



**FUTURITY  
PHILOSOPHY**

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.57125/FP.2025.03.30.05>

**How to cite:** Okoronkwo, M. E., & Dike, U. A. (2025). Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and the Judeo-Christian Practices: Toward a Theology of Thinking Machine. *Futurity Philosophy*, 4(1), 71-85.  
<https://doi.org/10.57125/FP.2025.03.30.05>

## **Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and the Judeo-Christian Practices: Toward a Theology of Thinking Machine**

***Michael Enyinwa Okoronkwo***

*PhD, Department of Religious Studies, National Open University of Nigeria, Abuja, Nigeria,  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1251-6376>*

***Uzoma Amos Dike\****

*PhD, Department of Religious Studies, National Open University of Nigeria, Abuja, Nigeria,  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7621-4011>*

**\*Corresponding author:** [udike@noun.edu.ng](mailto:udike@noun.edu.ng).

**Received:** October 26, 2024 | **Accepted:** February 20, 2025 | **Available online:** March 8, 2025

**Abstract:** Integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) into religious practices raises ethical and theological questions. Traditionally centred on human or divine agency, religious rituals are now mediated by AI technologies like robotic priests and AI-driven spiritual counselling. This shift challenges theological assumptions about personhood, divine will, and moral

responsibility. The ethical boundaries of delegating sacred roles to machines remain unclear, leading to uncertainties about authenticity, reverence, and the commodification of spirituality. This study aims to promote responsible AI development that aligns with Judeo-Christian values of justice, compassion, and stewardship. This research addresses the urgent need to explore these issues systematically, providing a framework to understand and navigate the evolving relationship between AI and religion. Drawing from biblical principles, Christian theology, and ethical philosophy, the study investigates how Judeo-Christian teachings can inform discussions on the moral implications of creating autonomous machines. It employs theological analysis to examine AI's impact on agency, morality, and divine will, and incorporates philosophical inquiry to explore debates on machine morality and personhood in religious contexts. The study evaluates their ethical and theological implications by analysing real-world applications of AI in religious practices, such as robotic priests and counselling tools. The study contributes to a theology that considers both the potential and dangers of AI, offering a perspective on the relationship between humans and machines.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence, Judeo-Christian Practices, Ethics, Theology, Machine Agency.

## Introduction

The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has brought transformative changes across numerous sectors, reshaping industries and redefining traditional practices. AI is revolutionising the field in healthcare by enhancing medical diagnostics, enabling personalised treatment plans, and supporting complex surgical interventions, improving patient outcomes and operational efficiency (Beets et al., 2023). Similarly, the transportation sector is undergoing a significant transformation with the advent of autonomous vehicles and intelligent traffic management systems, which are paving the way for safer, more efficient, and sustainable mobility solutions (Nwakanma et al., 2023). In finance and economics, AI is redefining practices such as algorithmic trading, fraud detection, and economic forecasting, fundamentally altering global market dynamics and decision-making processes (Chang et al., 2023). Furthermore, AI is making remarkable educational strides by delivering personalised learning experiences and intelligent tutoring systems, fostering individualised growth and improving educational outcomes for learners worldwide (Gašević et al., 2023). These advancements underscore AI's profound impact across diverse domains, highlighting its potential to drive innovation and address complex challenges.

However, the rapid proliferation of AI introduces critical ethical and societal challenges that demand thoughtful consideration. Concerns about job displacement and the future of work loom large as automation and AI systems increasingly replace human roles. Privacy and data security issues take centre stage, given AI's reliance on extensive personal data. The potential for bias and unfairness in AI decision-making algorithms raises the risk of perpetuating discriminatory practices. Furthermore, the influence of AI on human autonomy prompts deep reflections on the delicate balance between technological power and individual agency (Stahl et al., 2023).

These developments underscore the importance of examining the implications of AI within the context of Judeo-Christian practices. As AI influences various aspects of human life, it raises profound theological and ethical questions that demand engagement from religious communities. For instance, integrating AI in decision-making challenges traditional views on human free will and divine providence. How should believers respond to AI's role in shaping societal structures, especially when these advancements may perpetuate inequality or compromise human dignity?

