Vinayasādhana
Dharmaram Journal of Psycho-Spiritual Formation
VOL. XV, No. 1, January 2024

Theology Encounters Technology: Unraveling Imago Dei in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

A. John Kennedy
Dharmaram Vidya Kshetram, Bangalore

Abstract

The article explores the historical evolution of Artificial Intelligence (AI), tracing its roots from pre-modern myths and experiments to contemporary challenges and successes. It emphasises individual contributions, including religious figures and scientists, in shaping the field. The discussion delves into the theological implications of AI in the context of human distinctiveness, examining various biblical interpretations of the *Imago Dei* (image of God). The article further explores the parallels between AI and human intelligence, functionality, relationality, embodied cognition, co-creation, consciousness, affective domain, human transcendence and mental health care. It highlights the potential benefits and challenges of integrating AI into healthcare, particularly mental health and suggests the need for careful collaboration between AI researchers and healthcare professionals. It presents a comprehensive exploration of the evolution of AI and its theological and practical implications for humanity.

Keywords: *Imago Dei*, Relationality, Embodied Cognition, Human Transcendence

Introduction

The prompt progress of artificial intelligence is promising yet precarious, necessitating a revisiting of the substantial scriptural notion of *Imago*

Dei. This engenders an AI theology, redefining our self-understanding and preventing the misuse of AI. Prominent efforts of some bright minds to converge theology and artificial intelligence are heartening. For instance, Elias Kruger, a data scientist and theologian, has introduced a blog to share his thoughts on interconnecting theology and AI. He also expresses the implications of an encounter between theology and AI and shares the outcomes of such extensive deliberations in his blog. For his doctoral dissertation, Marius Dorobantu, an AI theologian, has analysed the potential Christian anthropological inferences of human-level AI. He also makes recurrent contributions to the blog dedicated to AI theology and is currently working on a project entitled 'Spiritual Intelligence: Psychological, Computational and Theological Approaches.' Benedikt Paul Goecke, a German philosopher and theologian, has delved deep into significant queries in AI theology, such as the consciousness of AI systems, superintelligence, artificial persons and the influence of AI on religious worldviews, among others.

Amidst genuine efforts to advance AI theology, some potential obstacles arise. For instance, the literature on AI theology is meagre, with certain disparate and sporadic attempts to break new ground in developing a theological discourse that can speak to both theologians and AI experts. There is a shortage of professionals well-versed in both theology and AI. In other words, AI experts generally lack a solid grounding in theology, whereas theologians often lack detailed information about AI and its subcategories. However, this should not dissuade us from venturing into the realm of AI theology. Thus, this article serves as a modest endeavour to contribute to AI theology by exploring the intersection of Christianity and science, focusing on the biblical concept of *Imago Dei* and its connection to Artificial Intelligence. The aim is to show how this technology is received within the Christian life.

Evolution of Artificial Intelligence

Coghill (2023) notes that the invention of electronic computers (analog and digital) in the twentieth century propelled AI to become a distinct field of research. However, a history of various interconnected efforts led to that point, and Christians played an active role in contributing to these advances.

Pre-History

Humanity has always desired to create beings in our image, with or without divine assistance. Literature throughout history is replete with

examples. It is an ancient Greek story of Pygmalion, who falls in love with a statue he sculpted and which Aphrodite brings to life for him. A Jewish myth about Rabbi Judah ben Bezalel of Prague, who crafted a clay golem and used Hebrew rites to bring it to life to protect Prague Jews from pogroms (Coghill, 2023, p. 606). The experiment of Abbe Nolet (a French clergyman and physicist) stimulated the amputated leg of a frog by electrical means. The play of Karel Capek (Czech novelist and playwright), where a scientist creates humanlike machines (Robot) that dominate the human race and threaten it with extinction. An attempt of Ramon Llull (a medieval Catalan missionary) who came across an Arabic astrologer's device (*zaijra*) and created a novel approach to logic and reasoning that went beyond the syllogistic reasoning of the scholastics and could propose new findings (Coghill, 2023, p. 607). The contributions of Charles Babbage (a mathematician and mechanical engineer) to automate error-prone navigational table calculations with his Difference Engine in a computer invented during the Victorian age and the future vision of Ada Lovelace (an English mathematician and the world's first computer programmer) where machines could perform more intelligent tasks (Coghill, 2023, p. 608) unveil human attempts to create life which is the sole prerogative of God.

