



Citation: Reali, F., (2026). On the Importance of Sentence Crafting in Times of Text Mass Production. *Aisthesis* 21(5): 261-271. doi: 10.7413/2035-8466089

Copyright: © 2026 – The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY-4.0).

On the Importance of Sentence Crafting in Times of Text Mass Production

FLORENCIA REALI

Universidad Católica del Uruguay
florencia.reali@ucu.edu.uy

Abstract. With the rise of artificially generated texts, there is growing concern about the future of creativity in written language. As a by-product of how they function, large language models push language toward normalized and homogeneous products, eroding the eccentric qualities of texts that reflect singular human distinctiveness. The notion of singularity is explored in relation to the act of writing. The argument is divided into two related parts. First, drawing on the work of Étienne Souriau and David Lapoujade, this paper underscores the importance of attunement to individual points of view in creation. It is argued that the erosion of distinctiveness in the writing gesture undermines the instauration of diverse modes of existence. Second, drawing on Walter Benjamin’s distinction between information and narrative, this work highlights the artisanal nature of narrative writing in contrast with the serialized, mass produced quality of informational texts. It is argued that writing creativity lives in the act of crafting the sentence through a process that unfolds over time rather than in the “germinative idea” of the final product. At odds with this, large language models offer a labor-free shortcut to the final and polished written piece. Finally, drawing on Deleuze and Guattari’s notion of desiring-production, it is argued that the dynamic process of crafting a sentence is essential for keeping subjective desire alive.

Keywords. Large language models, creativity, modes of existence, desiring-production.

1. *On the erosion of singularity in automatically generated language*

Singularity is fleshed out in the stroke of the painter. Santana's guitar is recognizable after listening to just a few chords. Singularity in the act of creation lies in the gesture. Far from being a trait limited to the artist's work, distinctiveness is a quality that is present in the creative composition of any human being who is alive. Drawing from a Lacanian perspective, singularity refers to «the individual's non-negotiable distinctiveness, eccentricity, or idiosyncrasy [...] insofar as it articulates something about the undead pulse of *jouissance*¹» (Ruti [2011]: 1113). As Ruti puts it, singularity carries something that is related to the pulse of life itself.

In the realm of written language, we look for an encounter with an author's singular perspective in a piece. A point of view is fleshed out in a certain distinctiveness in the choice of words, a particular insight, or a story that carries a novel angle that awakens in the perceiver an original way of experiencing something otherwise familiar.

Amid the sea of sloppy information that bombards contemporary life, singularity gasps for air. According to a recent article in *The Atlantic*, in the last couple of years the internet reached a critical tipping point: the volume of artificially generated articles published online surpassed that of human written ones (Warzel [2025]). Writing robots, that is, generative large language models (LLMs), are predictability machines that produce text with qualities opposite to those of human-made distinctive writing. LLMs operate by pursuing the word that is most likely to come next given the one before it in an unfolding sentence, based on millions of texts fed into their training data. A by-product of the way LLMs get optimized is that they tend to exacerbate exactly the qualities that make language "predictable", considering what has been said before by others. LLMs produce the average of what all speakers have said before in similar circumstances taken together (humans and robots). This mode of language production downplays the presence of eccentricities, slips, hyperbole, and interpretation gaps in texts. By means of their very *modus operandi*, LLMs iron out the wrinkles of a written piece, pushing the end-product toward a version of it that is lint-free, polished, and, importantly, predictable.

In the 19th century, within the study of hereditary traits in genomics, Sir Francis Galton introduced the concept of "regression to the mean". Drawing from mathematics and biology, Galton was able to identify and analyze general patterns of transmission across generations – both biological and cultural. One of his central findings was that extreme traits in parents, such as height, tended to

1 In Lacanian terms, *jouissance* can be characterized as "the result of gratification pursued beyond the pleasure principle" (Hook [2020]: 276), conveying a kind of enjoyment defined as the most singular character of any being.

be less extreme in their children, demonstrating a general tendency toward the average. This concept is foundational in statistics. When information is reproduced, “outliers” often move closer to typical values over time, and the information being transmitted gradually converges toward its average values. The regression-to-the-mean principle is central to the operation of LLMs. As previously generated information is fed back into the model to predict the next word to be spoken, the resulting text gradually converges toward an average of what has been produced before by both humans and talking bots (see Senn [2011]; Shumailov et al. [2024]).

