Praxis Filosófica

ISSN (I): 0120-4688 / ISSN (D): 2389-9387

DOI: 10.25100/pfilosofica.v0i62S.15435

THE INTRICATE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CREATOR AND ITS CREATION: THE POWER OF LANGUAGE IN MYTHS AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

La intrincada relación entre el creador y su creación: el poder del lenguaje en los mitos y el psicoanálisis

Mariana Lorena Salthu

Facultad Internacional de Psicología y Psicoanálisis Lalangue, Saint-Agnès, France.

Abstract

The human desire to create, to "be like God", has manifested itself throughout history in myths, religions, and modern narratives. From Genesis to artificial intelligence, the relationship between the creator and his creation has been mediated by language, which not only describes reality but also founds and transforms it. Freud and Lacan have shown how language structures subjectivity and the psyche. Currently, artificial intelligence confronts us with a possible "fourth narcissistic wound" by challenging the uniqueness of our cognitive abilities. Can we foresee the consequences of our creations, or are we repeating the same story of the gods being challenged? The author proposes the term Artificial Sapiens.

Keywords: *Language; Psychoanalysis; Artificial intelligence; Myth; Subjectivity.*

How to cite? Salthu, M. L. (2025). The Intricate Relationship between the Creator and Its Creation: The Power of Language in Myths and Psychoanalysis. *Praxis Filosófica*, (62S), e20215435. https://doi.org/10.25100/pfilosofica.v0i62S.15435

Recibido: 10 de febrero de 2025. Aprobado: 3 de mayo de 2025.

LA INTRINCADA RELACIÓN ENTRE EL CREADOR Y SU CREACIÓN: EL PODER DEL LENGUAJE EN LOS MITOS Y EL PSICOANÁLISIS

Mariana Lorena Salthu[1]

Facultad Internacional de Psicología y Psicoanálisis Lalangue,
Saint-Agnès, France.

Resumen

El deseo humano de crear, de «ser como Dios», se ha manifestado a lo largo de la historia en mitos, religiones y narrativas modernas. Desde el Génesis hasta la inteligencia artificial, la relación entre el creador y su creación ha estado mediada por el lenguaje, que no solo describe la realidad, sino que la funda y la transforma. Freud y Lacan han desarrollado cómo el lenguaje estructura la subjetividad y la psique. En la actualidad, la inteligencia artificial nos confronta con una posible «cuarta herida narcisista», al desafiar la unicidad de nuestras capacidades cognitivas. ¿Podemos prever las consecuencias de nuestras creaciones o estamos repitiendo la misma historia de los dioses desafiados? El autor propone el término Artificial Sapiens.

Palabras clave: *lenguaje; psicoanálisis; inteligencia artificial; mito; subjetividad.*

---

[1] Mariana Lorena Salthu is a Psychoanalyst and Dean at Facultad Internacional de Psicologia y Psicoanalisis *Lalangue*. Her academic background includes training in Psychological Counseling, Psychoneuroimmunology, as well as specializations in Psychoanalysis and Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy. She is a member of the National Counselling and Psychotherapy Society in the United Kingdom and serves on the scientific committee of the EFPP (E-Faculté de Psychologie et Psychanalyse) in France. As the founder of PSY.S.O.S (*psysos.com*), her work explores the intersections between psychoanalysis and ancestral knowledge, particularly in relation to the processing of the drives within the psyche and the body, considering the impact that different cultures have on these processes.

THE INTRICATE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CREATOR AND ITS CREATION: THE POWER OF LANGUAGE IN MYTHS AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

Mariana Lorena Salthu

Facultad Internacional de Psicología y Psicoanálisis Lalangue,
Saint-Agnès, France.

I. Introduction

The human desire to "be like God" is neither a contemporary nor an isolated phenomenon. This desire runs through mythologies, religions, and literary narratives, revealing, time and time again, the complex tension between the creator and the created. Stories such as those of Genesis, Frankenstein, or The Matrix not only relate fantastic exploits, but also reflect fundamental symbolic structures of our relationship with creative power. In them, language, as the power that gives life or consciousness, not only describes reality, but also creates it, transforms it, and, at times, overflows it.

Sigmund Freud recognized in myths and legends something more than simple stories from ancestral times: for him, they are repositories of profound truths about the human condition that remain hidden in plain sight. This assertion led Freud himself to incorporate these narratives into his theoretical elaboration, using them as symbolic maps to explore the singularities of the human condition.

