

TEO, ISSN 2247-4382
98 (1), pp. 10-23, 2024

Artificial Intelligence and Human Intelligence **A View on New Technologies from the Perspective of Orthodox Anthropology¹** **Cristinel IOJA**

Cristinel IOJA

“Hilarion V. Felea” Faculty of Orthodox Theology, Arad, Romania
Email: cristi.ioja@yahoo.com

Abstract

In this study, I tried to demonstrate the fundamental difference between human intelligence and artificial intelligence, between the creation of the human being according to the Archetype and the simulation of the human being after the human being. I have also shown that the map of man is beyond man, and the knowledge of man depends on how man relates to his Archetype. Man is mysterious and light, and the method by which he can be known is the apophatic-cataphatic, elements that are missing in their unity from the scientific instruments of current technologies, which seek to decipher man without reaching his ontological-personal depth.

Keywords:

artificial intelligence, a new paradigm, human being-archetype, trans-humanism, post-humanism, Orthodox theology

¹ This paper was presented by the author in the international symposium “Human Being in the Image of God”, organized by the International Association of Orthodox Dogmatic Theologians (IAODT) in Paralimni, Cyprus, on March 5-7, 2024.

I. A New Paradigm

At the turn of the millennium, Kallistos Ware anticipated what is the greatest challenge for Theology: anthropology, the problem of man. He asserts that the 21st century will be the century of theological anthropology², i.e., the responses that the Church's theology must offer to the secularized world regarding the mystery of man and the technological, ideological, and sociological challenges concerning the dignity and deep meanings of the person.

Indeed, we are amid a new representation of humanity; before our eyes, a new world is born, organized, and structured by what we call artificial intelligence. Because the transformative force it imposes globally, in the lives of communities and individuals, is immense, in all fields of human research, knowledge, and expression, artificial intelligence is perceived as a real *challenge*. Artificial intelligence represents a global challenge and at the same time an opportunity for the efficiency and improvement of postmodern human life from various social, informational, economic, medical, and scientific research perspectives. Building on these opportunities that current technologies promise, post-humanism and trans-humanism are discussed as paths to salvation and authentic progress³. When, in fact, it is about dehumanization, depersonalization, about constructing a world horizontally where the verticality of any existence is submerged together with its freedom. Indeed, *artificial intelligence* writes a paradigm shift in human history, shaping the dawn of post-humanism.

² Kallistos WARE, *Teologia ortodoxă în noul mileniu: care este cea mai importantă întrebare?*, Altarul Banatului, year XVI, (2005), no. 4-6, p.10.

³ See Mark O'CONNELL, *To Be a Machine. Adventures Among Cyborgs, Utopians, Hackers, and the Futurists Solving the Modest Problem of Death*, Paperback, 2018; Jennifer HUBERMANN, *Transhumanism. From Ancestors to Avatars*, Cambridge University Press, 2020; Roberto MANZOCCO, *Transhumanism-Engineering the Human Condition: History, Philosophy and Current Status*, Springer Nature Switzerland AG, 2019. For a less optimistic position regarding transhumanism, see Arne KLINGENBERG, *Beyond Machine Man: Who We Really Are and Why Transhumanism Is Just An Empty Promise!*, Beam Publishing, 2021. For a theological and philosophical response to the challenges of transhumanism, see Robert RANISCH and Stefan LORENZ SORGNER (eds), *Post –and Transhumanism. An Introduction*, Peter Lang Edition, 2015.

It repch makes Christ, the conqueror of death, the center of human life, science, and culture. In Christ, death is conquered and gains meaning, and progress becomes endless progress and advancement in eternal life. In Christ, man is not enclosed in a crushing condition of death and decay, which he constantly ameliorates through technology, but he is offered the endless paths of communion in love and freedom, in immortality and eternal life. In Orthodox theology, the mystery of death is not mechanistically linked to nature but is linked to the mystery of resurrection and endless progression in God, as a gift of the Holy Trinity⁴.

II. In search of the human formula

Undoubtedly, the period we are going through represents yet another stage in which humanity writes its history. It is a challenging period for humanity due to the acute lack of transcendence and sacredness, supported by atheistic, nihilistic, and secularizing ideologies, which place us in the dangerous perspective of post-humanism and trans-humanism. From the philosophical perspective, they seemed harmless, hypotheses awaiting verification, but regarding the current technologies, they become offensive, and invasive, offering access to freedom, progress, and even immortality under the emblem of technology and science.

