Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics www.iiste.org
ISSN 2422-8435 An International Peer-reviewed Journal
Vol.112, 2026

Reimagining Literary Authorship in the Age of Generative AI: Human Creativity, Machine Text, and the Politics of Literary Value

Fiza
Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Department of English, Benazir Bhutoo Shaheed University, Lyari, Karachi

Javeria Bashir
Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Department of English, Benazir Bhutoo Shaheed University, Lyari, Karachi

Abstract
This article reflects a second look at authorship in literary works in the context of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), when human creativity is increasingly intertwined with machine-produced text and literary value. It aims to explore the suitability of traditional notions of authorship in the context of direct engagement with the creation of texts by large language models, to identify the layers of literature-generating processes besides those of the conventional authorial roles of text generation, agency and intent, and to examine the ways in which the AI-mediated production can alter the cultural mechanisms that enable the assignment of literary value. Theoretically, the critical interpretive method is used, which integrates close textual analysis, post structural theories of authorship, sociology of literature fields and recent research on the literature created by artificial intelligence. It introduces current research on human and AI-created fiction and it investigates the institutional, ethic, and cultural discourses that categorize, assess, and attribute machine-generated texts. The analysis suggests that GenAI is not a replacement for the human author but extends the authorship to the prompt, the selection, the revision, the interpretation, the technological platform, and the institutional recognition. It suggests a model of "relational authorship" that is different from the standard idea of writers/creators having responsibility for the text they produce, and embraces a distributed model of creative agency. Its main application is to offer literary studies a framework for assessing AI-generated compositions without de-literarising the literary value either to human exceptionalism or to technological novelty.
Keywords: generative AI, literary authorship, artificial intelligence, creativity, literary values, digital humanities, machine-generated literature, posthumanism, literary field.
DOI: 10.7176/JLLL/112-01
Publication date: October 30th 2026

1. Introduction

Literary texts are being produced, circulated and evaluated in new conditions due to the development of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI). With growing fluency, large language models (LLMs) are now able to create poems, fictional stories, dramatic dialogue, and prose that follow familiar literary conventions, with increasingly impressive results. It has provoked at the same time, technological, aesthetic, ethical, and theoretical question: What is the literary author in the age of a machine that produces significant pieces of a literary text? The debate has shifted from whether AI can produce grammatically sound text to whether it can master the language. Its question relates to the continuation of considering textual generation, creativity, authorship and literary value under the umbrella of the same human-centred category.

With the swift normalization of AI-backed writing, the need for such a question has grown. Recent empirical studies show that human readers are confronted with a meaningful and more and more evolved form of fiction production in the form of AI-generated fiction. Appel et al. (2025), for instance, did a comparison between the stories generated by ChatGPT with stories written by 100 human people and checked both linguistic characteristics and the reader's experience. Their results show that there are significant differences between the human and AI created texts, but also that generative systems have an increasing ability to engage in activities that have traditionally been performed by humans.

Similar trends have been observed in other genres of writing, such as the drama. Elias et al. (2025) drew parallels between the human and AI-generated plays by applying computational assessments of originality, fluency, flexibility and effectiveness. While the AI play did not score as highly as the human play, it showed a strong

range of creativity overall. That man did better, however, is not the important point of the study. Instead, it shows that it is possible to increasingly evaluate literary creativity with increasing comparative methods between human and machine produced texts.

This is a discreditation of one of the core tenets of literary culture: the idea that recognisable textual creativity is a sign of a human creative source. But the opposite line of reasoning—that the generative system must then be regarded as the author—is also difficult. Machine-generated linguistic sequences are one aspect of authorship, but it is not the entirety of it. It includes elements of attribution, intention, selection, interpretation, cultural positioning and responsibility.

Recent scholarship has started to differentiate these dimensions. The results of the mixed-methods factorial experiment involving 602 participants by Formosa et al. (2025) showed that the level of assistance provided in the creation process had a significant effect on judgments of authorship, creatorship and responsibility. They also found that human assistants are credited more authorship and responsibility than similar levels of support by AI assistants. This implies that capability to help create a text is distinguished from the capability to be an author.

The difference is more significant because the authorship of literature isn't just the writing of certain sentences. It also represents a social, institutional classification. The title of a novel, poem or play sets up a connection between text and person, and allows for recognition and responsibility to be assigned to the reader, publisher, critic, and institution. Generative AI thus establishes a conceptual divide between the production of text and the role of the author in literary studies that must be faced and overcome.

