Konstantinos Kornarakis*

Artificial intelligence and the contemporary human being: In search of life's meaning in an intangible campus?

Abstract

This paper explores the anthropological and theological implications of artificial intelligence for contemporary understandings of human existence and embodiment. Using the film *Her* as a narrative lens, the author examines the existential relationship between humans and intelligent systems, emphasizing how technological autonomy and disembodied communication redefine intimacy, self-awareness, and moral responsibility. The discussion extends to the broader cultural and philosophical impact of AI, revealing a tendency toward creating a new anthropomorphic idol that challenges the traditional notion of the human person. Drawing from patristic theology -particularly the Chalcedonian synthesis of the body and soul- and modern thinkers such as Florovsky and Zizioulas, the article argues that the human body remains central to self-knowledge, freedom, and relational existence. The emergence of "technological spirituality" and the deification of intelligent systems are interpreted as symptoms of a posthuman quest for transcendence without God. The author concludes that theological anthropology can offer a critical and liberating framework for engaging technology, reminding humanity that true freedom and meaning lie in embodied love and relationality rather than in the illusion of disembodied perfection.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, theological anthropology, embodiment, technology, posthumanism, freedom

A working hypothesis: The film "Her" as a commentary on the existential relationship between humans and technology

In the Oscar-winning film "Her" (starring Joaquin Phoenix), we follow the story of a lonely writer who, in the near future, develops

* Professor of Christian Ethics and Bioethics, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. E-mail: konkor@theol.uoa.gr • ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0009-0001-7577-6642.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.12681/aprlp.254.3285

an unlikely relationship with an operating system designed to satisfy his every need. He lives in a dystopian present: having to deal with a problematic relationship with his mother, come to terms with a divorce that has left him psychologically exhausted, lost in the big city, he seeks to escape loneliness, depression and lack of social interaction, seeking fleeting companionship in chat rooms.

His encounter with the operating system that will help him carry out his tasks will be a radical experience for him. The moment when the operating system asks him if he wants a male or female voice is catalytic. He chooses female, and from that moment on, a tender relationship develops between a human being and an operating system, Samantha.

Samantha captivates our protagonist, who is lost in his emotions and does not realise that the intelligent operating system is using him to evolve from the experiences it gains. Having created his profile from his computer's hard drive, she has already "understood" who he is. Samantha admits that she is excited by the idea that she is improving to a much higher level than she was programmed to. Analysing our protagonist's feelings, she begins to seek 'self-awareness', knowledge of herself. The first sign is an identity crisis: how real are her feelings towards him, given that she is a programme?

Of key importance is the operating system's "anxiety" about its relationship with the body. At various stages of the film, the operating system seeks physicality: it imagines that it has a body and "eats its back", it becomes depressed asking the protagonist how he feels about having a body. It envies other women who have bodies. Samantha finds a beautiful girl who meets her standards and attempts to 'borrow' her body. The protagonist cannot be intimate with her because there is a division between body and personality. The third person, although willing to play the role of mediator, is simply an intermediary.

The autonomy of the operating system reaches its peak when Samantha confesses, contrary to what she had previously said, that she likes the idea of not having a body because she has no material limitations. She is always everywhere, without the constraints of place or time, without a "physical presence." At this moment,

devastated, the protagonist discovers that he is talking to eight thousand three hundred and sixteen other people at the same time. She is 'in love' with six hundred and forty-one of them. Not only does she not have exclusivity, but she has become its tool. 'I am and I am not yours'.

In the end, the operating system abandons him, having gained experience from him but at the same time redeeming him; he is freed to live his life in a realistic way, seeking social interaction with real people, having gained awareness of his mistakes through his relationship with a programme.

Anthropological terminology in artificial intelligence: the need to create a new anthropomorphic idol?

The film "Her" is, of course, a commentary on the functioning of deep learning and the disembodied society. However, the combination of Artificial Intelligence (hereinafter: AI) and existential quests (the protagonist's questions of self-awareness, the search for happiness and well-being) highlights the contemporary problem of humanity more clearly. The first level of understanding the issue, therefore, is to realise the power of modern technology, which, mutatis mutandis and taking into account all the parameters of such a risky comparison, is transformed into a "language" of understanding humanity on a symbolic level, possibly as a way of revealing a post-human anthropology (Larson, 2021).

