justification.

1.1. Questions of the Study

Questions remain whether machines are capable of creation, or reproducing semblances of creation. Such questions are more critical to surrealism, a genre where depth of psyche, culture, commentary, and interplay with antecedent works underpin poetic merit. AI-generated poetry may craft novel metaphors and blend unexpected ideas, but often failed to provide narrative coherence and continuity of symbolism that human poets deliberately weave. Additionally, with the rise of AI composed poetry, there are new ethical and legal issues to contend with. Who is the owner of the poem? Is AI content copyrightable? Can a piece of literature created by a machine truly be considered as "authored"? And how do institutional bodies dealing with literature need to think about this change?

1.2. Importance of the Study

Finally, the study explores the impact of AI on the teaching of creative writing, publishing, and the literary community. Others see AI as a tool that has been made available to marginalized people because it assists in navigating previously inaccessible restrictions on poetic formats. Conversely, others argue that such algorithm-led generative outputs threaten to erase literary quality and/or perpetuate pre-existing literary voids coopted from the training data (Bender *et al.*, 2021). Through referencing this symbiosis between human creativity and machine learning, a more sophisticated understanding of the nature of creation, emotion and communication through poetry can be developed for the digital age. The AI poet is not a replacement for a person but rather a mirror that reflects back at us the limitations and frameworks of our own creative potential.

1.3. Methodology

The study is qualitative, comparative, and interdisciplinary in its methodology of looking at the relationship between poetry produced by AI and poetry produced by humans within the surrealist genre. Numbers are not used in determining the quality of poetry in the study. Instead, it focuses on aesthetic structure, thematic depth, symbolic coherence, and intentionality as the hallmark of surrealist writing.

1.4. Objective of the paper

This paper looks at this new literary space by comparing how AI poetry goes beyond and undermines surrealist poetry written by people. It examines the psychological framework, or lack thereof that AI ostensibly provides. Case studies PoemPortraits, Ai-Da's poetry readings, and Pharmako-AI all show how AI's interfaces and poetry traditions can work together. The paper talks about the effects of identity construction perspectives using ideas from literary theory, cognitive science, digital humanities, and algorithmic creativity.

2. SURREALISM AND THE ALGORITHMIC MIND

A blend of art and literature, surrealism first appeared in the 20th century and sought to bypass rational thought, rather relying instead on one's subconscious. It sought to overturn, against Enlightenment logic and bourgeois sensibility, the deeply internalized logic of the society one lived in, heavily relying on Freudian psychoanalysis, especially the aspects concerning dreams, repression, and free association. "Automatism" - writing under a trance wherein one has no control over the pen, letting thoughts devoid of order flow, is the primary method of achieving surrealism. So, the surrealist movement aimed at freeing language, meaning and identity. With the advent of AI writing programs, particularly for poetry, surrealistic thought is now slowly being revived, not by dream journaling or psychoanalysis, but using algorithmic thought as the base.

Within the boundaries of surrealism, automatic writing was not a technique, rather, it was a philosophical approach to creativity. André Breton, Paul Éluard, and Robert Desnos had the same mindset of creating deeper truths, the primal, the irrational, and the symbolic, with the help of bypassing control. Because of this, surrealism is defined as introspective and psychological. The surrealist poet is a vessel for something way beyond oneself: mystic forces such as the dream world, the collective unconscious, and the divine.

When AI-produced poetry lacks human intervention, its structure bears resemblance to automatic writing. The absence of a self-aware mind capable of directing thought processes lends a particular phrasing to each work that frail and brittle. Nevertheless, this analogy is misleading. There is no unconscious subtext lying dormant in AI systems. The "freedom" enjoyed by AI is restricted by fixed bounds defined by its training data, ingrained biases, and the design of its algorithms. Lack of Surrealism logic does not stem from failing to mimic its "appearance."

Machine composing, as noted by Montfort (2016), does not disregard statistical reasoning. Surrealism's "skeleton" does not depend on psychology's "flesh." The profound structures and intricate layers AI-generated content lack make it purely algorithmic materialism, a hollow sequence of relations algorithmically determined. This prompts an imposing distinction: in human automatic writing clear and sought-after truths slumber amidst the depths of the psyche, while in AI companionship mimics aimless structure devoid of spontaneity as an echo of style, the two converge in appearance, but diverge in origin.

