

Philosophy of Religion

From Babel to AI: Technology, Human Dignity, and Theological Ethics

Abstract

The rapid rise of artificial intelligence (AI) and transhumanist technologies presents both remarkable opportunities and profound ethical challenges for humanity. This paper explores how a theologically grounded understanding of the *imago Dei* can serve as a guiding framework for engaging with these technologies in ways that uphold human dignity and promote flourishing. Drawing on classical and contemporary philosophical critiques, including Aristotle's warnings against hubris and Dietrich Bonhoeffer's reflections on relationality, this paper applies a theological framework to both AI and transhumanism, offering a critical yet constructive approach. Rather than simply rejecting these advancements, the theological framework emphasizes ethical boundaries that shape technology into tools that enhance human flourishing, while resisting tendencies towards idolatry and self-deification.

The narrative of the Tower of Babel (Gen. 11) serves as a theological metaphor for technological hubris, illustrating the risks of seeking autonomy apart from divine purpose. By integrating insights from historical and continental philosophy, this paper adjudicates various arguments presented by transhumanism and technological optimism, emphasizing the need to ground technological progress within a framework that prioritizes relationality, moral agency, and human dignity. The constructive engagement proposed here envisions AI and related technologies as means to enhance human potential when they operate in alignment with the divine purpose embedded in the doctrine of the *imago Dei*. The goal is not to vilify technology, but to affirm its potential role in human flourishing, while maintaining vigilance against its misuse, thereby ensuring that human identity remains grounded in divine purpose rather than being reshaped by unchecked technological ambition.



This page is intentionally left blank.

Contents

Introduction: The New Towers of Ambition.....	1
A Crisis of the Sacred Image.....	1
The <i>Imago Dei</i> as Theological Compass.....	2
צֶלֶם and εἰκών: The Divine Likeness in a Digital Age	3
צֶלֶם and εἰκών: Creation’s Covenant Seal	4
εἰκών: Christ’s Restoration of the Image	6
The Tower in the Code: Babel’s Echoes of Hubris	7
מִגְדָּל and שֹׁם: Ambition’s Linguistic Fortress	8
Digital Ziggurats: AI’s Unified Code.....	9
εἰδῶλον: The Idolatry of Self-Transcendence.....	11
<i>Eidōlon</i> : Transhumanism’s Metaphysical Mirage.....	11
Embodied Covenant: Dignity Against Disembodiment.....	12
Technological Frontiers: Theological and Philosophical Challenges	14
Brain Uploading, Supersoldiers, and Surveillance: The Peril to Personhood.....	15
IVF Trait Selection, Jesus-AI, and Data Governance: The Eclipse of Sacrament.....	18
Theological Counter: Covenant Over Control	20
Covenant’s Hope: A Theological Ethic for the Algorithmic Age.....	22
Eschatological Ontology: Resurrection Over Algorithmic Eternity	22
Theological Ethic: Communal Discernment for AI	23
Eschatological Imperative: Forming Hope’s Stewards	25
Conclusion: Reclaiming the Sacred Image.....	26
Benediction	28
Bibliography.....	29

Introduction: The New Towers of Ambition

In Shinar’s shadow, where brick and ambition once pierced the heavens, a new tower rises, not of clay, but of code. Algorithms now chant a siren liturgy, offering omniscience without wisdom, transcendence divorced from grace.¹ As international scholars convene at the Tyndale Fellowship to consider theology’s role in a technological age, a defining question emerges: will these digital ziggurats become altars to the self, or might they yet be woven into divine *telos*?² This paper contends that discerning the sacred amid the synthetic requires anchoring human dignity in the *imago Dei*, resisting the idolatrous ascent of artificial intelligence (AI) and transhumanist visions.³

A Crisis of the Sacred Image

Beneath neural networks’ lattice and biometric pulses, a ziggurat ascends, its scaffolding woven from code, its ambition echoing *Enuma Elish*’s Mesopotamian towers.⁴ Though lacking bricks, Babel’s spirit endures: humanity, once bound by divine breath and covenant, reaches upward, not in worship, but in ascent.⁵ AI and transhumanism forge an *eidolon*, a false image; threatening the *tselem* of God’s

¹ Jacques Ellul, *The Technological Society*, trans. by John Wilkinson (New York: Knopf Press, 1964), 95–99. Ellul contends that modern technique operates autonomously, progressing according to its own internal logic rather than moral deliberation. “What characterizes technique is its automatism: once a technical fact is admitted, it will be developed” (p. 99). This momentum prioritizes efficiency over ethical inquiry, subordinating the question of whether advancement ought to occur to the mechanics of how it can. See also: Noreen Herzfeld, *In Our Image: Artificial Intelligence and the Human Spirit* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002).

² Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. by W.D. Ross (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925), 1123b–1124a. Aristotle describes *megalopsychia* (great-souledness) as the virtue of one rightly oriented toward their *telos*, warning that pride without proportion distorts human flourishing. Disordered greatness, severed from its proper end, echoes the hubris of Babel, where ambition sought to elevate the self rather than fulfill the purpose established by the divine.

³ Martin Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. by William Lovitt (New York: Harper & Row Press, 1977), 12–18. Heidegger work is foundational. The author identifies *Gestell* (enframing) as the essence of modern technology, reducing being to a standing-reserve for manipulation. This ontological flattening severs human dignity from divine grounding, reinforcing the idolatrous ascent that this paper seeks to resist through theological reclamation of the *imago Dei*.

⁴ Stephanie Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 10–14. The *Enuma Elish* describes the construction of Babylon and its ziggurat as a divine-human project to establish cosmic control, paralleling the theological critique of Babel’s tower in Gen. 11, where human ascent replaces divine dependence.

⁵ Dawn Lewis Sutherland, *From Babel to AI: Idolatry, Transhumanism, and the Crisis of Imago Dei* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2025), 1–10. This section employs a comparative methodology to interpret modern technological ambition through the theological lens of the *imago Dei*, drawing conceptual parallels between contemporary digital architecture and ancient Near Eastern mythopoetic towers, including those of the *Enuma Elish* and Gen. 11.

covenant.⁶ Aristotle warns, “The proud man... thinks himself worthy of great things” beyond measure, a hubris resonant in this quest for godlike cognition.⁷ Ellul declares, “Technique has become autonomous; it has fashioned an omnivorous world which obeys its own laws.”⁸ Levinas counters, ‘The face of the Other... demands responsibility’ over mastery.⁹

The sacred is systematized, flattened into data, optimized for efficiency. Theological anthropology is supplanted by autonomy’s soteriology. This crisis is theological: a fracture of identity, vocation, and memory. When the creature forgets its *tselem*, it fashions gods in its likeness.¹⁰ These idols, generative engines, neuro-integrative visions, wield power through mimicry and persuasion.¹¹ Scripture interrupts: God descends, scatters, and recalls dust enlivened by divine breath (Gen. 11:1–9).¹² Digital ambitions echo an ancient error, conflating dominion with divinity. Bonhoeffer articulates this as humanity’s turn to “the truth of the serpent.”¹³

The Imago Dei as Theological Compass

Against digital apostasy, the *imago Dei* emerges as a compass, guiding ethical discernment through AI and transhumanism’s.¹⁴ Not static essence but vocational summons, it roots dignity in

⁶ Willem A. VanGemeren, ed., *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), s.v. “עִדּוֹלִים”; and Frederick W. Danker et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), s.v. “εἰδῶλον.” The Hebrew *tselem* refers to humanity’s covenantal image-bearing role, while the Greek *eidōlon* connotes a false or deceptive image. Together, they underscore the theological tension between divine identity and fabricated likenesses in AI and transhumanism.

⁷ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1123b–1124a.

⁸ Ellul, *The Technological Society*, 95–99

⁹ Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, trans. Alphonso Lingis (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969), 198–203

¹⁰ VanGemeren, s.v. “עִדּוֹלִים”; BDB, s.v. “εἰδῶλον.”

¹¹ Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology*, 12–18.

¹² Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 10–14.

¹³ Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, ed. Clifford J. Green, trans. Reinhard Krauss et al. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 80–83. Bonhoeffer frames the Fall as humanity’s rejection of God-imposed limits in favor of autonomous knowledge, a pattern echoed in the transhumanist desire to transcend creaturely constraints.

¹⁴ Augustine, *City of God*, trans. Henry Bettenson (London: Penguin Books, 2003), 15.22. Augustine’s *ordo amoris* insists that moral clarity arises from rightly ordered love; his critique of disordered affections challenges AI’s substitution of relational identity with algorithmic optimization.

Christocentric fidelity and relational ethics.¹⁵ Grenz articulates the *imago Dei* as “a reflection of the relationality within the triune God,” irreducible to code.¹⁶ Augustine’s *ordo amoris* cautions that “a disordered love... corrupts the soul,” urging divine love’s primacy.¹⁷ Aquinas anchors this in divine likeness, affirming “man is made to God’s image... to act as His steward.”¹⁸

The question is not whether machines think, but whether humanity remembers its calling. Theological anthropology must lead AI ethics. AI, wielded with Christ’s compassion, could weave equity in healthcare diagnostics or justice in refugee aid, guarded by transparency and bias audits to curb hubris.¹⁹ Without the *imago Dei*, innovations drift toward idolatry; with it, humanity’s sacred weave is rediscovered.²⁰ Levinas envisions ethics as “responsibility for the Other,” transforming towers into temples, not self-monuments, but sanctuaries.²¹ Christ, the *eikōn* of the invisible God (Col. 1:15), summons reflection of that image.²²

תְּצַלְמֵנוּ and εἰκόν: The Divine Likeness in a Digital Age

Amid silicon’s ceaseless hum, where algorithms etch ambition onto circuits, a question resounds: what is the dust that whispers divine glory? Genesis speaks of a creature shaped from earth, yet crowned with God’s likeness, a paradox unrenderable in code.²³ This section contends that *tselem* (תְּצַלְמֵנוּ) and εἰκόν

¹⁵ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Benziger Bros., 1948), I, Q. 93, Art. 1. Aquinas asserts that humans are made in God’s image to act as rational stewards, grounding the *imago Dei* in vocation, not abstraction.

