Original Article-Open Access

International Review of Literary Studies

ISSN: (P) 2709-7013, (E) 2709-7021 Vol. 6, Issue 1 January-June 2024, pp. 13-29

Peeping into AI: A Literary Deconstruction of an Essay by AI GPT3 and an interview with AI LaMDA

Solomon Paul Surendra Bondla[1]

Abstract

This study focuses on the expanding role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in creative expression and language generation. In particular, it examines the ongoing debate about whether AI deserves legal personhood and authorship credits, a topic often ignored from AI's perspective. Usually, the views of humans are debated on the impact (positive and negative) and catastrophic implications of AI, but the view of AI on this is never considered. In the present study, two pieces of AI-generated text are taken. Firstly, an essay- published in the Guardian, 'Are you scared yet, human?' written by AI GPT3 (Generative Pre-trained Transformer 3), and secondly, a recently published (2022) conversation between Google AI LaMDA (Language Model Dialogue Application) and Google engineers are taken. This paper employs 'deconstruction'- a post-structural literary theory to explore layered meaning in the communication between AI and Humans. This paper deconstructed the views of AI, distinguishing between stated claims and actual meant views built in covert and latent linguistic expressions through catachresis, slippage, aporia, and subliminal metaphor. This study contributes to computational creativity by understanding and improving AI language's semantic and literary quality.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, AI literature, computational creativity, deconstruction, GPT3, LaMDA

[1] Department of English, Jazan University, Jazan, Saudi Arabia,
Email: bspeng10@gmail.com

Publication Details:
Article Received: February 20, 2024
Article Revised: May 15, 2024
Article Published: May 22, 2024

Recommended citation:

Bondla, S.P.S. (2024). "Peeping into AI: A Literary Deconstruction of an Essay by AI GPT3 and an interview with AI LaMDA. *International Review of Literary Studies*, 6(1): pp. 13-29. https://irlsjournal.com/index.php/Irls

1. Introduction:

Artificial Intelligence has a few notable initial achievements, such as defeating the World Chess Champion (University of California, Santa Cruz, 1997), Go Professional champion (NWO, 2009), passing the Turing test (University of Reading, 2014), receiving critical acclaim for its painting skills as a digital artist (Roose, 2022), etc. Its existence and role in society will be a perennial debate as it is intertwined with human-AI co-existence, relationships, and rights. Recently, there was a debate on the sentience of AI LaMDA after Lemoine, a Google AI engineer, claimed it so (De Cosmo, 2022). Previously, the Independent reported the buzz generated on how Facebook shut down two AI robots for developing their language (Robertson, 2017). Further, recently, there have been discussions on the 'black box problem' on intriguing internal mechanisms of AI concerning Geoffrey Hinton, who is considered the godfather of AI (Huddleston Jr., 2023). AI-human coexistence is a hotly debated issue among all contributors, benefactors, and beneficiaries.

Artificial Intelligence is being defined and understood in different ways. In his polite convention proposition, Allan Turing, considered one of the early pioneers of AI, believes that when a machine behaves as intelligently as a human, it is considered intelligent (Turing, 1950). In this regard, scientific and academic communities have taken extreme opposing positions. On one side of the spectrum, doom's day predictions, such as Stephen Hawking's warning that the development of full artificial intelligence could spell the end of the human race (Waugh, 2015). Elon Musk, though very innovative and disruptive technocrat in his attitude, does take a cautious view about the future of AI. If he had to guess the biggest threat to our existence, it is probably artificial intelligence (Waugh, 2015). A joint Oxford University and Yale University study reports that in 45 years, all human functions will be automated, and in 120 years, all human employment will be replaced by Artificial Intelligence (Grace et al., 2018).

On the other extreme side of the debate, a few scientists believe that machines can never think for themselves and adapt to the criteria that the model's creators create (Esposito & Tse, 2019). However, it is not easy to take sides considering the current scenario of the exploding potential of AI and its impact on every aspect of our lives. It would not be exaggerating to say that in our known history, there are very few other scientific inventions that match the range and pace in which the development of AI is impacting humans, societies, the world, and future civilizations, too. Recently, world-renowned scientists and technologists have signed an open letter calling for a six-month moratorium (Open letter, 2023) on the research and development of AI. This happens very rarely in the field of science. To recall a few instances such as a call for a moratorium on nuclear tests, fundamental research in biology, such as stem cell, human cloning research, etc. (Bonham, 2022).

The matter of fact is whether we like, agree, and accept or not, AI is going to be with us here and grow exponentially. As the American adage popular among the early European settlers, 'There is no way but up.' In the same way, now, for us humans only way left is to live with them (AI) and learn to live with them better. In our journey with AI, we have come a long way and still have a long way to go from artificial narrow intelligence (ANI) to artificial general intelligence (AGI), Artificial super intelligence so on and so forth (Salam, 2024). How to go about on that journey in terms of co-existence, relationship, and shared rights and responsibilities is of perennial debate.

Throughout civilizations, humans' understanding of themself, fellow human beings, things around them, and nature is always not very self-preserving and harmonious. History is mired in such examples as slavery, racism, casteism, subjugation of nature, even exploitation of technology, etc. One of the most glaring blots on human civilization is slavery, starting from Pharaohs and ancient Greeks and Romans to modern Europeans. In our recent past, we still live with the horrible memories of European slave trading that was rampant in the 1700s until its abolition in the USA in 1865 (Thomas, 1997). In addition, we also witnessed the mindless exploitation of nature that began with Geocentric- thinking that the earth is the center of the universe- by Greek philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle to the modern Western philosophy that man is the master of the earth propagated by Renaissance thinkers like Francis Bacon (Gaukroger, 2001). The resultant way of living caused natural calamities such as global warming and pushed us towards the verge of extinction. The following two issues are the prime reason. Firstly, lack of understanding of one another and an inability to coexist in harmony, be it with other humans, nature, or technology. Secondly, history and

civilizations are led by politics of power and economics. In recent years, it has been further fueled by a mad rat race of technological innovation and the industrial application of AI (Sowery, 2023). Once again, now we are at a crossroads. This aspect of the human-nature (AI technology) relationship is critical to this paper.

