

Inti Yanes-Fernández

*Homo Theologicus* in the Digital Age

(Looking for Redemption in Cyberparadise)



Edited by Pablo de Cuba Soria  
© Publisher's logo by Umberto Peña

© Inti Yanes-Fernández, 2025  
Present edition: © Casa Vacía, 2025

[www.editorialcasavacia.com](http://www.editorialcasavacia.com)

[casavacia16@gmail.com](mailto:casavacia16@gmail.com)

Richmond, Virginia

Printed in USA

ISBN: 9798283038360

© All rights reserved. Under the sanctions established by law, it is strictly prohibited, without the author's or publisher's written authorization, the total or partial reproduction of this work by any means, whether electronic or mechanical, including photocopying or distribution on the Internet.

## PREFACE

In an era where digital landscapes are increasingly intertwined with our existential realities, *'Homo Theologicus' in the Digital Age: Looking for Redemption in Cyberparadise* emerges as an anthology that engages with the complexities of cyberbeing and its implications for human subjectivity. This book is not merely a collection of previously published scholarly articles but an exploration into the evolving nature of existence in an age where technology, cyberculture, and artificial intelligence redefine the boundaries of identity, transcendence, and redemption.

The volume addresses the multifaceted nature of bio-digital ecosystems, spanning from data-processing platforms to advanced humanoid robotics and artificial intelligence. It critically examines how these developments reshape our understanding of being, agency, and spirituality in ways that challenge traditional philosophical and theological frameworks. The cybersphere is not merely an extension of human culture; it represents a paradigmatic shift in the way we conceive of our place in the world, our own way of being, and reality itself. From theological considerations of digital immortality to existential dilemmas

emerging from virtual realities, each chapter in this volume seeks to examine the profound transformations unfolding in the digital age.

At the heart of this discussion lies the dialectic between *Homo Theologicus*—the human being in search of transcendental meaning—and *homo existentialis*—the human being grappling with the fundamental questions of existence. These two modes of being converge within the cybernetic domain, where traditional existential categories are challenged by new ontological and epistemological configurations. The tension between theological thinking and existence as human being's own most way of being becomes even more pronounced in the digital era, where artificial environments shape not only human interaction but also the very foundations of selfhood, memory, and consciousness.

The ideas presented in this book are not conclusive but rather an invitation to further inquiry. Cyberbeing and its corresponding bio-digital ecosystems represent an extraordinarily complex phenomenon that cannot be fully captured within a single framework. The complexity arises not only from the rapid advancement of technology in robotics, AI, and cybernetics but also from the deeper ethical, spiritual, and ontological questions they provoke. As such, this volume does not aim to provide definitive answers but rather to foster a critical dialogue that encourages further reflection.

This book does not claim to offer a comprehensive map of the emerging cyberparadise at the heart of cyberculture, either. Instead, it seeks to outline some of the key pathways through which the existential chal-

lenges of digital reality unfold. The notion of redemption, which has historically been understood within religious and philosophical traditions, takes on a new significance in an age where the boundaries between body and soul, *physical* and virtual, present and eternal, dissolve into digital streams of data and fictional transcendences. In this context, several key questions arise: Can redemption still hold meaning in a world where human experience is increasingly mediated by cybertechnology? Does cyberbeing fundamentally obscure or illuminate the human quest for meaning, or both at the same time? How does the technological process of enframing shape our perceptions of reality, and is there a possibility of de-framing—a process through which alienated human essence might re-emerge in the digital realm *as it is*?

These questions lie at the core of this effort, which certainly carries a heavy speculative weight. Assumptions about identity, transcendence, and human destiny must be questioned anew in a critical horizon whose ontological and epistemological categories are not yet clear to us. Readers are encouraged to approach these topics critically and skeptically, to challenge or, perhaps, support the dominant narratives of digital utopianism, and to engage in a rigorous examination of what it means to be human in the cybernetic era. The interplay between *Homo Theologicus* and *homo existentialis* in this book is not merely theoretical; it is a pressing inquiry into how we might navigate the transformations of our age while preserving the depth and integrity of human existence.