Its History Proper

The field of AI gained momentum with the creation of electrical computation machines. For instance, a collaboration between Warren McCulloch (physiologist) and logician Walter Pitts (logician) resulted in a Boolean model of the brain in 1943. This marked the beginning of distinct approaches to AI, branching into two strands: analogue (emerging from control theory and was termed Cybernetics) and digital (evolved from digital computer programming and was symbolic). MacKay (a young Christian physicist) developed an early analogue machine learning system to investigate intelligence and intelligent systems. In 1950, Alan Turing (a British logician and computer scientist) published his seminal paper, which provided an operational definition of intelligence. Allen Newell (an American researcher in computer science and cognitive psychology) and Herbert Simon (a Nobel Prize winner in economics and leader in AI and cognitive psychology) created Logic Theorist computer program which constructs proofs for the theorems found in *Principia Mathematica* (Coghill, 2023, p. 609). A major international conference occurred in the history of AI at Dartmouth College in 1956 where John McCarthy

(an American computer scientist and cognitive scientist) proposed the term 'Artificial Intelligence' to characterise the research area. Amidst various successes, AI also sparked consternation in certain areas, such as the issue of computational complexity. However, Joseph Weizenbaum (a German American computer scientist) designed ELIZA (a natural language processing system) to behave like a psychotherapist. Still, it caused some concern because they continued to do so even after being informed that there was no actual intelligence behind it (Coghill, 2023, p. 610).

The failure of AI systems resulted in an 'AI winter' due to *Perceptrons* (an algorithm for supervised learning of binary classifiers which could not solve key problems) by Marvin Minsky (an American cognitive and computer scientist) and Seymour Papert (a South African-born American mathematician and computer scientist). Later, David Rumelhart (an American psychologist) and James McClelland (an American psychologist and cognitive neuroscientist) addressed this problem using a backpropagation algorithm (originally devised for assigning credit and blame in economic systems). Thus, funds began to follow again for Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) research. On the symbolic side, with the Japanese push in the 'Fifth Generation' project, there was a surge in research in what came to be called 'Expert Systems.' These systems utilised sophisticated networks of rules to make deductions akin to those made by an expert in a specific domain. Achieving reasonable success in specialist areas, they gave rise to a group known as 'Knowledge Engineers.' These professionals devised methods to extract the knowledge embedded in experts' minds. However, this proved to be a tedious task due to the 'Knowledge Acquisition bottleneck' (difficulty in acquiring knowledge from experts or other resources in a format). It was eventually realised that observing and collecting data on what experts did could be a more effective means of acquiring the necessary knowledge and feeding it into a machine-learning engine (Coghill, 2023, p. 611).

Another issue surfaced was experts being protective of their expertise, especially if they perceived a threat of being surpassed by a machine. In response, Perry Miller (an American intellectual historian) proposed a 'Critiquing' approach to medical diagnosis. The system ATTENDING would review a proposed expert diagnosis, suggesting modifications or alternative possibilities and explaining the diagnosis. Agent-based systems, including sub-areas such as argumentation, have been active

research areas ever since in AI. While these were crucial technical developments, what captured the public imagination were successes in games like Chess, Jeopardy and Go. A significant feature of these successes is the involvement of both symbolic and neural methods. Neural networks initially paved the way as the original nature-inspired approach. However, since John Holland (an American Psychologist) introduced Genetic Algorithms, a proliferation of Nature-Inspired Algorithms has occurred. This has led to a burgeoning cottage industry in this field. In the new millennium, interest in neural networks resurged with the advent of Deep Learning (DL). The practical viability of DL became apparent with the adoption of Graphical Processing Units (GPUs), originally designed for high-speed graphical processing. However, DL faces two fundamental challenges: the mystery surrounding why it works and the inherent issue shared with all Artificial Neural Network (ANN) approaches. Symbolic AI proponents highlight this as a major difficulty, emphasising DL alone cannot suffice for real-world AI systems (Coghill, 2023, p.612). Hence, the series of AI proves that achieving genuine artificial intelligence remains a distant goal.

