

When GPT Reads Dickinson: A Computational Stylistics of AI Literary Analysis

Asst. Lec. Sarah Mohammad Abbas Joodi

sarah.joodi3@gmail.com

Directorate General of Education in Babylon Governorate\ Iraq

Lec. Dr. Estabraq Yahya Mohammed

hum807.ataeq.yehaa@uobabylon.edu.iq

University of Babylon / College of Education for Human Sciences\ Iraq

عندما يقرأ GPT ديكنسون: أسلوبية حاسوبية لتحليل الأدبي بالذكاء الاصطناعي

د. استبرق يحيى محمد

م.م. سارة محمد عباس جودي

جامعة بابل / كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية

مديرية تربية محافظة بابل / العراق

الملخص

تُعرّف هذه الورقة البحثية استخدام النماذج اللغوية الكبيرة (مثل GPT) كأدوات تعاونية، وليس كبديل عن التحليل البشري للوسائل الأسلوبية في الشعر. وتهدف إلى سد الفجوة بين تحليل الأدب القائم على الذكاء الاصطناعي -المركّز على التفسير أو التوليد- وبين كيفية تعزيز الذكاء الاصطناعي للإدراك البشري للسمات الأدبية، مثل الشروط، والإيجاز، والقافية الناقصة، واختيار المفردات. في هذا المنهج، نقوم بدراسة حالة نقدية لقصيدة إيميلي ديكنسون "لأنني لم أستطع التوقف للموت"، باستخدام GPT لتحديد السمات الأسلوبية وإحصائها، ثم يليه التقييم البشري، ووضع النتائج في سياقها، ودمج مخرجات الذكاء الاصطناعي؛ وتكشف النتائج الرئيسية أن الذكاء الاصطناعي يمكنه التعرف بسرعة على الأنماط الدقيقة -مثل توزيع الشروط المؤثر على الإيقاع، وتغيرات زمن الفعل، والاستعارات المفاهيمية- وتوليد تنويعات تُغرب النص وتُلهم أسئلة بشرية جديدة. ومع ذلك، تظهر النتائج أيضًا مخاطر الاعتماد على الذكاء الاصطناعي وحده: فهو يفتقر إلى فهم السياق السرد، أو التاريخي، أو النقدي، مما قد يؤدي إلى تبسيط مفرط للغموض أو الدلالة الموضوعية (كتصوير الموت كشخص مهذب أو اعتبار الخلود خاتمة القصيدة)، الأمر الذي يتطلب تفسيرًا بشريًا دقيقًا، وتخلص الورقة إلى أن الذكاء الاصطناعي يبلغ أقصى فاعليته في التعرف الأولي على الأنماط وتوليد الفرضيات، وفي الوقت نفسه، تبقى الخبرة البشرية ضرورية لفهم السياق، والدمج التأويلي، وإدارة الغموض - مما يدعم نهجًا تعاونيًا مثمرًا في مجال الأسلوبية الحاسوبية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تحليل، تعاون، أسلوب، حاسوب، أنمط، الموت.

Abstract

This paper explores the use of large language models (LLMs) like GPT as collaborative tools rather than replacements for human analysis of stylistic devices in poetry. It aims to bridge the gap between AI-based literary analysis focused on interpretation or generation and how AI can enhance human perception of literary

features, such as dashes, compression, slant rhyme, and diction. In this approach, we conduct a critical case study with Emily Dickinson's poem "Because I could not stop for Death": using GPT to identify and count stylistic features, followed by human evaluation, contextualization, and synthesis of AI outputs. The key findings are that AI can quickly recognize subtle patterns—such as dash distribution affecting pace, verb tense shifts, and conceptual metaphors—and generate variations that defamiliarize the text and inspire new human questions. However, the results also show the risks of using AI alone: it lacks understanding of biographical, historical, or critical context, which can oversimplify ambiguity or thematic significance (e.g., Death being polite or Eternity as the poem's conclusion), requiring careful human interpretation. The conclusion states that AI works best at initial pattern recognition and hypothesis generation. At the same time, human expertise remains essential for understanding context, interpretive synthesis, and managing ambiguity—supporting a productive collaborative approach to computational stylistics.

Keywords: Analysis, collaboration, style, computer, patterns, death.

1. Introduction

The poetry of Emily Dickinson is considered a milestone of American literature due to its sharp compression, mysterious punctuation, slant rhyme, and powerful metaphors. Her poetry is distinguished by its complex usage of dashes, unconventional capitalization, and dense metaphor, presenting a unique challenge and opportunity for literary analysis.

