



Technological Eschaton Versus Cosmic Transfiguration: The Body "Disputed" Between Immortality Through Silicon and Resurrection In Christ

Ioan Stelian ȚĂRAN¹

¹ PhD Candidate, Ovidius University of Constanța, Romania, pr_stelian@yahoo.com

Received: 29 April 2026

Revised: 2 June 2026

Accepted: 3 August 2026

Available online: 7 August 2026

Suggested citation

I. S. ȚĂRAN. "Technological Eschaton Versus Cosmic Transfiguration: The Body <<Disputed>> Between Immortality Through Silicon and Resurrection In Christ", *Research and Science Today*, vol. 2026, no. 2, art. no. 25.2026, pp. 1–11, 2026, doi: 10.38173/RST.2026.2.4

Abstract

The present study investigates the theological anthropology of the body as it stands between two radically opposed eschatological horizons: the transhumanist promises of technological immortality and the Orthodox Christian vision of bodily resurrection and cosmic transfiguration. Drawing on patristic soteriology, the theology of theosis, and Orthodox eschatology, the article argues that the human body is not a mere biological substrate to be overcome or digitally replicated, but the very locus of deification - irreplaceable in its material particularity, called to glory through the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of Christ. Distinguishing between therapeutic and radical currents within transhumanism, it contends that the radical, substrate-independent project - in its mind-uploading variants, its cyborg-enhancement paradigms, and its silicon-substrate immortality proposals - functions as a soteriological counterfeit that reduces the human person to information and the body to a disposable container. This claim is developed rather than merely asserted, in dialogue with both the patristic tradition and the philosophy of personal identity. Against this project, Orthodox theology proposes not the abolition of the body but its transfiguration: a pneumatization of matter in the Spirit, anticipated in the Eucharist and fully realized at the Parousia. The article concludes that the dispute over the body is ultimately a dispute over the nature of salvation itself.

Keywords: *body; resurrection; theosis; transhumanism; technological eschatology; Parousia; cosmic transfiguration; Orthodox theological anthropology*



I. The Human Body Between Biology, Code and Theology

There are times in the history of thought when a seemingly new question reveals, on closer inspection, that it is merely reformulating in contemporary language a controversy of venerable antiquity. The debate between transhumanism and Orthodox theology on the "destiny" of the human body is one of these moments. What presents itself today under the guise of biotechnological terminology - mental upload, cybernetic augmentation, neural emulation, digital immortality - does not represent a truly new challenge for theology, but a return, in ultramodern garments, of one of the oldest Gnostic temptations: that of escaping from the body, transcending it or replacing it with something purer, more sustainable, closer to what man thinks it should be.

The analogy with Gnosticism must, however, be stated with precision, lest it become a mere rhetorical label. What the radical transhumanist project shares with the ancient Gnostic systems is a specific structural feature: a soteriology of escape, in which deliverance is conceived as liberation from the material conditions of embodied existence, and in which the body figures as a prison, a limitation or a defective vessel from which the true self must be extracted. The classical Gnostic disparagement of the demiurgic, material order finds a functional analogue in the informational dualism that treats the person as a pattern in principle separable from its biological carrier. The differences are equally important and must not be elided. Ancient Gnosticism was framed in mythological and cosmological terms and located salvation in secret knowledge (*gnosis*) of a transcendent realm; transhumanism is resolutely immanent and secular, locating deliverance in engineering rather than in revelation. Nor does the analogy apply uniformly: the therapeutic and pro-body currents identified below do not share this anti-somatic premise and are therefore not Gnostic in the relevant sense. The claim advanced here is thus narrow and deliberate - that the substrate-independent, anti-body current reproduces the soteriological grammar of Gnostic escape, not that transhumanism is in every respect a revival of second-century cosmological myth.

The central question that transhumanism asks - can the body be overcome, replaced or radically improved by a technological intervention that would give man immortality? - is not basically a question about technology. It is a theological question: what is the body? What is a person? What does death mean and what does eternal life mean? If Orthodox theology is called to enter into dialogue with this challenge, it must do so not from the defensive, but from the depths of its own tradition, with the calm and clarity that an articulate vision of the person, the body and salvation gives.

