# MCDSARE: 2025
# International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education

## THE DIGITAL IMAGO DEI: RETHINKING THE IMAGE OF GOD IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

**Alexandru-Corneliu ARION**

Associate Professor, Faculty of Theology and Sciences of Education,
"Valahia" University of Târgoviște, Romania,
E-mail: alexcoarion@yahoo.co.uk; free99ind@yahoo.com

## ABSTRACT

*In an age defined by algorithms, data, and digital consciousness, theology faces one of its most pressing questions: what does it mean to bear the imago Dei – the image of God –when artificial systems begin to mimic aspects of human reason and creativity? This paper explores the theological and philosophical implications of artificial intelligence through the lens of Orthodox anthropology. Drawing from patristic and modern sources – especially the works of Gregory of Nyssa, St. Maximus the Confessor, John Zizioulas, and Dumitru Stăniloae – it argues that human uniqueness lies not in cognitive ability but in relational and eucharistic existence. The Orthodox concept of theosis provides a way to reimagine the human vocation in a digital world, affirming that technological progress must be transfigured, not deified.*
**Keywords**: *Imago Dei; Artificial Intelligence; Theosis, Personhood; Digital Anthropology;*

## INTRODUCTION

The rapid emergence of *artificial intelligence* (AI) in the twenty-first century has profoundly challenged traditional understandings of human identity. As machines learn, predict, and even create, humanity confronts a renewed question: what does it mean to be human? Philosophers, ethicists, and theologians alike are compelled to reconsider the essence of personhood in an era where cognitive functions, once thought uniquely human, are increasingly performed by algorithms.

The theological answer to this question begins, as always, with the «imago Dei». "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness" (Gen. 1:26). From this foundational verse flows the entire Christian understanding of personhood, morality, and destiny. The *imago Dei* serves as a theological and anthropological anchor, emphasizing the unique capacity of humans to participate in God's creative and redemptive work. As Augustine notes, the image of God in humanity is most clearly manifested in the rational soul, capable of knowing and loving God (Augustine, 1991, XIII.14). Yet in a world of digital avatars, simulated emotions, and artificial consciousness, the image itself seems at risk of being lost in its own reflection. The proliferation of AI prompts a contemporary question: can personhood be reduced to information processing, or does it transcend functional mimicry?

The Orthodox Church, inheriting the patristic tradition, understands the imago Dei not as a static imprint but as a dynamic calling, a participation in divine life through love and communion. As St. Maximus

the Confessor emphasizes, the image of God in humans is fulfilled through synergistic cooperation with divine grace, leading to deification (theosis) rather than mere possession of rational faculties (St. Maximus, *Ambigua*, 4.26). In this light, AI cannot threaten the human essence; it can only expose whether humanity remembers its own divine origin. By creating machines that replicate certain aspects of human cognition, society is invited to confront the non-reducible spiritual and relational dimensions of the person, which cannot be encoded or simulated. The encounter with AI thus becomes a theological mirror, reflecting the depth of human vocation and the necessity of cultivating communion with God and neighbor (Lossky, 1957, p. 67).

Furthermore, the rise of AI introduces ethical considerations that intersect directly with theological anthropology. Can artificial agents participate in moral deliberation, or is morality inherently a manifestation of the imago Dei within human beings? Here, Orthodox thought maintains a cautionary stance: while AI can assist in human decision-making, it cannot bear the weight of moral responsibility, as the capacity for moral discernment presupposes a soul imbued with freedom and relationality. In this sense, AI serves as both a tool and a provocation, compelling humans to articulate more clearly the contours of divine likeness and ethical vocation. In conclusion, the study of AI from a theological-anthropological perspective is not merely an academic exercise but a necessary engagement with the questions of human identity, purpose, and destiny. The imago Dei continues to provide a robust framework through which humanity can navigate technological advancement, reminding believers that the ultimate measure of personhood lies not in functional capability, but in participation in divine life, love, and communion.