Thus, the LLM method of language production is designed to converge to the average of what has been said in the past. This process tones down the atypical, outlier-like language that often lives in the margins of human speech. The loss of distinctiveness in enunciation has deeper consequences than just wiping out originality. The regression-to-the-mean phenomenon also erodes the traces of individual points of view that manifest in deviations from hegemonic language. This has consequences for the manner of existing of ideas, and it compromises the singularity that is grounded in the novel enunciative gesture. From an existential pluralism perspective, the next section revises the importance of the endurance of multiple points of view as a condition for the instauration of different modes of existence.

In *The Lesser Existences*, David Lapoujade (2021) offers an interpretation of Étienne Souriau’s work in order to elaborate key concepts underpinning existential pluralism. He foregrounds the importance of what he calls “the lesser existences”, as well as the moral imperative that underlies their right to exist. In a sharp and sensible reading of Souriau’s work, Lapoujade puts forward the question of “how to see”, not just a work of art but any human composition, pinpointing that the attunement to a singular point of view conveys a manner of existence. Each manner of existence proceeds from a gestural instaurative stroke. «Each existence proceeds from a gesture that instaurs it, from an “arabesque” that determines it to be such as it is (Lapoujade [2021]: 14). The gesture in human creation reveals a certain shape and singular curvature that unveils the architectonic of what is being created». In Souriau’s philosophy, as presented by Lapoujade, the instaurative forces that underlie the work of art merge the necessity of existence with the necessity to act:

To discern [...] a movement toward existence with the appearance of a work, which involves instaurative forces down below, and appeals and iridescences – in short, an assistance of which the apparently inert object is evidence – up above. (Souriau [2015]: 156-157)

According to this approach, the point of view is intrinsic to the phenomenon itself – that is, the point of view inhabits the created piece, as the unfolding act of

composition is «animated by forces, by internal dynamisms» (Lapoujade [2021]: 41). In Souriau, to perceive involves “entering” a point of view, insofar as our own perspective ensembles with another one in a participative act of perception. As the aesthetic phenomenon ensues, it becomes compelling to find “the point of view of the phenomenon” (Lapoujade [2021]: 36), as the point of view entails an existence, «our perspective is inserted into another perspective – our point of view is inserted into another point of view, as if there were an intentionality or, better, an organizing principle visible within the architectonic of the phenomenon» (Lapoujade [2021]: 37).

In this sense, the point of view from which the creative act unfolds is ontologically intrinsic to the existence of “the thing” being created. «Each mode of existence envelops a point of view [...]. Souriau often repeats, we need to find the thing’s point of view» (Lapoujade [2021]: 38). A text may offer a unique point of view that invites the reader to enter. This is true in literature, but also in academic or journalistic work animated by the author’s analytical perspective that aims beyond the mere transmission of new information. However, as we increasingly consume our news and reading material online (Kennedy, Pratt [2019]), the abundance of available information does not necessarily translate into an abundance of different perspectives. Rather, the opposite occurs: the volume of LLM generated articles published online recently surpassed that of human written ones, so that reverberating text becomes the main diet of the algorithm. This process exacerbates the regression-to-the-mean phenomenon, so that encountering an original point of view in a text begins to become a true needle in a haystack.

2. *Crafting the sentence: On the need for artisanal writing*

Singularity carries something of the order of the pulse of life. Large language models show no pulse other than the operational prediction of the next word in a sentence. Artificially created language can be remarkably informative, but a different question is whether it conveys a provocative narrative. There is a distinction between the act of narrating a story and the act of providing information. Long before LLMs were among us, in *The Storyteller*, Walter Benjamin (1936) elaborates on the distinction between information and narrative. At that time, considering the rise of journalism, Benjamin was raising the concern that narration was being replaced by information:

The art of storytelling is reaching its end because the epic side of truth, wisdom, is dying out. [...] The press as one of its most important instruments in fully developed capitalism, there emerges a form of communication which, no matter how far back its origin may lie, never before influenced the epic form in a decisive way. But now it does exert such an influence. And it turns out that it

confronts storytelling as no less of a stranger than did the novel, but in a more menacing way, and that it also brings about a crisis in the novel. This new form of communication is information (Benjamin [1936]: 3).