The body has never been a marginal issue in patristic thought. On the contrary, it represented the central stake of Christological disputes and soteriological controversies. Saint Gregory of Nazianzus had precisely formulated the axiom: what was not assumed was not healed [1]. If the Son of God has taken flesh, this means that the body is capable of salvation, that it is not an obstacle to divinization, but its ontological vehicle. The entire logic of the Incarnation is built on this premise: matter is not in itself evil, corruptible in the metaphysical sense, or inferior, but it is called to deification.

Transhumanism starts from a completely different premise. Philosophers such as Nick Bostrom, one of the intellectual founders of the movement, argue that man is at an early stage of his evolution and that technology can and must overcome biological limitations, including death [2]. In its more radical, substrate-independent variants, the biological body is regarded as a defective platform, subject to degradation, pain and death, which can be replaced or transcended. The mind - reduced, in computer terms, to a pattern of information processing - could, in the view of the proponents of mind uploading, be transferred to a silicon substrate, thus gaining functional immortality. The body becomes redundant, or at most a transient interface.



It is important, however, not to treat transhumanism as a homogeneous block. The movement contains markedly different currents, and the present study is concerned in the first place with its strongest, substrate-independent form rather than with every position that travels under the name. A useful distinction can be drawn between a “soft” or therapeutic transhumanism, which seeks the amelioration of the human condition through bioethics and advanced medicine and does not propose abolishing the body at all, and a “hard” or radical transhumanism, which envisions the supersession of the biological organism through mind uploading, whole-brain emulation or substrate independence. A further line separates dualist, anti-body approaches, for which embodiment is an accidental and ultimately disposable feature of personhood, from non-dualist, pro-body approaches, which value the lived body and seek its enhancement rather than its replacement. The theological objections developed in what follows bear principally on the radical, anti-body, substrate-independent current - the one that treats the body as an obsolete container - and not on every form of medical or therapeutic intervention. Naming this typology explicitly is necessary if the dialogue is to engage the transhumanist project at its strongest rather than at its most vulnerable point.

This fundamental divergence is not a simple difference of opinion about technology. It is a difference of ontology, of anthropology and, finally, of soteriology. That is why the response of Orthodox theology cannot be purely apologetic or exclusively critical - it must be first of all constructive, affirmative, articulated around its own vision of man, the body and destiny.

II. Immortality Through Silicon: The Anatomy of a Godless Eschaton

The term “technological eschaton” does not belong to the classical theological vocabulary, but it accurately captures the internal logic of the transhumanist project: that of producing, by technical and immanent means, a post-biological, final and irreversible state of existence, which would functionally reproduce what religious traditions called immortality or eternal life. It is not a question of a simple improvement of the human condition, but of a radical transformation of human nature itself - an immanent “parousia”, produced not by divine intervention, but by technical ingenuity.

The concrete projects that articulate this program are diverse, but they converge on the same ideological core. Mental upload assumes that human consciousness is reducible to an informational pattern that can be mapped, copied, and run on another substrate. Cybernetic augmentation proposes the progressive integration of artificial components into the biological organism, to the point where the boundary between man and machine becomes conceptual irrelevance. Medical nanotechnology, radical genetic engineering and brain-computer interfaces converge towards the same horizon: overcoming biological death by man-made means.

Orthodox theology does not relate to these projects with ignorance or moral panic. It identifies their false soteriological structure. The problem is not that transhumanism promises too much – but that it promises something fundamentally different from what salvation really is. Christian salvation is not the survival of consciousness or the perpetuation of cognitive processes. It is the deification of the person - *theosis* - a process of participation in the very life of God, which necessarily involves the body as a constitutive dimension of the human person.

This distinction is crucial. When Orthodox theology speaks of the human person, it does not separate the soul from the body as two distinct entities, one of which is valuable and the other is not. The person is the hypostatic unity of soul and body, constituted as such by the creative act of God. Saint John of Damascus, in his dogmatic treatise, insists that the soul and the body were created together and that their unity is not accidental, but constitutive of the identity of the person. Death is regarded not as a liberation of the soul from the prison of the



body - a platonic vision, alien to the patristic spirit - but as an unnatural, tragic rupture within the unity of the person, a rupture that will be healed by the resurrection of bodies [3].