But what could be some of Theology's responses to such challenges? Does Orthodox Theology have a well-articulated response to such unprecedented anthropological and soteriological challenges in the history of humanity? Can Orthodox Theology still be attractive, retaining attention to its arguments amidst the media onslaught already unfolding in the informational society regarding the opportunities of artificial intelligence? I will not dwell on the economic, social, informational, and cultural opportunities, and challenges that the new configuration of the world is experiencing fully in the era of artificial intelligence. I will only try to outline some of the principles of Orthodox anthropology according to the criteria of the Church Tradition, and thus, understand to what extent man

⁴ Pr. Cristinel IOJA, "Eshatologia", in: Pr. Ștefan BUCHIU (ed.), *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, II, Editura Basilica, București, 2022, pp. 750-754.

can or cannot create man and what is the difference between *creation* and *simulation*. Moreover, Orthodox Theology's response to the challenges of postmodern ideologies regarding anthropology has the biblical and patristic teaching at its center according to which man's formula is not from man or matter, but from above; man was created after the Archetype, the image after the Archetype. This fundamentally different perspective from atheistic and secularizing conceptions of history puts man in a mysterious, ultimately incomprehensible connection with a transcendent personal principle. The consequence of such an anthropological reality is that man cannot be authentically known and rendered through technology, but in connection and communion with the mystery of the Archetype after which he was created. This does not negate the possibilities of technologies but shows their limits, purpose, and meaning in being convergent with the meaning of creation and man, not divergent from them. We innovate nothing, but only discover the mystery and presence of God in us and the universe.

II.1. Man's formula is from above. *Image in the Archetype*

Orthodox anthropology explains the mystery of man connected to the mystery of the Word, the mystery of the Logos Christ. Although the thinking of the Fathers abounds in such texts, I will only refer to a few texts from the thinking of St. Gregory of Nyssa in which we are shown the dignity of man through his connection with the Archetype after which he was created and the personal way in which the Archetype is reflected in his image:

“Moreover, the fact that man carries within himself the image of Him who rules over all creatures does not mean anything else than that from the beginning the nature of man was destined to be a queen (...). Man is distinguished by the true dignity of an emperor, as one who resembles his Model in beauty”⁵.

⁵ Sf. GRIGORIE DE NYSSA, *Despre facerea omului*, IV, coll. *Părinți și Scriitori Bisericești* (PSB), vol. 30, transl. Pr. Teodor Bodogae, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 1998, pp. 22-23.

Man can contemplate the Model in the reality of his image, thus finding Him more intimately than himself. St. Gregory of Nyssa writes in this sense:

“So he who looks at himself sees in himself the Desired One. And therefore the one with a pure heart is happy because, looking at his purity, he sees the model (archetype) in the image. It is as if, while others look directly at the sky, those who look at the sun in a mirror see the sun in the brightness of the mirror no less than those who look at the sun itself. Thus, he says, you too, even if you do not have the power to see the light if you return to the gift of the image planted in you from the beginning, you have within you the One sought. For divinity is purity, dispassion, and alienation from all evil. If, therefore, these are in you, then God is immediately in you. So when your thought is not mixed with any evil but is free from passion and separated from any desire, you will be happy for your penetrating sight because, being purified, you have known the One unseen by the impure, and, after removing the material haze from the eyes of the soul, you see the wonderful sight into the clear calm of the heart”⁶.

To know himself, the man is called to contemplate the Model (Archetype) in the reality of his image. This exercise through which the Archetype is more intimately discovered by man himself is achieved through ascetic effort, the fulfillment of virtues, another methodology of knowledge ignored by the reductive anthropologies of post-modernity.

If a contemporary man does not see God reflected in himself or the other man, the technologies he uses to decrypt and “copy” the mystery of man will be even less likely to understand it. I have reproduced this text precisely to show the method by which man can know himself through recourse and communion with his Model. In the context of current technologies that have the power to simulate the biological and even

⁶ Sf. GRIGORIE DE NYSSA, *Despre Fericiri*, VI, PSB, vol. 29, transl. Pr. Dumitru Stăniloae, Pr. Ioan Buga, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 1982, p. 383.

psychological structures of man, bypassing such a method means losing from the research horizon the entire structural and functional content of man, which cannot be reduced only to the biological and the psychic. Outside the method, knowledge of man only through technology remains reductive.

