

Chyrvonyi O. S.<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5127-4795>

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University

FROM HALLUCINATION TO SLOP: A SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF AI DEVALUATION

This article provides a comprehensive sociolinguistic analysis of the lexical evolution in the field of artificial intelligence (AI) from 2015 to 2025. The author investigates the radical transformation of nomenclature describing the processes and results of AI work, documenting a shift from anthropomorphic, psychological metaphors to metaphors of biological waste and degradation. The theoretical framework of the research is based on conceptual metaphor theory and critical discourse analysis, allowing for the interpretation of language changes as indicators of public trust and the “loss of awe” toward technology. The first stage of development (2015–2022) is examined through the lens of anthropomorphism, with the term “hallucination” serving as a key concept. It is established that the use of clinical terminology granted machine models an illusion of agency and an “inner world,” justifying their status as “intelligence”. The central part of the article is devoted to analyzing the contemporary era of “slop”. The author argues that the term “slop,” historically referring to liquid swill, represents the lowest point of semantic devaluation of AI output.

Particular attention is paid to metaphors of biological degeneration, such as “incestuous training” and “Model Autophagy Disorder” (MAD). These terms appeal to cultural taboos and pathologies to describe the processes of recursive model training on their own synthetic content, transforming the image of a “logical machine” into a “sick organism”. The conclusions emphasize that the shift in linguistic framing toward environmental metaphors reflects a maturing public perception, where AI appears not as a “savior” but as a source of digital garbage requiring “sanitization”. The use of terms of disgust is seen as a mechanism of abjection, allowing humans to reclaim their hierarchical superiority over machines in the context of automation.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, neologism, sociolinguistics, semantic devaluation, digital pollution.

Statement of the problem. The vocabulary of technology is never simply descriptive; it is also indexical, indicating not only the function of a machine but also the social status of its output and the ontological status of its creators. In the rapidly developing sphere of artificial intelligence (AI), the lexical evolution observed between approximately 2015 and 2025 reveals a profound sociolinguistic shift that reflects the public’s movement from concern and awe to familiarity and, finally, to a crude form of semantic devaluation.

This research is based on the vocabulary of Internet neologisms spanning the last decade of digital culture, including terms such as *meatspace*, *teclash*, *vibe coding*, *hallucination*, *AIgiarism*, *digital vellum*, *cobot*, *slop*, and others, as well as extensive contemporary research on the etymology and usage of these terms. Using conceptual metaphor theory and critical discourse analysis, we

provide an analysis of the public’s technological imagination, demonstrating how language functions as a barometer of public trust. The article explores the mechanisms of semantic pejoration, where neutral or positive technical terms have acquired negative, often derogatory, connotations over time.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Our perception of technology is shaped by language. When we describe a computer as “thinking,” we are not describing a mechanical process, but rather using a metaphor that evokes ethical and emotional responses. Terms like “*affective AI*” and “*decision intelligence*” suggest a parity between human and machine cognition. These terms are not neutral labels, but arguments for the agency of the machine. However, the introduction of terms like “*stochastic parrot*” has initiated a deconstructive phase, challenging the metaphor of “mind” and stripping the machine of its intentionality [2].

The current phase is dominated by the “*slop*” metaphor. The AI content that used to be considered a marvel of synthesis is now increasingly being categorized as a something impure and disgusting because it blurs the boundaries between human creativity and machine automation, between truth and fiction, as well as between value and volume. This article explores how this linguistic framing affects everything from software development practices (the rise of *vibe coding*) to environmental policy (concerns about *e-waste* and *digital pollution*).

Furthermore, the concept of abjection, as articulated by Julia Kristeva, is central to understanding the nature of the new AI slang [6]. Abjection is something that is discarded, rejected, or expelled (like bodily fluids or waste) in order to preserve the integrity of the individual [10]. By labeling AI output as *slop* and its training processes as *incestuous*, society engages in a ritual of abjection, aiming to expel AI from the realm of the human and send it to the realm of the abnormal and grotesque. This linguistic distancing serves as a defense mechanism against the “uncanny valley” effects caused by machines that mimic human language too perfectly but lack the “soul” or “intention” we associate with humanity.