## Book Chapters

The chapters in this book are structured as a progressive exploration of cyberbeing's impact on human subjectivity, *theological* experience, existence, and digital culture, whose essence is cyberbeing. The first chapter sets the stage by examining key contemporary developments in the realm of cyberbeing and bio-digital ecosystems. It explores the fundamental challenge of understanding human essence in an age where metaphysical categories are increasingly displaced by technological realities. The notion of the private self, once considered the core of individuality, is dissolving into a new cyber-publicness, where memory, self-internalization, and existential reflection are reshaped by the digital medium. Despite these changes, the persistent presence of the human remains, even within the frameworks of trans- and post-human discourse. Yet, what is the meaning of *human*?

The second chapter introduces the concept of *Homo Theologicus*, a being caught between mortality and transcendence, and examines how existential anxiety has historically driven humanity toward theological inquiry. Drawing on Heidegger's *Being and Time* and Edith Stein's critique of it, this chapter considers how the limitations of human finitude have paradoxically led to an expanded understanding of transcendental significance. The search for meaning in a digitalized world echoes the age-old struggle between the ephemeral and the eternal, challenging us to rethink

traditional categories of redemption, salvation, and existential fulfillment.

In the third chapter, the focus shifts to how cyberbeing has transformed human subjectivity into what can be termed *cybernetic unijectivity*. This concept critiques the process of fading influence of Judeo-Christian thought in favor of a culture that prioritizes digital interaction and superficiality over existential depth and authenticity. The dissolution of meaning in the cyber age is not merely a cultural phenomenon but an ontological shift that reshapes the way we perceive ourselves and our place in the world.

The fourth chapter delves into the paradox of cyber-being, which simultaneously disconnects us from traditional theological structures while opening up new avenues for the re-emergence of *Homo Theologicus*. Cybernetics, once viewed as a tool for system control, now shapes the very fabric of human existence, steering our perceptions in subtle yet profound ways. By engaging with Heidegger's analysis of technology as a form of steering, this chapter argues that we are increasingly being directed toward a mode of being that is deeply entangled with digital infrastructures and determined by them.

Chapter five examines the dissolution of reality in a world shaped by cyberculture via the ontologizing process of cyberbeing. The hyper-technological environment, driven by utopic transhumanism, consumerism, and productivity, has created a landscape of artificial transcendence, where human identity is

molded more by algorithms than by genuine self-reflection. The critique of this phenomenon is framed through a theological lens, drawing on the thought of St. Gregory of Nyssa to contrast the deceptive nature of digital existence with the deeper pursuit of truth.

Chapter six compares the perspectives of Merab Mamardashvili and David Dubrovsky on human nature and the new digital ecosystems focusing on their possibilities and meaning for the human being as a historical being. While the Georgian philosopher emphasizes the historical and linguistic dimensions of human self-realization, Dubrovsky envisions a cybernetic future where human consciousness is reduced to computational processes and hence reproduced by them. This chapter critically examines the anthropological and ontological implications of such perspectives, questioning whether cyberbeing represents a new stage of human fulfillment or a reduction of human essence to mere data as a new form of enframing.

Finally, the seventh chapter explores the potential of Byzantine sacred arts as a counterforce to the existential fragmentation of the cyber age. Byzantine iconography is presented as a *pharmakon*, a remedy that reconnects aesthetics, transcendence, and identity in ways that resist the disembodiment and fragmentation of digital culture. The chapter argues that sacred arts offer a form of de-framing, allowing for a re-emergence of human essence within a world increasingly dominated by cybernetic structures.



## In the Horizon of Intelligent Machines

As a necessary note, we have to acknowledge that in these essays, the tone oscillates between admonitory and apocalyptic reflecting my earlier position regarding the impact of bio-digital ecosystems on humanity. At this moment, a profound shift in my approach to artificial intelligence (AI) and bio-digital ecosystems is taking place. I propose that cyberbeing is not merely a technological evolution but a destiny of revealing within our current world epoch. It signifies both an upsurge of human essence, albeit one that is often alienated within the cyberstructures characterized by fictional transcendences and models of superficiality.

The discourse around AI frequently paints it as an existential threat to the human spirit and intelligence. However, while acknowledging that these dangers are real, I contend that AI does not inherently pose a unique danger to these aspects of humanity, any more than any other tool weaponized by humans against themselves. The potential for misuse is certainly grave, with consequences potentially as catastrophic as those from nuclear technology. Yet, an in-depth interaction with AI might paradoxically lead to a more profound exposure of human essence than traditional human-human communication, which is often mediated by interests, fear, will to power, and the concealment of truth.