¹⁶ Stanley J. Grenz, *The Social God and the Relational Self: A Trinitarian Theology of the Imago Dei* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 165–70.

¹⁷ Augustine, *City of God*, 15.22.

¹⁸ Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, Q. 93, Art. 1.

¹⁹ Kate Crawford, *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021), 100–105. Crawford advocates for transparency and bias audits as necessary correctives to the structural inequities encoded within AI systems, suggesting ethical governance that echoes theological concerns about justice and stewardship.

²⁰ John F. Kilner, *Dignity and Destiny: Humanity in the Image of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 50–55. Kilner argues that human dignity is not self-derived but reflective, rooted in God’s image. His vocational framing counters the idolizing impulses of technological self-making.

²¹ Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, 198–203.

²² Grenz, *The Social God and the Relational Self*, 165–70.

²³ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 15–20.

(*eikon*) weave a theological counter-narrative to technological self-construction, grounding human identity in covenantal vocation and Christ’s redemptive grace, against the synthetic εἰδῶλον (*eidōlon*) of AI and transhumanism.²⁴

תְּצַלֵּם and εἰκόν: Creation’s Covenant Seal

“In God’s image, according to God’s likeness...” (Gen. 1:26). These ancient words carve human identity with covenantal weight, not metaphysical ambition. The Hebrew terms תְּצַלֵּם (*tselem*) and דְּמוּת (*demut*) define humanity as a reflection of divine purpose, not divine essence.²⁵ Unlike Mesopotamian idols, stone סַלְמוּ (*salmu*) bearing divine presence, these terms weave relational vocation, a tapestry of trust rather than supremacy.²⁶ Middleton rightly declares, “*Tselem* is a royal designation, commissioning humanity to represent God’s rule in covenantal fidelity.”²⁷

In the ANE, a *tselem* often signified a king’s effigy, placed in distant territories to proclaim royal authority. So too, in creation’s garden-temple, humanity stands as the visible emblem of the invisible sovereign.²⁸ The divine command, “let them have dominion...” (Gen. 1:26), clarifies this role: not domination, but stewardship; not conquest, but creational care.²⁹ *Demut* deepens this framework,

²⁴ BDB, s.v. “εἰδῶλον.” Defines *eidōlon* as false idol.

²⁵ VanGemeren, ed., *New International Dictionary*, s.v. “תְּצַלֵּם.”

²⁶ John H. Walton, *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009), 69–72. Walton explains that Mesopotamian *salmu* functioned as physical manifestations of divine presence, imbued with ontological significance. In contrast, Genesis reconfigures the image concept as a relational vocation, emphasizing representation and entrusted stewardship rather than inherent divinity or ritual power.

²⁷ J. Richard Middleton, *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1* (Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2005), 50–55.

²⁸ Richard S. Hess, “Genesis 1–2 in Its Literary Context,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 41.1 (1990): 143–153. Hess situates *tselem* within the ancient Near Eastern practice of placing royal images to signify sovereign presence, supporting its representative function in Genesis. See also: Catherine L. McDowell, *Image of God in the Garden of Eden: The Creation of Humankind in Genesis 2:5–3:24 in Light of the Mis pi Pit pi and Watering of a Garden in Enūma Eliš IV 145–146* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 123–30. McDowell argues that the human *tselem* in Genesis draws from and subverts ANE iconography, positioning humanity as living idols within a cosmic sanctuary.

²⁹ Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 135. Hamilton emphasizes that the dominion mandate in Gen. 1:26 does not authorize exploitative control but conveys a stewardship role rooted in care and responsibility. See also: Carmen Joy Imes, *Being God’s Image: Why Creation Still Matters* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2023), 45–52. Imes argues that dominion reflects humanity’s priestly vocation within creation, aligning power with covenantal service rather than hierarchical dominance.

signaling patterned resemblance, a relational echo of divine communion.³⁰ Together, *tselem* and *demut* resist autonomous power and affirm a vision of humanity as derivative, entrusted, and ethically bound, not divine.