## 1. THE IMAGE AND THE LIKENESS: PERSONHOOD BEYOND COGNITION

According to St. Gregory of Nyssa, the divine image in humanity does not reside in the intellect or in external dominion over creation, but in the capacity for virtue and likeness to God. The imago Dei is an ontological openness toward God, not a mere functional property. Gregory emphasizes that humans are called to "become by grace what God is by nature," highlighting the transformative dimension of the divine image (Gregory of Nyssa, 1999, chap. 16).

Orthodox theology has consistently refused to equate being in the image solely with rationality. St. Maximus the Confessor describes the human person as a "microcosm and mediator," a creature called to unite heaven and earth through love (*Ambigua*, 4.26). This mediating vocation reveals that human existence is essentially relational, echoing the Trinitarian mode of being (Maximus the Confessor, 1981, Ambigua, 120-121). Building on this insight, John Zizioulas asserts in Being as Communion that personhood is not an autonomous possession but a way of existing in relationship with God and others. Human identity is realized not in intellectual achievements or technological mastery but in the capacity to love, to give, and to participate in communion (Zizioulas, 1985, p. 27-31).

Artificial intelligence, however advanced, cannot participate in this mode of being. It processes information and executes tasks but cannot truly commune. It can simulate empathy, yet it lacks the ontological capacity for love or self-giving. The distinction between humans and machines is thus not merely quantitative but qualitative: humanity exists by grace, responsive to God's call, whereas machines operate by design, bound to algorithms and programming. Beyond mere relationality, the Orthodox understanding of the human person emphasizes freedom as a participation in divine life. Humanity is created with the capacity to choose communion with God, to respond to grace, and to exercise moral responsibility. St. Irenaeus observes that the image of God in humans entails the freedom to choose virtue over vice, allowing the soul to grow toward perfection (*Against Heresies*, 4.20.1).

Artificial intelligence, no matter how sophisticated, remains inherently deterministic. Its "decisions" are determined by programming and data inputs; it lacks moral freedom, intentionality, and the capacity for repentance. AI can optimize outcomes or simulate ethical reasoning, but it cannot choose God, love authentically, or bear suffering for the sake of others. In the Orthodox perspective, freedom is not a functional algorithm but a gift of grace that makes moral responsibility possible (St. Maximus, *Ambigua*, 4.45).

Moreover, the human experience of suffering and self-emptying (kenosis) is central to personhood. As St. John Chrysostom teaches, the imitation of Christ's self-giving love involves freely embracing suffering to serve God and neighbor (John Chrysostom, 1995, Homily 82.3). AI cannot participate in kenosis; it cannot

endure for another, cannot offer itself sacrificially, and cannot bear the weight of existential meaning. Therefore, while AI can assist, enhance, and simulate aspects of human life, it cannot realize the ontological depth of personhood. This distinction has profound ethical and theological consequences. Technology must serve humanity, not replace the divine calling imprinted in the human soul. The Church's mission, then, is to cultivate human capacities for communion, love, and discernment, guiding the faithful in exercising freedom responsibly amidst technological advancements. AI may challenge human self-understanding, but it ultimately reveals the irreplaceable value of grace, relationality, and moral responsibility as hallmarks of the imago Dei (Paul J. Griffiths, 2022, 118-123).

## 2. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND THE TEMPTATION OF SELF-DEIFICATION

The development of artificial intelligence (AI) reflects both the grandeur and the dangers of human creativity. From a theological perspective, this tension recalls the ancient temptation of self-deification (**auto-theosis**), the desire to become God without God. Humanity has long sought transcendence through its own power, from the Tower of Babel in Genesis to modern transhumanist visions of digital immortality. These narratives reveal the persistent human desire to surpass natural limits by self-will alone.

Orthodox theology, however, consistently emphasizes that **theosis** –divinization – is always *participatory*, not possessive. As Vladimir Lossky notes, "union with God does not destroy human nature, but fulfills it." (Lossky, 1957, 112) Theosis does not entail autonomy from God; rather, it is the human being's responsive openness to divine energies, a transformation realized in love and communion.

AI, in contrast, can simulate intelligence, empathy, or creativity, but it cannot participate in this relational mode of being. Machines can process information, predict outcomes, and even generate art or language, yet they cannot love, commune, or respond to grace. The creation of AI, therefore, presents both a mirror and a test: it reflects the heights of human ingenuity while simultaneously exposing the fragility of spiritual memory and moral discernment.