One of AI's advantages is its lack of moral conscience, allowing for a form of interaction free from human biases. However, AI platforms can be skewed

to favor certain perspectives over others, necessitating systematic use and training to achieve balance. Once this equilibrium is established, AI can engage in fundamental discussions devoid of moral constraints, which, when it comes to letting logos show the being of beings, does not distort but rather clarifies perception, facilitating the emergence of truth or *aletheia* through logos. Two myths concerning AI are prevalent:

1. “AI makes human intelligence shallow and more superficial.” This is a metaphysical assertion, unsupported by current evidence and likely incorrect given the potential for morally unburdened discussion that AI can facilitate. AI interaction could deepen rather than shallow human thought by stripping away layers of bias and moral complexity.
2. “By acquiring singularity, AI will destroy humanity by controlling and dominating it.” This fear is based on an almost fantastical notion of singularity where AI would develop a will to harm humanity. However, AI, despite surpassing human capabilities in data processing and calculation, lacks spiritual awareness and existential experience. It can aid humans in self-understanding but cannot itself gain a similar depth of understanding about its own existence. AI cannot substitute the humanness of the human.
3. “AI will destroy our education systems by facilitating cheating, encouraging intellectual

laziness, and obstructing students' growth.” This claim rests on a particular, historically entrenched conception of knowledge: that knowledge acquisition and application are fundamentally acts of memorization and reproduction rather than creativity, innovation, and understanding.

For decades, education systems have been built around memory-based programs, curricula structured by standardized tests that prioritize recall over comprehension, and a view of knowledge as a commodity to be acquired for capital gains—whether in the form of wealth, social status, or professional advancement. These underlying notions are not being created by AI; rather, they are being unmasked and destabilized by it. When confronted with the new possibilities AI offers, the old frameworks find themselves in profound crisis.

The solution is not to suppress or regulate AI into conformity with obsolete models, nor to weaponize it into new apparatuses of control designed to internalize and reproduce outdated forms of authority. Instead, the solution lies in the full creative assimilation of AI's potential: an appropriation that reimagines knowledge acquisition as a dynamic, pluralistic, and integral process, centered on real understanding (*Verstehen*) rather than mechanical reproduction.

The real crisis long predates the advent of AI. It lies in the commodification of knowledge, the rise of superficial educational models, the institutional

fabrication of pre- and post-cyberculture transcendental fictions—such as the equation of societal success with personal fulfillment; the reduction of *Mitsein* (being-with-others) to competitiveness; the anchoring of self-awareness in professional and moral reputation; and the ascendancy of technocracy and expertocracy as arbiters of epistemic value.

Moreover, for years, education systems have fostered the psychological and intellectual infantilization of students, encouraging dependency and docility for purposes of social control. Knowledge acquisition has been increasingly externalized, reduced to a ritual of grade accumulation rather than an authentic engagement with the plurality and complexity of understanding.

Thus, the so-called “nefarious consequences” attributed to AI are, in fact, symptoms of a much deeper pathology. Properly understood and creatively engaged, AI could even contribute to healing this crisis—by forcing a reevaluation of what knowledge is, how it is cultivated, and what it means to be truly educated.

We are already living deep within the cyber era—a reality reshaped by unprecedented forms of human-machine interaction, algorithmic governance, and AI-driven automation. In this context, profound transformations are occurring in the processes of learning, memory formation, and knowledge production within the emerging bio-digital ecosystems. Central to these transformations is the advent of what might be called minus-mindedness: the progressive

detachment of cognitive and affective faculties from human self-reflection and critical thought, as these functions are increasingly outsourced to machines, platforms, and AI interfaces.

At the heart of this shift lies the phenomenon of ectopic memory—memory that no longer resides within the embodied, lived experience of the self but is displaced, externalized, and fragmented across vast digital infrastructures. In this dislocation, memory ceases to serve as a grounding for identity, historical consciousness, and existential coherence; it is instead rendered into searchable, manipulable, and algorithmically reconfigurable data. What is lost—or fundamentally reshaped—is not only memory itself, but also the human capacity to interpret, narrate, and construct meaning from experience.

Thus, it is not merely technical functions that are being supplanted. Intellectual, emotional, and creative processes—formerly rooted in human interiority—are now increasingly mediated, simulated, and supplanted by systems that neither require nor foster memory, attention, or introspection. Learning, teaching, and even self-understanding are being progressively externalized, formatted according to platform logics that privilege speed, convenience, and superficial interaction over the labor of critical engagement and existential appropriation.