In AI-assisted surrealism, what stands out the most is how profoundly it can confuse the readers. Expressions like 'the night drips through the veins of silence like a glass butterfly' captures human drama on a poetic level, and so has every chance of captivating readers. The readers are left to wonder, analyze, and decode. The truth is this expression carries no personal history, emotional scars, or remnant from a dream, just an algorithmic fabrication. AI's patterned unpredictability creates the illusion of subconscious thought. Models like their output. The polished work produced has a human touch to it in some sense. As in Koeman GPT-4 utilize billions of examples of figurative language, poetry, and literary structure to create and Iriogbe den Bosch (2022) noted, "Some readers have indeed been convinced that the poems produced by GPT-3 were written by humans." Surpassing human capacity is not necessarily innovative intention, but rather a scope demonstrating the model's training data.

The entire movement of surrealism was based on the idea that chaos could be meaningful. In contrast, surrealism created by AI may be odd and aesthetically appealing, but because there is no consistent context, many of the images created do not conform to any understandable metaphor. Levy and Peart (2022) claim that "AI-generated metaphor tends to be pastiche, which does not fail on the surface level

of appearance, but has no symbolic density." Rather than viewing AI-generated surrealism as a failed attempt at reproducing human artistry, we may see it instead through the lens of post-humanism as being the next generation of hybrid poetics. Hayles (1999) argued that the post-human self is the result of disembodied consciousness and repositioning it as distributed within networks of codes and interfaces. Under this paradigm, the AI poet is no longer merely an imitator of human artistry; they are also a separately defined, metaphorically, radially conceptual "offspring" of the human-machine collective and unknowing; and anew type of author and as a surrogate for the body-as-language.

In Pharmako-AI's case, this phenomenon is evident where the collaborator suggests the machine-generated text and interprets it according to specific larger ideas. The AI is not a surrealist in the traditional sense, rather a surrealist tool, repeating those remnants of sounds and images that emerged from the unconscious. The AI model serves as a contemporary oracle, opaque, autonomous, and profoundly enlightening (Prabowo & Asmarani, 2025). As the automatic typewriter evoked external forces of inspiration, the AI model serves as a contemporary oracle. This type of collaboration fits the description of current fragmented poetic trends. Both post-human and postmodern poetics embrace the fragmentation of meaning, the copy and-paste style of intertextuality, and the decomposition of identity.

On the other hand, AI models do not possess the faculty of remembering. Models think in attitudinal patterns, indexing information in terms of frequency and association, rather than recollection or lineage. To use words from Bender et al. (2021), "stochastic parrots" (610) encapsulates language models aptly: repeating and remixing without reflecting or contextualizing meaning with depth intention. AI is heavily constrained by failure to capture memory or, the intended depth of recollection. When AI attempts intertextuality, it becomes apparent. The resultant imagery is devoid of context. For instance, mentioning figures from mythology absent thematic integration, or unanchored surreal nouns like fish in the sky, create disjointed poetic imagery. For surrealism, such pictures have psychological or sociopolitical functions while, in AI poetry, they tend to serve as decorative sound.

3. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: HUMAN VS. AI POETRY

The comparison of human-crafted poetry and AI-generated verse surpasses the examination of style or

structure of the poem. Rather, it focuses on the intention or the type of thinking that went into its creation, as well as the emotion to intent feedback loop that exists for AI poetry. For instance, while machines such as GPT-3 or GPT-4 can produce lines, phrases, or sentences that are elegantly constructed and are captivating to the eyes and ear, their linguistic output is qualitatively different from what human poets offer. In this part, we cover some of the basis of that difference: architecture and language, emotion, imagery, symbol, as well as the experience of the audience.

One classic example of AI art is poetry writing using an AI program. Many AI-generated poems demonstrate a level of language proficiency above and beyond what has previously been produced by humans. The algorithms used in programs like GPT-4, or third-party extensions built off of the GPT computer program, generate large amounts of text for their users based on previously created materials. Users provide various large data pools as input to the AI algorithm for use in creating text; these data pools include conversational material, literary sources, etc. The AI then models how rhyme, meter, enjambment, and other fixed style elements are represented in the user's input based on the information generated by the AI model. The model's ability to produce text in the style of a Shakespearean sonnet, haiku, or free verse surrealistic poetry is one example of how adaptable, useful, and innovative the program is. If given the prompt, "The moon dissolves in my tea," GPT-4 might produce the following poem:

The moon dissolves in my tea,
A bitter sky steeped in memory,
Night swirls in ceramic dreams,
Where silence floats like jasmine steam.