This problem is exacerbated by the emergence of AI systems that can imitate style. In the context of the literary and political, Alsadhan (2026) explored how well LLMs can replicate identifiable stylistic traits of literary and political figures. While the statistics of the AI produced texts were seen to have converged with the statistics of human texts on several linguistic criteria, the study also revealed ongoing statistical differences between the AI produced corpora and the human written corpora. The results provide an important contribution to literary research since they show that recognisability of style is not computationally determined in terms of the cultural identity, biography or experiential position of the writer whose style is emulated by the system.

The article answers three research questions:
RQ1: What are the implications for traditional notions of authorship in the context of generative AI?
RQ2: What is the difference between human and machine-generated texts in terms of creative agency?
RQ3: What are the implications of AI's intervention in literary creation for the cultural politics of literary value?
The analysis suggests that these questions relate to each other. Any account of literary authorship must be approached in the light of the shifting circumstances of literary value. The question of who is going to receive recognition for the words, who's going to be accountable for them, and what cultural conditions are going to give them value as literature is not just at stake here, but it is at stake.

2. Literature review

2.1. The use of AI to create literature and the modification of creativity.

AI-generated literature is no longer a speculative discussion but a subject of empirical investigation, as evidenced in the literature published during 2025. To compare the creativity of human and AI playwriting, Elias et al. (2025) used computational metrics of creativity to assess the performance of human and AI playwriting, and concluded that the performance of the human-generated drama is better overall, albeit the AI-generated drama has still some creative potential. The result is significant since it suggests that AI is neither exclusively creative nor exclusively non-creative. Rather, creativity is seen as a multi-dimensional phenomenon, and machine-generated texts might excel on certain dimensions while reflecting other differences from literary productions by humans.

Appel et al. (2025) also show the benefit of drawing parallels between written fiction and AI-generated fiction as well as between people and the AI. It is important because it extends the analysis of what they write, to an examination of how readers encounter and experience stories. Clearly, the idea is that there should be more than just a linguistic form to be valued for its literary value. The reader's understanding of the production process and their sense of the author's identity and expectations for authenticity may affect how they receive the text.

A more comprehensive review of creativity studies from 2025 also indicates that GenAI should not only be thought of as a substitute for human creativity. The systematic literature review and meta-analysis suggest that in some creative tasks, human-human co-creative collaboration can lower the diversity of ideas generated along

with human- GenAI co-creative collaboration. This presents an interesting paradox: AI can boost short-term creative output, but it also might limit the scope of creativity.

This paradox is essential for studies in the literature. It is not enough to have a lot of satisfactory literature, literature is valuable. Innovation often requires a deviation from the norm, experimentation, and resistance to dominant conventions in literature. A system designed using large-scale pattern recognition, then, could possibly be very successful at generating plausible literary language, while at the same time facilitating stylistic convergence.

2.2. Collaborating with AI in writing and authoring.

The distribution of the creative responsibility has become an increasing focus of research on authorship. One of the most directly relevant empirical studies is by Formosa et al. (2025). In their experiment, they looked at how participants rated human authors that got varying levels of support from either an AI or human assistant. The results indicated that the level of assistance affects perceptions of authorship and responsibility, and the type of assistant affects perceptions of the assisting agent.

This discovery calls into question the duality "human author vs AI author". The term literary production is best seen as a continuum of support and intervention. A human can use an LLM to spark an idea for a plot, to come up with different descriptions of the same event, to rewrite a paragraph and even to develop an entire novel or short story. They entail very different shifts in creative agency, but are frequently confused within institutional discourse under the heading of "AI use".

Likewise, Watson et al. (2025) show how GenAI is challenging and remixing the conventions of authorship, and how computational systems are becoming part of what has been traditionally considered a human scholarly agent. Their theme is not literary authorship but academic, but the conceptual implications are relevant to literature, as in both cases, authorship, accountability and institutional recognition are essential.

The recent literature is thus aligned with a stratified model of authorship whereby a distinction may be made between the generation of the text, its intention, its selection and its responsibility.

2.3. AI as a literary and sociocultural actor.

Building on this, Roland et al. (2025) investigate AI systems as sociocultural actors in simulated literary fields. Their study models 101 "AI authors" and examines how AI copies concepts of literary distinction in regard to race, gender, and publishing. This work is of great importance as it acknowledges that AI is not an outsider to literary culture. Patterns of cultural materials are inherited by models and can be reproduced by them, leading to replications of hierarchies of recognition and representation.