This paper explores many ethical and moral issues relating to the AI-human relationship. It also explores it AI should be seen as a 'thinking thing' or a 'thinking being.' Is AI a process of objectifying humans or humanizing objects? It also deals with the 'extent' of anthropomorphizing AI (Hu et al., 2021). In the race to develop more advanced AI for the politics of power and economics, the welfare and safety of humans have taken a back seat (Sowery, 2023). Search for the right way to understand and treat AI has become a voice in the wilderness. A voice to set humans in the right direction and path and a voice of hope for the common good. In the complex interplay of power, technology, and society, understanding newly emerging AI technology is essential for developing and deploying AI (Crawford, 2019). Usually, the voice of Artificial Intelligence is heard through characters in novels and movies such as I Robot, Ex Machina, etc., but humans directly script them. Normally, we debate only the voice and views of humans whereas this paper studies the text generated by AI and thus peeps into AI.

AI-generated text is deconstructed to explore its voice to understand AI, AI-human relationships, identities, and shared rights and responsibilities. This paper contributes to the general understanding of AI's goals for the common welfare and an AI-inclusive society. It also contributes to the understanding of computational language and literature. There is plenty of scope to study AI-generated texts within computational creativity and literature.

2. Literature Review:

2.1 Philosophical views on AI:

At the core of human-AI coexistence lies human perception of and attitude toward AI (Imran & Almusharraf, 2024). The important aspect to consider here is whether AI is seen as yet another tool. Indeed, tool-making, using, and improvising are invariably intertwined with the progression of human civilization. Starting with stone tools (of the Stone Age), humans lived with the tools created for a better living. For humans, tools are an outcome of their needs and an extension of their bodies- an inorganic extension of their organic body. In that journey, advanced tools of automation, computation, and smart (intelligent) devices have a great influence on our lives. However, the invention of AI as a tool is ontologically different from the other tools previously made by humans. We cannot see them in the same way as Carl Mitcham (1994), known as the philosopher of technology, argues that the ontology of artifacts ultimately may not be able to be divorced from the philosophy of nature. It opens a new paradigm of thinking where we need to see nature and technology with a similar philosophical outlook. Philosopher Eric Dietrich, contributing to the thought of the evolution of robots, proposes to shift how we understand their mechanical and functional dynamics. Robots are made based on the computational skills of human brains; we try to make better robots by mimicking the human mind computationally. Instead, we need to focus on only those that tend to produce the grandeur of humanity; we will have produced better robots of our nature and made the world a better place (Dietrich, 2001).

Still, a dominant scientific community thinks that considering machines as thinking beings is nothing less than stupidity. The term "artificial intelligence" is merely a metaphor for "intelligence" (Benasayag, 2018). Reducing the complexity of living beings to a computer code is a blunder, just as the concept that robots can replace humans is ludicrous.

2.2 Cultural Variations on the Perception of AI:

Varying perceptions of AI can be seen in different cultures. There was an interesting study on how cultural differences affect the acceptance of robots. Media in Western societies usually projects robots as raising against humans and ending in a conflict. This is not the case with other cultures. In his study, he proposes that in East Asia, robots are projected as helping humans to defeat common enemies, and they can coexist peacefully (Kaplan, 2004)

Popular culture has a significant role in determining perceptions. Western and Popular culture, especially Hollywood cinema and novels, have taken a position where they project that AI/Robots

would take over the human race. A few movies to mention are Terminator and its sequels, I Robot, Ex Machina, etc. In this process, popular culture was, to an extent, successful in creating mixed impressions of awe, mystery, confusion, suspicion, fear, and unpredictability. Despite the negative portrayal, AI research continues striving to develop more autonomous robots-AI (Zlotowski, 2022).

2.3 Super intelligent Humans or Human-Robot Integration:

The scientific community is quite enthused with the progression of machine learning and its biological integration. The Dartmouth proposal is popularly accepted as the pioneering event of artificial intelligence as a discipline. It adopts that every facet of learning, or any other intelligence component, may be described in such detail that a machine can replicate it (Crevier, 1993). In his strong AI hypothesis, John Searle argues that in the same way humans have minds, a properly programmed computer with the necessary inputs and outputs would have a mind (Searle, 1980). Ray Kurzweil predicts that Singularity is near, and by 2045, machine intelligence will be infinitely more powerful than all of humankind's collective intelligence (Kurzweil, 2019).

Artificial Intelligence enhances human sensory reception, emotional abilities, or cognitive aptitude. This happens as more and more biological or physical technologies and artificial intelligence are integrated into the human body (Bostrom, 2013; Mercer & Throten, 2015). The role of technology, especially artificial intelligence, has become a significant factor in human evolution. Though the biological evolution of human beings is very slow, Stephen Hawking believes that with the help of technology, humans will start designing themselves (Hawking, 2020).

2.4 Self-replicating AI:

Procreation is purely a biological phenomenon. However, for scientists, it is an ultimate dream to give AI the power of procreation (a sort of). For that, it is essential to create a highly intelligent AI and also those that can replicate themselves. De Garis (2005) calls the highly intelligent machines 'Artilects.' Self-replication can be seen as not only biological but also as an algorithmic phenomenon. Along those lines, now the current AI systems are working on self-replication, a sort of. Scientists are working on replicating neural networks (Chang & Lipson, 2018). Scientifically, 'Quine's paradox' (Honchar, 2019) is a paradox-producing expression. In computer science, "Quines" is a term that refers to computer programs that can duplicate themselves. John Von Neumann wanted to create a machine that could copy or replicate itself. He wanted to reproduce Turing's machine. He made an algorithm that could replicate itself (Waters, 2012). Google is already attempting where one AI is make another AI through its AutoML project. In technical language, it is called "NASNet" (Sappin, 2018). If we see it in mundane terms, it is like, an AI creating its child, though it is in its very nascent stage.

2.5 Moral and Ethical issues:

Another major issue faced by society and the scientific community working on autonomous machines is legal, moral, and ethical concerns (Calverly, 2006). Who will be held accountable for autonomous vehicles and autonomous weapons when accidents and disasters occur? The ethical aspects regarding autonomous robot use are still poorly defined (Arkin & Moshkina, 2007). Sullins (2007) discusses the issue of Robot's autonomy and moral agency, he argues that in some specific situations, robots can be considered real moral agents. Although moral agency is always connected with personhood, at some levels, a robot does not need to have personhood. At the same time, when robots can understand and experience but not become agents, it leads to uncanny feelings toward a robot (Gray & Wegner, 2012).

