COHERENCE – The Multidisciplinary Research Journal
Volume No: 17, Issue No: 2, Year: 2026 (July-December)
PP: 349-360
ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

THE POST-HUMAN ARTIST: RETHINKING AUTHORSHIP IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Kashish Verma

Student
Bachelor of Fine Arts, School of Art & Architecture, Sushant University, Gurugram, India

Aaditya Bijalwan

Assistant Professor
BFA Programme, School of Art & Architecture, Sushant University, Gurugram, India

Neha Gupta

Associate Professor
School of Engineering and Technology, Sushant University, Gurgaon

Orchid id_ 0000-0002-1201-777X

Choubey Rashmi Chinmoy

Student
Bachelor of Fine Arts, School of Art & Architecture, Sushant University, Gurugram, India

Rudraksh Kaushik

Student
Bachelor of Fine Arts, School of Art & Architecture, Sushant University, Gurugram, India

ABSTRACT

Generative Artificial intelligence challenges the traditional view of the artist as the sole originator of a work, raising the issue of who holds authorship and agency when an image is produced through human and machine collaboration. This paper examines how generative AI reshapes these concepts by drawing on theories of authorship from Barthes and Foucault and on posthuman thought from Haraway, Hayles and Braidotti. It proposes that authorship is better understood as a distributed, process-based practice than as a single act of image-making, and it introduces the "post-human artist" as one whose creative agency develops through relationships with computational systems rather than in opposition to them.

Three case studies illustrate different modes of human-machine involvement: Obvious's potrait of Edmond de belamy (2018), Anna Ridler's Mydriad (tulips) and mosaic virus (2018-19), and Refik Anadol's Unsupervised: Machine Hallucinations- MoMA (2022-23). Comparing them reveals a progression from attribution to labor to agency and shows a central tension between distributed production and concentrated attribution. The paper also considers the ethical and legal challenges of AI-generated art, including training-data consent, copyright and legal authorship, originality and style, dataset bias, and hidden labour. It concludes that generative AI does not bring about the "death of the artist" but relocates artistic agency, while responsibility remains with artists, developers, and institutions. The focus of inquiry should therefore move away from identifying who made the image and toward examining who designed the system, who curated the data, whose labor is embedded in the model, and who exercises judgement over the final output.

Keywords: Generative Ai, authorship, artistic agency, post-human artist, Ai art, Copyright, dataset ethics.

© Copyright @ Authors

ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

1. INTRODUCTION

The link between art and the field of technology has been ever evolving. There have been instances starting from photography and mechanical reproduction up to video, algorithmic systems and online media that artists have used latest technologies to practice art that earlier solely depended on a person and his or her manual abilities. [1], [2] In this regard, artificial intelligence raises an important question: When an image is generated by artificial intelligence without any human involvement, the identity of its creator becomes uncertain. The question is much deeper than creating images with the help of a machine. [3], [4]

To talk about generative artificial intelligence systems, it is worth mentioning that these systems are different from ordinary tools since they do not just repeat what has already been said. Generally, artificial intelligence (AI) learns from the data presented in various datasets and uses this information to create latest content. The different models of artificial intelligence used already proved that these systems can combine the existing forms of images and style.

This implies that the artist is now increasingly able to work through means of inspiring, repeating, choosing, changing, training, and curating instead of directly producing all visual elements. This, therefore, creates the instability of a traditional understanding of the artist as an independent originator. The romantic understanding of the artist promotes such things as originality, self-expression, intention as well as one individual creative subject. [5] However, it is worth mentioning that representatives of literary theory of the twentieth century have already questioned this understanding. For instance, Roland Barthes has called into question the notion of the author as the sole creator of meaning while Michel Foucault has analysed authorship as a mechanism of controlling the discourse in society. [6], [7] In addition, Donna Haraway and N. Katherine Hayles have questioned the idea of being able to separate human agency from technological systems. [8], [9] Thus, generative AI does not create such a problem of the distributed authorship, it just makes the older theoretical question visible in present-day artistic practice. [10]