Mental upload, therefore, even if technically possible - which is highly questionable - would not produce the immortality of the person, but a simulation of him. The digital copy of X's neural patterns is not X; it is at most a functional imitation, devoid of ontological continuity with the real person. The person is not the sum of his informational patterns. It is a unique, unrepeatable hypostasis, constituted in relationship with God and with others - what Ioannis Zizioulas described as an existence ontologically grounded in communion [4]. It should be noted that Zizioulas's relational ontology of the person is not an uncontested position within contemporary Orthodox theology; it has been subjected to searching criticism by Nikolaos Loudovikos, who questions its handling of nature and will, and stands in tension with the personalism of Christos Yannaras [13]. The argument advanced here does not depend on adjudicating that debate. What the present study draws from Zizioulas is the more modest and widely shared claim that personhood cannot be reduced to an individual substance or to a self-contained set of properties, and that identity is therefore not the kind of thing that could be exhaustively captured and transferred as a portable information pattern. No machine can reproduce this founding relationship.

This theological objection does not stand in isolation from the philosophical debate over personal identity; on the contrary, it intersects with it directly. The mind-uploading thesis presupposes a functionalist and broadly informational account of mind, according to which mental states are individuated by their causal-functional roles and are therefore substrate-independent: what matters is the pattern of organization, not the matter that realizes it [14]. On such a view, a sufficiently faithful computational replica of a person's functional organization would simply be that person. Yet even within secular philosophy of mind this inference is far from secure. The literature on personal identity has long distinguished between numerical identity and mere qualitative similarity, and Derek Parfit's analysis of teletransportation and branching cases shows that a perfect psychological replica need not preserve the numerical identity of the original; the replica may be a continuer, even an exact one, without being the same individual [15]. The duplication problem is decisive here: if a neural pattern can in principle be copied, it can be copied more than once, and a criterion of identity that would make several simultaneous replicas all identical to the original collapses into incoherence. The Orthodox claim that "the digital copy of X's neural patterns is not X" is therefore not merely a confessional assertion against an opposing party; it converges with a recognized line of philosophical argument that psychological or functional continuity is insufficient for the persistence of the numerically same person. Theology and philosophy here reinforce one another: where the philosopher speaks of the failure of qualitative continuity to secure numerical identity, the theologian speaks of the irreducibility of the hypostasis, constituted in body and in relation, to any transferable pattern of information.

Beyond the ontological impossibility, there is also a problem of telos. Transhumanism does not have a coherent answer to the question: immortality for what? The indefinite perpetuation of consciousness on an artificial substrate presupposes that life has value in itself, regardless of its purpose. Orthodox theology responds that eternal life is not the infinite prolongation of present existence, but its ontological transformation through participation in the life of God. This transformation cannot be produced by man; it is a gift, and its condition is humility, not technical mastery.

There is also an ecclesial-community dimension to the problem that transhumanism completely ignores. Digital immortality is, by definition, an individual project - and this is one of the clearest signs of its false eschatology. The Christian eschaton is not an individual immortality, but an entrance into the full communion of persons with God and with each other



- what Paul called "that God may be all in all" (I Corinthians 15:28). No silicon architecture can mimic this reality.

III. The Disputed Body: Incarnation, Resurrection, and Theosis as a Patristic Response

The real theological stake of the dispute over the body cannot be understood without passing through the center of Christian revelation: the Incarnation of the Son of God. That God took on human flesh - not as a temporary costume, not as a pedagogical condescension, but as a full and irreversible assumption of human nature - this is the cornerstone of Christian anthropology. Suddenly, the human body can no longer be regarded as an inferior, defective or transitory reality. It is the body that the Son of God assumed and made His own, drawing it into His own mode of existence.