The flow of the syntax is very smooth, and the images are extremely well defined. You might even say this could come from a book or magazine. But, the quality of the language is not present as totally unique though. In their study of readers' reactions to AI poetry, Iriogbe Krieken and collaborators (2023) have found that AI-generated poetry has a flatness or a too-shiny quality that readers begin noticing more as time goes by. Unlike AI, humans typically have a degree of roughness to their expression and often express themselves in a way that is intentionally vague, ambivalently beautiful, and brash or fragmented in their use of syntax, which gives them the appearance of being human. Poets break rules because they create new, progressive significations and sounds or rhythms of meaning; hence, challenging readers' presumption that breaking rules automatically means being unable to read literature.

In contrast, AI adheres to rules--possibly to a fault.

Emotional connection is what distinguishes human poetry from AI-generated poetry and is also the source of the biggest disparity between them; while humans have had life experiences that inform their creations, AI has no such experiences. Human poets rely on a memory bank that contains their trauma, desire, identity, cultural history, and self-reflection, and develop metaphors based on all these things. For instance, Sylvia Plath's "I eat men like air" conveys feelings of rage as well as complexity in the psyche. This scenario cannot be replicated with AI-created poetry. In contrast, AI creates poetry devoid of being emotionally real; it utilizes emotional descriptors that are based on tones and emotional ranges of the data that are represented in AI's embellishments, yet, all emotional tones created by AI are void of interior resonance. As noted by Gao (2024), the inability of machines to create the essence of emotion is a core limitation; AI can imitate emotion, but will never be able to create an essence of feeling. An AI-generated line may be able to hold a reader's attention temporarily, but, for the most part, AI-generated lines will not remain in the reader's mind long after they have been read nor will they cause the reader to reflect further on the line. Conversely, human-generated poetry is primarily written to elicit a confrontation between the reader and unresolved fears or subconscious passions. However, the emotional tone of all AI-generated poems is characterized by some degree of emotional detachment.

Metaphors do not merely represent a part of the figurative language; they provide a way to bring order to our environment. In human poetry, a poet will use metaphors to investigate their identity, loss, historical events, and even the notion of opposite; often these metaphors are tied together, creating complex mappings of meaning. An example would be the metaphoric themes of drought, death, and cultural decline in T.S. Eliot's poem *The Waste Land*, each of which can be interpreted from the points of view of an individual, mythologically and historically at the same time. Conversely, most AI-created metaphors tend toward embellishment rather than fundamental. For instance, "the piano cries feathers inside a cathedral of dust" has a great visual quality that represents a moment or concept; however, it lacks a thematic accumulation of meaning. According to Vyas (2022), AI-created metaphors base their associations on associations rather than symbolic construction, resulting in the appearance of splendid style but devoid of meaning or purpose. A defining aspect of human poetry is the

ability to play with the reader's expectations. Exemplary poets act in a manner contrary to the tradition. They can violate the established patterns of meter and/or rhyme, reverse the meaning of metaphors and will use startling irony to challenge the reader. These methods of critiquing language, society and self are purposeful. Each of the aforementioned methods of poetically critiquing language, society and/or self serves a function or purpose.

AI lacks intention to subvert. AI can produce surprising contradictions, but only because it is based on probability and not critique. It cannot reflexively employ poetic form ironically. Language models focus on, as Bender et al. (2021) stress, optimizing plausibility over provocation. Coherence takes precedence over disruption. This tendency gives AI poetry the feel of a docile mimic, stylistically proficient yet devoid of political or emotional infusion, sentiment, or context. Even in surrealist AI poems, there is a stark absence of ideological or existential tension. The images may be bizarre, but they are rarely disruptive. Surrealism is employed by human poets to explore the uncanny, the traumatic, or the sublime, while assembly is all AI does.

Engaging with AI poetry requires a unique approach. In human poetry, readers look for intertextual references, biographical context, or authorial intention to construct meaning. These factors deepen emotional connection and interpretation. Again, the use of AI in poetry evokes debates under topics such as the fabrication of meaning, or arguments on intent and selfhood as the underlying machine operates devoid of any strings. Nonetheless, this touches the surface as the intent devoid AI poetry of meaning lacking psychological depth or even interpretive freedom. Consequently, as Stanko-Kaczmarek et al. (2024) assert, "readers exploring AI poetry as some unassured yet appealing muse end up cataloging it if authorship is hidden", which devoid them of authenticity and emotive faculty once AI authorship reveals.