Imago Dei Reconsidered in the Darwinian Context

What are human beings that you are mindful of them? (Ps. 8:4). We have repeatedly asked this question with various methodologies, from theology and philosophy to biology, psychology, anthropology and cognitive science. So far, none of these intellectual frameworks have come up with complete or satisfying answers. From the perspective of evolutionary science, we are just one kind of living organism among many others. Biologically, we are essentially just another social ape with a slightly larger brain, which means that we do not seem to be as special as we thought we were (Dorobantu, 2022, p.179). This raises some problems for Christian anthropology because it holds that human beings are created 'in the image and likeness of God' (Gen 1:26).

Biblical Interpretations

The book of Genesis does not specify what exactly *imago Dei* is. The interpreters likely influenced by the Aristotelian tradition (humans as rational animals) thought of it in terms of some uniquely human capacity having to do with our intellect. This is known as the substantive interpretation of *imago Dei*. Nowadays, this interpretation has few adherents because most of the cognitive capacities thought uniquely human in the prescientific age have recently been fully or partially

identified in other animals. Furthermore, since Darwin, it has become clear that humans are not ontologically different from the rest of living creatures (Cortex, 2010, p.120-123). To replace the problematic substantive interpretation, theologians have creatively devised more sophisticated accounts of human distinctiveness and *imago Dei* into two big categories: functional and relational. The functional interpretation locates our specialness not in our mental capacity but in our election by God to represent God in the world by exercising dominion and stewardship over the rest of creation. The relational interpretation regards the image of God as manifested in the unique relationship humans are called to have with God and in the authentic personal relationships they have with each other. Triune God is relationship and so is humanity because in the image of God he created them, male and female he created them (Gen 1:26). Both these interpretations of *imago Dei* provide better answers to the scientific challenges mentioned earlier than the substantive interpretation (Cortex, 2010, p.125-130).

Human distinctiveness does not reside in any uniquely human intellectual faculty but in our unparalleled agency in the world to care for and even co-create with God (functional interpretation) or in the relationality that is so central to what it means to be human and in which we mirror a Trinitarian God (relational interpretation). Although we are not the only relational species that significantly acts upon its environment, the complexity of our relationships and the importance of relationships in the development of the human person seem to support the idea that it is through our relationality that we are special and in the image of God. The functional and relational interpretations of the image arguably represent progress from the earlier substantive proposal (Dorobantu, 2022, p.180). This shows that theological anthropology ultimately stands to gain from an open and honest engagement with science.

Human Distinctiveness

Revolutionary scientific ideas, such as Copernicus' heliocentric theory or Darwin's evolutionary theory, may initially threaten long-held religious beliefs about the world and the human being. Still, once the dust settles, theological reflection is actually enriched by the process of incorporating new scientific knowledge. As it turns out, it is still perfectly possible to speak of a creator God even when we know the cosmos is way older than a few thousand years. Likewise, there are new and arguably better theological ways of speaking of human

distinctiveness, even when evolutionary theory shows that we are of the same kind as non-human creatures and that our cognitive abilities are not that much different from theirs. However, a new challenge for human distinctiveness looms on the horizon, as hinted at earlier in the AlphaGo story (Dorobantu, 2022, p.181).

Computer programs have become capable of matching and surpassing human abilities in an increasing range of tasks, which, when done by humans, require what we vaguely call intelligence (AI). Even if AI operates somewhat differently from biological intelligence, AI programs are astonishingly capable of doing many of the things we used to regard as the unique domain of human intelligence, such as solving problems, proving theorems, labelling the content of images, transforming speech into text, translating various languages, composing music and answering questions etc. If progress in AI continues, it is not entirely absurd to imagine a time in the future when computers will reach human-level intelligence, becoming able to do all the things that we do equally well or even better. To a certain extent, this is already happening in some domains. AI algorithms can diagnose some forms of cancer better than human doctors. They operate superhumanly in chess, Go and many other strategy games. We trust AI programs to land planes and run the stock markets because of their ability to make fast decisions better than error-prone humans. One day, our streets might be filled with the much-hyped autonomous cars or we might engage in deep spiritual conversations with our robotic companions (Dorobantu, 2022, p.182).

