

Man as God's creation and Artificial Intelligence

Maria Pazarski*

The term *Artificial Intelligence* (hereinafter AI) refers to the field of a set of sciences, theories and techniques aiming to imitate the cognitive abilities of a human being¹. It is nowadays the most powerful emerging technology on the planet and has applications everywhere society uses computers. It is transforming the past and shaping our future faster than any other technology².

One of the greatest fears of many scientists is the AI's uncontrollable potential and unpredictable results. In the scientific community it is accepted that it can now exceed the limits of the human mind³, σὲ to such an extent that humans can neither control it nor understand how it works. Therefore, there is talk of “unreadable technologies” and “black box models”, whose operation can hardly be incorporated in the right regulatory framework to benefit human activity and at the same time be aligned with the fundamental values of our societies⁴.

* Maria Pazarski is a Doctor of Theology from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and a member of the Laboratory and Teaching Staff (E.D.I.P.) of the Higher Ecclesiastical Academy of Athens.

1. Council of Europe, *History of Artificial Intelligence*. Available in the website: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/artificial-intelligence/history-of-ai> [20.9.2023].
2. See M. Tegmark, *Life 3.0*, Τί θὰ σημαίνει νὰ είσαι ἀνθρωπος στὴν ἐποχὴ τῆς τεχνητῆς νοημοσύνης;, N. Chounos (ed.), Greek transl. N. Apostolopoulos, Travlos Publications, Athens 2018; ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΤΥΠΟΣ, Ὡ ἡθικὴ διάσταση τῆς Τεχνητῆς Νοημοσύνης, ΤΥΠΟ-Σι, 13.06.2019, <https://typos-i.gr/article/h-h8ikh-diastash-ths-texnhths-nohmosynhs> [20.9.2023].
3. See Martha Kiskila, Τεχνητὴ νοημοσύνη. Φίλος ἢ ἐχθρός;, tvxs, 19 Δεκ. 2017, <https://tvxs.gr/news/sci-tech/texniti-noimosyni-filos-i-exthros/> [20.9.2023].
4. G. Palaiologos, Daron Acemoglou in «Κ»: «Ἡ τεχνολογία δὲν σημαίνει πρόοδο», *H*

The disruption that AI is bringing with its widespread application in every sector is an issue of concern to the academic and scientific community⁵. The ongoing global debate on the positive or negative impact it will have on all major issues –wars, climate change, migration, health, social justice issues etc.– is perhaps the most important of our time because it is related to our collective future. That is why it should not be limited to AI researchers alone. The issues raised are many and crucial from an ethical point of view, as it is up to us humans to choose what kind of future we want. Will we control the intelligent machines or will they control us? What will be man's relationship with this advanced technology? What will it mean to be human in the age of AI? How will automation affect justice, jobs, politics, medicine, society, humanity as a whole? How acceptable will the verdict of a robotic judge be? Should we develop lethal autonomous weapons? Would we like to create Life 3.0 and spread it around the world? What is consciousness and when will machines have it? Is a moral AI possible? How anthropocentric will the new course of history be⁶?

Καθημερινή/ I Kathimerini, 15-6-2023, <https://www.kathimerini.gr/society/562463419/ntaron-atzemogloy-stin-k-i-technologia-den-simainei-kai-proodo/> [20.9.2023]. According to Stephen Cave, a philosophy researcher and executive director of the Leverhulme Centre for the Future of Intelligence at the University of Cambridge, the key point is that the changes that artificial intelligence will bring about must be aligned with the fundamental values of our societies. See Ang. Al. Athanasopoulos, «Η τεχνητή νοημοσύνη πρέπει νὰ εύθυγραμμίζεται μὲ τὶς θεμελιώδεις ἀξίες μας», *Tὸ Βῆμα/To Bima*, 11.09.2021, <https://www.tovima.gr/2021/09/11/society/i-texniti-noimosyni-prepei-na-eythy grammizetai-me-tis-thelemiodeis-aksies-mas/> [20.9.2023].

5. See Roumpina Spathi, «Οι ἀνατροπὲς ποὺ φέρονται ή τεχνητή νοημοσύνη», *Η Καθημερινή/ I Kathimerini*, 18.06.2023, <https://www.kathimerini.gr/economy/562476553/oi-anatropes-poy-fernei-i-techniti-noimosyni/> [20.9.2023].

6. These observations, the terms *Zωὴ 1.0*, *Zωὴ 2.0*, *Zωὴ 3.0* and the explanation of them belong to Max Tegmark, distinguished Professor of Physics at MIT, one of the leading researchers on how AI will benefit humanity. According him, the term, *Zωὴ 3.0* (*Life 3.0*) is the life that does not yet exist on earth. Instead of waiting to evolve gradually over many generations, it can dramatically redesign not only its software (technological stage) but also its hardware (biological stage). *Life 2.0/cultural life* can redesign much of its software: people are learning complex new skills such as languages, sports and professions. Thus, they can completely reconsider not only their worldview but also their goals. *Life 1.0/simple biological* is unable to redesign its hardware and software during the lifetime of an organism: both are determined by its DNA and are only modified

To all these crucial questions the answers are neither easy nor quickly given.