Meanwhile, some critics have reframed the discussion of AI generated poetry instruments conceding any sense of depth. In their lenses AI produced poetry shifts into the realm of experiments akin to Dada or Oulipo where voice, confession, pattern, and randomness displace the confessional tone (Prabowo & Asmarani, 2025). While critics claim Ai-Da's poetry lack semantic weight, arguing over the performance's blend of physical presences and algorithmic texts straying into uncanny theatrical spaces, the humanoid robot creates irreducible blends of AI poetics declaring the birth of

Pharmako-AI as the latter emerges through the collaboration of human and AI text.

The outcome is a multi-dimensional blend that creates a new atmosphere and blurs out definition while still retaining identity. In this case, AI is not a poet; it is a poetic assistant. It does not write poems; it stimulates human ingenuity by providing unparalleled resources (Prabowo & Asmarani, 2025). This case highlights AI's most innovative potential in the field of poetry: as a stimulus. When properly stewarded, AI has the ability to enrich a poet's word bank, animate previously dormant structures, or impersonate alien selves. Absent thoughtful stewarding and emotional intuition, however, its outputs become stylized hollow artifacts.

Overall, the result of using an AI will delight, generate unexpected poetry, or even raise wonder. On the other hand, AI will not, and therefore does not capable of feeling, thus lacking a meaningful expression. It lacks the ability to feel, and for that reason, lacks a full expression. It can take on the forms of surrealism spanning within the framework of true poetry, but not the experience, contradiction, memory, grief, and joy.

4. AUTHORSHIP, AUTHENTICITY, AND ETHICS

Literary communities prefer to subscribe to the notion that authors are expected to disclose whether a work was entirely AI-generated, co-created with a human, or merely drafted by a machine. The ethics of attribution ensure that readers are able to construct their own interpretation based on full knowledge, rather than giving undue credence to a split work that features undisclosed contributions. For Petridou Aikaterini (2020), the ethics of Creative AI demand that AI users ask pertinent questions and that audiences fully grasp what has been done to a work so as any critique levelled suffices. AI-powered writing software and generative tools are becoming increasingly available, with ChatGPT and Sudowrite now commonplace. Youven (2024) points out educators have been forced to teach students responsible AI use in discussions of authorship, voice and originality. Such discussions acknowledge the existence of powerful tools masquerading as unethical shortcuts.

Generally, the author or copyright holder is the person who supervises the AI or the business that owns the AI Matsui (Hutson, 2023). If a captive AI is used to assist a competitor in generating drafts with the intent to master into an edited poem, what will happen to the owner ship credits of the master? If several people take part in prompt submission,

editing, or curation, will they get co authorship credits? And what will happen when AI created poems are published or commercialized, or used in teaching materials? Some scholars argue the need of creating a new hybrid category within the copyright system where AI is acknowledged but does not negate the human element (Patil, 2025). Until such configurations are proposed, creators and institutions have to operate within those constraints and develop their own ethical frameworks.

The introduction of artificial intelligence (AI) into poetry and other creative fields is not only challenging the boundaries of art but also raising many legal, philosophical and ethical issues. The most significant issue is regarding authorship. Who or what can be credited with writing a poem created by a computer program? Other questions surround the authenticity of AI-generated works, whom may be credited for the creative work of another, and how individuals will be recognized as collaborators and developers. As more AI-generated works are submitted to contests and published in literary journals, as well as used in educational settings, the literary community faces challenges that undermine the concept of artistic identity and integrity.

In the so-called "author-based" model of literary creation presumes that authors have intentionality, are self-aware, and can numerically and contextually arrange their sentences and paragraphs to create literature through a conscious act of literature creation. Copyright laws, the practices of literary criticism, and ways of creating literary forms are all developed from and rest upon this theory of authorship. However, the author-based models of authorship cannot adequately serve as the framework for creating poetry through generative artificial intelligence (AI) technology. While generative AI technologies like GPT-4 contain programmed procedures, they lack intentionality, aim, sentience, and consciousness; thus, Floridi and Chiriatti (2020) assert that the contentiousness between the current intellectual property legal frameworks with generative AI technology is a result of the fact that AI cannot be considered to have, and therefore, is neither legally or morally responsible for their creation, nor can be deemed an author.

As authorship is attributed primarily to the user of the AI or the owner of the AI model as to the creator of the work, this does not provide a satisfactory answer to the philosophical questions about authorship. For instance, in projects such as Pharmako-AI, authorship is reconceptualized as the emergent product of multiple voices. Thus, in this case, the AI is considered not an author, but rather a

participant whose textual contributions are assigned meaning and context by the human poet who interprets and reorders elements contributed by the AI and collates those elements with her own textual contributions. This illustrates that the human poet has a distinct intention in that she creates from her use of the AI as a medium of discovery, yet she must also account for the effect of the generative AI on the final product of the creative process (Prabowo & Asmarani, 2025).