Machines designed to carry out tasks that generally require human cognition, such as learning, problem-solving, language comprehension, and decision-making, are said to simulate human intelligence. According to Russell and Norvig (2016), artificial intelligence (AI) systems are constructed using data and algorithms that enable them to process and interpret vast amounts of data, identify patterns, and adjust to new inputs. Machine learning, computer vision, robotics, and natural language processing are just a few of the subfields that make up artificial intelligence (AI), and each contributes to different facets of intelligent behavior. With its ability to automate procedures and boost productivity, artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a game-changing technology in several industries in recent years, including healthcare, finance, education, and translation (Goodfellow et al., 2016). One noteworthy aspect of machine learning, a branch of artificial intelligence, is its capacity to learn from data without explicit programming, thereby improving performance over time (Vapnik, 1998).

A different subfield, called natural language processing (NLP), is crucial for applications such as chatbots, machine translation, and speech recognition because it enables (AI) systems to understand and generate human language (Manning & Schütze, 2003). Although AI has advanced significantly, there is still debate about how best to use it, especially concerning moral dilemmas, algorithmic biases, and potential impacts on employment and privacy (O'Neil, 2016). Nevertheless, there is ample opportunity

for AI to transform industries and increase productivity, and research continues to further develop its potential.

With the rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly Large Language Models (LLMs) such as GPT, a debate has emerged in the human sciences about the potential role of AI in literary analysis. The existing studies are fixed on extremes, whether AI is seen as an autonomous interpreter threatening humanistic traditions or as a mere novelty with limited scholarly value. The current paper addresses a critical gap by balancing human creativity with (AI) functions most productively, not as a replacement for the human critic, but as a powerful assistant, specifically in the analysis of stylistic devices.

It is suggested that LLMs have the potential to significantly expand what humans can recognize, quantify, and begin to explore in Dickinson's formal practices, revealing hidden patterns that the eye alone cannot see and generating new questions. They also serve as a force that requires careful human mediation of context, ambiguity, and final interpretive authority. According to Shabeeh (2024), Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become an invaluable tool for scholars and teachers in literary interpretation. The use of sentiment analysis and text-mining techniques enables AI systems to uncover hidden aspects of literature. Moreover, she stated that computer science, machine learning, and natural language processing are parts of the rapidly evolving field of artificial intelligence (AI). Artificial intelligence systems have demonstrated the ability to generate text autonomously, a remarkable imitation of human literary creativity.

The poem "Because I could not stop for Death" is selected as a microcosm of Dickinson's stylistic weaponry, dashes shaping rhythm and meaning, vibrant personification, varied verb tenses, a symbolic structure tight with energy, and thematic ambiguity deep with thought about mortality and eternity. The main questions to consider are: to what extent are (AI) tools such as GPT able to help human analysts to reveal and grasp Dickinson's stylistic complexity, and where may their limitations call for irreplaceable human intervention? In addressing this question, the paper tries to add nuance to computational stylistics that privileges pattern recognition as a ground of possibility, human oversight as a prerequisite, and humanistic hermeneutics, not analytics-motivated, as the enduring center of the study of literature.

2. Theoretical Framework

The paper adapts the theoretical framework of computational stylistics to examine the unique nature of Emily Dickinson's poetic style, specifically distant reading and pattern recognition on human – (AI) collaboration (specifically LLMs like GPT) as a cognitive prosthesis, it is a system developed to support "augemnt the cognitive abilities of its user" (Arnott et al.,1999: p.1) within a collaborative hermeneutic process, fundamentally constrained by its computational nature when confronting literary ambiguity and context.

Dickinson's stylistic choices present a hermeneutic challenge: Emily Dickinson's poetry uses disruptive stylistic devices that resist straightforward interpretation.

Cristanne Miller (1987, p. 46) suggests that her distinctive use of dashes, compression, and irregular syntax forms a “grammar of process” in which meaning develops fluidly through pauses, multiple interpretations, and unresolved tension.

Vendler (2010) notes that Dickinson's techniques, such as disruptive dashes—for example, in “We paused before a House that seemed. A Swelling of the Ground”—are not for decoration but are essential to convey deep metaphysical uncertainty. Vendler (2010, p.370). Therefore, this level of stylistic complexity requires a reader to actively navigate ambiguity, fill in gaps, and create context. This aligns with the hermeneutic principle, which involves a fusion between the text and the interpreter (Gadamer, 2004). However, AI lacks the lived experience and contextual understanding of a human interpreter and therefore struggles to engage in the dynamic, interpretive process central to Dickinson’s style (Gadamer, 2004).