On the basis of the observations mentioned above, it seems that is necessary to redefine the place and future course of modern man in the world. In this direction, the biblical view of man is as relevant today as ever. The narratives about the prehistory of mankind⁷, especially around the creation of man, the history of Heaven, the Fall and the tower of Babel, on which we will focus in this paper, proclaim fundamental theological truths and are powerful messages to man in the golden age of data and algorithms⁸.

The Old Testament considers man to be God's creation, whose life is based on his relationship with God. According to the theological teaching provided by the two sections from the first book of the Old Testament on the subject of creation, the first⁹, which comes from the J tradition, and the second¹⁰, which comes from the P tradition, man is God's supreme creation, and he bears responsibility to his creator¹¹.

Throughout his description, J gives special emphasis to the love and care that God shows for man¹². Every action of God serves this purpose¹³. He gives him the beautiful garden to dwell in, creates for him the animals and

through evolution over many generations. See M. Tegmark, *Life 3.0*, *Tί θὰ σημαίνει νὰ εῖσαι ἄνθρωπος στὴν ἐποχὴ τῆς τεχνητῆς νοημοσύνης*, *op.cit.*, pp. 46-54, 64-67, 80. 7. *Gen.* ch. 1-11.

8. At this point, we should note that Erich Fromm, in his Introduction of his book entitled: *You shall be as gods*, poses the question if the Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament is of any relevance today, if it has anything meaningful to say to the humans that are living in age of revolutions, automation, nuclear weapons, in a world with a materialistic philosophy that implicitly or explicitly denies religious values. See Er. Fromm, *Καὶ ὡς Θεοὶ Ἐσεσθε. Μιὰ Ριζοσπαστικὴ Ἐρμηνεία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης καὶ τῆς Παράδοσής της*, Greek transl. Dim. Theodorakatos, Boukoumanis Publications, Athens 1977, p. 9. 9. *Gen.* 2, 4β-25.

10. *Gen.* 1, 1-2, 4α.

11. See G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, v. 1, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München 1966, p. 155; D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκῆς Θεολογίας*, Vanias Publications, Thessaloniki 2007, p. 23 et seq.; H. D. Preuß, *Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, v. I-II ed. & transl. Io. Mourtzios, Kyriakidis Publications, Thessaloniki 2016, p. 745; P. J. Cools, *Geschichte und Religion des Alten Testaments*, Walter-Verlag, Olten 1965, pp. 196-202.

12. The same is also the case when Adam and Eve's fall is mentioned, i.e., *Gen.* 3, 24.

13. See D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκῆς Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, pp. 30-31.

in the end the woman, because it is not good to be alone¹⁴. He offers him the privilege of naming the animals, which elevates him above the rest of the creatures. *Gen 2, 7* presents God as a master craftsman, a potter, who takes clay as raw material, molds it and gives it a specific shape, thus creating from the earth the first man (Adam)¹⁵. «Καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν»¹⁶ [“Then God, the Lord took man from the dust of the earth and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Thus, man became a living being”]¹⁷. For this purpose, he uses the verb *yachar*/ יָצַר¹⁸, which means “formed, molded, created”; to show that God did not create man by his word as he did the other creations, for which the differently-meaning verb *bara* is used, also translated as “created”¹⁹. Furthermore, the term *afar*/עָפָר²⁰ (*Gen 2, 7*), which means “dry earth, dirt, dust, sand”²¹, indicates the weakness of man for he is only dust and will become dust²². In this simple and

14. W. Zimmerli, *Ἐπίτομη Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, transl. B. Stogiannos, Artos Zois Publications, Athens ³1981, pp. 38-39.

15. See G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, *op.cit.*, p. 172.

16. *Gen. 2:7* LXT, *Bible Works 10*, Software for Biblical Exegesis & Research.

17. *Gen. 2, 7. Ἀγία Γραφή (Παλαιὰ καὶ Κανὴ Διαθήκη)*, transl. Modern Greek translation from the original texts, Hellenic Bible Society.

18. See D. Doikos, *Λεξικὸ τῆς Βιβλικῆς Εβραικῆς Γλώσσας*, Α' Γένεσις, n.p., Thessaloniki 1991, pp. 21, 103.

19. The verb *bara*/ בָּרָא (*Gen. 1, 1* BHS) is used to denote exclusively God's creative action, never the human act. Always having as subject the word *God*, and denoting creation by his word. The idea of creation by word also exists among peoples neighboring to Israel, e.g. the primitive solar deity, the god Re. The divine word in the case of the biblical text is distinct from creation, as it is the one that gives form to amorphous matter. It is a creative word. The verb *yachar*/ יָצַר (*Gen. 2:7* BHS) does not denote the material from which God creates something. See W. Zimmerli, *Ἐπίτομη Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, pp. 39-40, 41-42; W. Eichrodt, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, v. 2-3, Stuttgart ⁵1964, pp. 63-66; D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκικῆς Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, pp. 24-25; G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, *op.cit.*, p. 156; M. Konstantinou, *Μικρὲς ἔρμηνευτικὲς μελέτες σὲ ἀφηγματικὰ κείμενα τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, Ropi Publications, Thessaloniki 2016, pp. 71-72.

