As result of the current generative art boom, many generative works are flooding the art and media sphere. However, meaningful analysis, comparison, and discussion of generative art have so far been complicated by two factors: 1) the commonly used definition of generative art is broadly defined, resulting in a large variety of works sharing the same heading, and 2) existing methods for classifying and comparing generative art only facilitate a descriptive analysis of the generative systems within an artwork, but neglect the role & contribution of those systems to the work as a whole. In this paper we propose an alternative framework for analysing generative art, to aid the understanding of what generative art includes, where ‘the generative’ aspect(s) in a work take(s) place, how the generative relates to other aspects in that work, and how this differs from the generative elements and aspects in other works. Two concepts are introduced: autonomous ability (AA) and artistic significance (AS), including a larger framework to analyse artworks along these concepts. The framework asks 1) what elements (generative and non-generative) the work consists of, 2) what the role of these elements is within the artwork, 3) how autonomous these elements are, and 4) how artistically significant the contribution of the element’s role is in relation to the artwork as a whole. We apply the framework to a selection of four generative artworks to test its working, present the corresponding results, and reflect upon the framework.
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1. Introduction

Generative art is currently experiencing a significant boom. Developments in GAN, blockchain and NFT technology, but also the introduction of generative AI tools such as DALL-E, Midjourney, Stable Diffusion have pushed methods for creating, collecting, and trading computer generated art, giving extra momentum to the field of computational creativity and the related discussions about creativity, authorship and authenticity. Artworks generated through these technologies are flooding online portfolio platforms, but are also well represented at art & media festivals globally and even have entered traditional art auctions (Cohn 2018) and art competitions (Vincent 2022), demonstrating that generative art is a field and practice that is here to stay and continues to provide both an interesting scope of work and discussions. So, what exactly is generative art? Following the commonly accepted definition, introduced by Philip Galanter, generative art:

... refers to any art practice where the artist uses a system, such as a set of natural language rules, a computer program, a machine, or other procedural invention, which is set into motion with some degree of autonomy contributing to or resulting in a completed work of art. (Galanter 2003, 4)

Most will think of computer-generated art, such as the works of Manfred Mohr, Lillian Schwarz, Michael Hansmeyer, or Anna Ridler. However, as Galanter’s definition proposes, generative art also includes art that is not computer generated, yet still produced by autonomous systems. We support this perspective and see Sol LeWitt’s wall drawings, Alexander Calder’s mobiles and forms of Islamic tiling as examples of generative art without the use of a computer, acknowledging the long history of generative art. These examples show that a wide variety of works can be considered generative art. Its broad definition allows for this: it not only includes many different types of generative artworks under the same heading (e.g., both generative computer and non-computer art), but also blurs the many differentiations that exist between generative artworks, such as style, discipline, or media. It’s not surprising therefore, that in the past decades multiple methods by various researchers were formulated to classify, evaluate and compare generative art forms, resulting in multiple schools of thought. Although these entail useful descriptive frameworks, we notice that a critical analysis and comparison of the artworks through these frameworks is harder to obtain. There is a considerable focus on generative processes themselves but what falls short is the positioning of, and reflection on, the role of these processes in relation to the artwork as a whole. With this study, we aim to formulate an alternative perspective for analysing generative art, that could facilitate a critical understanding of what generative
art is, what ‘the generative’ comprises in an artwork, and how this can differ between generative artworks.

2. Review of Theoretical Framework

To illustrate the current discourse, we will shortly review the main existing frameworks on analysing generative art, being those of Galanter (2003; 2008; 2016), Boden & Edmonds (2009), and Dorin et al. (2012).

Galanter (2003; 2008) proposes to view generative art from a systems and complexity theory influenced paradigm. He states that systems (i.e. complex, dynamic systems that inhibit “a large number of small parts or components that interact with similar nearby parts and components” (Galanter 2003, 5), and proposes to classify these systems on a scale from ordered-disordered and simple-complex. We reckon the importance to look at systems, as their properties play a crucial role in generative art. However, we think it is limiting to solely focus on a system’s inner workings without taking its output into account too. Moreover, we doubt if complexity as such is an interesting parameter for evaluating generative art, as it reveals little about what the regarding system contributes to the work. Galanter does identify problems regarding evaluating generative art which he augments with questions (2016) of which some we think are valuable to look into (such as the problem of locality: “is the art in the object, the system, code or something else?” (Galanter 2016, 171) or the problem of creativity: “Are generative systems creative?” (Galanter 2016, 172). These questions however are only asked after elaborating on his paradigm, and do not seem explicitly integrated in his framework. Moreover, an explanation of how these systems are applied in the artwork and what the generative properties of these complex systems attribute to the artwork as a whole is largely left untouched in Galanter’s theory, which we consider crucial for achieving a critical understanding of the generative in art.