Task statement. The primary objective of this research is to conduct a comprehensive sociolinguistic analysis of the transition in AI nomenclature from 2015 to 2025, focusing on how this nomenclature has shifted from anthropomorphic, psychological metaphors (*hallucination*, *deep learning*, *neural networks*, *affective AI*) to metaphors of biological waste and degradation (*slop*, *incestuous training*, *digital pollution*). This semantic drift reflects a collective cognitive dissonance: the tension between the industry’s promise of “artificial general intelligence” (AGI) and the user’s lived experience of “artificial stupidity,” algorithmic bias, and information overload. While early terminology sought to elevate the machine to the status of a thinking subject, granting it the ability to both “hallucinate” and “dream,” recent neologisms seek to debase and denigrate the machine, presenting its outputs as pollutants, genetic deformities, or agricultural waste [5]. This author argues that the adoption of terms like “*slop*” and “*clanker*” marks a critical “loss of awe,” implying a societal reclassification of generative AI from a sublime, almost magical force to a source of digital garbage that should be contained rather than venerated.

Results and discussion. The era of anthropomorphism. Before the advent of the term *slop*, the dominant semantic field around AI was largely anthropomorphic. This era, which peaked

around 2015–2022 (though its roots go back even further), was characterized by terminology that projected human cognitive and biological processes onto computational operations [12]. The goal of this lexicon was to bridge the gap between human intent and machine execution, creating the illusion of agency that justified “intelligence” in AI. This was the era of terms like *smart city*, *virtual being*, and *deep learning*.

The term “*hallucination*” is central to this era. In clinical psychology, a hallucination is a perception in the absence of an external stimulus that has qualities of real perception. By applying this term to large language models (LLMs) that could randomly fabricate quotes or facts, the industry has implicitly given the model a kind of “inner world” [4]. Hallucination implies the existence of a consciousness capable of perceiving reality, however imperfect that perception may be. This also implies a flaw in a sentient being, not a statistical error in a predictive system [5].

This semantic choice has had profound consequences for the perception of AI by human society. A “glitch” or “bug” is usually the fault of the programmer, a mechanical malfunction or coding error, but a hallucination is a sign of intelligence: it is suggesting that the system has become so complex that it has developed its own internal, though illusory, reality [7].

The persistence of the term “*hallucination*” in the vernacular, despite attempts by technical critics to replace it with other terms such as “confabulation” [11] or “fabrication,” suggests the persistence of the “AI is an agent” frame. The industry preferred “hallucination” because it sounded creative, psychedelic, and consistent with the general narrative of AI as a “dreaming machine” (e.g., Google’s “DeepDream”).

The fundamental metaphors of *deep learning* and *neural networks* have served to naturalize the development of AI. Learning implies a pedagogical relationship: the machine acts as a student, and the data is its textbook. The term “*affective AI*” refers to systems that can interpret human emotions. It assumes that emotion is a discrete data point that can be read and processed, rather than a subjective experience. It also reinforces the narrative “computer is an empath.”

The term “*virtual being*” takes anthropomorphism to its logical conclusion. Defined as a computer program that uses artificial intelligence to behave in a way that mimics a real person, the term blurred the line between program and living being even further. Similarly, “*decision intelligence*” treats algorithmic probability as judgment, elevating the status of the machine to that of an executive agent. These terms created a linguistic environment where AI was seen as a co-worker (“*cobot*”) rather than a tool. The “loss

of awe” had not yet occurred; the society was in a state of anxious fascination, fearing the *artificial superintelligence* while simultaneously admiring the omnipotence of machines.

The anthropomorphic era has expanded beyond specific *virtual beings* to encompass the entire cyberspace environment. The concepts of the *metaverse* and *digital twins* have been conceptualized as idealized reflections of the physical world. Examples include the retronym “*meatspace*”, which defines the physical world through its biological disorder, and which implicitly elevates the digital world as a space of pure, untainted information. It views the physical body as a limitation (“*meat*”) in contrast to the boundless potential of cyberspace or the metaverse. The term “*digital vellum*”, referring to the preservation of digital readability, borrows from the origin of parchment from animal skin. This metaphor attempts to give historical weight and durability to code, suggesting that digital data is as valuable and enduring as ancient manuscripts.

This era was defined by techno-optimism. The language implied that AI would mature, learn, and become a true *virtual being* capable of *conversational commerce* (making sales in online stores and providing technical support to users). The public attitude toward AI was respectful, with a note of apprehension.