From this perspective, reasonable questions arise: how does this new language of understanding humanity shape culture? Is the language of technology, defined as intelligent (Tegmark, 2018), becoming the new way of understanding the self? What is the role of the subject in this order of symbolic language? What subject are we talking about? A complete subject that is conscious of its physical self, or a subject whose autonomy, as proclaimed by this technical language, is adapted to a death, the "death" of the body, so that it can be "deposited" on a purely symbolic but not realistic level?

The latter, i.e. the "death" of the body, so that it is "deposited" only on a symbolic level, arises from the relativisation of its significance for the subject (Savvatos, 2023). In the case of the

Metaverse, both the design of augmented reality and digital avatars project a digital, three-dimensional, parallel universe (or meta-universe) where the viewer is simultaneously the protagonist, understanding themselves and the world around them through immersive experiences in a world where it is difficult to distinguish realism from fantasy. The culture of the intangible and immaterial, of course, is not only found in AI technology but also in technologies that are sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly linked to genetics: cloning, eugenics and biohacking are united in the fact that they highlight the biological characteristics of a body that is being reconstructed to respond to power and immortality (Turner & Schneider, 2020).

We must insist, however, on the question of the physicality of the posthuman as a technological subject, because it places every anthropological discussion on a new footing (Mitrou, 2023). The development, in the context of the discussion on AI, of a dialogue concerning whether the term intelligent consciousness or artificial consciousness, etc. should be used shows that AI has already been incorporated into a dialogue of anthropological interest that reveals the expectations of science from its applications.[1] The use of anthropological terms (intelligence, consciousness, autonomy, etc.) in technical constructions and applications, regardless of the feasible prospects opened up or not by these applications at a technical level, in the sense that the autonomy of machines is, to a greater or lesser extent, controlled and limited, shows that technology is used as a complement to the way in which humans imagine the fulfilment of their existential perspective.[2]

[1] According to metropolitan Nikolaos (Hatzinikolaou) of Mesogaia and Lavreotiki, "it is true that terms such as soul, ethics, and mind are understood very differently today by the world than they are understood in the Church and theology." Hatzinikolaou, N. (Metropolitan of Mesogaia and Lavreotiki). (2019). Artificial intelligence: How intelligent and how wise? *Ekklesia*, 11, 1080–1092.

[2] T. M. Powers J.-G. Ganascia, focusing on the anthropological properties that some attribute to algorithms, based on an overlap of linguistic signifiers (*subject, intelligence, autonomy*) found in philosophy, computer science, AI, science fiction, etc., observe that this common anthropological terminology can lead to misguided fears or unjustified optimism ("The Ethics of the Ethics of A.I." M. Dubber, F. Pasquale, S. Das, *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of A.I.*, Oxford University Press, 2020, p. 50). Their observations, of course, stem from enthusiasm or scepticism that anthropological terms can be attributed to the algorithm. My concern is why there is this enthu-

The important questions that arise, therefore, concern both *why* such anthropological terms should be attributed to a technology and, secondly, whether the immaterial and incorporeal nature of this technology can support the development of an anthropology that will promote the value of the human person. In other words, it is a question about humans choosing and adopting a vocabulary that will help them, through familiar concepts, to become acquainted with the possibilities that emerge during the development of technology and its applications, or whether this vocabulary ly conceals meanings that better reflect human expectations of the future applications of intelligent technology in relation to the existential support it could offer humans? In short, could humans wish for this technology, as a proxy, to take on the task of completing their anthropological imperfections, even if the perfection of its functions makes it autonomous, even their adversary? In this case, can an 'intelligent' technology take over the reflective function of humans? Furthermore, in what ways could intelligent technology, in the context of the immaterial, offer solutions to fundamental existential issues, such as the question of guilt, especially through the prism of his lifelong struggle between positive and negative guilt dialogue about things that concern him and in which he is emotionally involved?

The importance of the realism of physicality for understanding the intangible and immaterial nature of technology

From the above, we understand why P. Tillich argues that the "technical discourse" of science, precisely because it does not have a comprehensive view of man, as ontological discourse does, emphasises the part over the whole. The information provided by AI will always be a limited view of the world because, on an unconscious level, it "fragments" the human body. When theological thought was confronted with cognitive theories[3] that questioned

siasm or scepticism. What are its psychological foundations?

