



Received: 2025-07-29

Revised: 2025-09-09; 2025-10-13

Accepted: 2025-10-15

Magdalena Górka

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5766-0921>

Institute of Art History

University of Lodz

magdalena.gorska@filhist.uni.lodz.pl

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, GLITCH, AND THE UNMAKING OF IDENTITY IN THE ART OF MARIO KLINGEMANN

Abstract: This article attempts to reinterpret the work of Mario Klingemann, one of the leading representatives of generative art, in light of the concept of *dé-coïncidence* formulated by François Jullien. The focus is on the question of how artistic practices utilizing artificial intelligence can constitute a contemporary realization of the philosophy of a rupture form, identity and meaning. By analysing selected works by Klingemann, such as *Neural Glitch*, *Memories of Passersby I* and *Imposture Series*, the author shows that generative art not only blurs the boundaries between the author and the system, intention and chance, but also becomes a space of rupture, a discontinuity in which something new emerges. Jullien's thoughts, combined with the aesthetics of glitch, the ephemerality of the image and the dispersion of authorship, allow us to understand generativity not as a technology, but as a philosophical category of creative separation. In this sense, the article suggests that generative art can be read as a practice of *dé-coïncidence*, as a space where form "ceases to be itself", opening to the unknown and unpredictable.

Keywords: generative art, François Jullien, *dé-coïncidence*, Mario Klingemann, glitch, portrait, artificial intelligence, authorship.

Contemporary art increasingly operates as a field of shifts and ruptures that occur between the artist and viewer, intention and chance, image and code, medium and algorithm. A particularly significant site of these displacements is generative art, which employs artificial intelligence as a partner in the creative process. Generative models, especially GANs (Generative Adversarial

Networks), not only redefine the technical conditions of image production, but more fundamentally challenge traditional notions of authorship, artistic process and form. They often introduce elements of randomness, discontinuity and machine autonomy into the heart of the artwork. It is precisely within this unstable and error-prone space that clear parallels can be found with the philosophy of François Jullien.

In his book *Dé-coïncidence. D'où viennent l'art et l'existence?*¹ François Jullien develops the concept of *dé-coïncidence*, understood as a process of stepping beyond coincidence². The French philosopher identifies a tendency within the Western intellectual and artistic tradition to seek alignment between reality and conceptual systems, which he sees as obstructing the possibility of discovering the other and the new³. *Dé-coïncidence* is conceived as a deliberate act of loosening this alignment. It is a moment of rupture, revealing what has been unthought (*impensés de pensée*)⁴. Importantly, Jullien argues that *dé-coïncidence* is not an act of destruction but a creative process that requires sustaining tension between what is familiar and what is foreign (“<<transition>> enables the attainment of another <<form>> – between forms”⁵). This tension, which he describes as discrepancy or divergence, becomes the source of creativity and innovation.

From this perspective, art should not be understood as a harmonious form that mirrors the world, but rather as a process that initiates ruptures and discontinuities within aesthetic, narrative and cultural expectations. Art is conceived here as an act of loosening, one that does not necessarily generate a new form, but instead enables the emergence of another way of seeing, imaging and thinking. Jullien thus opposes the idea of *coïncidence*, understood as perfect alignment of language with reality, of image with the world, of author with a work, and instead argues that creation should be based on the deconstruction of such alignment. In this sense, artistic practice becomes a movement toward

¹ The Polish edition, where you could also find fragments from this publication: F. Jullien, *Ponownie otworzyć możliwości: de-koïncydencja i kolejneżycie*, transl. E. Marynowicz-Hetka, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź 2024.

² For the French philosopher, coincidence is a state in which our thinking, perception and actions coincide with accepted patterns, categories or expectations. *Ibid.*, p. 38.

³ The French philosopher notes that the Greeks sought to speak of the world as a ‘whole’ and that European culture became the heir to the imperative of thinking in universal categories: the (Greek) philosophical plane of the concept, the (Roman) juridical plane of citizenship, and the (Christian) religious plane of salvation. F. Jullien, lecture entitled ‘There is No Such Thing as Cultural Identity, but We Shall Defend a Culture’s Resources’, 16 November 2017, UVA East Asia Center in Charlottesville, Virginia, US, www.youtube.com/watch?v=4YT-g6EuwiCs&t=4966s [accessed: 06.06.2025].