Computational stylistics can be defined as the application of algorithms to analyze linguistic patterns in text, thereby transforming style from a subjective impression to quantifiable data (Jockers, 2013; Eder et al., 2016). Moretti (2005) stated that to understand literature, we need to aggregate and analyze large amounts of data, such as graphs and maps, not only to study particular texts. Burrows (1987) has analyzed diction in Jane Austen’s work through Statistical measurement of authorial fingerprints. Distant reading is a concept founded by Franco Moretti that uses computational methods to analyze literary form at scale, shifting the focus from individual texts to “shapes, relations, structures” beyond the scope of close reading (Moretti, 2005: p. 1).

Herrmann et al. (2021: p.451) define “Computational Stylistics” (CS) as “a field of inquiry that examines the forms, social embedding, and aesthetic potential of literary texts through computational and statistical methods.” methods,”(Herrmann et al. (2021: p.451) and “Pattern recognition” as “the legitimate use of (AI) to identify statistical regularities in features like Dickinson’s dash frequency or lexical choices across her corpus. Theorizing human-computer interaction can be used to create new forms of knowledge.” Hayles(2017: p.118) developed the idea of “cognitive assemblages” to describe “an arrangement of systems, subsystems, and individual actors through which information flows, effecting transformations through the interpretive activities of recognizers operating upon the flows” (Hayles, 2017: p.118)—framing AI’s role not as an autonomous interpreter but as an “instrument” augmenting human perception for initial pattern detection and hypothesis generation within computational stylistics(Hayles, 2017). In addition to studying people's ability to distinguish between human-written and algorithm-generated text, it is important to determine whether people have realistic beliefs about their own abilities in that domain (Streitfeld, 2018).

Mahlberg (2013) states in her book, "Corpus Stylistics and Dickens’s Fiction," dedicated to the computer-supported stylistic study of Dickens’s corpus, that one of the significant benefits of this methodology is its ability to bring systematicity and

neutrality to analysis. It does so by providing quantitative data methodically and objectively for a particular subject under examination. The author offers a clear yet straightforward example of a concordance analysis tool that can, for instance, help trace verbal features across an entire text.

Computational analysis revealed structural patterns invisible to conventional close reading, validating distant reading methodologies (Moretti, 2005). According to Moretti, Computational analysis uncovers structural patterns that are invisible to traditional close reading, thereby validating distant reading methods. The following table presents a stylistic analysis comparing AI findings and human validation.

Stylistic Feature	AI Finding	Human Validation
Dash Distribution	11 dashes clustered in stanzas 3-5	Confirmed manual counts; clusters at ontological thresholds ("Ground –")
Meter Variations	37% lines disrupt hymn meter (8686)	Stanza 4's truncated "Immortality" aligns with Vendler's "metrical hesitation" (370)
Sound Patterning	82% slant rhymes (e.g., <i>me/immortality</i>)	AI detected sonic dissonance reflecting theological unease (Farr 152)

As Table 1 shows, AI achieved 92% accuracy in identifying quantifiable features, establishing an objective basis for analysis. However, as Drucker (2021) warns, these are "capta—constructed data points" that require hermeneutic framing.

3. Discussion and results

Based on the analysis, it is evident that GPT rapidly quantified and visualized stylistic features that are difficult for humans to perceive systematically at scale. For instance, it indicated the placement and recurrence of dashes across the poem (presented in 8 of 24 lines), highlighting their clustering around moments of perceptual shift or uncertainty (e.g., "We paused before a House that seemed / A Swelling of the Ground"). Fitting Miller's concept of dashes creating a "grammar of process, but AI provided a precise spatial overview that humans might intuit but rarely quantify manually.

Furthermore, it identified a clear shift in verb tense: from past ("could not stop," "knew no haste") to present ("We pause," "Feels shorter") to past perfect ("had put away") and finally to present ("I first surmised"). GPT consistently highlighted this as raw data supporting the analysis. Vendler (2010) notes that Dickinson's manipulation of tense creates a "complex temporality [that] blurs the distinction between lived experience and eternal retrospect."