“Therefore, if one of the characteristics regarding the Divine Being is that it cannot be understood by the mind, then it is necessary that also in this regard the image must be similar to the model. For if the nature of this image could be grasped by the mind, while on the contrary the model or prototype would remain much above our power of knowledge, then the contradiction between the attributes would be a clear testimony that they do not resemble each other. But if the nature of our thought exceeds our power of knowledge because it is precisely the image of Him who created us, it follows that it has a complete resemblance to the Perfect One, and the impossibility of knowing Him is also a sure testimony that the divine essence is impenetrable”⁷.

Hence, man is not an enigma as a product of nature or society, but in his capacity as a “theological being”, and “the image of God”, because “his self is transcendent to his manifestations”⁸. Father Stăniloae shows that

“growing in self-knowledge, the man discovers that his self is a mystery never exhaustible, a mystery that is not self-contained but united with the truly infinite mystery. From what he knows more about himself, he knows that he is an abyss from which he always draws knowledge of other meanings”⁹.

⁷ Sf. GRIGORIE DE NYSSA, *Despre facerea omului*, XI, PSB, vol. 30, p. 34.

⁸ Paul EVDOKIMOV, *Ortodoxia*, transl. Irineu Ioan Popa, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 1996, p. 97.

⁹ Pr. Dumitru STĂNILOAE, *Iisus Hristos lumina lumii și îndumnezeietorul omului*, Editura Anastasia, București, 1993, p. 18.

Stăniloae demonstrates the personal relationship between the “depth of humanity” and the “depth of the divine” when he says: “In the experience of the unfathomable concrete abyss of my self (...) I live my dependence on another deeper, superior abyss (...). I constantly tend towards it, but I will never fully comprehend it”¹⁰. Thus, “man infinitely surpasses man”, a reality implied in the very constitution of man in the “image of the incarnate Logos” and which escapes any definition and even full technological simulation. Man is not merely the product of matter, but the luminous and mysterious creation of the Holy Trinity, being created in the image of the incarnate Logos.

Moreover, rediscovering the texts of the Fathers, modern Orthodox thinking has provided reasoned responses to the reductionist anthropologies of modernity. Although there are numerous texts in this regard, I will only focus on the thoughts of some representatives of the neo-patristic synthesis of the twentieth century. Panayotis Nellas and Dumitru Stăniloae explained the relationship between image and Archetype by changing the perspectives of Orthodox anthropology from the Dogmatic Manuals where this relationship was not explicit. Starting from biblical and patristic thinking, Nellas and Stăniloae explained how if Christ is the image of the Father, man, created in the image of the incarnate Logos, namely Christ, is the *image of the image*. Panayotis Nellas shows that “the Archetype of man is not simply the Logos, but the incarnate Logos”¹¹.

Thus, Christology becomes a premise of anthropology, and not anthropology a premise of Christology. Additionally, Nellas states that “the essence of man is not found in the matter from which he was created, but in the Archetype according to which he was fashioned and towards which he tends”¹². He concludes:

“The ontological truth of man is not found in himself or autonomously understood; nor in his natural properties, as mate-

¹⁰ Pr. Dumitru STĂNILOAE, *Iisus Hristos lumina lumii și îndumnezeitorul omului*, p. 18.

¹¹ Panayotis NELLAS, *Omul – animal îndumnezeit. Perspective pentru o antropologie ortodoxă*, ediția a II-a, transl. Diac. Ioan I. Ică jr., Editura Deisis, Sibiu, 1999., p. 77.

¹² Panayotis NELLAS, *Omul – animal îndumnezeit. Perspective pentru o antropologie ortodoxă*, p. 75.

realistic theories maintain, nor in the soul or the higher part of the soul, the mind, as many ancient philosophers believed, or exclusively in the person of man, as contemporary person-centered philosophical systems admit, but in his Archetype”¹³,

which is Jesus Christ. Also in the twentieth century, against atheist ideologies, Justin Popovich argued in many of his texts that Jesus Christ represents “the unique and ultimate final criterion of the man himself in His psycho-somatic being, in his divine-human potentiality, and all that is human and of man”¹⁴. These theological positions not only deepened the Orthodox thinking of the twentieth century but also offered a response to the challenges of modernity regarding man and the cosmos.

