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**INTRODUCTION**

In recent years, the ability of AI technology to generate creative content has progressed in leaps and bounds, especially in the realms of visual art and music. However, even the most advanced modern language models, such as GPT-2, AI still has not succeeded in replicating the as of yet uniquely human propensity for creating literary texts. Poetry is widely considered to be one of the more difficult literary forms to master even for humans, as it is by definition more sparse, and therefore denser than prose writing—Poetry distills emotion with the aid of metaphor, imagery, and more formal considerations such as line breaks and rhyme schemes. So, while GPT-2 has had some measured success in modeling screenplay plays and the work of playwrights, it would not be unreasonable to expect it to struggle to generate coherent poems. It has been previously shown to understand meter and rhyme with enough training input, but has fallen short with regard to coherence [1]. With that in mind: How well, after being trained to replicate the poetic style of mid-century Ohio poet James Wright, can GPT-2 put that style into practice while generating new works? Where are its strengths and shortcomings?

**BACKGROUND ON GPT-2 TECHNOLOGY**

GPT-2, created by OpenAI, is a transformer-based language model with 1.5 billion parameters, and it has been trained on 8 million webpages with the goal of accurately predicting the next word in a piece of text, given all the previous words in that text [2]. This goal makes GPT-2 capable of completing various tasks: It can answer questions about the content and comprehension of texts, summarize, and translate. It can also generate synthetic texts in which it mimics the style and content of a given input [2], in order to mitigate possible malicious use and provide additional time to analyze the implications of releasing GPT-2. 1.5BM OpenAI is taking a staged-release approach, with the most powerful version currently available being GPT-2 345M.

**METHODS**

In order to generate poems in the style of James Wright, a 345M-sized GPT-2 model was fine-tuned to a corpus of 177 of his poems across a span of his entire career. During the training process the text of these 177 poems was fed to the GPT-2 model 6,000 times, with the model’s poetic style becoming more like that of Wright each time. Following this, the model used its understanding of the patterns contained in human language combined with its new knowledge of James Wright’s poetry in order to generate two sets of poems in the style of Wright. These two sets differ in their temperature, with one being set at 0.7 and the other at 0.9. A higher temperature setting means more randomness will be present in the text generated by the model, so the set of poems with the 0.9 temperature setting should be expected to contain more deviations from Wright’s poetic style and content than the set with the 0.7 temperature setting.

**RESULTS**

Provided here are some of the most interesting samples from the 0.7 and 0.9 temperature sets generated by the 345M-GPT-2 model respectively:

Spinning on its side,The boat tumbles down the channel And, a mile or so further, I can hear trilling in the trees. I want to leap on its back and protect My dear friend, the beautiful bird. Spinning, on its side, I can carry on for a mile or two What we both had to carry Against the force of the rain That came down in vast of darkness. The coffin had to be hoisted up the bank And down the other side of the immense post, And all the time give time to gather and bring Sweet Charlie home.

Now, a mile down, I can still see the spot where he went Out of sound sleep and into sound Dead.I wonder how much further I have to go To see a living brown owl, gray in wind, Dreaming big in a barn overhead.

I stand here in the sight of everyone, I see my own face Look at your teeth chatter in the air, And yet keep silent. You gaze up at the sky Resonate with the voice of the hunted Two humps above the summit of the brooks. Both of them starved down their.

Beside the open wound where the pany Strapped to the tree, between the trees. The other man lay reeling, panting, Brookside to Brookside, down, down, down, dead, I take the tree by the husus and lean Keen for a liar, quick to jump to conclusions, Strong enough not to trip my spine. One bell before I step outside Broke the silence. A tall.

In the Ancient City, Lazarus Full of Blood, a dozen of Lake Miners Where follows Don Quijote Laredo. He cried, and some strange voices Alien and WyhelfenThrough The Rue Ambroise. And the Call To ArmsWeJossed Last Down Near The Irishman Islands, AndVeronica Cola. Renamed As A Poet. Desperate For The Kiss Of A Fresh Married Branding The Rocinante, Where The Blackbirds Speak A Sweet Song Wind Beneath A Sand-Heir Dune.

I Need No Water, And Lara Logan’s Dead. If I Only Had A Blanket I Float Dead In, A mailboxShould Be The Truth.

**ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS**

As expected, the 345M-GPT-2 model trained on a corpus of Wright’s poetry encountered problems generating believable, coherent poems in his style. However, it did not go entirely without success. The model was most successful, especially in its 0.7 temperature iteration, in generating work that matched the style and form of Wright’s earliest work, which was much more beholden to traditional poetic forms and rhetoric than his later work, often to the point of criticism [4]. The model was fairly quick to pick up on elements like rhyme and meter in and its execution of these poetic structures was surprisingly nuanced—there were multiple examples from the 0.7 temperature set of the model using various slant rhymes in interesting ways, something not achieved in the 0.9 temperature set. The first example at left was the strongest replication of Wright’s later work generated in the 0.7 temperature poem set. The model was good at picking up on vocabulary content and themes, using these two elements to capture Wright’s tone and maintain it more or less consistently. Its core images and phrasing are believable for Wright. It falls short when it comes to keeping images and metaphors consistent over the course of the poem, instead overloading the text with many disconnected images. The second example at left is especially interesting. It comes from the 0.9 temperature poem set, which contains more randomness, allowing for the grammatical and syntactical flexiblity characteristic of much contemporary poetry. This works well in the poem’s first half. The model is successful at capturing Wright’s distinctly understated phrasing, and combining it with unique images that are nonetheless reminiscent of Wright’s work. However, in the second half of the poem, the model becomes mostly incoherent, pulling words from corners of its lexicon unrelated to Wright in the slightest—Note the extremely strange Don Quijote references that double as a reference to the novel The Expanse, in which “the Rocinante” is a spaceship. Overall, there is evidence that GPT-2 has the potential to accurately replicate contemporary poems if trained well. Currently, it’s strengths lie in capturing phrasing and tone. For this to happen, the model would need to have enough randomness that it avoids consistent rhyme and meter structures while also remaining on topic. Additionally, the model would need to learn to carry an image or set of images all the way through a poem. In theory, this would lead to narrative coherence, an element that was lacking in these sets.
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