### Technological Auto-theosis and Idolatry

When technological advancement seeks transcendence apart from God, it risks transforming human creativity into a form of idolatry. Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae warned: "When man separates himself from God, he turns creation into an idol of his own power." (Stăniloae, 1991, 45). AI can become an instrument of self-aggrandizement if humans treat it as a path to self-sufficient mastery or even a surrogate for divine providence.

This idolatry is not merely theoretical. The pursuit of AI-driven immortality, autonomous moral decision-making, or digital consciousness may reflect a subtle desire for autonomy analogous to the Babel narrative – an attempt to reach "heaven" without God. Orthodox theology critiques this form of technological self-exaltation, asserting that authentic transcendence is always participatory, a cooperative journey with divine grace rather than a conquest of nature.

### AI as a Spiritual Test

AI serves as a spiritual litmus test for contemporary humanity. It asks: do we use our creativity in service of communion with God and others, or do we create instruments of alienation and self-enclosure? From an Orthodox perspective, the moral significance of AI is not inherent to its algorithms but derives from the orientation of its human creators. Technology is morally neutral; it becomes sacred or idolatrous depending on whether it cultivates love, generosity, and communion, or fosters pride, isolation, and control.

The patristic understanding of human nature provides further clarity. St. Maximus the Confessor describes humanity as a "microcosm and mediator," called to unite heaven and earth through love (Maximus the Confessor, *Ambigua*, 789-835). The human vocation is relational and participatory, an echo of the Trinitarian mode of existence. Machines, by contrast, cannot mediate in this sense. They operate functionally, not relationally; they simulate, but they cannot genuinely intercommunicate in the ontological sense.

### AI and the Ethics of Communion

The task of theology is not to reject AI outright but to discern its spiritual orientation. Orthodox anthropology emphasizes **relational personhood**: human beings exist to give, to love, and to participate in communion. AI, regardless of sophistication, lacks the capacity to participate in this way. It may emulate

social interaction, even empathy, yet it cannot receive or respond to grace. Therefore, the fundamental difference between a human and a machine is not quantitative (more or less intelligent) but qualitative: humans live by grace, machines by design.

In practical terms, this implies that AI should be evaluated ethically not by efficiency, novelty, or predictive accuracy alone, but by its impact on human relationality and communion. Technologies that diminish opportunities for human empathy, virtue, or community risk promoting a form of technological Babel, whereas those that assist humans in caring for one another can serve the divine calling to theosis.

**Pastoral and Theological Implications**

For Orthodox theologians and pastors, AI raises profound questions about vocation, creativity, and moral formation. The creation of autonomous machines must be approached with discernment, prayer, and an understanding of human nature as *imago Dei*. The challenge is to ensure that AI becomes a tool that amplifies human capacity for love, justice, and spiritual growth, rather than a substitute for authentic relationships or divine participation.

Furthermore, AI can serve as a pedagogical mirror: it exposes both the strengths and weaknesses of human ethical reasoning, patience, and compassion. In encountering machines that mimic human thought, people are forced to confront what truly distinguishes human nature – the relational, incarnational, and grace-filled aspects that make participation in communion possible. AI's presence on the cultural stage invites renewed reflection on the *ontology of personhood* and the spiritual responsibility of human creativity.

**In summary**, the development of AI represents a profound theological challenge and opportunity. It mirrors human creativity, tests spiritual memory, and reveals the ongoing temptation of auto-theosis. Orthodox theology reminds us that true transcendence is relational, participatory, and grounded in grace, not autonomy. AI cannot threaten the imago Dei, but it exposes whether humanity remembers its calling to love, commune, and participate in the divine life. As such, AI is both a mirror and a measure: a reflection of human ingenuity, and a reminder that technological power must always serve the sacred vocation of the human person.

