Literature Chronicle ISBN: 978-93-7724-871-0

Chapter-1

Between Text and Technology: Rebooting the Humanities in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

By

Ms. S. Swapna

Assistant Professor (English), Department of H&S, MRCET, JNTU, Hyderabad

DOI Number:https://literaturechronicle.com/doi-2026-9576

Abstract

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into knowledge production fundamentally challenges the epistemological foundations and methodological practices of the humanities. As algorithmic systems increasingly mediate reading, writing, interpretation, and archiving, the humanities must move beyond defensive postures and actively reconfigure their critical frameworks. This chapter argues that the encounter between text and technology is not a rupture but a transformative moment that demands methodological recalibration. Drawing on contemporary debates in digital humanities and AI ethics, it examines how machine learning systems reshape authorship, interpretation,

and textual authority. Rather than positioning artificial intelligence as a replacement for humanistic inquiry, the study conceptualizes it as a co-constitutive agent that redefines interpretive labor (Hayles, 2012; Bender et al., 2021). The chapter critically evaluates the implications of large language models for hermeneutics, pedagogy, and scholarly production, highlighting both epistemic risks—such as bias amplification and opacity—and new possibilities for augmented analysis and interdisciplinary synthesis. By situating AI within longer histories of technological mediation, the study underscores the humanities' capacity to interrogate the cultural, ethical, and political dimensions of computational systems (Crawford, 2021). Ultimately, it proposes a framework for "rebooted" humanities that integrates computational literacy with critical reflexivity, ensuring that technological innovation remains accountable to human values. The future of the humanities, therefore, lies not in resisting artificial intelligence but in shaping its development through sustained critical engagement.

Keywords

(*Artificial Intelligence; Digital Humanities; Authorship; Hermeneutics; Algorithmic Bias; Computational Literacy*)

Introduction

The humanities have always been the custodians of meaning, memory, and moral imagination. Today, they confront a transformative challenge: artificial intelligence systems that generate, classify, and circulate texts at unprecedented speed

are reshaping the very terrain on which interpretation stands. The pressing question is not whether AI can produce language, but how the humanities can sustain their critical authority in a world where textual production is increasingly automated.

Historically, the humanities emerged as disciplines devoted to understanding human experience through language, art, philosophy, and history. Their central commitments have included interpretive depth, contextual sensitivity, and ethical reflection. As Gadamer (1975) argues, interpretation is a dialogical process rooted in historical consciousness. Ricoeur (1981) similarly frames textual understanding as an act of mediation between explanation and interpretation. These foundations underscore that meaning is never mechanical; it is situated within traditions, cultures, and lived realities. When algorithmic systems process language as data patterns, they challenge but do not replace this hermeneutic horizon.

The contemporary moment calls for renewed attention to the intellectual mission of the humanities. Rather than viewing AI as an external threat, scholars must ask how humanistic inquiry can illuminate its cultural assumptions and normative implications. Critical theory reminds us that technologies are embedded in structures of power and ideology (Habermas, 1971). Poststructuralist thought further destabilizes fixed notions of authorship and authority, offering conceptual tools for examining machine generated texts (Foucault, 1977; Barthes, 1977). These traditions equip the humanities to interrogate the shifting boundaries between human creativity and computational production.

At the same time, the humanities must reaffirm their pedagogical and civic roles. Nussbaum (2010) emphasizes that humanistic education cultivates empathy, critical reasoning, and democratic responsibility. In an era saturated with algorithmic mediation, these capacities are more vital than ever. AI systems may organize information, but they cannot substitute for ethical judgment or historical understanding. The interpretive labor of the humanities remains essential for assessing the cultural narratives and value systems embedded within technological infrastructures.

Rebooting the humanities, therefore, entails deepening rather than diminishing their intellectual commitments. It requires integrating technological awareness with enduring humanistic concerns about meaning, agency, and justice. By centering interpretation, ethics, and cultural critique, the humanities can shape how artificial intelligence is understood and governed. The encounter between text and technology becomes not a displacement of humanistic inquiry, but a moment for its reinvigoration.