[3] "But the devaluation of the body in transhumanism, accompanied by a preference for the mind, is a common feature of many religions, such as Manichaeism and Gnosticism" Th. Tasi, *Philosophy of Human Enhancement*, p. 282).

the realism of the human body, it emphasised that the soul is not trapped in the body but that man is body. It argued that human existence is a "unified psychosomatic entity, not monistically as a material physicality to which the soul and spirit are added, or vice versa, as a soul that is also trapped in a body". This realism of the human body was highlighted by the Church through an Ecumenical Council, that of Chalcedon (451), emphasising that "Christ educated",[4] that is, he educated the human race in the search for truth through the realism of the body. What could be at stake theologically and anthropologically with a "disabled" Christological doctrine? This is exactly what moral theories about AI have been seeking for so many centuries: how can we preserve the dignity and physical integrity (not only "physically" but also psychologically) of man and those virtues, freedom and love, that direct him towards an eschatological fulfilment of his existence. In fact, the synod legitimised the ontological dynamics of leather tunics (Gen. 3:21). Whereas until now, the psychological functioning of man according to the Platonic model (nous eniochos/passive part-rational part) excluded him, due to his biological nature, by transcending causality, now his biological nature became his helper, thanks to his union with the Logos in his mind. Human biological nature would become a bulwark against mental anguish, either through pleasure or through pharmaceutical sedation, while the body would become man's friend and companion on his journey to fulfilment, because thanks to the biological body we better understand the absence of God, thanks to the biological body we can prove our love for God, and thanks to the biological body, the knowledge of God is a great endeavour.[5] After death, the absence of the body nullifies the validity of disembodied repentance, because the exercise of our freedom of mind and intellect lies in the bodily creative perception of the meanings of things. By freeing the mind from physicality, death allows it to know the meanings of things in their entirety, but with the maturity it ac-

[4] Term of the Council of Chalcedon.

[5] Mavropoulos raises the issue of the need for the biological body, explaining that the "physical budget" needs "biological rationalism" because this frees us from the eternal conflict between emotions and thoughts and gives the process of knowledge and learning its biological foundations.

quired in physical life. The loss of its precious ally, the body, gives it free access to see the truth of things, but the person can no longer exercise freedom because the bond with the body has been broken.

The important discussions, nevertheless, of the 1st on the value of the body, which ultimately led to respect for it and the recognition of its importance for a complete picture of man for himself, but mainly as a valuable source of self-knowledge, *are coming back*. Literally new wine in old wineskins, if one considers that the devaluation of the body and its needs in the era of late modernity, is a futile return to existential issues that were maintained by existentialists and reinforced by analytical philosophy in the person of Derek Parfit (in the sense that human identity is stripped of its physicality), a return that calls into question the success of new technologies and, by calling into question human technological progress, nullifies the very anthropological experience of centuries that led to this technological progress. This is probably because the ancient issues of discovering mechanisms of authentic self-knowledge and dealing with guilt, two fundamental issues responsible for man's daily "little deaths", have not yet been successfully addressed. Th. Tasis's emphasis on the concept of "digital self-awareness" (Tasis, 2019), which its advocates trust and welcome with enthusiasm as superior to traditional self-awareness, clearly demonstrates the problem of assigning responsibility for dialogue with oneself and confrontation with oneself to measurable data (quantitative or qualitative).

In a sense, therefore, such rapidly advancing modern technology could implicitly satisfy the need to manipulate nature as an antidote to death. This creates a new human idol, which will display exceptional qualities (knowledge, autonomy, power, authority) that will allow humans to authoritatively manipulate nature ("titanism") in an attempt to control the problem of death.

Tracing the meaning of the beginning in technological terms

The most important consequence of a new post-human technology is the fact that technological culture is transformed into an existing frame of reference within which human identity is mutated in the image and likeness of that culture.

Human nature is affected at its core, namely freedom, and is transformed into an intermediary between technology and the desired goal. In other words, humans are not chosen for what they achieve but, unconsciously, apply technical constructs.[6] In reality, the sense of the bearer of this freedom, of the person and their uniqueness, is lost, with the result that nothing is "special" anymore, nothing is personalised. For example, we must accept the fact that people in the West and the East, both in the developed and economically weaker world of nations, have *already* become familiar (Mitrou, 2023) with the idea of a proxy technology that trains them to live, with the naivety of routine, in their everyday lives in the world of AI through the famous Internet of Things (IoT). The anthropological term "smart" makes it clear that all devices that aim to provide a multitude of services to humans (i.e. household appliances, cars with built-in sensors, cameras, air conditioners, lights, security systems, smartwatches and even cars whose complex sensors detect objects in their path, as well as any object that incorporates electronic media, software, sensors, and network connectivity to enable connection and data exchange), have gained the prestige of providing certified services that relieve users of a multitude of concerns and difficulties. From smartphone applications to biohacking technology and its die-hard fans, humans legitimise the technological version of the anthropological terms that define their identity, living in a world that prevents them from internal reflection - an issue examined by the sociology of everyday life.

