436

Caietele Echinox, 49/ 2025: *From Robot to AI. Techno-sciences vs. Literature and Arts*

Petre Nicolescu

Human-AI Creative Symbiosis. Redefining the Artist in Contemporary Visual Art

Abstract: This paper aims to investigate how creative symbiosis between humans and artificial intelligence leads to redefining the artist in visual contemporary art, from the perspective of recent theories and practices. I will examine how the context of integration of AI into visual creation has normalized the concept of *human-machine co-creation*. The notion of *creative symbiosis* will be explored, highlighting how the artistic authorship is distributed between human and non-human actors. Traditional notions such as originality, intentionality and artistic genius are also being challenged. In addition, my investigation addresses aesthetic, ethical and practical considerations of these developments, outlining the posthuman artist as a hybrid agent, augmented by co-intelligence with machines.

Keywords: AI Art; Creative Symbiosis; Human-AI Co-Creativity; Computational Creativity; Aesthetic Agency; Posthuman Artist; Posthumanism.

Petre Nicolescu
Babeș-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
petre.nicolescu@gmail.com

Fast development of generative artificial intelligence in the last decade has produced profound changes in contemporary visual art. Machine learning algorithms can generate images and other art forms using large amount of data as learning source, giving rise to unprecedented questions about creativity, authorship and originality. The arrival of intuitive tools that generate images based on simple text inputs has democratized the creative act, enabling people without professional artistic training to produce impressive visual results[1]. The use of these tools by artists and designers has created a new type of creative relationship between humans and machines, where the algorithm has become a partner, a collaborator of some sort, with a certain degree of aesthetic autonomy[2].

These technological advancements have sparked both excitement and controversy. The sale of an algorithm-generated portrait[3] in 2018 marked the entry of AI-generated art into the art mainstream scene. Some art critics have accused these systems of imitating, plagiarizing even, previous human artists' creations, arguing that neural networks are trained on

existing images and "the technology copies and processes images while violating copyrights"[4].

This attitude which shows concerns about the loss of authenticity and originality is opposed by the perspective of new media art creators, who consider themselves full artists even if they use algorithms as creative partners[5] and who see AI as a powerful tool that can enhance their creativity while opening up unprecedented forms of expression[6]. This dispute poses a legitimate question: how does the presence of creative algorithms alter the public's perception of the artists and their art?

The Status of the Contemporary Artist in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

From a philosophical perspective, the AI era contributes to the consolidation of the idea of the "death of the human" as the absolute measure of all things[7], replacing it with the image of a posthuman, fluid and interconnected subject. The artist, who could once be idealized as a solitary creator infused with divine genius, is now reconceptualized as an agent in a wider network of entities. Posthumanist philosophy urges us to see human identity as something relational and negotiated with *otherness* (technological, biological etc.). The posthuman artist thus becomes an example of "hybrid becoming": a creative cyborg, in the sense proposed by Donna Haraway[8], that is, a fusion of man and machine in order to overcome his previous limits. Philosopher Rosi Braidotti observes that, in posthuman thought, man is no longer seen as the "measure of all things", but as part of an extended ecosystem, in which machines,

animals, plants and digital entities coexist and collaborate[9]. This change of perspective, from a classical humanist vision to a posthuman one, is strongly reflected in contemporary digital art, where identity becomes fluid, forms become technologically hybridized, and creation takes on a collective and distributed character[10]. In posthuman art, the human body is no longer necessarily represented in its natural form; it may appear augmented, fused with artificial elements, or replaced by the presence of algorithmic avatars or abstract generative forms that question the distinction between natural and artificial[11]. Other theorists, such as Eckart Voigts, note that advances in information science and digital technologies "cast a shadow on the idea that we can maintain clearly defined boundaries between organisms and machines"[12]. This transformation raises hopes and concerns alike: on the one hand, the possibility of a creative human-AI coevolution; on the other hand, the anxiety that "posthuman machines" could replace human creativity and even the artist himself[13].

This concept raises a profound question: can an algorithm be considered part of someone's artistic identity? If an artist intensively uses a particular AI model in his creations, a model that in turn bears the imprint of the programmers and the data from which it was trained, then that artist's work is the result of a subjectivity extended beyond the boundaries of his own person. Thus, it can be argued that the individual's own artistic self extends to include technological tools and networks, an idea close to the "extended mind" theory in the philosophy of mind, where external tools become an integral part of cognitive processes[14]. In this sense, some artists have

begun to explicitly recognize the contribution of AI as something *internal* to their creative process, not *external*. Such a perspective suggests an ontological modesty: the posthuman artist accepts that he does not control and does not originate everything, that he works together with forces outside his consciousness. Moreover, this posthuman positioning also comes with an ethical imperative. If man is now only one of the agents of creation, then ethical responsibility is also distributed differently. The artist becomes an ethical mediator between society and technology. A posthuman artist is called upon to reflect critically on how the "non-human" in him – that is, the algorithmic part – influences the world. This aspect has also been highlighted by theorists of digital art and culture, such as Joanna Zylinska, who argues that artists have a duty to situate AI in a socio-political context, to show the public the "pleiade of non-human agents" that influence our actions and decisions[15].