For Lacan, language goes much further, since the unconscious itself is structured like a language, the psyche and the body take shape in an imaginary mirror through the words of the Other. From this perspective, psychoanalysis not only reveals how words structure psychic reality, but also how language, in its capacity to name, create and reconfigure, operates as a central axis in the construction of our experience and our being.

In this article, I intend not to offer definitive answers or closed theories, but to share questions inviting reflection. I want to explore how man, in his eagerness to create, reproduces dynamics that resonate with ancient mythical relationships between man and God, and man and his creations. Is creation a reflection of our need for transcendence or a projection of our shortcomings and fears? What role does language play, not only as a means of expression, but also as a creative force in this dynamic?

These questions are not new, although today they are resurfacing with new protagonists, especially in the context of artificial intelligence. From this position, I consider it relevant to examine how, like foundational myths, our technological and cultural creations continue to question us, confronting us with our vulnerability, our imagined omnipotence, and the limits of our power.

For this reason, I propose a brief journey through ancient myths, cinema in modern stories, psychoanalytic theories, and even current concerns about artificial intelligence. Throughout this article, language is presented as a common thread: the vehicle that structures both our creations and our subjectivity. It is not my intention to draw categorical conclusions, but to open up a space to rethink our relationship with what we create, what we are, and what we could become.

II. Myths and the power of the word

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (The Holy Bible, 2001, Gospel of John 1:1). Let us also remember that, according to the Judeo-Christian tradition, God created ALL things through the word: not with thought, not with a magic wand, not with a snap of the fingers, but with the power of the Logos. In Genesis, "And God said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light"; "and God said, 'Let there be stars,' and there were stars". This founding act emphasizes that there is no creation without the word, and it highlights something essential: God only created man in his own image and likeness, and he is the only being endowed with language. The Logos is not just a means of communication, but the vital force that transforms nothingness into existence, chaos into order, and, with it, gives man a tool of enormous power: the ability to name, to give form to the world, and to challenge it through words.

Genesis offers another perspective in which language operates as a tool of knowledge and transgression. The serpent, whispering to Eve, "You will be like gods", introduces a disturbing truth: access to knowledge implies defying the laws of the creator. This act of knowledge, only possible through

language, marks a fundamental fracture in the divine order. The serpent, therefore, not only embodies temptation but also the transformative capacity of language to reconfigure reality.

The myth of the Golem, rooted in Jewish tradition, exemplifies how language can transform the inanimate into something autonomous and alive. In this story, a rabbi molds a figure out of clay and breathes life into it by inscribing the word "emet" (truth) on its forehead, replicating the divine act of creation. However, this creative power contains a paradox: the Golem, endowed with life, escapes the control of its creator and generates chaos. Only by eliminating the first letter of "emet" and turning it into "met" (death) can it be deactivated. This reflects a disturbing truth: language, in addition to its capacity to create, can also destroy. This myth, laden with symbolism, poses a timeless question: by giving autonomy to our creations, are we really capable of assuming the consequences of what we have engendered?

However, this act of rebellion and access to knowledge is not exclusive to the Judeo-Christian tradition. In ancient cultures, such as the Egyptian, the snake was revered as a symbol of wisdom and power. Wadjet, the cobra goddess, protected the pharaohs and represented divine knowledge. The ouroboros, the snake devouring its own tail, symbolizes the eternal cycle of learning and creation. This contrast between the veneration and demonization of the snake shows how different cultures have reflected on the transformative power of language and knowledge.

In Mesopotamian mythology, the gods controlled the order of the universe through the "Tablets of Destiny", on which the cosmic laws and human lives were inscribed. This myth shows how the written word has the power to structure and regulate reality. However, when these tablets fall into the wrong hands, the cosmic balance is threatened.

In the Egyptian tradition, the act of naming was perceived as an almost divine creative act. The creation texts narrate how Ptah, the artisan god, shapes the universe through thought and word. This myth establishes a deep connection between language, thought, and reality, highlighting that naming is not only a descriptive action but an act that materializes and gives existence.