The Holy Fathers have penetrated the depth of this mystery with an intensity that leaves no room for equivocation. Saint Maximus the Confessor, perhaps the most systematic thinker of the Orthodox ascetic-mystical tradition, develops a theology of the organic body linked to his doctrine of the *logoi* - the divine reasons of creation. The human body is not a purely biological entity; He participates in his divine logos, in his creative reason, which directs him towards theosis. Saint Maximus sees in the flesh not an obstacle to union with God, but precisely the environment through which divine grace flows into creation. Through the asceticism of the body and through participation in the Mysteries of the Church - first of all the Eucharist - the body itself becomes pneumatized, a participant in the uncreated divine energies [5].

The resurrection of Christ is the moment when this promise becomes a full fact. Christ did not rise as a spirit stripped of the body, nor as a pure conscience thought from a transhumanist perspective. He was resurrected with the body—the body that bore the marks of nails and wounds in the rib, the body that Thomas touched, the body that ate fish with the disciples. And yet, the same body was transfigured: it was no longer subject to the usual spatio-temporal limitations, it could enter through locked doors, it was glorified. Orthodox theology calls this reality the "spiritual body" (*soma pneumatikon*) – not an immaterial body, but a fully pneumatized body, in which matter fully participates in the light of grace. The Apostle Paul articulates this reality with remarkable clarity: "A natural body is sown, a spiritual body is raised" (I Corinthians 15:44).

The doctrine of theosis is not a later addition of the Eastern mystics. It belongs to the nucleus of patristic soteriology. Saint Athanasius the Great had formulated in his famous maxim in "De Incarnatione": "God became man so that man might become god" [6]. This is not a metaphor; It is an ontological statement. Theosis means the real participation of the human person - soul and body - in the divine life through the uncreated energies of God, without the divine and human natures being confused. The fundamental distinction that Saint Gregory Palamas defended in the hesychastic controversies - the distinction between the divine essence and the divine energies - has precisely the role of guaranteeing the reality of theosis without falling into pantheism. Man participates in God not by essence, but by energies - but this participation is real, ontological, transformative [7].

If theosis involves the body, then the resurrection of bodies is not an appendix of Christian eschatology—a matter that theology could dispense with without major loss. It is the culminating moment of theosis, in which the process of pneumatization, begun in Baptism and nourished in the Eucharist, reaches its full realization. The resurrected body will not be the amplified biological body, nor a digital copy of the neural structure, nor a "better" artificial body. It will be the same body - ontological continuum with the actual body - but transfigured,



fully participating in the divine energy. "For this corrupt (body) must put on incorruption, and this mortal (body) must put on immortality" (I Corinthians 15:53).

This ontological continuity is essential and marks the difference in principle from any transhumanist project. The mental upload produces, at best, an informational continuity - not an ontological one. The person uploaded digitally is not the real person; It is a functional replica. The resurrection, in contrast, is a continuity of the same hypostasis, of the same personal "I" - but transfigured, not replaced. God does not create another person in place of the dead one; He raises the very person who has died, with the body that belonged to him, from the matter to which he was consecrated by creation and the Incarnation.

The Eucharist occupies a special and insurmountable place in this theology of the body. The Body and Blood of Christ - ontological realities, not symbolic in an exclusively metaphorical sense - are received by the believer through participation in the Divine Liturgy. The body of the believer becomes itself a participant in the glorious body of the Risen Christ. Through the Eucharist, not by uploading, the human body already begins the process of transfiguration. This is the patristic logic, from Saint Ignatius of Antioch - who called the Eucharist "the doctrine of immortality" [8] - to the contemporary theologians of the ecclesial body.

Saint John of Damascus, in his systematic exposition of the Orthodox faith, precisely formulates what patristics has constantly affirmed: "The Body of Christ is the Body united with the Godhead, the Body of the Virgin, not of heaven. And the same Body is given to us for food, not for swallowing, but for participation and union with the Divine One" [9]. The body is not a transitory instrument of spiritual life. He is a co-participant in salvation, a co-heir to glory - and that is why he cannot be left behind, nor replaced, nor simulated by silicon architectures.

