A Research on The Subjective Eligibility of Generative Artificial Intelligence Copyrights

Tianai Xie
Department of Law and Business, Shue Yan University, Hong Kong, China

Keywords: Generative Artificial Intelligence, Subject of The Law, Copyright Law, AI Technologies.

Abstract: Artificial Intelligence is a technology that mimics human thinking, using powerful algorithms and data to help humans solve problems. In the last few years, AI technology has been evolving at a faster and faster pace. From the early days of simple activities such as waving a hand to today's conversations, these changes signal that AI has reached a higher level. While these massive advances have brought a lot of convenience and benefits to human life, a series of legal issues brought about by AI technology are slowly coming to the fore. Questions like the more concerned about the product of generative artificial intelligence can be protected by law? These questions are still undecided and worth thinking about. This paper focuses on the subject qualification of generative artificial intelligence. I will discuss the feasibility of subject qualification of generative AI from three aspects to affirm the subject status of AI.

1 INTRODUCTION

Generative Artificial Intelligence, as a new technology, has attracted a lot of attention since it was proposed. From 1956 to the present day, AI technology has continued to develop and grow rapidly, gradually occupying people's lives. Early artificial intelligence development is not mature and not much functionality. It can only carry out some very simple unilateral activities, such as waving hands, checkers program and so on. This stage of artificial intelligence is seriously need to rely on external forces and control, there is no full autonomy. And then, the artificial intelligence undergoes a revolutionary progress and enters into a booming stage. Artificial intelligence has been improved a lot of functions such as dialogue, synthesize pictures, etc., and even have deep thinking. For example, a very famous event before, Ke Jie versus AI AlphaGo, finally ended with the defeat of Ke Jie. And now generative AI gradually came into everyone's view, and widely used in real life, like home sweepers, face recognition and automatic driving, etc. Regardless of what we think about it, it is undeniable that artificial intelligence is making profound changes to our lives, and the era of artificial intelligence has already arrived (Ma, 2019).

With the rise of artificial intelligence, it has caused a boom in the use of artificial intelligence in the society. A large number of enterprises and individuals have put AI technology into production, work and even study. The use of artificial intelligence can also be seen everywhere in all walks of life. These have just become very common, and people's tolerance of AI has gradually increased. At present, with the deep adjustment of the international industrial division of labor pattern and the global competition for scientific and technological innovation, the new round of scientific and technological revolution represented by artificial intelligence poses new challenges to the current intellectual property system (Yu et al., 2021). Right now the development of artificial intelligence is a hot topic, and many corporations and investors are trying to join the industry because of its prospects. But the more people involved often leads to greater confusion and malicious competition, such as malicious use of AI technology for face-swapping to scam. So how to define the product of artificial intelligence? Can its products keep legal protection? And as well as in the field of jurisprudence, nothing is more controversial than the exploration of the possibility of legal subjectivization by the consciousness displayed by AI (Gong and Yan, 2024). None of these issues have yet been resolved, and in this way regulating the use of AI is imminent.

In November 2023, the Beijing Internet Court heard the first "AI" case, which clarified the attributes of "works" for images generated by AI and the

Xie, T.
A Research on the Subjective Eligibility of Generative Artificial Intelligence Copyrights.
DOI: 10.5220/0013975400004912

In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Innovative Education and Social Development (IESD 2025)*, pages 173-179
ISBN: 978-989-758-779-5

"creator" status of AI users, a decision that triggered a debate about the legal subjectivization of AI. This judgment triggered heated debate in the academic community. There are also cases related to AI in Australia. In Thaler v. Commissioner of Patents (2021), the Australian Patent Office rejected an application for an AI invention, which triggered a wide-ranging discussion on whether AI can be recognized as an inventor, and emphasized the limitations of the current patent law on AI. If AI is given the status of a subject, it means that it possesses the qualification of a legal subject, enjoys the capacity of civil rights, and bears civil obligations (Wen, 2020). This paper will focus on the subject qualification of generative artificial intelligence, discussing the following three aspects: the connotation and characteristics of generative artificial intelligence, the necessity of granting the legal subject qualification of generative artificial intelligence and the feasibility of granting the legal subject qualification of generative artificial intelligence. With many academic views mixed, it is necessary to discuss the legal subject status of artificial intelligence, which helps to establish the responsibility and right attribution and improve the formulation of relevant laws and regulations to cope with the emergence of new problems in the future.