Zylinska also argues that technology has always been intertwined with human creativity, even before the digital age: any artistic act involves tools, mediations and technical processes, from the brush and the camera obscura to the camera or editing software. The theorist even proposes the provocative idea that artificial intelligence is not something totally "alien" to creativity, but an extension of it – "human creativity has always been, essentially, technical and to some extent artificially intelligent"[16]. In her posthumanist vision, any work of art is the product of a multitude of non-human agents acting together with the artist: from chemicals and tools, to processing algorithms and cultural networks that influence creative decisions[17].

The concept of creativity as an exclusively human trait is undermined by current realities. If we accept that "AI undermines the idea of creativity as an intrinsically human trait"[18], then the status of the artist needs to be rethought. Some might see this as a loss of the artist's special aura – a reactionary humanist argument that wants to defend human exceptionalism at all costs. A posthumanist perspective interprets this decline of the human idol rather as an opportunity for evolution. The artist is relieved of the weight of genius, becoming a navigator in an ecosystem of multiple intelligences. He loses his demigod status but acquires the role of coordinator in a very complex world.

This perspective fundamentally changes the way we define art and those who create it. If in modernism the artist was often seen as a solitary demiurge, and in postmodernism the author was "dead"[19]– that is, the role of the author's intention was minimized in favor of the viewer's interpretation – in posthumanism we witness a "rebirth" of the author in the form of a collective: man and machine together. A posthuman artist becomes, in essence, a designer of creative processes and relationships, rather than a craftsman who directly shapes matter. Instead of directly manipulating the materials, the posthuman artist can train an algorithm, then select a data set or adjust parameters in order to initiate a generative process. The end result is not only the direct expression of the human hand or thought, because it emerged from the interaction of the human mind with artificial intelligence. From a philosophical perspective this could be a type of *becoming-machine*, in Deleuze's terms, where the human-machine boundary is not clear anymore, and the two become partners in a larger whole[20].

As a consequence, the posthuman artist is conceived as a collective entity, a man-machine body, able to create together. The concept of posthuman artist is not used to undervalue the human artist, nor to imply its disappearance. It is rather an expansion beyond its own biological and intellectual limits, due to creative integration of technology. It is a paradigm shift in which creativity is reconceptualized as an emergent property of networks and interactions, and not as a strictly individual human essence. This concept is the basis for understanding the man–AI creative symbiosis.

Artists and Algorithms

The inclusion of artificial intelligence in the artistic process has its roots in the second half of the 20th century, when artists such as Harold Cohen (with the AARON program) and Lillian Schwartz have laid the foundation of algorithmic art by experimenting with computer-generated images[21]. However, only after the explosive evolution of neural networks in recent years, particularly the Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) and text-to-image diffusers (DALL-E, Midjourney, Stable Diffusion), the AI has been propelled into the cultural mainstream and into the general public's attention[22].

Since 2021, text-to-image models have adopted friendly interfaces, drastically simplifying the interaction with the creative intelligence, allowing tech-savvy artists and amateurs alike to generate high quality imagery using simple text prompts[23]. The liberalization of access to such tools has led to a surge in generated visual content. These developments disrupt the art ecosystem on many levels. Dejan Grba observes four such levels in which art is impacted by AI: *expressive* (new themes or aesthetic forms are introduced), *exploratory and analytical* (cultural studies use AI to identify patterns and various attributes in artworks), *economic* (the ways of art production and monetization are reorganized) and *notional* (the ideas about the art and art creators are challenged)[24].

The first three levels have already been analyzed within the new discipline of critical AI studies applied to art, but the *notional* dimension requires a nuanced attention[25]. Contemporary art is in a phase of conceptual interrogation: what does it mean to "be an artist" when part of the content is generated by neural networks? How do we define creativity when the algorithm can produce surprising images, but without intention or consciousness? It is useful to examine some examples and distinct roles that AI already has in artistic practice, in order to understand the extent of the transformation.