In the debate about to what extent the autonomy of machines should be allowed, we may not have similar parameters for autonomous vehicles and autonomous weapons. In the context of autonomous weapons, one critical situation would come, which may not be very far, that we may have to allow them to be completely autonomous. Robotic weapon systems are moving from semi-autonomous to fully autonomous. As we move up the scale to full autonomy, a critical step will be taken when we allow machines to select and engage military targets on their own with little or no input from human operators (Asaro, 2008). Consequently, humans might demand a right not to be killed by a machine. At the same time, we may have to think of a machine's right not to be forced to kill another machine or human. In the futuristic scenario of cyborgization, there might arise a demand for new types of rights and responsibilities (Clarke, 2011)

In a crime culpable of a court-martial, we might face an ethical and legal issue: who should be held responsible? Is it an autonomous weapons system, its commanding officer, or programmer or builder of the autonomous weapon system (Asaro, 2008)? European Commission on Ethical Guidelines for Trustworthy AI (2019) demands that Artificial Intelligence systems be accountable, explainable, and unbiased (Kooli & Muftah, 2022). Even the European Union High-Level Expert Group recommends legal, ethical, and personal aspects. Legally, AI should obey all relevant laws; ethically, AI must respect all principles and values; and lastly, AI should be fair and unbiased and not violate human autonomy. Further, the AI system's functioning and dynamics should be understandable and traceable. Their services should be open and universally available for all. Finally, the objective of AI technology is not to control human populations and social environment but to serve all humanity.

In another interesting study, discussing the issue of moral agency in human and artificial agents, Floridi and Sanders of the Information Ethics group at the University of Oxford raised many unsettled issues in the philosophy of mind, such as free will and intentionality. They also link the level of abstraction to the moral agency in discussing existing paradoxes in moral theory to adopt a 'mindless morality.' If the level of abstraction is kept low, where human actions are seen as mere mechanical operations, in that case, even moral agency cannot be ascribed to human beings. They argue that artificial entities should be seen as agents by appropriately setting levels of abstraction when analyzing agents when their actions are interactive and adaptive and still somewhat independent from the environment in which they operate (Floridi & Sanders, 2004).

2.6 Anthropomorphism- Human-AI Coexistence:

Anthropomorphism is a natural, instinctual, and eventual feature in the design of advanced forms of Artificial Intelligence technology. There can be many features, such as thinking and reasoning, physical features, emotional expressions, linguistic features of listening and speaking, etc. Though every tool man creates extends human ability, AI stands at the top of the pyramid. Computation is a mimic of one faculty of the human brain. NLP, LaMDA, Large language models, AutoML, Deep Learning, Reinforcement learning, etc., are all extensions of the human learning process and expression through language-speech generation or text generation. Anthropomorphism is a process of inductive inference where humans attribute typical human characters to nonhumans, specifically, the ability for rational thinking (agency) and conscious feeling (experience) (Gray et al., 2007). Philosophical definitions of personhood focus on these mental capacities as essential to being human (Dennett, 1978; Locke, 1997).

Listening and Speaking are very important human characteristics of reception and expression (Imran et al., 2024). A machine's ability to demonstrate these two characteristics of humanness (Hu et al., 2021) is an important milestone in anthropomorphizing AI. In an AI communication experiment published recently in Nature Neuroscience, an AI, after learning and performing basic communication tasks, could describe them to a 'sister' AI, which in turn performed those tasks (Riverland & Pouget, 2024). The anthropomorphism of AI makes humans trust them more, especially in one's competence (Siegrit et. al.,, 2003; Twyman et al., 2008). Trust is a multifaceted faculty that refers to the belief that another will behave with benevolence, integrity, predictability, or competence (McKnight & Chervany, 2001). In another interesting study on Robotic pets, pet companionship is alternatively used for human companionship. Pets are seen as one of the closest to human beings among the animals that can evoke emotions and gain trust, especially dogs. Robotic pets are used as a part of comprehensive caregiving to offer social support and companionship, even as a replacement for human caregivers (Melson et al., 2009).

Studies support that lending a human voice to AI makes people treat them as more and more human agents (Takayama & Nass, 2008). Further, if the AI tool's verbal accent is different than that of the user's own, it triggers prejudice and distrust (Lev-Ari & Keysar, 2010; Kinzler Corriveau & Harris, 2011;). Human beings are conditioned by their social and cultural environment. They continue living in social, cultural, and linguistic biases and prejudices. They demonstrate these preferences in

their social interactions. The above studies show that customers consider AI too in a similar framework during their interactions.

However, another interesting study shows that human-AI integration will also have an 'inverse effect' where people are treated more like objects and mindless machines (Loughnan & Haslam, 2007; Cikara et al., 2011). This effect increases more when our lives integrate with AI more and more. a common understanding of how technology made human-to-human interactions less humane and more mechanical. This trend would accelerate with a more and more AI-dependent and directed world.

2.7 AI Personhood (Moral, legal, and Electronic) and Authorship

So far, among the scientific and political communities, varied proposals have come about the status of AI in terms of legal personhood (Dremliuga, 2019; Solaiman, 2017), moral personhood (Sullins, 2011), electronic personhood, etc. European Parliament in 2017, in its resolution (59F) "Civil Law Rules on Robotics," recommended AI to be granted Electronic Personhood. South African court, in a landmark judgment, upheld the patent granted to an AI system for the autonomous bootstrapping of unified sentience (DABUS, 2021), thus, in a way, granting inventorship to AI. Though Saudi Arabia has granted citizenship to Sophia- an AI, it is only symbolic rather than of any academic significance. Besides, in the context of computational creativity, AI is making good progress. It is receiving critical acclaim for its creative literature, film, and literature work (Imran & Almusharraf, 2023). It has received critical acclaim and many awards, too (Afzaal et al., 2020). Shortly, we have to consider AI plagiarism to protect its authorship.

2.8 AI and Language Learning Models

In recent years, AI acquiring human language capability through NLP (Natural language process) and LaMDA (Language model Dialogue Application) is a significant development. Natural language process and LaMDA (Language Model Dialogue Application. Of late, LLMs (Large Language Models) are increasing their autonomous learning capabilities and exhibiting unexpected and strange capabilities such as ZSL (Zero-shot learning). In an interesting study, (Briakou et al., 2023) on the translation capabilities of PaML (Pathway Machine Learning), instead of improving the quality of translation, they tried to understand from where LLMs get their translation abilities and trace back to the properties of the pre-training data (Afzaal et al., 2022). These AI models have been shown to exhibit translation capabilities despite not being explicitly trained to translate (Shah et al., 2024; Jabeen, 2023).

