Journal of Philosophy and Linguistics
Research Article Peer-review, Open Access

Linguistic Reviews on Ai Speech

Ataboyev Ahadjon Djumakuzievich [1]

Abstract: This article presents a comprehensive linguistic examination of artificial intelligence–generated speech as discussed in contemporary research. Drawing on studies from linguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and cognitive science, the paper synthesizes key perspectives on the nature, structure, and functioning of AI speech. Particular attention is paid to issues of coherence, contextual sensitivity, pragmatic simulation, and stylistic adaptability in AI-generated language. The review also addresses critical debates concerning authorship, communicative intention, agency, and the epistemological status of AI speech in comparison with human language use.

Keywords: AI speech, linguistic review, discourse analysis, pragmatics, language generation, communicative agency, contextual meaning, digital communication, human–machine interaction, cognitive linguistics, authorship, artificial intelligence.

[1]*Associated Professor of Andijon State Institute of Foreign Languages*

Introduction. Philology, traditionally defined as the historical and comparative study of language through texts, has long concerned itself with how meaning is produced, transmitted, and transformed across time. With the emergence of artificial intelligence capable of generating and interpreting language, philology encounters a new and unusual object of study: AI speech. Unlike human speech, which is rooted in embodied experience, social context, and historical continuity, AI speech is produced through statistical models trained on vast textual corpora. Yet despite this difference, AI-generated language participates in many of the same linguistic, rhetorical, and semantic structures that philology has analyzed for centuries. This article explores AI speech from a philological perspective, examining its sources, structure, meaning-making processes, and implications for our understanding of language itself.

Classical philology treats speech and text as artifacts shaped by history, culture, and intention. Words are not merely signs; they are carriers of tradition, ideology, and power. From Homeric epics to medieval manuscripts, philologists have sought to reconstruct original meanings, trace textual variations, and understand how language reflects human thought. Speech, in this tradition, is inseparable from speakers: it presupposes intention, audience, and context. AI speech disrupts this framework. While it resembles human language in form, it lacks consciousness, intention, and lived experience. A philological study must therefore ask: what kind of “speech” is AI producing? Is it a continuation of human textual tradition, a derivative simulacrum, or a fundamentally new linguistic phenomenon?

Discussion. One of the most philologically significant aspects of AI speech is its dependence on prior texts. Large language models are trained on extensive corpora that include literature, academic writing, journalism, and digital communication. In this sense, AI speech is radically intertextual. Every sentence it

generates is statistically conditioned by countless earlier sentences written by humans. From a philological viewpoint, this resembles a vast, uncritical compilation of textual tradition. Medieval scribes copied texts by hand, sometimes introducing errors, glosses, or reinterpretations. Similarly, AI absorbs linguistic patterns without direct understanding, reproducing conventions, metaphors, and idioms. However, unlike scribes, AI does not distinguish between authoritative and marginal texts unless explicitly guided. Canonical literature and ephemeral online discourse coexist in its training data, producing a flattened textual hierarchy. This raises questions central to philology: authority, authenticity, and transmission. AI speech does not have an "original text" in the traditional sense. Each output is a recombination rather than a reproduction. The notion of textual variants is replaced by probabilistic variation, where multiple plausible expressions coexist without a privileged version.

A core concern of philology is meaning. Traditionally, meaning is understood as arising from the interaction between authorial intent, textual structure, and reader interpretation. AI speech challenges this triad. There is no authorial intent in the human sense; the model does not "mean" what it says. Yet readers often attribute meaning, coherence, and even personality to AI-generated text. From a philological perspective, this situation foregrounds the role of the reader more strongly than ever. Meaning becomes almost entirely interpretive. AI speech functions as a semantic mirror, reflecting patterns that readers recognize and complete. This is not entirely unprecedented: ancient texts of unknown authorship or fragmentary manuscripts have long been interpreted without secure knowledge of intent. However, in AI speech, the absence of intent is systematic rather than accidental. This invites a rethinking of semantics. Meaning in AI speech is emergent rather than intentional. It arises from linguistic probability and reader inference, suggesting that some aspects of meaning may be more structurally embedded in language than previously assumed.