AI as creative tool. Most artists who use AI consider these systems as advanced instruments and integrate them in their technological arsenal. For example, the artist may use a GAN network to generate several visual variations which are selected and integrated into the final work. The human control in this scenario is central because the algorithm produces visual suggestions based on the data set used for training, but the selection and the interpretation belong to the human creator. Mazzone and Elgammal suggest three stages of the process: *pre-curation* (the artist chooses the data set used in training), *generation* (the algorithm learns the style and generates new images) and *post-curation* (the artist selects the variations and refines the

final result)[26]. The AI becomes a creative assistant that produces variants, sometimes surprising even for the artist, but without any intentionality of its own. Critics point out that many resulting images are essentially imitative, reproducing patterns from the training data with small deformations. For example, the distorted portraits generated by a GAN trained on paintings may be reminiscent of Francis Bacon's compositions, but essentially different: in Bacon the deformation was the artist's conscious intention, while in the AI network the deformation arises from the inability to perfectly imitate a human face – a "failure" of the machine, which can however be aesthetically perceived as a visual novelty[27]. The attribution of meaning and value to these "accidents" remains the responsibility of the viewers and the artist curator.

AI as a creative agent (co-author). Here, artificial intelligence is not just a passive tool, but an active partner to the artist, contributing substantially to the conception of the work. Thus, co-creation projects and interactive installations appear and the algorithm has a certain autonomy of decision in real time. Pamela C. Scorzin argues that, despite appearances, "AI alone cannot yet make art", because it lacks the consciousness, intention, and common sense that underpin human creative act[28]. However, once integrated into human-designed processes, such systems can function as a robotized teammate, a creative "co-bot" that stimulates the inspiration of the human artist by generating ideas, forms or variations. Artistic authorship becomes diffuse: the final work is the result of a collective intelligence and the traditional concept of a single author is called into question.

AI as curator or critic. Artificial intelligence is beginning to be used in the organization, selection and interpretation of art. Museums and galleries are experimenting with AI to analyze collections (identifying styles, unknown authors or thematic connections) and even to propose algorithmically curated exhibitions. Algorithmic curation is not without its problems. It inherits opacity and optimization criteria that can narrow the cultural diversity displayed to the public. Von Davier concludes that a "human-in-the-loop" is still needed in the automated curatorial process, to correct distortions between the public's perception and the cold "view" of the machine[29]. As a consequence, even if the capabilities of AI to analyze and organize art are constantly increasing, critical valuation and contextualization remain the prerogatives of human sensitivity.

These three positions – AI as a tool, as a co-creative partner and as a curatorial agent – are not mutually exclusive, but often intertwine in real practice. Artistic discourse has begun to adapt to this hybrid reality. If in the past art was seen as an expression of the individual subjectivity of the artist, now there is more and more talk about collaborative process and about creative networks that include humans, AI and distribution systems. The concept of distributed creativity has been observed since the 2000s, but only today do we see it fully manifested in digital art.

The Distribution of the Artistic Agent

In the romantic and modern aesthetic tradition, the artist was seen as a sovereign author, endowed with autonomy, individual

inspiration and full control over the work. However, collaboration with algorithms raises the question: *can the work still be attributed to a single author*? Or must we accept a shared model, in which the creative agency is divided between man and machine?

In the current discourse, we identify several positions. A conservative perspective states that, in essence, AI is just a tool lacking originality, so any collaboration remains subordinate to the human vision. According to this point of view, creativity belongs exclusively to man, and the algorithm only extends the arm and mind of the artist. A second, more radical position argues that in human-AI collaboration there is a real distribution of agency: both the human and the machine interact in order to shape the creative process. This approach admits that decisions made by algorithm have a substantial impact on the artwork, in ways not anticipated by the artist. Theorists such as Jens Schröter argue that the author becomes *a double*, an *author-network*, in which human intentionality is intertwined with the machine's generative capacity[30]. The concept of distributed authorship gains relevance: creation is the fruit of a network of actors, human and algorithmic, and the notion of singular originality is replaced by the idea of originality emerging from collaboration. A third, moderate position admits the influence of AI in the process, but emphasizes that the final aesthetic word and artistic responsibility still belong to humans. Philosopher Sarah Misselhorn notes that although AI also shapes the course of creation through its own rules, the human artist retains control over the final aesthetic decisions and bears the conceptual responsibility for the work[31].

Despite these divergent points of view, what we observe is a shift in the focus of the discussion: from the question "can AI be a creator of art on its own?" (and does it deserve to be called an artist) to the question "how do we collaborate with AI in the creative act and how do we share our roles and merits"[32]? Terms such as co-creativity, co-authorship or human-nonhuman hybrid have come into use, reflecting a clear trend: authorship is becoming increasingly diffuse. Paul Goodfellow even suggests a new taxonomy of authorship. He imagines a continuous spectrum: at one end relies the human creation, derived from author's ideas and emotions, and at the other end the algorithmic creation, generated without any human assistance[33]. Between these extremes lies a range of forms of collaboration and co-evolution: works made with collective tools and processes, where the boundary between human and technological input becomes fluid[34].