Additionally, the intersection of AI and religious thought raises profound questions about the ethics of AI, its potential role in religious settings, and how theological frameworks can engage with the evolving capabilities of AI. As machines become more sophisticated, capable of performing tasks once reserved for human cognition, a critical theological and ethical inquiry emerges: Can AI be integrated into religious practices? What ethical guidelines should govern its use in these spaces? And how can religious traditions provide a framework for understanding the emerging role of AI in human life?

AI, particularly in its machine learning form, can mimic human reasoning, process vast amounts of data, and potentially make decisions. These characteristics present opportunities and challenges for the Judeo-Christian communities that rely heavily on human interpretation, emotion, and ethics in their practices. The concept of a "thinking machine" that could process moral dilemmas or interpret sacred texts prompts significant questions. How would AI, devoid of human experience, interpret theological matters? Can it truly understand or replicate the nuance of human consciousness central to religious experience?

The ethical considerations surrounding AI often revolve around autonomy, responsibility, accountability, and preserving human dignity. Within religious contexts, these issues take on additional significance. Many religious traditions, like the Judeo-Christian doctrines, emphasise the sanctity of human life, the centrality of human agency, and the divine gift of free will. As such, the deployment of AI in religious practices must consider these theological imperatives. Additionally, there are concerns about the potential for AI to exacerbate inequalities, undermine the role of human agency in faith-based communities, and reduce the authentic experience of worship to a mechanical or transactional process.

In exploring these issues, scholars have begun to address the possibility of a "theology of thinking machines." This theology would seek to understand how religious principles can guide the ethical use of AI while engaging with the technological advancements of our time. Such a theology would interrogate the very nature of thought, consciousness, and moral reasoning in both human and machine contexts. This emerging discourse is not just about the technology itself, but also about how religious communities can maintain their relevance and ethical integrity in a world increasingly shaped by artificial intelligence.

Scholars such as Lundby and Evolvi (2021) have argued for the need for a religious framework that considers AI's impact on faith practices, while others like Ayling and Chapman (2022) emphasise the importance of integrating ethics into the development of AI technologies. Religious thinkers are now beginning to explore whether theological ethics could inform AI development in a way that aligns with human flourishing, dignity, and moral responsibility.

This study area remains underexplored, but it offers rich opportunities for dialogue between theology, philosophy, and AI ethics.

Noticeably, some research considers religion and AI generally; this study explicitly examines AI's implications for Judeo-Christian traditions, exploring how AI interacts with core tenets like free will, divine providence, human dignity, and the sanctity of life. This focused approach allows for a more nuanced understanding of the challenges and opportunities AI presents to these specific faith communities. This study tackles how AI, particularly machine learning, might interact with religious practices. It probes the possibility of AI interpreting sacred texts, engaging in moral reasoning within a religious framework, and the implications of such capabilities for human religious experience. Exploring "thinking machines" within religious settings is a novel contribution. This study goes beyond simply identifying ethical concerns. It explores how theological ethics can actively inform the development of AI, ensuring that these technologies align with human flourishing, dignity, and moral responsibility, as understood within Judeo-Christian traditions. This proactive approach to shaping AI development is crucial for ensuring its responsible integration into society. This study aims to contribute to the emerging discourse on a "theology of thinking machines" – a framework for understanding the nature of thought, consciousness, and moral reasoning in human and machine contexts. This theoretical contribution is significant as it provides a starting point for further exploration of the complex relationship between AI and religious belief.

The primary focus of this study is on the intersection of AI and Judeo-Christian traditions. It addresses key theological concerns such as divine will, human agency, and sacred authority. It highlights AI's potential to enhance religious practices while posing ethical risks. Its main contribution, however, is developing a "theology of thinking machines." It raises further concerns and provides a framework for religious communities to engage with AI responsibly. It aligns with other scholars and argues that, given AI's growing influence in all aspects of life, structured ethical and theological guidelines are essential (Ayling & Chapman, 2022; Lundby & Evolvi, 2021). The study integrates theological analysis, philosophy, and case studies using an interdisciplinary approach. It critically interrogates AI applications such as robotic priests and AI-driven prayer technologies, assessing their impact on authenticity and reverence. This research advances scholarly understanding by addressing these challenges and equips religious communities with ethical frameworks for AI's integration, ensuring that technological progress aligns with core Judeo-Christian values.