Nevertheless, the issue of authenticity becomes irrelevant when the author is represented by an algorithm. The ethical implications of artificial intelligence in authorship extend beyond concern for how poems are credited. Vyas (2022) also highlights the importance of perception. The reader expects something about himself and his relationship with the human poet, and how his relationship would offer him a chance to experience true emotions, recollections of true events, or understand perspectives after extensive research. Virtual experiences occur without thinking, and hence there is no way for a reader to ascertain whether the artificial intelligence poetry was generated by the emotions of the author. To put it another way, while the language conveys emotions, it does not stem from the emotions of the author. The lack of emotion stems not from the language but from the transfer of emotion from the author to the writing mechanism. It has been proven that readers view literary pieces as less authentic when they discover that the poems are generated using artificial intelligence technology (Stanko-Kaczmarek et al., 2024).

Such an assumption forms the basis of copyright laws, literary analysis, and creative instruction. With the integration of poetry written by the use of artificial intelligence in this framework, it does not provide an answer to the philosophical query whether authorship can be said to exist without the conscious effort of the person who writes such poetry. In the event that the artificial intelligence makes use of extensive data input and complex algorithms to produce poetry, there is an implicit transfer of authorship from the writer of the poetry to the human user.

A subtler but equally important ethical issue concerns the decline in the value attributed to creativity among humans. Increasingly, we will see literature receiving boundary-pushing or over-the-top accolades for works of poetry created by AI. The potential exists for publications in the literary scene—caught up in the excitement and marketing surrounding AI—to use AI-generated works as a measuring device or baseline from which to create

their own work—potentially resulting in, as indicated by Floridi and Chiriatti (2020), a commodification of creativity whereby anything new (distinct from original) is born out of something new (distinct from established); furthermore, emotional energy behind an effort may dominate or overshadow a creative act. This is particularly concerning with respect to populations that have been marginalised as poetry has been a significant way for these communities to express their culture, resist oppression, and find comfort in unique experiences.

An overabundance of AI-generated poetry may create obstacles to representation for underrepresented cultures and may perpetuate mainstream power structures through language. According to Huston (2023), even the best intentions of AI tools typically reproduce the same underlying biases as do the training materials used to create them. Therefore, we can expect that the continued process of normalising knowledge through elitist Eurocentric lenses will further embed elitism. It is therefore critical that developers engaged in the ethical use of AI in poetry focus on addressing the culture gaps. Software developers should be required to provide explanatory models for their poetry generation systems while literary organisations must develop programs carved out for the benefit of human voices historically silenced. The goal is not to denigrate the role of AI; rather, it is to encourage that. The aim here is not to dismiss AI, but to advocate that it enhances human creativity rather than replace it.

A poet's work poses new ethical considerations. As users of AI tools, poets must consider how, when, and why they choose to integrate algorithms into their creative processes. Solani's poetry machine project encourages poets to use AI solely as a creative prompt rather than as a collaborator in order to guide more ethical practices within the genre (Frouchan, 2025). This way, the AI serves a purpose as an instigator of exploration rather than as a voice that replaces the individual. Poets are fully able to expand their practices by engaging with new technologies while ensuring the integrity of art through innovation. The Ethics of authorship of AI tools lie not in the lines distinguishing mind from machine, but in the elements that bereave poetry of its significance, truthfulness, memorial culture, emotional depth, and the bravery to speak from the sensitive edges of lived experience.

The issue of authenticity complicates this question even more. The reader expects poetry to be a means of expressing emotions, memories, or thoughts, and

he or she assumes that there is a human presence behind each poem. The value of poetry in terms of its aesthetic appeal is associated not only with the quality of language used but also with the conscious author behind it. There are no ethical standards regarding the disclosure and transparency of AI poetry considering the fact it is submitted to literary competitions, journals and anthologies. Without that perceived human trace, even eloquent verse can appear emotionally diminished. There are no ethical standards regarding the disclosure and transparency of AI poetry considering the fact it is submitted to literary competitions, journals and anthologies.