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to say that Artificial Intelligence (AI) render artists meaningless. The artistic process with Artificial Intelligence (AI) still requires the human intervention, including the choice of subject and data sets, prompts, model, output, managing, and processing data. Anna Ridler's process is particularly interesting since the dataset contributes to the art. She shot and labelled many hundreds of tulips and what is usually hidden in the creative process becomes visible as part of the work. [11] In her next work, Mosaic Virus, this data set is the basis for generating a new colourful image of tulips. [11] Therefore, the work does not replace human work but rather shows the correlation between the usage of human classifications, machine learning, and the cultural meaning behind it. The art installation known as Unsupervised Machine Hallucinations MoMA by Refik Anadol offers more than simply an automatic machine that generates images. The installation is rooted in the machine learning process that interprets the data from The Museum of Modern Art's collection while also taking environmental aspects into account, including light, movement, sounds, and weather. [12] The implication of this art piece is that Artificial Intelligence (AI) art is better viewed as a socio-technical phenomenon than a mere outcome of an algorithm on its own. [10] The algorithm serves as a part of a bigger whole that incorporates the artist, the institution, the dataset, the software and hardware, the environment, and, finally, the audience. These examples reflect the key research question of this section: How does the combination of generative artificial intelligence and art change people's belief of the concept of authorship and agency in art? The paper puts forward the idea that neither declaring artificial intelligence (AI) to be an artist nor

© Copyright @ Authors

ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

treating artificial intelligence (AI) as a neutral tool is a valid choice. Generative artificial intelligence (AI) should be viewed in terms of its role in the common field of agency. This implies that while idea of authorship becomes more complicated, responsibility stays intact.

In this paper, the author connects worldwide de facto philosophical implications of authorship theory with reality of the modern visual art. [6], [7], [9] Three case studies are analysed in which the authors discuss several ways of how humans and machines take part in authorship practices: Portrait of Edmond de Belamy; Myriad (Tulips)/Mosaic Virus; and Unsupervised work of art. After that, the authors summarise what such distinctions mean for originality, labor, authenticity, copyright, ethics, and the evolution of artistic practices.

2. BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Theorists have questioned the notion of an individual, identifiable author who has the complete control in figuring out the production and meaning of a work. [13] Roland Barthes's The Death of the Author questions the significance given to the individual author's intention. [6] Here, he puts forward an interesting argument that meaning should not be confined to what the artist intends to communicate. Meaning appears through various factors-language, cultural influence and the viewer's or reader's interpretation. From this standpoint, the work becomes open to interpretations beyond the control of the creator, and the author is no longer considered as an individual source of meaning. Since traditionally the artist has been understood as the sole source of a work's ideas, decisions and final form, artistic production is not an isolated activity as it is affected by existing visuals, cultural and social contexts, materials, and other technological tools. In reference to artificial intelligence, these complexities become clearer because the outcome of the artwork may result from an interaction between the artist's prompts, computational system's procedures, system trained data and the selection and modification of the artist.

Correspondingly, Michel Foucault's idea of the "author-function" also regards authorship as an institutional and cultural concept instead of purely the identity of an individual person. [7] It explains how authorship works as an institutional and cultural construct. Foucault examines how the author's name organises, classifies, and assigns importance and value to texts within specific social and historical contexts. He does not merely treat the author as an individual who produces a work. Authorship does not identify as an individual identity or creative intention, it is also shaped by systems of ownership, classification, authority, and cultural recognition.

Together these perspectives critique the assumption that authorship appears entirely within an individual. Even though Barthes focuses on the relationship between the author, the text and the reader, Foucault examines institutional constructs of the author's identity. [6], [7] Both provide frameworks for reconsidering authorship. In the context of artificial intelligence (AI), these arguments become particularly relevant in the areas where artistic production involved. Interactions between human decisions, training data, and computational process. The occurrence of artificial intelligence (AI) generated art therefore shifts the understanding about authorship beyond the individual artist and involves a wider network of human and technological interactions.

These notions become pertinent to artificial intelligence (AI) artwork because an artificial intelligence (AI) art can entail many forms of contribution. The artist may engage with datasets holding existing artworks, machine learning models, generated artworks, and software developed by others. Post humanist thinkers also explain this relationship. Donna Haraway's cyborg argues the rigid boundary between humans and machines. [8] N. Katherine Hayles and Rosi Braidotti likewise question human centred concepts of the subject. [9], [14]

© Copyright @ Authors

ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

In this context, the artist can be understood as working with and through technological systems instead of merely using technology as an impartial tool.