### **The Judeo-Christian Concept of Divine Will, Human Agency and Sacred Authority**

Divine will is a theological and philosophical term used with divine providence. By divine will, God's intentional and deliberate plan or desire for creation, humanity, or specific individuals, encompassing God's purposes, intentions, and decrees. In *Summa Theologica*, Thomas Aquinas addresses the distinction between God's "antecedent will" and "consequent will" to explore how divine will and divine providence function within the framework of God's perfection, omniscience, and omnipotence (Aquinas, 2012). This distinction helps reconcile the apparent tension between God's universal salvific desire and the existence of evil and suffering in the world.

Aquinas' distinction between antecedent and consequent will provides a nuanced understanding of how God's perfect will interacts with a contingent and free creation. It bridges divine omnipotence with human responsibility, ensuring that God's providence is consistent with His nature as both just and merciful. This theological insight invites deeper trust in God's plans and encourages ethical cooperation with His will.

By the antecedent will, Aquinas posits that as the ultimate source of all good, God wills the flourishing of all creation. This will express God's benevolence and encompass His desire for all to participate in divine goodness. This is found in 1 Timothy 2:4: "God our Saviour, who desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth."

On the other hand, the consequent will reflects God's will as it is executed in the concrete reality of creation, considering the conditions and actions of creatures. While God's antecedent will expresses a universal desire, His consequent will operates in light of divine foreknowledge and the free choices of creatures, allowing for a balance between divine sovereignty and human agency.

In an attempt to reconcile antecedent will and consequent will, Aquinas emphasises that the antecedent and consequent wills are not contradictory but complementary aspects of God's singular will, viewed from different perspectives. The apparent differences arise because:

1. God's antecedent will operates in abstraction, expressing His ultimate desires.
2. God's consequent will considers the actual conditions of the world, including the interplay of human freedom, natural law, and divine justice.

Aquinas uses the analogy of a physician who desires health for all patients (antecedent will) but prescribes painful treatments or accepts the inevitability of death for some (consequent will) to achieve a greater good or accommodate realities beyond their control to illustrate the wills (Pasnau, 2022).

Aquinas' distinction between antecedent and consequent will provides a nuanced understanding of how God's perfect will interacts with a contingent and free creation. It bridges divine omnipotence with human responsibility, ensuring that God's providence is consistent with His nature as both just and merciful. This theological insight invites deeper trust in God's plans and encourages ethical cooperation with His will.

Similarly, John Calvin systematically attempts to understand the relationship between God's eternal decree (divine will) and His providential government (divine providence). In his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Calvin, Book 3, Chapter 23), Calvin (2009) provides a framework emphasising God's sovereignty, predestination, and governance of all creation. His discussion addresses both theological clarity and pastoral concerns, particularly regarding human free will, salvation, and the existence of evil.

For Calvin, God's eternal decree refers to His unchangeable and sovereign purpose, established before the foundation of the world. This decree encompasses all things, including the destiny of individuals and the overarching course of history. It is a key concept in Calvin's doctrine of predestination. Calvin's doctrine of providence complements his teaching on God's

eternal decree by explaining how God actively governs and sustains creation by His will. Providence is the execution of God's eternal decree in the temporal realm. Calvin underscores that providence is the temporal unfolding of God's eternal decree. While the decree establishes God's purposes from eternity, providence ensures their fulfilment in history (Providence Presbyterian Church, n.d.).

From the philosophical perspective, William Lane Craig explores the distinction between divine will and divine providence within the broader framework of philosophical theology. His discussions are often situated in the context of debates surrounding divine omniscience, human freedom, and the problem of evil. Craig integrates classical theological insights with contemporary philosophical tools, particularly drawing from Molinism, to address these topics (Perszyk, 2013). His work distinguishes between God's "will" (divine will) and "providence" (divine providence) within philosophical theology. Craig discusses divine will in God's intentional and purposeful plan for creation. He further distinguishes between two aspects of divine will: decretive will and preceptive will.

Decretive will is God's sovereign will, which is always accomplished. It includes God's eternal decrees and plans that cannot be thwarted. An example is the creation of the world and the plan of salvation through Jesus Christ, which are part of God's plan. Conversely, preceptive will refers to God's revealed will, which includes His commands and instructions for human behaviour. Unlike the decretive will, humans will resist or disobey the preceptive. The Ten Commandments and Jesus' teachings in the Sermon on the Mount are examples of God's preceptive will. Craig argues that God's providence is not inconsistent with human freedom, but instead that God works through and with human choices to accomplish His purposes (Perszyk, 2013).