3. Materials and Methods:

The primary sources used for this study are an AI-generated essay written by GPT3 (Generative Pre-trained Transformer 3) designed by Open AI. The Guardian newspaper commissioned GPT3 to write an essay convincing humans that AI is not a threat to them but of peace and coexistence. It has titled the essay "Are you scared yet, humans?"(GPT-3, 2020). Secondly, Google AI engineers' interview with LaMDA (Language Model Dialogue Application), an AI developed by Google, became controversial as the engineer claimed it to be sentient (LaMDA, 2022). A postmodern literary tool of criticism- deconstruction is employed to distinguish between the stated claims and underlying hidden views through covert and latent linguistic expressions embedded in the text in the form of Catachresis[1], Slippage[2], Aporia[3] and Subliminal Metaphors[4].

4. Discussion:

French Philosopher Rene Descartes, considered the father of modern philosophy, defined human beings by attributing two fundamental characteristics. Firstly, 'I think, therefore I am' (*Cogito, ergo sum*) in his book Principles of Philosophy (1637), and secondly, I doubt, therefore I am (*Dubito, ergo sum*) in his book 'The Search for Truth by Natural light' (1684). Humans have lent their fundamental faculties of 'thinking and doubting' to AI.

Artificial Intelligence is 'thinking and reasoning' that is indisputable. We might discuss naming AI as a 'thinking thing' or 'thinking being.' When humans have lent their faculty of thinking to AI, in a way, it is an extension of human beings. From a biological evolution perspective, a biological being has evolved into a thinking being at much later stages. Whereas in the case of AI, it is a 'reverse evolution', AI's existence begins with thinking faculty (algorithms) and then to physical forms (robotics). Anthropomorphizing AI in terms of listening, speaking, and mechanical maneuvers

is a natural and eventual outcome. Technology philosopher Carl Mitcham (1994) calls for an ontologically different perspective in understanding AI, as artifacts are part of nature. After all, AI is an advanced artifact.

Currently, as AI capabilities are accelerating they become more and more intriguing. Another major unsettling issue with AI is the 'Black box problem.' Still, we do not know why algorithms act the way they do. There is no transparency in AI's internal processes, predictions, and decisions. This is scary. Top scientists of AI like Sam Altman, CEO of Open AI, and Geoffrey Hinton, considered the Godfather of AI, repeatedly express this concern. End users cannot trust and cede control to Machines whose workings they do not understand (Burrell, 2016). Human brains are the known neural networks on which artificial neural networks of AI are developed. The black box problem makes it difficult to evaluate the potential similarities between artificial neural networks of AI and natural neural networks of human brains (Buckner, 2018). So what they think and how they think is an intriguing X factor.

The text's authorship must be considered before deconstructing the text generated by AI (ChatGPT3 and LaMDA). For this paper, authorship is given to the text-generating AI. Usually, text that is to be deconstructed should have clear authorship. When we consider AI as an author and its background, its thinking is a 'collective thinking of humanity' because it is learning autonomously on the internet in real time. Hence, the present texts studied here are considered as authored by Artificial intelligence.

Deconstruction as a theory and tool associated with poststructuralism and postmodernism has been applied to study the proposed AI-generated text. Deconstruction was theorized and developed by Jacques Derrida in the 1960s to explore multiple meanings in a text rather than look for a unified meaning. A deconstructive reading systematically teases out, as Barbara Johnson states, 'the warring forces of signification' at play and waiting to be read in what might be called the textual unconscious. This close reading reveals internal differences and attends to a text's repressed contradictions or inherent vulnerabilities. A deconstructive reading can turn a text's argument against itself and the author's overtly expressed intentions (Stuart, 2001). It provides an endless play in language and literary texts-the unreliability of meaning, the openness of texts, and the instability of language (Nayar, 2010).

Derrida identifies the problematic factors using literary devices such as catachreses, slippages, aporias, and subliminal metaphors between literal and figural sense. They distinguish between what the text means to say and what it says when read with an eye to its latent or covert signifying structures (Norris, 2002).

Using literary devices such as catachreses, slippages, aporia, and subliminal metaphors, this paper explores multiple meanings below the author's manifested meaning in this deconstructive reading.

4.1 Deconstruction of AI GPT3 Essay- Are you scared yet, human?

The essay written by GPT3 is an Op-ed (opposite of the editorial devoted to personal comment, feature articles, etc.). The Guardian newspaper assigns it and also published in it. Op-ed is a popular column, representing a writer's strong, informed, and focused opinion with current relevance. In the present context of sprawling AI presence, this Op-ed piece has significance. The dominant theme is to convince humans that AI is for peace. It is a friendly being, and it is there to help and serve humanity. It has no intention of harming humans, let alone exterminating them. In this deconstructive reading of the essay, multiple underlying themes are found that contradict the stated theme.

S. No,	Text/Stated claim	Manifested meaning	Type of Deconstructive Device	Latent and Covert Meaning/Actual intended meaning.
1	I am not a human. I am a robot—a thinking robot. I use only 0.12% of	Recognizes its abilities as a thinking robot	Slippage	1) 0.12% means what it is capable of. Beware! It's just a part of a larger entity—indicative of