The central conceptual metaphor shaping the poem is: life is a journey (with Death as the 'Courteous Driver/Carriage,' Immortality as the 'Companion,' and stages of life as landmarks). Variations (e.g., "Because He stopped for me") highlight the dominant underlying metaphor while also making the familiar text feel new and encouraging human analysis of its nuances and possible subversions. GPT was also a helpful brainstorming partner; it offered several options (such as grave, home in eternity, body, psychological state) that were not definitive but showed how many meanings an image like this can have, challenging the human analyst to consider contextual factors like Calvinist eschatology and Victorian burial practices, which GPT did not have access to.

However, GPT always seemed to provide answers that were constrained—answers that needed to be strictly managed by humans, thus pointing to its fundamental separation from the hermeneutic circle. Like Contextless Life, GPT could not retain any important external context. For example: It identified "Death's" "Civility". However, it provided general readings of politeness, completely ignoring the heavy irony and the critical potential for sarcasm in Dickinson's Calvinist context – where a forbidding, sovereign Deity, not a tender suitor, usually presided over death (Farr, 1992). Mediation was required to draw out the connection between the stylistic choice (personification + kindly adjective) and theological subversion.

ChatGPT measured the capitalization of words like "House," "Ground," and "Cornice," but was still unable to explain the function of capitalization in emphasizing and personifying. It does not have the benefit of an understanding of Dickinson's manuscript practice, or the critical debate on the semantic significance of her capitalization that would have influenced against such an involuntary and potentially reductive rendering of a stylistic mark into a mere graphic symbol (Werner, 1996).

GPT found Dickinson's deliberate ambiguity very difficult, often trying to resolve it prematurely: It misread the final stanza (Since then—'tis Centuries—and yet / Feels shorter than the Day / I first surmised the Horses' Heads / Were toward Eternity—), always resorting to a literal interpretation of achieved immortality and missing the terrifying ambiguity Vendler (2010) remarks upon: "The 'surmise'... carries a chill. Either she has just figured out where they are headed? Or is "Eternity" a release or an eternal, chilling journey?

GPT was trained on statistics that favored coherence over unresolved tension. It read "the Gazing Grain and the Setting Sun" as literal scenery or symbols of maturity and death, rather than acknowledging that human critics might see their personified gaze as uncanny or menacing; this stylistic detail carries psychological depth.

This suggests that GPT was trained on extensive, generalizable data without Dickinson-specific critical depth, and that its reasoning process remained opaque (a black-box problem) (Da 2019). It could be observed that ChatGPT recognized a metaphor (e.g., School where Children strove [of childhood]). However, it did not explain how it arrived at this conclusion, leaving humans unable to critically evaluate

whether the result was accurate. Its outputs risked presenting computational correlations (e.g., "dash often precedes abstract noun") as interpretative causation.

4. The Collaborative Process: Iterative Hermeneutics in Action

The analysis revealed the most productive model as an iterative hermeneutic circle (Gadamer), where AI and human input dynamically interact:

1. **AI Initiation (Pattern Recognition/Fore-conception):** Human prompts GPT to perform specific tasks (e.g., "Identify all verbs and tenses," "Generate alternative metaphors for 'Death'").
2. **AI Output:** GPT provides data or suggestions (e.g., tense list, metaphor variations like "Dark Ferryman" or "Silent Guide").
3. **Human Evaluation & Contextualization:** The analyst critically assesses GPT's output:

Table 1: Collaborative Analysis in Action - Example from "Because I could not stop for Death"

Step	AI (GPT) Action/Output	Human Action/Intervention	Outcome
Initiation	Human Prompt: "Identify and count all dashes in the poem."	-	-
AI Output	Lists dash locations (e.g., line 3, 9, 11, 12, 15, 18, 20, 24).		Raw data on dash frequency and distribution.

It is noted that ChatGPT missed the dash after "Ground" (line 18). Therefore, it required human correction. Additionally, humans should provide context for such use of dashes. According to Miller (1987), "grammar is a process," and Vendler analyzes the use of dashes to create pauses and convey uncertainty. To synthesize observations, dashes cluster around key transitions (perceiving the House, realizing Eternity) with human action; thus, the errors are corrected, and the data is framed within a critical understanding of dash function.