This brings up an interesting question about the literary value. If an LLM echoes and mimics stylistic traits of historically dominant writers over the voices of marginal writers, then computational literary production can reaffirm existing cultural inequalities. AI-generated literature is thus not composed in a cultural void. It is woven into datasets, literary platforms, commercial literary structures and literary recognition histories.

Haidemariam (2026) explores a similar query concerning the re-distribution of creative functions in cultural production as it relates to GenAI. The study does not view AI as a standalone tool for creating art, but as a player in human-centric creative processes. This helps to reinforce the present article's argument that the unit of analysis is not just the machine, but a human–machine assemblage.

2.4. Toward relational authorship

The most directly relevant recent theoretical development is the conceptual struggle against the notion of AI authorship developed by Uebel and Hamamra (2026) who argue that generative systems cannot have the normative function of (accountability, vulnerability and justificatory) dialogue. They suggest a relational approach to authorship that is based on the principles of ethical and epistemic stewardship.

This insight is taken over and further developed in the present article in the field of literature. Relational authorship is here defined not only in terms of co-authorship, but as a combination of four aspects:
Generation: Output of linguistic material by an AI system.
2. Direction — literary purposes, constraints and contexts that are humanly established.
3. Selection and transformation – human evaluation, editing, combination and revision.
4. Accountability — responsibility for publication, representation and cultural consequences.

This framework allows a more nuanced analysis then "AI author" or "AI tool". It understands that machine generated is materially significant and does not equate generation with authorship.

3. Research methodology

3.1. Research design

The study is qualitative research with interpretive research design, which is suitable for literary and cultural studies research. Instead of fabricating speculations about reader responses and engagement or a new experimental research project with primary data, the research investigates the developing scholarly and literary literature on the topic of AI-mediated authorship.

The method used is a combination of critical literature synthesis, comparative conceptual analysis and interpretative textual analysis. It is not about the objective of the creativity of the AI, but about the contemporary scholarship's definition of what is and what is not creative, who's writing and who's not, and who's valuable and who's responsible.

Corpus and selection criteria

The research corpus includes peer-reviewed or academically published studies from 2025 and 2026 that have at least one of the following topics:

- AI-generated literature;
- human versus AI-generated non-fiction; and
- AI-generated drama;
- literary authorship;
- AI-assisted creative writing;
- stylistic imitation;
- literary creativity;
- how culture can be leveraged to enhance the capabilities of GenAI;
- distributed creativity;
- authorship and responsibility.

Studies by Appel et al. (2025), Elias et al. (2025), Formosa et al. (2025), Roland et al. (2025), Haidemariam (2026), Alsadhan (2026) and Uebel and Hamamra (2026) are particularly examined as they offer complementary empirical, computational, literary and theoretical perspectives.

3.2. Analytical procedure

The analysis is carried out in four stages.

The literature was categorized based on the main concept being examined: authorship, creativity, generation, agency, literary value, authenticity and responsibility/cultural recognition.

Second, conceptual relationships were recognized that reoccur. For instance, research focused on authorship often differentiated between human support and AI support; literary research started to focus more on prompting, editing, curating and disclosing paratexts.

Third, the findings were compared in empirical and conceptual studies to find commonalities and differences.

Fourth, the resulting patterns were synthesized into the proposed framework of the relational authorship.

The approach is therefore interpretative, and not statistical. It is not meant to be a statement of the universal properties of all AI-generated literature, but rather a suggestion of what it might look like. It rather outlines a pattern found in the current scholarship literature, one that is theoretically informed: Literary production is becoming more distributed across AI, yet still requires human processes of selection, contextualisation and accountability.

3.3. Analytical limitations

The conclusions of the study do not necessarily represent claims about the population of literary audiences, since the study is not based on a newly recruited sample of writers or readers. The proposed model needs to be validated through reader tests, interviews of authors, corpus analysis and longitudinal research in the future.

4. Results and analysis

Result 1: "Generative capacity and authorship are separable.

First major point: It is not enough to write with literary language to be an author.

Recent empirical research has shown that AI systems have the ability to generate recognisable literary forms. There are many ways to measure degrees of creativity in AI-generated plays and AI-generated stories can be read as a coherent object of story. But these results reflect the competence in writing, not authorship.