IV. Cosmic Transfiguration: The Orthodox Eschaton Between Parousia and the Pneumatization of Matter

Orthodox eschatology does not stop at the individual "destiny" of the body. It has a cosmic dimension that contemporary theology - in dialogue with the natural sciences, but never reductive to them - must articulate clearly. The created world as a whole is called to transfiguration, not to annihilation. Creation is not a temporary platform that will be abandoned at the end of time; it is, by God's will, the subject of an ontological transformation that makes it capable of being the "place" of the eschatological existence of transfigured human persons.

To speak of a theology "in dialogue with the natural sciences" is not to gesture vaguely at an undeveloped possibility, for that dialogue has a substantial recent history with which the present argument should be situated. The work of Ian Barbour on the typology of relations between science and religion, of John Polkinghorne on eschatology and the continuity-in-transformation of the created order, and of Nancey Murphy on non-reductive physicalism and the constitution of the person, has shaped a field in which the questions raised by transhumanism can be posed with conceptual care rather than mere opposition [16]. The point of invoking this literature is not to import its conclusions wholesale; some of its commitments - for instance, certain physicalist accounts of mind - sit uneasily with the hypostatic anthropology defended here, and the engagement must therefore be critical as well as receptive. The point is rather to make clear that the Orthodox response to transhumanism need not, and should not, be conducted in a single direction, as if theology spoke and science merely listened. Within Christian thought itself, including currents close to ecological theology and the science-theology dialogue, there are resources for thinking the transfiguration of matter in conversation with cosmology and biology, and an Orthodox eschatology of cosmic transfiguration is strengthened, not threatened, by acknowledging them. What distinguishes the Orthodox contribution within that conversation is its insistence that the transformation of the cosmos is



neither mere physical continuation nor sheer replacement, but pneumatization: the penetration of created matter by the uncreated energies, a category that the natural sciences can neither supply nor refute, but which reframes the very meaning of continuity and end that those sciences describe.

The Holy Apostle Paul expressed this with remarkable lyrical power in the Epistle to the Romans: creation as a whole suffers and sighs together with men, awaiting "the revelation of the children of God" (Romans 8:19-22). The suffering of creation is not an accident of material existence; it is the sign of its vocation - matter is waiting to be freed from the bondage of corruption, to participate in the freedom of glory. This cosmic perspective is profoundly anti-dualistic: matter is not evil, it should not be eliminated or overcome, but transfigured.

Saint Maximus the Confessor, in "Mystagogia" and "Ambigua", develops a vision in which the movement of creation towards God is not only spiritual, but cosmic and corporeal. The distinction between created and uncreated will not be abolished—that would be pantheism—but creation will be penetrated by the divine energies to a degree of intensity that the present cannot comprehend. The transfigured world will not be a different world from this one; it will be exactly this world, but healed by the separation between nature and grace, between matter and Spirit. The cosmic theosis does not cancel out the particular; he perfects it [10].

The parousia - the second coming of Christ - is not in Orthodox eschatology a nihilistic catastrophe that ends the world through destruction, but precisely the moment when the cosmic transfiguration becomes complete. Christ returns not to annihilate creation, but to fully manifest his dominion over it, to bring to fullness what the Incarnation inaugurated. This vision of the Parousia as cosmic fulfillment is the polar opposite of the technological eschaton, which imagines an end of history produced by human ingenuity - Ray Kurzweil's Singularity, the moment when artificial intelligence surpasses human intelligence and the world changes irrevocably - without God, without grace, without person in the full theological sense [11].

Structurally, the technological eschaton reproduces the logic of an immanent self-transcendence: like the builders of Babel in Genesis, it promises to reach heaven by human means and to secure immortality by its own power. The comparison is offered here not as polemic but as a way of naming the underlying soteriological structure - the substitution of human technical achievement for the gift of divine communion. Orthodox theology does not reject technology as such; it is neither Luddite nor hostile to scientific progress, and it readily acknowledges the real benefits of medicine, biotechnology and applied engineering for the alleviation of human suffering. What it rejects is the implicit soteriology of certain transhumanist currents: the conviction that man can produce his own salvation, that death can be removed by calculation, that the body can be replaced by engineering without ontological loss.