Benjamin observes that information operates under the imperative to appear plausible, and in this regard, it stands in opposition to narration. This opposition, for Benjamin, marks a decline in the art of storytelling, as the demand for the diffusion of information rises. Information instructs us about the world's novelties; however, this does not result in the flourishing or accumulation of memorable stories. On the contrary, within the realm of information dissemination, stories are produced to convey novelty yet remain transient:

The value of information does not survive the moment in which it was new. It lives only at that moment; it has to surrender to it completely and explain itself to it without losing any time. A story is different. It does not expend itself. (Benjamin [1936]: 4)

Information is valuable if it carries novelty or explanation. Informative events are “burdened” with explanations. On the contrary, as Benjamin observes, the art of storytelling consists precisely in recounting a tale free from explanation. The extraordinary is never narrated with complete precision; rather, some gaps in the interpretation of the story are left for the reader to fill, never imposing upon the reader the psychological context of what takes place. The reader is left free to grapple with the subject according to their own understanding, and through this freedom, narration attains a resonance and amplitude that information altogether lacks. Benjamin offers the example of Montaigne telling Herodotus's story of an Egyptian king who, after being defeated by a conquering enemy, is forced to watch members of his family being humiliated in a public parade. After witnessing, with a stoic semblance, the passage of his own daughter, the king then sees his lifelong old servant walking before him – and only at that moment does he burst into lament. Montaigne does not explain why the king cried at that moment and not before, leaving interpretation to the reader. The interpreter will make sense of the story from their own subjective perspective. Benjamin argues that the story produces surprise and reflection. It leaves room for our own point of view to inhabit it. As an additional example, consider the first paragraph of Clarice Lispector's story *The egg and the chicken*:

In the morning in the kitchen on the table I see the egg. I look at the egg with a single gaze. Immediately I perceive that one cannot be seeing an egg. Seeing an egg never remains in the present: as soon as I see an egg it already becomes having seen an egg three millennia ago. – At the very instant of seeing the egg it is the memory of an egg. – The egg can only be seen by one who has already seen it. – When one sees the egg it is too late: an egg seen is an egg lost. – Seeing the egg is the promise of one day eventually seeing the egg. – A brief and indivisible glance; if indeed there is thought; there is none; there is the egg. – Looking is the necessary instrument that, once used, I shall discard. I shall keep the egg.

– The egg has no itself. Individually it does not exist. Seeing the egg is impossible: the egg is supervisible just as there are supersonic sounds. No one can see the egg. Does the dog see the egg? Only machines see the egg. The construction crane sees the egg. – When I was ancient an egg landed on my shoulder. – Love for the egg cannot be felt either. Love for the egg is supersensible. We do not know that we love the egg. (Lispector [2015]: 191)

In this paragraph, the referential meaning of “egg” becomes completely blurred. The passage establishes an atmosphere rather than a plot; what “egg” means in the narrator’s mind no longer matters. What matters is what the reader makes of it. The story provides a gate for the perceiver to enter – and then again, returning to Souriau, to perceive a singular piece involves entering a point of view, insofar as the perceiver’s perspective ensembles with the authors in a participative act.

To host the perceiver’s point of view, however, a story needs to leave room for interpretation; that is, its narrative needs to be loosely woven. The narrator should put the material together in a way that leaves gaps for the perceiver’s point of view to move through. Benjamin describes the art of storytelling by comparing it with the work of the artisan:

The storytelling that thrives for a long time in the milieu of work – the rural, the maritime, and the urban – is itself an artisan form of communication, as it were. It does not aim to convey the pure essence of the thing, like information or a report. It sinks the thing into the life of the storyteller, in order to bring it out of him again. Thus, traces of the storyteller cling to the story the way the handprints of the potter cling to the clay vessel. (Benjamin [1936]: 16)

Drawing on the textile metaphor, conceiving creative writing as an artisanal endeavor gives a new status to the presence of distinctiveness, atypicality, and idiosyncrasy in the thread of linguistic fabric. Handcrafted material can be distinguished from industrial fabric by its imperfections – but those imperfections are precisely what LLMs are built to remove through the serial manufacturing of adequate language.