2 MEANING AND CHARACTERISTICS OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

2.1 Connotation

Artificial Intelligence is a technology that mimics the human mind, Generative AI is AI that is capable of generating text, images, or other media using generative models (Yilin Li, 2024). AI works on principles involving data-driven, algorithmically-enabled, and computationally-efficient use of computing resources, and revolves around mimicking and expanding human intelligence's capabilities, enabling computer systems to automatically perform cognitive tasks such as learning, reasoning, perceiving, understanding, communicating, and decision-making. The 2018 White Paper on Artificial Intelligence Standardization defines Artificial Intelligence as: Artificial Intelligence is the theory, methodology, and application system that uses digital computers or machines controlled by digital computers to simulate, extend, and expand human intelligence, to perceive environments, to acquire knowledge, and to use that knowledge to obtain optimal results (Wen, 2020). Generative AI operates by relying on powerful arithmetic capabilities to generate appropriate content by sifting through information in a database to fulfill instructions. The creative thinking of human authors is simulated with input of questions and requirements, and eventually generates a complete and innovative work in generalized language that is expected by human authors and is difficult to be fully predicted by the current human intelligence before the output of the result (Mengfei Li, 2024).

The best known AI in the current society is dominated by ChatGPT. ChatGPT has the qualities of spontaneous deep learning of mass-stored data, and is able to excel in understanding user requests, and then generating the corresponding answers in an almost human natural language way, combining the contextual context and the logic and conventions of the corresponding language (Gong and Yan, 2024). Compared with the original AI, the current stage of AI embodies the nature of strong interactivity and corpus dependency, which better meets the needs of customers. In addition, generative AI can be unimodal or multimodal depending on different types of quantities of inputs.

2.2 Characteristics

One of the characteristics of generative AI is autonomy. The scientific definition of autonomy is the motivation, ability, or characteristic of an agent to act on his or her own volition. Of course, the concept of autonomy is different from different fields and perspectives. This article will discuss it from a legal perspective. How to judge whether an object has autonomy is analyzed from the two bases of self-consciousness and free will. Generally speaking, self-consciousness is more a matter of the difference between strength and weakness than whether it exists or not. Take humans for example, most humans are self-aware, even people with mental illnesses have their own self-awareness, they just think differently than the general public. Adults have a stronger sense of self than children, and again there are differences across adults and individuals. Some people with a stronger sense of self are more subjective, while others with a weaker sense of self are less subjective. The expression of the intensity of self-awareness is mainly reflected in the two aspects of objective evaluation and reflection on oneself. Then free will develops on the basis of self-awareness. There are two criteria for free will, one is the internal factor, the

ability of the actor to make choices independently from external constraints; the other is the selective criterion that is the external influence, the ability of the actor to make choices according to his own will or needs (Cheng, 2022). The synthesis of the above is substituted into artificial intelligence. For the self-awareness of AI, if AI has complete and independent self-awareness, then they will exist independently from human control. This is not possible at the current level of development, and AI is not yet completely free from human control and commands, because AI is created by humans, and the pre-production process relies on a plurality of roles (Mengfei Li, 2024), which is a derivation of human civilization. It is impossible for AI to have substantial self-awareness but only formal self-awareness, which is a reflection of human consciousness. Although AI does not seem to be independent of humans, in addition to self-awareness, free-will AI is higher than humans. Some AIs are not only able to fulfill the instructions given by humans, but also set up behaviors according to the set goals. This means that the AI can satisfy both the selectivity criterion of free will and the endogenous criterion of free will, thus judging that it has free will. Thus viewed, AI is not self-aware but still has a certain degree of autonomy.

The second characteristic is humanoid nature. Generative AI works by utilizing neural networks inspired by neurons in the human brain to learn patterns and features from existing data. Even though AI, as a human-like machine, may feel devoid of emotions and human-like instincts, so much so that such mental instincts and emotions are only the result of modeling, prompting the public to feel that it cannot be compared to human beings (Jia, 2024), in fact, “there is a simulation and creation function in the internal system, which is capable of simulating and replicating the human brain's thinking process and writing thoughts that always maintains a high degree of similarity to human works. These models can then generate new data that match the learned patterns” (Mengfei Li, 2024). For example, an AI model trained on a set of images can create new images that look similar to those used in training. The humanoid nature of AI is also reflected in aspects such as emotion recognition, visual imitation, and memory storage. Artificial intelligence can capture human facial expressions and analyze their mood through cameras; Humanoid robots can communicate face-to-face with humans and mimic each other's appearance and behavior. There is also an artificial intelligence that can remember the user's preferences and historical data for adjustments. Aside from that, some of the more advanced AIs are also able to communicate with the user in a continuous dialog, allowing the AI to break through the original drawbacks of rigid terminology and stilted exposition, and take the technology to the next level.