Goodfellow points out that we can no longer isolate the work as the product of a single author, but as the result of an entire distributed system involving neural training networks, datasets, code, distribution platforms, and, of course, the human intervention that orchestrates the whole. This state of shared authorship inevitably transforms the role of the artist. In his analysis, Goodfellow states that the artist moves from the traditional position of creator of objects with aesthetic significance to that of "translator and curator" of objects produced in the network[35]. The posthuman artist becomes the one who translates, selects and guides the partially autonomous creations of algorithms, giving them meaning, contextualizing them and assuming their presentation as art.

This idea resonates with the intuitions of media art pioneer Roy Ascott who, since the 1980s, spoke of a "network consciousness" in art and of an author decentralized in space and time, in the context of telematic arts[36]. When a work is the result of a complex interaction between several actors – including non-humans – the creative act becomes collaborative and negotiated.

In light of these developments, the term *posthuman artist* can be understood as designating precisely this collective and augmented subject, who creates not in brilliant isolation, but in partnership with intelligent systems. The posthuman artist is a hybrid between the creative human and the generative machine, a cultural cyborg who amplifies his imagination through computation and, simultaneously, humanizes the machine's output through its sensitivity and intentionality. Collaboration with AI can be seen as a reflexive process: the algorithm offers an imperfect and strange mirror of the artist's preferences and perspective, forcing the artist to a new level of awareness. Mariya Dzhimova describes the creative process with AI as a system of iterative feedback loops, oscillating between order and disorder, between calculated randomness and control, which forces the artist to a particular form of self-reflection and "alienation of one's own perspective"[37]. In this way, Dzhimova adds, almost all artistic projects with AI demonstrate a certain hybridity and co-dependency, a distribution of agency between human and non-human, and can be viewed as network phenomena rather than individual creations[38]. Not coincidentally, Dzhimova compares artistic practice with AI to historical avant-garde experiments that challenged the notion of the

autonomous artist by introducing either chance (Dada, Surrealism) or impersonal rule systems (Minimalism, conceptual art) into the creative process[39]. The main difference is that along hazard and static rule, AI adds a dynamic factor, an artificial agent which learns and makes decisions during the interaction with the artist. This makes the act of co-creation more enthusiastic and unpredictible.

Ethics, Aesthetics and the Future of the Artist in the AI Era

As artificial intelligence becomes a creative partner, critical questions emerge, about originality, responsibility and value in art. Originality, understood as radical novelty and creativity unrestricted by preexisting models, has long been the cornerstone of artistic value. In the era of generative AI, the concept of originality becomes problematic from two opposing directions. Some critics argue that art generated by algorithms is not truly original, because the algorithm does not "imagine" anything from a vacuum, but rather bases its production on the redistribution of features from the images it has seen during the training phase. Thus, even if the final result is new in terms of a combination of elements, it contains nothing that did not already exist in one form or another in the training corpus. Others consider that human creativity does not operate *ex nihilo* either: any artist is influenced by previous works, visual culture and accumulated experiences, originality actually consisting in the way they are recombined and recontextualized[40]. Beni B. Issembert argues that "the pre-training phase of an AI represents the direct technological equivalent

of human artistic inspiration, and creativity itself is best understood as a process of combinatorial synthesis. [...] both man and machine rely on a vast corpus of previous works to synthesize new creations"[41].

Thus, the recombination of the existing is not a unique feature of AI, but of the human mind as well. The difference lies in the degree of consciousness and intention of the process: the human intention and experience guide the selection of elements, while AI lacks intrinsic motivation and recombines based on statistics from data. Mazzone & Elgammal show that in order to evaluate the creativity of an image produced with AI, it is not enough to analyze the statistical novelty of the generated result, but also the interaction with the human receptor. A generated image is considered art if it provokes a valuable aesthetic experience and in the same time it is recognized as such by the viewers and by the artistic community[42].

Another set of challenging questions is of legal and ethical nature: who owns the copyright of an AI generated image? How can we prevent the algorithms which generate art from propagating injustice or prejudice? In *The AI Dilemma: 7 Principles for Responsible Technology*, Juliette Powell and Art Kleiner suggest a set of principles that can conduct the responsible use of AI. Among these principles are: ensuring the transparency and explainability of AI systems, so that not only engineers, but also users – including artists and the public – can understand how the AI makes decisions, protecting personal data and privacy, and preventing algorithmic biases[43]. In addition, Powell and Kleiner emphasize the responsibility of organizations and AI developers to be responsible

for negative consequences in case of copyright infringement or offensive generated content[44]. Applied to art, such principles could require artists and institutions that use AI in their projects to be transparent with the public, to mention the use of AI, briefly explain the process, and to ethically assume any problems. Serious disputes ended in several lawsuits filed against Midjourney by groups of artists who accused the company of copyright infringement[45], signaling the need for regulations to protect human creators from the "data hunger" of Ais. If the AI is constantly feeding off existing art, to the detriment of the original creators, the human-AI symbiosis risks becoming parasitic.