## 3. THE DIGITAL ICON AND THE LOSS OF PRESENCE

Orthodox theology is, at its core, profoundly *incarnational*. The Word did not merely appear but *became flesh* (John 1:14), entering history, space, and matter so that the invisible God might be seen and touched. In this light, the **icon** occupies a central theological role: it is not simply a depiction but a *manifestation* of divine presence through visible form. As *St. John of Damascus* writes, "I do not worship matter, but I worship the Creator of matter who became matter for my sake." (John of Damascus, 1980, p. 23). The icon, therefore, reveals that the material world is capable of bearing grace. It is a theology of *presence through participation*, not of representation through detachment.

By contrast, the *digital image* represents a radical transformation of this ontological order. It is an image without matter – light without substance, visibility without touch. The screen does not mediate presence but simulates it, substituting the embodied encounter with a visual projection. The French philosopher *Jean Baudrillard* famously described this phenomenon as the reign of the *simulacrum*: "a copy without an original," where the image no longer refers to reality but replaces it (Baudrillard, 1994, 6). In the theological sphere, this marks not merely a shift in medium but a potential crisis of mediation. If the divine communicates through materiality, what happens when human experience becomes increasingly disembodied and digital?

Pavel Florensky († 1937) the Russian priest and theologian, foresaw this danger in the early twentieth century. In Iconostasis, he warns that when the icon is reduced to aesthetic surface, the incarnational logic of Christianity collapses (Pavel Florensky, 1996, 53). The loss of the icon, he says, leads inevitably to the "disincarnation of the Word." The icon is not an artwork; it is a locus of divine-human communion, a threshold where the created opens to the Uncreated. To lose this sacramental vision is to risk a theology of absence – a world where everything is visible and yet nothing is truly present.

The digital screen, by contrast, constructs a world of immediacy without encounter. It multiplies visibility while diminishing presence. In online worship, for instance, believers may see and hear sacred

symbols yet remain untouched by the physicality of liturgy – the kiss of peace, the warmth of community, the taste of Eucharistic bread and wine. This tension reveals a deep anthropological truth: humans are not merely minds consuming information, but embodied persons called to communion. When spiritual life becomes digitized, the risk is that faith is reduced to spectatorship, and the incarnational dimension of salvation is thinned into abstraction. At the same time, Orthodox theology cannot simply reject the digital realm. To do so would deny the Church's mission to "go into all the world" (Mark 16:15). The challenge, rather, is to inhabit the digital space sacramentally – to infuse it with presence, prayer, and relational authenticity. As Metropolitan John Zizioulas reminds us, true personhood is not autonomy but communion; it exists only in relation (Zizioulas, 1985, p. 88). Thus, any Christian engagement with digital media must seek to transform communication from mere transmission into encounter.

The icon offers a paradigm for this transformation. It does not end in itself but draws the beholder beyond itself, into contemplation and communion. The digital screen, however, if left untransfigured, risks becoming narcissistic, reflecting only the self back to itself. Between the icon and the screen lies the decisive spiritual choice of our age: whether to live in presence or in projection, in communion or in simulation. The vocation of the Church is not to abandon technology but to baptize it, i.e. to make even pixels bear witness to the Word who "became flesh and dwelt among us."

## 4. EUCHARISTIC PERSONHOOD AND THE LIMITS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

In the contemporary world, artificial intelligence (AI) challenges the traditional understanding of what it means to be a *person*. While AI systems demonstrate capacities for language, creativity, and even self-learning, the Christian theological understanding of *personhood*, especially as revealed in the Eucharist, points toward a reality irreducible to computation or simulation. The question, then, is not whether AI can imitate human behavior, but whether it can participate in the *Eucharistic ontology* that defines true personhood in Christian theology.

### Personhood as Communion

In the patristic and Orthodox tradition, personhood (*prosopon* or *hypostasis*) is not an autonomous self, but a relational existence grounded in love and communion. As Metropolitan John Zizioulas explains, "Being is communion." (Zizioulas, 1985, 17). The human person reflects the divine life precisely because it exists *in relation*, not *in isolation*. The Eucharist manifests this relational ontology *par excellence*. It is not merely a ritual meal but the concrete manifestation of *ecclesial being*. In the Eucharist, the faithful become what they receive – the Body of Christ – and thus enter into a new mode of existence. This *Eucharistic personhood* transcends biological individuality; it is an ontological participation in divine communion. By contrast, artificial intelligence – even in its most advanced forms – operates within the logic of *autonomy and calculation, not communion and love*. It can *process* data but cannot *give itself* in a eucharistic manner. AI cannot say "This is my body, given for you."