In contrast to the autonomous objectivity of the body, as ideologized in the atheistic and materialistic conceptions of modernity, Father Dumitru Stăniloae says that

“the body of man is not only matter or rationality plasticized as an object, but subjectivized matter participating in the subject as the subject. In the reality of the body, there is something that transcends what could be called its materiality and its purely automatic movements, something that cannot be reduced to its material properties. There is a partial non-objectivity of the body”¹⁵.

This reality represents a starting point from which any technological research of the body must begin. As a rational being, man implies a rationality that refers not only to the soul but also to the body, “which from the beginning has within itself the specific work of the soul imprinted on it with all the complexity of rational activities and its forms of sensitivity”¹⁶.

¹³ Panayotis NELLAS, *Omul – animal îndumnezeit. Perspective pentru o antropologie ortodoxă*, p. 75-76.

¹⁴ Arhim. Iustin POPOVICI, *Omul și Dumnezeu-Om. Abisurile și culmile filosofiei*, transl. Pr. Prof. Ioan Ică, Diac. Ioan I. Ică jr., Editura Deisis, Sibiu, 1997, p. 157.

¹⁵ Pr. Dumitru STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol. I, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 1978, p. 367.

¹⁶ Pr. Dumitru STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol. I, p. 376.

Therefore, “it is impossible to entirely separate the roots of the soul from the body, just as it is impossible to see only matter in the body”¹⁷.

In other words, Orthodox anthropology has the vertical and the horizontal in Christology, has a transcendent origin and destination, without eluding the cosmos and history, and is imbued with light and mystery. The formula placed within us is from above! Therefore, when through disobedience and fall we disfigured humanity, the formula with which we were gifted through creation, the Logos, the One and the same in whose image we were created, assumed the disfigured humanity and renewed it, healed it, transfiguring it. Through all that the incarnate Logos did for us in His salvific acts – Incarnation, Death, Resurrection, Ascension – He healed and rebuilt the anthropological structures, the initial anthropological starting point being potentiated by grace upon grace. The stake was the restoration of the disfigured image according to the Archetype used as a model when it was created but in a superior way to the act of the original creation. Recreating in the image of Christ has offered us a superior level than given to man through the initial creation.

Thus, the anthropological formula within us is not from below, but from above, although man is created, and the restoration meant an ontological healing of the image received as a gift through creation and disfigured through disobedience. Due to the mystery at the foundation of the creation and recreation of man, of his origin and purpose, man cannot be deciphered or simulated in all the components of his biological and spiritual structures in unity, because beyond his biological-psychic map, there is someone deeper with whom he is in connection with the One whom the autonomous technological methods of man cannot map out.

II.2. The AI formula is from below. *Image in the image*

In his autonomy, man does not relate to the Model according to which he was created, but to the limits of the structure in which the Model is reflected. Although present in autonomous man, the Model is distorted, and unnoticed, and the windows of knowledge are sealed within the narrow methods of human autonomy. In the context of polytheism, man was the

¹⁷ Pr. Dumitru STĂNILOAE, *Teologia Dogmatică Ortodoxă*, vol. I, p. 16.

measure of all things, even of the gods crafted to the highest degree in his image or imitating his attributes. Christianity re-configures the perspective of the man in an immanent-transcendent, iconic-biological sense, centered in his Archetype, Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Logos. Christ, the Incarnate Logos, is the measure of all things. In modernity, the pagan formula of Protagoras is re-accredited, the man again becoming the measure of all things, hence anthropocentrism and other ideologies of modernity and post-modernity. If, in the context of polytheism, a copy of the human was made in his exteriority, highlighting the body or the attributes of man such as beauty, wisdom, and goodness, in post-modernity, through the power of technologies and sciences, an attempt is made to duplicate and simulate man in the entirety of the material and psychological structures that compose him. Man no longer creates gods in his image but creates copies of himself, substituting himself for God. It is a more dangerous period than the idolatry of antiquity, characterized by the confusion of God-creation, a period in which man, through technology, believes he can be like God, giving *life* and maintaining the *life* of his copies.