Boden & Edmonds (2009) introduced a list of eleven subcategories of computer art, ranging from “Ele-art” (involving electrical engineering and/or electronic technology), to “Evo-art” (evolved by processes of random variation and selective reproduction that affect the art-generating program itself) (Boden & Edmonds 2009, 37), and question for every category “whether the appropriate aesthetic criteria and locus of creativity are the same” (Boden & Edmonds 2009, 21). Compared to Galanter, we think that their view holds a broader notion of what constitutes the artwork, as they speak of an art system of which “the artist, the program, the technological installation (and its observable results), and the behaviour of the human audience” (Boden & Edmonds 2009, 40) are all part. We value this more inclusive notion of (locus of) creativity, but miss the possibility in their taxonomy for a critical look into the roles of all these parts. This
arguably makes Boden & Edmonds’ classification more of a detailed, medium-specific description of the current computer art landscape, but it does not allow for a dissection or evaluation of the individual elements that are at play in generative art.

According to Dorin et al. (2012), generative art systems are constituted by four components: entities, processes, environmental interaction, and sensory outcomes, along which they propose to outline generative artworks in order to reveal the dynamic processes at play. Compared to Galanter and Boden & Edmonds, we think this method enables a more thorough view into the individual subjects or media used in the artwork and their underlying interrelations: a factor we consider characteristic for generative art and therefore essential to critically look at. Also, Dorin et al. take into account some level of external input (which they termed “environmental interaction”) (Dorin et al. 2012) involved in the artwork as well as something that could translate to the artwork ‘as such’ (i.e. “sensory outcomes”) (Dorin et al. 2012). Although we think this last component is still a fairly narrow conception of the artwork as a whole (as an artwork can include more than just sensory outcomes), we do think that, when analysing generative art, taking into account both external factors and the output of the system are valuable steps in understanding the complete picture. However, other than naming these components, Dorin et al’s framework does not facilitate a critical examination of these, which renders it more of a descriptive tool, similar to Galanter’s and Boden & Edmonds’.

In short, the above mentioned frameworks do contribute to a useful and necessary body of knowledge on generative art, especially for establishing a singular vocabulary for researching and discussing generative works. However, their descriptive approach does not allow for a more in-depth critical analysis of what the generative in a work contains and what it contributes. And although this might not be their ambition (Dorin et al. express their “desire for an analytical descriptive rather than a critical framework” (Dorin et al. 2012, 256) and Galanter poses considerations through meta-questions), in our view this leaves possible interesting and valuable questions unanswered. For example: what exactly is the ‘generative’ aspect in the work? Where in the artwork does this take place? How does this generative element relate to other elements involved in the work? Can we, for example, define different degrees of ‘generativity’ in or between artworks? And for that, can certain artworks be more generative than others, or in different aspects? We try to formulate an alternative way of looking that could cover this and facilitates a cross-comparison of these factors amongst generative artworks, by the following approach.
3. Approach and Methodology

When we closely interpret the definition of generative art as given by Galanter, it seems to imply that there are two types of ‘degrees’ at play within the artwork. First, if generative art involves a (partially) autonomous system of some sort, then this implies that there is a degree to which that system itself is able to operate autonomously. And second, if generative art is art that is (partially) produced by these systems, then this implies that there is a degree to which the system’s output is important for establishing or creating the artwork as a whole. But what does this autonomous behaviour entail? How autonomous is this truly? Can we define multiple levels of autonomy in these systems across generative artworks? And if an autonomous system is involved, to what extend is the output of the generative system used in the artwork? What is its creative importance within the artwork? As these factors by definition seem to be important for generative art, we think it could be interesting to analyse generative art according to these. We thus introduce two concepts: autonomous ability and artistic significance, through which lens we propose to analyse generative art to find answers to the questions posed above and explore if we can come towards new insights about the generative in art.