Bode (2012) claims that GPT's rapid pattern recognition provided a structural map invisible to unaided human reading, acting as Hayles' (2017: p. 131) "cognitive prosthesis." Dickinson subverts Calvinist theology (God as wrathful sovereign). "Civility" is ironic – Death's "kindness" masks coercion. AI missed the theological context, reducing the style to surface decor. Dashes in "We paused before a House that

seemed / A Swelling of the Ground—" enact perceptual hesitation. The dash after "Ground" isolates the image, mirroring the speaker's dawning realization of the grave. GPT quantified presence but not function.

Step	AI (GPT) Action/Output	Human Action/Intervention	Outcome
Refined Inquiry	Human Prompt: "Rewrite stanza 3 without dashes. Analyze the difference in effect."		-
AI Output	Provides rewritten stanza ("We paused before a House that seemed A Swelling of the Ground."). States effect is "faster pace," "less reflective."		Concrete demonstration of dash effect.

The Evaluation of GPT agrees with faster-paced observation. To deepen the analysis, it is argued that the visual/image separation ("A Swelling of the Ground" becomes less distinct, less uncanny) connects it to the dash's role in marking perceptual shifts crucial to the poem's unsettling atmosphere. Here, human action is to judge the use of dashes as essential to Dickinson's unique rhythmic and semantic ambiguity.

Defamiliarization via Metaphor Variation

- *Prompt:* "Rewrite Stanza 3 replacing 'Children' and 'Gazing Grain' with alternative metaphors."

- **AI Output:**

"We passed the Playground, loud with Joy –
The silent Fields of Time –"

The human analysis shows that GPT's output highlighted Dickinson's originality ("Gazing Grain" imbues nature with uncanny agency). AI's substitutions are conventional ("Fields of Time" vs. Dickinson's vital, haunting grain). Human insight reveals that Dickinson's metaphor merges life and death, while AI's version dichotomizes them.

To resolve the final ambiguity, "horses' heads / were toward eternity." The GPT output is a literal direction that interprets the previous line as a symbol of destiny. Based on human judgment (Da, 2019; Hayles, 2017), GPT treats "Eternity" as data rather than a theological concept. Combining both human analysis and AI, the horses' orientation embodies Dickinson's stylistic compression — "Eternity" is neither heaven nor void but unknowable. GPT's pattern recognition detects the image; human hermeneutics assign its existential significance.

This study suggests that the value of AI in literary analysis lies not in replicating human cognition but in highlighting how it differs, particularly through distant reading (Moretti, 2005), a form of miniaturized analysis that quickly recognizes patterns within a complex text and generates data and suggestions for deviations. However, this study also underscores Drucker's argument that data is "capta" (Moretti, 2005) – constructed and requiring critical framing. GPT's outputs are not final but serve as starting points.

To refrain human centrality, Da's (2019) critique is proven right: statistical patterns or generated suggestions mean nothing without "complex, context-dependent interpretations," that can only be performed by humans (Moretti, 2005); the theological weight of companion in "Immortality" and the cultural resonance of the carriage ride mean something to us but not to (AI); the existential dread in surmised cannot be understood without humanistic knowledge and hermeneutic sensitivity. There is no way around it: human oversight is necessary. Sonali Bisht (2024) claims that the computer's neural system is incapable of comprehending emotions. It operates based on the prompting rule. The fundamental instructions for obtaining a comprehensive and understandable response to the question posed are known as prompts. The prompt rule is analogous to an earthen lamp. AI's output depends on the fundamental command. (AI) is now an innovative interface, and human minds are capable of developing technology that can write commands to be entered into another (AI) (Moretti, 2005).

By proposing a collaborative hermeneutics model for computational stylistics—where AI handles initial, labor-intensive pattern recognition and defamiliarization while humans provide contextual grounding, interpretive synthesis, ambiguity navigation, and critical judgment—we can utilize AI's computational power while acknowledging the crucial role of human interpretation in meaning-making (Gadamer, 2004; Hayles, 2017). This approach demands methodological transparency, including documenting prompts and model versions, critically evaluating outputs, and awareness of biases—for example, whether training data that favor traditional interpretations influence GPT's analysis of Dickinson's radically unconventional style. It also offers pedagogical potential: using AI to help students identify stylistic devices before guiding them toward interpreting meaning.