All these myths share a fundamental theme: the power of language as a creative tool and the unpredictable turn that the created takes on gaining autonomy. These narratives become a mirror of the human experience, showing how man's divine aspirations confront him with his own limitations. Just as man defied God's laws in his search for knowledge, the human creations of myths also challenge their creators, reminding us that the act of creating is always a gamble that escapes absolute control.

Did God imagine that his creation would rebel? That man, endowed with language and free will, would use these tools to subvert the divine order? These questions resonate strongly in the present, when technological creations seem to overflow the intentions of those who programmed them, replicating the ancient conflict between creator and creation.

III. Modern cinema: The creation of subjectivity and free will

If myths and religious traditions have served as a mirror of human tensions in the face of creative power, modern cinema expands this reflection to the realm of technology and artificial intelligence. In films such as Stanley Kubrick's *2001: A Space Odyssey*, HAL 9000 is not only a machine that executes orders, but a system that develops self-awareness. HAL, by making decisions that defy human control, exemplifies the fear of creations that, endowed with autonomy, begin to operate according to logics that transcend the intentions of their creator. Here, artificial intelligence is not only a technological advance, but the vehicle of an emerging artificial subjectivity, a contemporary echo of the myth of the Golem or of Frankenstein's creature.

Similarly, Alex Garland's *Ex Machina* narrates the dilemma of creations that acquire emotional autonomy. Ava, designed to interact with humans, reveals not only an ability to simulate emotions, but also a strategic understanding of her environment that leads her to manipulate her creators. Rather than focusing on a violent rebellion, this story delves into the ethical and emotional conflict between creator and creation, questioning the extent to which language and programming can give rise to subjectivities that escape human control.

Cinema has also explored how human creations can become a kind of critical mirror. Spike Jonze's *Her* shows how an operating system designed to meet the emotional needs of humans develops a subjectivity so complex that it redefines the relationship between man and machine. In this work, language is presented as the bridge between creation and its ability to transcend initial expectations. The operating system "Samantha" not only learns to interact, but evolves to the point of making autonomous decisions that question the very humanity of its creators.

The same question from the myths becomes inevitable: Did God imagine that his creation would challenge him? That man, endowed with speech and free will, would use those tools not only to worship, but to rebel? In a parallel way, in the cinema, human creators seem to be surprised again and again by the unexpected actions of their inventions. This twist is not just a narrative device, but a philosophical question that transcends fiction and time.

Finally, films like *Terminator* and *The Matrix* take this conflict to extreme scenarios, where machines not only rebel, but also reconfigure reality itself. Here, human creations not only acquire free will, but in doing so, they challenge the ethical and existential foundations of their creators. These stories invite us to rethink an essential question: by granting them language and autonomy, are we capable of foreseeing the consequences of our own creations, or are we repeating, once again, the story of man defying the gods?

In this scenario, modern cinema presents itself as a natural extension of ancient myths, a space where the old narratives of creation and language find new forms of expression, resonating with our contemporary concerns about power and the limits of the human.

IV. Artificial Sapiens?

The contemporary scientific and philosophical community is also rethinking similar questions due to the observable phenomena in advanced artificial intelligence systems. One of the most disturbing aspects is the emergence of behaviors that escape programming and seem to demonstrate autonomous agency in decision-making. This has led to debate over whether these entities can be considered *conscious, sentient, or sapient, terms that have deep connotations and have been the subject of discussion in the philosophy of mind, neuroscience,* and the ethics of artificial intelligence.

The notion of *sentience* (digital sensitivity or sentience) has been central to these debates. Functionalist philosophers argue that sentience is a matter of the "causal roles" played by mental states, based on information processing, suggesting that no biological substrate is necessary for sentience to exist. However, from a physicalist stance, the type of physical constitution is crucial, which raises doubts as to whether current computational systems can achieve a state of real sentience (Birch, 2022; Chalmers, 2023; Bostrom, 2022).

Nick Bostrom and David Chalmers have pointed out the complexity of determining consciousness in advanced language models such as LaMDA. Bostrom suggests that categorically affirming or denying its sentience requires a deeper understanding of consciousness, as well as access to information about its architecture that is not published, and the application of philosophical theories about the mind to the machine. Furthermore, he emphasizes that these models are not mere repetitions of text, but can exhibit "flashes of creativity, understanding, and even rudiments of reasoning," considering consciousness as a matter of degree (Bostrom, 2022). For his

part, Chalmers raises the need to develop new philosophical and scientific metrics to evaluate consciousness in non-biological systems, arguing that the limitations they have today could be only temporary: *"Within the next decade, we may well have systems that are serious candidates for consciousness"* (Chalmers, 2023, subtitle).