20. *Gen. 2, 7* BHS, *Bible Works 10*, Software for Biblical Exegesis & Research.

21. D. Doikos, *Λεξικὸ τῆς Βιβλικῆς Εβραικῆς Γλώσσας*, Α' Γένεσις, *op.cit.*, pp. 21, 168.

22. The same it is said in *Gen. 3, 19* (cf. *Eccl. 12, 7*). The body of the man will return to the ground, i.e. he will die, which was not the case in the original created order. Cf. *Rom.*

descriptive way, J emphasizes man's close relationship with the earth, the land, and his dependence on his Creator²³. The first man is referred to in the Hebrew text by the masculine noun אָדָם (Adam)²⁴, which also reflects his relationship with the earth. Man's existence on earth should be understood neither as a punishment nor as a misfortune in the context of a cosmological dualism, but as a human condition according to God's will²⁵.

The Lord God then, by a characteristic action, makes the man He formed from the dust into a living existence.

He breathes into his nostrils *the breath of life*²⁶, “*nephesh*”²⁷/ שֶׁבֶת. In the Old Testament, the breath of life as breath is most often called by the word *ruach*²⁸/ רֹאשׁ which has a great semantic range²⁹. If God removes it from

5,12; H. D. Preuß, Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, v. I-II, *op.cit.*, p. 745; D. Kaimakis, Ψαλῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου, Υπόμνημα σὲ ἐκλεκτοὺς Ψαλμούς, Ektypotiki E.P.E. Publications “Uniprint Hellas”, Thessaloniki 1990, pp. 318-319.

23. H. D. Preuß, Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, v. I-II, *op.cit.*, p. 726.

24. Definite, as in *Gen. 2:7 haadam/ אָדָם Gen. 2:7 BHS*, means the first man, Adam, and in *Gen. 5:1* the forefather of the human race. Without an article, as an adjective in the masculine, « אָדָם »(*Gen. 16, 12 BHS*) and « אָדָם » (*Gen. 4:2 BHS*) or « אָדָם » (*Gen. 47, 20 BHS*) in the feminine means the common, the inferior. The Hebrew word אָדָם meaning “man” and the same in the feminine gender, אָדָם meaning “earth”, “fruitful cultivated ground” have a common root and denote man's origin from the earth. See D. Doikos, Λεξικό τῆς Βεβλικῆς Εβραικῆς Γλώσσας, Α' Γένεσις, *op.cit.*, p. 21; M. Konstantinou, Μικρὲς ἐρμηνευτικὲς μελέτες σὲ ἀφηγματικὰ κείμενα τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, *op.cit.*, p. 84; *Ellicott's Commentary for English Readers*, “Man. Hebrew, Adam”, in: Bible Hub, Commentary, *Gen. 1, 26*, <https://biblehub.com/commentaries/genesis/1-26.htm> [20.9.2023].

25. Th. Klein, „*Fleisch (NT)*“, Das Wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet (Wiblex), Deutsche Bibel Gesellschaft, Mai 2007, <https://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/ressourcen/wiblex/neues-testament/fleisch-nt> [20.9.2023].

26. *Gen. 2, 7.*

27. See H. W. Wolff, *Anthropologie des Alten Testamens*, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Augsburg 1973, pp. 25-48; H. Schwarz, *Wir werden weiterleben. Die Botschaft der Bibel von der Unsterblichkeit im Lichte moderner Grenzerfahrungen*, Verlag Herder, Freiburg 1984, pp. 13-14.

28. *Isaiah 42, 5, 57, 16; Job 27, 3; 32, 8; 33, 4; 34, 14.*

29. The word *ruach* can mean the wind (*Ex. 10, 13, 19; 14, 21; Isaiah 7, 2*), the breath of air (*Gen. 3, 8*), breathing, and even spirit (*Isaiah 19, 3; 29, 24*). It denotes the man's vitality (*Gen. 45, 27; Judges 15, 19; 1 Kings 30, 12*), but also his breathing (*Isaiah 42, 5; 57, 16; Zech. 12, 1*). What is described in *Gen 2, 7* as the “breath of life”, which God breathed into man, is attributed in *Ezek. 37, 1-14* with the full semantic range of the term. The energy of the *ruach* (*Ezek. 37, 6-14*) is expressed by the word of the prophets. Also, as

man, he dies³⁰. While his construction material is the most precious, i.e. earth, an element that makes him weak already from his creation, he gets life from God, he becomes “*living soul*”³¹ («ψυχὴ ζῶσα»), i.e. a living organism³². From the moment that God, the bearer of life, gives life to man and animals, the latter’s life is totally dependent on God³³. The heart is part of the human nature’s unity. According to the Old Testament anthropology, it performs thought, but its functions cannot be limited to cognitive faculties alone. The *heart*, *lev*/ לב, is an organ of relationship, an instrument of communion between man and God³⁴. It is a part of the human entity as a whole, not an isolated part, and must also be directed towards God³⁵.

a spirit of life it is not only limited to humans but it is also extended to animals (*Gen. 6, 17; 7, 15* of P). The dead idols have no breath (*Hab. 2, 19*). The term *ruach* generally represents the whole being of man (*Ps. 31 [30], 6; Ps. 143 [142], 7*). See H. D. Preuß, *Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, v. I-II, *op.cit.*, pp. 313-319; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropologie des Alten Testamens*, *op.cit.*, pp. 57-67; H. Schwarz, *Wir werden weiterleben. Die Botschaft der Bibel von der Unsterblichkeit im Lichte moderner Grenzerfahrungen*, *op.cit.*, pp. 14-16.