Present day research has also started discussing AI authorship as dispersed or interconnected. However, artificial intelligence (AI) artwork is not one individual practice. Diverse artists involve artificial intelligence (AI) in remarkably unusual ways. This paper therefore compares three cases to understand human agency that exists in each process.

3. CORE CONCEPTS

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) produces latest content from patterns learned from ongoing data. [15], [16] By showing and learning patterns from the trained model's data. In artistic practice, the process can be introduced in multiple stages between the artist's initial concept and the final artwork. The process is understood as a sequence of: **Human concept - data - Computational system - generated output - human choice - final artwork.** Each stage adds to the development of the artwork in a diverse way. The process may begin with the artist's idea, concept, a visual intention, which is then converted into prompts or other type of input. The integrated system then processes this input through it has learned patterns and existing data during training to generate possibilities of any visual outcome. The next step is where the artist evaluates the outputs, selects the ones that align with their concept, intention, notion. Then, the artist changes those selected outputs, combines them with other elements to produce the final work.

Therefore, artistic agency can exist at several points. The artist might produce the dataset, select the model, choose the useful outputs, decide how the system works or control the final presentation. Within this process, artistic agency is not contained to one single moment of the creation. [10] It runs at multiple stages, which depends on the practice of the artist and the level of control in directing the system. The decisions concerning composition, editing, material presentation and the context of the work which is presented can also influence the final art piece. Simultaneously, the computational system adds by generating outputs through processes that extend beyond the artist's control. The relation between systematic operation and human intention is thus complex. [17] The system generates possibilities that cannot be predicted by the artist despite the prompts provided to the system. [18] Nonetheless, the degree of this relationship differs according to the tools, methods and decisions that are involved in each artistic practice.

This suggests that authorship can be understood as a process instead of only as the person who physically makes the final image. This artistic production's process-based understanding encourages a reconsideration of authorship. Instead of finding authorship solely in the individual who physically shows or produces the final image, this allows for an analysis of the sequence of interactions, decisions, and technical processes through which the artwork takes shape. Through intention, choice, interpretation and modification, the artist continues to exercise its agency. But these actions take place alongside computational processes and the broader circumstances under which artificial intelligence (AI) systems are developed and trained. Authorship can be understood as appearing through a sequence of interconnected contributions instead of being proven solely by the physical act if making an image.

The concept of Post human artist is used here to characterise an artist whose practice is formed through a relationship with computational systems. [8], [9], [14] It does not mean that the machine replaces the human artist. Rather, the human artist's role becomes relational with non-human systems. Within artificial intelligence (AI) aided art practice, the artist's role extends beyond direct image making. It includes- designing inputs, setting up parameters' evaluation of the generated possibilities, and then deciding how the final work is to be shown

© Copyright @ Authors

ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

and interpreted. The computational system becomes a part of the many conditions through which artistic possibilities appear. From this point of view, the post-human artist can be understood as an entity whose creative agency develops through the interaction with the technological systems instead of being separated from them. This perspective offers a way to re-evaluate authorship as process oriented and relational while keeping in mind the importance of human intention, human creativity, judgement, and responsibility.

4. CASE STUDIES

4.1 Obvious, Portrait of Edmond de Belamy (2018)

Obvious's *Portrait of Edmond de Belamy* (2018) is an important example of how generative artificial intelligence (AI) complicates conventional ideas of artistic authorship. The work Obvious created using a Generative Adversarial Network (GAN) trained on approximately 15,000 portraits from the fourteenth to twentieth centuries. [19] It gained considerable attention after being sold by Christie's in 2018 for $432,500. [20] The work raises an important question: if the final image is produced through an interaction between a dataset, an algorithm, and human decisions, where exactly should authorship be found? [7] Obvious is credited as the artist, but the production of the image depended on existing images, computational techniques, software, and the collective's decisions about how the system was used. [19] Discussions surrounding the work also drew attention to its relationship with existing GAN research and the work of programmer and artist Robbie Barrat. [20] Foucault's concept of the **author-function** is useful here. [7] Authorship is not simply a statement of who physically produced an object; it also figures out how that work is classified, circulated, and valued. In this case, "Obvious" provides the identifiable authorial identity through which the artwork entered the institutional art market, even though its production involved a wider network. [1], [19] The significance of *Portrait of Edmond de Belamy*, therefore, lies in the gap between **distributed production and concentrated attribution**. The work does not necessarily drop the human author, but it makes the limitations of singular authorship more visible.