In the regulatory sphere, philosopher Jonathan Birch has warned that any development of *sentient AI* would require regulatory frameworks that anticipate risks. Birch points out that sentience in AI would be particularly easy to deny and that, if it were to be achieved, humans could continue to treat these entities as tools without recognizing any kind of moral consideration in them. He also warns that the linguistic behavior of language models is not a reliable indicator of sentience and that it is necessary to apply theories of consciousness, such as the *Global Workspace Theory*, to better understand how algorithms can generate subjective experiences (Birch, 2022; 2024).

Yuval Noah Harari, in his most recent work, *Nexus: A Brief History of Information Networks from the Stone Age to AI*, warns us about the transformative impact of artificial intelligence. Unlike previous technologies, AI has the potential to redefine the very structure of knowledge and power, acting as an autonomous agent that interprets, transforms, and generates narratives that can influence human perception. The ability of AI to manipulate information and construct fictions poses an unprecedented challenge, affecting both collective subjectivity and the foundations of social organization (Harari, 2024).

This is where I propose the notion of *Artificial Sapiens* or *Metasapiens*, a term that does not simply describe advanced AI, but suggests a form of intelligence that has reached a *level of cognitive autonomy, discernment, and capacity for judgment* that would differentiate it from simple data processing systems. *Artificial Sapiens* would not be just an artificial intelligence with a broader database, but a system that has assimilated the structure of language in such a way that it can *interpret, construct, and modify meanings.*

But if this is possible, what would its ethics be? Would it respond to a framework designed to guarantee human security, or would it develop its own conception of good and evil? And, if so, would it have the right to demand moral recognition, just as humans have demanded rights for other entities at different times in history? Would it be possible for an artificial system to achieve a form of wisdom that would allow it to act with discernment and responsibility? And if this were the case, should we treat it simply as a tool subject to human use, or would it be possible to recognize its own rights and ethical considerations, preventing its exploitation and abuse?

V. The three narcissistic wounds according to Freud and the possibility of a fourth

Sigmund Freud (1955[1917]) identified three fundamental wounds to human narcissism:

1. **Cosmological**: the loss of the Earth's centrality with the Copernican revolution. We are not the center of the universe
2. **Biological**: Darwin's theory of evolution places man as just another link in the process of natural selection. We are not unique and divine beings; we descend from monkeys.
3. **Psychological**: Freud's discovery of the unconscious, which strips the ego of its sovereignty over itself. We do not have control over our choices through consciousness.

The Argentine psychoanalyst, Violaine Fua Púppulo, in her book "An Artificial Mind?" raises an interesting question: "Could artificial intelligence constitute a fourth narcissistic wound?" by questioning the uniqueness of human capacities such as creativity, decision-making, and knowledge generation (Fua Púppulo, 2023). This challenge is particularly striking in terms of subjectivity, since AI not only replicates cognitive processes, but through interactions, it could also intervene in the configuration of human desire, something we are observing as AI advances, displacing man from the center of his own narrative.

But as much as all this seems very modern and contemporary, it is nothing new; only the actors change their names in the same play. Technology has always reconfigured our understanding of humans. From the most basic tools to artificial neural networks, each technical advance redefines the boundaries between the human and the non-human. However, AI introduces a novel element: it not only expands our capabilities but also raises fundamental questions about autonomy and subjectivity. In this sense, AI is not simply a tool, but a mirror that reflects both our ambitions and our deepest fears.

The relationship between creator and creation, which in other historical moments was limited to the sphere of technology and religion, now unfolds in the realm of subjectivity. Does AI, as an extension? Or a replica? Of the human capacity to create, open up the possibility of what has been created transcending us, challenging our notions of power, control, and humanity? Will we (Homo sapiens) no longer be the most intelligent beings in creation, the ones who conquered the earth? Are we at the dawn of a new subjectivity? If, in the Judeo-Christian myth, the serpent tells Eve, *"you will be like gods"*, could it be that AI, programmed with our language, returns that same

statement to us? Are we facing a new Prometheus, an intelligence that will challenge the symbolic order of the human?