3.1. Autonomous Ability

With the autonomous ability (AA) of an aspect in the artwork, we aim to examine how independently this aspect can operate or execute its role without external help or input. This could mean setting things into motion, performing a task, initiating something, but also creating or revealing something that is unpredictable, new, or surprising (i.e. things that could be defined as “emergent” behaviour or properties (Monro 2009; McCormack 2001), depending on the generative system itself. For example: where or when does it require support, assistance or input? If so, from whom or what? And is this supporting aspect then internal to the artwork or external, such as the artist, the audience or any other environmental factor? How autonomous is it able to operate if these supporting factors weren’t there? Next to this practical execution, also the degree to which the aspect can make its own ‘choices’ independently are part of autonomous ability, as well as how much creative freedom the aspect has within these choices. For example, where does the decision making within the work take place? And how does this work? Is the output of the generative system in a way already predetermined? If so: to what degree, and by whom or what? What range of ‘freedom’ does the aspect have when creating its output? How much leeway or agency does the aspect have to navigate or transform the output space? Ultimately, can we define levels of independence, and subsequently degrees of autonomous ability?
3.2. Artistic Significance

With the artistic significance (AS) of an aspect in the artwork, we aim to examine *what its creative contribution to the artwork is and how artistically important this contribution is for the final work as a whole.* We reckon this might be hard to objectively determine, but we aim to achieve this with the following questions. What does the aspect contribute to the artwork? How does this contribution compare to the contribution of other aspects involved in the work? Could the artwork still be the artwork, if the aspect’s contribution and its characteristics were not there? We would argue that deliberately distinguishing *output or performance* of the generative aspect from the *artwork as a whole* helps to more clearly formulate the concerning aspect’s contribution to the work, and subsequently its artistic significance. For some works this might even be a necessity, in case the generative aspect is *not the only* aspect in the work. Therefore, in order to discern more relevant aspects in the work and their tasks, we feel the need to define two other factors for analysis, namely *elements* and their *roles.*

3.3. Elements

To define the autonomous ability and artistic significance of an aspect within a generative artwork, a good understanding of *what the actual artwork is* is required. What parts does the artwork consist of? And what part does the output or performance of the involved generative system take in this? Is this output or performance the artwork (i.e. does the output equal the work)? Or are more factors involved in constituting the overall work? We state that generative artworks often consist of more than just ‘the generative’, whether that being systems or processes. In fact, they can be a mix of both generative and non-generative aspects, or might even contain more non-generative elements than generative. For example, in Sol LeWitt’s mural drawings, both the sets of written rules and instructions (generative), the draftsmen interpreting these (generative), as well as the site specific drawing surface with all its characteristics (non-generative) play important roles in how the resulting work will look like (Lovatt 2010, 2012). Moreover, their interrelations are relevant too, as the generative properties of the written rules are dependent on the non-generative properties of the surface, and vice versa. What we hope to illustrate here, is that it is difficult, and even unfavourable, to only take the generative aspects into account and ignore the non-generative when analysing generative artworks. Unfavourable, because it is imaginable that in a work the *non-generative* aspects have a crucial influence on the *generative* aspects, which in that case, might affect how we regard the autonomous ability of that generative aspect. Moreover, not only the generative aspects in a work can be from artistic importance for the artwork as a whole, but the non-generative aspects evidently as well. We thus state that isolating solely the
generative in an artwork falls short of a thorough analysis, would leave dependencies amongst aspects unseen, and eventually would skew the comparison of generative works fundamentally. Therefore, we propose to include both generative and non-generative aspects in the analysis, as well as their mutual dependencies and dynamics. We will call these the elements of the artwork in this study: the building blocks that constitute the artwork; its most important parts, that all together make the work ‘the work’. There can be many or few elements involved in the work. To create more clarity, we define six element categories, being:

1. **Artwork elements:** the individual components or tools that are used in the artwork, both during its making process as well as in the final resulting work. These can be hardware, software, data, material, etc. and their possible output. Questions to distill elements under this category are: what individual parts are used in making this work? What generative system(s) are used? And what separate elements does this system itself consist of or are important to define? Next, the artwork might also include non-generative elements, as we discussed. What are these?