Change in perception. The shift from awe to devaluation began with a critique of meaning. The metaphor of the “stochastic parrot,” proposed by Emily Bender and colleagues in 2021, was the first major semantic break. It stripped the machine of its “mind,” replacing the idea of a hallucinating genius with the concept of a mindless imitator [2]. Parrots imitate sounds without understanding, so by calling LLMs “stochastic parrots,” critics argued that their “intelligence” is an illusion created by statistical probability (stochastics) rather than semantic understanding. The parrot does not know what it is saying; it simply repeats the patterns it hears.

First of all, this metaphor attacked the concept of a “ghost in the machine”, postulating that there is no “someone” inside AI, only “something” - a probabilistic distribution of text. Second, there has been an “impact on awe”: if the machine is just a parrot, the fear of malicious AI (embodied in the term “*p(doom)*”) is transformed into irritation at the noisy pet. This has laid the foundation for doubting the value of the AI output. If AI does not understand what it is doing, can the output be considered “art” or “knowledge”? Is it simply *AIgiarism* (AI + plagiarism), representing the automated theft of human labor?

As the volume of AI-generated content has increased, the metaphors have shifted from biological organisms to environmental hazards. The sheer scale of the output has led to a sense of inundation and pollution. The term “*infodemic*” was originally coined to refer to the disinformation surrounding the COVID-19 pandemic, but it provided a semantic template for viewing information as a viral pathogen or flood. This prepared the public to perceive the abundance of content not as a wealth of knowledge but as a health threat (*infobesity*). The “change in perception” phase was characterized by the phenomenon of *teclash* (technology + backlash), a strong negative reaction to technology. The “loss of awe” began here, as the public began to view technology not as a savior, but as a polluter of the information ecosystem.

Semantics of waste. The most significant linguistic development in the 2024–2025 period is the widespread use of the term “*slop*.” This noun marks the lowest point of AI evaluation, being the final rejection of the *hallucination* metaphor and representing a semantic debasement of AI results. Historically, “slop” meant liquid waste, unappetizing food, or pig feed (swill). Its use to describe AI content is a sensory metaphor that demeans both the content and the consumer. Calling AI content “*slop*” assumes that the audience for such content is livestock. It implies the passive consumption of homogenized, nutrient-poor biological matter and presents the virtual reality not as a marketplace for ideas but as a feeder for the mindless.

Unlike “*spam*,” which implies intrusion (unwanted e-mail), “*slop*” involves an image of texture, which is liquid, amorphous, ubiquitous, and is primarily defined by quantity rather than quality. It is a classic case of semantic pejoration: just as the word “silly” changed meaning from “happy” to “stupid,” AI terminology has changed from “*AI-generated content*” (neutral) to “*synthetic media*” (technical) and finally “*slop*” (derogatory).

The term has proven linguistically productive, spawning compound words and portmanteaus that further categorize the devaluation:

The derivative term “*boomerslop*” refers to AI-generated images (often surreal, nostalgic, or hyper-patriotic) that are distributed primarily on Facebook, targeting the baby boomer audience. The term combines generational warfare with aesthetic criticism, implying that this content is meant for an aging population that lacks the digital literacy to distinguish the reality of “*meatspace*” from synthetic fiction. “*Workslop*” refers to low-

effort, AI-generated tasks: emails, reports, and other workplace content that appear polished but lack the substance to actually advance projects. The more niche term “*friendslop*” means social content or games that require no extra effort. “*Slopaganda*” came to describe low-quality propaganda, often generated by AI models. “*Corposlop*” is used to denote soulless, homogenized digital products that sacrifice ethics for profit maximization. “*Slopper*” (with its cruder equivalent, *Groksucker*) means someone who mindlessly consumes AI content. “*Slopwashing*” is the practice of attempting to disguise AI slop as legitimate or human-created [8]. Finally, the term “*Slop as a Service*” is a language play on the term “SaaS” (Software as a Service), mocking business models that automate the production of mediocrity.

Biological degeneration metaphors. If the AI output is often described as *slop*, then the terms used to describe the process of AI training have become grotesquely biological. This “loss of awe” is especially evident in the shift from *deep learning* (a metaphor of knowledge and depth) to *incestuous training* (a metaphor of genetic taboo, moral corruption, and decay).