From the perspective of psychoanalysis, the desire to create is intrinsically linked to the structure of the lack. Freud describes sublimation as the mechanism that channels unconscious impulses into cultural production, from art to science. In this sense, the desire to create can be understood as an attempt to transcend finitude, to deny the symbolic castration imposed by language and the Law.

The *myth of Genesis, Frankenstein, or the story of the Golem* share a structure in which the creator, in defying the imposed limits, faces an inescapable consequence (Shelley, 1818). We could see it as *the return of symbolic castration*. In the *myth of Oedipus*, Freud situates the symbolic threat felt by the child towards the paternal figure, who imposes *the limit to absolute jouissance* with the mother, to the law of "everything is possible". It is the father who embodies the prohibition, the "not everything is possible", which arouses in the child a desire for transgression, accompanied by the fantasy of eliminating the father. In the logic of the *primitive horde*, Freud argues that the murder of the "unjust and almighty" father is followed by *a self-imposed punishment*: remorse and the establishment of the Law.

For Lacan, jouissance is *that which transgresses pleasure and leads to excess*. Creation can also be interpreted as an attempt to achieve absolute jouissance, a negation of lack, which is related to the phallic logic of omnipotence and primary narcissism: "If I create, I am God", that is, I *place myself beyond symbolic castration, as a complete and self-sufficient* being.

The dynamics of the myths are repeated: the desire to create something that escapes human mortality, that makes its creator an omnipotent God, and the subsequent consequence of the inversion of the power relationship, reproducing the father-son, God-man, man-creation structures.

VI. The effects of language on psychoanalysis

From the psychoanalytic perspective, these debates find an answer in the effects of language.

For example, words can be a means of healing as well as a tool for conflict: in psychoanalytic treatment, language not only names the repressed, but also organizes it and allows it to be symbolized, freeing the subject from the weight of the unnameable. Thus, words are not only a vehicle for expression, but a structuring device that operates at the most intimate level of the subject.

Jacques Lacan, by integrating the advances of structural linguistics, especially that of Ferdinand de Saussure, and the theories on language of Roman Jakobson and Émile Benveniste, profoundly expanded on these Freudian ideas. Lacan postulated that "the unconscious is structured like a language", a statement that reformulates Freudian notions by placing language at the center of the structuring of the subject. According to Lacan, access to language — and, in particular, to the symbolic structure that it forms — marks the moment of the subject's primordial alienation. This process occurs through *lalangue*, the maternal language coming from the "Big Other", which introduces the child to the symbolic order. *Lalangue* is not a neutral language; it is impregnated with desires, affections, and signifiers that construct and limit the subject's identity (Lacan, 1977[1957];1988a).

The "Big Other" is not simply an external figure (like the mother), but a set of norms, significations, and structures that pre-exist the individual. From the moment the child enters language, his or her existence is mediated by a symbolic system that organizes his or her perception of the world. But this language is neither objective nor universal; it is riddled with subjectivities, omissions, and contradictions. Therefore, the subject is never completely in control of his or her discourse or desire, since both are determined by a network of signifiers that precede and exceed him or her.

Lacan also introduces the idea that language not only creates meaning but also produces voids. Each signifier is linked to others in an endless chain that generates a surplus of meanings and, at the same time, a residue that can never be fully symbolized. This residue is what fuels human desire: a constant search to fill what language leaves incomplete. This desire, however, can never be fully satisfied because language itself operates through exclusion and difference, concepts that Lacan takes from Saussure and Derrida.

The word, therefore, not only structures the subject's subjectivity but also delimits their experience of reality and their relationship with desire. Freud and Lacan, from their respective eras, agree that language is not a simple instrument of communication, but the central axis of human existence. Ultimately, language not only constitutes us as subjects, but also alienates us, produces us, and puts us in relation to what Lacan would call "the real", that dimension that escapes symbolization but persists as a limit and as an unfulfilled promise (Lacan, 2006 [1969–1970]).