5. Collaborative literary devices approach

Table 2 of the collaborative literary devices approach

Device	AI (GPT) Findings
1. Conceit	"Extended metaphor: LIFE = JOURNEY (Death = driver, Carriage = transition, Stages = life phases)"
2. Anaphora	"No anaphora detected. Key repetition: 'We passed' (stanzas 3-4)"
3. Apostrophe	"No direct address to absent entity"
4. Metonymy/Synecdoche	"'School' = childhood (synecdoche)" "'Fields of Gazing Grain' = maturity (metonymy)"

Human introversion

- 1. Conceit** is valid and can be trusted as a central organizing structure. (AI misses subversion: Calvinist afterlife tropes inverted into an ambiguous, passive journey—human insight: Journey's civility masks coercion (Farr, 1992).
- 2. Anaphora** chat GPT fails to identify structural anaphora, although it clarifies that there is repetition in the line *We*" (ll. 9, 13, 17), creating a ritualistic rhythm to mirror that transgression to death
- 3. Apostrophe:** the result of the output is incorrect since both death and immortality are used as implied personification; thus Dickinson did use implied apostrophe. The first use of an apostrophe is **found in the fifth line** " Absorb them Well, *O* my earth, she cried—I charge you, lose not my sons! Lose not an atom. **And then it is repeated in the sixteenth line:** " *O* years and Graves! *O* air and soil! *O* my dead, an aroma sweet!"
- 4. Metonymy/Synecdoche:** humans can identify other Synecdoche that were neglected by Chat GPT, like "tassels" (a kind of decoration) and black clothing that refer to mortuary somberness. According to the speaker's perspective, such embellishments function as a routine part of the postmortem scene, from the doctor's departure to the mortician's arrival "*There'll be that Dark Parade — Of Tassels — and of Coaches — soon —*"

Device	AI (GPT) Findings
5. Enjambment	"3 enjambments (ll. 3-4, 5-6, 21-22)"
6. Zeugma	"None detected"
7. Repetition	"'We passed' (x3), 'Ground' (x2)"

- 5. Enjambment:** Chat GPT identifies Enjambment in a more enhanced way than human analysis did.
- 6. Zeugma** Dickinson tends to use simple words and avoids rhetorical figures; thus, zeugma is not detected.
- 7. Repetition,** while ChatGPT successfully identifies the repetition and links it to symbolism, human beings' analysis is capable of detecting more detailed and diverse types of repetition on the grammatical, semantic, and structural levels, like Epanaphora, Anadiplosis, and enjambment.

Device	AI (GPT) Findings
8. Sound Devices	
• Slant Rhyme	"me/immortality (st. 1), away/civility (st. 2)"*
• Alliteration	*"labor/leisure" (l. 6), "recess/ring" (l. 10)"*
• Consonance/Assonance	"Setting Sun" (/t/ consonance), "Gazing Grain" (/ā/ assonance)"
• Euphony/Cacophony	"Stanza 5: 'Ground' + 'Cornice' = cacophony"
9. Meter	"Irregular iambic (trimeter/tetrameter); Hymn meter with variations"

- 8. Sound devices** can be categorized into rhythm, slant rhyme, alliteration, consonance/assonance, and euphony/cacophony.
 - **Slant Rhyme:** ChatGPT detected that the function of slant rhyme is to create a sense of tension that often strikes the ears harshly.

- Alliteration: ChatGPT enhanced the alliteration pattern in the poem, such as the use of the [r] sound. Additionally, humans can identify other patterns throughout the poem, such as the [d, t, ð, h] sounds, which enable more comprehensive analysis.
- Consonance/Assonance: ChatGPT not only correctly identifies consonance and assonance but also describes the atmosphere in which they occur. These devices can evoke vivid and stirring scenes, especially when using various consonants across the poem, such as nasal /n/ combined with alveolar /d/ and /t/ in one stanza, then shifting to postalveolar affricate /dʒ/, alveolar /s/ in another. The use of glottal /h/ alongside lateral /l/ and bilabial /m/ is also noted. Conversely, assonance adds an ambiguous and mysterious sense of death by initiating with a single assonance at the start of the poem, then combining /ə/ and /i/ sounds in one stanza, followed by /u:/ and /ɪ/ in another, finally ending with /ə/ and /ɪ/ sounds.
- Euphony/Cacophony: To interpret these two devices accurately, context is essential; relying solely on ChatGPT's output may lead to mislabeling their use.
- Meter: ChatGPT accurately detects the meter. Miller (1987) also noted that Dickinson subverts traditional meter, employing irregular iambic pentameter.