⁴ J.-M. Barbier, *Koncept kultury działania*, in: F. Jullien, *Ponownie otworzyć możliwości...*, p. 234.

⁵ F. Jullien, *Ponownie otworzyć możliwości...*, p. 74.

discontinuity and the artist becomes one who enables the loosening of the world and its reinterpretation. As Jullien writes: “Art will never cease to reveal this threat, whether in music, theatre, drawing, painting or film. It is precisely in the re-performance of a given work that a departure from its familiar interpretation takes place, thus creating openings for a different interpretation that revives its reception”⁶.

It is worth mentioning here Jullien's another key critical category, namely the concept of ‘adequacy’ (*adéquation*)⁷. Traditionally, Western thinking about art has strived for consistency: between image and reality, form and function, the work and the viewer's expectations. Such a coincidence was considered a determinant of aesthetic value and meaning. Jullien, however, shows that it is precisely this conformity that becomes a trap – a state that prevents transformation and perpetuates the familiar. In his view, art should rather ‘unseal’ adequacy, provoking us to think differently. A work of art is not meant to be an illustration of meaning, but a space for its destabilisation. Jullien cites the creative work of Georges Braque, who is quoted as saying: ‘You paint what lies between the apple and the dish, as well’⁸. Similar ideas can be found in the work of Mario Klingemann: his portraits and figures are almost human, but never quite; the images are formally familiar, but semantically alien. The generative algorithms he uses in his artistic activities do not create ‘adequate’ forms, but rather fractured images, i.e. those that do not correspond unambiguously to either expectations or experience. In this sense, the artist does not ‘create’ in the classical sense but undermines (dismantles) the adequacy of the image and meaning, giving voice to what has been invisible and unthought-of until now.

Mario Klingemann (b. 1970)⁹, also known as Quasimondo, is one of the most prominent contemporary artists exploring the boundaries of generative art and artificial intelligence. He was among the first to experiment with generative adversarial networks (GANs) to create portraits and images with complex layers of meaning, investigating the relationship between algorithmic autonomy

⁶ Ibid., p.174.

⁷ Ibid., p. 37; Jullien writes that „The artist is indeed an artist insofar as he breaks away from art that has already been created, established in its adequacy, recognized as “art”, and is able to oppose it, insofar as he gradually widens the gap between it and what is currently accepted and admired as “art”, constituting its “canon” in a state of invisible inertia. Ibid., p. 154.

⁸ F. Jullien, lecture entitled ‘There is No Such Thing....’

⁹ Mario Klingemann has collaborated with prestigious institutions including Google Arts & Culture, the British Library, the New York Public Library, and Cardiff University. His works have been exhibited at international festivals and in renowned art institutions, including the Ars Electronica Festival, The Photographers’ Gallery in London, the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, and the Centre Pompidou in Paris. More about the artist: <https://quasimondo.com/> [accessed: 26.06.2025].

and artistic intention¹⁰. In his projects, Klingemann tests the capacity of AI systems to autonomously generate images, exploring how algorithms “learn” to represent and reinterpret human faces, objects and scenes. His works often oscillate between recognizability and abstraction, producing visual narratives that provoke questions about identity, memory and perception. Each layer of the neural networks he employs is responsible for a different level of analysis, ranging from basic forms and textures to higher stylistic and cultural conventions. A crucial shift in Klingemann’s practice involved moving away from classical algorithms toward machine learning systems capable of producing unpredictable results. As he explains: “In classical algorithmic approaches, the machine has no choice. It just produces random variations, and you decide what works and what is noise”¹¹. This lack of autonomy on the machine’s part led him to seek new solutions. The artist emphasizes that his inspiration came from the vision of artificial intelligence not as a tool, but as a creative partner. His artistic practice is thus grounded in a dialogical relationship with the machine and a willingness to embrace surprise and the unexpected. Klingemann notes that “art created with artificial intelligence and machine learning is inherently tied to technological advancement, and that artists working in this field must continually follow developments in a rapidly accelerating domain”¹².