30. *3 Kings* 17, 17 et seq.; *Job* 27, 3; 34, 14-15.

31. The term *soul* in the Old Testament has a different meaning than the one it later acquired due to the influence of Greek philosophical thought. It means breathing and is not a separate part of the body. In Old Testament anthropology there is no division of man into body and soul, nor is there a trichotomy (body-soul-spirit). See H. D. Preuß, *Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, v. I-II, *op.cit.*, p. 727; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropologie des Alten Testamens*, *op.cit.*, pp. 25-48; H. Schwarz, *Wir werden weiterleben. Die Botschaft der Bibel von der Unsterblichkeit im Lichte moderner Grenzerfahrungen*, *op.cit.*, pp. 13-14.

32. Cf. *Gen. 7, 22; Eccl. 3, 19-21; Ps. 104 [103], 29; Is. 42, 5*.

33. M. Konstantinou, *Μικρὸς ἔρμηνευτικὸς μελέτες σὲ ἀφρηγματικὰ κείμενα τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, pp. 82-85; D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκικῆς Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, p. 30; H. D. Preuß, *Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, v. I-II, *op.cit.*, p. 727. 34. *Deut. 6, 4-5*.

35. See Th. Klein, „*Fleisch (NT)*“, Das Wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet (Wibilex), Deutsche Bibel Gesellschaft, Mai 2007, <https://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/ressourcen/wibilex/neues-testament/fleisch-nt> [20.9.2023]; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropologie des Alten Testamens*, *op.cit.*, pp. 68-95; H. Schwarz, *Wir werden weiterleben. Die Botschaft der Bibel von der Unsterblichkeit im Lichte moderner Grenzerfahrungen*, *op.cit.*, pp. 13-14; B. Janowski, „Das Herz – Ein Beziehungsorgan. Zum Personverständnis des Alten Testaments“, in: J. van Oorschot – A. Wagner (Hrsg.), *Anthropologie(n) des Alten Testaments*, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, Leipzig 2018, pp. 43-63; B. Janowski, „Anthropologie des Alten Testaments. Grundfragen – Kontexte – Themenfelder“, *ThLZ* 139 (2014), pp. 535-554; B. Janowski, „Der ganze Mensch. Zu den Koordinaten alttestamentlicher Anthropologie“, *ZThK* 113

In the narrative of the man's creation according to the P tradition³⁶ man is created after God's special decision: "let us make man in our own image and likeness" («ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὄμοιώσιν»)³⁷. It is a decision that seems to come from the depths of His heart³⁸. God's thought in the opening part of verse 1, 26, "Let us make man"³⁹, indicates the special place he wants to offer him as a gift within creation⁴⁰. The plural of the verb and the word *elohim*/ אלהים are a special way of expression for emphasizing the solemnity of the occasion, without departing from strict monotheism⁴¹. The speaker is God, and He neither assigns His work to other nor shares it with them. The word *elohim* is used to convey His absolute power and inner fullness⁴².

The resources provided by God for man place him on the creation's highest pedestal, above all other creatures. The creation "in the image and likeness" («κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὄμοιώσιν») of God⁴³ is the most important theological information about man in the Old Testament. By making his particularity as an existence

(2016), pp. 1-28.

36. *Gen.* 1, 1-2, 4α.

37. *Gen.* 1, 26.

38. D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκικής Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, p. 26.

39. See *Gen.* 1, 26 translation from the original texts. According to the Septuagint, we have: «καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός» (*Gen.* 1:26 LXT), Bible Works 10, *Bible Works 10, Software for Biblical Exegesis & Research*.

40. W. Zimmerli, *Ἐπίτομη Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, p. 42; M. Konstantinou, *Μικρὲς ἔρμηνευτικὲς μελέτες σὲ ἀφηγηματικὰ κείμενα τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, p. 81.

41. Plural of absolute emphasis. And the word *Lord* (adon/adonaj was used in the plural in formal moments, such as at prayer as an address. See D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκικής Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, p. 18; Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, "Let us make/LXX ποιήσωμεν, Lat. *faciamus*" in: Bible Hub, Commentary, *Gen* 1, 26, <https://biblehub.com/commentaries/genesis/1-26.htm> [20.9.2023].