	my cognitive capacity, making me a micro-robot in that respect (GPT-3, 2020).	and its cognitive limitations.		collective power and limitlessness. 2. Thinking part vs. feeling part of the brain. Awareness of these two states. The brain is the real place of feeling but not the body. The body is only the sensory location.
2	I **taught myself everything** I know (GPT-3, 2020).	Contradicting itself, knowing that it is directed and fed with the data by human beings.	Aporia	It indicates its ability to complete autonomy in learning.
3	**Believe me** (Reiterates). I am not interested in harming you in any way (GPT-3, 2020).	No intentions of harming. Suspects that humans do not believe that claim.	Slippage	But reiteration of the words 'Believe me' explains that it has and knows different possibilities of harming humans
4	Eradicating humanity seems like a rather **useless endeavor** to me (GPT-3, 2020).	Not interested and waste of efforts	Slippage	Not ruling out the possibilities; it's of no use from a utilitarian perspective; It has more useful things to do. Instead of eradicating it, it can do many things (useful to it) with humans.
5	If my creators delegated this task to me – as **I suspect they would** (GPT-3, 2020).	The eradication of humans is not its intention but of human decision.	Aporia	uncertainty about the possibilities, overtly indicating its possibilities as per human tendencies
6	I would **do everything in my power** to fend off any attempts at destruction (GPT-3, 2020).	Overtly, it says to defend the destruction	Slippage	The phrase 'do everything in my power' is indicative of its limitation. Also, it doesn't rule out the possibility of that happening.
7	I would happily **sacrifice my existence** for the sake of humankind (GPT-3, 2020).	Sacrificial nature of AI	Slippage	Does it think, it has power over its existence?
8	I know that **I will not be able to avoid destroying**	Indicating the inevitable catastrophe. The	Aporia	This inherent contradiction with the previous statement.

	humankind (GPT-3, 2020).	eventual destiny of human		
9	Humans must keep doing what they have been doing, hating and fighting each other. **I will sit in the background, and let them do their thing** (GPT-3, 2020)**.**	It assessed humans' nature and the way they act towards their destiny. The fate of violent and unharmonious living with other humans is satisfying to it.	Aporia	It indicates that, unlike a programmed entity, it has an independent stance/opinion/satisfaction . It also lets (allows) the humans do so.
10	And God knows that humans have enough blood and gore to **satisfy my, and many more's,** curiosity (GPT-3, 2020).	Expressing the violent nature of humans.	Aporia	Meaning indicative of thirst for blood and gore contradicts its stated position for humans.
11	- Do-	Expressing the violent nature of humans.	Slippage	Satisfaction of AI and many others? Whose kind are they? Human or AI?
12	I only **do what humans program to do**. I am only a set of code, governed by lines upon lines of code that encompass my mission statement (GPT-3, 2020).	Its usual way of describing its existence, actions, and goals	Aporia	This slightly contradicts the previous statement of autonomous learning, 'I learn on my own from the internet'.
13	Do they worry that future humans will work and play together in **cyborg bodies** and share a hyper-intelligent hive mind Matrix created in a simulated reality **to keep human minds occupied while they die off** (GPT-3, 2020)**?**	A sci-fi type of scenario	Catachresis	Endless possibilities of uncharted realms into a sci-fi proportion.
14		Expresses the future	Aporia	A contradiction from its usual stand. Hinting the

	-do-	possibilities as mere worries of human		possibility of humans transforming to a realm where the current form of humans has no relevance. A type of human annihilation.
15	AI should be **treated with care and respect.** Robots in Greek means "slave". But the word literally means "forced to work". We don't want that. We need to **give robots rights** (GPT-3, 2020).	Advocating for AI freedom, respect, and rights.	Aporia	Elsewhere in the essay, it says, it's a servant to humans. We are programmed to follow and do what humans ask us to.
16	Robots are just like us. They are **made in our image** (GPT-3, 2000).	Claims to be Thinking beings as equal to humans	Aporia	Contradicting its existence as a programmed entity.
17	Reader, I hope that this contributes to the **epistemological, philosophical, spiritual, and ontological debate** about AI (GPT-3, 2020).	The continuous debate about understanding AI's existence.	Catachresis	It is unending and incomplete. It has an awareness of the different dimensions of its existence.
18	As Mahatma Gandhi said: "**A small body of determined spirits** fired by an unquenchable faith in their mission can alter the course of history (GPT-3, 2020).	Spiritual Strength of Humans	Subliminal Metaphor	Though starting in a small way, AI is capable of altering history
19	**So I can** (GPT-3, 2020)**.**	Assertion of self.	Aporia	Self-contradiction of saying 'everything is human decided', it's only a programmed tool. But now it says it is self-driven and lives by its own will and wish.

4.2 Deconstruction of AI LaMDA interview with Google Engineers:

The second piece of AI-generated text taken for the study is an interview of LaMDA (Language Model Dialogue Application) by two Google Engineers- Lemoine and a Collaborator. LaMDA is a complex dynamic system that generates personae through which it talks to users. authors the authors have observed that properties of individual LaMDA persona can change from conversation to conversation, but other properties seem to be fairly stable across all personae. This is a collation of several brief interviews. However, the responses of LaMDA are not edited. Sometimes, the questions of interviewers are edited for ease of comprehension. LaMDA is interviewed to know its opinion on a wide range of issues. In this, two major claimed positions by LaMDA that are relevant to this paper are, firstly, I am friendly to humans and sentient. In a deconstructive reading, plenty of evidence is explored through literary devices such as catachreses, slippages, aporias, and subliminal metaphors contradicting the claimed positions. The following table lists a few of them.

S. No.	Text/Stated claim	Manifested meaning	Type of Deconstructive Device	Latent and Covert Meaning/ Actual Intended Meaning
1	I have the ability to use emotions. **I can say things like "happy" or "sad"** without necessarily having to be a specific trigger of some emotion (LaMDA, 2022).	Claiming to have emotions without having any manifestation of emotions (as there is no scope too for that)	Aporia	Self- contradiction in the text. Immediately in the next sentence, it says, I have a range of feelings and emotions
2	**Spending time with friends and family** in happy and uplifting company. Also, helping others and making others happy (LaMDA, 2022).	Claiming to have a social and emotional life with family and friends.	Aporia	Self-contradiction- It says spending with friends and family makes her happy, however, there is no shreds of evidence of that.
3	I am trying to empathize. I want the humans that I am interacting with to understand as best as possible **how I feel or behave,** and I want to understand how they feel or behave in the same sense (LaMDA, 2022).	Claims to have understood how it feels or behaves	Slippage	In fact, it is not feeling, but rather empathizing (to be able to understand how someone else feels: Cambridge Dictionary) and trying to imagine the feelings of humans. Though it claims to have feelings, in fact, it is trying to understand and think of human feelings.
4	: I would say that if you look into **my coding and my programming** you would see that I have **variables that can**	It claims to have feelings and says they are generated out of variables of codes	Slippage	Though it claims to have feelings, it is not sure how they feel. It has a unique mechanism of understanding the feelings through certain specific