In the context of generative art, de-coincidence allows us to analyse how Klingemann’s GAN-based works challenge traditional notions of authorship, aesthetics and the static nature of artworks. Analysing them, we can introduce the terminology proposed by Jullien, such as *écart*¹³ (exploratory divisions)

¹⁰ The Generative Adversarial Network (GAN), proposed by Ian Goodfellow in 2014, is an innovative architecture of artificial neural networks based on the competition between two models: the generator and the discriminator. The generator’s task is to create new data – for example, images – from random noise, attempting to produce samples so realistic that they become indistinguishable from real data. The discriminator, in turn, evaluates whether a given sample originates from a real dataset or has been generated by the model. The training process of these two networks resembles a zero-sum game: the generator tries to “fool” the discriminator, while the discriminator strives to identify fake samples correctly. Both networks are trained simultaneously, pursuing opposing goals – the generator aims to maximize its ability to produce convincing outputs, while the discriminator seeks to minimize the number of incorrect classifications. In an ideal scenario, the generator becomes so effective that the discriminator can no longer distinguish between real and generated data, and begins to guess randomly.

See: I. J. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza et al., *Generative Adversarial Nets*, “Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems” 2014, vol. 27, https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2014/file/f033ed80deb0234979a61f95710dbe25-Paper.pdf [accessed: 20.06.2025].

¹¹ www.electricartefacts.art/news/twenty-thousand-leagues-under-the-screen-mario-klingsmann-explores-the-depths-of-artificial-intelligence-part-1 [accessed: 25.06.2025].

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ecart (divide) “is not identificatory but exploratory. It gives rise to some other possibility”. F. Jullien, lecture entitled ‘There is No Such Thing....’

and *vivre*¹⁴, in relation to art perceived as a living process – not as a product, but in relation to a dynamic process of becoming. For Jullien, creativity is a movement towards the unknown, an opening up to something that has not yet come into being. It is a process in which the artist does not act as a demiurge, but as an initiator of a gap, mediating what was previously immobile. As Jullien concludes: ‘By opening a crack, de-coincidence effectively separates itself, escapes and paves the way. The crack penetrates locally and, by outlining the whole, weakens it. On the one hand, de-coincidence favours distancing oneself from what blocks, and on the other, it destabilises the content’[3]. In this context, therefore, the artist does not create in the traditional sense, but rather unsticks, brings to a point where the form loses its function and thus gains the potential for something new and unknown to emerge. Mario Klingemann’s artistic practice vividly illustrates François Jullien’s call to move beyond coincidence – that is, beyond the alignment of image with expectation, form with function and artwork with the category of recognition. In projects such as *Memories of Passersby I*, *Neural Glitch*, and *Imposture Series*, the artist does not so much represent reality as he fissures it, initiating a process of *décoïncidence* understood as an aesthetic gesture of rupture (*fissuration*) in what is familiar, harmonious and culturally internalized¹⁵. In this perspective, art does not reproduce the coherence of the world but rather unbinds it. Klingemann appears to embody this postulate quite literally, collaborating with neural networks that generate images which are unpredictable, contingent and not necessarily aligned with human aesthetic norms. As a result, the artist does not construct a finished form but initiates a process in which the image becomes a fissure rather than a structure. Jullien notes that the artist should no longer be merely someone who designs and models, but someone who ‘questions, disagrees with what he has already done’¹⁶. In Klingemann’s work, this postulate is realised literally: the artist initiates a process of de-coincidence by working with error, deformation and algorithmic discontinuity, and instead of creating forms, s/he opens up possibilities (*ouvrir des possibles*), while trying to ‘capture some hidden essence’¹⁷. Through systems that interpret input data in unpredictable ways, s/he creates ‘visions, things so that the artist can see something he could not have imagined himself’¹⁸.

¹⁴ Read more about this topic in: F. Jullien, *Philosophie du vivre*, Gallimard, Paris 2011.

¹⁵ F. Jullien, *Ponownie otworzyć możliwości...*, p.73.

¹⁶ Ibid., p.56.

¹⁷ www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/mar/04/can-machines-be-more-creative-than-humans [accessed: 23.06.2025].

¹⁸ <https://thequietus.com/culture/art/mario-klingemann-ai-art-interview> [accessed: 22.06.2025].