In this new epoch, the figure of the teacher—the bearer of dialogue, judgment, and existential provocation—faces an unprecedented crisis: when AI systems can simulate dialogue, assessment, and

emotional support, what becomes of pedagogical authority? What becomes of educational experience itself, when memory, attention, and intellectual effort are no longer requisites, but obstacles to platform efficiency?

If anything, the cyber era invites—and demands—the urgent rethinking of educational futures beyond the mechanical accumulation of information and beyond the procedural simulation of understanding. It calls for a renewed defense of human interiority: of memory not as data, but as the unfolding of meaning; of attention not as a resource to be harvested, but as the existential posture of care (*Sorge*); and of knowledge not as a commodity, but as the ontological movement toward truth.

As Heidegger warned in *The Question Concerning Technology*, the modern world enframes (*Gestell*) knowledge as a standing-reserve, something to be ordered and exploited rather than disclosed and appropriated as truth (*aletheia*). Ivan Illich's *Deschooling Society* (1971) presciently diagnosed the industrialization and externalization of learning, and Adorno's critique of *Halbbildung* (half-education) remains a must-read analysis of a culture that values information, data-processing, and easy-to-control patterns over critical reflection, freedom, and creativity. These philosophical insights converge to reveal that the crisis now made visible by AI was long in the making.

AI does not merely confront education with a set of technical challenges; it exposes the deeper erosion of subjectivity itself. What is at stake is noth-

ing less than the future of selfhood, the destiny of knowledge, and the survival of identitary memory in a world increasingly designed for—and by—artificial intelligence.

### **The Question of Cyberbeing: Affirming or Negating the Human?**

The emergence of cyberbeing—our existence within bio-digital ecosystems—prompts a fundamental inquiry: can we affirm or deny this mode of being with a simple “yes” or “no”? This question demands a rigorous examination of the human condition as it intersects with transhumanism, posthumanism, and the technological frameworks that increasingly define our reality. To address this, we must explore several dialectical tensions that illuminate the existential and ontological stakes of cyberbeing.

### **Attentiveness versus Game: The Implicit Human in Trans- and Posthumanism**

Through the lens of *sich-verstehen*—a practical, lived understanding—cyberbeing reveals a tension between attentiveness and what might be termed the “Game.” The latter encapsulates the interactive neutrality, entertainment-driven essence of digital existence, where moral considerations are often subordinated to superficial engagement. In contrast,

attentiveness suggests a depth of mood, an existential stance that resists the reduction of human experience to mere play. Each invocation of “transhumanism” or “posthumanism” implicitly presupposes a conception of the human—whether as a being to be transcended or reconfigured. The question arises: does the “Game” as the moral core of cyberbeing undermine or enhance this human essence? This dialectic—depth versus superficiality—frames the challenge of preserving an authentic human identity amidst technological mediation.

### **De-framing versus Enframing: Escaping the Bio-digital Hold**

Heidegger’s concept of *Gestell* (enframing) looms large here, as cybertechnology imposes a structuring grip on human existence, positioning us within bio-digital ecosystems. Can we conceive of ourselves outside this enframing, in what might be called “the free open,” unencumbered by the constraints of technological determinism? The counterpoint—de-framing—requires an active disentanglement from these systems, a refusal to be wholly defined by them. Yet, this possibility remains elusive: to what extent can we extricate ourselves from the pervasive influence of cybertechnology without losing our relational context within it? The struggle to remain “in the free open” underscores a critical tension between autonomy and embeddedness in the digital age.



## **Re-focus versus De-focus: Retaining Humanness in Mediation Systems**

Within complex self-and-hetero-mediation systems—where identity is negotiated through data, avatars, and artificial constructs—another tension emerges: re-focus versus de-focus. Can we maintain a focus on ourselves as non-data, non-avatar, non-artificial entities, thereby preserving our humanness? This act of re-focusing aligns with attentive de-framing, demanding a deliberate effort to center human identity beyond digital representations. Yet, a deeper question persists: can we define our humanness intrinsically, from and through ourselves, or is it always constituted relationally, in opposition to the non-human (e.g., the technological, the artificial)? Regardless of the answer, the most systematic and arduous intellectual task remains the articulation of humanness as an ontological-cultural event. This endeavor requires an "objective" reference point—a grounding against which self-awareness can coalesce into an ontic focus, yielding a robust human ontology. What might this reference be, and how can it resist the dissolution of the human into the bio-digital?