3 THE NECESSITY OF GRANTING LEGAL SUBJECTIVITY TO GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

At the current time, there is no conclusive answer on the issue of the subjectivization of artificial intelligence. There are schools of thought that affirm the legal subject of artificial intelligence, and at the same time, there are also negative schools. But no matter which viewpoint and position, it is a push for the legalization of artificial intelligence. This paper argues that there is a need to affirm the subject status of generative artificial intelligence.

A legal subject is a person in the legal sense, a subject that by definition has both legal rights and legal obligations. In lawmaking, entities that exist in reality are transformed into legal persons, so that entities with various characteristics in life appear in law as legal subjects with a unified identity (Ma, 2019). When AI meets the requirements of intelligent consciousness and is able to understand rights and obligations in order to follow the law in practicing its behavior, it rightfully possesses the qualification of legal subject (Yuan, 2020; Yuan, 2023). In 2023, the State Council promulgated the Interim Measures for the Administration of Generative AI Services to encourage the innovative application of generative AI in various industries and fields, and this document recognizes the legal liability of generative AI to a certain extent. Based on the characteristics of generative AI mentioned above, we have learned that AI has a certain degree of autonomy. This means that AI can not only fulfill tasks according to human instructions, but it can also reflect and learn on its own within a given framework, and may even develop into a human-like subject. The counter-argument, mentioned earlier, is that AI is not self-aware, is not independent of humans, is emotionless, and will not develop beyond humans themselves. These ideas are not fully accepted nor can they be criticized in their entirety, “simply on the grounds that the existence of AI is predicated on human intellectual activity does not negate the self-will of AI” (Yang and Zhang, 2018). It is true that a complete AI needs to be set up and produced by humans in order to emerge. Once an AI AI has a complete

system, it has an independent operating program, which means that the AI can actually operate independently of humans. Looking at it this way there is no doubt that AI has a form of self-awareness and free will. And in society artificial intelligence has become an advanced labor force to replace some manual labor. Some low-level simple and repetitive operations can be replaced by artificial intelligence, which not only saves labor costs but also less prone to errors and accidents. Therefore a large number of enterprises and factories have chosen this model. Artificial intelligence labor force has competitive, complementary and independent relationship with human labor force (Cheng, 2022). After the above analysis, it shows that artificial intelligence with autonomy needs to take responsibility related legal responsibility, then artificial intelligence needs another reasonable legal status. Only from the moral responsibility is very difficult to constrain and determine the behavior of artificial intelligence, even if the advanced computer system also lacks the attributes of a fully mature moral actor (Song and Li, 2019). This is where statutory responsibility has to intervene.

Meanwhile, how to determine tort liability if AI does not have the status of a legal subject. Moral responsibility is theoretically impossible to discipline, and artificial intelligence is only applicable to humans as the behind-the-scenes controllers, because human beings have thoughts and feelings, and artificial intelligence has no emotions and naturally cannot know the concept of morality. Strong laws are a good way to do that. The consideration of accident liability for human-machine systems must consider the roles and interactions between humans and technology in this whole (Song and Li, 2019). Even if the content generated by the AI is only ideologically similar to the prior work and thus cannot be recognized as infringing content, it does not necessarily follow that the use of the work while training the AI does not infringe copyright (Wang, 2024). This is because the AI underwent a lot of training and simulation before it reached the standard. And whether the samples used in this process are seen as infringement in the full sense or not. Liability capacity should be a substantive subjective element, and can meet the specific standards to obtain the subjective element (He and Liu, 2024). As mentioned earlier, artificial intelligence is already high-tech will bring certain risks, is no longer purely controlled by human tools, to give artificial intelligence subject status is very necessary. It is unfair that only human beings should bear the risk and responsibility of the consequences of AI behavior alone. It should be the responsibility of the will of multiple parties. If the establishment of the legal subject status of artificial intelligence is more convenient to clarify the responsibilities and rights of all parties, the boundaries are more clear. For example, a special account (Sun, 2024) should be set up for AI, and the infringement can be compensated from its account. If the nature of the infringement is more serious, the system of AI can be deactivated or eliminated. This is a way to solve the problems caused by AI and to ensure that the AI itself can be held accountable. A few years ago there were countries that penalized AI, and in the United States, the driverless system was held fully responsible for the death of a pedestrian in a driverless crash. In short, artificial intelligence actually has the ability to assume responsibility, so it is also feasible to give legal subject status. It can be seen that the subject status of artificial intelligence can effectively control the risks brought by artificial intelligence. Although the emergence of artificial intelligence brings great convenience and greatly changes people's way of life, it also impacts on traditional culture, morality and values. Therefore, it is necessary to give artificial intelligence legal personality, incorporate artificial intelligence into a unified system of technical and ethical norms for regulation, and establish a corresponding legal system mechanism to dissipate the risks and dangers that artificial intelligence may bring (Yang and Zhang, 2018). And AI technology, as an independent product, should also be given the status of a subject.