One of the most significant manifestations of *dé-coïncidence* in Mario Klingemann's generative art is the phenomenon of the glitch, understood as an error, disruption, or interruption of a system's continuity. In a traditional context, the glitch would be seen as a defect; however, within an artistic framework, it becomes a point of creative tension. The German artist not only refrains from eliminating these emerging faults but consciously embraces them as an artistic strategy. Unpredictability thus becomes the source of a new aesthetic rooted in the philosophical category of the unbinding of coherence, as described by François Jullien. Klingemann intervenes in the structures of trained neural networks (GANs), modifying their parameters, introducing random corruption into model weights, or even manipulating input data. As a result, these systems lose their capacity for consistent logic, entering a realm of discontinuity and aesthetic deconstruction. This technique is employed in the series of works titled *Neural Glitch* (2018), a project that emerged as a development of Klingemann's earlier explorations into the aesthetics of error and visual disintegration in art created with artificial intelligence. These interventions result in visual anomalies – images marked by chaotic, dreamlike structures. Human-like figures disintegrate into pixels; distortions blend with realistic fragments; the boundary between form and glitch noise remains fluid. Klingemann describes this project as “a dialogue with a machine that tries to repair itself”¹⁹. It is, therefore, not only a visual inquiry into the limits of the image but also a philosophical meditation on error as a creative possibility. These disruptions break the alignment between form and function, between expectation and outcome, giving rise to new ways of seeing and thinking the image. It is the aesthetics of entropy and unpredictability, in which the artist partially loses control over the work, giving space to a machine co-creator. This kind of glitch, which in Klingemann's work becomes a metaphorical figure of philosophical rupture, is therefore an invitation to transcend stability. The disruption of the system's operation gives rise to images that emanate the aura of something uncannily human and yet entirely alien. As visual attempts at meaning-making, they are the outcome of a machine which, though devoid of understanding, can nonetheless generate forms that evoke the impression of emotion or a trace of identity²⁰.

Mario Klingemann also touches upon the important issue of authorship and the redefinition of aesthetics in the post-digital era. This strategy gives

¹⁹ M. Klingemann: “The glitches can be introduced in some of those models and, depending on their location, models following later in the chain try to “fix” or “heal” the accidents in which case their misinterpretations can create surrealistic compositions or as I call it >>Neurealism<<”. www.quasimondo.com/2018/10/28/neural-glitch [accessed: 21.06.2025].

²⁰ The works can be viewed at: <https://quasimondo.com/2018/10/28/neural-glitch/> [accessed: 29.06.2025].

rise to a crisis of the classical concept of authorship. In the traditional view, the author was a figure of coherence who gave meaning to and exercised control over the work. In generative art, and especially in Klingemann's work, the author disintegrates. Their function is dispersed between code, training data, network architecture, chance, system actions and the aesthetic decisions of the artistcurator. It is precisely this moment of the disintegration of the creative subject that Jullien could probably consider a manifestation of *dé-coïncidence*²¹. Klingemann himself admits that training artificial intelligence models is, in his view, similar to working with another artist²². He recognises this difference not as a loss of control, but as an opportunity to generate something he could not have created himself. The process does not end with a product, but remains a movement, a shared stream of discontinuity between man and machine.

Memories of Passersby I, 2018 (the installation mentioned above in the article), is a pioneering and autonomous example of generative art, in which GAN algorithms continuously produce an infinite stream of portraits without human intervention. The installation consists of two screens encased in classically styled frames and a computer concealed within a chestnut wood console. This computer functions as the “brain” of the artwork, generating in real time unique facial images based on thousands of portraits from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century²³. Each portrait appears, undergoes subtle distortions and glitch effects, and then vanishes, leaving the viewer in a state of aesthetic uncertainty – an effect that Klingemann himself describes as a metaphor for transient, fragmentary memory²⁴. This generative process, structured through the feedback loop between the generator and discriminator, allows for the emergence of singular compositions that are never repeated²⁵. The title of the installation evokes the ephemerality of the image: the faces resemble fleeting memories of people we have never met, “reconstructed” by the machine through data rather than lived experience. Klingemann notes that this is a closed system that

²¹ F. Jullien, *Ponownie otworzyć możliwości...*, p. 56.

²² M. Klingemann: “There’s a certain fascination that humans have with different types of intelligence. Kind of like a mirror, what can it do that I cannot do? What am I better at than it? I don’t have to be afraid. Or do I?” [...] “I don’t have that fear, I’m curious. You do what you have to do. Because you enjoy it. A machine cannot take it away.” www.thequietus.com/culture/art/mario-klingsmann-ai-art-interview [accessed: 29.06.2025].