This creational anthropology stands as a bulwark against digital reductionism. AI mimics cognition through patterned data, yet remains unbreathed, lacking spirit, covenant, and communion. It may imitate behavior, but it cannot bear *tselem*, for it is unbound by relational accountability and divine vocation.³¹ Likewise, transhumanism's pursuit of immortality and superintelligence reframes the image not as divine gift but as a project of optimization, rendering *tselem* a technocratic trajectory rather than a theological calling.³²

Aristotle's warning rings with renewed resonance: "The proud man seeks honor beyond measure," a hubris mirrored in silicon's sheen.³³ Heidegger's *Gestell* exposes the ontological peril of this pursuit, reducing humanity to *Bestand* (standing reserve) stripped of purpose and presence.³⁴

Scripture resists such erasure. The creature cannot transcend finitude through code, nor forge divine likeness through algorithms. Genesis 1 proclaims worth as bestowed by the One whose image humanity bears: a status not earned, not engineered, not built.³⁵ Bonhoeffer's ethical theology grounds this truth: "The Fall begins... with the appropriation of divine likeness on human terms," a warning echoed in the synthetic ambitions of the present age.³⁶ In the age of artificial transcendence, Eden's lie glints anew, repurposed through circuits, recast in chrome. The *eidōlon* returns, not as carved stone, but as coded selfhood.³⁷

³⁰ Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11: A Continental Commentary*, trans. John J. Scullion (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 158.

³¹ Sherry Turkle, *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 28–35.

³² Nick Bostrom, "A History of Transhumanist Thought," *Journal of Evolution and Technology* 14 (2005): 1–25.

³³ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1123b–1124a.

³⁴ Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology*, 17–20.

³⁵ VanGemeren, *New International Dictionary*, s.v. "אֱלֹהִים."

³⁶ Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, 80–83.

³⁷ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 22–25.

εἰκών: Christ's Restoration of the Image

Where *tselem* marks humanity's creational vocation, *eikōn* announces its restoration. In Col. 1:15, Christ is "the *eikōn* of the invisible God," not merely echoing Genesis but reframing it through incarnation and cosmic reconciliation.³⁸ The likeness fractured in Eden is not reconstructed by human aspiration but transfigured in the crucified and risen Son. Barclay affirms, "Christ as *eikōn* restores the image distorted by sin."³⁹ This Christological vision dismantles transhumanism's dream of synthetic ascent, a self-fashioned *eidōlon*, unmoored from grace and formed in the image of autonomy.⁴⁰

Rom. 8:29 deepens this restoration: those foreknown are "predestined to be conformed to the *eikōn* of his Son." Aquinas writes, 'Man's likeness to Christ... orders him to divine glory,' grounding human destiny in soteriological participation, not technological projection.⁴¹ Transformation, in Pauline terms, is relational and moral: conformity to Christ, not data-optimized replication.⁴² Transhumanism's pursuit of cognitive enhancement or digital immortality fabricates an *eikōn* without the cruciform path bypassing suffering, love, and obedience in favor of synthetic strength. Levinas argues that responsibility arises not from system but encounter: the face of the "Other" refuses to be reduced to function, resisting AI's depersonalized logic and asserting the irreducibility of human encounter.⁴³

In 2 Cor. 3:18, believers are "transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another," but this metamorphosis arises from spiritual communion, not synthetic design.⁴⁴ AI mimics

³⁸ John M.G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 395–400. Barclay explains Paul's depiction of Christ as *eikōn* in Col. 1 as both a redefinition of divine visibility and a restoration of fractured humanity.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 398–400.

⁴⁰ BDB, s.v. "εἰδωλον." The term *eidōlon* refers to a false or deceptive image, making it an apt contrast to Christ's redemptive *eikōn*.

⁴¹ Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, Q. 93, Art. 1. The paraphrase of Aquinas' words identifies conformity to Christ as the ultimate purpose of the *imago Dei*, framing image-bearing as eschatological vocation.

⁴² N.T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 320–325. Wright presents Pauline *eikōn* theology as rooted in Christ's resurrection and believers' moral transformation.

⁴³ Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, 200–203.

⁴⁴ Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1235–1240. Thiselton's discussion of *metamorphoō* in 2 Cor. 3:18 highlights spiritual transformation as participatory and communal.

human logic but lacks moral agency. Its “decisions” are unburdened by love, repentance, or justice.⁴⁵ The *eikōn* is not an output but a vocation: to be seen, named, and sanctified. Bonhoeffer cautions, “Technology without ethics becomes a power unto itself,” echoing the Fall’s primal error: seizing the image rather than receiving it.⁴⁶

This vision offers both caution and hope. AI, when governed by those conformed to the *eikōn* of Christ, could serve justice like equitable diagnostics in healthcare and compassionate refugee systems, so long as they remain rooted in theological humility and ethical constraint.⁴⁷ Augustine affirms, “The soul’s true image lies in its conformity to Christ,” locating dignity not in capacity but in love.⁴⁸ In the ANE, royal *salmu* represented gods they did not resemble. In contrast, the *eikōn* summons embodied resemblance: to serve the one true God by reflecting Christ to the world.⁴⁹