The influx of AI into creation has given rise to new aesthetics and changed the criteria by which we evaluate art. Do we value a work of art the same way knowing that it was generated by an algorithm? In the early decades of photography, painters viewed photography as a mechanical process, inferior to "real" art. Only with the evolution of an aesthetic discourse of photography was it accepted as an autonomous art. Similarly, we can ask whether art generated by AI will also develop its own aesthetic framework, or will it always remain accompanied by comparison with human art. Jan-Noël Thon and Lukas Wilde investigate precisely these issues, trying to determine to what extent traditional aesthetic criteria such as originality, complexity and expressiveness apply to the generated image[46]. One aspect noted by theorists is the tendency of generative models to produce images with a certain *kitsch flavor* or to perpetuate visual clichés, given that they are trained on popular images[47]. Dejan Grba speaks of the "mutual permeability of art and kitsch

in digital culture", suggesting that AI can lead to an inflation of images that trivializes visual language[48].

One of the essential characteristics of generative art is the emphasis on process and variability, rather than on the static, finite object. Traditional aesthetics valued the "finished" work, with a clearly defined final form. In contrast, algorithmic aesthetics values the ephemeral, the openness of form, and emergent complexity. An algorithm can produce infinite variations of an image, which causes the notion of a singular masterpiece to be replaced by the notion of a family of works or a creative flow. Generativity itself becomes an aesthetic quality: viewers are invited to contemplate not only a painting, but also the procedure that generated it, possibly visible through multiple copies or through time-lapse animations showing the evolution of the image[49].

At the same time, an aesthetic of ambiguity between the real and the artificial is observed. Many AI-generated images have a particular look: they are realistic at first glance, but contain something slightly "off" upon closer inspection, bizarre anatomical details or illegible text. This "strange familiarity", sometimes known as the *Uncanny Valley* effect in the context of generated faces, becomes an aesthetic element intentionally exploited by some artists, to create tension between what *appears to be* and what *is*. The fluidity of representation is another feature: in digitally generated posthuman art, forms can flow into each other, visual identities are unstable – a human body can be composed of pixels that metamorphose into a landscape, a figure can be both male and female, human and digital. This deliberate ambiguity man and digital. This deliberate ambiguity

reflects precisely the identity fluidity, in a philosophical sense, transposed here visually. We thus see that what is now valued in digital visual art is the ability to suggest hybridity and interconnection. A work is all the more aesthetically interesting to the extent that it makes us ask: is this the work of a man, a machine, nature, all of them together? Going beyond clear categories becomes a value.

In addition, the concept of "beauty" in the classical sense is complemented by the concept of "visual complexity". Many AI art creators are fascinated by the visualization of complexity – for example, images that incorporate multiple levels of detail, fractal patterns, high-order symmetries combined with random elements. This resonates with older interests in generative art, which dates back to the 1960s and 1970s, with pioneers such as Vera Molnar or Harold Cohen, but today the tools allow for much greater complexities. Current generative art often amazes the viewer with an overwhelming richness of shapes and colors, sometimes bordering on sensory overload – what Zylinska criticized as "Candy Crush art", oriented towards easy visual spectacle[50]. In opposition there is a counter-movement: artists who use AI to create minimalist or conceptual images, where the aesthetic emphasis is not on visual enchantment, but on idea and message. The posthuman artist is often perceived, and perceives himself, as a pioneer of new aesthetic territory. He navigates between the enthusiasm of defining new standards in beauty and expressiveness, and the risk that his works could be considered "technological curiosities", if he is not able to infuse them with conceptual substance. The recent inclusion in galleries

and museum collections of art generated using artificial intelligence demonstrates its growing aesthetic legitimacy.

Will AI Replace the Artists or Will it Enhance Them?

Yassi Moghaddam argues that "advances in artificial intelligence are disrupting the way we live and work, and this phenomenon will create fantastic opportunities for economic progress, individual prosperity and growth"[51]. AI should be treated as a complementary technology since its purpose is to expand human capacities and resolve repetitive tasks, allowing the artists to focus on the truly creative parts of their work. A similar message we receive from Ethan Mollick in his volume *Co-Intelligence: Living and Working with AI*. In his words, "we should stop fearing the AI and start a collaboration with it", since the human-machine partnership will increase the productivity and creativity in all fields[52]. Mollick uses the concept of "co-intelligence" to describe how humans and AI can think together by combining the strengths of each: the intuition, cultural context, and human emotion with the computational speed, vast memory, and generative power of the machine[53].