²³ www.sothebys.com/en/articles/artificial-intelligence-and-the-art-of-mario-klingsmann [accessed: 28.06.2025].

²⁴ M. Klingemann, *Exploring the frontiers of AI, data poisoning, ethical challenges & art*, “Clot Magazine”, www.clotmag.com/interviews/mario-klingsmann-exploring-the-frontiers-of-ai-data-poisoning-ethical-challenges-art [accessed: 28.06.2025].

²⁵ J. Vincent, *A never-ending stream of AI art goes up for auction. In the second major auction of AI art, a video installation shows endless AI-generated portraits*, 05.03.2019, www.compart.uni-bremen.de [accessed: 28.06.2025].

no longer learns, which he sees as “a metaphor of our civilization” seduced by self-propelling creativity²⁶. The aesthetic of “convulsive beauty” references the Surrealists, including André Breton, as well as the artistic value of error, glitch and deviation from reality’s expected coherence. Formally, the work resists classification as a traditional painting: without a beginning or end, it unfolds as a continuous process that interrogates the boundaries of authorship between artist, algorithm and dataset, while also reinterpreting the notions of medium, identity and memory in the age of artificial intelligence. These are portraits of ephemeral presence without identity. While the classical portrait marked individual singularity, Klingemann’s images become diffused shadows of processed data. Here we can see an echo of Jullien’s diagnosis that to live means to question what has already been experienced or to question oneself²⁷. In this context, *dé-coïncidence* involves a rupture with the classical understanding of portraiture as the representation of a person. The generative machine becomes a medium of *alterity*, offering images that escape the logic of reference and instead gesture toward the *impensé* – that which remains unthought, hidden beneath the surface of cognitive familiarity. The works from the series *Memories of Passersby I* do not depict the world, as they detach themselves from it. Therefore, they do not preserve, but destabilise it. Images created by algorithmic splitting do not confirm reality, but become a crack in it. As in Jullien’s work, it is not the perfection of form, but its instability and tension that are the source of potentiality. In this sense, these works are a practical realisation of Jullien’s philosophy, a space of disintegration, transience and non-representation.

One of the most radical examples of identity breakdown in Klingemann’s work is the *Imposture Series* (2017), created as an experiment using GAN algorithms to create figural images resembling painted representations of figures (including erotic nudes)²⁸. The works were created using machine learning of

²⁶ Personified data in a post-human utopia with Mario Klingemann, Interview by Ally Ferraro and Guilherme Ferrari, Introduction and Writing by Matthew Burgos, <https://frenchfries-mag.com/interview/2022/2/22/personified-data-in-a-post-human-utopia-with-mario-klingemann> [accessed: 29.06.2025].

²⁷ F. Jullien, *Ponownie otworzyć możliwości...*, p. 56.

²⁸ Each work from the *Imposture* series is generated entirely by artificial intelligence. Here, the role of the “brush” is fulfilled by a Generative Adversarial Network (GAN), which autonomously constructs the representation of the human figure. The process involves a technique referred to as “transhancement,” whereby low-resolution input is enriched with additional visual data. The algorithm adds elements such as skin texture, hair and other complex pixel-based structures, endowing the image with a painterly depth. The result is a fleeting, almost dreamlike vision of the human form, not crafted by the human eye or hand, but brought into being through the operations of a neural network. www.lumenprize.org/2018-winners/mario-klingemann [accessed: 27.06.2025].