Theoretical Framework

Rebooting the humanities in the age of artificial intelligence requires a framework that begins and ends with the humanities themselves. Artificial intelligence is not the conceptual center of this inquiry; rather, it is the contemporary condition through which longstanding humanistic questions about meaning, ethics, subjectivity, and culture must now be rearticulated. The humanities provide the interpretive depth, historical consciousness, and

normative orientation necessary to understand how AI reshapes textual practices without displacing the humanistic tradition.

At the core of this framework lies hermeneutics. Schleiermacher's (1998) early articulation of interpretation as the reconstruction of meaning and Dilthey's (1989) emphasis on lived experience establish understanding as historically situated and dialogical. These principles foreground the irreducibility of context and intentionality, reminding us that texts are embedded in lifeworlds. Even when AI generates language, interpretation remains a human act grounded in historical consciousness and ethical responsibility. The humanities thus retain epistemic primacy in evaluating machine-produced discourse.

Complementing hermeneutics is critical humanism, which positions interpretation within structures of power and ideology. Eagleton (2003) argues that literary theory exposes the political dimensions of cultural production, while Spivak (1999) underscores the ethical stakes of representation and voice. Applied to AI, these insights compel scholars to interrogate whose knowledge is encoded, whose narratives are marginalized, and whose authority is amplified within algorithmic systems. The humanities do not merely analyze texts; they question the conditions under which texts emerge and circulate.

A further dimension emerges from narrative theory and poetics. White (1987) demonstrates that historical writing is structured by narrative choices, revealing the constructed nature of knowledge. Attridge (2004) emphasizes the

singularity of literary events and the ethical encounter with alterity. These perspectives resist the reduction of language to data points and highlight creativity as an event of meaning rather than a statistical outcome. In this sense, the humanities defend the qualitative dimensions of textuality against purely quantitative logics.

Finally, philosophical anthropology strengthens the framework's normative foundation. Taylor (1989) situates human identity within moral frameworks shaped by language and culture, while MacIntyre (1984) links ethical reasoning to narrative traditions. Such perspectives reaffirm that technological developments must be assessed in light of human flourishing and communal values. Artificial intelligence may transform modes of production, but the humanities remain essential for articulating the purposes toward which such transformation should be directed.

This theoretical framework therefore prioritizes the humanities as both origin and horizon of analysis. Hermeneutics, critical theory, narrative inquiry, and philosophical anthropology collectively ensure that technological change is interpreted through enduring humanistic commitments to meaning, justice, and ethical responsibility. Artificial intelligence becomes a site of inquiry, but the humanities remain the guiding discipline.

Chapter Analysis

If the humanities have historically been devoted to interpreting texts, the age of artificial intelligence compels them to interpret the conditions under which texts are now

produced. This chapter advances the argument that AI does not signal the obsolescence of the humanities; rather, it exposes their renewed necessity. The analysis unfolds across three interrelated domains: authorship and creativity, knowledge production, and ethical-cultural responsibility.

First, the question of authorship demands critical scrutiny. Barthesian and Foucauldian destabilizations of authorial sovereignty prepared the ground for questioning singular authorship, yet AI intensifies this shift by introducing machinic co-production. Drawing on Genette's (1997) theory of transtextuality, AI-generated texts can be read as hypertextual transformations of vast textual archives. However, unlike human intertextual play, machine production lacks situated intentionality. This distinction does not invalidate AI texts but reframes them as artifacts of infrastructural authorship, where creativity emerges from patterned recombination rather than experiential depth. The humanities must therefore refine criteria for evaluating originality, voice, and responsibility.