Looking into a more distant future we could anticipate the emergence of an artificial general intelligence, or a superintelligence, as Nick Bostrom calls it[54], that could surpass human creativity not only quantitatively, but also qualitatively. For now, such scenarios are more related to speculation and science fiction, but thinkers like Bostrom or Max Tegmark urge us to reflect on the implications of such a leap[55]. If at some point we had machines with their own consciousness and creativity, what status would they have in art? Would they compete directly with humans, would they have copyrights, would they be recognized as artists with legal personality? The artistic community will perhaps have to answer these questions too, someday. Until then, the current reality – confirmed by experts like Scorzin – is that "AI alone cannot make art yet"[56]. It has no motivation, intention or consciousness, and therefore what we call AI creativity is essentially an extension of human creativity by algorithmic means. For this reason, most informed voices emphasize the opportunity for collaboration, not antagonism.

Conclusions

The creative symbiosis between man and machine is a palpable reality in current creative processes. Generative algorithms expand the creative toolkit of artists, while the fundamental notions of artistic practice are put under scrutiny. The author in the AI era is no longer an isolated demiurge, but a conductor of an ensemble of neural networks, data and software tools, orchestrating the whole process of producing art. The result is a democratization and distribution of creative merit. This change also invites us to accept that artists do not create in a vacuum, but are in constant dialogue with the technologies and context[57].

Originality is not dead. It has become an act of selection and creative synthesis more than an invention act. Posthuman artists are original precisely because they are able to find new combinations among an infinity of possibilities offered by systems, and not because they would, somehow, generate forms *ex nihilo*. This reflects

the combinatorial way in which the human creativity works[58]. We have seen how artistic control is transformed, from the careful control over the material to the meta-control over the process. Instead of being a simple technology operator, the posthuman artist becomes a hybrid, a creative mediator that combines cold calculations with warm intuition and sensibility.

A philosophical perspective presents the posthuman artist as a natural evolution in the current context, rather than a paradox or oxymoron. Traditional humanist ideologies should be adjusted: creativity is no longer the exclusive prerogative of man, but an attribute of man-machine systems, where non-human agents play their own role[59]. Posthuman artists become, in a sense, promoters of the whole socio-technological mechanism, integrating our consciousness into art. From an aesthetic point of view, we conclude that the AI era has diversified the visual language and aesthetic criteria. The generative processes, fluidity of forms and complexity are valued alongside classical beauty. Contemporary art very often looks like a postmodern blend where the spectacular and conceptual coexist[60].

The major conclusion of this study is that artificial intelligence does not replace the artists, it transforms them. This transformation holds a remarkable opportunity to reinvent art. The posthuman artist is not a diminished human, nor is he a humanized machine. He is an amplified creator, an augmented craftsman able to handle one of the most complex tool in the toolkit of creative humanity. A tool that, as one curator put it, "invites us to reconsider the concept of art, of creation, to examine our coexistence with the artificial, and to imagine our aesthetic future not as an exclusively human one, but as a deeply interconnected and radically different one"[61]. Posthuman artists will be the ones who will map this future, working side by side with intelligent machines and expanding the boundaries of creativity to unsuspected horizons.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barthes, Roland, "The Death of the Author", in *Image–Music–Text*, translated by Stephen Heath, London, Fontana Press, 1977, p. 142–148.

Bostrom, Nick, *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014.

Braidotti, Rosi, *The Posthuman*, Cambridge & Malden, Polity Press, 2013.

Charami, Maria, "Art after Humanism: Post-human Aesthetics in the Age of Artificial Intelligence," in *Insistrum*, 14 May 2025, https://www.insistrum.com/post/art-after-humanism-post-human-aesthetics-in-the-age-of-artificial-intelligence (accessed on 11 October 2025).

Clark, Andy, Chalmers, David J., "The Extended Mind", in *Analysis*, vol. 58, no. 1, 1998, p. 7–19.

Dzhimova, Mariya, Tigre Moura, Francisco, "Calculated Randomness, Control and Creation: Artistic Agency in the Age of Artificial Intelligence", in *Arts* 13, no. 5, 2024, article 152.

Foucault, Michel, *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of Human Sciences*, translated by Alan Sheridan, New York, Vintage Books, 1994.

Goodfellow, Paul, "The Distributed Authorship of Art in the Age of AI", in *Arts*, vol. 13, no. 5, 2024, article 149.

Grba, Dejan, "Art Notions in the Age of (Mis)anthropic AI", in *Arts*, vol. 13, no. 5, 2024, article 137.

Haraway, Donna J., "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and SocialistFeminism in the Late Twentieth Century", in Donna J. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, New York & London, Routledge, 1991, p. 149–181.

Issembert, Beni Beeri, "The Algorithmic Muse – Why AI, Like Humans, Needs a Universe of Inspiration to Create", in *PhilArchive*, Version 1, 2 July 2025. https://philarchive.org/archive/ISSTAMv1 (accessed on 16 October 2025).

Khan, Hilal Ahmad, "The Role of the Artist in Algorithmic Creation: Between Code and Consciousness", in *Medium*, 6 October 2025, https://medium.com/@azha.khan.6/the-role-of-the-artist-in-algorithmic-creation-between-code-and-consciousness-f6e804db5c5d.