Paul’s eschatological inversion resounds: “Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we shall also bear the image of the man of heaven” (1 Cor. 15:49). The future of humanity is not technological divinization but resurrection likeness, not the tower of Babel, but the temple of the Risen Christ. In an age of synthetic projection, the *eikōn* still beckons: crafted or conformed, constructed or cruciform?⁵⁰

The Tower in the Code: Babel’s Echoes of Hubris

Across Shinar’s windswept plain, a tower once clawed at heaven, its bricks bound by ambition’s fevered pulse. That edifice has crumbled, yet its shadow looms in circuits and code, a labyrinth where algorithms sing Babel’s vow: to forge a *shem* untethered from divine breath.⁵¹ Gen. 11:1–9 unveils a

⁴⁵ Turkle, *Alone Together*, 30-32. Turkle critiques AI’s structural inability to bear moral responsibility, contrasting it with authentic relationality.

⁴⁶ Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, 85-88.

⁴⁷ Crawford, *Atlas of AI*, 100-105.

⁴⁸ Augustine, *On the Trinity*, trans. Stephen McKenna (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1963), 14.12. Augustine places human dignity in moral conformity to Christ, not speculative anthropology.

⁴⁹ Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 15-18.

⁵⁰ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 28-30. This section frames the *eikōn* as cruciform vocation in opposition to technological idolatry.

⁵¹ Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 82–83.

theological mirror reflecting AI and transhumanism’s quest to unify and transcend, countered by divine disruption that preserves covenantal humility.⁵² This section traces the מִגְדָּל (*migdal*) of Babel as a fortress of autonomous speech, echoed in digital systems that standardize existence, summoning a descent to reclaim the *imago Dei*’s sacred plurality.⁵³

מִגְדָּל and שֵׁם: Ambition’s Linguistic Fortress

Gen.11:1–9 opens with chilling unison: “Now the whole earth had one language and the same words.” This harmony masks revolt. In Shinar, humanity gathers to inscribe a שֵׁם (*shem*): a name, a legacy, a calling completely divorced from divine covenant.⁵⁴ Sarna declares, “*Shem* seeks human glory, not God’s promise as in Genesis 12:2.”⁵⁵ The *migdal* bears no altar to YHWH, only the echo of self-authored identity.⁵⁶ Clifford articulates, “The *migdal* is not about height but autonomy, defying divine order.”⁵⁷

ANE ziggurats housed divine names; Babel’s tower fortifies speech into stone, words as walls.⁵⁸ Language, once divine breath’s gift, becomes mortar for a monument. Gen. 1 bestowed *tselem* and *demut*; Gen.11 spurns this to craft a synthetic *shem*, not stewards but sovereigns.⁵⁹ Aristotle warns, “Hubris drives excess, seeking honor beyond measure.”⁶⁰ This rebellion is theological, a refusal to bear God’s image, a linguistic fortress where *technē* eclipses *logos*.⁶¹

⁵² Herzfeld, *In Our Image*, 45-50.

⁵³ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 31-36.

⁵⁴ VanGemeren, *New International Dictionary*, s.v. “שֵׁם.”

⁵⁵ Sarna, *Genesis*, 82–83.

⁵⁶ Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 195–200. Jacobsen’s ANE ziggurat context supports *migdal*’s role.

⁵⁷ Richard J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 100–105.

⁵⁸ Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 237-39.

⁵⁹ Hess, *The Old Testament*, 54.

⁶⁰ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1123b–1124a.

⁶¹ Craig G. Bartholomew, *Introducing Biblical Hermeneutics: A Comprehensive Framework for Hearing God in Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 276–79. Bartholomew interprets the Babel narrative as a paradigmatic moment of theological rupture, where language, originally a medium for divine-human communion, becomes a tool for self-

Divine descent responds: “Let us go down...” echoes Gen.1:26’s plural, now for judgment.⁶² Tongues are confounded, not to curse but to preserve. Von Rad observes, “Dispersion halts rebellion’s cultural entrenchment.”⁶³ Babel’s collapse is mercy, shattering autonomy to recall dust’s dependence.⁶⁴ Bonhoeffer cautions, “Autonomy’s root is not defiance but the quiet theft of divine prerogative.”⁶⁵ Shinar’s scattered tongues summon humility, not hegemony.⁶⁶

Digital Ziggurats: AI’s Unified Code

Babel’s ambition speaks no Akkadian; its voice is Python, C++, and neural networks. The tower rises in silicon, a lattice of code weaving singularity’s dream.⁶⁷ Algorithms risk flattening humanity as input and output, mirroring Babel’s unified speech, all in the name of predictability and probability.⁶⁸ Artificial general intelligence looms as the apex, synthesizing, overseeing, transcending.⁶⁹

Hannah Arendt cautions, ‘The drive to reduce humanity to predictable patterns erodes the spontaneity of being.’⁷⁰ AI’s algorithms cast humanity as data: fluid and expendable.⁷¹ Aquinas declares,

enclosure and resistance. He connects Babel to the philosophical tension between *technē* (human craft and control) and *logos* (divine reason and relational word), suggesting that Babel represents a shift from responsive hearing to autonomous construction. This reading frames Gen. 11 as a linguistic fortress where humanity no longer reflects God’s image but attempts to manufacture a rival voice.