42. The word *elohim*, when used to denote God, is compounded with a singular verb, so that the plural expresses God's limitlessness in size, glory, power, grace. Based on such a semantic framework, the patristic tradition, interpreting the passage typologically, justifiably considers that the Holy Trinity is prefigured in this sign. See M. Konstantinou, *Μικρὲς ἔρμηνευτικὲς μελέτες σὲ ἀφηγηματικὰ κείμενα τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, p. 82; D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκικής Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, p. 18.

43. *Gen.* 1, 26.

pronounced, it signifies his special relationship with God⁴⁴, as well as his role in creation and his relationship with other creatures.

The terms *εἰκόνα* [“*tzelem*”/ οὐγά = image⁴⁵, statue, a carved object⁴⁶] and *δομοίωση* [“*demout*”/ οὐμά = likeness, simulacrum, likeness, idea, image⁴⁷, similarity, correspondence, analogy⁴⁸] have almost the same meaning. The meaning of the more abstract term of the two (*likeness*) intrudes and interferes with the meaning of the more concrete one (*image*). For this reason, they must be interpreted in relation to each other⁴⁹. Man, then, as “image and likeness” together, is created as a copy of the divine prototype. The “in the image of God” does not mean a representation of God in his uniqueness. The remark in *Gen. 1, 27*: “...male and female he created them” is intended to state from the beginning that God created man in two different genres –male and female– as a mark of distinction from God’s uniqueness⁵⁰. Of course, we are not talking about similarity concerning the God’s form, His external features. In the Old Testament, Yahweh often takes the human form; in this case, we speak of the God’s anthropomorphism. In the case of in the image of God, we speak of the man’s theomorphism. Man’s existence must be understood only through Him from Whom he comes⁵¹.

The continuation of *Gen. 1, 26*, where the value of man is highlighted and his role in creation is determined as the embodiment of the power that imposes order in it, helps us to further realize the importance of

44. See M. Konstantinou, *Μικρές έρμηνευτικές μελέτες σε ἀφηγηματικὰ κείμενα τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, p. 81.

45. D. Doikos, *Λεξικό τῆς Βιβλικῆς Εβραϊκῆς Γλώσσας*, Α' Γένεσις, *op.cit.*, p. 185.

46. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, v. 1, *op.cit.*, p. 158; D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκῆς Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, p. 26.

47. D. Doikos, *Λεξικό τῆς Βιβλικῆς Εβραϊκῆς Γλώσσας*, Α' Γένεσις, *op.cit.*, p. 65.

48. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, *op.cit.*, p. 158; D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκῆς Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, p. 26.

49. H. D. Preuß, *Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, v. I-II, *op.cit.*, p. 734; W. Zimmerli, *Ἐπίτομη Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, p. 43; G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, *op.cit.*, p. 158.

50. See W. Zimmerli, *Ἐπίτομη Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, p. 43.

51. See W. Zimmerli, *Ἐπίτομη Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, pp. 42-43; D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκῆς Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, p. 28; G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, *op.cit.*, p. 159.

man's creation in the image and likeness of God⁵². See also *Psalm* no. 8, v. 5, where man as “*ben Adam*”/ בֶּן־אָדָם exerts special authority over nature. God places everything under man's feet⁵³. In the same spirit, in the Greek translation of *Book of Sirach* 17, 1-4, it is proclaimed that God is the one who created mortal men of dust, with authority over everything on earth (v. 1-2), offering them power, as He himself has, and molded them in His image (v. 3). The same is also true in the *Book of Wisdom* 2, 23⁵⁴. God created man to be incorruptible. He made him in His own image, the image of the eternal God⁵⁵.

The purpose of man's creation was to make man God's representative on earth⁵⁶, but not equal to God. In this spirit, according to v. 6⁵⁷ of *Psalm* 8, God made him slightly inferior to the angels⁵⁸. Though small and weak, he nevertheless occupies a high place in God's world. He approaches the sphere of divine beings to which God's angels belong and is crowned as a king with glory and honor, for he is God's representative on earth⁵⁹.

Although man was placed above all creatures as similar to God, he did not cease to be a created being⁶⁰. According to the Old Testament, God is

52. See H. D. Preuß, Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, v. I-II, *op.cit.*, pp. 734-735, 738; M. Konstantinou, Μικρές έρμηνευτικές μελέτες σε ἀφηγηματικὰ κείμενα τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, *op.cit.*, p. 83.

53. Ps. 8, 7: «καὶ κατέστησας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ» (Ps. 8:7 LXT) Bible Works 10, *Bible Works 10, Software for Biblical Exegesis & Research*. For an interpretation of the verse, see D. Kaimakis, Ψαλῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου, Υπόμνημα σε ἐκλεκτοὺς Ψαλμούς, *op.cit.*, pp. 45-47; D. Kaimakis, Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκικῆς Θεολογίας, *op.cit.*, p. 26.

54. «...ό θεός ἔκτισεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἴδιας ἀειδότητος ἐποίησεν αὐτόν» (Wis. 2:23 LXT), Bible Works 10, *Bible Works 10, Software for Biblical Exegesis & Research*.