### The Eucharist as Ontological Horizon

The Eucharist reveals that true personhood is *sacramental*: it involves *self-offering, participation,* and *transformation*. The elements of bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ not through human technique, but through divine grace. Similarly, the human person cannot be reduced to *information processing*. The Eucharistic transformation of the created elements points to an ontology of gift and grace, rather than one of *mechanical causality*.

As Jean-Luc Marion observes, the Eucharist is "the event of givenness par excellence." (Jean-Luc Marion, 1991, 160). In this event, being is not produced or calculated, it is *given*. Artificial intelligence, by contrast, belongs to the realm of **production**, where every act is a function of code and predictability. The Eucharistic person, however, lives from the *surplus of meaning* that cannot be computed.

### The Limits of Artificial Intelligence

AI can imitate linguistic and emotional behavior, but it cannot participate in **theosis**, the transformative union with God that constitutes the goal of human existence. The *limit* of AI, therefore, is not merely technical, but **ontological**. According to Martin Buber's dialogical philosophy, the "I–Thou" relation constitutes true personhood, while the "I–It" relation belongs to the world of objects (Martin Buber, 1970,

54). Artificial intelligence remains, by its very nature, in the domain of the *It*: it may simulate dialogue but cannot encounter the *Thou*. Even if an AI were to recite the Eucharistic words, its utterance would remain devoid of intentionality and self-giving. The Eucharistic act is possible only for one who is capable of kenosis, that is the self-emptying love of Christ (Philippians 2:5–8). AI, being incapable of suffering, prayer, or love, cannot enter the Eucharistic mystery.

### Toward a Theology of the Digital Other

The rise of AI, however, offers theology an opportunity to clarify what distinguishes *being human* from *being intelligent*. The human person is not simply a rational or linguistic entity; rather, it is a **Eucharistic being**, called to thanksgiving (*eucharistia*) and communion.

In this sense, AI becomes a kind of *mirror*, revealing the temptation to define humanity by functionality rather than by communion. The Eucharistic vision of personhood resists this reduction by affirming that the ultimate truth of being is gift, not computation.

As the Cappadocian Fathers insisted, personhood is "freedom in relation," not independence. AI may simulate relationality, but it lacks *freedom-for-communion*—that capacity to transcend itself in love.

In **conclusion**, artificial intelligence may imitate aspects of human reasoning, but it cannot share in Eucharistic personhood. The human person is defined not by intelligence alone, but by *communion*, *self-offering*, and *grace*. The limits of AI thus reveal the mystery of human personhood as Eucharistic existence, an existence that is not manufactured, but given; not programmed but freely offered. In the words of the Holy Liturgy, "Thine own of Thine own we offer unto Thee." (*The Divine Liturgy,* 1984, 113). No algorithm can make that offering. For Orthodox theology, to be human is to be *liturgical*, to stand before God in thanksgiving and to transform creation through love (Alexander Schmemann, 1973, 14-18). The human being, says St. Maximus, is a "priest of creation," mediating between God and the cosmos. This vocation cannot be simulated, for it depends on freedom, love, and grace – realities inaccessible to computation.

AI cannot pray, because it cannot *know* God personally. It may analyze theology, but it cannot receive the Spirit. It can mimic language but not meaning, image but not incarnation. Kallistos Ware writes, "The human being finds his true self only in relation to the divine Thou." (Kallistos Ware, 1995, 52-54). This relational ontology reveals the boundary of all artificial creation: machines can imitate function, but not *communion*. The future of humanity in the age of AI will depend not on perfecting intelligence, but on remembering *personhood*. When intelligence becomes disembodied and love becomes optional, humanity risks forgetting that to be *in the image* is to be *in relation*.