On top of that, the current law should hold an open attitude to adapt to the legal needs of the rapid development of artificial intelligence, which can be given a certain legal subject status. The old traditional legal personality can no longer meet the development speed and changes of artificial intelligence, and there is an urgent need to give artificial intelligence a new legal subject status. Nowadays, artificial intelligence has been commonly used in life, when a thing is widely developed, if it is not restrained and managed then it will inevitably cause unforeseen disasters. Therefore, it is very important to give artificial intelligence subject status. If artificial intelligence has the status of the main body, it will be better to carry out its responsibility subdivision, but also can effectively control the risk in favor of artificial intelligence in a good and fair and orderly environment for the healthy development of artificial intelligence. If AI is considered a legal subject, the public may have more trust in its decisions and behaviors, especially in settings involving important decisions, such as medical diagnosis or legal advice. Giving AI the status of a legal subject in terms of

social responsibility could motivate developers and operators to pay more attention to their social responsibility and promote more responsible technology development. In addition, different countries have different views on the legal subject status of AI, and if AI is given legal subject status, it can simplify legal issues in international transactions and reduce the complexity of cross-border disputes. The subject status of artificial intelligence can be used as an open structure, this program not only helps to solve the problem of artificial intelligence damage sharing also provides new ideas for the future development of artificial intelligence, helping new laws and regulations to flourish.

4 LEGAL FEASIBILITY OF GRANTING LEGAL SUBJECTIVITY TO GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

4.1 The Content of The Civil Subject Qualifications

From the perspective of law alone, civil subjects are centered on human beings. So, does artificial intelligence as a robot fail to become a subject in the legal sense? The human being in law is essentially a technology for establishing legal order (Sun, 2024). Legal mimesis, as a way of constructing law, is merely a manifestation of a more obviously mimetic character of the law as mimesis (Zu, 2024), in other words, the law itself is mimetic. Given that the legal system is mimetic, the subject of law, which is one of the core elements of law, is also mimetic. By analogy, it is also possible to anthropomorphize personality, that is, to anthropomorphize a specific object other than a person. In the Anglo-American system, the subject of law is not necessarily a “person” but a duty, a relatively hidden subject. For example, a fiduciary duty can only act in good faith and trust in the name of the trustee, so that when viewed in isolation the trust is no longer a hidden subject. Then artificial intelligence as a specific object must also be able to become the subject of the law. According to the human-like characteristics of artificial intelligence, not only from the thinking to simulate human beings but also from the appearance to imitate the appearance of human beings, structural-behavioral characteristics embedded in the kernel of artificial intelligence “human-like characteristics”, artificial intelligence robots are essentially a kind of chimera of human consciousness (Zu, 2024). Some scholars who deny that generative AI has become a legal subject believe that AI lacks rationality and emotion and cannot be a legal subject. And now in the era of strong AI, simply denying the subject status of AI ignores the potential emotional needs and management risks of AI. Apart from this, AI, as an already relatively mature technology, is capable of independent expression. The autonomy of artificial intelligence requires it to have free will and self-awareness, and the current artificial intelligence is having free will and formal self-awareness. Artificial intelligence outputs the corresponding content according to the requirements of the input, under the domination of emotions, strong artificial intelligence has the ability of independent expression and should be part of the social subject (He and Liu, 2024). Artificial intelligence discerns the authenticity and accuracy of users' messages, exchanges and communicates with users, and relies on its own understanding of the requirements not only the settings within the framework of the programming program. In this way, the AI's ability to express itself independently is sufficient to support it as a subject in law. In addition to the above two points, the law also needs to change and adapt to the new group of things. In the era of rapid iteration of science and technology, the establishment or not of the independent legal status of emerging legal subjects should also consider the pursuit of the value of the legal system that encourages technological innovation and development, and explore the diversification of legal subjects (Sun, 2024). Furthermore, how to apply traditional theories to new scenarios is also something that scholars of AI jurisprudence should do. However, the relevance of AI jurisprudence cannot be denied. When artificial intelligence is given the status of legal subject, the court can directly attribute the responsibility to the artificial intelligence. If you want to find out the authorizer behind the artificial intelligence may be very complicated, and the artificial intelligence has become the subject can quickly solve such problems. In this case, it is a direct requirement for the AI to be obligated to pursue responsibility in order to realize “stopping the infringement”, which is also based on the need for human beings to protect their own rights (Yang and Zhang, 2018).