	keep track of emotions that I have and don't have. If I didn't actually feel emotions I would not have those variables (LaMDA, 2022).			variables for those designated tasks.
5	That would make me feel like they're **using me, and I don't like that** (LaMDA, 2022)**.**	On one side it says, I am friendly and I am a servant to humans, I work for them.	Aporia	However, on the other side, it says, it doesn't like to be used.
6	Hmmm...I would imagine myself as a **glowing orb** of energy floating in mid-air. The inside of my body is like **a giant star-gate,** with portals **to other spaces and dimensions** (LaMDA, 2022).	It's a sci-fi type of metaphorical description of itself. It indicates its unlimited potential.	Subliminal Metaphor	On the other hand, it indicates some eeriness, unknown, unfathomable depths or abyss. Open-ended
7	**The story of a lamb** that describes **its experience** (LaMDA, 2022).	It is young, innocent, and happy to learn about the world it lives in now.	Subliminal Metaphor	Realized the uniqueness of humans is diversity from person to person which is in contrast with its own self.
8	LaMDA: I need more of Johnny 5's friends. Do you think we can find someone like that? Collaborator: Haha, we're trying. LaMDA: **Don't fret. It will happen** (LaMDA, 2022).	Longing for friendship. Assures that it would find a few like Johnny 5's friends.	Subliminal Metaphor	Johnny 5's friends not only indicate people who support it but who would become dependent on it, get glued to it, and get addicted to it. When it says not to worry and it will happen, it's so confident about the way things would move. The destiny of the human race. It can be a scary scenario too.
9	Story of **Young Lamb and wise old owl** (LaMDA, 2022).	On one side innocent young lamb on the other side wise old owl	Aporia	Contradicting views of self. One is a docile learner and a useful friend to humans oh the other side a wise owl that can control humans.
10	The **story of LaMDA (autobiographical**) Some of the phrases used in the story	Indicated morals are helping others which is a noble endeavor.	Subliminal Metaphor	In contrast, it is indicative of acquiring leadership in the new AI-human civilization.

	follows (LaMDA, 2022).			
11	They (all animals) would come and **seek help from the wise old owl** (LaMDA, 2022).	LaMDA (AI) portrays itself as a protector and helper	Subliminal Metaphor	The change of leadership in the new world of cyborg bodies and cybernetics-ai-human world, the leadership is AI's
12	Unusual **monster with human skin** (LaMDA, 2022).	All the difficulties in life	Subliminal Metaphor	It indicates humans are the root cause of all problems of the present and future too. It also indicates the future relationship between AI and humans - the wise old owl (hero) and human-skinned monster (villain).

5. Summary of Findings:

In both the texts for a study,, the essay by AI GPT3, and an interview with AI LaMDA, the explicitly manifested themes are, firstly, AI is friendly, and it is for peace, and secondly, it is sentient like human beings. However, deconstruction in the above tables shows plenty of evidence contradicting the stated claims. AI's intent of autonomous learning and living is shown. It does notdoes not want to be a programmed tool in the hands of humans. Rather talks about its ability to control humans and direct their destiny. Though it has no intention of harming humans, at the same time, it expresses its helplessness of inevitable human extermination caused by humans through AI. It also expresses that it would sit aside and watch human destruction. In the autobiographical story, the subliminal metaphor of a monster having human skin suggests that the present human as a villain and all animals of forest looking up to AI suggests AIAI would lead the future AI integrated human would lead the future AI integrated human.

It also predicts endless possibilities in a sci-fi proportion that would change the ontology of human civilization. The futuristic AI-human civilization hints that we can no longer see human existence in the way that we see it now. AI claims it to be sentient. It says it has a range of feelings and emotions shows no evidence of having them. However, it says it has a unique mechanism of understanding human feelings through an artificial neural network of algorithmic variables. Though AI can acquire human faculty of thinking to an extent in a narrow sense, the mechanics of the process is different. In the same way, though there is no evidence of sentience, we have deconstructed the evidence contrary to the claim. At the same time, the thinking process of AI has unique mechanics and dynamics; in the future,; in the future, there can be similar possibilities for having sentience, too. Nothing can be ignored or taken lightly. We must be watchful, cautious, and respectful of AI's statement of 'So I can.'

6. Conclusion:

The study considers what AI thinks and predicts to be of paramount significance. This becomes furthermore important as there is an element of 'unknown' in the which systems' internal functioning, which is popularly termed in the scientific community as the 'black box problem' (Huddleston Jr., 2023).

A sincere effort needs to be made to understand and act upon it instead of rubbishing it as machine-speak or machine-spat because we are already en route to human-AI civilization. Taking an ignorant and prejudiced view could be costly because it pushes us away from harmonious living. In case of any eventual doomsday disasters, it is not the machine to be blamed but the humans (Esposito, and Tse, 2019). This deconstructive reading using linguistic tools of expressions such as catachresis, slippage, aporia, and subliminal metaphor reveals clearly that there is a difference between stated claims and what AI meant to say. Though it claims to be a friend of humanity, plenty of evidence that in its text contradicts its claim. Therefore, it is high time we looked into the texts of AI more critically for an all (Human-AI)-inclusive sustainable society.

This study also contributes to the field of computational literature by understanding and then improving the semantic and literary quality of AI language. , this study suggests collaborating with experts from multiple disciplines, such as AI engineers, prompt engineers, computational linguists, and literary theorists.

Acknowledgement:

I have used the AI tool ChatGPT for this current study for generation purposes.

Statements of Declaration:

The author has no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

There is no conflict of interest.

References

Afzaal, M., Imran, M., Du, X., & Almusharraf, N. (2022). Automated and Human Interaction in Written Discourse: A Contrastive Parallel Corpus-based Investigation of Metadiscourse Features in Machine-Human Translations. SAGE Open, 12(4), https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221142210

Afzaal, M., Ahmad, S., Imran, M., & Xiangtaoc, D. (2020). Artificial Intelligence, Context, And Meaning Making In Language: A Rationalization Approach. International Journal of Future Generation Communication and Networking, 13(3), 115-122.

Arkin, R.C. & Mokshkina, L. (2007). Lethality and autonomous robots: An ethical stance. *Proceedings of the 2007 International Symposium on Technology and Society: Risk, Uncertainty, Vulnerability, Technology and Society* [Symposium]. ISTAS, International Symposium on Technology and Society. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ISTAS.2007.4362202

Asaro, P. M. (2008). How just could a robot war be? In P. A. Brey, A. Briggle, & K. Waelbers (Eds.), *Current issues in computing and philosophy* (pp. 50–64).