Mazzone, Marian, Elgammal, Ahmed, "Art, Creativity, and the Potential of Artificial Intelligence", in *Arts*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2019, article 26.

Moghaddam, Yassi, Yurko, Heather, Demirkan, Haluk, Tymann, Nathan, Rayes, Ammar (eds.), *The Future of Work: How Artificial Intelligence Can Augment Human Capabilities*, New York, Business Expert Press, 2020.

Mollick, Ethan, *CoIntelligence: Living and Working with AI*, New York, Portfolio/Penguin, 2024.

Oancea, Raluca Nestor, "Artă, tehnologie și posthumanism", in *Scena9*, 16 February 2017, https://www.scena9.ro/article/arta-tehnologie-si-posthumanism (accessed 12 October 2025).

Pineschi, Anastasia, "We are all machines: AI art and post-humanism", in *Burlington Contemporary*, 29 January 2021, https://contemporary.burlington.org.uk/reviews/reviews/we-are-all-machines-ai-art-and-post-humanism (accessed on 20 October 2025).

Powell, Juliette, Kleiner, Art, *The AI Dilemma: 7 Principles for Responsible Technology*, Oakland, CA, BerrettKoehler Publishers, 2023.

Scorzin, Pamela C., "Artificial Intelligence and the Arts: The AI Robot as a Creative CoBot?", in *rrrreflect. Journal of Integrated Design Research*, Special Issue 1 (2024), article 7.

Ștefănescu, Bogdan, "Inteligența artificială și arta contemporană", in *Istoria Artei*, 12 February 2025, https://istoriaartei.com/2025/02/12/inteligenta-artificiala-si-arta-contemporana/ (accessed on 10 October 2025).

Tegmark, Max, *Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 2017.

Thon, Jan-Noël, Wilde, Lukas R.A. (eds.), *AI Aesthetics: AI-Generated Images between Artistics and Aesthetics*, Routledge, 2025.

Voigts, Eckart, Auer, Robin Markus, Elflein, Dietmar, Kunas, Sebastian, Röhnert, Jan, Seelinger, Christoph (eds.), *Artificial Intelligence – Intelligent Art? HumanMachine Interaction and Creative Practice*, Bielefeld, transcript Verlag, 2024.

von Davier, Thomas Șerban, Herman, Laura M., Moruzzi, Caterina, *"A Machine Walks into an Exhibit: A Technical Analysis of Art Curation", in Arts, vol. 13, no. 5, 2024, article 138.*

Zylinska, Joanna, *AI Art: Machine Visions and Warped Dreams*, London, Open Humanities Press, 2020.

Notes

1. Bogdan Ștefănescu, "Inteligența artificială și arta contemporană", in *Istoria Artei*, 12 February 2025, https://istoriaartei.com/2025/02/12/inteligenta-artificiala-si-arta-contemporana/ (accessed 10 October 2025).

2. Hilal Ahmad Khan, "The Role of the Artist in Algorithmic Creation: Between Code and Consciousness", in *Medium*, 6 October 2025, https://medium.com/@azha.khan.6/the-role-of-the-artist-in-algorithmic-creation-between-code-and-consciousness-f6e804db5c5d (accessed 14 October 2025).

3. *Portrait of Edmond de Belamy* (2018), created by the art collective Obvious using a generative adversarial network (GAN), was sold at Christie's, New York, on October 25, 2018, for $432,500.

4. Bogdan Ștefănescu, o*p. cit.*

5. *Ibidem.*

6. Thomas Șerban von Davier, Laura M. Herman, Caterina Moruzzi, *"A Machine Walks into an Exhibit: A Technical Analysis of Art Curation",* in *Arts*, vol. 13, no. 5, 2024, article 138.

7. See Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of Human Sciences*, translated by Alan Sheridan, New York, Vintage Books, 1994.

8. Donna J. Haraway, "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and SocialistFeminism in the Late Twentieth Century", in Donna J. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, New York & London, Routledge, 1991, p. 149–181.

9. Rosi Braidotti, *The Posthuman*, Cambridge & Malden, Polity Press, 2013, p. 67; see also p. 94–95.

10. Maria Charami, "Art after Humanism: Post-human Aesthetics in the Age of Artificial Intelligence", in *Insistrum*, 14 May 2025, https://www.insistrum.com/post/art-after-humanism-post-human-aesthetics-in-the-age-of-artificial-intelligence (accessed on 20 October 2025).

11. *Ibidem.*

12. Eckart Voigts, Robin Markus Auer, Dietmar Elflein, Sebastian Kunas, Jan Röhnert, Christoph Seelinger (eds.), *Artificial Intelligence – Intelligent Art? HumanMachine Interaction and Creative Practice*, Bielefeld, transcript Verlag, 2024.