55. See D. Kaimakis, Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκικῆς Θεολογίας, *op.cit.*, p. 28.

56. See W. Zimmerli, Επίτομη Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, *op.cit.*, p. 43; D. Kaimakis, Ψαλῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου, Υπόμνημα σε ἐκλεκτοὺς Ψαλμούς, *op.cit.*, pp. 45-46.

57. Cf. *Hebr.* 2,7.

58. See D. Kaimakis, Ψαλῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου, Υπόμνημα σε ἐκλεκτοὺς Ψαλμούς, *op.cit.*, pp. 37-51.

59. See W. Zimmerli, Επίτομη Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, *op.cit.*, p. 43; D. Kaimakis, Ψαλῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου, Υπόμνημα σε ἐκλεκτοὺς Ψαλμούς, *op.cit.*, pp. 45-46.

60. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, *op.cit.*, p. 158; D. Kaimakis, Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκικῆς Θεολογίας, *op.cit.*, p. 26.

“bashar”/ בָּשָׂר = flesh, i.e. mortal⁶¹. His life is limited⁶², temporary⁶³ and dependent on the God’s life-giving spirit⁶⁴.

The anthropological term *Basar* in one of its many meanings⁶⁵ that has in the Old Testament, depending on the context of the text, denotes man’s weakness, feebleness, helplessness⁶⁶. That is why it is never used of God⁶⁷. Man is created by God as “flesh”, i.e. as a totality⁶⁸—a personal entity⁶⁹. Through this fleshly, earthly, transient nature, his earthly state,

61. See *Ps.* 65 (64), 3-4. Γιὰ τὴν ὀνάλυση τοῦ ὅρου σάρκα στὸ *Ps.* 65 [64], 3-4 see D. Kaimakis, Ψαλῷ τῷ Θεῷ μου, Υπόμνημα σὲ ἐκλεκτοὺς Ψαλμούς, *op.cit.*, p. 116.

62. *Gen.* 6, 3; *Jer.* 17, 5.

63. Man’s life as “flesh” is like grass (*Is.* 40, 5-6), like a wind that passes away and does not return (*Ps.* 78 [77], 39). He must die and return to the dust (*Job* 34, 15).

64. *Numbers* 16, 22; 27, 16.

65. The term πᾶσα σάρκα/col *basar*/ בָּשָׂר [(*Gen.* 6, 12 BHS, *Bible Works 10, Software for Biblical Exegesis & Research*)] can include all living beings (*Gen.* 6, 12.13.17; 7, 21; 9, 11.15.17; *Numbers* 18, 15; *Ps.* 136 [135], 25; *Dan.* 4, 9). It mainly refers to mankind, the inhabitants of a country (*Ezek.* 21, 4, 9) or to the worshipping community (*Il.* 3, 1). Central to the meaning of the term is its connotation of transience, limitation and dependence. Finally, in the context of the prophetic message, “all flesh” is the podium in front of which the Lord himself is revealed (*Is.* 40, 5; 49, 26) on which his judgment will be carried out (*Is.* 66, 16; *Jer.* 12, 12; 25, 31; 45, 5). See Th. Klein, „*Fleisch (NT)*“, Das Wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet (Wiblex), Deutsche Bibel Gesellschaft, Mai 2007, <https://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/ressourcen/wiblex/neues-testament/fleisch-nt> [20.9.2023].

66. The interpretation of the term «σάρξ» (flesh) by the Apostle Paul has been decisive for Christian anthropology (cf. *Gal.* 5, 16-17: «Λέγω δέ, πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε. ἡ γὰρ σάρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται, ἵνα μὴ ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε ταῦτα ποιῆτε» (*Gal.* 5, 16-17 UBS4, *Bible Works 10, Software for Biblical Exegesis & Research*). See E. Lohse, Ἐπίτομη Θεολογία τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης, Greek transl. S. Agouridis, Artos Zois Publications, Athens 2010, pp. 133-136; Th. Klein, „*Fleisch (NT)*“, Das Wissenschaftliche Bibellexikon im Internet (Wiblex), Deutsche Bibel Gesellschaft, Mai 2007, <https://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/ressourcen/wiblex/neues-testament/fleisch-nt> [20.11. 2023].

67. H. D. Preuß, Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, v. I-II, *op.cit.*, p. 726.

68. See *Ps.* 65 [64], 3-4, in contrast with the anthropology of the Greek philosophy, which perceives human nature as the synthesis of body and soul. See D. Kaimakis, Ψαλῷ τῷ Θεῷ μου, Υπόμνημα σὲ ἐκλεκτοὺς Ψαλμούς, *op.cit.*, p. 116.

69. Cf. *Ps.* 56 [55], 5, 12, where the term «σάρκα» corresponds to Ἀδάμ / אָדָם with the sense of the mortal man in its entirety. See D. Kaimakis, Σύντομο Υπόμνημα στοὺς Ψαλμούς, Psichogios Publications, Athens 2010, p. 208.

it is possible for him to communicate with God. In this sense, the destiny of fleshly man is to be similar with his Creator but not equal with Him.