The difference is that:

Generation - Who or what created the linguistic material?

Authorship questions: "Who claims, interprets, contexts and takes responsibility for the work?"

They are not the same questions.

LLM can create a paragraph without having a human project in literature. A human writer can choose that paragraph, edit it, add it to a story, decide on its meaning, and then publish the story. The literary object is then, in turn, the result of a process of machine-generated and human-given judgment.

This distinction is echoed by the results of Formosa et al. (2025), who found that participants were able to tell the difference between the contribution of their human and AI assistant, despite receiving assistance of similar levels. The findings indicate that there is no simple correlation between the amount of linguistic material produced and social understandings of authorship.

Result 2: The human author is changing from the originator to the coordinator.

The second finding is related to the transformation of the role of the human writer.

Within literary production, traditionally, the author is conceived in the role of the source of the work. Within AI-mediated writing, the human writer might be progressively being used more as a creative coordinator.

That doesn't have to take away human creativity.

A writer can set up the plot, create a character, decide on a theme, come up with various ideas, abandon some ideas, sift through and select others, try the story again, tweak the language and then choose which form in which the story circulates in public consciousness.

The creative process is thus a process of iteration:

The sequence of intention, generation, evaluation, selection, revision, contextualization and publication is the order in which it is performed. The order in which it is carried out is intention, generation, evaluation, selection, revision, contextualization and publication.

This is also not the whole process the AI system is involved in.

This phenomenon aligns with recent studies on the creation of literature with the aid of AI, which elucidate the roles of prompting, editing and curating in the continued human agency of machine-generated texts.

This change is not to be taken lightly. Traditional literary criticism has been focused on the finished product. The creative process is becoming more significant as AI is increasingly being used in literature. Two texts can be linguistically alike but have different literary value due to the processes of intention, selection and revision.

Result 3: Authorship is becoming more of an issue of accountability.

The third is that there is a better yardstick for contemporary authorship than text generation itself – namely, accountability.

The human author can be queried:

Why does the writer have written this story?

- Why was this character represented in this way?

Why was this verse included?

What sources did you get information from for the work?

- Was AI used?
- How much of the text was generated?

Whose fault is harmful or misleading representation?

The following is not to say that an LLM cannot be engaged in this normative exchange, as it can, but not in the same way as can a human author.

One of the key distinctions that Uebel and Hamamra (2026) develop is that AI systems can serve as strong elements in distributed creative assemblages, where they do not require to be held accountable for their actions as authors.

The argument is especially pertinent to literature because the texts often come to terms with subjects of historical interest. A human author may be asked about depictions of race, gender, violence, migration, class or cultural identity. If an AI-generated text makes such representations, it is not enough to simply put the burden on the algorithm.

The authorial category is then not only called “generator” but “accountable agent”.

Result 4: Shift from product to process in literary value.
The fourth discovery has to do with the literary worth.
When AI systems produce grammatically complex and convincing prose from the drop of a hat, linguistic skill fades. The value of a literary product becomes more and more dependent on its provenance: its mode and method of production, its origin, its conditions of production, the extent of human intervention.

In modern literary experimentation, there is a strong trace of significance attached to a literary work and called its "provenance". Studies of AI-generated literature have demonstrated that paratextual elements around the AI-mediated literature can reveal the process of the prompt, editing and co-creation and hence shape the construction of authorship and value.

This gives rise to a seeming paradox.

The more easily literary language can be produced, the more significant the history of the text can be. Human readers might enjoy a novel not just for the sentences, but for the relationship of the sentences to a certain person, a certain kind of work, a certain cultural place and a certain creative struggle.

But it does not mean that writing by people will always be beautiful. Appel et al. (2025) prove that the stories produced by AI can be compared with human stories in an empirical way in both textual and experiential terms, while Elias et al. (2025) demonstrate that the AI-generated drama achieves a high level of creative performance.

Instead, the discovery indicates that there are separate variables for aesthetic quality and cultural value. Literary value is not just a function of cultural values, but while literary texts may have cultural values, they may also be aesthetically effective without having those values.

Result 5: Where originality is concerned, AI’s ability to mimic styles wrenches it from its moorings.

The fifth discovery is on style. Alasadhan's (2026) study into the stylistic imitation of AI reveals that LLM can replicate recognizable linguistic traits of literary and political personalities, but with remaining stylistic differences from human-generated texts.