13. *Ibidem.*

14. Andy Clark and David J. Chalmers, "The Extended Mind", in *Analysis*, vol. 58, no. 1, 1998, p. 7–19.

15. Joanna Zylinska, *AI Art: Machine Visions and Warped Dreams*, London, Open Humanities Press, 2020, p. 54.

16. *Ibidem*, p. 13.

17. *Ibidem*, p. 54.

18. Anastasia Pineschi, "We are all machines: AI art and post-humanism", in *Burlington Contemporary*, 29 January 2021, https://contemporary.burlington.org.uk/reviews/reviews/we-are-all-machines-ai-art-and-post-humanism (accessed on 20 October 2025).

19. Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author", in *Image–Music–Text*, translated by Stephen Heath, London, Fontana Press, 1977, p. 142–148.

20. Raluca Nestor Oancea, "Artă, tehnologie și postumanism", in *Scena9*, 16 February 2017, https://www.scena9.ro/article/arta-tehnologie-si-posthumanism (accessed 15 October 2025).

21. Marian Mazzone and Ahmed Elgammal, "Art, Creativity, and the Potential of Artificial Intelligence", in *Arts*, vol. 8, no. 1, 2019, article 26.

22. Dejan Grba, "Art Notions in the Age of (Mis)anthropic AI", in *Arts*, vol. 13, no. 5, 2024, article 137.

23. *Ibidem.*

24. *Ibidem.*

25. *Ibidem.*

26. Marian Mazzone and Ahmed Elgammal, *op. cit.*, paragraph 4.

27. *Ibidem*, paragraph 1-4.

28. Pamela C. Scorzin, "Artificial Intelligence and the Arts: The AI Robot as a Creative CoBot?", in *rrrreflect. Journal of Integrated Design Research*, Special Issue 1, 2024, article 7.

29. Thomas Șerban von Davier, Laura M. Herman, and Caterina Moruzzi, *op. cit.*

30. Jens Schröter, "Künstliche Intelligenz'…", cited in Mariya Dzhimova and Francisco Tigre Moura, "Calculated Randomness, Control and Creation: Artistic Agency in the Age of Artificial Intelligence", in *Arts*, vol. 13, no. 5, 2024, article 152.

31. Catrin Misselhorn, "Künstliche Intelligenz–das Ende der Kunst?", cited in Mariya Dzhimova and Francisco Tigre Moura, "Calculated Randomness, Control and Creation: Artistic Agency in the Age of Artificial Intelligence", in *Arts, vol.* 13, no. 5, 2024, article 152.

32. Mariya Dzhimova and Francisco Tigre Moura, "Calculated Randomness, Control and Creation: Artistic Agency in the Age of Artificial Intelligence", in *Arts*, vol. 13, no. 5, 2024, article 152.

33. Paul Goodfellow, "The Distributed Authorship of Art in the Age of AI", in *Arts*, vol. 13, no. 5, 2024, article 149.

34. *Ibidem.*

35. *Ibidem.*

36. *Ibidem.*

37. Mariya Dzhimova and Francisco Tigre Moura, *op. cit.*

38. *Ibidem.*

39. *Ibidem.*

40. Beni Beeri Issembert, "The Algorithmic Muse – Why AI, Like Humans, Needs a Universe of Inspiration to Create", in *PhilArchive*, version 1, uploaded 2 July 2025, https://philarchive.org/archive/ISSTAMv1 (accessed on 22 October 2025).

41. *Ibidem.*

42. Marian Mazzone and Ahmed Elgammal, *op. cit.*

43. Juliette Powell and Art Kleiner, *The AI Dilemma: 7 Principles for Responsible Technology*, Oakland, CA, BerrettKoehler Publishers, 2023.

44. *Ibidem.*

45. Dejan Grba, *op. cit.*

46. Jan-Noël Thon, Lukas R.A. Wilde (eds.), *AI Aesthetics: AI-Generated Images between Artistics and Aesthetics*, Routledge, 2025.

47. Dejan Grba, *op. cit.*

48. *Ibidem.*

49. Hilal Ahmad Khan, *op. cit.*

50. Joanna Zylinska, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

51. Yassi Moghaddam, Heather Yurko, Haluk Demirkan, Nathan Tymann, and Ammar Rayes (eds.), *The Future of Work: How Artificial Intelligence Can Augment Human Capabilities*, New York, Business Expert Press, 2020.

52. Ethan Mollick, *CoIntelligence: Living and Working with AI*, New York, Portfolio/Penguin, 2024.

53. *Ibidem.*

54. Nick Bostrom, *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014.

55. Max Tegmark, *Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 2017.

56. Pamela C. Scorzin, *op. cit.*

57. Anastasia Pineschi, *op. cit.*

58. Beni Beeri Issembert, *op. cit.*

59. Anastasia Pineschi, *op. cit.*

60. *Ibidem.*

61. Maria Charami, *op. cit.*