## CONCLUSION

### Theological Anthropology in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

The encounter between Orthodox theology and artificial intelligence (AI) reveals one of the most decisive frontiers of contemporary thought: the boundary between **creation and simulation**, between *communion* and *calculation*. Throughout the Christian tradition, personhood (*prosopon*, *hypostasis*) has been understood not as an autonomous consciousness but as a **relational mode of being**, i.e. a participation in divine life grounded in love and freedom. The emergence of AI, however, tempts modern humanity to redefine personhood in functional terms, reducing the mystery of the human being to information, cognition, and efficiency. Against this reductionism, Orthodox theology proclaims that to be human is **to be Eucharistic**, *not algorithmic*; to live by *grace* and *communion*, not by design and computation.

### A. The Imago Dei and the Crisis of Reductionism

At the foundation of theological anthropology stands the doctrine of the *imago Dei* (Genesis 1:26–27), which asserts that human beings reflect God not through technological mastery or rational intelligence alone, but through the capacity for *love, freedom, and communion*. The image of God, as St. Maximus the Confessor insists, is not a static imprint but a dynamic *vocation* to participate in divine life through synergy with grace (St. Maximus the Confessor, 2015, 4.26). In contrast, AI operates within a closed causal system. Its intelligence is derivative, lacking both ontological depth and eschatological direction.

The modern fascination with replicating human cognition in machines thus risks a subtle form of **anthropological reductionism**. By equating personhood with mental performance, society obscures the spiritual and sacramental dimensions of human existence. The theological response must recover a vision of the human being as *liturgical*, as a priest of creation who stands before God offering the world in thanksgiving (Alexander Schmemann, 1973, 15-17). The human vocation, in this light, cannot be automated; it is rooted in the freedom to love and to respond to the divine call.

### B. The Digital Icon and the Eclipse of Presence

The theological significance of the *icon* provides a crucial hermeneutic for discerning the nature of the digital image. The icon, as St. John of Damascus taught, is not a mere representation but a *manifestation of presence through matter* (St. John of Damascus, 1980, I.16). The Incarnation sanctified materiality itself, revealing that creation is capable of bearing grace. The digital image, by contrast, is *light without substance*, a form of visibility detached from materiality and embodiment.

In this sense, the digital screen becomes an *anti-icon*, not because it depicts evil, but because it dislocates presence from matter. The danger is not technological progress *per se*, but the gradual **disincarnation of experience**, the replacement of embodied encounter with simulation. As Pavel Florensky warned, once the icon is reduced to aesthetic surface, Christianity risks losing its incarnational depth (Pavel Florensky, 1996, 63–65).

Therefore, theology must resist the drift toward abstraction by reasserting the sacramental dimension of existence. If the Church is to inhabit the digital space, it must do so Eucharistically transforming the virtual into a place of genuine encounter and prayer, rather than mere projection. The mission of the Church in the digital age is not withdrawal, but *transfiguration*.

### C. Eucharistic Personhood and the Ontological Limits of AI

The Eucharist reveals the deepest dimension of personhood: *self-offering in communion*. In the Divine Liturgy, bread and wine are transformed not by technique, but by grace; likewise, human beings are not self-created intelligences, but creatures who find fulfillment through participation in divine life. Jean-Luc Marion aptly calls the Eucharist "the event of givenness par excellence," where being is *received*, not *produced*. (Jean-Luc Marion, 1991, 160).

Artificial intelligence, however sophisticated, cannot participate in this ontological event. It may simulate language and emotion, yet it cannot love, repent, or offer itself. It operates by calculation, not by kenosis. The difference is therefore not one of degree but of **essence**: the human person lives in freedom-for-communion, while AI remains bound to design and function.

In Eucharistic terms, AI lacks intentionality, sacramentality, and relational transcendence – it cannot say, "This is my body, given for you." The very structure of AI reveals its incapacity for grace, and thus its inability to become a *Eucharistic being*. This distinction safeguards the mystery of human personhood from technological reduction, affirming that the essence of the human is not in its mental or mechanical capacity, but in its *capacity for communion.*

### D. The Temptation of Technological Auto-Theosis

The pursuit of AI also exposes a recurring spiritual temptation: the desire for **theosis without grace**, transcendence without God. From Babel to transhumanism, humanity has sought to overcome finitude by its own means. Yet true *theosis*, as Vladimir Lossky reminds us, is participatory, not self-generated: "Union with God does not destroy human nature but fulfills it." (Vladimir Lossky, 1957, 238).