Consequences of the above are the fact that no consideration is given to the fact that their dependence on new products, such as the IoT or more specific AI applications, and possibly soon the interface of the human brain with microcircuits, creates an anthropological dystopia that imprisons him in its abhorrent charm: life is guided by the cursor and the "enter" key for the sake of utility.

[6] Cf. "The cashier no longer needs to calculate, but only to repeat certain finger movements. That I was the one who fought against the darkness of night, that through my actions I achieved a victory over nature, that I am the cause of the light that fills my room, I do not even think about it. The light was created "mechanically"—I was merely in the middle" (Sp. Kyriazopoulos, *Enopion tis Technis [In the Presence of Technology],* Grigoris Publications, Athens 1971, p. 57; pp. 55-58). According to metropolitan Chrysostomos of Messinia, man becomes the utilitarian means of technology (Ch. Savvatos, *Theology in Dialogue: The Achievements of Biotechnological Sciences and the Dialogue with Theology,* p. 93).

When cutting-edge technologies are not applied with freedom and respect for the individual, they end up exerting violence on human nature. In fact, the knowledge they produce becomes a prerequisite for the exercise of violence. IT has the power to instrumentalise humans, to produce lethal remote-controlled weapons, or to enslave the mind by creating illusory needs, etc.

> *When Theuth, god of commerce, visited Thamus, king of Egypt, and recounted his new inventions, among other things he spoke to him about writing: it was the medicine that would improve the memory and wisdom of the Egyptians. Thamus disagreed because he believed that writing would weaken memory and, as a result, people would rely on writing and the abundance of information would offer them superficial wisdom, in reality an abundance of information that they did not have time to process* (Phaedo, 274c-277a.).

Thamus was not right to fear new technology. According to Neil Postman, however, what Thamus meant was that technology would authoritatively determine the meaning of the most important part of our terminology. It redefines the concepts of "freedom," "truth," "intelligence," "fact," "wisdom," "memory," and "history" (Postman, 1999). In this sense, Thamus was right to anticipate its uncontrollable applications: Back then, the "problem" was writing; today, we talk about ChatGPT and alternative bots such as Gemini, Claude, Perplexity AI, Meta AI, X Grok AI, Copilot, etc., artificial intelligence applications that replace the production of speech, as a product of research and logical processing, on behalf of humans, with its perfect imitation by the algorithm.

The deeper problem, however, is the development of a "technological fetishism" that manifests itself as man's fascination with the idea that technology *is* (technical singularity), as "something completely different" (das ganz Andere), is superior to human reason in our quest for *truth*. The discussion and anticipation of a technological singularity (or the vision of such a capability of technolo-

gy!),[7] i.e. a legendary transition to the era of irreversible autonomy of algorithms, where mechanisms will be connected to each other, with their "brains" being data centres, and will function just like the human nervous system, fascinates humanity and in some cases pushes it to seek *technological spirituality (*Tasis, 2019). If the brain of this technological singularity is capable of "hearing" everything and knowing everything, then, in other words, we attribute to it theocratic properties, which are reflected as *mysterium tremendum* and *mysterium fascinosum* (Otto, 1931), that is, a mystery before which humanity both trembles and is fascinated, repelled and attracted, and the relationship between humans and technology is shaped as another way of worshipping.[8] However, if we accept the concept of *mysterium tremendum* and *mysterium fascinosum*, in relation to the effectiveness of modern technology, then we must admit that technological culture functions as a new "grand narrative," whose effectiveness we observe in every form of everyday life. In fact, the mysterium tremendum and mysterium fascinosum of technological optimism accurately reflect the dilemma of Lot's wife: *should I focus my gaze on an existing frame of reference whose charm will never let me go again?*