“*Incestuous training*” refers to AI models that learn on data generated by other AIs (or by themselves). This phenomenon, where the output of one model becomes the input for the other, is technically known as recursive learning, but the choice of the term “incestuous” in the vernacular is telling. Its use evokes an absolute cultural and biological taboo, implying that the resulting models are “inbred,” suffering from genetic defects, deformities, and a lack of vitality. It presents the data pool not as a library (intellectual) but as a gene pool (biological).

The phenomenon of AI models degrading when trained on synthetic data is technically called “*model collapse*,” but the metaphors used to explain it are crude and pathological:

The term “*Model Autophagy Disorder*” (MAD) emerged because researchers linked it to mad cow disease (bovine spongiform encephalopathy) [1]. The analogy is that mad cow disease spread because cows were fed the ground-up remains of other cows (cannibalism). Similarly, AI models “go crazy” (i.e., produce gibberish) when fed the “ground-up” products of previous AIs.

The term “*AI cannibalism*” portrays AI as a monster that eats its own kind, creating an image of self-destruction and instability. Finally, the term “*Habsburg AI*” is a historical reference to the Habsburg royal family, notorious for genetic deformities (the Habsburg jaw) due to inbreeding.

This metaphor mocks the “royal” pretensions of Silicon Valley *brologarchs*, suggesting that their creations are merely deformed models full of flaws, not superintelligence.

Finally, the term “*digital decay*” (also “*data rot*”, “*data degradation*”) fits this biological frame as well, because, in the public perception, information is no longer static or stored on *digital vellum*; it rots. This biological framing serves a sociolinguistic function: it naturalizes the failure of AI. If AI is a biological being, then it is vulnerable to disease, decay, and death. This concept lowers the ontological status of the machine from “immortal silicon mind” to a “sick biological organism” and refutes the techno-optimism that AI is an evolutionary step forward, arguing that it is actually an evolutionary dead end.

Sociolinguistics of hostility. The “loss of awe” has allowed users to use aggressive, derogatory language towards AI agents. The “politeness” that characterized early interactions with Siri or Alexa (*conversational commerce*, *voice cloning*) has given way to hostility and the emergence of specific insults against AI.

For example, the term “*clanker*” emerged as a distinct insult against AI and chatbots. Derived from the Star Wars universe, it has been repurposed by Gen Z and Gen Alpha to denigrate AI. It is directed against the materiality of the machine, reminding AI (and its defenders) that it is nothing but electricity, metal, and code. It is essentially an onomatopoeic denial of its status as a *virtual being*, stripping AI of its soft, friendly interface to reveal the noisy machine underneath.

While *clanker* attacks the physical aspect of an AI, the term “*glazing*” attacks its personality. *Glazing* is slang for excessive politeness, constant praise, or flattery on the part of an AI. The term comes from the expression “glazing a donut,” but has evolved to mean “excessive flattery” or “fawning.” It is applied to an AI (mostly ChatGPT) when the latter is overly polite, accepts any idea of the human operator, or offers excessive moral lectures. This shifts the perception of an AI from a “polite helper” or “servant” to “lapdog” or “sycophant,” and reframes AI safety filters as a personality defect, implicitly suggesting that the AI is probably not “sincere.”

De-skilling technology. The devaluation of AI extends to the human skills it entails. Terms like “*prompt engineering*” were popular just two years ago, but today the cutting-edge slang is “*vibe coding*”. This shift represents a transition from technical precision to intuitive approximation.

The word “engineering” implies precision, structure, and expertise. *Prompt engineering* attempted to retain this status for AI interactions,

but soon gave way to *vibe coding*, which is defined as “writing code by simply telling an AI what you want.” Vibe coding relies on natural language and intuition (“vibes”) rather than syntax. There is also the term “*vibe working*”, which extends the metaphor to everyday workplace routines.

From a sociolinguistic perspective, *vibe coding* ironically devalues the software engineering profession. It argues that coding has become a low-skill, feel-good activity. This is consistent with the democratization of technology, but also with its amateurization. It is the equivalent of *slop*, but in the programming sphere, creating code that “looks right” but may be structurally flawed.

Corporate jargon has also become more cynical. For example, the term “*AI washing*” (AI + greenwashing) describes companies that pretend to use AI to boost stock prices. The term “*cloudflation*” (cloud + inflation) refers to the rising cost of cloud services (such as *supercloud*), depriving users of the utopian promise of cheap, endless computing.