The discovery has implications for literary theory. Appropriating style in a computational sense is what will make style cease to be a simple signal of individual identity. However, style is more than just a pattern in statistics.

A literary style is developed by the repetition of experiences between words and the world. It is a reflection of time, history, memory, genre preferences, personal preferences. AI can replicate patterns of a style, but not necessarily the conditions of that style.

Therefore, the act of simulation of style should not be taken as synonymous with literary identity.

This is particularly true when models create the voices of marginalised writers. Literary stylistic patterns can be computationally extracted, and then reused as a technology. The consequence is an ethical issue not only about copyright, but also about cultural power.

Result 6: AI could help boost productivity and reduce creativity.

The sixth finding relates to the question of efficiency and originality.

The new creativity literature claims that human–AI collaboration can enhance the performance on some creative tasks while decreasing the diversity of ideas.

This is a key difference for literary production.

What is new on the literary market is the ability to produce narrative structures and commercially successful styles that are familiar to readers. The efficiency of GenAI might inadvertently exacerbate these trends, especially when trained on extensive amounts of existing cultural production and optimized for generating plausible continuations.

The danger is therefore not necessarily that AI will produce “bad literature”.

The other risk is that it might churn out too much familiar literature.

When literary texts are so technically accomplished and so stylistically uniform, the identification of genuine experimentation might be more difficult.

Literary value would then become a matter of politics, for writers and institutions to identify, defend and reward the divergent.

5. Discussion

The results suggest that generative AI is not just adding another tool to literary production, but a shift in the conceptual dynamic between the production of the text, creativity, authorship and literary value. The question of whether or not AI can now be an author is no longer the more fruitful one than is the one of how authorship is reorganized when linguistic production is distributed between human and computational systems.For the moment, the question “Can AI be an author?” is not as fruitful as the one of how authorship is reorganized when linguistic production is distributed between human and computational systems. Uebel and Hamamra (2026) state that the generative systems can be strong elements of socio-technical creative systems but are not capable of taking on the role of the authors' normative position of accountability, vulnerability and justificatory role. This is significant for literary studies because it doesn't allow for the production of texts to be interpreted as a synonym for the author's agency. An LLM can produce a poem, a passage of narrative, a scene of drama, but the qualities of the literature this material will become will depend upon the individual and institutional practices it undergoes in its selection, interpretation, editing, attribution and circulation.

In the present study, then, the distinction between generative capacity and authorial agency is affirmed. Empirical studies in recent years have shown that AI systems are capable of generating coherent and stylistically appropriate texts that are worthy of direct comparison with human writing. In an experimental study with 602 participants (Formosa et al. 2025), the level of assistance offered by an AI tool had a significant effect on the perception of authorship, creatorship and responsibility, and participants still reported a difference between human assistants and AI when evaluating the assisting agent. These results indicate that readers don't always think of textual contribution as the same as authorship. Rather, the degree of assistance given, and the level of assistance, and assumptions about the abilities of the contributing agent, all impact judgments of authorship. This helps to make the case made in this article that the production of linguistic material needs to be analytically distinguished from the more general cultural and normative role of authorship.

The difference is especially important in the context of literature. Vlaad (2025) shows that AI-generated literature engenders a unique interpretative challenge as traditional approaches based on the author's intention are

more problematic when there is no conventional human author. Her analysis also indicates that AI-generated texts can still have meaning, but it may need to be interpreted as a piece of literature to go beyond an obvious appeal to the intentions of the first writer. The consequences of this development are of great significance for modern literary criticism. But if text without a traditional author does not obtain significance, then authorship cannot be seen as a condition for textual significance. Concurrently, the unassigned authorship of the work raises interpretative and framing questions of authorship as well as questions of authorship of origin.But at the same time, the problem of authorship (which is unassigned in the present instance) heightens rather than diminishes the importance of questions of framing and interpretive responsibility. The literature generated from the use of AI, in turn, moves from an interpretation centred perspective to an interpretation that takes into account the interaction between the generated language, the human intervention and the cultural conventions and the interpretation of the reader.

The results also confirm that the human writer does not necessarily have to go by the wayside of literature, but is more and more shifting roles. The human writer does not necessarily play the role of the creator of any given linguistic sequence, but may increasingly become a designer, curator, editor and evaluator of generated possibilities.