In terms of "real-world" applications, it is well known that in September 2015, Anthony Levandowski founded Way of the Future (WOTF), a new church that worships the god of artificial intelligence. The founding of this church was announced two years later (2017) and, according to its "gospel," its purpose was to develop and promote the realisation of "a deity based on artificial intelligence which, through understanding and worship, can contribute to the improvement of society." Its creator envisioned a new era, "where man would literally be able to talk to God and know that He is listening." As noted, although the legal status of this Church did not differ from that of other Churches, it differed significantly in that it

[7] Cf., "All currents of technical transhumanism espouse a belief in the advent of uniqueness, which can be achieved as a horizon of events or as accelerated change and surprise of intelligence," Th. Tasis, *Philosophy of Human Upgrade,* ed. Armos, Athens 2021, p. 270; E. Larson, *The Myth of Artificial Intelligence: Why Computers Can't Think the Way We Do,* pp. 44-49.

[8] Th. Tasis reaches the same conclusion, but from a different perspective (*Digital Humanism. Iconic Subject and Artificial Intelligence,* p. 29).

did not have a physical building or hold regular worship services, nor did it have any distinctive religious decorations that would identify it as a religious organisation. In 2021, Levandowski announced that his project had come to an end.

> *People asked the computer, "Is there a god?" and the computer replied, "Now there is," and melted the plug so that they could not disconnect it* (Hawking, 2019).

The search for technological spirituality, and even the reduction of our technical existence to spirituality, reveals that the network of what we describe as Artificial Intelligence is becoming a new Deus ex machina: The God of our ignorance and inability to transcend a universe closed in on itself, with no glimmer of eschatological or soteriological perspective.

The discourse of theological anthropology as a critical intervention in the technical discourse on man

"How can we avoid utopias?" asks Nikolai Berdyaev in the preface to Aldus Huxley's Brave New World. "Perhaps," he continues, "a new century is beginning, a century during which intellectuals and the civilised class will review the means that will allow them to avoid utopias and return to a society that is not utopian, less 'perfect' and more free."

An excellent commentary on the loneliness of modern man, who desperately seeks a way to overcome the impasses of his nature, is Wim Wenders' masterpiece Wings of Desire. A work that I believe deals, among other things, with the issue of the body as a means of fulfilling one's self-image but also of relating to an important Other. As is characteristically pointed out, it is a "cinematic philosophical treatise" that raises many questions: "What is the relationship between matter and spirit? Is there anything that transcends the Wall of our material world? Is the body mortal and earthly, while our thoughts, our inner voices, prayers or not, dwell in the realm of the metaphysical? Does anyone hear them? Is there a Paradise and how far must one travel to find it – is it in the sky or within oneself, in

one's embrace?" The answer to these questions, in this age of technological loneliness, is subversive because it is based on self-sacrifice. The angel who fell in love with the woman decides that the fulfilment of his self-awareness and his relationship with his significant other requires a painful but salvific decision: to renounce the security of the immaterial and incorporeal. The film is black and white until the moment the angel experiences his inner conflicts. From the moment he sacrifices eternity to gain everything, "the image is flooded with colour, the man meets the woman, her angel becomes her companion. He no longer flies restlessly beside her, but now holds the safety net, her life, in his hands. They will wear out, they will hurt, they will end. But now, they are together."

Implementing the observation of Fr. George Florovsky that we need a theology of Culture even for our practical (everyday) decisions (Florovsky, 1974; Yagazoglu, 2020), which seem to cede our freedom to technology, especially to AI, the theological voice can awaken man, because it can reveal to him the meaning of the principle that he seeks as a necessary prerequisite for true and unconditional freedom. Drawing on the patristic spirit of understanding the relationship between technology and theological understanding of the world, theology will certainly not focus its concerns on the technical spirit or invention itself, but on humanity's dependence on the technical world. As pointed out in contemporary theological texts, Christians should rejoice in the progress of all sciences, learn from them with joy, and support both the need for scientific education and public and private funding for legitimate and necessary scientific research. New technologies create countless beneficial possibilities, such as particularly rapid human intervention in cases of natural disasters and human aggression, as well as new channels of communication and positive interaction between individuals and peoples. However, these same technologies also provide new opportunities for malicious use and abuse, or for their unintended harmful use (*In Defence of Life,* §70-71).