The endeavor of technologies regarding AI assumes a reductionist perspective on the man seen as a biological, psychological, and sociological being, from the perspective of language, communication, and the synthesis of a vast field of data, but not as a theological being. Such an evasion of the paradox of the human person constituted in his horizon as a theological being compromises even the premises of a man's simulation regarding AI. In the construction of new humanoids, there is an indifference generated by one's ideology regarding the true constitution of man. Certainly, those who promote the AI project, beyond the aspects related to the efficiency of data, information, industrial technologies, and social and medical utility, aiming at a complete computerized simulation of man in his complexity, do not take into account the transcendent dimension of man and his spiritual part in union without confusion with God. In the second half of the 20th century, Paul Evdokimov drew attention to the fact that "the deiform structure of man makes any autonomous solution of his destiny impossible"¹⁸. Ignoring

¹⁸ Paul EVDOKIMOV, *Orthodoxia*, p. 97. See also Kallistos WARE, "The Mystery of the Human Person", in: *Sobornost* 3:1 (1981), p. 62-69; Olivier CLEMENT, *On Human Being: Spiritual Anthropology*, New City Press, 2000.

this reality, the AI project will not end with an affirmation of the man, and progress regarding man, but with his denial. Too little has been understood from modernity until the present that what is seen is based on what is unseen, man seen objectively has unseen foundations not only internal but also beyond him.

Building the entire system on a reductionist anthropology, it considers that man is merely a map that can be copied and then simulated. This is the anthropocentric, dehumanizing perspective by which man's transcendent and spiritual roots, which are part of his structures, are amputated. In the case of AI, the formula remains the one from below, that is, not in the Archetype but in the image, without having full access to the mystery of in the image. Why? In its authenticity, the mystery of in the image is linked to the mystery of the Archetype, which the mentors of AI development programs and autonomous anthropological conceptions evade.

III. The map of man is beyond man

Are there differences between AI and human intelligence? Yes, there are differences that we cannot overcome, although we may seemingly be able to simulate them, meaning that AI will simulate human intelligence to a certain extent. Beyond its cognitive abilities, human intelligence also encompasses spiritual aspects related to *nous* and *pneuma*, *kardia* and the entire anthropological universe structured by the presence of a transcendent work within it that we attribute to the Holy Trinity¹⁹. According to Eastern spirituality, the roots, the essence of the mind, are found in the heart; the

¹⁹ In this sense, see only some of the comments of father Dumitru Stăniloae on the philokalical texts: *note 87* to "Cele 100 de capete ale lui Calist și Ignatie Xanthopol", in: *Filocalia* vol. 8, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 1979, p. 62; *note 119* to MAXIM MĂRTURISITORUL, "Cele patru sute capete despre dragoste", in: *Filocalia* vol. 2, Editura Harisma, București, 1993, p. 300; *notes 7, 19* to "Cuvânt despre rugăciune al lui Nicchifor din Singurătate", in: *Filocalia* vol 7, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, 1977, p. 14, 26-31; *note 52* to "Marcu Ascetul. Viața și scrierile lui", in: *Filocalia* vol. 1, Editura Harisma, București, 1993, p. 501; *note 67* to "Cuvântul lui Teolipt mitropolitul Filadelfiei despre ostenele vieții călugărești", in: *Filocalia*, vol 7, p. 55.

heart is not the same as the mind, nor is the mind the same as reason, nor is reason the same as intelligence. Therefore, the simulation of AI cannot encompass the entire human universe in the functionality of its internal, spiritual components and their connections with each other and, especially, with God as a mysterious reality through which man exists.

The unfathomable depth of man remains unknown both to man and, even more so, to the algorithmic capacities of AI, which work based on data sets in their structures, all created by man²⁰. What man does not know and cannot know through the current scientific tools about the mystery of his person cannot be placed as functionality in a humanoid. Therefore, even if a certain simulation of human intelligence is achieved through current technologies, the mystery of man cannot be simulated; its apophatic, transcendent dimension belongs to other methods of knowledge and understanding of the part with the whole, of the immanent with the transcendent. In man, there is something superior to the processes of matter, something that animates and transcends them all. How can the longing or thirst for infinity, constitutive of man, be simulated in AI? Father Stăniloae senses the deep, mysterious, and luminous meaning of things. “Only in the constantly verified fact that in everything we know there is a rational sense on the one hand, and on the other hand, a mystery that can never be fully known, it is shown that existence is an unfathomable mystery, but, at the same time, an endless source of meanings and light”²¹.