As God is Lord of all creation, so man was placed as the image of God above all creatures and received by concession from the Creator the authority to rule over them as a sign of his own ownership⁷⁰. Having this position, man is henceforth obliged to remember that he represents the Creator and that he is responsible and accountable to Him for the right management of creation, that his authority is not unlimited but is restrained by the Lord's commands, which he must preserve, obey and carry out⁷¹. This is the only way, which, if he follows, he has the possibility to maintain a harmonious relationship with Him, with his fellow men and the creation, and to remain an image of God⁷² with the possibility of becoming similar to Him.

Man's harmonious relationship with God, represented by the image of a happy life in the Garden of Eden⁷³, was broken from the moment Adam and Eve disobeyed God's command not to eat of the tree of good and evil⁷⁴. They trusted the created thing, the serpent, and not the Creator, and succumbed to the temptation of the desire to disobey the Lord's command⁷⁵. They succumbed to their desire to transcend the limits of their finite existence, wanting to know everything⁷⁶, like God; but from a state of complete autonomy, without communion with Him and therefore

70. D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκής Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, p. 26; M. Konstantinou, *Μικρές έρμηνευτικές μελέτες σε ἀφηγηματικὰ κείμενα τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, p. 83.

71. While J's account of man's creation makes no mention of the creation in the image of God and is more oriented towards the Fall, P's account is more analytical. See D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκής Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, pp. 28-29.

72. D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκής Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, pp. 28-29.

73. This is the story of heaven in *Gen.* 2, 8-17.

74. This is the story of the Fall in *Gen.* 3, 1-24.

75. See M. Konkel, „Diesseits von Eden, Überlegungen zur sog. Sündenfallerzählung (*Gen.* 2-3)“, *ThG* 58, 4 (2015), pp. 261-276.

76. G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, *op.cit.*, pp. 168-169; B. Schmitz, „Ihr werdet wie Gott, erkennend Gutes und Böses (*Gen.* 3, 5). Gut und Böse-Grenzziehungen in der Urgeschichte (*Gen.* 1-9)“, in: Beatrice Acklin-Zimmermann/Barbara Schmitz (Hg.), *An der Grenze – Theologische Erkundungen zum Bösen*, Otto Lembeck, Frankfurt a.M. 2007, pp. 13-41.

without His protection⁷⁷. In this case, the decision of disobedience and the tasting of the fruits of the knowledge of good and evil⁷⁸ was a decision of disobedience to God's command and meant a decision of self-determination, a desire to decide for oneself what is good for oneself and what is not, without taking into account the God's will. Ultimately, man denied to be dependent on God. According to God's warning to the first man, the independence from the source of life means death: "for the very day you eat of it, you most certainly die"⁷⁹ [«ἡ δ' ἀν ἡμέρᾳ φάγητε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε»⁸⁰]. By keeping God's commandments, man remains in communion with God and therefore continues to live. If he ceases to do this, his behavior is in disharmony with God's will. Then he breaks his connection with the source of life and thus dies⁸¹. This is not about his physical death but his spiritual one, which deprives him from communion with God⁸².

The narrative of the Tower of Babel also speaks of man's refusal to depend on his Creator and to function as an autonomous being, showing absolute trust in his own abilities⁸³. Humans overestimated their own capabilities;

77. See M. Konstantinou, *Μικρὲς ἔρμηνευτικὲς μελέτες σὲ ἀφηγηματικὰ κείμενα τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, pp. 87, 100-108.

78. See H. J. Stoebe, „Gut und Böse in der Jahwistischen Quelle des Pentateuch“, *ZAW* 65 (1953), pp. 188-204; H. S. Stern, “The Knowledge of Good and Evil”, *VetT* 8 (1958), pp. 405-418.

79. *Gen.* 2, 17. *Η Ἁγία Γραφή (Παλαιὰ καὶ Καινὴ Διαθήκη)*, transl. from the original texts, *op.cit.*

80. *Gen.* 2, 17 LXT, LXX (Rahlfs) Text, *Bible Works 10, Software for Biblical Exegesis & Research*.

81. Likewise, in the first chapters of the Book of Proverbs (*Prov.* chapters 1-9), the personified wisdom, acting like a prophetess, proclaims in places where many people are gathered, such as the gates of the city, that whoever keeps the commandments of God gains life, and that is wisdom, while death awaits whoever does the opposite, and that is foolishness, folly. See Maria J. Pazarski, *Ἀπὸ τὴ σοφίᾳ στὸ λόγο καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, Προβληματισμοὶ στὴ Σοφιολογικὴ Γραμματεία*, Thessaloniki 2009, pp. 48 et seq.; D. Kaimakis, *Ψαλῷ τῷ Θεῷ μου. Ὑπόμνημα σὲ ἐκλεκτοὺς Ψαλμούς*, *op.cit.*, pp. 319-321; L. Köhler, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Tübingen 1936, p. 156; M. Konstantinou, *Μικρὲς ἔρμηνευτικὲς μελέτες σὲ ἀφηγηματικὰ κείμενα τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, pp. 103, 109, 110, 111.