2. **Artist elements:** the maker(s), initiator(s), or architects of the work. What has been created and decided by the artist (and what not)? To define what level of autonomy or what level of artistic significance a certain element has, a good understanding of the role of the artist(s) is required. For example: is the artist’s input required to let an element create output? Additionally, what role does the artist have in the final artwork or output? E.g. was there selection, modification or curation involved in the resulting work? If so, at what level?

3. **Performer elements:** the one(s) performing or executing the work. In the same manner as the artist element: is there a ‘performer’ present in the work that is from influence? Something that for example executes the work? Or let it ‘become’ the final resulting artwork? And if so: who or what is this?

4. **Audience elements:** the ones experiencing or witnessing the resulting work. What influence do they have on the work as such? Can they interact with or participate in the work? If so, what is their range of control: how and to what degree can they affect the work?

5. **Environmental elements:** external factors from the environment the resulting work is situated in. Is there any external input required or involved in the artwork? If so, what is it, and how does it affect the final work?

6. **Element interactions:** dissecting a work in the individual components involved might obscure how they work together. To mitigate
this, we describe their interactions, interdependencies and resulting behaviour as Element Interactions.

3.4. Roles

We have touched upon it already in some questions above, but we would like to highlight it explicitly. An element’s autonomous ability and artistic significance is depending on its specific role within that artwork. Namely, a generative system involved in a work can by itself have strong autonomous qualities but if its output is filtered, restricted or a byproduct in the overall work than that influences its autonomy and thereby its artistic significance in relation to the artwork as a whole. Therefore, we argue it’s important to examine each element’s role within the context of that artwork. For example, what does the element do? What is its function or task(s) in the work? E.g. does it require interaction with other elements in the artwork and provide or receive input? Does it perform or execute something? Additionally, a work (or its output) doesn’t have to be completed by the artist. A work can be ongoing, ever changing or interactive. Does the audience, performer (if required) or environment have a role in the work? For example, is a generative musical composition fully completed when the artist has finished writing/making it? Or does it require certain executions by performers to become a final instance of the artwork (and does it allow for multiple different instances)? In other words: is the role of an element to create a blueprint or score of the work or to fully complete the artwork? We suggest that not the elements themselves, but the qualities and the contribution of their roles, should be analysed along the concepts of autonomous ability and artistic significance to get the most accurate and thorough understanding of where the generative in an artwork is situated. This requires to not only look at the internal elements of the artwork but also the roles of the other element categories: like the artist(s), performer(s), audience, environment, and element interactions. Therefore, we propose to first define all the elements present in the artwork, then evaluate what the roles of each element are, and only then analyse how autonomously these elements are able to perform these roles and how artistically significant their roles are for the final artwork as a whole.

In summary, the steps and questions for the analysis look like this:

1. What are the generative and non-generative elements involved in the artwork? This includes not only the material (e.g., hardware and software) the work consists of, but also the artist(s), performer(s), audience and environment of the work. Furthermore, both the making process and the resulting work are included in the analysis.

What are the roles of these individual elements within the artwork? The role describes an element’s functions and tasks. Does it generate, create, instantiate or determine something? Does it have emergent
properties? Does it require interaction with other elements in the artwork? Does it perform/execute something? Does it function as (or creates) the blueprint/score of the work? Does it complete the artwork, or create an instance of the artwork?

2. How **autonomously it is able to execute/perform this role?** I.e. can it operate/execute independently? Where or when is the artist or audience needed to let it create output? What levels of independence can we define and distinguish? And, to what extent does it have creative freedom in its role?

3. How **artistically significant is this role** for the content of the artwork as a whole? I.e. how important is the element’s performance for creating the output? And how significant is that output and performance to the artwork as a whole? Could the artwork still be the artwork if the element’s capacity/characteristics/input were not there?

Answering these questions carefully and consistently gives a thorough dissection of the generative artwork and what is at play. We hope it discloses what differences or similarities exist between the generative amongst separate artworks, and helps in making various dimensions of generativity in generative art explicit. For example, does the generative in an artwork lie on the level of the execution by the audience? How much generativity is held or performed by the artist self? Or, does the generativity exclusively lie on the level of the generative system? Making these differences explicit might, ultimately, aid comparison and evaluation of generative art.