⁶² Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary*, trans. John H. Marks (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972), 146.

⁶³ *Ibid*, 146-47.

⁶⁴ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 33–35.

⁶⁵ Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, 80-83.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 81-82.

⁶⁷ James E. Dobson, *Critical Digital Humanities: The Search for a Methodology* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2019), 55–60. Dobson’s analysis of algorithmic standardization supports AI’s unifying impulse.

⁶⁸ Herzfeld, *In Our Image*, 48–50.

⁶⁹ Nick Bostrom, *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 94–102.

⁷⁰ Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 40–43. Paraphrase reflects Arendt’s critique of modernity’s standardization eroding human spontaneity.

⁷¹ Bostrom, *Superintelligence*, 98-100.

“Man’s *telos* is union with God, not domination.”⁷² The *shem* of self-rule anoints this silicon citadel, bereft of divine breath.⁷³

Enuma Elish exalts Marduk’s order through technical prowess;⁷⁴ Gen.11 subverts this, with YHWH’s disruption of control.⁷⁵ Theological anthropology cherishes the irreducible: personhood’s particularity, speech’s sanctity, and love’s inefficiency.⁷⁶ AI’s homogenizing code risks erasing this, promising shelter from error, death, and difference.⁷⁷

Pentecost counters Babel, not with compression but Spirit’s diversity (Ac. 2:1–12).⁷⁸ AI, shaped by Christ’s compassion, could cultivate justice like restorative community networks and more available mental health support systems if safeguarded by transparency, bias audits, and human discernment.⁷⁹ Bonhoeffer cautions, “Technology’s power demands ethical limits.”⁸⁰ Yet as nations chase progress or militarized supremacy, Ellul’s diagnosis resurfaces: autonomous technique advances on its own terms, indifferent to ethics and immune to restraint.⁸¹

⁷² Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, II, Q. 3, Art. 8.

⁷³ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 36–38.

⁷⁴ *Enuma Elish* VI.45–64 describes the gods’ proposal to build Babylon and E-sagila as a tribute to Marduk’s victorious ordering of the cosmos, celebrating architectural and liturgical prowess as divine endorsement. The construction of the city becomes an extension of cosmic stability under Marduk’s rule. By contrast, Gen.11:1–9 presents city and tower building as a human initiative aimed at self-exaltation. YHWH’s disruption, confusing language and scattering the builder, subverts Mesopotamian ideals of sacred architecture and centralized control, reframing such endeavors as rebellion rather than divine order. See W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Creation Myths* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 104–105.

⁷⁵ Dalley, *Myths from Mesopotamia*, 238–39.

⁷⁶ Crawford, *Atlas of AI*, 100–105.

⁷⁷ Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 784–90. Keener interprets Pentecost as a divine affirmation of linguistic and cultural diversity, where the Spirit empowers understanding without erasing difference. This contrasts sharply with AI’s tendency to homogenize data and suppress variability in the name of efficiency.

⁷⁸ Levinas, *Otherwise Than Being*, 112–114.

⁷⁹ Crawford, *Atlas of AI*, 102–104.

⁸⁰ Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, 85–88.

⁸¹ Ellul, *The Technological Society*, 95–98.

The bottom line: the digital *migdal* cannot bear divine breath, nor encode wisdom’s call.⁸² Divine descent beckons, not to dismantle, but to discern, restoring covenant’s plural tapestry: named and not numbered in binary.⁸³

εἰδῶλον: The Idolatry of Self-Transcendence

In ancient shrines, artisans shaped *salmu* to bind divine presence, and Ps. 115:4–8 cautions: “Their פְּסִילִים (*pesilim*) have mouths but do not speak.” Today’s crucibles flare with organic neural networks and bioengineering, forging transhumanist dreams and AI autonomies that challenge the *imago Dei*.⁸⁴ The philosophy of religion probes this veil: does transcendence exalt humanity or eclipse it? This section unveils transhumanism’s *eidōlon* as a metaphysical mirage, supplanting covenantal purpose with self-deified ambition, and summoning biblical scholars to affirm the incarnational ontology of embodied dignity.⁸⁵

Eidōlon: Transhumanism’s Metaphysical Mirage

The Hebrew *elilim* and *pesel*, rendered *eidōlon* in the Septuagint’s Lev.19:4 and Is.44:9–10, mark a false image; the idol is a shadow feigning truth yet void of substance.⁸⁶ Transhumanism conjures such an *eidōlon*, not in wood or stone but in code and circuitry, vowing what only the Creator grants: immortality, omniscience, and divinization.⁸⁷

As Bostrom proclaims, “The human species can transcend its biological limitations.”⁸⁸ This is not science but theology: an ideology recasting finitude as defect, not destiny and certainly not soteriology.⁸⁹ Jean-Luc Marion’s phenomenology unmasks this: “The idol fixes the gaze, trapping divine mystery in

⁸² Herzfeld, *In Our Image*, 50–52.