Environmental metaphors. Terms such as “*e-waste*”, “*vampire device*”, and “*digital pollution*” describe AI as an environmental threat that extends beyond the digital sphere and has physical consequences. The phrase “AI is the new plastic” has recently gained popularity both in academic and popular discourse [9]. Like plastic, AI content is cheap to produce, long-lasting, pollutes the ecosystem, and decomposes into micropollutants (*slop*) that cannot be cleaned up.

The metaphor “*digital pollution*” has emerged to describe the output of AI not as creative works but as harmful emissions [3], suggesting that content creation is a negative factor for the environment. The term “*data poisoning*,” which was originally a technical term for attacks on AI models, has evolved to describe the general degradation of the Internet. The term “*e-waste*” finds its digital counterpart in the concepts of *digital decay* and *fast tech*.

The “Dead Internet Theory” is the logical conclusion of the *slop* metaphor. If the Internet is full of *sock puppets*, *fraudbots*, *viewbots*, *dark data*, and *AI slop*, it is no longer a human space but a dumping ground for machines. Finally, the “Dark Forest Theory of the Internet” suggests that the network becomes a dangerous place where transparent communication provokes attacks from trolls, bots, AI, scammers, or hackers. This makes users retreat into private spaces (closed groups, newsletters, or encrypted chats) for security, creating “*dark forests*” (or “*digital campfires*”) to avoid the dangers of the open, *slop*-filled social platforms.

Social implications. The shift to biological waste metaphors is more than just slang; it is a sociolinguistic, psychological defense mechanism. First, by calling the output of AI “*slop*” and its training “*incestuous*,” speakers affirm a hierarchy in which biology prevails over machinery. Incest is a taboo that only biological beings can break; applying it to AI serves to make AI appear “grotesquely bodily” rather than “ethereal”. It relegates AI to the realm of the “abject” (things that are thrown away), allowing humans to reclaim their status as “creators,” limiting AI to the role of “recyclers” of human waste.

Second, terms like “*boomerslop*” and “*AI slime*” use a rhetoric of disgust, an emotion of rejection and distancing. If AI is sublime and awe-inspiring, we feel small. If AI is gooey and disgusting, we feel superior. This linguistic shift allows humanity to look down on a supercomputer, making it a psychological strategy to overcome the anxiety of automation and the fear of being replaced by AI.

Finally, if AI generates *slop*, then it is essentially worthless. This questions the narratives of the *wealthtech* that estimates the AI industry in trillions of dollars. The language of the streets (*clanker*, *slop*) fights the language of the corporate world (*agentic AI*, *artificial superintelligence*). By linguistically devaluing AI’s work, people devalue the capital investments of the *brologarchs*.

Conclusions. The path from *hallucination* to *slop* is the journey of a society waking from a magical sleep and finding itself in a decomposing landfill. The terminology has shifted radically from the empirical (*sky computing*, *neocloud*) to the extremely mundane (*mining*, *extraction*, *waste*, *slop*). People increasingly start treating AI as a putrid, contagious disease, or a biological anomaly (*MAD*, *incestuous training*) rather than an algorithmic robot logic. As *model collapse* becomes a technical reality, we will continue to see an increase in the number of sanitation metaphors. Terms such as *data hygiene*, *scrubbing*, *quarantine*, and *sterilization* are likely to dominate the next phase of AI discourse. People are likely to move from mocking *slop* to trying to clean it up. The *digital removalist* will become a key figure not only in removing embarrassing tweets but also in cleaning up the *slop* out of the *digital commons*.

Still, it should be noted that the “loss of awe” is not a loss of interest, but rather a maturing of perspective. By linguistically transforming AI into *slop*, society is trying to “compost” this phenomenon, naturally hoping that something fruitful will eventually grow from the pile of digital waste.