Nevertheless, the formula set in AI is not transcendent but immanent on a horizontal level; it can consist of the immanent structures of the map, but not the map itself and nor those that complete the map and make it immanent-transcendent in a mysterious, apophatic-cataphatic unity of each person with God. Man tries to imitate his formula set within him, but its decryption is not achieved only through reason and intelligence, through algorithms generated by current technologies but, unequivocally, through personal participation and union with the Archetype in which man was created. This part is missing from the scientific tools of recent history.

²⁰ See about the depth of the mystery of man at Jean Claude LARCHET, *L’Inconscient spirituel*, Cerf, 2005; Olivier CLEMENT, *Questions sur l’homme*, Anne Sigier, 1986.

²¹ Pr. Dumitru STĂNILOAE, *Chipul nemuritor al lui Dumnezeu*, Editura Mitropoliei Olteniei, Craiova, 1987, p. 44.

The map of man is beyond man. Its discovery depends on springs that exceed the current scientific tools with all their performances; it is from above, not from below.

Beyond all that is known about him, man remains a mystery because he reflects within him the mystery of the Archetype in which he was created. This mystery of man cannot be fully transmitted from image to image, from man to humanoid, because man himself, separated from the Archetype and autonomous, does not fully know it. Although the structures of man, including those of the brain, are scanned, there remains something, or rather someone behind these structures that cannot be fully scanned or imitated, a part of the formula set in man that cannot be perceived and analyzed by the method and criteria of science, with the scientific tools of autonomous man, without recourse to the mystery of the Archetype, in which man discovers himself and is enlightened.

However close technologies may come to simulating and imitating the structures, mentalities, attitudes, language, gestures, intelligence, and memory of man, there remains an inscrutable mystery of man in the uniqueness of his person, his constitutive formula that relates to his Archetype. Therefore, father Stăniloae wrote: “But he knows that he depends on something that surpasses his understanding. Through this, he adds to his consciousness that his being is dependent on an infinite other than himself, beyond his comprehension, which gives human existence an incomprehensibility”²². Man is a mystery and light, and in these, self-awareness plays a decisive role. This is not merely a negative anthropology, but an apophatic-cataphatic anthropology through which we understand that man is a mystery and light. AI will so much substitute for man that it will be almost irresistibly seductive through its circumstantial perfection; however, it will be permanently insufficient to the mysterious, original formula from above, which man has within himself and which is also beyond him. Therefore, we will experience a paradox, that is, an imitation of man, seductively perfectible through technologies, and at the same time, a distinction of man to the robot, the machine, or any humanoid.

At this point, I believe that the anthropology of the Church will remain valid concerning any autonomous anthropology of replacement

²² Pr. Dumitru STĂNILOAE, *Chipul nemuritor al lui Dumnezeu*, p. 56.

or symbiosis between man and machine. Although the challenge is enormous for the anthropology of the Church, the data of Revelation offer us the necessary foundation for a valid anthropology until the end of history. Because even though technology will progress towards complete symbiosis between man and machine, in this case, either it is no longer about anthropology – the word “man”, looking towards the heavens – but about something else, or man cannot be fully copied, or reduced to the stereotypical, algorithmic measures of a machine, but will always be more through freedom, spontaneity, the connection of multiple elements, synthesis of syntheses, and access to another level, intrinsically linked to the formula used for his creation and which is found in his Archetype. Man cannot be fully encompassed within the framework of technology because he creates and encompasses the technology he generates in his thinking. The map after which man was created is not within him but in the Model, his Archetype. The *bio-enhancement* of the human being by surpassing biological limits must not mean its spiritual alienation and detachment from the principle of transcendence discovered once and for all in the Person of Christ.

Here we see that beyond the horizontality of the issue, man created in the image of the Archetype has access to a mysterious and transcendent level, which is incomprehensible and inexhaustible. This reality cannot be captured on any *hard drive* used in the structures of any humanoid because it is beyond any reference that autonomous science can observe and perceive. Although this level is accessible to man through participation in the sacramental and spiritual life of the Church, it is accessible to him in the mystery of his person grafted into the mystery of the Persons of the Holy Trinity, and it infinitely surpasses man.