Haidemariam (2026) further asserts that the role of generative AI in the cultural production process is to shift the functions of creativity from the human creator to the human-driven cultural production process instead of eliminating or replacing human creativity. This is important because it calls into question the prevailing belief that machine participation leads to less human creativity. Instead, human creativity can be focused on decisions about the direction of the narrative, selection, revision, contextualisation and evaluation. It is not, then, the percentage of handwritten words that is the problem, but the nature of the human decisions made as to what will eventually be a literary work.

This re-distribution of creative labour also involves the need to differentiate between distributed creativity and distributed responsibility. While generative AI can be part of the creative process, there's no escaping the fact that responsibility cannot be delegated to the system that generated the text. Today's AI systems are not capable of taking a normative role of answerability, since they can not engage in practices of justification, take responsibility or answer criticism as agents of their own are required to do. This is particularly relevant to literature since they often deal with culturally and ethically sensitive topics. If the AI-generated narrative reproduces stereotypes, distorts the history or represents a community in a harmful way, it is not sufficiently fair to say that it's the fault of the model. The production, publication and other identification of such content still lie within the power of human authors, editors, publishers and other identifiable cultural agents as to when, and in what way, such content might be taken up by the public sphere.

The politics of literary value is therefore in the midst of a related metamorphosis. The more that generative systems can generate linguistically competent prose, the less singular and therefore the less distinctive prose will be when judged by textual fluency. Exactly this is the problem identified by Danesi (2025) in his analysis of mechanical literary works, which reflect a growing trend in the production of literary texts by artificial intelligence, posing fundamental questions about creativity, authorship, interpretations and the meaning of literature in the future. In no way does this mean that works written by AI are not necessarily less beautiful than human writing. Instead, literary value must be assessed in other ways besides formal or stylistic. Literary cultures might come to rely more on source, purpose, cultural location, authorial articulation and conditions of creation of a text as machine-generated language becomes more advanced.

This is supported by recent studies reflecting an approach to AI as a sociocultural literary actor. Roland et al. (2025) see AI systems in the literary domain as not individual technological devices, but rather as systems. Their simulations of AI “authors” show that generative systems can mimic and manipulate aspects of literary distinction in the social identity, publishing context and cultural position. This discovery is significant because literary value is always created by a combination of language and text. It is produced by the interplay between writers, publishers, critics, readers and institutions and cultural expectations. AI systems, in turn, are indirectly involved with these structures in the data they are trained on, the prompts they are provided with, the platforms on which they are deployed, and the institutional environments where their results are shared. Therefore, AI-made texts ought not to be judged solely as a technological product, but rather as a part of literary culture that is already in place.

Originality is especially tricky in this case. The contemporary generative systems can generate more or less recognizable stylistic patterns, and it becomes more and more difficult to consider stylistic resemblance as decisive evidence concerning the individual literary identity. Recent stylometric studies on the creative output of humans and computers have shown that the machine's output may have some linguistic characteristics in common with human writing that can be measured and quantified, but also has some distinguishable characteristics. Such discoveries would not only have implications for AI detection but also for VR experiences and the way they are created. They believe that style can slowly start to be perceived as something to be mathematically represented and emulated. However, historical, cultural and experiential conditions that engender an author's style do not necessarily reproduce the computational reproducibility of style. A machine can imitate the linguistic surface of a literary voice but lacks the situated experience out of which it grew. The separation of stylistic imitation and cultural authorship thus becomes ever more pronounced.

This issue is pertinent particularly in literary traditions where voice is closely related to identity, historical memory and cultural experience. Questions of literary value are entangled with questions of cultural authority if generative systems can produce the stylistic features of specific writers or literary communities. But it is not just about how close an AI-produced text is to being a human's writing style: It's about whether patterns of style can be distinguished from the historical and cultural context in which they exist. To make a literary statement, AI writing should not be confused with statistical similarity. It is also an idea which might indicate that literary research should focus on the underlying datasets, cultural values and representational forms that are involved in generative systems, not just the resulting works.

The results also indicate that a literary piece's provenance could become more and more a part of literary value. With the growing prevalence of such machine-generated text, readers and institutions might want to understand how a text was created, how much it was created with AI and what part the human writer played in the creation. Knowledge of the production process is already important in perceptions of AI-assisted creative production, as revealed by disclosure practices (Formosa et al., 2025), showing that social judgments of authorship and responsibility involve knowledge of the production process. Likewise, new research on authorship and AI recently contended that the task of attributing authorship requires a focus on the real-world interactions between human creativity and the assistance of AI, and not consideration of all AI assisted products as a uniform entity. The results suggest that the story of the text's production could become more and more of a part of the cultural identity of the text.