2.1 *Cultural homogenization and the normalization of text*

Singular, artisanal sentences – embodying an aesthetic of imperfection – disrupt the homogenizing flow of capitalist serial production, standing against the standardization of mass-produced, formulaic texts.

In recent decades, cultural homogenization has been well documented as part of the more general phenomenon of globalization (Zulfiqar, Kalid [2022]). New forms of media have introduced new methods of organizing and sharing information. More than ever, a person’s identity is shaped by their belonging to a particular group defined at the level of a global culture. Identity-marking

groups, in turn, vary in scale and are relative to the context in which identification takes place. In the field of identity politics, for example, Todd McGowan (2020) provides an insightful account of the dialectic of the universal and the particular in relation to identity politics in the context of twenty first century collective struggle.

Cultural homogenization is intrinsic to capitalism and serves as a background for social identity development. McGowan notes in relation to the building of identity: «one place becomes indistinguishable from another, and even countries come to resemble each other because of capitalism’s homogenizing effect. McDonald’s colonizes the entire world and places the same stamp on all differences» (McGowan [2020]: 243). As an example of this, Kyle Chayka [2024] describes what has been known as the “hipster coffee shop” phenomenon, identified as the globally spread preference for the hipster coffee shop – an «industrial-size wood tables for accessible seating; a bright interior with walls painted white or covered in subway tiles» (Chayka [2024]). This example illustrates how forms of aesthetics that conform to this globalized norm are preferred over other, more idiosyncratic, culturally specific aesthetic forms, contributing to a broader phenomenon of homogenization in goods and consumption observed across different corners of the world.

An analogous phenomenon is starting to emerge in the realm of written language. The action of LLMs produces a new form of cultural homogenization, not at the level of services or goods for consumption, but at the level of language production: we can now tailor (and even buy) the kind of language we prefer to produce. LLMs offer us a shortcut to a polished version of our own language. We make LLMs write for us. We submit our emails, letters, and documents to the corrective hand of the robot. LLMs are even recruited to write emotion-filled letters to relatives and friends when words don’t come easily to mind. Students write essays using this “tool”. As a result, we see how, at an increasing rate, the production of written language is converging toward standardized piles of texts, in the same way the next coffee anywhere in the world will most likely adhere to the globalized style.

2.2 Sentence composition and desiring-production

Imperfections in written language are traces of subjective experience. However, we seem to choose to outsource our writing, even at the cost of sacrificing our personal linguistic fingerprint. One aspect of this is that we are offered a shortcut that reduces the labor involved in language production. Warzel (2025) observes that, in the creative process, LLM tools remove an enormous amount of “friction” between conception and completion – that is, they remove the work that goes with execution. LLMs enable us to go directly from the idea to the end-

product without traversing the “gruesome” process entailed in writing and editing. But as Warzel observes, «the frictionless future they portend is nightmarish – recursive and soulless, a cultural dead end».

LLMs are tools that save humans time and effort, promising to free up resources to focus solely on the “creative” process. However, as Warzel rightly argues, the removal of friction is the removal of agency and singularity. Creativity without craft is not possible. To think that artificial aids will enhance our creative potential by removing the friction that comes with the work of execution is a fallacy:

This is tragic. The loss of friction deprives people of something crucial. What happens between imagination and creation is ineffable – it entails struggle, iteration, joy, and frustration, disappointment, and pride. It is the process through which we enact agency [...] To lose that, I fear, is to capitulate on our very humanity. (Warzel [2025])

The process of composing a written sentence is clumsy in nature. A human made phrase involves the act of connecting a word with the next one as the sentence unfolds in time. The process of sentence crafting is intentional, as the choice of individual words and the order they take is a gesture infused with subjective sovereignty. LLMs offer a fast ride from the germinative idea to an envisioned final form. However, creativity is not just the initial visualization of the final product. Rather, the creative act entailed in language production is intrinsic to the dynamic process of weaving a word with the next one during the unfolding composition. The force of creativity lives in the act of word weaving that unfolds dynamically over time.