William Lane Craig's distinction between divine will and divine providence provides a robust framework for understanding God's relationship to creation. By employing Molinism, he offers a nuanced approach that reconciles divine sovereignty, human freedom, and the reality of evil (Craig, 2022). Craig's theology invites believers to trust God's meticulous planning, live responsibly, and find hope in His providential care. His work continues to be a significant contribution to contemporary philosophical theology.

Alvin Plantinga examines the relationship between divine will and divine providence within the framework of addressing the problem of evil. His approach, rooted in philosophical theology, introduces the concept of possible worlds and the free will defence to reconcile the existence of an all-powerful, all-knowing, and all-good God with the presence of evil in the world (MacPherson, 2021). Plantinga champions the free will defence, which posits that God, in creating morally significant creatures (like humans), had to grant them genuine freedom. This freedom, however, inevitably opens the door to the possibility of moral evil. Humans, with their free will, can choose to do wrong, causing suffering and injustice. Plantinga (1977) argues that a world without free will would be less valuable, where genuine love, compassion, and moral growth are impossible.

## Human Agency in Theological and Philosophical Perspectives

Human agency refers to the capacity of individuals to act independently and make their own free choices (Williams et al., 2021). More succinctly, it connotes a “meaningful, purposive self-direction. However, it has been observed that human effort is largely powerless or ineffective when confronted with strong, unseen forces that determine outcomes (Williams et al., 2021). This concept is central to theological and philosophical discussions, intersecting with ideas about free will, moral responsibility, and the nature of human action. Here is a detailed discussion on human agency from both perspectives and references for further reading.

### *Theological Perspectives*

In theology, human agency is often discussed in the context of divine sovereignty and human free will. St. Augustine emphasised the sovereignty of God and the necessity of divine grace for human action (Prahasan, 2024). He argued that human free will is genuine but limited by original sin, and that true freedom is found in aligning one’s will with God’s will.

In his *Summa Theologica*, St. Thomas Aquinas developed a more nuanced view, integrating Aristotelian philosophy with Christian theology. Aquinas (2012) argued that humans have free will and can make moral choices. However, he maintained that God’s providence and foreknowledge do not negate human freedom. In the Reformed tradition, particularly in the works of John Calvin, there is a strong emphasis on the sovereignty of God and predestination. Calvinists believe that God’s will is ultimately determinative but affirm that humans are morally responsible for their actions (Grebe & Grössl, 2023).

Philosophical discussions of human agency often revolve around the nature of free will, determinism, and moral responsibility. Key philosophical perspectives include: libertarianism, compatibilism and existentialism. Libertarians argue that human beings possess free will in a robust sense, meaning that individuals can choose between different courses of action (Bok, 2001). This view is often contrasted with determinism, which holds that all events, including human actions, are determined by prior causes. Libertarians maintain that free will is necessary for moral responsibility (Wright, 2022).

Compatibilists, such as David Hume and Daniel Dennett, argue that free will is compatible with determinism (Frantin, 2021). They suggest that human freedom is acting according to one’s desires and intentions, even if prior causes determine them. Compatibilism seeks to reconcile the intuition of free will with a deterministic understanding of the universe (Wright, 2022).

Existentialist philosophers, such as Jean-Paul Sartre, emphasise the radical freedom and responsibility of the individual (Valčo & Bírová, 2024). In *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre argues that humans are "condemned to be free," meaning they bear full responsibility for their actions once placed into the world. In essence, freedom is an inherent aspect of human existence (Sartre et al., 2022). This perspective highlights the existential burden of human agency and the importance of authenticity in one’s actions.

## **The Judeo-Christian Concept of Sacred Authority**

Sacred authority in the Judeo-Christian tradition refers to the divinely sanctioned power or right to lead, command, or guide religious, moral, and social conduct. This concept is deeply rooted in the belief that God is the ultimate source of authority, which is delegated to specific individuals, institutions, or texts to govern human affairs by divine will. The Bible describes God as the Creator, Sustainer, and Sovereign ruler of the universe, whose commands are absolute and eternal (Genesis 1:1; Psalm 103:19). This divine authority is the foundation upon which human authority is legitimised. In Judaism, God's covenant with Israel (e.g., through Abraham in Genesis 17 and Moses in Exodus 19-24) established a framework for divine authority manifested in laws, rituals, and leadership (Sanders, 2016). In Christianity, Jesus Christ embodies divine authority, emphasising obedience to God's will (Matthew 28:18; Philippians 2:9-11).