However, this doesn't necessarily reduce the literary value of AI-generated content. Rather, it can yield new modes of literary distinction. A future literary culture might appreciate literature based on the obviousness in its creation, the complexity of human editorial manipulation, the ethical application of generative systems, and the originality of the human conceptual system that serves as the basis for the use of machine-generated materials. In this regard, generative AI could alter the meaning of literary value from the creation of language to the curation, transformation and contextualisation of language.

The writer's creative effort, then, would move away from the continuous inscription and towards a certain choice in a growing domain of possibilities created.

The result of the present study also adds to the field of literary criticism. In traditional close reading, the literary text is the focus of the analysis, while AI mediated literature places the conditions of textual production more into view. When reading a novel generated by AI, for instance, one must also take into account the process of prompting, iterative generation, selection, editing and disclosure. Watson et al. (2025) also maintain that the GPT revolution is redefining traditional conceptions of authorship, as it is reshaping the dynamics between technological systems, agents and institutions. In the case of literary studies, it means that the process-oriented methodology should be integrated with a close approach to the text rather than supplanted. The literary text is still the main focus and the history of its production is added to the layers of interpretation.

Combined, these findings are consistent with the idea of relational authorship, although there is a caveat: the authorship of a HAS should not be one-to-one distributed amongst all actors of the system. The role of an AI model, a human writer, an editor, and a publisher can all be involved in the creation of the literary object, although their tasks are quite different. The writer plays a role in setting goals and making judgements, the editor in shaping the text and its institutional context, and the publisher in bringing it to the public and granting its cultural legitimacy. The case of authorship is thus more complex than a straightforward credit-sharing scenario, but is rather a patterned transaction between various modalities of agency. The social responsibility that is

currently in development (2026) is especially applicable here, as it focuses on the need for there to be identifiable human actors, who are answerable in a social sense for the products of an AI.

In conclusion, the overarching message is that generative AI is not wiping out the idea of the author, but revealing its inner workings. Prompt, algorithms, datasets, interfaces, editors and audiences change the face of the traditional image of the individual author. But the other extreme, of considering the AI system as an autonomous author, is not sufficient to explain the normative aspects of literary authorship either. The more defensible position is thus relational: literary production can be technologically distributed, but authorial responsibility must be firmly grounded in human practices of intention, selection, interpretation and accountability. This also leaves room for the idea that the literature produced by AI could truly become a form of art and culture, even though it is not necessarily human art or culture.

In the GenAI era, the politics of literary value will rely more and more on the negotiations of literary institutions with regard to the value, provenance and responsibility of literature. The profusion of machine-generated texts might lead to a blurring of linguistic skills and an increase in the value of human judgment, cultural situatedness and ethical accountability. Instead of the question of whether AI can replace human writers, literary research should thus explore how AI alters the conditions for writing to be recognized as literature. The most significant change might not be the arrival of machine-generated text, but the arrival of a culture of reading in which readers, publishers and critics will have to learn all the time to make a distinction between reading and being read. The presence of another powerful language producer might not be the only reason why human authors have lasting importance, but because they can provide explanations for the work, they can place it in a cultural landscape and hold themselves responsible for the meaning and action of the work.

6. Conclusion

The advent of Generative AI is no reason to say goodbye to the human author. Shows that the writer is not just a person who writes words.

The act of writing is a cultural practice.

It relates textual production to purpose, authenticity, authority, ownership, accountability, meaning, and worth. GenAI upsets the first of these relationships by separating language generation from human writing. But this disruption emphasizes the other relationships.

The wisest answer is, then, neither that it is the new author nor that there has been no change. Both roles have a faulty understanding of the complexity of modern literature production.

The argument here is that the authorship of literary works should be rethought as ‘relational authorship', a situation where creative production can be shared between human and computational agents, but the authorial responsibility is allocated to definite human agents and institutions.

This model doesn't rule out the role of the machine. Nor does it maintain a noncritical myth of human genius. It separates the capacity to produce text from the capacity to hold an accountable cultural place, however.

A distinction like that is becoming more and more essential, as literary value is changing as well. Where language production is profuse, it is not text which is lacking, but meaningfully distinct text. Hence, authenticity, cultural situatedness, embodied experience, ethical responsibility, formal risks and historical awareness can be given fresh meaning.