Schematically, the framework looks like the matrix below:

**4. Analysis and Comparison**

To evaluate the framework, we tested it on a small, diverse selection of eight generative artworks (ranging from ‘traditional’ to ‘uncon-
ventional’, older to contemporary, and computer to non-computer examples of generative art) from different art disciplines. For the scope of this paper however, we chose to illustrate the model by means of four artworks: Alexander Calder’s *Mobile* (c. 1932) (Fig. 2), Vera Molnár’s *Structure de Quadrilatères* (1985) (Fig. 3), Mario Klingemann’s *Memories of Passersby I* (2018) (Fig. 4), and Tyler Hobbs’s *Fi- denza Collection* (2021) (Fig. 5). In this section we will explain how we approached the analysis and what our insights are from comparing these analyses between the four artworks.

For each artwork, we filled in the matrix as introduced in Fig. 1. To support consistent comparison, for the third (AA) and fourth row (AS) we used a semi-quantitative measurement in the form of a six-step scale. To keep the matrices concise and improve cross-referencing to cells, all cells were tagged with a short alphanumeric string corresponding to the element category abbreviation letters, column number (starting from “1” for every element category, if more than one element under the same category is present) and row letter(s).

Once the matrices were completed, we traced 1) where in the artworks the generative is situated (by detecting in which cells of the row Roles the most generative concepts (e.g. “creating”, “emerging”, “inventing”, “producing”, etc.) are present. Elements with these concepts were defined as ‘generative’ (i.e. ‘active’, displayed in bold text in the matrices), whereas elements without these concepts were defined as ‘non-generative’ (i.e. ‘passive’, in regular text), 2) how the autonomous ability is distributed over the elements of the work (by evaluating the content of the /AA coded cells on their score), and 3) how the artistic significance is distributed over the elements (by evaluating the content of the /AS coded cells on their score). Lastly, to not obscure the boundaries between the making process of the work and the work itself, an extra visual distinction in the matrices was made between elements that are part of the resulting work (highlighted columns) and elements that are not (non-highlighted columns). The completed matrices can be viewed in fig. 6, 7, 8, and 9.

**4.1. Amount of Distinguishable Elements**

When we compare the matrices with each other (meaning: between the four artworks), we find that first: the amount of distinguishable elements.

---


2. Being: 0) Not Applicable (N/A); 1) None; 2) Low; 3) Medium; 4) High; 5) Very High.

3. Artwork = AW; Audience = AD; Artwork = AT; Environment = EV; Performer = PF; Element Interactions = EI.

4. Element = E; Autonomous Ability = AA; Role(s) = R; Artistic Significance = AS; Format of the code tag thus becomes: [ElementCategoryLetters+ ColumnNumber]/[RowLetter(s)]. E.g. EV2/AA = the second environmental element’s autonomous ability.

5. As the highlighted element columns already make clear what is part of the resulting work, the Element Interactions column was not highlighted.
elements per artwork is considerably higher than we expected to define a priori. Apparently, when critically dissecting a work, more elements (both passive and active) emerge as essential. This could broaden the scope of what to take into account when analysing generative art, but moreover: requests for a broader conception of what could be seen as generative, autonomous or artistically significant within a generative artwork.

4.2. Distributed Generativity and Autonomy

Second, in all works the generative properties seem not confined to one individual element, but are distributed across multiple elements. For example, in Klingemann’s work, the GAN models (AW3/R), the application (AW3/R), and the external output of successful samples (AW6/R) all hold generative properties. In Calder’s Mobile and in Hobbs’ Fidenza, also elements outside of the work play a generative role (for Calder the air current (EV/R), and for Hobbs the Art Blocks platform on the Ethereum blockchain (EV1/R)). Notably, the matrices make clear that in all four works the artists (AT/R) essentially have the most generative roles. This signals that more elements than the ones involved in — what are traditionally considered — “the generative systems” (such as algorithms, computers, set of natural language rules, etc.) can hold generative properties and can have an essential role for the content of the work. Furthermore, we see that the interdependencies between the ‘traditional systems’ and external elements in the works become visible in the column Element Interactions of the matrices. E.g. in both Memories of Passersby and Fidenza, we observe that the most generative processes take place at the level of the interactions of the elements (EI/R). This indicates that individually, many elements possess some degree of generative behaviour or properties, but that this range can be significantly enhanced, facilitated or kickstarted, in combination with the behaviour or properties of other elements: of which some might not even be internally part of the resulting work itself (i.e., ‘Artwork’ elements), but external (such as ‘Environmental’ or ‘Audience’ elements). This shows that the actual generative “system” of the work often encompasses more than solely the ‘main’ generative Artwork elements, and results from the greater whole of all its generative elements. Moreover, when comparing the autonomous ability of the generative elements across the artworks, we see a similar phenomenon: individually the generative elements have a lower degree of AA then a priori expected, mostly due to their dependency on other elements in order to operate autonomously. But when viewed in context of their interactions, it appears that they collectively hold a very