Philology also examines style, genre, and rhetoric. AI speech is remarkably adept at imitating stylistic features: academic formality, poetic devices, persuasive rhetoric, or conversational tone. It can produce texts that resemble philosophical treatises, legal documents, or literary criticism. Yet this stylistic competence is imitative rather than experiential. AI does not innovate in the strong sense; it recombines existing stylistic elements. From a philological standpoint, this resembles pastiche or centonization, a practice common in late antiquity where texts were composed entirely of quotations from earlier works. AI speech can thus be seen as a modern, automated form of centonization, drawing unconsciously on a collective archive. This has implications for genre theory. If AI can generate convincing instances of multiple genres, then genre itself may be less tied to human creativity than to formal and linguistic constraints. Philology, which has long categorized and analyzed genres, may find in AI a tool that exposes the underlying mechanics of genre formation.

Another philological concern is diachronic change: how languages evolve over time. AI speech is trained on texts from different periods, often blending archaic and contemporary usages. This can result in temporal ambiguity, where expressions from different historical layers coexist in a single output. This phenomenon resembles what philologists encounter in composite texts or later redactions of older works. However, AI does not experience historical time; it collapses centuries of language use into a single statistical present. As a result, AI speech may preserve obsolete constructions or revive archaic phrases, contributing to a kind of artificial linguistic conservatism.

At the same time, AI models are periodically retrained, reflecting contemporary language use. This introduces a new mechanism of language change: curated updates rather than organic evolution. Philology may thus need to account for algorithmic influences on linguistic history.

Philological study has always been intertwined with questions of authorship and authority. Who speaks, and with what legitimacy? AI speech complicates these questions. When an AI produces a text, authorship is distributed among developers, data contributors, and users. Authority becomes ambiguous: the text may sound confident and scholarly, yet it lacks epistemic responsibility. From a philological perspective, this recalls pseudepigrapha—texts falsely attributed to authoritative figures. Historically, such texts were studied carefully to determine provenance and credibility. Similarly, AI-generated texts

require critical scrutiny. Philology's traditional tools—source criticism, stylistic analysis, and contextual evaluation—remain relevant, perhaps even essential, in an age of AI speech.

Conclusion. A philological study on AI speech reveals both continuity and rupture in the history of language. AI speech is deeply rooted in human textual tradition, drawing on accumulated linguistic practices and cultural forms. At the same time, it lacks the intentionality, embodiment, and historical situatedness that have traditionally grounded speech and writing. For philology, AI is not merely a technological novelty but a conceptual challenge. It forces scholars to reconsider fundamental assumptions about meaning, authorship, genre, and language change. By applying philological methods to AI speech, we gain insight not only into artificial language systems but also into the nature of human language itself. In this sense, AI speech becomes a new kind of text—one that reflects humanity's linguistic past while reshaping its linguistic future.

References:

1. Cerquiglini B. In Praise of the Variant: A Critical History of Philology. Johns Hopkins University Press. 1999.
2. Ehrman B. D. Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics. Oxford University Press. 2013.
3. Gadamer H.-G. Truth and Method (2nd rev. ed.). Continuum. 2004.
4. McGill S. Virgil Recomposed: The Mythological and Secular Centos in Antiquity. Oxford University Press. 2005.
5. Plato. Phaedrus (A. Nehamas & P. Woodruff, Trans.). Hackett. (1995).
6. Saussure F. de. Course in General Linguistics. Open Court. 1986.
7. Schleiermacher F. Hermeneutics and Criticism. Cambridge University Press. 1998.
8. Tanselle G.T. (1992). A Rationale of Textual Criticism. University of Pennsylvania Press.
9. Turner J. (2014). Philology: The Forgotten Origins of the Modern Humanities. Princeton University Press.