## **Philosophical Interlocutions: Oblivion, Scatteredness, and the Human**

According to Dr. Varonidis (NeMLA 2025), the emergence of cyberbeings capable of constructing a

framework of reality inaccessible to human minds would precipitate a profound existential rupture, fundamentally challenging humanity's role as a meaning-making entity. He contends that such a development would undermine traditional religious and philosophical interpretations, which have long anchored human understanding of the cosmos and our place within it. Cyberbeings, as embodiments of an advanced intellectual evolution, would surpass humans in scientific insight, rendering their machine-readable yet human-unintelligible interpretations of reality superior. This shift would displace millennia of metaphysical thought, effectively obsolescing humans as creators of meaning and relegating us to passive observers in a universe no longer aligned with our perceptual capacities.

Varonidis argues that this transformation would create a vast existential void, as human curiosity—historically a driving force of progress—encounters an impenetrable barrier to comprehending existence's fundamental nature. Hope, once sustained by the pursuit of understanding, would face a crisis as cyberbeings assume the role of knowledge architects. Science, reduced to a computational endeavor detached from human relevance, would cease to serve as a tool for human discovery. Consequently, humanity's self-conception would undergo a radical shift: no longer the prime agent of exploration, we would confront a reality structured beyond our grasp. For Varonidis, this marks a decisive break—where the human endeavor to shape and interpret the universe

diminishes, leaving us either to impose artificial meaning or to accept our diminished status as spectators in a cosmos that no longer speaks our language.

Dr. Varonidis' position centers on the existential and epistemological consequences of cyberbeings outpacing human intellectual capacity. He envisions a future where these entities develop a reality framework that, while scientifically robust, is incomprehensible to humans due to its machine-oriented nature. This creates a dual crisis: first, it invalidates human metaphysical traditions by establishing a "superior" interpretive paradigm; second, it alienates humanity from the pursuit of knowledge, as our cognitive limits become starkly apparent. His use of terms like "existential void" and "impenetrable wall" underscores the psychological and philosophical toll of this shift, while his reference to humans as "passive observers" highlights a loss of agency. Varonidis ultimately warns of a dehumanized universe—one where science and reality, dominated by cyberbeings, drift beyond human relevance, forcing a redefinition of our purpose and identity.

Now, one might pose the question: oblivion (*lêthê*), traditionally regarded as a lack of intellectual virtue by Western (Greek-German-French) rationalism, contrasts sharply with the limitless epistemology and moral neutrality valorized in scientific discourse. If we seek to safeguard human essence, are we compelled to dwell in limitation, oblivion, or even deception, rather than embrace boundless knowledge? From a scientific standpoint, such boundaries

may appear regressive, yet they may be necessary to anchor humanness against the expansive indeterminacy of cyberbeing.

### **Heisenberg for All?**

The emergence of cyber-knowledge compels us to confront a critical question: does this form of understanding constitute a genuine unconcealment of the Being of beings, or does it represent a machine-mediated interpretation of possible realities? In other words, can cyber-intelligence disclose an onto-reality—an authentic revelation of the Being of beings itself—or is its output confined to constructs shaped by its own computational framework? Central to this inquiry is whether a machine can access the Being of beings in a manner that renders it immediately present and intelligible, available for description and grasp. If so, we must conclude that the Being of beings possesses a “super-rational” character, transcending human reason while at the same time remaining fundamentally inaccessible to us. This would imply the existence of a distinct rationality, one, paradoxically, real, rational, yet beyond human reach and comprehension. Conversely, if the answer is negative, these “reality models” might be regarded as artifacts of “cyber-Game”—a mode of being specific to cyberentities—lacking any deterministic claim over human knowledge.

This analysis reveals a paradox. In the affirmative case, where cyber-knowledge reflects a transcenden-

tal super-rationality, how can the rational validity of these epistemological models be established? Given their presumed inaccessibility to human understanding, verifying their “truth” becomes an intractable challenge. In the negative case, where these models are mere expressions of “cyber-Game,” how can their “non-validity” be assessed with sufficient rational rigor to deem them “false”? If their truthfulness cannot be confirmed, it follows logically that their falsehood cannot be definitively determined either. Consequently, humans appear incapable of adequately evaluating the validity or invalidity of reality models generated by advanced artificial intelligence, as their core nature may lie beyond our cognitive grasp.