4.2 Anna Ridler, Myriad (Tulips) (2018) and Mosaic Virus (2018–19)

Anna Ridler's *Myriad (Tulips)* and *Mosaic Virus* focuses on the relationship between AI and authorship differently. For *Myriad (Tulips)*, Anna produced and manually classified approximately 10,000 photographs of tulips over three months. [11] The resulting dataset was presented as an artwork, making visible the human labour normally hidden behind machine-learning systems. [21] This process challenges the assumption that artificial intelligence (AI)-generated art begins with the machine's output. Before an algorithm can generate an image, data must be collected, selected, organised, and classified. [21] Anna's work makes these activities part of the artwork itself. [11] The dataset is therefore not simply technical material but also a product of artistic decisions. In *Mosaic Virus*, the dataset becomes part of a larger conceptual relationship between tulips, Tulip Mania, and contemporary cryptocurrency speculation. [11] The machine contributes to the generation of images, but the conceptual structure within which those images get meaning comes from Anna Ridler. [10] Her practice, therefore, shifts the question from **"Who generated the image?"** to **"Where does artistic labour occur?"** It proves that AI may redistribute human creative labour rather than simply remove it.

4.3 Refik Anadol, Unsupervised Machine Hallucinations (MOMA) (2022–23)

Refik Anadol's *Unsupervised* provides another model of human-machine interaction. [4] Presented at The Museum of Modern Art, the work uses machine-learning systems to interpret material from MoMA's collection and continuously generate changing visual forms.

© Copyright @ Authors

ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

Anadol Studio states that the project processed 138,151 pieces of data from the museum's collection using StyleGAN2 and a custom Latent Space Browser. [12] Unlike a conventional artwork in which the artist decides the final visual form, *Unsupervised* produces outcomes that cannot be completely predicted in advance. [18] Anadol establishes the conceptual framework, selects and processes the data, and constructs the system, but the computational process contributes to the final visual result. This creates a different understanding of artistic agency. The artist does not lose agency completely; rather, agency shifts from directly producing every visual element towards **designing the conditions under which visual outcomes can appear**. The machine therefore takes part in the production of the work without necessarily becoming an autonomous artist.

5. COMPARATIVE DISCUSSIONS

The three case studies reveal diverse ways in which generative artificial intelligence (AI) challenges conventional understandings of authorship and agency. In *Portrait of Edmond de Belamy*, the central issue is **attribution**: who should be recognised as the author when an artwork is produced through a network of human and technological contributions? [7], [20] Ridler's work shifts the focus towards **labour**, revealing the human effort embedded within datasets. [11] *Unsupervised* moves the discussion towards **agency**, as the artist deliberately creates a system capable of producing unpredictable outcomes.

The distinction between authorship and agency is particularly important. Authorship concerns who is recognised and attributed as responsible for an artwork, while agency concerns the different forces that take part in its production. An artificial intelligence (AI) system can therefore influence the appearance of an artwork without necessarily becoming its author. Generative artificial intelligence (AI) consequently complicates the traditional image of the artist as a completely autonomous creator. However, the case studies do not suggest that human creativity disappears. Instead, artistic decisions can shift towards selecting data, constructing systems, showing parameters, interpreting outputs, and deciding what becomes part of the final work. The artist therefore becomes less a sole producer and more a **mediator between human intention and technological processes**. [17] This provides a basis for understanding the "post human artist" not as an artist replaced by a machine, but as an artist whose creative practice appears through relationships with technological and non-human systems. [9], [10]

The three works suggest that artificial intelligence (AI) does not produce the "death of the artist." [6] Rather, it makes visible a transformation in **where artistic agency is located**. [10], [14] Production can become distributed across artists, datasets, algorithms, and technological infrastructures, while attribution may remain attached to a particular artist or collective. This tension between **distributed production and concentrated attribution** is central to understanding authorship in contemporary artificial intelligence (AI)-mediated art.