A central issue facing literary research is the question, then, of whether machines can replace writers. It is important to learn about the nature of literature in the context of distributed socio-technical writing.

Literary authorship is not going to be just human or just machine. It will be relational and not relational.

But, because it is relational, it is the fundamental literary question again –

6.1. Recommendations

Based on the results, five recommendations are put forward.

Firstly, a distinction should be drawn between the two concepts of generation and authorship in literary scholarship. AI systems cannot be automatically assumed to be the authors simply because they produce linguistic content.

Second, the literary researcher should view the texts created by AI as a "processual object. Analysis should include prompts, revisions, selection, paratexts and contexts for publication with the final text.

Third, implement a progressive level of AI disclosure policies by publishers and literary institutions. How much or how much AI is involved should be recorded, rather than simply reported as yes or no.

Fourth, the university must educate in the critical AI literacy in literary studies. Students need to be able to assess artificial language and maintain their own interpretation, creative judgment, and cultural responsibility.

Fifth, relational authorship should be empirically tested in future studies. Experiments that involve reader response, interviews with writers, stylometric comparison, corpus analysis, and longitudinal studies could help identify the importance of literary value that could be different with varying degrees of use of AI.

6.2 Limitations

There are some limitations to this study. First, its evidence is mostly in the form of literature and documented literary experiments that have been published in the year 2025 and 2026. The results are subject to change if additional technological developments are made in the field. Secondly, the study is not experimental, and it does not allow for population level claims from readers or writers. Third, the notion of relational authorship must be tested on a variety of literary cultures, languages, and publishing contexts.

Therefore, a study of literature, mediated by AI, needs to be studied beyond the dominantly Anglophone context. Comparative research with literature from other cultures in South Asia, Africa, Middle East, and elsewhere would be especially important as the ideas of authorship, originality, and literary authority can be quite different in different cultures.

References

Alsadhan, N. A. (2026). Decoding AI authorship: Can LLMs truly mimic human style across literature and politics? *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities, 41*(2), 594–612.

Appel, M., Malecki, W. P., Messingschlager, T. V., & Winkler, J. R. (2025). I, ChatGPT: Linguistic properties and human experiences of human- versus AI-generated stories. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12*, Article 1892.

Barthes, R. (1977). The death of the author. In S. Heath (Trans.), *Image–music–text* (pp. 142–148). Hill and Wang. (Original work published 1967)

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature*. Columbia University Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). What is an author? In D. F. Bouchard (Ed.), *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected essays and interviews* (pp. 113–138). Cornell University Press.

Formosa, P., Bankins, S., Matulionyte, R., & Ghasemi, O. (2025). Can ChatGPT be an author? Generative AI creative writing assistance and perceptions of authorship, creatorship, responsibility, and disclosure. *AI & Society, 40*, 3405–3417.

Haidemariam, T. (2026). After generative AI: Authorship, labour, and cultural governance. *AI & Society*. Advance online publication.

Nath, R. (2025). Artificial intelligence (AI): An evolution toward an “authorless” literature. *World Futures, 81*(4), 291–298.

Raffini, D. (2025). Authorship and hallucination in AI-generated literary texts. In *Proceedings in humanities and social science* (pp. 21–31). Springer.

Ramos-Zaga, F. A. (2025). Reconceptualizing human authorship in the age of generative AI: A normative framework for copyright thresholds. *Laws, 14*(6), Article 84.

Roland, E., So, R. J., & Long, H. (2025). The social AI author: Modeling creativity and distinction in simulated cultural fields. *AI & Society*.

Uebel, M., & Hamamra, B. (2026). Authorship after generative AI: Distributed creativity and relational responsibility. *Philosophy & Technology, 39*, Article 152.

Vlaad, S. (2025). Texts without authors: Ascribing literary meaning in the case of AI. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 83*(1), 4–11.

Watson, S., Brezovec, E., & Romic, J. (2025). The role of generative AI in academic and scientific authorship: An autopoietic perspective. *AI & Society, 40*, 3225–3235.

Yong Pung How, C. L. S., & Limb, D. (2026). The case for AI authorship in copyright law. *Law, Innovation and Technology, 18*(1), 43–82.

Zafar, M. B., Ali, H., & Yasin, T. (2025). Reimagining human creativity and learning in the age of generative AI: A multi-method meta-thematic synthesis. *Next Research, 2*(4), Article 100802.