In the book *Spheres of Insurrection: Notes on Decolonizing the Unconscious*, Suely Rolnik (2023), offers a critical analysis of how contemporary neoliberal racial-capitalist structures produce the emergence of instrumental and serialized subjectivities. In this work, Rolnik engages with concepts developed in Deleuze and Guattari, especially around desire, production, and subjectivation. This work foregrounds the importance of reclaiming a form of singular production that is freed from the grid of capitalist normative parameters. Rolnik emphasizes the role of the creative process itself as a form of singular expression. As an example of the dynamic nature of the creative unfolding, she brings the work of the Brazilian artist Lygia Clark, entitled *Caminando (Walking)*. In this performative piece, Clark invites her audience to cut along a Möbius strip lengthwise with scissors, but without passing through the original cutting point. A potentially endless cutting process is produced – the artistic experience is embedded in decomposing the original strip into new strips of paper tape that follow a Möbius-like trajectory and become narrower. In this piece, however, the artistic experience is not so much realized in the final product as in the dynamic experience of cutting the strip. Suely Rolnik describes colonial and capitalist oppression

as processes that capture and drain vital force. This capture reduces subjectivity to its experience as a subject, neutralizing the complexity of the effects that the forces of the world exert upon the body, in favor of producing an individual endowed with a stable identity. This process of subjectivation operates through repetition and through the closure of possibilities for creation, thereby preventing the emergence of “virtual worlds”. In this sense, the modern colonial subject is a zombie who expends a greater part of their libidinal energy in the production of a normative identity.

The artisanal sentence – and the aesthetics of imperfection it embodies – introduces a rupture within the homogenizing logic of capitalist serial production. Rolnik’s approach to creative production draws from Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s conception of desire as an underlying productive force that creates reality, decentering the notion of desire as a lack that needs to be fulfilled. In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari further elaborate the concept of *desiring machines*, in which desire is conceived as a constant life force that operates as a flow, connecting and articulating relations among people, objects, and social contexts, thereby generating subjectivities and realities. The productive phenomenon is the conceived as inseparable from the flow of desire:

The coupling that takes place within the partial object-flow connective synthesis also has another form: product/producing. Producing is always something “grafted onto” the product; and for that reason, desiring-production is production of production. (Deleuze, Guattari [1972]: 6)

The desiring machine is not taken there as a metaphor, but as that which “cuts and is cut” according to three modes that operate during production. The first refers to the connective synthesis and mobilizes libido as an energy of extraction. The second refers to the disjunctive synthesis and mobilizes the divine will (*Numen*) as an energy of separation. Finally, the third refers to conjunctive synthesis and mobilizes the force of joy (*Voluptas*) as residual energy. That is, to extract, to separate, to produce a residual, is to carry out the real operations of desire. Desire bursts forth, always carrying out the grafting of producing onto the product. Then, in *Anti-Oedipus*, the process of desiring-production is conceived simultaneously as the production of production, the production of recording, and the production of consumption.

Like LLMs, human beings are language-producing machines. However, unlike them, we are Deleuze-Guattarian desiring machines; we speak and write by weaving words according to the rhythms of what Rolnik calls “the pimping of life”. The premise that human language is produced, impelled by the rhythms of life, implies that LLM modes of language production obliterate human creativity because of the way they operate. Artificial language is designed and implemented to spare us from the “friction” and labor that are involved in the putting

together of words in a sentence to express some idea. Such friction, however, is the cost of life, as it is attached to the gears of desiring-production in the process of composing sentences.