6. CHALLENGES, ETHICS, AND LIMITATIONS IN AI-GENERATED ART

Introduction to ethical and computational complexities

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into the artistic practice introduces many complex challenges like authorships, originality, ownership of a particular artwork, consent, and responsibility. While artificial intelligence (AI) allows the artist to produce the images and multimedia through just simply explaining it or just explaining your concept, these technologies are very heavily dependent on the pre-existing data, technical research, software development and also the data we human feed to it, the data also contains the images, audio, videos and other mediums you share with it. The ai-generated work may appear autonomous, but it is the production of a complex chain of decisions and thoughts and the Conversation

© Copyright @ Authors

ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

made by artists, programers, researchers and dataset contributor. All these contributions are rarely visible in the final display.

The three primary case studies examined previously in the research shows different modes of human involvement. Firstly, the obvious's portraits of Edmond de Bellamy raises a concerning question about public attribution and credits; anna Ridler's myriad(tulips) and mosaic virus demonstrate the conceptual weight of dataset curation; and Refik Anadol's unsupervised- machine hallucinations- MOMA illustrates the artist's role in which architecting an interactive, generative system. [11], [12], [19] Al through these practices diverge in technical execution they share. A common thread exploring the evolving relationship between human and ai. Evaluating the limitation of both ai and human proves a balanced framework for understanding the potential of artwork generated or created by ai.

6.1 Training data, consent, and ownership

The most ethical concern in generative ai is the unauthorised use of copyrighted works for model training. What ai systems do is that they learn normal patterns and visual relationships from massive collections of images, paintings, photographs, and illustrations. However, most of the data collected through these mediums or should I say mostly all the data is created by human only who have never gave any consent to get their work shared or are even awarded that their work is used in a generative artwork and might be copied or taken by someone else though the generative art. These things introduce an extremely critical legal and ethical distinction between the making of an artwork publicly views and granting permission for AI training. An artist commonly uploads their work images in their work portfolios to get recognition, to promote their work and exhibit their practices but it does not automatically means that an artist is giving consent that their art can be replicated by an ai engine or their study can be exactly copied by someone else. The UNESCO recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence (AI) emphasises transparency, fairness, human rights, and responsibility, so no one's data get misused in anyway and privacy of someone's data should be made. [22] Art training datasets of an artificial intelligence (AI) does not barely embody only the raw pixels, but the cultural knowledge, lived experiences, and creative labour of individuals and communities. Utilising all these contributions without attribution or any compensation results in an asymmetric distribution of the benefits derived from technological progress. [21] Furthermore, setting up a direct link between turning input and specific output stays a bit technically difficult. A generative adversarial network (GAN) progresses patterns from thousands of sources without reproducing a single identifiable source file. An output can closely resemble a specific artist's distinctive style or protected expression, or it can also be possible that it is exactly same. Distinguishing between general style learn, derivative generation, and copyright infringements becomes complicated when model weights and training logs stay proprietary. [23]

6.2 Artistic authorship and legal authorship

The division between artistic authorship and legal authorship creates further friction. I traditional art the person who individually conceives the idea and executes it recognised as the sole author of that specific artwork or any work, but in ai its different, it distributes the creative input across a network of participants:

- The operating artist: the person who creates the prompt, curates outputs, and frames the final installation.
- The model developer: the person who designs the underlying software architecture, loss functions, neutral network topology.

© Copyright @ Authors

ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

- The research scientist: the person who discovers the foundation of the machine learning algorithms and training methodologies.
- The dataset curator gathers, cleans, categories and labels training imagery.
- The source creator: the system that generates the historical and contemporary works that populates the dataset.

This distributed workflow complicates the attribution. For example, obvious portrait of Edmond de Bellamy achieved fame at Christie in 2018, it sold for 432,500 dollars. [20] Yet the production of that artwork heavily relied on the open-source code and the prior research shared by the artist-programmers like Robbie Barrat. The public spotlight focused exclusively on the exhibiting collectives and sidelining the technical bedrock which made the artwork possible. [19]The legal framework straggles to classify these contributions. Authorities such as the United States (USCO) and the European union need a threshold of direct human intellectual creation for copyright protection so the errors like this do not happen in future. [23], [24] Prompts with only text and no human modification often does not secure copyright, leaving purely achene-generated artefacts in the public domain. strict UK provisions assign authorship of ai or computer-generated works to the person making the arrangements necessary for the creations. Distinguishing between artistic recognition, legal ownership, and ethical responsibility stays essential evaluating contemporary artificial intelligence (AI) art.