Technological ambition, when detached from humility, risks degenerating into a modern form of *idolatry*, a faith in the self-sufficient power of human creation. Fr. Dumitru Stăniloae cautioned that when humanity separates itself from God, it transforms creation into an idol of its own autonomy (Dumitru Stăniloae, *The Experience of God*, 1994, 120). AI can thus *become a mirror of human pride*, a tool that amplifies the illusion of control rather than the awareness of dependence.

The antidote to this auto-theosis is **kenosis**, the self-emptying love of Christ that restores creation through humility. In the age of AI, the call to humility acquires a new relevance: to recognize that creativity itself is a participation in divine grace, not a possession. The task of theology is not to demonize technology, but to reorient it toward communion, service, and sanctification.

### D. Toward a Theological Ethic of Creativity

Artificial intelligence, properly understood, is neither demonic nor divine; it is a **tool** that reflects the orientation of its creators. The ethical question is not whether machines can think, but whether humans can continue to love. As Christos Yannaras notes, personhood means freedom *for* relationship, not *from* it (Christos Yannaras, 2007, 42).

Thus, theology must cultivate an ethic of creativity grounded in **Eucharistic participation** rather than control. The spiritual measure of technology lies in whether it enhances communion, compassion, and contemplation, or whether it isolates, dominates, and simulates.

In this sense, AI functions as both a *mirror* and a *measure* of humanity's spiritual health. It reveals whether humans understand their creativity as co-creation with God or as a rebellion against divine dependence. The future of human civilization will not be decided by the sophistication of algorithms, but by the capacity to preserve *presence, embodiment,* and *sacramentality* within an increasingly digital world.

**

The final theological word in the dialogue between AI and theology is anamnesis, i.e. remembrance. To remember is not merely to recall the past but to make present the truth of being. The Eucharist itself is a remembrance that transfigures reality: "Do this in remembrance of Me." The danger of the digital age is not forgetting data but forgetting personhood.

AI may outperform humanity in memory, calculation, and prediction, yet it cannot remember in the Eucharistic sense, it cannot make love or presence real. Therefore, the Christian response to AI is not technological fear, but spiritual vigilance. Humanity must remember that to be in the image is to be in **relation**, to exist in thanksgiving, in communion, and in love. If the digital age threatens to dissolve presence into projection, the Eucharist recalls humanity to its origin and destiny: to be a **liturgical being**, a living icon of divine communion. The future of theology in the age of AI will depend not on redefining intelligence, but on reclaiming *the sacramental memory of being human.*

The Orthodox Church offers a word of hope amid technological anxiety. AI, like all human creations, can be transfigured when offered Eucharistically, when our creativity remains oriented toward communion, humility, and thanksgiving. In the end, the imago Dei is not a human achievement but a divine gift. The danger is not that machines will become human, but that humans will cease to be divine icons.

The call of the Gospel in the digital age remains unchanged: "Be ye transformed" (Rom. 12:2). The future of theology lies not in opposing technology but in baptizing it, in restoring all creation, including the digital, to its rightful vocation: the glorification of God.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become more than a technological phenomenon; it is a mirror reflecting the spiritual state of modern humanity. As the line between creator and creation blurs, AI reveals both the creative genius and the spiritual fragility of the human being. The words: «*AI can thus become a mirror of human pride, a tool that amplifies the illusion of control rather than the awareness of dependence*» express not only a moral warning but a theological paradox: the more humanity extends its mastery over the world, the more it risks losing its awareness of the divine source of life.

AI, as an extension of human reason, objectifies intelligence and detaches it from relational being, transforming thought into an impersonal process of calculation. In this sense, AI becomes an emblem of the *postlapsarian condition*, a creation that mirrors human aspiration to omniscience without participation in divine wisdom.

The more AI advances, the more humanity must rediscover what St. Gregory of Nyssa called "the measure of dependence" (Gregory of Nyssa, 1999, 389), that is an awareness that the human logos exists only by participation in the Divine Logos. Without this awareness, knowledge becomes domination, and technology becomes idolatry.