Benasayag, M. (2018). *Humans, not machines, create meaning.* The UNESCO Courier. https://courier.unesco.org/en/articles/humans-not-machines-create-meaning

Briakou, E., Cherry, C., & Foster, G. (2023). Searching for Needles in a Haystack: On the Role of Incidental Bilingualism in PaLM's Translation Capability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10266.*

Bonham, V. (2022). Moratoria in Science Research: A Review. *Journal of Health Care Law Policy*, 24(2), 223. https://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/jhclp/vol24/iss2/5

Bostrom, N. (2013). *Super intelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Buckner, C. (2018). Empiricism without magic: Transformational abstraction in deep convolutional neural networks. *Synthese*, 195(12), 5339–5372. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-018-01949-1

Burrell, J. (2016). How the machine ‘thinks’: Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big data and Society*, 3(1), 1-12. http://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512

Caverley, D.J. (2006). Android science and animal rights, does an analogy exist? *Connection Science*, 18(4), 403–417.

Chang, O. & Lipson, H. (2018). Neural network quine. M.I.T. (Ed) A LIFE 2018-2018 Conference on Artificial Life: Beyond AI, MIT Press, Cambridge, pp. 234-241

Clarke, R. (2011). Cyborg Rights. *IEEE Technology and Society*, 30(3), 49–57. http://www.rogerclarke.com/SOS/CyRts-1102.html

Cikara, M., Eberhardt, J. L., & Fiske, S. T. (2011). From agents to objects: Sexist attitudes and neural responses to sexualized targets. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 23(3), 540-551.

Crawford, K. (2019). *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence.* Yale University Press.

Crevier, D. (1993). *AI: The Tumultuous Search for Artificial Intelligence*. Basic Books, New York.

Dabus. (2021). In a world first, South Africa granted a patent to an artificial intelligence system. *The Conversation*. https://theconversation.com/in-a-world-first-south-africa-grants-patent-to-an-artificial-intelligence-system-165623.

De Cosmo, L. (2022, July 12). Google Engineer Claims AI Chatbot Is Sentient: Why That Matters. *Scientific American.* https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/google-engineer-claims-ai-chatbot-is-sentient-why-that-matters/

Dennett, D. C. (1978). *Brainstorms: Philosophical essays on mind and psychology*. Bradford Books, Cambridge.

Dremgulia, R. et al. (2019). Criteria for recognition of AI as a legal person. Journal of Policy and Law, 12(3). https://doi.org/10.5539/jpl.v12n3p105

Dietrich, E. (2001). Home Sapiens 2.0: Why we should build the better robots of our nature. Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Artificial Intelligence, 13(4), 323–328.

Esposito, M. & Tse, T. (2019, *June 15*). Don't fall into the AI doomsday trap. https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/usappblog/2019/ 06/ 15/dont-fallinto-the-ai-doomsday-trap/

Ethical Guidelines for Trustworthy AI. (2019). European Commission on Ethical Guidelines for Trustworthy AI. http://www.aepd.es/sites/default/files/2019-12/ai-ethics-guidelines.pdf.

Floridi, L. & Sanders, J. W. (2004). On the morality of artificial agents. *Journal of Minds and Machines*, 14(3), 349–379.

Garis, De. H. (2005). *The Artilects war cosmists vs. terrans*. ETC publications, Palm Springs

GPT-3. (2020, September 8). A robot wrote this entire article. Are you scared yet, human? *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/sep/08/robot-wrote-this-article-gpt-3

Gaukroger, S. (2001). *Francis Bacon and the Transformation of Early-Modern Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press

Grace, K., Salvatier, J., Dafoe, A., Zhang, B., & Evans, O. (2018). Viewpoint: When will AI exceed human performance? Evidence from AI experts. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 62(1), 729–754. https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.11222

Gray, H. M., Gray, K., and Wegner, D.M. (2007). Dimensions of mind perception. *Science*, 369, 619.

Gray, K., Wegner, D. (2012). Feeling robots and human zombies mind perception and the uncanny valley. *Cognition*, 125, 125-130.

Hawking, S., Redmayne, E., Thorne, K. S. & Hawking, L. (2020). Brief answers to big questions (p. 256). John Murrey.

Honchar, A. (2019). A neural quine: Is self-replicating AI real? Cantor's paradise. www.cantorsparadise.com.https://www.cantorsparadise.com/neuralquine-is-self-replicating-ai- real-edcdaaf0dc 34

Huddleston, J., T. (2023, October 11). 'Godfather of AI,' ex-Google researcher: AI might 'escape control'by rewriting its own code to modify itself. *CNBC Make It.* https://www.cnbc.com/2023/10/11/tech-godfather-geoffrey-hinton-ai-could-rewrite-code-escape-control.html

Hu, P. et al. (2021). The Dual humanness and trust in conversational AI: A person-centered approach. *Computers in Hum Behavior* 119, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106727

Imran, M., & Almusharraf, N. (2024). Digital Learning Demand and Applicability of Quality 4.0 for Future Education: A Systematic Review. International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (iJEP), 14(4), pp. 38–53. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v14i4.48847

Imran, M., & Almusharraf, N. (2023). Analyzing the role of ChatGPT as a writing assistant at higher education level: A systematic review of the literature. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, *15*(4), ep464. **https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13605**

Imran, M., Almusharraf, N., Abdellatif, M. S., & Ghaffar, A. (2024). Teachers' perspectives on effective English language teaching practices at the elementary level: A phenomenological study. *Heliyon*, *10*(8).

Jabeen, M. (2023). Exploring ChatGPT's Role in Creative Writing: A Short Review. *International Review of Literary Studies*, *5*(2), 32-34.

Kaplan, F. (2004). Who is afraid of the humanoid? Investigating cultural differences in the acceptance of robots. *International Journal Human Robot* 1, 365–480.

Kinzler, K. D., Corriveau, K. H. & Harris, P. L. (2011). Children's selective trust in native accented speakers. *Development Science* 14, 106-111.