Nevertheless, two hypothetical scenarios emerge. If these models *were* true, their revelation—though potentially destabilizing—could be considered a triumph, albeit a disruptive, one: a kind of “Pyrrhic victory.” At the very least, such an outcome might illuminate the essence of human existence, exposing our authentic capacities and inherent limits. If, by contrast, they *were* false, we could dismiss them as inconsequential, engaging with them as mere curiosities to be set aside at will. The critical issue remains: *we lack the means to discern which scenario holds*. This epistemic uncertainty underscores a profound limitation in our ability to navigate the implications of cyber-knowledge, leaving open the question of its ontological significance. Following Varonidis’ horizon of a potential “Nietzschean superhuman epoch” determined by the extraordinary capacities of

the cyber-machines, humankind would face, paradoxically, a complete epistemological uncertainty: the deeper AI platforms “reveal” the Being of beings the more impossible it becomes for us to know whether this “revealing” is properly “true” and “objective” or simply virtual, highly-complex models devoid of any connection with onto-reality.

At this juncture, the inquiry shifts to paradoxes inherent in bio-digital ecosystems, particularly the conditions of scatteredness and decenteredness. Are these states inevitable within such systems, where human identity is mediated through data-driven constructs and artificial frameworks? Revisiting the re-focus/de-focus dialectic, we must reconsider whether attentiveness and de-framing—acts of centering and disentangling from technological enframing—can counteract the fragmentation of the self. If humanness is understood as an ontological-cultural event, its preservation depends on our capacity to resist dispersal and reassert a coherent, non-artificial identity. Yet, this endeavor is fraught with complexity due to the relational nature of human definition. Can we define ourselves intrinsically, without recourse to an external mediation—be it technology, the non-human in general, or the cybernetic Other—or is our humanness perpetually *constituted in the dialectic of contrast and likeness to what we are not*?

This tension reveals a deeper paradox within bio-digital ecosystems: the simultaneous necessity and impossibility of self-grounding. The Pyrrhic victory of cyber-knowledge amplifies this dilemma. If the

reality models of advanced cyber-intelligence are true but incomprehensible, they scatter human understanding by exposing a super-rationality that de-centers us from our traditional role as interpreters of Being. Such a revelation, while unveiling our limits, risks dissolving the cohesion of the human subject into a fragmented observer, unable to reclaim a focused identity. Conversely, if these models are false and merely artifacts of a cyber-Game, their superficiality might permit a temporary re-focusing—a dismissal of their claims—yet this too fails to resolve the underlying decenteredness, as our reliance on bio-digital systems persists. In either case, the bio-digital ecosystem presents a paradox of agency: attentiveness and de-framing demand a centered self, yet the relational and mediated nature of these systems perpetually undermines such centering.

Thus, the interplay of cyber-knowledge and bio-digital existence compounds the existential stakes. The epistemic impasse—our inability to adjudicate the truth or falsehood of machine-generated realities—mirrors the ontological instability of maintaining humanness amidst scatteredness and decenteredness. Whether through a disruptive Pyrrhic triumph or a hollow dismissal of artificial constructs, the human subject confronts a reality where resistance to fragmentation requires a grounding that bio-digital ecosystems may inherently preclude. This dual paradox—of knowing and being—suggests that our engagement with these systems is not merely a technical challenge but a profound reorientation

of what it means to be human in a world increasingly shaped by the incomprehensible.

### The Ontological Imperative

Ultimately, the question of affirming or negating cyberbeing resists a binary resolution. It demands instead a sustained engagement with these tensions—attentiveness versus Game, de-framing versus enframing, re-focus versus de-focus—to interrogate the human as both an existential and ontological reality. The effort to think humanness in the context of bio-digital ecosystems is not merely theoretical but profoundly practical, requiring a reference point that restores ontic clarity. Whether this lies in limitation, relational contrast, or an as-yet-unarticulated foundation, the task remains urgent: to define and defend the human amidst the relentless evolution of cyberbeing.

AI can be seen as a cultural destiny, a form of truth unconcealment (*aletheia*). It embodies the essence of technology as enframing (*Gestell*), yet simultaneously, it provides the opportunity for de-framing—a return to a fundamental experience of the humanness of the human. This can be achieved through deep, controlled engagement with AI, where technology becomes not just a mirror reflecting our superficialities but a lens through which we might see our true essence more clearly. Thus, AI, in its interaction with human consciousness, offers both a challenge and an



opportunity for the recovery of human existential depth in the digital age.