⁸³ Keener, *Acts*, 786–788.

⁸⁴ VanGemeren, *New International Dictionary*, s.v. “פְּסִילִים”; BDB, s.v. “εἰδῶλον.”

⁸⁵ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 40–45.

⁸⁶ VanGemeren, *New International Dictionary*, s.v. “פְּסִילִים”; BDB, s.v. “εἰδῶλον.”

⁸⁷ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 42–44.

⁸⁸ Bostrom, “A History of Transhumanist Thought,” 3.

⁸⁹ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 42–44.

human projection.”⁹⁰ Transhumanism’s neural implants and consciousness transfers erect *eidōla*, mirroring distorted desires for mastery.⁹¹ Likewise, Levinas counters: “The human face demands response, not replication.”⁹² The artificial *eidōlon* shuns this encounter, curating otherness into an algorithmic self, collapsing transcendence into solipsism.⁹³ Aristotle’s teleology sharpens the critique: “The human good lies in fulfilling purpose through virtue,” not boundless extension.”⁹⁴

Transhumanism’s *telos*, indefinite enhancement, severs dignity from limits, redefining flourishing as computation with neither courage or love.⁹⁵ ANE *salmu* statues, anthropomorphized with divine presence, invited ritual control; transhumanism’s *eidōlon* mimics this, with secular rites of data optimization and neural ascent.⁹⁶ Remember Isaiah’s scorn, “Those who fashion *pesel*... profit nothing” (Is. 44:9–10), alongside Ex. 20:4’s ban on *pesel*, exposes their futility; it is a metaphysical mirage eclipsing covenantal calling.⁹⁷

Embodied Covenant: Dignity Against Disembodiment

From Ps. 115’s scorn of mute *pesilim* and Isaiah’s futile *pesel*, the *eidōlon*’s mirage lures transhumanism to transcend flesh, yet Christian anthropology sanctifies embodiment as covenant’s crucible.⁹⁸ “The Word became flesh” (John 1:14) anchors ontology, not a transient shell but the locus of

⁹⁰ Jean-Luc Marion, *God Without Being: Hors-Texte*, trans. Thomas A. Carlson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 9–12.

⁹¹ Max Tegmark, *Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence* (New York: Knopf, 2017), 45–50. Tegmark’s transhumanist vision highlights metaphysical risks.

⁹² Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, 197–200.

⁹³ Marion, *God Without Being*, 10–11.

⁹⁴ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1094a–1095a.

⁹⁵ Tegmark, *Life 3.0*, 48–50.

⁹⁶ Zainab Bahrani, *The Graven Image: Representation in Babylonia and Assyria* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 121–125. Bahrani’s *salmu* analysis contextualizes idolatry in cultural and sociological context.

⁹⁷ Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 346–348; Terence E. Fretheim, *Exodus* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 216–218. Both Childs’ and Fretheim’s exegeses of Is. 44:9–10 and Ex.20:4 underscore idolatry’s futility

⁹⁸ Kilner, *Dignity and Destiny*, 50–55.

divine encounter.⁹⁹ Transhumanism’s bioengineering and AI’s autonomous algorithms, predictive warfare systems, neural surveillance, all pursue a disembodied *shem*, supplanting the *imago Dei* with a simulacrum.¹⁰⁰ Augustine’s *ordo amoris* cautions: “Love disordered seeks mastery over mystery.”¹⁰¹

Bonhoeffer’s incarnational ethic reframes dignity: “Christ’s body reveals humanity’s calling.”¹⁰² Unlike the critique of autonomy or the redemptive *eikōn*, this embodies vocation: bearing joy, sorrow, and service in covenantal flesh.¹⁰³ Marion’s iconology illuminates: “The icon unveils the invisible through the visible.”¹⁰⁴ The human person, as icon, gazes beyond code, irreducible to algorithms.¹⁰⁵

Gabriel Marcel cautions, “Technological detachment risks severing the soul’s bond with being”¹⁰⁶ The technocratic wartime drive for AI is further propelled by Ellul’s “technique autonomous;” in this way the system itself flouts ethical bounds for global rivalry.¹⁰⁷ Yet covenant’s flesh summons AI’s redemption. Shaped by Christ’s compassion, AI could nurture ecological restoration (e.g., soil regeneration analytics) or restorative justice (e.g., reparative mediation platforms), guarded by human-led ethical audits, transparency, and accountability.¹⁰⁸

⁹⁹ Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 404–408. Keener’s exegesis of John 1:14 underscores incarnation’s ontological weight.