There is a difference in principle between curing the disease and replacing the body. The first is compassion; the second is ontological hubris. Therapeutic medicine, even in its most advanced forms, remains in the logic of serving the body as a gift of God. Radical transhumanism goes beyond this limit: it no longer serves the body, but denies it as the ultimate reality, proposing its replacement with an artificial construction. This is not an improvement of man; it is the proposal to create another type of entity, instead of man as he was created and redeemed.

Stated thus, however, the distinction risks appearing too neat, as though every intervention fell cleanly on one side or the other of a single line. The contemporary situation is more complicated, and the most pressing cases lie precisely in the intermediate zone: intelligent prostheses that restore or extend lost function, cochlear and retinal implants, deep-brain stimulation, gene therapies, artificial organs, and brain-computer interfaces deployed for



rehabilitative purposes. None of these is reducible either to the simple cure of a discrete pathology or to the wholesale replacement of the body, and an Orthodox theology of technology that wishes to be taken seriously cannot leave them unaddressed. What is needed is not a prohibited list but a criterion of discernment, and such a criterion follows from the anthropology developed above. The decisive question is not how technologically advanced an intervention is, nor how deeply it penetrates the organism, but whether it serves the body as the constitutive locus of the person or instead treats embodiment as a contingent platform to be optimized, transcended or discarded. By this measure, a neural implant that restores speech to a paralyzed patient, an artificial heart that sustains a failing one, or a genetic therapy that corrects a lethal mutation all remain within the logic of healing: they serve the integrity of the embodied person and its vocation. The line is crossed when intervention ceases to serve the given body and aims instead at its supersession - when the goal is no longer the flourishing of this embodied hypostasis but the migration of the self to a substrate held to be superior to the flesh. Many real technologies, of course, are ambivalent and may be turned to either end; the criterion does not classify devices in the abstract but interrogates the intention and the anthropology that govern their use. This refusal of a rigid opposition between Christianity and technology is itself faithful to the patristic estimate of matter as capable of grace.

The hesychastic tradition adds an unavoidable perspective. The Taboric light—the light seen by the Apostles at the Transfiguration of the Savior—is not a created light or a psychological metaphor. It is the uncreated divine energy, which has penetrated and transfigured the human body of Christ, and which, by grace, can also penetrate the body of the one who is spiritually striving. Saint Gregory Palamas strongly defended this reality against Barlaam of Calabria: it is not a question of intellectual enlightenment or a mental state; it is a question of a real ontological participation of the body in the divine glory. The bodily theosis is not a metaphor; it was seen on Tabor and is lived, in anticipation, in hesychastic prayer and in Eucharistic participation [12].

This reality casts a completely different light on the question of immortality. Man does not aspire to immortality because he is a rational being and his rationality could be perpetuated on any substrate. He aspires to immortality because he bears within himself the image of God - the image of Him who is Life by Himself. "I am the resurrection and the life" (John 11:25) - not a promise of the continuous functioning of cognitive processes, but an ontological affirmation of who it is that holds existence in hand. Immortality is not a property that man can produce; it is a gift that God grants through the participation of the person in His life.

Conclusions

This study set out to examine the body as it stands between two opposed eschatological horizons, and the argument has moved through four connected stages. It began by showing that the question transhumanism poses - whether the body can be overcome, replaced or radically improved - is at bottom not a technological but a theological question about the person, death and eternal life, and that the radical, substrate-independent current reproduces, in immanent and secular form, the soteriological grammar of Gnostic escape. It then argued, in dialogue with both the Orthodox tradition and the philosophy of personal identity, that mind uploading would yield at most a functional replica rather than the numerically same person, since neither psychological nor functional continuity is sufficient for the persistence of the hypostasis. It located the positive theological response in the Incarnation, the unity of soul and body, the resurrection of the flesh and the doctrine of theosis, with the Palamite distinction between essence and energies guaranteeing that deification is real participation rather than pantheistic fusion. And it extended this anthropology to its cosmic horizon, where the Parousia is read not as annihilation but as the pneumatization of matter - the penetration of the created order by the



uncreated energies - which stands as the structural antithesis of an end of history engineered by human means.