6.3 Originality, artistic style, and creative agency

The originality in conventional art is tied to personal vision, lived experience, and the mastery of a distinct visual language. However, the human creation never existed in isolation; artists constantly study, borrow, and reinterpret historical traditions. But the process is so big, generative ai accelerated this process by analysing millions of references instantly. When the person prompts a model for a specific aesthetic, the system automatically synthesises an output that evokes a style without copying anything from anyones work. You can also see that this blurs the line between what he was inspired by or influenced by and the thing which is algorithmically right. The visual similarity alone cannot prove direct violation, but it demands critical inquiry into how these systems or models emulate specific creators.

Furthermore, the generative tools also alter artistic agency because ai systems produce dozens of variations of an artwork in just seconds, often in between the creative act often shifts from physical execution to curation and evaluation. An artist might generate dozens or even hundreds of iterations before selecting, cropping, or digitally altering a single successful frame. The artist himself shows the first constraints and steers the direction of the work, while the model or computational model generates unexpected possibilities. But these things are also important as these unexpected outputs can also spark new creative directions, but this also does not mean that an ai itself owns an independent consciousness. exaggerated terms like thinking or dreaming obscure the underlying mathematics and human decision-making.

6.4 Bias and representation in training datasets

Artificial intelligence (AI) systems act as mirrors of their training data. If a dataset reflects historical inequalities. Cultural biases, or demographic imbalances, model will reproduce and amplify those distortions. [21], [25], [26]

- Cultural dominance: datasets dominated by western visual culture produce superior results for western motifs while making non-western traditions stereotypical or distorted

© Copyright @ Authors

ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

- Categorical reductionism: automated labelling flattens complex cultural objects into simplistic tag, erasing contextual nuance.
- Institutional filtering: when models are tran on museum archives (such as Anadol's use a MOMA), historical acquisition biases are hardcoded into the generative output. [12]

The construction of dataset is therefore an ideological act. To understand an ai artwork requires analysing not just the final image, but what the model was taught to include, and crucially, what was omitted. [21], [26]

6.5 Hidden labor and responsibility

The speed of artificial intelligence (AI) generation conceals extensive human labour. From the software engineering and hardware manufacturing to dataset scraping, cleaning and safety filtering an army of unseen workers sustains the generative pipeline. [21], [27] Anna Ridler's myriad (tulips), confronts this dynamic directly. By hand-photographing and categorising 10,000 individual tulips, Ridler turned dataset creator into an explicit artwork. [11] Her practice proves that data is not just a neutral resource; gathering and labelling demand intense physical efforts and subjective decision-making. [21]

When ai outputs generate harmful biases or any infringe on copyright, accountability cannot be deflected onto the machine. Artists, developers, and institutions share distinct ethical obligations about system deployment, transparency, and the acknowledgement of underlying labor. [22], [23]

6.6 Limitations of the present study

The research focuses of the three specific case studies- obvious, Anna Ridler, and Refik Anadol- which cannot stand for the entire landscape of artificial intelligence (AI) art. [11], [12], [19], [20] The study relies on published documentation and critical texts rather than direct ethnographic interviews with the artists or developers. Finally, the rapid evolution of the generative models and legal frameworks means the findings captures a specific historical moment rather than a permanent technological consensus.

7. FUTURE SCOPE

The future research must expand beyond the first case studies to examine emerging generative models, scores model technologies, and shifting legal landscapes. As artificial intelligence (AI) tools evolve from static GANs into real-time multi-model diffusion models and immersive spatial environment, the intersection of human creativity and systematic will continue to transform.

The future scholarship should investigate how different technical architectures alter artistic agency:

- Diffusion models vs GANs: diffusion models allow image to image, text to image video to image steering, while GANs rely on adversarial training loops between a generator and discriminator.
- Multi-model system: systems which integrate test, audio, video and 3d special geometry introduces new questions about temporal control and cross-modal authorship.
- Hybrid media workflows: artists increasingly combine artificial intelligence (AI) generation with traditional physical media, using digital outputs as base layers for oil painting, sculpture, or printmaking.