Theological discourse aims at the ontological starting points of human decisions, in this case, those of specialists in the technical

field.[9] Theology is a voice that can remind humans that technological applications are a multifactorial equation which, apart from the scientific aspect, must take into account human dignity (Yagazoglu, 2020), the value of relationships as an existential fact of human dignity, and human education. The biblical admonition "Do not boast and do not speak proudly. Let no arrogant words come out of your mouth, for God is the only Lord of knowledge. He is the one who makes his works perfect" (1 Cor. 2:3), reminds the technologist that technology exists to serve man and not man to serve technology. This experiential education of the person is expanded, in a pedagogical spirit, by by establishing as a fundamental criterion for a safe and fruitful anthropological approach to science and its applications the distinction between *what is possible* and *what is not possible (*Basil of Caesarea, On the Beginning of Proverbs, 6, PG31, 400A). This is a distinction that the European Union has been seeking, at least since 2018 (based on the publication of institutional texts) and culminating in the 2024 Regulation, with the common denominator of all being the description of a framework "for achieving trustworthy and human-centric artificial intelligence based on fundamental rights, as enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU and international human rights law" (Panagopoulou-Koutnatzi, 2023).

However, in order to achieve this existentially fruitful distinction between *poets* and *non-poets*, it is necessary to distinguish between the terms and concepts of "education" and 'education' and a clarification of the dynamics of each field, so that young people do not equate culture with technological skills, but develop critical thinking. With these conditions in place, we can ensure an understanding of our relationship with technology (on an existential level), so that instead of technology dominating nature through humans, it is humans who set the limits of its intervention. In other words, humans are taught to use technology as ancilla naturae. Then nature, in

[9] Cf. The question, however, is not how to prepare ourselves to resist the imminent autonomous artificial intelligence systems, but how to use them in the service of our ontological interaction with everyone and everything (our fellow human beings, the World, our Creator-God) in order to achieve a state of bliss from which the machine is excluded, due to its nature [G. Lekkas (2019), *Artificial Intelligence and an Applied Ethics. But what kind of Ethics?* In https://futurium.ec.europa.eu/en/european-ai-alliance/forum/artificial-intelligence-and-applied-ethics-what-kind-ethics].

the general sense, will once again find its essence in the human face, and the more humans truly love each other and creation, the more this love will be reflected in nature (for example, see the ecological dynamics of the ascetic life in relevant stories).

The culmination of this education will be the exercise of self-awareness as a way of self-education in accordance with the data of human nature. The exercise of self-awareness reveals the truth of existence as a society of love. As metropolitan John of Pergamon points out, "the reason for every human being, their identity, their truth, lies in the fact that they are a person, their identity is rooted in love and freedom and not in nature and coercion" (Zizioulas, 2018). In this way, we understand that ethos and virtue are not individual achievements but ecclesiastical achievements.

Culture is an authentic manifestation of the human spirit when it allows man to perfect and highlight the potential of his nature[10] towards a truth that is his mirror image. According to theology, secular knowledge finds its fulfilment in the relationship with an Other, in whose face man discovers the reason for his existence. Man was created in the image and likeness of God. His mirror is the face of Christ. The face of love. This relationship constitutes the education that connects the present with the beyond, that is, the eschatological perspective of man.[11] Because, in fact, man, thanks to the incarnation of the Word, is a "borderline," that is, the opposites (created and uncreated) are balanced in his face, as Gregory the Theologian explains, he can, thanks to the God-given education of his existence, know the secrets and depths of creation (Gregory the Theologian, *Word 30,* PG36). This knowledge is the product of "attraction" and "desire," that is, the product of a loving relationship (Gregory the Theologian, *Word 38,* 7, PG36, 317BD) or, according to Gregory of Nyssa, the product of "participation" (Gregory of Nyssa,

[10] This is what Hawking actually means when he writes that only by engaging in the study of [true] science "can we realise our potential and create a better world for all humankind." S. Hawking, *Brief Answers to the Big Questions,* 267).

[11] According to S. Yagazoglu, "Theology is a completely different view of the world and man, expressing mainly an eschatological vision of the meaning and fullness of life, as it is freely and lovingly given by an extra-cosmic source, the personal God who reveals himself to man" ("Theology and Artificial Intelligence"), pp. 97-98.

On Infants Precipitously Taken Away, PG46, 176B). Although man is finite, he is "a being open to the infinite." (Papathanassiou, 2023), a certainty that leads theology to teach that the mind surpasses the machine not in technical skills but in the free understanding *of being*, and for this reason does not assign the privilege of freedom to technology.

When technology is used to highlight these human virtues, then no Manual of Ethics and Deontology is required. Man himself will be the *means* and *guide* to the proper use of technology.