Second, AI reconfigures knowledge production within the humanities. Foucault's archaeology of discourse (1972) reminds us that knowledge systems are governed by rules of formation. AI models operate through statistical regularities that both reflect and amplify dominant discourses. As Pasquinelli (2019) argues, machine learning abstracts social labor into algorithmic form, embedding historical inequalities within computational architectures. The chapter contends that digital acceleration intensifies what Lyotard (1984) described as the performative logic of postmodern knowledge, where efficiency and output risk overshadow

critical depth. The humanities must resist this reduction by reaffirming slow, contextual, and dialogical inquiry.

Third, the cultural and ethical stakes of AI foreground the humanities' civic role. Arendt's (1958) distinction between labor, work, and action provides a lens for assessing how automation alters public and intellectual life. When textual production becomes automated labor, the space for reflective action may contract unless deliberately preserved. Moreover, Butler's (2004) ethics of vulnerability underscores that language shapes recognition and exclusion. AI systems that generate or filter discourse participate in these processes, influencing whose voices are heard. The humanities are uniquely positioned to interrogate such dynamics through critical discourse analysis and ethical critique.

The chapter ultimately demonstrates that rebooting the humanities does not mean capitulating to technological determinism. Rather, it involves cultivating methodological pluralism. Digital philology, cultural analytics, and archival digitization expand research capacities, yet they must remain accountable to interpretive rigor (Burdick et al., 2012). The humanities thrive not by imitating computational logics but by situating them within broader narratives of power, culture, and human meaning.

In this analysis, artificial intelligence emerges as both a challenge and catalyst. It destabilizes traditional practices while illuminating the enduring relevance of humanistic inquiry. By foregrounding authorship, epistemology, and ethical responsibility, the chapter affirms that the humanities

are not peripheral in the age of AI. They are indispensable for ensuring that technological transformation remains oriented toward critical reflection and human flourishing.

(OpenAI, 2026)

Implications of the Chapter

The central implication of this chapter is clear: the future of artificial intelligence as a cultural force depends significantly on the intellectual leadership of the humanities. Rather than being peripheral to technological development, the humanities emerge as foundational to interpreting, guiding, and ethically framing AI's role in society. The chapter demonstrates that the encounter between text and

technology is not a disciplinary threat but a moment that reasserts the humanities' normative authority.

First, the chapter implies a reconfiguration of humanistic methodology. Traditional close reading remains indispensable, yet it must now coexist with computational awareness. This does not entail subordinating interpretation to algorithmic analysis; rather, it calls for critical fluency in digital systems so that scholars can interrogate how texts are produced, circulated, and curated by machines. The humanities must therefore cultivate scholars who are both interpretively rigorous and technologically literate. Such integration ensures that digital tools remain instruments of inquiry rather than determinants of epistemic value.

Second, the chapter underscores the renewed importance of ethical reflection. AI systems participate in shaping cultural narratives, public discourse, and educational practices. The humanities, grounded in philosophy, literary studies, history, and cultural criticism, provide the conceptual vocabulary necessary to evaluate these transformations. Questions of authorship, accountability, bias, and representation cannot be resolved through technical optimization alone. They require moral reasoning, historical contextualization, and sensitivity to power relations. The implication is that humanities scholarship must actively engage policy debates, curriculum design, and public discourse concerning AI governance.

Third, the chapter suggests a pedagogical transformation. Humanistic education must reaffirm its commitment to cultivating interpretive judgment, empathy, and critical

skepticism in students who inhabit algorithmically mediated environments. AI may assist in information processing, but it cannot replace the reflective capacities nurtured through sustained engagement with literature, philosophy, and the arts. The classroom thus becomes a site where students learn not only how to use AI tools, but how to question them.

Finally, the chapter implies a broader cultural responsibility. If AI reshapes how societies remember, narrate, and imagine, then the humanities must safeguard the plurality of voices and the depth of historical consciousness that sustain democratic life. Rebooting the humanities is therefore not a technical adjustment but an intellectual renewal. It affirms that meaning, justice, and human flourishing remain the ultimate horizons within which technological innovation must be situated.