When thinking about the challenges posed by AI to the idea of human distinctiveness, the hypothetical scenario of human-level AI is undoubtedly of great relevance. Nonetheless, an argument can be made more broadly that AI is still relevant for theological anthropology even without such spectacular developments. In this respect, AI can be seen as an applied form of cognitive science, and its results can be interpreted as saying something relevant about how humans achieve cognition. If AI quickly masters chess, Go, prose or visual arts, this can produce meaningful clues about the nature of such endeavours. On the contrary, if AI stumbles at particular tasks, that is also relevant, perhaps pointing to features that pertain to human distinctiveness (Dorobantu, 2022, p.183). Therefore, through its successes and failures, AI can produce new data points, which can serve as food for insightful theological reflection.

Implications of *Imago Dei* for AI

AI is considered a significant blessing, closely resembling human nature and capabilities. We aim to highlight distinct features of humans in contrast to AI, acknowledging that creation reflects and contrasts its creator. The following points could contribute towards a foundation for an AI theology.

AI and Human Intelligence

The substantive interpretation of *Imago Dei* identifies the image of God mainly with human reason. Reason and intelligence play pivotal roles in AI, paralleling human natural intelligence. The analogy between computers and the human mind underscores the replication of human intellect in AI, which, in its early stages, followed logic-based monotonic deductive learning. However, human intelligence stands as an unparalleled phenomenon distinct from Artificial Intelligence. For instance, a brain has 1,000 trillion neurons, each connected to as many as 10,000 neighbours; the number of possible patterns interconnecting them is greater than the number of atoms in the universe (Barbour, 1999, p.378). Thus, Human intelligence, a unique gift from God, defies a clear and distinct definition due to its intricate nature, leading AI researchers to acknowledge an imperfect understanding of intelligence.

The evolution of intelligence understanding in AI reveals a shift from mathematical and logical categorisations to a broader perspective encompassing human aspects like body, emotions, society and environment. The emergence of probabilistic thinking, common sense thinking, affective computing and bodily cognition signifies breakthroughs addressing contemporary challenges. Despite advances in cognitive and computational sciences, mysteries persist in unravelling the multidimensional nature of human intellect, posing challenges for cognitive scientists. The spiritual attributes and intentionality associated with human intelligence, beyond scientific capture, find explanation in the *Imago Dei*, underlining the limitations of reducing human mind and life to a mechanized realm within current scientific scope (Kavalackal, 2020, p.704).

AI and Human Functionality

The functional approach of *Imago Dei* shares a lot of similarities in the field of AI research since the first and foremost concern of AI is to be functional by performing the tasks for which it is created. Perhaps functionality is the lifeblood of AI. One of the major challenges of

AI is to achieve human-level functional versatility because however sophisticated current AI systems are, they cannot multitask at a human level. If we ask the stupendous AlphaGo computer, which beat Lee Sedol, the world Go champion, to send a congratulatory letter to its creators, it will be as helpless as a toddler (Dorobantu, 2022, p.178).

AI and Human Relationality

The relational interpretation of *Imago Dei* gains significant importance in AI. Just as God created humans for communion through mutual relationships, AI researchers aim to develop machines that emulate human behaviour and address societal concerns. Human beings are inherently social beings, emphasising the need for AI to balance individualistic and communitarian dimensions by focusing on matters of the human community (Kavalackal, 2020, p.711). Current AI research emphasises creating machines that interact naturally and responsively with people, reflecting a human inclination to impart inanimate objects with human-like features. The second AI100 report underscores the challenge of building machines that seamlessly cooperate and collaborate with humans, making decisions aligned with diverse human values. AI is evolving towards enhancing its ability to collaborate and support people, rather than merely imitating human intelligence, embracing relationality as a crucial aspect. Alan Turing prioritised AI-powered computers' indistinguishability from humans over raw computing power. His Turing Test emphasises relationality, favouring AI that behaves human-like. This aligns with the relational interpretation of *Imago Dei*, showing compatibility between AI and the concept of humans made in the image of God (Barbour, 1999, p.380).