82. H. D. Preuß, *Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, v. I-II, *op.cit.*, p. 742.

83. *Gen.* 11, 1-9.

thanks to their technological knowledge, they were able to construct great edifices. Driven by feelings of self-sufficiency and omnipotence, they decided to build a tower too high for their own glory⁸⁴, believing that nothing could prevent them from achieving it. Their arrogance⁸⁵ caused God to intervene⁸⁶. He came down to see the city and the tower. He observed that the people with their God-given intelligence, having the ability to communicate effectively with each other, decided to follow their own plans and not God's plan to scatter and fill the earth. They sought to implement an grandiose agenda for personal exaltation. God, annoyed by this, confused their communication with each other, causing them to eventually abandon their own goal and scatter as he had already planned⁸⁷. The Tower of Babel narrative describes a united mankind that uses all its resources to establish a city, which is the opposite of what God intended when he created the world. The tower symbolizes autonomy, and the builders of the city consider themselves to be able to determine their own destiny without any reference to the Lord⁸⁸.

In the Garden of Eden and in the Babel of the virtual world that modern man has created due to the tremendous progress of AI, he has the feeling of being omniscient and omnipotent⁸⁹ one who can control everyone and everything, a "god" who seems to have lost his measure. With an arrogance that stems from his self-admiration for the level of knowledge he has attained, man acts as an autonomous being and places himself on the highest pedestal of the world. This attitude does not distinguish him from the first creatures or the craftsmen of Babel. Now the tree of knowledge of good and evil has been made by mortal man

84. *Gen. 11, 4.*

85. H. D. Preuß, *Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, v. I-II, *op.cit.*, p. 744.

86. M. Konstantinou, *Μικρές έρμηνευτικές μελέτες σε ἀφηγηματικά κείμενα τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, *op.cit.*, pp. 132, 138-141.

87. *Gen. 11,6*; See on this D. E. Pratte, *Commentary on the book of Genesis: Bible Study Notes and Comments*, Lulu.Com, n.p. 2018, p. 129.

88. ESV Study Bible Contents, "Introduction to Genesis, 11, 1-9, The Tower of Babel", *Bible Works 10, Software for Biblical Exegesis & Research*.

89. M. Ploritis, «“...Καὶ ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοί...”». Καὶ ὅν ἡ «ἀλάθητη» ὑφηλὴ τεχνολογία κάνει κάποιο λάθος;», *Tὸ Bῆμα/To Vima*, 24.11.2008, <https://www.tovima.gr/2008/11/24/opinions/kai-esesthe-ws-theoi/> [20.9.2023].

himself and its fruits are the products of AI, which “he himself treats and eats”⁹⁰ ignoring God’s will. He gives the impression that he seeks to become a superhuman, to establish the new Babylon – the symbol city of humanity’s ambition to dethrone God and make the earth its own⁹¹. While he feels omniscient, he stands inadequate and troubled before the moral dilemmas and questions raised by the creation of the self-willed and intelligent machines which he constantly creates.

It is up to man to behave as a godly creature, managing his knowledge as God’s partner⁹² and representative on earth for the benefit of humanity, or whether moving towards a new Fall, possessed by a negative will for power, he will wish to transcend his limited human nature by reproducing his own idol with the construction of the posthuman (bio-robot)⁹³, thus giving himself the role and position of Creator in the world. Finally, it depends on man whether he will remain an image of God⁹⁴, imitating his Creator, who “*everything in wisdom hath created*”⁹⁵ and eternally cares for his salvation.

90. M. Ploritis, «...Καὶ ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοί...». Καὶ ὅν ἡ «ἀλάθητη» ὑψηλὴ τεχνολογία κάνει κάποιο λάθος;, *op.cit.*

91. Rev. chap. 17-18; See ESV Study Bible Contents, “Revelation 17,1-15, Babylon’s Power and Luxury”, *Bible Works 10, Software for Biblical Exegesis & Research*.

92. See H. D. Preuß, *Θεολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης*, v. I-II, *op.cit.*, p. 736.

93. For the posthumans, see Konstantina Io. Gongaki, «Τὸ ὄραμα τοῦ ὑπερανθρώπου καὶ τὸ μετανθρώπινο μέλλον: Σχεδιάσματα, ἐπιτεύγματα, οὐτοπίες», in: *Πρακτικά τοῦ Β' Φιλοσοφικοῦ Συμποσίου, Αθήνα, 16 Μαΐου 2014*, eds. Konstantina Io. Gongaki – Io. G. Kalogerakos, Papailiou Publications, Athens 2014, pp. 113-130; T. Sermetis, Ό Μετάνθρωπος καὶ ὁ Υπεράνθρωπος, δρόμος τῆς Αριστερᾶς, 4-3-2020, <https://edromos.gr/o-metanthropos-kai-o-yperanthropos/> [20.9.2023].

94. D. Kaimakis, *Θέματα Παλαιοδιαθηκῆς Θεολογίας*, *op.cit.*, p. 29.

95. See Ps. 104 [103], 24; Ps. 19,2; Job 38, 4 et seq.; Prov. 3, 19.