The original contribution of the study can be stated more precisely than a general defense of the body would suggest. Its principal claim is that the dispute over the body is, finally, a dispute over the nature of salvation, and that transhumanism in its radical form is best understood not as a rival technology but as a rival soteriology - a counterfeit eschaton whose informational anthropology fails by criteria internal to the philosophy of mind as well as by those of Orthodox dogmatics. Three more specific contributions follow from this. First, the study brings the patristic doctrine of theosis and the Palamite essence-energies distinction to bear directly on the mind-uploading thesis, showing that the resurrection offers an ontological continuity of the same hypostasis that informational continuity cannot supply. Second, it proposes a criterion of discernment for the theology of technology - whether an intervention serves the embodied person or aims at its supersession - that distinguishes therapeutic and enhancement technologies from the radical transhumanist project without collapsing into a blanket opposition between Christianity and technology. Third, it draws an explicit and qualified typology of transhumanist currents, so that the theological critique engages the position at its strongest rather than at its most easily refuted.

Several directions for future research remain open. A sustained engagement between Orthodox hypostatic anthropology and contemporary theories of personal identity - functionalism, animalism, narrative and psychological-continuity accounts - would test and refine the convergence sketched here. The criterion of discernment proposed for the intermediate zone of biotechnologies invites case-by-case development in conversation with bioethics, particularly around neural interfaces, gene editing and life-extension medicine. The cosmic dimension of the argument could be deepened through a closer dialogue with cosmology and ecological theology on the meaning of continuity and transformation in the created order. And the comparison between Gnostic and transhumanist soteriologies, advanced here in a deliberately narrow form, would repay fuller historical and conceptual treatment. What this study has aimed to establish is the framework within which such inquiries belong: that the transfiguration of the body and the cosmos, understood as participation in the life of God, is not one option among others but the form of fulfillment that respects the human person in its full psychosomatic integrity - which is precisely what an immortality of information, however prolonged, cannot do.

Author Contributions: The author confirms being the sole contributor to this work and has approved it for publication.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical approval was not required as secondary and publicly available data was used.

Informed Consent Statement: No informed consent statement was required as secondary de-identified and publicly available data was used.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are included in the article.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.