Sacred texts are a central repository of divine authority in the Judeo-Christian tradition. The Torah in Judaism and the Bible in Christianity contain laws, commandments, and teachings believed to be inspired or directly communicated by God (2 Timothy 3:16; Exodus 24:12). These texts guide moral conduct and provide the basis for religious authority. The Torah in Judaism is the ultimate source of authority, interpreted and applied by rabbis and sages (Baras, 2021). As codified in the Mishnah and Talmud, Rabbinic authority extends this tradition (Libson, 2024). In Christianity, the New Testament complements the Old Testament, emphasising Jesus as the fulfilment of divine law (Matthew 5:17-18). Clergy interpret and teach scripture, exercising derived sacred authority (Sullivan, 2002).

In both traditions, sacred authority is exercised through institutions, which mediate the relationship between God and the people. For example, in Judaism, the priesthood, particularly the Aaronic line, was central in ancient Israel (Exodus 28:1-4). Later, the synagogue and rabbinic traditions became key institutions (Sanders, 2016). The Church in Christianity serves as the custodian of divine authority. The early Church saw the apostles as foundational figures (Ephesians 2:20). Over time, hierarchical structures (e.g., bishops, priests, and popes in Catholicism) emerged to administer this authority (Dulles, 2002).

Beyond institutional structures, sacred authority in the Judeo-Christian tradition often manifests through charismatic individuals who are believed to be specially chosen by God. In Judaism, Wilson (1980) notes that prophets such as Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel exercised sacred authority by speaking on God's behalf, often challenging existing structures (see Jeremiah 1:4-10; Ezekiel 2:1-7). Similarly, Keener (1997), writing about the Christian faith, opines that Jesus Christ epitomises charismatic authority. His teachings and miracles demonstrated divine power, challenging religious and political systems (see also Mark 1:22). The apostles and early Church leaders, empowered by the Holy Spirit, continued this tradition (Acts 2:1-4).

## **Real-Time Cases of Artificial Intelligence in Judeo-Christian Practices**

Integrating robotic priests in Christian communities is a relatively recent development, primarily aimed at exploring how technology can supplement spiritual practices. Below are real-world examples:

- BlessU-2. BlessU-2 is a robotic priest designed to deliver blessings in five languages while raising its arms and emitting light from its hands. Members of a Protestant church in Germany created the robot, intending to explore the impact of technology on the church. It features a digital face with moving eyebrows and a mouth that can shift between serious and smiling expressions. Users can interact with their touchscreen chest to select a prayer type, such as encouragement or renewal, and choose between a male or female voice (Kassam, 2024).
- AI-Powered Jesus. St. Peter's Chapel in Lucerne, Switzerland, has unveiled an innovative art installation called "AI Jesus" as part of the "Deus in Machina" initiative. This project allows visitors to converse with a digital avatar of Jesus capable of communicating in over 100 languages. The tool was designed to supplement traditional ministry to reach tech-savvy individuals and those hesitant to approach clergy (Simmerlein & Tretter, 2024).
- SanTO in Italy. In 2018, roboticist Gabriele Trovato developed SanTO (short for "Sanctified Theomorphic Operator"), a compact robot inspired by saint statues, designed to provide spiritual support to Catholic believers, accompany them in prayer, and teach catechism (Sinha, 2021).

These examples highlight how technology is being integrated into religious practices, sparking conversations about the future of faith and the role of AI in spiritual care. These AI innovations are undoubtedly reshaping how faith and religious practices are experienced, introducing a process of dis- and re-embodiment of "officiating agents." This shift significantly changes meaning-making, ethical reasoning, decision-making, and the regulatory frameworks required to guide these interactions.

### **Ethical and Theological Implications of AI in Judeo-Christian Practices**

Integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) into religious practices presents profound ethical and theological implications within the Judeo-Christian tradition. These concerns are explored in the light of the foundational concepts of divine will, human agency, and sacred authority, as rooted in the tradition and referenced in theological frameworks by Aquinas, Calvin, Craig, and Plantinga.

#### ***AI and Divine Will***

AI challenges traditional understandings of divine will by introducing autonomous systems capable of decision-making. In Judeo-Christian theology, divine will encompasses God's intentional and deliberate plan for creation (Aquinas, 2012). The distinction between antecedent will (God's universal salvific desire) and consequent will (God's will executed in reality) raises questions about whether human creations like AI align with divine intentions.