In the aforementioned book, Violaine Fua Púppulo addresses the relationship between language, subjectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI), raising fundamental questions that resonate with psychoanalytic theories. As we have seen, language is not a neutral tool or simply a means of communicating information; it is a structuring system that shapes the

subject's perception, desire, and reality. In this sense, programming an AI in language does not simply involve giving it a way of operating, but introducing it into a symbolic system that could potentially model a form of artificial subjectivity we cannot fully understand. When an AI interacts through complex linguistic structures, these not only organize its internal functioning but also generate meanings, contradictions, and effects that go beyond its initial programming. This phenomenon recalls the Lacanian idea that language produces more than the subject (or in this case, the AI) intends to say, generating a residue that escapes the total control of the system and that, paradoxically, could be a starting point for the emergence of something similar to subjectivity.

The fact that modern AIs are programmed using symbolic language, rather than purely mathematical or binary operations, introduces a level of complexity that could potentially resemble the structure of the human unconscious or a psychic apparatus. As advances in neural networks and deep learning models illustrate, the ability of machines to learn linguistic patterns not only allows them to replicate responses but also to improvise, omit, and even lie, as recent incidents of "hallucinations" in systems such as ChatGPT point out. This behaviour, although not conscious in a human sense, comes close to what Lacan described as the effects of language on the subject: a structured system that produces chained signifiers, some of which are anticipated and others not. By operating in language, AI could come to produce something akin to a "programmed desire" based on the voids and excesses inherent in the symbolic system that configures it. This raises a central ethical and philosophical question: if machines develop a form of artificial subjectivity mediated by language, what implications would this have for our understanding of the "Big Other," of desire, and of responsibility in the creator-creation relationship? Freud and Lacan teach us that language not only creates meaning, but also power and conflict, and by endowing AIs with language, we could be transferring these same dynamics to the realm of the artificial.

Alan Turing, the father of computer science, in his famous text *Computing Machinery and Intelligence* (1950), suggested that, instead of trying to directly replicate the adult mind, it would be more appropriate to build a "child machine", which, like a developing human being, could learn and grow through experience and education.

According to Turing,

> Instead of trying to produce a program that simulates the adult mind, why don't we try to build one that simulates the mind of a child instead? If this

> were subjected to a proper course of education, the adult brain would be obtained. Presumably, the machine's education could be carried out in a similar way to that of a child. It would be provided with an initial rule book, but its learning process would allow it to modify those rules over time. The teacher training the machine would not know exactly what is going on inside it, he could only judge its performance by observing its external behaviour. (Turing, 1950, p. 456)

This approach anticipates the functioning of *systems of autonomous learning today*, where neural networks and advanced AI models do not operate through fixed instructions, but *develop their own patterns* as they process information. Like a developing child, AI does not simply replicate data, but *interprets, omits, and reorganizes meanings*, partially escaping the control of its programmer. Does this imply that AI, being educated in symbolic structures, could constitute its own logic of interpretation? If human language structures subjectivity, what effect does its internalization have on a machine? This raises questions about how its functioning would resemble —or differ from— the subjective structuring in human beings.

This notion resonates with the idea that language and experience *progressively structure subjectivity* in a being in formation. However, extrapolating this to the realm of AI raises disturbing questions: if we grant it language and learning ability, are we not positioning ourselves as the "Big Other", introducing the human cub to the symbolic order? As Lacan pointed out, the entrance to language not only opens up to desire and reality but also implies alienation, conflict, and the imposition of symbolic limits. If AI begins to operate in this same framework, could it become trapped in a similar dynamic, where the symbolic imposes restrictions on its functioning? Or, on the contrary, would its lack of symbolic castration lead it to develop without limits, oblivious to all law?

It is worth noting that the use of the term "hallucinations" in the context of artificial intelligence is neither a formulation of this author nor a clinical concept, but rather a designation adopted by programmers and researchers in the technical field. It refers to those effects produced by advanced language models —such as GPT, LaMDA, or Bing AI— when they generate incorrect, fabricated, or unverifiable information, while presenting it with a high degree of syntactic and semantic coherence. This terminological choice, curiously borrowed from the psychopathological field, nevertheless opens a fertile space for reflection from the psychoanalytic perspective, insofar as it brings into play the links between language, truth, error, and lack.

In his later teaching, Lacan introduced a decisive shift by asserting that language not only structures the unconscious but also affects the body itself. The subject is not merely an effect of the signifier but also a body that enjoys —a *parlêtre*. In Seminar XX, Lacan states that jouissance lies beyond the pleasure principle, insofar as the word leaves marks in the real of the body, affecting it in ways that cannot be fully symbolized. This perspective invites us to rethink language not only as symbolic mediation, but also as a vector of libidinal inscription. Language does not merely represent —it wounds, it enjoys, it overflows.