The modern version of the Turing Test, proposed by AI researcher Barbara J. Grosz in 2012, raises the bar for AI relationality. The challenge is creating machines that communicate fluently with humans without being mistaken for humans. Future AI-powered robots may exhibit human features to the extent that they become indistinguishable, potentially leading to unique challenges. Grosz's version of the test emphasises that the nonhumanness of the computer system should not be noticeable, highlighting the latest developments in AI that align with the relational interpretation of *Imago Dei* (Barbour, 1999, p.382).

AI and Embodied Cognition

The rabbinic interpretation, which identifies *Imago Dei* with the human body, holds significant implications for AI. There is a growing realisation

of the human body's crucial role in producing and applying knowledge. The human body reflects *Imago Dei*, constituting an organic unity of physical, mental and spiritual dimensions, thereby playing a decisive role in human intelligence. AI researchers have, later on, recognised the importance of the body in human perception. A movement in cognitive science that emphasises granting the body a central role in shaping the mind. Proponents of embodied cognition start with the theoretical standpoint that a body requires a mind to function, moving away from a mind working on abstract problems (Wilson, 2002:625).

Human intelligence encompasses the physical, mental and spiritual dimensions. The Cog project at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) is an influential illustration. This project, involving the construction of a humanoid robot, is underpinned by embodied AI, emphasising the role of the body in intelligence development. It explains that intelligence cannot be abstracted from bodily features and conditions. The researchers call this Embodied AI, asserting that intelligence cannot be implemented on a disembodied machine. According to their creed, intelligence emerges only in bodies and depends on bodily features and conditions. Human intelligence can only emerge in a body that closely resembles a human. The Cog project attempts to build a human-like creature, whose shape closely resembles that of a human (Foerst, 1998, p.100). Therefore, the body cannot be separated even in artificial intelligence; artificial intelligence unequivocally demands an artificial body.

AI and Humans as Co-Creators

AI serves as a remarkable testament to human creative prowess. AI mirrors God's creative powers, suggesting that our scientific and technological advancements reveal the human capacity for creativity inherent in the image of God. This positions AI as an outcome of our God-given imagination and courage to co-create by innovating. The *Imago Dei* in humans elevates them to the role of co-creators with God, exemplified by the extraordinary creativity unleashed through powerful technologies like AI. This creativity is reshaping the Earth, generating a virtual world that often appears more vibrant than reality. The synergy of human intelligence and creativity yields remarkable outcomes in science and across various domains. Pioneering minds behind AI development warrant unequivocal appreciation, and AI itself becomes a celebration of our creative role in the world, representing

a spectacular achievement of our scientific spirit (Kavalackal, 2020, p.712).

Moreover, the remarkable capacities of AI challenge human presumptions of it being the only intelligence capable of extraordinary feats. The awe-inspiring achievements of artificial intelligence, from lightning-fast data processing to indefatigable task execution, offer a humbling experience (Foerst, 1998, p.100). Hence, AI shows the potential for collaboration between human ingenuity and technological innovation, emphasising the collective journey toward new frontiers of knowledge and capability.

AI and Human Consciousness

Human consciousness is a contentious topic in AI, generating sharp debate about whether future computers can attain consciousness akin to humans. Some scientists assert that computers will eventually develop human-like consciousness, viewing phenomena like consciousness as illusory and arising from the brain's complexity to abstract and categorise certain processes. As long as science maintains a materialistic perspective on anthropology, human consciousness is seen as a biological phenomenon awaiting complete comprehension for subsequent computational replication (Foerst, 1998, p.104). The hope is that as future computers advance in brute computation power, especially with breakthroughs like quantum computing, they might achieve comparable complexity and illusions, marking a transition from organic to inorganic life (an idea fervently supported by transhumanists). While human consciousness, rooted in the biological basis of the brain, remains within the realm of scientific exploration, activities in the brain are deemed computationally accessible (Foerst, 1998, p.105).