© Copyright @ Authors

ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

Comparing these workflows clarifies whether authorship depends primarily on the underlying technology, the degree of human intervention, or the overarching conceptual framework.

Conducting qualitative research such as interviews with practicing artificial intelligence (AI) artists, software developers, and curators would bridge the gap between theoretical analysis and lived experience.

- How artist categories their own roles
- How developers view the creative appropriation of their neutral network architectures?
- How curators evaluate the balance between technical novelty and conceptual depth?

Comparing all these perspectives shows where the creative decisions truly happens and how different does the participants negotiate authorship in practice.

Study by the audiences can measure how contextual framing affects the reception of artificial intelligence (AI) art as presenting viewers with identical descriptions, labelled as human made, purely AI generated or human ai collaborative would reveal psychological shifts in perceived originality, emotional resonance, and economic value.This type of research also helps explain how institutional reputation and transparency shape public acceptance within the contemporary art market. Future investigations must explore the political economy of artificial intelligence (AI) art. Comparing artist curate datasets (like Ridler's) with massive commercial databases scraped from the web which exposes stark economic divides. [11], [21] The research should also address how art markets price works whose production depends on distributed, uncompensated labor and how fair attribution models might be legally and financially structured. [27] As the global legal systems works with text and data mining (TDM) exceptions, comparative legal studies are important. [24] Also examining how different authorities- such as the US, the EU, and Japan handle training permissions of artificial intelligence (AI) models and other systems, fair use and output copyright will shape future artistic compliance. [23] Also, researchers should continue auditing training datasets to correct cultural biases and ensure underrepresented communities are not systematically erased from ai visual culture.

Finally examining the human artificial intelligence (AI) collaboration through processed journals, screen recordings and real time studio observations will clarify how the agency is shared. Documentation of the iterative dialogues between human prompts modification and machine output offers a granular view of how conceptual control is supported across complex generative workflows.

CONCLUSION

This study shows the generative ai fundamentally challenges definitions of authorship, originality, and artistic agency. Traditionally centred on the artistic production in the age of artificial intelligence (AI) operates as a networked collaboration between human intentions, training archives, software developer, and computational models.

These three examined case studies illustrate different modes of human involvement: obvious highlights the complexities of public attribution and credit; Anna Ridler shows that dataset construction is an important conceptual and artistic act; and Refik Anadol show an artist can architect a dynamic, generative visual environment. [11], [12], [19], [20] These practices together prove that artificial intelligence (AI) generated art cannot be understood solely through the visual aesthetics of its final output.

© Copyright @ Authors

ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

8.1 Three case studies and three form of involvement.

Obvious: it exposes the tension between public gallery presentations and underlying technical debt, proving that single name attribution often masks collaborative technical foundations. [19]

Anna Ridler: reimagines data as an artistic medium, revealing the physical and conceptual labor needed to build training corpora. [11]

Refik Anadol: shifts the locus of creativity from object making to environmental and systemic design, transforming archival data into living installations [12]

The emergence of the post human artist does not automatically signify the death of the human creativity, but rather its evolution. [9], [10], [14] The artist's labour shifts from direct physical execution like brushwork, carving, and molding to systemic orchestration. Setting parameters, curating training data, engineering prompts and framing unexpected machine outputs. Automatic algorithms do not absolve human creator of ethical responsibility, artist, developers, and institution must remain accountable for datasets ethics, mias mitigation, consent, and transparent attributions. [21]–[23] Artificial intelligence (AI) is a powerful tool for aesthetics experimentation, but its use must be balanced with social awareness and respect for cultural labor. Generative artificial intelligence (AI) shifts the fundamentals question of art historical inquiry. Authorship is not limited to the human who produced the final image. It also involves the system design, selection of data, human labour involved in the model and finally, the decision made during the selection and presentation of the final output. By considering these different stages of creation of a final artwork, contemporary art theory can show a rigorous, fair, understanding of authorship and agency in the age of artificial intelligence.