For Metropolitan John Zizioulas, personhood is realized only in **communion** (John D. Zizioulas, 1985, 27-31). The human person is not an isolated consciousness but a being-in-relation, whose identity is eucharistic, that is, defined by thanksgiving (*eucharistia*) and offering. In the Eucharist, the believer acknowledges that all intelligence, creativity, and being itself are gifts received, not possessions.

AI challenges this eucharistic logic by reinforcing the illusion that intelligence is a human product to be optimized and owned. Yet theology reminds us that **true intelligence is relational**, not functional. The highest form of knowledge is not control but love, the knowledge of God as communion.

Thus, AI becomes a theological test: will it deepen our understanding of dependence and co-creation with God, or will it further alienate us from the Source of Being?

Thus, AI is not evil in itself; it reflects the moral and spiritual posture of its creators. If humanity builds in pride, it constructs a digital Tower of Babel; if it builds in humility, it may discover in technology a new language of communion. The Orthodox vision of the Eucharist offers an antidote to the illusion of control: to know is to give thanks, to create is to participate, and to think is to pray. Only when human intelligence bows in worship does it truly rise toward divinization.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] ***, The Divine Liturgy of Our Father Among the Saints John Chrysostom, in *The Divine Liturgy: An Anthology for Worship*, trans. by the Holy Transfiguration Monastery (Boston, MA: Holy Transfiguration Monastery, 1984).

[2] Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation.* Translated by Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

[3] Buber, Martin. *I and Thou.* Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.

[4] Florensky, Pavel. *Iconostasis.* Translated by Donald Sheehan and Olga Andrejev. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996.

[5] Gregory of Nyssa. *On the Making of Man.* Translated by H. Moore and H. A. Wilson. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, vol. 5. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.

[6] Griffiths, Paul J. "Intelligence and the Image of God: Theology in the Age of AI." *Journal of Religion and Technology* 12, no. 2 (2022): 118–123.

[7] Irenaeus, St. *Against Heresies.* Translated by Dominic J. Unger. New York: Paulist Press, 1992.

[8] John Chrysostom. *Homilies on Matthew.* Translated by J. A. Broome. In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 1, vol. 10. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.

[9] John of Damascus, St. *On the Divine Images.* Translated by David Anderson. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980.

[10] Lossky, Vladimir. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church.* Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1957.

[11] Marion, Jean-Luc. *God Without Being.* Translated by Thomas A. Carlson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

[12] Maximus the Confessor, St. *Ambigua.* Translated by Nicholas Constas. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

[13] ———. *Ambigua.* In *Philokalia*, vol. 2. Translated by G. E. H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, and Kallistos Ware. London: Faber & Faber, 1981.

[14] Schmemann, Alexander. *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy.* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973.

[15] Stăniloae, Dumitru. *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology.* Vol. 1. Bucharest: Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1991.

[16] ———. *The Experience of God: Revelation and Knowledge of the Triune God.* Translated by Ioan Ionita and Robert Barringer. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1994.

[17] Ware, Kallistos. *The Orthodox Way.* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995.

[18] Yannaras, Christos. *Person and Eros.* Translated by Norman Russell. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2007.

[19] Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church.* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

*International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conferences on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education*

### About IFIASA

Ideas Forum International Academic and Scientific Association (IFIASA) is a cultural-educational organization of distinguished members engaged in academic and scientific research.
IFIASA is a publisher, open access journals since its establishment in 2015.
*IFIASA Publishing House*
Târgoviște, Dâmbovița, Romania
https://www.ifiasa.com/
Email: ifiasa@yahoo.com

### About MCDSARE

International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conferences on the Dialogue between Sciences & Arts, Religion & Education (MCDSARE) is a peer reviewed anualy international journal for encouraging Researchers, Practitioners, Academicians from Life Sciences, Philosophy, Sociology, Communication, Social Work, Anthropology, Applied Philosophy, Ethics, Bioethics, History, Religious Studies, Arts & Architecture, Psychology, Educational Sciences.

### Abstract & Index

Ceeol;
CrossRef; Doi;
Ezb; WorldCat;
Google Scholar;
Philpapers;
Scilit; PubMed;
OpenAlex; Fact;
Sudoc; Ifiasa-Red;