Human consciousness comprises computational dimensions (intelligence, communication skills) and non-computational dimensions (freewill, awareness, understanding), suggesting the potential for scientific unpacking with profound consequences. Despite ongoing analysis, the innermost recesses of human consciousness elude complete understanding, with the latest findings acknowledging the open questions and grey areas in consciousness research. Even if computers were to acquire consciousness, it is unlikely to mirror the complexity of adult human consciousness (Malayil, 2020, p.611). The distinctive properties of neural cells and networks, absent in

silicon-based systems, may pose empirical challenges to achieving human-level consciousness in computers or robots. From theological and philosophical standpoints, consciousness holds paramount importance. It underscores the inseparable relationship between reality and consciousness, framing consciousness as the sacred space where God, humans, and the world converge (Malayil, 2020, p.612). Thus, the vast and mysterious nature of human consciousness, beyond absolute computation, grants humans a uniqueness that defies full comprehension due to the limitations of human reason.

AI and Affective Domain

St. John encapsulates God as love, portraying it as a profound and universally resonant definition. Elevated as a lofty emotion, love becomes an integral part of the divine experience, connecting humans with the world in indescribable unity. *Imago Dei*, reflecting this divine image, encompasses human emotions alongside cognition. The scripture, emphasising the heart as the seat of thoughts and emotions, acknowledges the pivotal role emotions play in human life. In contrast to the Greek notion of ignorance as a human problem, biblical thought underscores the significance of attitudes and motives (Foerst, 1998, p.108).

The inquiry into whether AI-powered robots can feel introduces the evolution of AI research. Initially rooted in logic and accuracy, AI's cognitive focus shifted with the emergence of Affective Computing, championed by influential women scientists like Rosalind Picard. Affective Computing delves into recognising, interpreting and simulating human emotions, marking a paradigm shift. By incorporating sensors, microphones, cameras and software logic, Affective Computing aims to simulate human empathy, recognising the profound affective dimension in human beings. However, the unity of thoughts and emotions inherent in humans poses a unique challenge to AI. Damasio's argument about the interconnected role of the cortex and limbic system in constructing emotions reinforces the intrinsic unity of affective and cognitive domains in humans, a level of organic unity not yet achieved in AI. The second AI100 study acknowledges the splintering of psychometric work on intelligence, highlighting the importance of empathy, impulse control, and storytelling (Malayil, 2020, p. 612-613). Therefore, human actions result from the intricate interplay of thoughts and emotions in a unity yet to be fully realised in AI.

AI and Human Transcendence

Humanoids like Sophia, remarkable embodiments of AI, excel in various tasks with human-level efficiency but lack a crucial human attribute: self-transcendence. Unlike machines, the human spirit incessantly questions itself, with thoughts soaring into infinite horizons and epistemic curiosity probing the depths of realities. Karl Rahner eloquently captures this characteristic, highlighting how humans, by experiencing their finiteness radically, recognise themselves as transcendent beings. The infinite horizon of human questioning extends further with each answer discovered (Foerst, 1998, p.110). Humans contend with profound existential questions such as Who am I? Where do I come from? what should I do? raising intriguing queries about the origin and purpose of such inquiries. The Rig Veda emphasises the philosophical burden of humanity, expressing a lament about the unknown nature of oneself. While AI researchers may create robot philosophers with vast knowledge, these creations, lacking genuine self-awareness and the existential perturbations humans experience, are unlikely to be genuinely troubled by the ultimate mysteries that elude even their human creators (Foerst, 1998, p.111).

AI and Mental Health Care

Artificial Intelligence in healthcare involves the application of machine-learning algorithms to analyse and comprehend complex medical data, surpassing human capabilities in diagnosing, treating and preventing diseases. The primary goal is to correlate clinical data with patient outcomes, impacting diagnostics, treatment protocols, drug development, personalised medicine and patient monitoring. Mental health conditions affecting a significant population pose challenges in identification and treatment accessibility. AI technologies offer a promising avenue by providing fresh perspectives, detecting trends and enhancing the diagnosis and treatment of mental health issues. Chatbots like Woebot and Tess facilitate communication and support, adapting to users' personalities. Wearable AI solutions like Biobeat interpret bodily signals to assess mood and cognitive states, issuing warnings and enabling timely interventions (World Health Organization, 2022).