REFERENCES

1. W. Benjamin, "The work of art in the age of its technological reproducibility (second version)," in *The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility, and Other Writings on Media*, M. W. Jennings, B. Doherty, and T. Y. Levin, Eds. Cambridge, MA, USA: Harvard Univ. Press, 2008, pp. 19–55. (Original work published 1936).
2. McCosker and R. Wilken, *Automating Vision: The Social Impact of the New Camera Consciousness*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2020.
3. M. Turing, "Computing machinery and intelligence," *Mind*, vol. 59, no. 236, pp. 433–460, 1950, doi: 10.1093/mind/LIX.236.433.
4. L. Manovich, *AI Aesthetics*. Moscow, Russia: Strelka Press, 2019.
5. M. A. Boden, *The Creative Mind: Myths and Mechanisms*, 2nd ed. London, U.K.: Routledge, 2004.
6. R. Barthes, "The death of the author," *Aspen*, nos. 5–6, 1967.
7. M. Foucault, "What is an author?" in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, D. F. Bouchard, Ed., D. F. Bouchard and S. Simon, Trans. Ithaca, NY, USA: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977, pp. 113–138. (Original work published 1969).
8. D. Haraway, "A manifesto for cyborgs: Science, technology, and socialist feminism in the 1980s," *Socialist Review*, no. 80, pp. 65–108, 1985.
9. N. K. Hayles, *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics*. Chicago, IL, USA: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1999.
10. J. Zylinska, *AI Art: Machine Visions and Warped Dreams*. London, U.K.: Open Humanities Press, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.openhumanitiespress.org/books/titles/ai-art/
11. Ridler, *Myriad (Tulips)*, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://annaridler.com/works/myriad-tulips

© Copyright @ Authors

ISSN: 0976-5301
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 7.85)
Journal Website www.coherencejournal.in

12. R. Anadol Studio, “Unsupervised—Machine hallucinations—MoMA.” [Online]. Available: https://refikanadol.com/works/unsupervised/
13. S. Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author: Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida*. Edinburgh, U.K.: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1992.
14. R. Braidotti, *The Posthuman*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity Press, 2013.
15. Goodfellow *et al*., “Generative adversarial nets,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27*, 2014, pp. 2672–2680. [Online]. Available: https://papers.nips.cc/paper/5423-generative-adversarial-nets
16. Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton, “Deep learning,” *Nature*, vol. 521, pp. 436–444, 2015, doi: 10.1038/nature14539.
17. L. Suchman, *Human-Machine Reconfigurations: Plans and Situated Actions*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007.
18. P. Galanter, “What is generative art? Complexity theory as a context for art theory,” in *Proc. 6th Generative Art Conf.*, 2003. [Online]. Available: https://www.generativeart.com/on/cic/papersGA2003/a22.htm
19. Obvious, “La famille de Belamy.” [Online]. Available: https://obvious-art.com/
20. Christie’s, “Can a portrait, created by AI, be called art?” Dec. 12, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://www.christies.com/stories/a-collaboration-between-two-artists-one-human-one-a-machine-0cd01f4e232f4279a525a446d60d4cd1
21. K. Crawford, *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. New Haven, CT, USA: Yale Univ. Press, 2021.
22. UNESCO, *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/recommendation-ethics-artificial-intelligence
23. U.S. Copyright Office, *Copyright and Artificial Intelligence, Part 2: Copyrightability*. Washington, DC, USA: U.S. Copyright Office, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.copyright.gov/ai/Copyright-and-Artificial-Intelligence-Part-2-Copyrightability-Report.pdf
24. European Parliament and Council of the European Union, “Directive (EU) 2019/790 on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market,” *Official Journal of the European Union*, vol. L 130, pp. 92–125, 2019. [Online]. Available: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dir/2019/790/oj
25. J. Buolamwini and T. Gebru, “Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification,” in *Proc. 1st Conf. Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, 2018, pp. 77–91. [Online]. Available: https://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/buolamwini18a.html
26. E. M. Bender, T. Gebru, A. McMillan-Major, and S. Shmitchell, “On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big?,” in *Proc. 2021 ACM Conf. Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT)*, 2021, pp. 610–623, doi: 10.1145/3442188.3445922.
27. M. L. Gray and S. Suri, *Ghost Work: How to Stop Silicon Valley from Building a New Global Underclass*. Boston, MA, USA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2019.
28. M. Mitchell, *Artificial Intelligence: A Guide for Thinking Humans*. New York, NY, USA: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2019.
29. European Parliament and Council of the European Union, “Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act),” 2024. [Online]. Available: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj

© Copyright @ Authors