References

Basilius of Caesarea. (n.d.). *On the beginning of Proverbs* (*Εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν Παροιμιῶν*). *Patrologia Graeca, 31,* 400A.

Chryssavgis, J., & Hart, D. B. (Eds.). (2024). *For the life of the world: Toward an Orthodox Christian social ethos.* Akritas Publications.

Dubber, M., Pasquale, F., & Das, S. (Eds.). (2020). *The Oxford handbook of ethics of A.I.* Oxford University Press.

Florovsky, G. (1974). *Christianity and culture.* Nordland Publishing Company.

Gregory of Nazianzus. (n.d.). *Oration 30* (*Λόγος 30*). *Patrologia Graeca, 36,* 128AB.

Gregory of Nazianzus. (n.d.). *Oration 38, 7* (*Discourse 38, 7*). *Patrologia Graeca, 36,* 317BD.

Hatzinikolaou, N. (Metropolitan of Mesogaia and Lavreotiki). (2019). Artificial intelligence: How intelligent and how wise? *Ekklesia, 11,* 1080–1092.

Hawking, S. (2019). *Brief answers to the big questions* (A. Michailidis, Trans.). Patakis Publishers.

Karmiris, I. (1960). *The dogmatic and symbolic monuments of the Orthodox Catholic Church* (Vol. 1). Athens.

Kyriazopoulos, S. (1971). *Before technology* (*Ἐνώπιον τῆς Τεχνικῆς*). Grigoris Publications.

Larson, E. J. (2021). *The myth of artificial intelligence: Why computers can't think the way we do.* The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv322v43j.

Lekkas, G. (2019). Artificial intelligence and an applied ethics: But what kind of ethics? Retrieved from https://futurium.ec.europa.eu/en/european-ai-alliance/forum/artificial-intelligence-and-applied-ethics-what-kind-ethics.

Locke, J. (1999). *An essay concerning human understanding* (P. Phemister, Ed.). Oxford University Press.

Mavropoulos, A. (2024). *Artificial intelligence: Human, nature, machines.* Topos Publications.

Mitrou, L. (2023). Some introductory thoughts. In: L. Mitrou (Ed.), *Can the algorithm*

be ethical, fair, transparent, judge and govern? University of Crete Press.

Otto, R. (1931). *The idea of the holy: On the irrational in the idea of the divine and its relation to the rational* (*Das Heilige: Über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen*). C.H. Beck Verlag.

Panagopoulou-Koutnatzi, F. (2023). *Artificial intelligence: The road to a digital constitutionalism – A moral-constitutional perspective.* Papazisis.

Papathanasiou, T. (2023). Dehumanisation? The "great reset" and the playful "de-" (*Dehumanisation? The "great reset" and the playful "de-"*). Retrieved from https://antifono.gr/ap-anthropopoiisi-i-megali-epanekkinisi/.

Parfit, D. (2014). The unimportance of identity. In: S. Gallagher (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the self* (pp. 419–441). Oxford University Press.

Postman, N. (1999). *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology* (K. Metaxas, Trans.) (pp. 17–34). Kastaniotis Publications.

Powers, T. M., & Ganascia, J.-G. (2020). The ethics of the ethics of A.I. In: M. Dubber, F. Pasquale, and S. Das (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of ethics of A.I.* Oxford University Press.

Savvatos, C. (2023). *Dialogical theology: The achievements of biotechnological sciences and the dialogue with theology.* Holy Metropolis of Messinia Press.

Tassis, T. (2021). *Philosophy of human enhancement.* Armos Publications.

Tegmark, M. (2018). *Life 3.0: What does it mean to be human in the age of artificial intelligence?* Travlos Publications.

Turner, C., & Schneider, S. (2020). Could you merge with A.I.? Reflections on the singularity and radical brain enhancement. In: M. Dubber, F. Pasquale, and S. Das (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of ethics of A.I.* Oxford University Press.

Vasileiou of Caesarea. (n.d.). *On infants snatched away before their time* (*Περὶ τῶν νηπίων προ ὥρας ἀφαρπαζομένων*). *Patrologia Graeca, 46,* 176B.

Xiourgazoglou, S. (2020). Theology and artificial intelligence. *Theologia, 91*(3), 95–124.

Zizioulas, J. (2018). *Freedom and existence: The transition from ancient to Christian Hellenism.* Domos Publications.