5. RECEPTION OF AUDIENCE AND CRITICISM

The emergence of AI poetry has changed both how literature is created and how these new poems relate to their readers and reviewers. Though AI poetry can use complex and eloquent language, and even has the potential to atypically structure verses, many people receive this literature with doubt, confusion, and a lack of understanding. The question of how to evaluate AI poetry is linked to the public perception of emotional authenticity and, importantly, whether the poems were written by a human or a machine. Meanwhile literary critics and scholars are inventing new methods for evaluating this literature, attempting to synthesize conventional poetic methods with new approaches rooted in post-humanism. The lack of information regarding the authorship of AI generated poetry results in AI poetry being well received as it's commonly assumed the author is a human poet. Iriogbe Krieken *et al.* (2023), studying reactions to AI generated poetry, reported respondents' claims to the pieces being emotionally strong, beautiful, and 'human-like'. When respondents were informed of the pieces being AI generated, ratings were lower. 'Inauthentic', 'less genuine', and 'more mechanical' were the sentiments expressed regarding the works. This underscores the imagined or real importance of 'intentionality' in the audience's interpretation and the meaning created from the poems. Readers will always make meaning from text, but this is largely based on the author figure they construct in their minds. It is very likely that a human poet is thought to have felt, suffered, thought and emotionally engaged a lot in the poem. This extensive engagement is dismissed when the author is concerned the poetry is AI generated, no matter how sophisticated the algorithm is.

At the same time, alongside more readers showcasing different sides of AI poetry, the same comes from fascination alongside more skepticism.

The very notion that a machine can compose beautiful, surreal lines challenges the notion human creativity is exclusive. Some consider the outcome of AI-generated poetry to resemble that of a modern oracle, distant and alienating, yet captivatingly unpredictable in its scope (Stanko-Kaczmarek *et al.*, 2024). This suggests that the meaning of poetry lies not only inscribed in the lines but also in- the in-between, in a gestalt of the spin between the author and reader interacting with the text. But when the author is a machine, the emotional and relational facets of reading are displaced. Transparency is key to trust and confidence in any literary community. Readers ought to have a comprehensive understanding of the poem as well as its context, specifically who or what delivered it and in which manner.

Criticism derived from humanistic traits, like voice, intentionality, and emotional inflection, now needs to grapple with a post-human question: What meaning do we give to the text generated by machines? With tools such as close reading, psychoanalytic theory, or sociohistorical contextualization, can one analyze poetry that lacks human consciousness? For instance, a critic may focus on the emerging questions that AI poetry poses to traditional metaphors or genre expectations and to what extent biases embedded within training data shape its cultural reflections (Punch, 2024). Some critics remain skeptical. Poetry, in their view, devoid of an existential crisis makes that use of literary tools built for human literature, which makes sense, unlike machine texts, deeply questionable. As Elam (2023) inquires provocatively: "What is literature to AI, and what is AI to literature?" While these tensions are present, a hybrid form of a critical discourse, combining traditional literary criticism with the digital humanities, is emerging. Criticism grapples with how to situate AI poetry within histories of constraint-based writing, and multimedia poetics. They consider not only the poems, but the relationships, human and machine that generate them (Youven, 2024).

6. THE COLLABORATIVE FUTURE OF HUMAN-AI CREATIVITY

As poetry written by AI grows more frequent, the majority of those in the fields of writing, teaching, and academia cease to ponder whether or not computers are able to create poetry. What they are beginning to explore is how these machines might collaborate with human beings to produce artwork with significance. Many have found it more beneficial and helpful to view AI not simply as a

competitor of human artistic ability but rather as an accomplice in the creative process by way of pushing, challenging, and exploring the boundaries of poetic form. This represents an opportunity for us to reconsider how to define creativity, as well as authorship, originality, and the entirety of the creative experience.

There is no longer a singular or definitive understanding of AI as poet. People have begun to view AI as a collaborative partner capable of providing a variety of unexpected images, unique language formulations, and different modes of expression. Poets have the ability to select, clarify, modify and shape the generated material. The final product is representative of the collaboration between the human and the automated output. One example is the project of pharmaceuticals by artist Santos known as Pharmako-AI. Here, the human defines the physical form of the poem, while AI generates all the language, thereby creating a collage that has a cohesive direction and provides rationale for the artistic outcome. The result is both an original poem and what may be a new genre of poetry termed "processual poetry," whereby the output evolves via successive algorithms. As a result, AI's capabilities fit nicely within this continuum of progressive experimentation in that it is able to interpret text that can be easily modified by the poet. Thus, AI's proficiency directly aids contemporary poets during their writing process. AI can be an imaginative partner for poets throughout all the phases of the creative writing and revision process. For example, AI generates metaphor, generates visualizations, and expands the poet's creative range through alternative structures for poetry, as well as assisting the revision process by producing alternative language (e.g., "the evening was like a soft velvet bruise"). At the same time, AI assists with cross-linguistic translation.