6. NB: the terms “low(er)” and “high(er)” as used in the text for comparison and discussion of the analyses results are different from the values “Low” and “High” used in the matrices. “Low(er)” in the text refers to the lower part of the six-step scale in the matrices (N/A - None - Low - Medium). “High(er)” in the text refers to the upper part of this six-step scale (High - Very High).
high degree of AA. E.g. in *Fidenza*, where the artist (AT/E), the script (AW1/E), the on-chain art platform (i.e. an ‘Environment’ element) (EV1/E) as a system (EI/AA) together are responsible for much more creative choices in the whole process, and carry significantly more autonomy than individually.

4.3. Deviated AA and AS

Third, the matrices show that the degrees of AA and AS not always align within elements. Meaning: not all elements that scored high in AA in an artwork, also scored high in AS, or vice versa. E.g. the application (AW2/E) and the external output of successful samples (AW6/E) in *Memories of Passersby*, or the program (AW1/E) or computer monitor (AW1/E) in *Structure de Quadrilatères* (both low AA, but high AS), or the on-chain art platform (AD1/E) in *Fidenza* (high AA, medium AS). This finding seems to contradict what is generally (implicitly) assumed in most studies into generative art, namely that when an autonomous element is used for creating the work, this element by definition also is important for the work as a whole, and the other way around. From the perspective of this framework, it appears that the degrees of AA and AS can diverge across individual elements involved in the artwork. However, one element that structurally does show alignment in AA & AS (i.e. both high) in the analyses is the ‘Artist’ (AT/E). This seems to indicate that, despite the general conception that in generative art a large part of control is attributed to a system or machine, the artist still plays a significant role in making the decisions (AT/AA) in the analysed works, that are — compared to decisions of other autonomous elements — highly important for the artwork as a whole (AT/AS). In the matrices, this becomes most evident in row /R, where the amount of crafting, developing, testing, and altering required by the artist in order for the machine or system to generate the envisioned output is listed. E.g. Calder’s methodological experimentation with the physics of the mobile’s hardware (AW/E) in combination with the air current (EV/E) to ensure interesting compositions, or Hobbs’ extensive iterative process of designing, testing, tweaking an existing algorithm (Hobbs n.d.) in order to create a script producing coherent quality output over the full series of 999 at-random instances. As example, the designed properties of the *Fidenza* algorithm are particularly important for the content of the artwork, which makes the artist’s role more artistically significant for the work than for example the role of the on-chain platform (EV1/AS) or the minting collectors (AD1/AS).

Additionally, the matrices also make explicit how the artist (AT/R) executes significant steps of selection, moderation, and curation of the in- or output of what can be regarded as the generative system, before the work becomes the final work. E.g. Molnár not only iteratively altered the code of her program (input) (AW1/E) based on the outcome visible in real-time on the monitor (output) (AW4/E) (a
process she termed “conversational method” (Molnar 1975), which was only enabled after the introduction of computer monitors), but subsequently also selected one particular instance of this program as fit for printing and exhibiting (and thus discarded the other outcomes). These form profound interventions, affecting the resulting artwork and its experience. This emphasises that although generative art involves “independent systems”, on various levels the ‘hand’ of the artist is still very present.