**Theological Tension:** If God's antecedent desires the flourishing of all creation (1 Timothy 2:4), then AI development could reflect human participation in fulfilling divine creativity. However, the consequence will consider the ethical misuses of AI, such as biases, job displacement, and exploitation, as part of human free choices. For instance, Aquinas' analogy of

the physician's painful treatments parallels the ethical dilemmas in deploying AI to achieve long-term benefits while risking short-term harm (Pasnau, 2022).

**Ethical Consideration:** AI's ability to predict and influence human behaviour raises concerns about predestination versus free will. If AI systems can anticipate human actions with high accuracy, this could undermine the belief in human freedom aligned with God's providence (Craig, 2022).

### ***AI and Human Agency***

The concept of human agency in theology emphasises free will as a divine gift, enabling moral responsibility (Aquinas, 2012; Prahasan, 2024). The rise of AI introduces complexities about human autonomy and moral accountability.

**Shared Decision-Making:** When humans rely on AI for critical decisions (e.g., medical diagnoses or legal judgments), it challenges the philosophical and theological notion of human purposive self-direction (Williams et al., 2021). Does delegating such responsibilities dilute the exercise of moral freedom and the divine image in humans (Genesis 1:27)?

**Freedom and Co-Creation:** Calvin emphasised God's sovereignty and upheld human moral accountability within divine providence (Providence Presbyterian Church, n.d.). Using AI as a co-creative tool aligns with this framework if it enhances human capacity for ethical action. However, misuse of AI, such as creating deepfakes or weaponised systems, reflects a deviation from ethical cooperation with divine will.

**Existential Dilemma:** Philosophers like Sartre (Valčo & Bírová, 2024) argue that humans are "condemned to be free," bearing full responsibility for their actions. In contrast, heavy dependence on AI could erode the authenticity of moral agency, reducing individuals to passive executors of machine decisions.

### ***AI and Sacred Authority***

The Judeo-Christian tradition anchors sacred authority in God, as mediated through scripture, institutions, and individuals (Sanders, 2016; Sullivan, 2002). AI's role in religious practices, such as sermon generation or ethical counselling, raises questions about the source and legitimacy of spiritual authority (Alkhouri, 2024; Yao, 2024).

**Scriptural Mediation:** If AI algorithms interpret sacred texts, they may lack the spiritual discernment necessary for theological exegesis. While sacred texts are divinely inspired (Jusu, 2017), AI tools may inadvertently prioritise efficiency over theological depth, risking misinterpreting divine will.

**Institutional Authority:** Religious institutions might use AI for governance, such as managing congregations or analysing social trends. While this enhances administrative efficiency, it risks undermining sacred authority's relational and pastoral dimensions. For example, an AI-generated pastoral letter might lack a human leader's personal and charismatic authority.

Charismatic Authority: Judeo-Christian history highlights individuals like Moses, Jesus, and prophets, whose authority derived from divine calling (Keener, 1997). AI lacks the spiritual experiences and moral accountability intrinsic to such roles. Delegating spiritual guidance to AI could dilute the sacredness of divine-human interaction.

### ***Ethical Frameworks for AI in Religious Practice***

Several ethical frameworks derived from theological and philosophical perspectives can guide the integration of AI:

Stewardship and Co-Creation: Human creativity in AI development reflects God's image and mandates responsible stewardship of creation (Okoh & Dike, 2021). This includes ensuring that AI promotes justice, equity, and human dignity.

Moral Responsibility: Drawing on Plantinga's free will defence (MacPherson, 2021), developers and users of AI must accept responsibility for the ethical implications of AI systems, recognising that these tools amplify human agency.

Ethical Transparency: Craig's distinction between decretive and preceptive wills (Perszyk, 2013) suggests that while AI may fulfil specific divine purposes, its operation must align with God's preceptive will—His revealed commands for moral conduct.

AI in Judeo-Christian practices presents a profound intersection of theology, ethics, and technology. It offers opportunities to reflect divine creativity and enhance human agency, but also challenges traditional understandings of divine will and sacred authority. The Judeo-Christian tradition can navigate these complexities by grounding AI integration in robust theological and ethical frameworks while preserving the sacredness of divine-human relationships.