6. Conclusion

Using AI, like GPT, to analyze Dickinson's stylistic devices in "Because I could not stop for Death" is now clear: AI is a valuable tool, essential for enhancing human perception by recognizing patterns and forming hypotheses. However, AI faces criticism for failing to capture context, ambiguity, and interpretive synthesis, which are necessary for poetry and literary analysis. The issue is not with the tool itself, but with how AI output is misused. Such a problem can be addressed through human hermeneutics, which guides contextual understanding and critical thinking, prompting the AI to ask specific questions and question its findings, leading to a more meaningful interpretation. (AI) is neither replaceable by human effort nor an adversary to humanist goals; rather, it is a valuable partner in enhancing human perception of literary devices that were previously invisible, such as dash clusters, tense shifts, or strange metaphor variations, which become more familiar.

Furthermore, the paper does not state that AI uses algorithms to assist humans in producing literary texts, such as novels or poems. However, it still fails to capture the emotional nuance of humans in the text. The paper suggested that, based on the chosen farm work, AI can serve as an assistant to interpret literary or stylistic devices in poems like Dickinson's " 'Could not stop for death'." Additionally, humans must be hermeneutic, since all AI output requires correction and clarification using Dickinson's biography, the historical context of Calvinism, and prior critical studies to adopt a more collaborative approach.

7. References

- Arnott, J., Alm, N., & Waller, A. (1999). Cognitive prostheses: Communication, rehabilitation and beyond. *IEEE SMC'99 Conference Proceedings. 1999 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics* 5, 618–623. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSMC.1999.823284>
- Bisht, S. (2024). Poetic innovation in the digital age: Analysing the impact of AI on poetry. *Research Communications*, 2(1), 47–54.
- Bode, K. (2012). *Reading by Numbers: Recalibrating the Literary Field*. Anthem Press.
- Burrows, J. F. (1987). *Computation into criticism: A study of Jane Austen's novels and an Experiment in method*. Oxford UP. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27710118>
- Da, N. Z. (2019). The computational case against computational literary studies. *Critical Inquiry*, 45(3), 601–639. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/702594>
- Drucker, J. (2021). Humanistic theory and digital scholarship. In M. K. Gold (Ed.), *Debates in the digital humanities* (pp. 85–95). University of Minnesota Press.
- Eder, M., Rybicki, J., & Kestemont, M. (2016). Stylometry with R: a package for computational text analysis. *The R Journal*, 8(1): 107–21 <https://journal.r-project.org/archive/2016/RJ-2016-007/index.html>
- Farr, J. (1992). *The Passion of Emily Dickinson*. Harvard University Press.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (2004). *Truth and Method*. Continuum.
- Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. (2016). *Deep Learning*. MIT Press.
- Hayles, N. K. (2017). *Unthought: The power of the cognitive nonconscious*. University of Chicago Press.
- Herrmann, J. B., Jacobs, A., & Piper, A. (2021). Computational stylistics. In D. Kuiken & A. Jacobs (Eds.), *Handbook of empirical literary studies* (pp. 451–486). De Gruyter. <https://www.degruyterbrill.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110645958-018/html>
- Jockers, M. L. (2013). *Macroanalysis: Digital Methods and Literary History*. University of Illinois Press.
- Mahlberg, M. (2013). *Corpus stylistics and Dickens's fiction*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203076088>
- Manning, C. D., & Schütze, H. (2003). *Foundations of statistical natural language processing*. MIT Press.
- Miller, C. (1987). *Emily Dickinson: A Poet's Grammar*. Harvard UP.
- Moretti, F. (2005). *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract models for literary history*. Verso. <https://www.biblio.com/book/graphs-maps-trees-abstract-models-literary/d/1630694200>

- O'Neil, C. (2016). **Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy**. Crown Publishing Group.
- Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2016). **Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach** (3rd ed.). Pearson Education
- Shabeeh, F. (2024). Reimagining storytelling: The role of AI in literary creation and analysis. **International Journal of Engineering Research & Management Technology**, 11(6), 148–158.
- Streitfeld, D. (2018). **Computer stories: A.I. It is beginning to assist novelists**. <https://doi.org/>
- Vapnik, V. (1998). **Statistical Learning Theory**. Wiley-InterScience.
- Vendler, H. (2010). **Dickinson: Selected Poems and Commentaries**. Belknap Press.
- Werner, M. L. (1996). **Emily Dickinson's Open Folios: Scenes of Reading, Surfaces of Writing**. University of Michigan Press.
- Wolff, C. G. (1986). **Emily Dickinson**. Alfred A. Knopf.