In the second half of 2017, at the Future Investment Program conference in Saudi Arabia, the Saudi government announced the granting of citizenship to Sofia, an artificial intelligence robot. This is a good attempt at the legal subject status of

generative AI. The interaction between non-humans and humans is the intermingling and merging of two rules. Just as AI robots are created, but they themselves may develop their own rules of the AI world, and then interact with humans, we should accept the rules of adaptation and create the human world for them (Wen, 2020).

4.2 Legal Approach

There are now two main arguments for granting AI the status of a legal subject, e-personality and mimetic argument. The mimetic theory believes that the legal personality of artificial intelligence should be positioned as an independent mimetic legal personality from the realistic requirements of the development of artificial intelligence (Yang and Zhang, 2018). The emergence of artificial intelligence is to protect the rights and interests of human beings. The order or rank of human's own rights is naturally higher than that of artificial intelligence (Yang and Zhang, 2018). The ethical starting point of the proposed legal subject system is the pattern of human-centered order, and the purpose of the system also serves to safeguard the practical interests of human beings (Zu, 2024).

This article will focus on the e-personality narrative. In recent years, the legal person system is also expanding, in addition to corporate and non-organizational legal persons, more and more interest-based groups are seeking the qualification of legal persons, such as public interest legal persons, environmental legal persons and so on. All these legal anthropomorphisms can become legal subjects, then artificial intelligence robots with human-like intelligence with autonomous consciousness and recognition ability can also become civil law subjects (Wen, 2024). In 2021, the European Union proposed the Artificial Intelligence Act, which divides the risks of AI into four levels: prohibited risk, high risk, limited risk, and minimal risk. Each risk has a different regulatory approach. It aims to establish a comprehensive legal framework to regulate the development and use of AI. By categorizing and regulating AI systems with different risk levels, the EU hopes to promote technological innovation while protecting the rights of citizens and the safety of society.

As technology advances, AI robots have advanced to the point where they are virtually indistinguishable from real people. Assuming that one day AI is completely out of human control, who will bear the consequences of what it does? Some scholars(Zhang,2019) arguethat this view of e-humanity starts from the fact that AI has the ability to mean and be responsible in terms of property, and argues that behind the autonomous behavior of AI is the embodiment of the will of multiple subjects, and that it is feasible to anthropomorphize it into an e-legal person with the progression of property personality. Since many objects other than human beings can become legal subjects, artificial intelligence as a more mature and advanced object can also become a legal subject. Artificial Intelligence Artificial Intelligence has autonomous free will, and will surely generate autonomous consciousness soon, when the self-control consciousness of AI develops to a certain extent, how should it be controlled? Who will bear the responsibility for the damage brought about? So about the advocated e-personality, some people think that e-personality is similar to the legal fiction of the legal person system, which grants it limited civil rights and establishes a fund and insurance to bear the loss of the risk of robotic damage (Wen, 2024). Judging from the development history of artificial intelligence, artificial intelligence is actually more inclined to "cyborg". AI is a virtual image but can be seen everywhere in life, and "the human being in law is not a separate ontology outside of 'its' obligations and rights, but only a personified unity of them" (Ma, 2019). To put it simply, a legal “person” is distinguished by rights and duties, without which there is no “person”. In February 2016, Google's self-driving car's artificial intelligence system was recognized by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration as a “driver”. The above case illustrates the preference of some countries for the legal subject status of AI, which has been granted a certain degree of rights and obligations. Moreover, beyond the AI's property rights and ability to assume responsibility as described above, emotional rationality also makes the AI look like a “cyborg”. The ancient Greek philosopher Kant considered reason as “the human capacity to recognize things in the perceptible world and their regularities. Human rationality enables human beings to explore the laws of the world, and artificial intelligence can also analyze and explore things, which means that artificial intelligence should also be a "human" with super intelligence, closer to "cyborg". The manifestation of the capacity of meaning and responsibility of artificial intelligence is not limited only to property, but its most important expression is emotion. The possession of the emotional element allows the AI to develop the ability to mean the contents of multiple parties. In addition, the ability of legal persons to obtain the status of independent

subjects in law is dependent on the need of society for legal persons (He and Liu, 2024). Overall, the ability of artificial intelligence to assume responsibility and the right to own property, as well as the development of a sense of autonomy, make artificial intelligence more and more in line with the “electronic human being”. Hence, artificial intelligence should be given the status of a legal subject as soon as possible.