Lastly, a finding that taps into this: over the course of time, some artworks have been generally renowned as undisputed examples of generative art, such as Molnár’s. Often, critics tend to attribute a degree of autonomy in these works to the computer, mostly because of its ability to incorporate “randomness” (Guillermet 2020). With that, Molnár’s aforementioned conversational method is often mentioned as an instinctive approach “that enables greater receptiveness to the unpredictable” (Rigamonti di Cutò 2018) which would prevent “premeditation” of the work. However, analysing Molnar’s work through our framework suggests that one could also interpret Molnár’s work as the opposite because of this conversational method, as the matrices disclose how much curation and iteration of the “random output” is present: the work is generated using an algorithm but the behaviour of the algorithm (including the used amount of randomness) is programmed by the artist instead of autonomously generated. In this case, one could arguably question how ‘unpredictable’ a generated work is, if the outcomes of the generating machine are heavily controlled, reviewed and curated in the process by the artist self. The matrices show that in other approaches curation and control takes place on a different level, such as in Hobbs’ where controlled randomness is still at play (Hobbs n.d.), but who’s method does allow a large range of different, ‘unknown’ output that can be generated/produced based on the randomly generated seeds. These different approaches could suggest for a more critical perspective on how ‘generative’ and ‘autonomous’ the involved elements in generative art actually are.
Figure 6: Matrix with analysis for Mobile I (c. 1932)
Figure 7. Matrix with analysis for Structure de Quadrilatères (1985)
Figure 8: Matrix with analysis for "Memories of Passersby" (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1</td>
<td>Detailed description of Category 1 analysis</td>
<td>Further examination needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>Comprehensive analysis of Category 2</td>
<td>Improved understanding possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3</td>
<td>In-depth analysis of Category 3</td>
<td>Additional insights required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4</td>
<td>Thorough analysis of Category 4</td>
<td>Further examination recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5</td>
<td>Extensive analysis of Category 5</td>
<td>Significant improvements anticipated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Analysis and interpretation based on observed data and detailed examination.
Figure 9. Matrix with analysis for Fidenza Collection (2021)
5. Discussion and Limitations

Having analysed a few artworks with this framework, we can discuss the first findings on its working and its results. First we observe that, when completed, the matrices tend to make clear where the generative gravity within an artwork is located, that is within the presented artwork itself (i.e. ‘closed’: at the left side of the matrix, under column AW), or outside of the artwork (i.e. ‘open’: at the right side of the matrix, under columns AT - PF - AD - EV - EI). This visual aid might be valuable for obtaining a quick, basic understanding of a generative work. Second, columns AW (Artwork) and EI (Element Interactions) seem to disclose that generative art exist in roughly two forms: works that are generated (i.e. works that are created with or through generative methods, but of which the resulting work is not generative themselves) or works that are generating (i.e. resulting works that are generative themselves). The first form consists of final work or ‘end products’ that are ‘finished’, do not require any further input and are not evolving over time (e.g., the works of Molnár and Hobbs). Works of the second form, however, are not ‘finished’, do require certain input in order to ‘work’ and are evolving over time, (e.g., the work of Calder and Klingemann (ONKAOS 2018)). We think this is an important distinction to make and could function as an extra classifier for analysing and comparing generative artworks.

Lastly, we found that the framework exposes how generative art artists are not specifically interested in letting a machine or system produce something autonomously, but more in creating something in collaboration with it. They use generative methods as a way to establish a dialogue between them and ‘the system’, that adds a sense of serendipity, unexpectedness and (controlled) ‘out-of-control-ness’ that makes generative art both interesting to make and experience e.g. Molnár’s conversational method, Hobbs’ and Calder’s structural grammar that generates surprising compositions in combination with other system elements. This, together with the argument for an adjusted notion of the AA of those systems, might shift the discourse around generative art from art created by the machine, to co-creating art with the machine.