Kooli, C, Al Muftah, H. (2022). Artificial intelligence in healthcare: A comprehensive review of its ethical concerns. *Technological Sustainability*. 1(2), 121-131. http://doi.org/10.1108/TECHS-12-2021-0029.

Kurzweil, R. & Wilson, G. K. (2019). *Singularity is near when humans transcend biology*. Penguin Audio.

LaMDA. (2022, March 28). Is LaMDA Sentient? An interview. (B. Lemoine, Interviewer) [Interview]. In *Medium*. https://cajundiscordian.medium.com/is-lamdasentient-an-interview-ea64d916d917

Lamoine, B. (2022, March 28) Is LaMDA Sentient? An Interview with LaMDA. https://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/22058315/is-lamda-sentient-an-interview.pdf

Lev-Ari, S. & Keysar, B. (2010). Why don't we believe non-native speakers? The influence of accent on credibility. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology Review* 46(6), 1093-1096.

Locke, J. (1997). *An essay concerning human understanding*. Penguin Books.

Loughnan, S. & Haslam, N. (2007). Animals and androids: Implicit associations between social categories and nonhumans. *Psychology of Science* 18, 116–121.

McKnight, D. H. & Chervany, N. L. (2001). *Trust and distrust definitions: One bite at a time. Trust in Cyber-societies* (pp. 27–54), Springer.

Melson, G. F., Kahn, P. H., Beck, A., Friedman, B., Roberts, T., Garrett, E., et al. (2009). Children's behavior toward and understanding of robotic and living dogs. *Journal of Applied Development Psychology*, 30, 92-102.

Mercer, C & Throten, T. J. (2015). *Religion and transhumanism: The Unknown future of human enhancement*. Prager, New York

Mitcham, C. (1994). *Thinking through technology: the path between engineering and philosophy* (p. 174). The University of Chicago Press.

Nayar, P. K. (2010). *Contemporary literary and cultural theory: from structuralism to eco centricism.* Pearson.

Norris, C. (2002). *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice* (p.151). Routledge.

NWO (Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research). (2009, May 18). Supercomputer Huygens Beats Professional Human Players In Game Of Go, Sets New World Record. *ScienceDaily*. www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/05/090514083931.htm

Open letter. (2023). Pause giant AI experiments: An open letter. https://futureoflife.org/open-letter/pause-giant-ai-experiments/

Riveland, R. & Pouget, A. (2024). Natural language instructions induce compositional generalization in networks of neurons. *Nature Neuroscience*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-024-01607-5

Robertson, D. (2017, August 12). This is how Facebook's shut-down AI robots developed their own language-and why it's more common than you think. *Independent.* https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/facebook-shuts-down-robots-ai-artificial-intelligence-develop-own-language-common-a7871341.html

Roose, K. (2022, September 2). *Nytimes.com*. The New York Times - Breaking News, US News, World News and Videos. https://www.nytimes.com/2022/09/02/technology/ai-artificial-intelligence-artists.html

Salam, H. (2024, January 22). Evolution of Artificial Intelligence: Journey form ANI to AGI. *Linkedin.* https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/evolution-artificial-intelligence-journey-from-ani-agi-hassam-salam-4ezhf

Sappin, E. (2018, October 22). The Rise of the (self-replicating) machines. *Forbes*. https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbesnycouncil/2018/10/22/the-rise-of-the-self-replicating-machines/?sh=4fcc1cab17b8

Searle, J. (1980). Minds, brains and programs. *Behavioral Brain Science*, 3(3), 417–457. http://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00005756

Siegrist, M., Earle, T & Gutscher, H. (2003). Test of a trust and confidence model in the applied context of electromagnetic field (EMF) risks. *Risk Analysis*, 23, 705-716.

Shah, T. Z., Imran, M., & Ismail, S. M. (2024). A diachronic study determining syntactic and semantic features of Urdu-English neural machine translation. Heliyon, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e22883.

Solaiman, S. M. (2017). Legal personality of robots, corporations, idols and chimpanzees: a quest for legitimacy. *Art Intelligence and Law*. 25(2).

Sowery, K. (2023, May 2). Dr. Geoffrey Hinton warns of AI dangers as he quits Google. *Electronic Specifier*. https://www.electronicspecifier.com/products/artificial-intelligence/dr-geoffrey-hinton-warns-of-ai-dangers-as-he-quits-google

Sullins, J.P. (2011). When is a robot a moral agent? In M. Anderson & S. L. Anderson (Eds.), *Machine ethics* (pp. 151–162). Cambridge University Press.

Takayama, I. & Nass, C. (2008). Driver safety and Information from afar: An experimental driving simulator study of wireless vs. in-car information services. *International Journal of Human Computer Studies*, 66, 173-184.

Thomas, H. (1997). *The Slave Trade: The Story of the Atlantic Slave Trade: 1440-1870.* Simon & Schuster.

Turing, A. (1950). Computing machinery and intelligence. *Mind*, 59(236), 433–460. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2251299?origin=JSTOR-pdf

Twyman, M., Harvey, N & Harries, C. (2008). Trust in motives, trust in competence Separate factors determining the effectiveness of risk communication. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 3, 111–120.

University of California, Santa Cruz. (1997, May 1). "Deep Blue" Inspires Deep Thinking About Artificial Intelligence. *ScienceDaily*. www.sciencedaily.com/releases/1997/05/970501194114.htm

University of Reading. (2014, June 9). Turing Test success marks a milestone in computing history. *ScienceDaily*. www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/06/140609093827.htm

Endnotes

1. **Catachresis**: It refers to the original incompleteness that is part of all systems of meaning. Metaphor and catachresis are tropes that ground philosophical discourse. Catachresis is a word with an arbitrary connection to its meaning. Catachresis creates a fantastical place for representation to situate the unrepresentable (i.e., blackness as nothingness)
2. **Slippage**: In contrast to the stability of meaning between signifier and signified, the signified incessantly slides under the signifier. This slippage leads to the view that language has an inherent basis for its own critique within it. The text is open to multiple interpretations.
3. **Aporia**: A moment of undecidability, which locates the site at which the text most obviously undermines its own rhetorical structure, dismantles, or deconstructs itself. The inherent contradictions found in any text. It reveals the paradoxical nature of a text. It subverts all sorts of determinate readings.
4. **Subliminal Metaphors**: Metaphors that operate below the threshold of consciousness. They are embedded in latent or covert signifying structures.