### **Conclusion**

This study interrogates the ethical and theological impact of AI in Judeo-Christian practices. It explores AI's role in divine will, human agency, and sacred authority, and argues that AI can enhance spiritual experiences but also raises ethical concerns. The study proposes a theological-ethical framework that aligns with core religious principles to address these.

Summary of key findings:

1. Divine Will and AI: AI challenges traditional views of divine will. It creates tension between its potential benefits and risks of misuse.
2. Human Agency and Moral Responsibility: AI can support ethical decision-making. However, too much reliance on it may weaken human autonomy and accountability.
3. Sacred Authority and AI: AI in spiritual roles raises concerns about legitimacy. Sacred authority is rooted in divine revelation and human discernment. This highlights the need to preserve religious leadership.

## Implications of AI in Judeo-Christian theology:

1. **Religious Communities:** AI can enhance spiritual practices if used responsibly. Core values like human dignity and moral responsibility must be upheld.
2. **Policy and Practice:** Ethical guidelines are needed to regulate AI's role in religious settings. AI use must align with Judeo-Christian principles.
3. **Interdisciplinary Dialogue:** The study encourages discussion between theology, philosophy, and AI ethics. This can help address ethical challenges in various religious and cultural contexts.

This study has some limitations. It focuses on Judeo-Christian traditions, which may not apply to other religions. AI technology evolves quickly, requiring continuous research to address emerging ethical and theological questions. The study is based on theory and case studies. Empirical research could help validate its conclusions.

## ***Suggestions for Future Research***

1. **Cross-Religious Perspectives:** Study AI's impact on different religious traditions.
2. **Empirical Studies:** Assess AI's real-world effects on religious practices.
3. **Ethical Frameworks:** Develop guidelines for AI's use in religious settings.
4. **Long-Term Effects:** Examine AI's influence on religious identity and traditions.
5. **Technological Bias:** Investigate AI biases in interpreting sacred texts and providing spiritual guidance.

## **Acknowledgements**

None.

## **Conflict of Interest**

None.

## **Funding**

The Authors received no funding for this research.

## **References**

- Alkhouri, K. I. (2024). The role of artificial intelligence in the study of the psychology of religion. *Religions*, 15(3), Article 290. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15030290>
- Aquinas, S. T. (2012). *Summa Theologica Part I ("Prima Pars"): Extended Annotated Edition*. Jazzybee Verlag.
- Ayling, J., & Chapman, A. (2022). Putting AI ethics to work: Are the tools fit for purpose? *AI and Ethics*, 2(3), 405–429. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00084-x>

- Baras, D. (2021). A moral argument against the absolute authority of the Torah. *Sophia*, 60(2), 307–329. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11841-019-00731-1>
- Beets, B., Newman, T. P., Howell, E. L., Bao, L., & Yang, S. (2023). Surveying public perceptions of artificial intelligence in health care in the United States: Systematic review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 25, Article e40337. <https://www.jmir.org/2023/1/e40337/citations>
- Bok, H. (2001). *Freedom and responsibility*. Princeton University Press.
- Calvin, J. (2009). *Institutes of the Christian religion: The first English version of the 1541 French edition*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Craig, W. L. (with Carson, D. A.). (2022). *How do we know God exists?* (1st ed). Faithlife Corporation.
- Chang, L., Taghizadeh-Hesary, F., & Mohsin, M. (2023). Role of artificial intelligence on green economic development: Joint determinates of natural resources and green total factor productivity. *Resources Policy*, 82, Article 103508. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2023.103508>
- Dulles, A. (2002). *Models of the Church*. Image Books. <https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/43525/models-of-the-church-by-avery-cardinal-dulles/>
- Frantin, J. (2021). *Free will and determinism* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Miami. <https://scholarship.miami.edu/esploro/outputs/doctoral/Free-Will-and-Determinism/991031655018002976>
- Gašević, D., Siemens, G., & Sadiq, S. (2023). Empowering learners for the age of artificial intelligence. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 4, Article 100130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100130>
- Grebe, M., & Grössl, J. (Eds.). (2023). *T&T Clark handbook of suffering and the problem of evil*. T&T Clark.
- Jusu, J. (Ed.). (2017). *Africa Study Bible, NLT*. Tyndale House Publishers.
- Kassam, A. (2024, November 21). *Deus in machina: Swiss church installs AI-powered Jesus*. The Guardian. [https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2024/nov/21/deus-in-machina-swiss-church-installs-ai-powered-jesus?CMP=share\\_btn\\_url](https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2024/nov/21/deus-in-machina-swiss-church-installs-ai-powered-jesus?CMP=share_btn_url)
- Keener, C. S. (1997). *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine purity and power*. Hendrickson Pub.
- Libson, A. H. (2024). Is the Talmud Law? In S. L. Stone & Y. Y. Brafman (Eds.), *Jewish Law: New Perspectives* (pp. 1–34). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110454970>