REFERENCES

- [1]. Saint Gregory of Nazianzus, Epistle 101 (To Cledonios), in: Theological Writings, trans. Rev. Prof. Dumitru Stăniloae, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1998, p. 94. Gregory's Christological axiom - "what was not assumed was not healed" - was the cornerstone of patristic soteriology and was taken up in its entirety by the Council of Chalcedon (451) as the norm of Christological orthodoxy
- [2]. Nick Bostrom, "A History of Transhumanist Thought", in: Journal of Evolution and Technology, vol. 14, no. 1, 2005, p. 4. Bostrom traces the cultural and philosophical roots of transhumanism, defining the movement as an intellectual project that seeks to overcome the biological limitations of man through technological means, including the abolition of death.
- [3]. Saint John of Damascus, Dogmatics (The Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith), trans. Fr. Dumitru Fecioru, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 2005, p. 198. Damascene systematically expounds the Orthodox doctrine of the unity of soul and body as the constitutive reality of the human person, rejecting any dualism that would make the body a secondary or dispensable entity.
- [4]. John Zizioulas, Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church (Crestwood, NY: Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), p. 27. Zizioulas argues that the human person cannot be defined in terms of individual substance, but only in terms of relationship and communion—a personal ontology that makes it impossible to reduce identity to a transferable information pattern.
- [5]. Saint Maximus the Confessor, Ambigua, translated from Greek by Fr. Prof. Dumitru Stăniloae, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 2006, p. 185. Maximus develops the doctrine of the logoi as divine reasons of creation, through which each being participates in the divine Logos and is ontologically oriented towards theosis, including in its bodily dimension.
- [6]. Saint Athanasius the Great, De Incarnatione Verbi, in: Writings, Part I, trans. Rev. Prof. Dumitru Stăniloae, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1987, p. 131. The Athanasian formula - God became man so that man might become god - constitutes the nucleus of Orthodox soteriology and ontologically substantiates the possibility of theosis as the real participation of the human person, body and soul, in the divine life.
- [7]. Saint Gregory Palamas, Triads, trans. Rev. Prof. Dumitru Stăniloae, in: Filocalia, vol. VII, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1977, p. 224. Palamas defends the distinction between the divine essence and the uncreated divine energies, thus guaranteeing the ontological reality of theosis without falling into pantheism: man participates in the real God, not symbolically, through energies, not through essence.
- [8]. Saint Ignatius of Antioch, Epistle to the Ephesians, XX, 2, in: The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers, trans. Fr. Dumitru Fecioru, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1979, p. 165. The Ignatian expression *pharmakon athanasias* - the doctrine of immortality - designates the Eucharist as the ontological means of the participation of the body of the believer in the glorious body of Christ, already inaugurating the process of eschatological transfiguration.
- [9]. Saint John of Damascus, Dogmatics (The Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith), trans. Fr. Dumitru Fecioru, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 2005, p. 234. Damascene formulates with dogmatic precision the identity between the Eucharistic body and the body of Christ assumed from the Virgin, emphasizing that the Eucharist is not symbolic, but ontological: through it, the believer enters into real communion with the Body and Blood of the Risen One.
- [10]. Saint Maximus the Confessor, Mystagogia, trans. Fr. Prof. Dumitru Stăniloae, in: Writings and Christological and Spiritual Epistles, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1990, p. 17. In the Mystagogia, Maximus articulates the cosmic movement of creation towards God as a progressive pneumatization of matter through divine energies, without canceling the ontological distinction between created and uncreated - a vision that makes any confusion between the Orthodox cosmic transfiguration and the pantheistic or immanentist projects of "overcoming" matter impossible.
- [11]. Ray Kurzweil, The Singularity Is Near: When Humans Transcend Biology, New York: Viking, 2005, p. 9. Kurzweil describes the Singularity as the moment when artificial intelligence will irreversibly surpass human intelligence, producing a radical transformation of the human condition through exclusively technological and immanent means, without reference to any transcendence.
- [12]. Saint Gregory Palamas, Triads, trans. Rev. Prof. Dumitru Stăniloae, in: Filocalia, vol. VII, Bucharest, EIBMBOR, 1977, p. 311. Against Barlaam of Calabria, who reduced the Taboric light to a psychological or symbolic reality, Palamas affirms that this is the uncreated divine energy, really seen by the body in the hesychastic prayer, proof that the transfiguration of the body is not a metaphor, but an ontological fact already anticipated in the spiritual life.



- [13]. See Nikolaos Loudovikos, "Person Instead of Grace and Dictated Otherness: John Zizioulas' Final Theological Position", in: *The Heythrop Journal*, vol. 52, no. 4, 2011, pp. 684-699, and Christos Yannaras, *Person and Eros*, trans. Norman Russell, Brookline MA, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2007. These works situate the relational ontology of the person within an ongoing intra-Orthodox debate and caution against treating it as an uncontested authority.
- [14]. For the functionalist and substrate-independence theses presupposed by mind uploading, see Hilary Putnam, "The Nature of Mental States", in: *Mind, Language and Reality: Philosophical Papers*, vol. 2, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1975, pp. 429-440, and Nick Bostrom and Anders Sandberg, *Whole Brain Emulation: A Roadmap*, Technical Report 2008-3, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford University, 2008.
- [15]. Derek Parfit, *Reasons and Persons*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984, pp. 199-243. Parfit's teletransportation and branching thought experiments demonstrate that exact psychological continuity does not guarantee numerical identity, and that the possibility of multiple replicas renders any purely psychological or functional criterion of personal identity incoherent.
- [16]. Ian G. Barbour, *Religion and Science: Historical and Contemporary Issues*, San Francisco, HarperSanFrancisco, 1997; John Polkinghorne, *The God of Hope and the End of the World*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2002; Nancey Murphy, *Bodies and Souls, or Spirited Bodies?*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006. These works represent the established science-theology dialogue with which an Orthodox eschatology of cosmic transfiguration must engage critically; the present study receives their framing of the questions while declining the reductive-physicalist anthropology that some of them adopt.