In addition to this, AI assists poets in trying new techniques and thinking differently about their work, and allows poets to see their art more as a result of collaboration rather than authorship. By providing authors with new approaches and sources of information, AI acts as a buddy to inspire them to think outside the box. Through the use of algorithms, poets are able to discover new philosophical frameworks and stylistic directions. These sometimes contrasting concepts are brought together through AI's ability to act as both a collaborator and a motivator by balancing methods grounded in structure and form and those based on improvised approaches and randomness. There are many opportunities for growth in poetry through AI's assistance to expand poetic boundaries. Yu (2024)

posits that poets will enjoy greater access to time and feel less pressure to create when using digital tools of this nature. Poets may discover new styles and methods for creating original works of poetry when utilizing AI. Additionally, AI-generated poetry has been a powerful source of inspiration and provides insights into how language is constructed by way of the rhythms, patterns, clichés, metaphors and myths that comprise our collective language. The content produced using digital tools does not replace the poet; instead, it reveals the poet. Ultimately, all poets will benefit from utilizing such digital tools as a means of expanding their creative analysis.

7. CONCLUSION

The realm of AI and surrealism-based written poetry is one of the most fascinatingly dangerous areas of modern literature. This study aims to evaluate how much AI-generated poetry challenges established perceptions of creativity separate from authorship and emotion. We have analyzed both machine-generated verses as well as traditional human-created poetry for their differences, as well as conducted research on the audiences for each, and looked at the ethical grey areas regarding authorship and originality. It's clear from our research that by establishing poetry through the use of AI technology, the domain of literature has been expanded; but the human aspects of creative intuition, collective cultural memory, and the incredibly rich subtleties of human genius cannot and most likely will not be replicated.

AI has a unique role in creating poetry, and there are many fascinating aspects of that role. On one hand, it generates extraordinarily precise imagery (like a simulation) and has created surreal pieces of art in the process; however, none of these attributes derive from any emotional content nor from any intentional/psychological influences on the part of the machine (all algorithms generate surrogates according to certain patterns & probabilities). Therefore, a machine can simulate without contemplating. The machine's rhythm is mathematical, not musical; and its metaphor is associative, not symbolic. These distinctions may not seem important, but when applied to the surrealist aesthetics of poetic form (before the 20th century), where the actual is the source of the illogical & unconscious nature of, and was built into, what we consider to be the truths that govern poetic composition (ie: not an optional form).

While this suggests a real threat from AI to the world of poetry, it doesn't mean we should abandon AI entirely as a useful tool. If designed & constructed

in such a manner that it creates unique forms & frameworks for collaboration with other writers & their works (such as Pharmako-AI), and therefore encourages writers to rethink both language and methodology, then the use of AI in writing also creates opportunity for critical examination & creative exploration of text generated by machines through myriad pedagogical means (including but not limited to every pedagogy I have ever attempted to implement into my own classroom) will provide ample chances for both writers' critique of AI-generated texts, & for interaction with AI-generated texts as legitimate components of contemporary literature.

The advent of AI-generated poetry has necessitated a more thorough examination and dialogue on the ethics of artistic worth, the presence of bias and the notion of authorship. Avoiding cultural bias in data that contribute to training AI, disclosing authorship of AI creations and producing literature via AI mandates a fundamental overhaul of our current societal tenets to ensure AI will be more of a helpful tool than an impediment to the future of our society, which is in need of critical attention to ensure that the public's values and traditions continue to evolve and adapt with the integration of AI in the world of poetry to enhance the public's values rather than erode them.

The ways that readers will engage with AI poetry will greatly alter the overall consequence of this integration of AI and poetry. Current research reveals that poems still continue to carry with them a desire for the human creation of a poet made up of memories, struggles and feelings, which lends support to the human inclination of poets as not merely creators of language and culture, but more like vessels for holding humanity. However, most of the interest that readers will have in AI's creative

Acknowledgements: The author declares that no specific funding or institutional support was received for this study.