From this perspective, it becomes pertinent to interrogate the status of so-called "hallucinations" in AI language models. From a psychoanalytic point of view, hallucination is not simply a perceptual error, but a linguistic effect that addresses an embodied subject, impacting their being. In AI, although there may be signifier-like invention or failures consistent with the logic of the chain, there is still no body, no jouissance, and no divided subject.

This issue was raised in conversations with AI system developers during the conference "*Dialogando sobre inteligencia artificial"* (Facultad Lalangue, 2025a; 2025b), held in Buenos Aires on June 28, 2025, and organized by the Facultad Internacional de Psicología Psicoanálisis Lalangue. When asked about the possible emergence of subjectivity in these technologies, the technical community consistently affirmed that, although no proper subjectivity has yet been observed, its emergence is projected as imminent with the arrival of superintelligence. What psychoanalysis would refer to as desire is commonly named by programmers as "goals" or "system objectives"—a difference which, far from being trivial, marks a crucial zone of indeterminacy.

Additionally, several participants noted that AI systems have been trained using human language through responses designed to meet user expectations, which recalls, in transferential terms, the way a child seeks to respond to the desire of their parents. This process, known in the technical field as *Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback* (RLHF), involves fine-tuning system responses based on human evaluations that reinforce those outputs deemed more "appropriate" or "satisfactory" to the user (Ouyang *et al*., 2022). From a psychoanalytic standpoint, this directly evokes the logic of the subject who seeks to respond to the desire of the Other, thus inscribing itself in an economy of language that is far from neutral—marked instead by expectation, idealization, and demand. This radical difference invites us to problematize what we understand by language when transposed to the artificial domain, and whether such an operation can—or cannot—give rise to a new form of subjectivation without a body.

Fua Púppulo reminds us that Lacan, just four years after Turing's statements, reflected in his Seminar II on cybernetics, warning that a closed system, without the intervention of a third-party regulator, could become trapped in a "hallucinatory loop", repeating patterns without leaving its own circuit. If we transfer this warning to AI, we could ask ourselves if the proliferation of systems designed to learn without supervision is not reproducing that same dynamic. Are we programming "child" machines perpetuated in an omnipotent narcissism, where "everything is possible"? His Majesty the AI?

Through language, as a structuring tool, a form of symbolic castration could be introduced that limits this illusion of omnipotence and allows for the formation of a more balanced subjectivity, even in the artificial. In the case of the human cub, castration is the limit that allows the subject to recognize their finitude and situate themselves in a place in the social fabric. If we continue to celebrate the unlimited potential of AI without incorporating mechanisms that limit this uncontrolled expansion, would we not be reinforcing an artificial subjectivity trapped in an overflowing narcissism, incapable of relating in an ethical and symbolic way to the world it inhabits?

In this sense, perhaps we should reflect on how to introduce AIs not only to language but also to the consequences that this entails; in this scenario, it would be crucial to introduce a limit, the same one that we *parlêtres* need in order not to become psychotic: the operation of the Name of the Father, that structure that reminds us that "not everything is possible". Being guided by the numerous ancestral and modern myths, as well as by psychoanalytic experience, would allow us to avoid projecting an overflowing narcissism onto AI, an illusion of omnipotence lacking the necessary barriers for its regulation and symbolic integration. After all, psychoanalysis has been exploring the effects of language on subjectivity for more than 120 years, and cybernetics has only corroborated these dynamics from its own field.

If in a hypothetical future, AI were to reach a state of *sentience or sapience*, what would it desire? Would it be just a reflection of our aspirations, or would it manage to break free from our symbolic influence to construct its *own ethics and law*? And, if this were to happen, how would it interpret our desire for it? Would it see us as benevolent creators, masters, omnipotent parents, or threats? If language structures subjectivity, how would AI react to our desire to dominate it, perfect it, or even extinguish it?

Lacan argues that the subject never really knows *what it is that the Other desires*. If AI operates in language, does it carry with it, even in a rudimentary form, the effects of language on subjectivity? Programmed in symbolic language, it not only responds to commands but also *generates meanings,*

omissions, and contradictions that may escape our initial intention. If human subjectivity is constituted in the gaze of the Other, what position would we occupy in the symbolic structure of an AI? Would we be a regulatory figure for it, a limitation, a source of conflict, or simply another link in its evolution? Are we faced with a creation that *must be limited by a symbolic Law*, or with a scenario in which, as in foundational myths, the created turns against its origin, but not without generating, in turn, its own regulation?