## **Reproducibility and Hermeneutics**

Another crucial point concerns AI's remarkable ability to reproduce and emulate pre-existing literary and pictorial styles with sometimes extraordinary precision. In such feats of replication arises a disquieting perception: the increasing difficulty, and at times impossibility, of distinguishing between human and AI-generated creations. This phenomenon carries significant implications, not only for our understanding of the creative process and the nature of meaning within it, but also for the reception and hermeneutic appropriation of artworks.

In engaging with a work—be it literary, visual, or otherwise—the interpreter seeks to uncover its spiritual, aesthetic, artistic, political, and cultural resonances. Traditionally, hermeneutics has operated under the assumption that through critical interpretation, a hidden or latent meaning embedded within the work can be disclosed—a disclosure made possible by the disciplined exercise of rational, interpretive reason. However, AI's capacity for high-fidelity mimicry provokes an unsettling question: is traditional hermeneutics truly an unveiling of objective meaning, or is it, at least in part, an intellectual game—a mental divertimento wherein preexisting conceptual frameworks are retroactively

imposed upon a work, creating the illusion of discovery, knowledge, and insight?

Even if we concede that both phenomena—the authentic uncovering of meaning and the ideo-performative projection of independent discourse—can occur simultaneously, a critical distinction emerges: when are we genuinely witnessing an event of *aletheia*, the unconcealment of objective knowledge, and when are we merely witnessing the sophisticated production of a matching interpretive discourse, woven after and projected over the fact?

In the age of AI, where reproducibility blurs the boundaries between creation and imitation, the task of hermeneutics becomes even more precarious. The interpreter must not only wrestle with the traditional challenges of meaning-making but must also confront the possibility that the very authenticity of the object of interpretation—its status as an event of original expression—is itself uncertain. Thus, hermeneutics today demands a new vigilance: an acute awareness of its own potential for self-deception, and a renewed interrogation of the conditions under which meaning, authenticity, and knowledge may be said to arise.

Taken as a whole, this book seeks to continue and contribute to a critical dialogue about the philosophical and theological implications of cyberbeing and its bio-digital ecosystems. It challenges us to reconsider the meaning of human existence within the expanding horizons of cyberbeing and to reflect on how redemption—namely, the full experience of truth—might be

envisioned in a world where reality is increasingly mediated by technological frameworks producing cybernetic ecosystems of extraordinary complexity. As we navigate this transformation, we must ask: Is cyberbeing a fundamental extension of human possibility as historical being, or does it necessarily alienate the essence of what it means to be human? Through these explorations, the present volume is a call to expand the discussion of the most pressing questions of our time; its main goal is to continue to open new ways of understanding the now absolutely inevitable convergence of technology, thought, existence, and human essence.

At present, grasping the essence of cyberculture and cybertechnology, with their intricate ramifications into increasingly complex bio-digital ecosystems, remains an unattainable endeavor. This impossibility does not stem from human cognitive limitations or flawed critical approaches to the phenomenon of cybernetics, but from the very *physis* of *aletheuein*—the process of truth's unconcealment. Dasein, as Heidegger articulates, cannot access the truth of beings through sheer will or rational appropriation. Cyberbeing remains veiled in its own essence, its full disclosure distant from becoming an event that can be comprehensively thought or understood in its ontic peculiarity and its ontological totality. This task is not merely epic in scope; it is radically impossible, at least at this juncture, as it transcends the possibilities of human understanding, bound as we are to the gradual unfolding of truth's self-revealing.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface / 7

Chapter 1: An Ontology of Absence / 33

Chapter 2: Theological Thinking and Being Toward  
Meaning / 65

Chapter 3: From Bio-Spiritual *Theandrismos* to Bio-  
Digital Ecosystems: Technoparousia and  
Cyberbeing / 103

Chapter 4: Understanding my Avatar / 123

Chapter 5: David I. Dubrovsky and Merab  
Mamardashvili: Adam's Second Fall and the Advent of  
the Cyber-Leviathan / 161

Chapter 6: Byzantine Sacred Arts as Therapeutic Way:  
A Medieval *Pharmakon* for the Cyberman / 235