Declaration of interest: the author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? FAccT '21: Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 610–623. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- Campolo, A., Sanfilippo, M., Whittaker, M., & Crawford, K. (2017). AI Now 2017 Report. AI Now Institute, New York University. https://ainowinstitute.org/AI_Now_2017_Report.pdf
- Elkins, K., & Chun, J. (2020). Can GPT-3 pass a writer's Turing Test? *Journal of Cultural Analytics*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.22148/001c.17212>
- Floridi, L., & Chiriatti, M. (2020). GPT-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines*, 30(4), 681–694. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09548-1>
- Froushan, A. (2025). Measuring poetic intensity: A multi-dimensional AI model for evaluating creative imagination in texts. ARIN.

ability, will be the result of an inability to recognize any human attributes in the poems created by an AI, and thus the reader does not experience the human experience that would typically be associated with the poem. The impact of the above outcomes reflects the negative effect of the intention of democracy as it relates to the creation of art.

Rather than ending human-centered poetry with AI, this technology offers poets a chance to push the bounds of their imagination. It can prompt a transition of poetry from written work into curation, edit, and interpret machine generated speech. It also encourages educators and critics to reevaluate the methods they use to analyze and evaluate poetry, and will likely spark significant conversation among literature scholars about the purpose of one's()Self; what constitutes originality in the new digital reality?

AI surrealist creations provide numerous, dynamic ways to think about text, consciousness, and technology. For poets, AI has created new styles of machine and weaved together many types of craftsmanship while forcing us to rethink where the line is drawn between giving birth to creative works and serving as a creative work. What these creations do not do is capture the heart and soul of the origination process that creates poetry, by stripping away the experiential intimacy, rich culture of lexical significance, and intention of how to transform nuggets of language into written compositions. Why do we respond to a reality dominated by algorithms and imagination with horror or naive hope? Why not respond with a desire to continuously interrogate and critique each other and be mindful of being ethical during this process? Even though poets will create poems using technologies, the core essence of poetry is still rooted in the need for connection and the potential to stimulate growth or change.

- https://www.academia.edu/128006503/Measuring_Poetic_Intensity_A_Multi_Dimensional_AI_Model_for_Evaluating_Creative_Imagination_in_Texts
- Gao, J. & Yin, J. 2024. Emotional Expression of AI-generated Artistic Design: A Case Analysis Approach. *Chitrolekha Journal* 8:1 <https://doi.org/10.21659/cjad.81.v8n104>
- Elam, M. (2023). Poetry will not optimize, or what is literature to AI? *American Literature*, 95(1), 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00029831-10575077>
- Hayles, N. K. (1999). *How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226321394.001.0001>
- Hutson, J., & Schnellmann, A. (2023). The poetry of prompts: The collaborative role of generative artificial intelligence in the creation of poetry and the anxiety of machine. *Global Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 23, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.34257/GJCSTDVOL23IS1PG1>
- Iriogbe, H. (2023). Can machines be poets? Debating the authenticity of AI-created literature. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391122180_CAN_MACHINES_BE_POETS_DEBATING_THE_AUTHENTICITY_OF_AI-CREATED_LITERATURE
- Montfort, N. (2016). *Exploratory programming for the arts and humanities*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/10666.001.0001>
- Patil, D. (2025). ChatGPT and similar generative artificial intelligence in art, music, and literature industries: Applications and ethical challenges. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5057426>
- Petridou, Aikaterin., *Ai - Da: The World's First Humanoid AI artist. Will AI Become Art's Next Medium?*Dessertation. Hellenic International University
- Prabowo, B., & Asmarani, R. (2025). Generative literature: The role of artificial intelligence in the creative writing process. *Allure Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.26877/allure.v5i1.19959>
- Punch, V. (2024). Artificial intelligence, the poetic process, and the critical editor. In *AI and Literary Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003255789-38>
- Santos, A. E. dos. (2024). *Generative artificial intelligence and its impact on writing* (Doctoral dissertation, Universidade Federal de Sergipe, São Cristóvão).
- Stanko-Kaczmarek, M., Dera, L., & Koscielska, H. (2024). Between the lines: Perceptions of poetry with authorship attributed to artificial intelligence or humans – A comparative analysis. *Journal of Creative Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.1513>
- Vyas, B. (2022). Ethical implications of generative AI in art and the media. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4, 1–11. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/376717725_Ethical_Implications_of_Generative_AI_in_Art_and_the_Media
- Youvan, D. (2024). Visualizing the invisible: Artistic interpretations of Jung's collective unconscious. ResearchGate. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27793.85609>
- Yu, K. (2024). Utilizing AI in liberal arts education. *Barun Academy of History*, 20, 221–235. <https://doi.org/10.55793/jkhc.2024.20.221>.