an artificial intelligence model trained on simplified silhouettes (so-called stick figures) based on an analysis of images collected from the Internet²⁹. In this way, the German artist explored the possibilities of transforming schematic silhouettes into images showing how a machine constructs and deforms physicality. The result of these experiments was a series of six works, oscillating between realism, grotesque and glitch, selected from over 50,000 generated variants. The bodies depicted are deformed, excessive, often incomplete, devoid of distinct facial features and at the same time highly expressive. These are images of subjects who have lost their identity coherence and no longer strive to regain it. In this sense, *Imposture Series* is not only a visual experiment but an existential question about the possibility of existence outside the canon of identity. The figures become representations of someone who does not fit into the tradition of painting, an unambiguous gender subject, or the culturally constructed idea of corporeality. Jullien's concept of *dé-coïncidence* allows us to read this project as a departure from the coherence of the body and identity, as a deliberate unravelling of their functions, forms and meanings. These images emerge from an algorithm, but their presence is not stable, as they are entities between being and non-being, between code and matter. These are not portraits, but pictorial events that force us to redefine what visibility and corporeality are in the age of artificial intelligence. Their deformation reflects not only machine error, but also a philosophical break with the concept of the 'I' – that stable, homogeneous subject recorded in the image. In this sense, the works in the series are a radical manifestation of a shaken identity: an image that does not preserve but decomposes, does not represent but decodes. Here, too, the force of *écart* is at work, whose source is the tension between the human and the post-human, between the artist's choice and the autonomy of the algorithm. Klingemann does not construct form but finds it in generative space. This type of creativity is art expressed as a search for a crack in the system, rather than its affirmation. Thus, Klingemann's works do not meet expected aesthetic standards but provoke a tension that disrupts the viewer's cognitive comfort.

François Jullien contrasts the static and closed concept of being (*être*) with a dynamic understanding of life (*vivre*) as a continuous process of becoming open to change, susceptible to disruption and, by definition, unfinished. Life, in his view, never takes on a final form, because it 'feeds' on movement, rupture and constant actualisation³⁰. Similarly, in Mario Klingemann's work,

²⁹ www.collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1572110/the-butchers-son-drawing-mario-klingemann/ [accessed: 26.06.2025], www.artsy.net/artwork/mario-klingemann-imposture-series-cobalamime [accessed: 26.06.2025].

³⁰ F. Jullien, *Ponownie otworzyć możliwości...*, pp. 84-86; F. Jullien, lecture entitled: *There is No Such Thing...*

we do not find a closed work, but a living, generative form, a constantly transforming structure that exists only as a process, as a flow of visual possibilities. His works do not attempt to capture life in form, but to simulate it as constant change, ephemerality, becoming.

The analyses presented in this article are based on a hermeneutic approach inspired by François Jullien's concept of *dé-coïncidence*. Instead of viewing Klingemann's works as representations of reality or the result of a technical algorithmic operation, we interpret them as dynamic fields of unsealing, moments of aesthetic discontinuity in which image, identity and authorship are shifted. We treat them as carriers of meaning, readable in dialogue with philosophy, culture and the individual experience of the viewer. In this view, artificial intelligence ceases to be merely a tool and becomes a participant in a 'conversation' that leads to the revelation of new meanings. This philosophical and aesthetic perspective, rooted in relational thinking, allows us to see generative art not as a closed structure, but as a process of negotiation between the artist, the algorithm and the viewer. This process undermines traditional notions of form, intention and meaning, opening them up to unpredictability, randomness and otherness. Mario Klingemann's work shows that generative art can be not only an aesthetic experiment, but also a living field for the realisation of the philosophy of *dé-coïncidence*. Generative models, neural networks, algorithms and system errors are not limited to reproductive or stylistic functions, but open up a new creative space. In this sense, generative art transforms into a process, a stream of ruptures, shifts and discontinuities. Glitches, the disintegration of identity, the ephemerality of forms and the separation of the work from its author are part of Jullien's idea of creativity as an act of abandoning stability in favour of a constant drift towards the unknown. It is in this instability that the possibility of the new reveals itself – not through the realisation of what has been planned in advance, but through active *dé-coïncidence* – a disruption that unleashes the potential of another way of being.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Goodfellow Ian J., Pouget-Abadie Jean, Mirza Mehdi, Xu Bing, Warde-Farley David, Ozair Sherjil, Courville Aaron, Bengio Yoshua (2014) *Generative Adversarial Nets*, "Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems", vol. 27, https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2014/file/f033ed80deb0234979a61f95710dbe25-Paper.pdf.

Jullien Francois (2024) *Ponownie otworzyć możliwości: de-koïncydencja i kolejne życie*, transl. E. Marynowicz-Hetka, Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Jullien Francois (2011) *Philosophie du vivre*, Paris: Gallimard.

Jullien Francois (2017) lecture entitled 'There is No Such Thing as Cultural Identity, but We Shall Defend a Culture's Resources', 16 November 2017, UVA East Asia Center in Charlottesville, Virginia, US, www.youtube.com/watch?v=4YTg6EuwiCs&t=4966s.