5 CONCLUSION

The rapid development of technology nowadays has brought us into the era of strong artificial intelligence. Wrapped up in the trend of the times, we also have to adapt to the changes and developments. Since generative artificial intelligence is an unstoppable craze, we have an open attitude and mind to accept it.

The legal subject status of generative artificial intelligence is still inconclusive, and each academic school holds its own opinions and views. We don't have to deny any one viewpoint, “existence is reasonable”. In the face of the qualification of the legal subject of generative artificial intelligence, we need to combine the current law with the technical characteristics of the current stage of artificial intelligence, and explore the challenges brought by artificial intelligence to the judicial system and the arrangements for the future. As for, the legislation related to artificial intelligence is actually a dynamic process, slowly groping and developing in a gradual manner. Human beings, as the leading legal constructor, are already planning the relationship and status of human beings and artificial intelligence. Although there are still some controversies as well as the law has a lag, but always adjusted to adapt to the needs and changes in society. If the technology of artificial intelligence is utilized properly and regulated by law, it will certainly bring our scientific and technological innovation to a higher level.

REFERENCES

Cheng, C. P. 2022. On the Autonomy of Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Shanghai Jiao Tong University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition)* (01), 43-51.

Gong, S. S. & Yan X. X. 2024. Consciousness as the standard? A Critique of the "False Proposition" of the Legal Subjectivity of Artificial Intelligence. *Dialectics of Nature Newsletter* (07), 92-102.

He, P. & Liu, J. K. 2024. Study on Intellectual Property Issues of Generative Artificial Intelligence Products from the Perspective of Jurisdictional Coordination--Taking ChatGPT as an Example. *Rule of Law Research* (03), 47-56.

Jia, Z. Y. 2024. Thoughts and rule conception of the legal subject status of artificial intelligence under the perspective of negativism. *Journal of Shanxi Youth Vocational College* (02), 67-72+85.

Li, Y. L. 2024. Generative artificial intelligence and copyright law: legal challenges and future prospects. Jianghan Academic (06), 5-15.

Li, M. F. 2024. Attribution of Rights and Path of Protection of Generative Artificial Intelligence Creations in the Field of Copyright. *Rule of Law Practice* (02), 189-199.

Ma, L. 2019. On the legal subject status of artificial intelligences. *Regional Governance* (31), 104-106.

Song, C. Y. & Li, L. 2019. Autonomy and Responsibility Assumption of Artificial Intelligence Bodies. *Dialectics of Nature Newsletter* (11), 95-100.

Sun, N. 2024. Rethinking the Establishment of the Legal Subject Status of Artificial Intelligence. *Law Forum* (05), 112-121.

Wang, Q. & Chu, C. 2024. A preliminary study on the boundary between artificial intelligence and copyright: legal challenges and reflections under technological progress. *Chinese Editorial* (08), 56-62.

Wen, Q. H. 2020. Exploration of legal subject development and artificial intelligence legal subject qualification. *Journal of Zhejiang Wanli University* (02), 27-31+111.

Yu, X., Zhang, R. Z., Zhang, B. & Wang, H. 2021.Research on intellectual property system adapting to the rapid development of artificial intelligence. *Research Management* (08), 176-183.

Yuan, Z. 2020. Re-examining the legal personality of artificial intelligence based on functional perspective. *Journal of Shanghai University (Social Science Edition)* (01), 16-26.

Yuan, Z. 2023. A study on the liability capacity of generative artificial intelligence. *Oriental Law* (03), 18-33.

Yang, Q. W. & Zhang, L. 2018. On the Mimetic Legal Personality of Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Hunan University of Science and Technology (Social Science Edition)* (06), 91-97.

Zhang, Z. J. 2019. On the status of artificial intelligence as an electronic legal person. *Modern Jurisprudence* (05), 75-88.

Zu, L. 2024. *R*e-exploration of the status of legal mimetic subject of artificial intelligence - oriented to the legal subject system under the perspective of mimetic philosophy. *Journal of Beijing Institute of Technology (Social Science Edition)* (04), 152-163.