The dynamic unfolding of the artisanal utterance inevitably leaves behind traces of imperfection and gaps in meaning, as the thread of expression knits itself together according to its own rhythms. Such imperfections and gaps – such unavoidable remainders – are not expected under the workings of artificial machines designed, by their structure, to erase imperfections. In fact, the sole objective of an LLM is to obliterate a virtual gap before it materializes in the unfolding sentence. In contrast, Deleuze-Guattarian desiring machines function «amid hiatuses and ruptures, breakdowns and failures, stalling and short circuits, distances and fragmentations, within a sum that never succeeds in bringing its various parts together so as to form a whole» ([1972]: 42). Cuts are productive and are even forms of connection, as the ways in which desiring machines break or malfunction form part of their functioning. These cuts are inherent to the operations of the speaking desiring-machines that work at the crafting of a sentence, insofar as they function “amid the hiatus” left by the processes of desiring-production, upon which they also feed. In this sense, they run counter to the logic of mass, serial production of texts. On the other hand, LLM offer of “friction free” mode of language production, together with an instantaneous shortcut to the finished product, both incompatible with the workings of desiring-production, which are dynamic and imperfect in form. That is, creativity fleshes itself out in the making of language, before the idea becomes crystallized as a final product. The weight that LLMs lift for us is inherent to the operation of desiring-production: if the friction involved in the crafting of a sentence is removed from the writing process, then, as a byproduct, desire is killed.

Concluding remarks

Building on Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of desiring-production, this paper proposes that the mobilizing power of subjective desire is intrinsic to the ongoing, dynamic process of composing a sentence. The act of writing can be seen as a micro-assemblage, in which the writer, language, and context co-constitute a flow of singular expression. Large language models tend to steer text toward standardized, uniform outputs, diminishing the eccentric features of writing that bear the mark of singular human creation. This paper examines the idea of singularity as it is expressed in the writing process and develops its argument in two interconnected movements. The first establishes, following Étienne Souriau and David Lapoujade, that the creative act requires

a careful attunement to distinct points of view. Then, the process of weakening singularity in the writing gesture hinders the instauration of different modes of existence, disrupting the productive interplay between desire and language. The second movement draws on Benjamin's contrast between information and narrative to emphasize the craft-based dimension of narrative writing, as opposed to the serialized, mass-produced character of informational discourse. Here, creativity is understood as inherent to the temporal, processual labor of construing the sentence, where desire, perception, and linguistic material intertwine. Large language models, by contrast, provide a frictionless route to a polished product, bypassing the step-by-step generative work that sustains the dynamic assemblage of human expression.

References

- Benjamin, W., 1936: *Illuminations*, transl. by H. Zohn, Schocken Books, New York, 1969.
- Chayka, K., 2024: *The tyranny of the algorithm: why every coffee shop looks the same*, "The Guardian", 16 January.
- Deleuze, G., Guattari, F., 1972: *Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, transl. by R. Hurley, M. Seem and H.R. Lane, Viking Press, New York, 1977.
- Deleuze, G., Guattari, F., 1987: *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*, transl. by B. Massumi, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1980.
- Lapoujade, D., Beranek, E., 2021: *The Lesser Existences. Étienne Souriau, an Aesthetics for the Virtual*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis. doi:10.5749/j.ctv1p3xjq
- Lispector, C., 2015: *Complete Stories*, transl. by K. Dodson, ed. by B. Moser, New Directions, New York.
- McGowan, T., 2020: *Universality and Identity Politics*, Columbia University Press, New York. doi:10.7312/mcgo19770
- Patrick, J.K., Prat, A., 2019: *Where do people get their news?*, "Economic Policy" 34 (97), pp. 5-47. doi:10.1093/epolic/eiy016
- Ruti, M., 2011: *The singularity of being: Lacan and the immortal within*, "Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association" 58 (6), pp. 1113-1138. doi:10.1177/0003065110396083
- Rolnik, S., 2023: *Spheres of Insurrection. Notes on Decolonizing the Unconscious*, transl. by S. Delgado Moya, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Senn, S., 2011: *Francis Galton and regression to the mean*, "Significance" 8 (3), pp. 124-126.
- Shumailov, I., Shumaylov, Z., Zhao, Y., et al., 2024: *AI models collapse when trained on recursively generated data*, "Nature" 631, pp. 755-759. doi:10.1038/s41586-024-07566-y
- Souriau, É., 1943: *The Different Modes of Existence*, transl. by E. Beranek and T. Howles, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 2015.
- Warzel, C., 2025: *A tool that crushes creativity: IA slop is winning*, "The Atlantic", 20 October.
- Zulfiqar, A., Kalid, F., 2022: *New media and identity crises: a challenge of cultural homogenization*, "Pakistan Journal of Social Research" 4 (4), pp. 143-147. doi:10.52567/pjsr.v4i04.796