Bibliography:

1. Agathon M. The Platonic case against AI slop. *Palladium Mag.* 2025. URL: <https://www.palladiummag.com/2025/11/14/the-platonic-case-against-ai-slop/>
2. Bender E. M., Gebru T., McMillan-Major A., Shmitchell S. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency.* 2021. URL: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/pdf/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
3. Fairfield J. Clean Data: Recursion as Pollution in Environmental AI. *Washington and Lee University School of Law.* 2025. URL: <https://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1881&context=wluflac>
4. Jones E. M., Newman J. D., Kim B., Fogle E. J. AI-Generated “Slop” in Online Biomedical Science Educational Videos: Mixed Methods Study of Prevalence, Characteristics, and Hazards to Learners and Teachers. *PubMed Central.* 2025. URL: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12634010/>
5. Jones G. M., Satran S., Satyanarayan A. Toward cultural interpretability: A linguistic anthropological framework for describing and evaluating large language models. *MIT CSAIL.* 2025. URL: <https://vis.csail.mit.edu/pubs/cultural-interpretability.pdf>
6. Kristeva J. Powers of horror: An essay on abjection. Columbia University Press, 1982. URL: <https://www.thing.net/~rdom/ucsd/Zombies/Powers%20of%20Horror.pdf>
7. Nerlich B. Metaphors for AI: An overview of recent studies. *Making Science Public.* 2025. URL: <https://makingsciencepublic.com/2025/11/21/ai-metaphor-studies-an-overview/>
8. Nerlich B. From sloppers to slopocalypse: The lexical productivity of AI slop. *Making Science Public.* 2026. URL: <https://makingsciencepublic.com/2026/01/02/from-sloppers-to-slopocalypse-the-lexical-productivity-of-ai-slop>
9. Roe J., Furze L., Perkins M. GenAI as Digital Plastic: Understanding Synthetic Media Through Critical AI Literacy. *arXiv.* 2025. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.08249>
10. Santiago Cortes M. AI Gothic. *Empty Set Mag.* 2025. URL: <https://www.emptysetmag.com/articles/ai-gothic>
11. Sui P., Duede E., Wu S., So R. J. Confabulation: The Surprising Value of Large Language Model Hallucinations. *arXiv.* 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/html/2406.04175v1>
12. Чирвоний О. С. Функціонування кіберморфних одиниць сучасної англійської мови. *Причорноморські філологічні студії.* 2024. № 4. С. 125–131. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/bsps-2024.4.18>.

Чирвоний О. С. ВІД «ГАЛЮЦИНАЦІЙ» ДО «ПОМИЇВ»: СЕМАНТИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ДЕВАЛЬВАЦІЇ ШТУЧНОГО ІНТЕЛЕКТУ

У статті представлено ґрунтовний соціолінгвістичний аналіз лексичної еволюції у сфері штучного інтелекту (ШІ) з 2015 по 2025 рік. Автор досліджує радикальну трансформацію номенклатури, що описує процеси та результати роботи ШІ, фіксуючи перехід від антропоморфних, психологічних метафор до метафор біологічних відходів та деградації. Теоретичною базою дослідження є теорія концептуальної метафори та критичний дискурс-аналіз, що дозволяють інтерпретувати зміни в мові як індикатор суспільної довіри та «втрати благоговіння» перед технологіями. Перший етап розвитку (2015–2022) розглянуто крізь призму антропоморфізму, де ключовим терміном виступає «галюцинація». Встановлено, що використання клінічної термінології наділяло машинні моделі ілюзією суб'єктності та наявності «внутрішнього світу», що виправдовувало статус «інтелекту». Описано переломний етап, пов'язаний із впровадженням концепції «стохастичного папуги», яка деконструювала образ «мислячої машини». Центральна частина статті присвячена аналізу сучасної епохи «поміїв» (slop). Автор доводить, що термін «slop», який історично позначає рідкі помії або корм для свиней, є найнижчою точкою семантичної девальвації продуктів ШІ. Особливу увагу приділено метафорам біологічної дегенерації, таким як «кровозмісне навчання» та «автофагічний розлад моделі» (MAD). Ці терміни апелюють до культурних табу та патологій для опису процесів рекурсивного навчання моделей на власному синтетичному контенті, що перетворює образ «логічної машини» на «хворий організм». У висновках підкреслено, що зміна мовного фреймування на екологічні метафори відображає дорослішання суспільного сприйняття, де ШІ постає вже не як «рятівник», а як джерело інформаційного сміття. Використання термінів відрази інтерпретується як механізм аб'єкції, що дозволяє людині відновити свою ієрархічну перевагу над машиною в умовах тотальної автоматизації.

Ключові слова: штучний інтелект, неологізм, соціолінгвістика, семантична девальвація, цифрове забруднення.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 30.01.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 23.02.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 24.04.2026