Despite the potential benefits, challenges in AI applications for mental health care exist. Issues include corporate-driven applications, posing ethical and regulatory questions and concerns about model validity, interpretability and potential biases. The collaboration between

AI researchers and healthcare professionals is essential to address these challenges. Research projects, like the one at the University of California, Davis, focusing on creating understandable AI algorithms, exemplify efforts to bridge the gap between AI advancements and medical practice. The advantages of AI include enhancing diagnostic accuracy by analysing diverse data sources, personalising treatment plans based on individual data and improving access to mental health care through virtual interventions (World Health Organization, 2022). Hence, the potential benefits and challenges underscore the importance of careful integration and collaboration in harnessing AI for mental health care.

An Appraisal

Navigating the myriad perspectives, we can draw a few nuanced conclusions about the distinctions between AI and human attributes. Functionally, AI excels in specific cognitive domains and task execution, leveraging its speed and power in data processing and analysis. However, it falls short of the multifaceted versatility inherent in human functionality, where body, thoughts, emotions, sensations and consciousness coexist organically. The unity found in organic beings, particularly humans, surpasses the capabilities of even the most sophisticated AI systems. Humans are intricately woven into the web of life, starkly contrasting to AI agents that can be turned on and off. The human brain's cosmic nature reflects the universe's ordering forces. Human intelligence, perceived as driven by cosmic intelligence, seems unparalleled and deeply rooted in the cosmos (Dolan, 2020, p.683).

AI lacks the divine spark of life found in humans. Unlike AI's external power source, humans possess an organic connection with the cosmos, fostering ethical responsibilities. Imago Dei inspires altruism and dominion over the world that AI cannot replicate. While AI can offer valuable contributions, replicating human dominion remains unattained. AI, while powerful, cannot replace the unique essence of humans, crowned by *Imago Dei*. Natural human intelligence holds an irreplaceable status.

Conclusion

The biblical concept of *Imago Dei* (image of God) needs revisiting in the age of AI. This technology challenges our understanding of human uniqueness and prompts questions about our goals, the differences between natural and artificial intelligence, and the ethics of

augmentation. To answer these, we need interdisciplinary perspectives. Theologians must consider both computational and spiritual worlds, integrating science and faith. This will keep theology relevant and responsive to the changing landscape brought about by AI, addressing the ethical issues surrounding this transformative technology. About various theological and philosophical issues in AI, Malayil (2020) opines that theology has to consider both the world of computation and the world beyond computation. It has to be genuinely integrating science and faith. For theology to be living and relevant, it has to accept and respect the mature growth of science and get integrated with our living faith and its lived dimensions.

References

Barbour, I. G. (1999). Neuroscience, Artificial Intelligence and Human Nature: Theological and Philosophical Reflections. *Zygon, 34*(3), 361-398.

Coghill, G. M. (2023). Artificial Intelligence (and Christianity): Who? What? Where? When? Why? and How? *Sage Journal: Studies in Christian Ethics, 36*(3), 604-619.

Cortex, M. (2010). *Theological Anthropology: A Guide for the Perplexed*. A&C Black.

Dolan, P. (2020). Artificial Intelligence: How Close will it Come to Being 'Made in The Image and Likeness of God.' *Asian Horizons, 14*(3), 686-698.

Dorobantu, M. (2022). *Imago Dei* in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Challenges and Opportunities for a Science-Engaged Theology. *Christian Perspectives on Science and Technology,* 1, 175-196.

Foerst, A. (1998). Cog a Humanoid Robot and the Question of Image of God. *Zygon, 33*(1), 91-111.

Kavalackal, R. (2020). Artificial Intelligence: An Anthropological and Theological Interpretation. *Asian Horizons, 14*(3), 699-712.

Malayil, G. M. (2020). Will artificial intelligence replace the human being: A critical analysis of the views of Roger Penrose and Stephen Hawking with Theological Reflections. *Asian Horizons, 14*(3), 601-614.

Wilson, M. (2002). Six views of embodied cognition. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 9*(4), 625-636.