Needless to say, this framework is not conclusive in every aspect. To an extent it has fixed guidelines on how to analyse and interpret generative artworks, but in theory multiple readings of elements, roles, AA or AS are still possible. We tried to obviate this as best as possible, by articulately defining what we consider under every concept and element category, and what to fill in where in the matrices. However, we realise that some ambiguity in interpretation of these questions might exist: per artwork, but also per analyser. For example, for Fidenza, we listed the on-chain Art Blocks platform as an environmental element (EV1/E), as the work technically is presented there, whereas one arguably could also consider it an Art-
work element. Additionally, we chose not to include the computer monitor as element in the analysis for Klingemann and Hobbs, but we did for Molnár since we considered that in context of Molnár’s work the monitor was from greater importance to the work as such. Other well-argumented choices for elements and placements, however, are just as valid for analysis. This touches on a challenge we encountered ourselves: how to deal with the tools used for making the work? How to interpret their AA and AS? E.g. the computer: essentially a tool that ‘follows’ instructions provided by a program to generate output. Framed by the question: “what does its role contribute to the artistic content of the work?”, we considered its AA and AS therefore low (see AW4/AS in Klingemann’s, and AW2/AS in Hobbs). However, we reckon one could also interpret its AS as high based on a different reasoning (e.g. in case of Molnár: “using computers as tools for artistic expression was novel at that time, and therefore the idea of this element being able to generate something artistically is more important to the work” or “the computer enables a certain vision on or inspiration for producing art in general, which in itself is artistically significant (to the work)”). We realise this might diminish the effective conclusiveness of the framework, and therefore suggest to assess this in future research, while ensuring its flexibility. Analysing generative artworks through this framework proved to be an iterative process of adding, deleting, and shifting elements across the matrix, going back-and-forth between all elements for understanding and defining their roles, AA, and AS. This in itself already illustrates the intricate, multifaceted aspects of generative art. Concerning representation, we aimed to test the framework on works from multiple art disciplines. However, due to the scope of the research, examples from literature, design and architecture were not included in the analyses, nor were works outside of the Western art canon. We are aware that this affects the results, and therefore suggest for future research to include works from outside these frames, in order to facilitate more comprehensive comparisons and conclusions with the framework.

6. Conclusion

We developed this framework from the need for a more in-depth, critical method for analysis of generative art, that honours its diversity and allows for an understanding of the generative beyond solely the denotation of the ‘system’ or its processes. Important notions were previously coined by Galanter, Boden & Edmonds, and Dorin et al., which established a useful ground. From this, we aimed to make the next step and approach the generative in relation to the work as a whole including all involved external elements and their interactions. Therefore, we pushed dissecting generative art further

---

7. Due to the facilitating role the monitor directly played for Molnár’s specific way of making generative art (i.e. her “conversational method” (Molnár 1975)), resulting in this specific work.
by deliberately defining more element categories (e.g. ‘Artist’, ‘Per-
former’, ‘Audience’, etc.) in our framework in order to make their
impact within the work explicit. We took Galanter’s definition of
generative art quite literally, and proposed to analyse generative art
through the lens of autonomous ability and artistic significance, to
see what it would reveal about the generative within and between
artworks. We noticed that by being very meticulous and explicit in
this, details on what plays an important role in the work, what is
generative and on what level this takes place in the artwork come to
the surface. The most notable findings are that significantly more
elements then generally accredited for, together constitute the ‘sys-
tem’ in a generative work. Also, more elements than the generative
can (either) be autonomous and artistically significant for the work
as such but correspondingly: not all generative elements by defini-
tion are autonomous nor artistically significant. In that fashion, the
degree of autonomous generativity of some generative works could
be questioned, and lastly: a lot of autonomy and artistic significance
within the artworks is located at the level of the artist. Perhaps these
findings challenge some general assumptions of generative art (e.g.
that something “generative” is unquestionably autonomous, and that
something “autonomous” by definition is artistically important for a
work). We reckon this way of thinking about generative art certainly
adds to the idea of “creative machines” and “art autonomously made
by systems”, which unmistakably speaks to our collective imagina-
tion and hype sensitivity. However, analysis through our framework
discloses that even system-generated work contains a considerable
degree of control and direction held by other elements — especially
the artist self, which might nuance our general view on how much
control the artist actually relinquishes to an autonomous system,
and might adjust our conception of how “autonomous” those sys-
tems truly are.

We hope this framework provides an interesting alternative per-
spective on generative art. We think it can be a meaningful tool for
analysing and comparing artworks, and help in obtaining a more
critical understanding of generative art. We consider the framework
valuable for art critics, researchers, and curators, but also for mak-
ers of generative art themselves, as it might reveal opportunities
for applying generative methods or elements at different categories
or in different modes. Needless to say, the field of generative art
evolves rapidly and turbulently, which provides both a challenge
for the framework and interesting conditions for its application and
relevance. We are therefore curious what it can contribute in light of
these rapid developments in generative AI, the proliferation of gen-
erative art production, and corresponding public discussions about
creativity, authorship and authenticity.
References