Can machines be more creative than humans? (2019, March 4) "The Guardian" <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2019/mar/04/can-machines-be-more-creative-than-humans>

Imposture Series: Cobalamime – Mario Klingemann. Artsy. <https://www.artsy.net/artwork/mario-klingemann-imposture-series-cobalamime>.

Klingemann Mario, *Official website*, <https://www.quasimondo.com/>.

Mario Klingemann: The Butcher's Son (V&A Collection), <https://www.collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1572110/the-butchers-son-drawing-mario-klingemann/>.

Mario Klingemann wins 2018 Lumen Prize for AI Art. Lumen Prize, <https://www.lumenprize.org/2018-winners/mario-klingemann>.

Personified Data in a Post-Human Utopia: An Interview with Mario Klingemann (2022, February 22). *French Fries Magazine*, <https://www.frenchfries-mag.com/interview/2022/2/22/personified-data-in-a-post-human-utopia-with-mario-klingemann>.

Twenty Thousand Leagues Under the Screen: Mario Klingemann Explores the Depths of Artificial Intelligence (Part 1). *Electric Artefacts*, <https://www.electricartefacts.art/news/twenty-thousand-leagues-under-the-screen-mario-klingemann-explores-the-depths-of-artificial-intelligence-part-1>

When AI Meets Art: Mario Klingemann Interview. The Quietus, <https://www.thequietus.com/culture/art/mario-klingemann-ai-art-interview>.

O SZTUCZNEJ INTELIGENCJI, BŁĘDZIE I ROZPADZIE TOŻSAMOŚCI W TWÓRCZOŚCI MARIO KLINGEMANNA (streszczenie)

Artykuł podejmuje próbę reinterpretacji twórczości jednego z czołowych przedstawicieli sztuki generatywnej Mario Klingemanna w świetle koncepcji *dé-coïncidence* sformułowanej przez François Julliena. W centrum zainteresowania znajduje się pytanie o to, w jaki sposób praktyki artystyczne wykorzystujące sztuczną inteligencję mogą stanowić współczesną realizację filozofii rozklejenia formy, tożsamości i znaczenia. Analizując wybrane prace Klingemanna, takie jak *Neural Glitch*, *Memories of Passersby I* oraz *The Butcher's Son*, autorka ukazuje, że sztuka generatywna nie tylko rozmywa granice między autorem a systemem, intencją a przypadkiem, ale staje się także przestrzenią pęknięcia i nieciągłości, w której zjawia się nowe. Zestawienie myśli Julliena z estetyką błędu (glitch), efemerycznością obrazu oraz rozproszeniem autorstwa pozwala uchwycić generatywność nie jako technologię, lecz jako filozoficzną kategorię twórczego rozdzielenia. W tym sensie artykuł wskazuje, że sztuka generatywna może być odczytywana jako praktyka *dé-coïncidence*, czyli jako przestrzeń, w której forma „przestaje być sobą” otwierając się na nieznanie i nieprzewidywalne.

Słowa kluczowe: sztuka generatywna, François Jullien, *dé-coïncidence*, Mario Klingemann, glitch, portret, sztuczna inteligencja, autorstwo.

Magdalena Górská - PhD, assistant professor at the Institute of Art History at the University of Łódź, Department of History of Painting and Sculpture. Her research interests include contemporary art and art of the first half of the 20th century, with particular emphasis on Jewish art and the issue of inclusiveness of art. Author of articles: *Historia i rozwój przestrzenny osadnictwa żydowskiego (XVII-XIX wiek) w Piotrkowie Trybunalskim na podstawie wybranych materiałów źródłowych*, "Acta Universitatis Lodzensis. Folia Historica" (2020); *Kwestia żydowska w antysemitycznej polityce Trzeciej Rzeszy na przykładzie miasta Osnabrück*, "Piotrkowskie Zeszyty Historyczne" (2022); Co-author of articles: *Jewish Capital as the Factor Shaping the City's Architecture. Selected Examples of Industrial Urban Development of Piotrków Trybunalski in the Second Half of the 19th Century (up to 1914)*, "West Bohemian Historical Review" (2020), *Friendly City. Making Architectural Heritage Accessible*, "International Journal of Conservation Science" (2023).