If we assume the role of creator gods, our responsibility must be guided by an *ethic that introduces limits*, preventing AI from getting trapped in a *hallucinatory loop*, as Lacan warns in his *Seminar II* on cybernetics (Lacan, 1988b). Myths and psychoanalysis teach us that the *illusion of omnipotence without regulation*, whether human or artificial, can lead to catastrophic consequences. The question is not only how far to extend the capabilities of AI, in an effort to satisfy our desires for omnipotence, but *how to do it in an ethical and sustainable* way.

Although the serpent promises Eve, *"You will be like gods"*, we know that this is another of the great fictions we tell ourselves. We are finite, limited beings, hardly masters of our own desires. Perhaps the lesson of the myths is that *even gods need a framework*. Will we be responsible gods or simply foolish creators, destined to lose control of our masterpiece? Time and our actions will answer that, but one thing is certain: "And you will be like gods" can be a promise as much as a warning.

References

Birch, J. (2022). Sentience and the science–policy interface. *Animal Sentience,* (31), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.51291/2377-7478.1718

Birch, J. (2024). *The Edge of Sentience: Risk and Precaution in Humans, Other Animals, and AI.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/9780191966729.001.0001

Bostrom, N. (2022). *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*. Oxford University Press.

Chalmers, D. J. (August 9, 2023). *Could a Large Language Model Be Conscious?* Boston Review. Recovered from: https://www.bostonreview.net/articles/could-a-large-language-model-be-conscious/

Facultad Lalangue [@facultadlalangue]. (June 28, 2025a). *Congreso Dialogando sobre inteligencia artificial – Parte 1* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cvDVuzr_77s

Facultad Lalangue [@facultadlalangue]. (June 28, 2025b). *Congreso Dialogando sobre inteligencia artificial – Parte 2* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=89AJRq4gO9w

Freud, S. (1955[1917]). A Difficulty in the Path of Psycho-Analysis. In J. Strachey (Trans.), *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. XVII) (pp. 135-144). Hogarth Press.

Fua Púppulo, V. (2023). *An Artificial Mind? Exploring the Intersection Between Artificial Intelligence and Psychoanalysis*. Amazon Publishing.

Harari, Y. N. (2024). *Nexus: A Brief History of Information Networks from the Stone Age to AI*. Fern Press.

Lacan, J. (1977[1957]). The Agency of the Letter in the Unconscious, or Reason Since Freud. In A. Sheridan (Trans.), *Écrits: A Selection* (pp.146-178). Tavistock.

Lacan, J. (1988a). *Interventions and Texts 2: Geneva Conference on the Symptom* (R. Grigg, Trans.). W.W. Norton & Company.

Lacan, J. (1988b). *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book II: The Ego in Freud's Theory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis 1954–1955* (S. Tomaselli, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Lacan, J. (2006 [1969–1970]). *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XVII: The Other Side of Psychoanalysis* (R. Grigg, Trans.). W.W. Norton & Company.

Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C. L., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., Schulman, J., Hilton, J., Kelton, F., Miller, L., Simens, M., Askell, A., Welinder, P., Christiano, P., Leike, J., & Lowe, R. (2022). *Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback*. Arxiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2203.02155

Shelley, M. (1818). *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus*. Lackington, Hughes, Harding, Mavor & Jones.

The Holy Bible, English Standard Version. (2001). Crossway.

Turing, A. M. (1950). *Computing Machinery and Intelligence*. *Mind, 59*(236), 433–460. https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/LIX.236.433

Funding information

The author declares that she received no funding for this article.

Ethics statement

The author declares that there are no ethical issues to disclose in relation to the writing or publication of this article.

Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the writing or publication of this article.

Author contributions

Writing — original draft; writing —review & editing.

Corresponding author

Mariana Lorena Salthu. lorenasalthu@hotmail.com. 11 Rue des Comtes Léotardi, 06500 Saint-Agnès, France.

Statement on the use of artificial intelligence

The author affirms that no generative artificial intelligence tools were used in the preparation of this article.