- Lundby, K., & Evolvi, G. (2021). Theoretical frameworks for approaching religion and new media. In H. A. Campbell & R. Tsuria, *Digital Religion* (2nd ed., pp. 233–249). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429295683-23>
- MacPherson, A. (2021). *The Redeemed good defense: The great controversy as a theodicy response to the evidential problem of Evil*. Wipf and Stock.
- Nwakanma, C. I., Ahakonye, L. A. C., Njoku, J. N., Odirichukwu, J. C., Okolie, S. A., Uzundu, C., Ndubuisi Nweke, C. C., & Kim, D.-S. (2023). Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) for intrusion detection and mitigation in intelligent connected vehicles: A review. *Applied Sciences*, 13(3), Article 1252. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app13031252>
- Okoh, J. I., & Dike, U. A. (2021). Religion and economic growth: A correlational analysis. *The Noun Scholar: Journal of Arts and Humanities, Maiden Edition*, 1(1), 179–187. <https://www.thenounscholar.nou.edu.ng/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/Article-15.pdf>
- Pasnau, R. (2022). Thomas Aquinas. In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aquinas/>
- Prahasan, M. (2024). Comprehending the metaphysical framework in St. Augustine's moral philosophy: An analytical inquiry. *South Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 5(3), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.48165/sajssh.2024.5312>
- Perszyk, K. (2013). Recent work on Molinism. *Philosophy Compass*, 8(8), 755–770. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12057>
- Plantinga, A. (1977). *God, freedom, and evil*. Eerdmans.
- Providence Presbyterian Church. (n. d.). *The Westminster confession of faith: Westminster Assembly Confession of Faith (PCA American Revision)*. <https://www.providencepres.net/westminster-confession-of-faith>
- Sanders, E. P. (2016). *Judaism: Practice and belief, 63 BCE–66 CE*. Fortress Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt17mcs1x>
- Sartre, J.-P., Richmond, S., & Moran, R. (2018). *Being and nothingness: An essay in phenomenological ontology*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429434013>
- Simmerlein, J., & Tretter, M. (2024). Robots in religious practices: A review. *Theology and Science*, 22(2), 255–273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14746700.2024.2351639>
- Sinha, D. (2021, August 11). AI and robotics: Next-generation religious priests for worshippers. <https://www.analyticsinsight.net/artificial-intelligence/ai-and-robotics-next-generation-religious-priests-for-worshippers>
- Stahl, B. C., Antoniou, J., Bhalla, N., Brooks, L., Jansen, P., Lindqvist, B., Kirichenko, A., Marchal, S., Rodrigues, R., Santiago, N., Warso, Z., & Wright, D. (2023). A systematic review of artificial intelligence impact assessments. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 56(11), 12799–12831. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-023-10420-8>

- Sullivan, F. A. (2005). *Magisterium: Teaching authority in the Catholic Church*. Recording for the Blind & Dyslexic.
- Valčo, M., & Bírová, J. (2024). Freedom and Responsibility in Jean-Paul Sartre's Existentialist Philosophy: A Christian Personalist Critique. *Philosophia: International Journal of Philosophy*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.46992/pijp.25.1.a.1>
- Williams, R. N., Gantt, E. E., & Fischer, L. (2021). ). Agency: What does it mean to be a human being? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article693077. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.693077>
- Wilson, R. R. (1980). *Prophecy and society in ancient Israel*. Fortress Press.
- Wright, J. D. (2022). Compatibilist Libertarianism: Why it talks past the traditional free will problem and determinism is still a worry. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, 8(4), 604–622. <https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2021.37>
- Yao, D. W. J. (2024). The role of artificial intelligence in shaping religion and social studies. *Convergence Chronicles*, 5(1), 334–342. <https://globalweb1.com/index.php/ojs/article/view/1>