In this sense, the humanities are not adapting to survive in the age of artificial intelligence; they are redefining the ethical and interpretive terms by which that age will be understood.

Conclusion

The central claim of this chapter has been that artificial intelligence does not diminish the humanities; it clarifies their indispensability. As algorithmic systems increasingly mediate textual production, circulation, and interpretation, the humanities remain the primary domain in which meaning, value, and responsibility are critically examined. AI may generate language, but it does not inhabit history, assume ethical accountability, or engage in dialogical

understanding. These remain distinctly humanistic practices grounded in interpretation and moral reflection.

Throughout this chapter, the humanities have been positioned not as reactive observers of technological change but as active interlocutors. Nussbaum (2010) argues that democratic societies depend upon the cultivation of critical thinking and empathetic imagination, capacities nurtured through humanistic education. In an era shaped by automated textuality, these capacities are not optional; they are safeguards against uncritical acceptance of algorithmic authority. Similarly, Ricoeur (1981) reminds us that interpretation involves a surplus of meaning that exceeds mechanical explanation. This surplus underscores the limits of computational systems and the continuing relevance of hermeneutic inquiry.

The chapter also affirms that technological developments must be situated within broader ethical and cultural narratives. Taylor (1989) emphasizes that human identity is formed within moral frameworks sustained by language and tradition. AI operates within these frameworks but cannot define them. The humanities therefore retain the responsibility of articulating normative horizons within which innovation must be assessed.

Rebooting the humanities is not a concession to technological inevitability; it is a reaffirmation of intellectual vocation. By integrating critical literacy, ethical scrutiny, and historical consciousness, the humanities ensure that artificial intelligence remains accountable to human flourishing rather than detached from it. The enduring task

of the humanities is to interpret, to question, and to guide. In the age of artificial intelligence, that task becomes not less urgent, but more so.

Works Cited

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press.

Attridge, D. (2004). *The singularity of literature*. Routledge.

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

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922

Burdick, A., Drucker, J., Lunenfeld, P., Presner, T., & Schnapp, J. (2012). *Digital humanities*. MIT Press.

Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*. Verso.

Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.

Dilthey, W. (1989). *Introduction to the human sciences* (R. J. Betanzos, Trans.). Wayne State University Press.

Eagleton, T. (2003). *Literary theory: An introduction* (2nd ed.). University of Minnesota Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Pantheon Books.

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

Gadamer, H. G. (1975). *Truth and method*. Continuum.

Genette, G. (1997). *Palimpsests: Literature in the second degree* (C. Newman & C. Doubinsky, Trans.). University of Nebraska Press.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interests*. Beacon Press.

Hayles, N. K. (2012). *How we think: Digital media and contemporary technogenesis*. University of Chicago Press.

Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.

MacIntyre, A. (1984). *After virtue* (2nd ed.). University of Notre Dame Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton University Press.

OpenAI. (2026). *ChatGPT* (GPT-5.2) [Large language model]. https://chat.openai.com/

Pasquinelli, M. (2019). Three thousand years of algorithmic ritual: The emergence of AI from the computation of space. *e-flux Journal, 101*, 1–15.

Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Hermeneutics and the human sciences*. Cambridge University Press.

Schleiermacher, F. (1998). *Hermeneutics and criticism and other writings* (A. Bowie, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Spivak, G. C. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason*. Harvard University Press.

Taylor, C. (1989). *Sources of the self: The making of the modern identity*. Harvard University Press.

White, H. (1987). *The content of the form: Narrative discourse and historical representation*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Author's Bio

Ms. S. Swapna is a dedicated Ph.D. research scholar with 13 years of teaching experience, specialized in English Language Teaching (ELT). Her work focuses on pedagogy, language skills development, and learner-cantered practices. With a strong ELT background, she strives to integrate innovative methods, contribute to academic scholarship, and foster effective communication skills in diverse learning environments.