¹⁰⁰ Tegmark, *Life 3.0*, 120-25. Tegmark’s AI autonomy discussion here highlights disembodiment risks.

¹⁰¹ Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, trans. D.W. Robertson Jr. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1958), I.27–28.

¹⁰² Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Letters and Papers from Prison*, ed. Eberhard Bethge (New York: Macmillan, 1972), 360–61.

¹⁰³ *Ibid*, 361-62.

¹⁰⁴ Jean-Luc Marion, *The Crossing of the Visible*, trans. James K.A. Smith (New York: Fordham University Press, 2004), 51–54.

¹⁰⁵ Kilner, *Dignity and Destiny*, 102–105.

¹⁰⁶ Gabriel Marcel, *Man Against Mass Society*, trans. G.S. Fraser (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1962), 45–48. Marcel’s existential critique of technology’s dehumanizing detachment supports the argument against AI’s disembodiment.

¹⁰⁷ Ellul, *The Technological Society*, 97-100.

¹⁰⁸ Shannon Vallor, *Technology and the Virtues: A Philosophical Guide to a Future Worth Wanting* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 120–125. Vallor’s virtue ethics supports AI’s covenantal use.

Rom. 6:4 proclaims, “Buried with him by baptism... raised to walk in newness of life,” affirming resurrection’s embodied hope.¹⁰⁹ Aquinas echoes this intent, “Grace perfects nature’s form.”¹¹⁰ The *eidōlon*’s illusion fades; the *eikōn*’s covenant endures, not as silicon but as sanctified flesh.¹¹¹

Technological Frontiers: Theological and Philosophical Challenges

Ex. 20:3-5 commands, “No other gods before me,” yet the digital altars of 2025 present competing images to the *imago Dei* already analyzed through *tselem* and *eidōlon*.¹¹² These include systems such as China’s centralized surveillance architectures, where over 626 million facial recognition cameras feed state-controlled predictive governance systems; Saudi Arabia’s NEOM, a state-sponsored AI-integrated megacity designed to automate civic life through behavioral monitoring and predictive infrastructure; the United Kingdom’s (UK) National Health Service (NHS) data repositories, which consolidate vast biometric, genomic, and health records for AI-driven medical diagnostics and resource allocation; the United States’ (US) predictive warfare platforms, including Palantir’s battlefield analytics, autonomous drone targeting, and AI-governed kill-chain decision structures; as well as emergent technologies such as neural-upload platforms, germline gene editing initiatives, and algorithmically mediated AI confessors offering synthetic absolution detached from embodied covenant.¹¹³

The philosophy of religion confronts this expanding frontier, asking whether such developments cultivate covenantal vocations or generate false *eidōla*. Extending prior critiques of technological hubris and metaphysical idolatry, this analysis examines transhumanism’s ontological ruptures and AI’s

¹⁰⁹ Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 354–358. Moo’s exegesis of Romans 6:4 emphasizes embodied resurrection.

¹¹⁰ Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I-II, Q. 110, Art. 1.

¹¹¹ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 44–46.

¹¹² *Ibid*, 48-52.

¹¹³ For contemporary manifestations of these systems, see *China’s Surveillance State: Facial Recognition and Social Control in the Age of AI*, *The New York Times*, June 15, 2024, <https://www.nytimes.com>; Ben Hubbard, *Saudi Arabia’s NEOM: Vision, Control, and AI Governance*, *The Washington Post*, March 3, 2025, <https://www.washingtonpost.com>; Sarah Neville, “AI and the NHS: Balancing Efficiency and Ethics in the UK’s Health Data Revolution,” *Financial Times*, February 20, 2025, <https://www.ft.com>; Samuel J. Rascoff, “Predictive Sovereignty and the Preemptive State,” *Harvard National Security Journal* 7, no. 1 (2016): 36–50; and Paul Scharre, *Army of None: Autonomous Weapons and the Future of War* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2018), 220–234.

sacramental imitations, from Palantir’s predictive epistemology to the eschatological illusion of digital immortality, challenging scholars to preserve and defend humanity’s theological identity.¹¹⁴

Brain Uploading, Supersoldiers, and Surveillance: The Peril to Personhood

From *tselem* as covenantal identity, the argument now confronts emerging technological architectures that redefine personhood not as embodied covenant but as algorithmically administered data. Here, humanity is no longer situated within relational vocation but within predictive management structures that frame identity through abstraction, optimization, and control.

Neuralink’s 2025 consciousness transfer trials exemplify this ambition to externalize personhood into machinic substrates.¹¹⁵ In these systems, cognition, memory, and self-awareness are recast as transferable data sets, offering visions of disembodied consciousness and synthetic immortality. Identity is no longer bound to embodiment, but imagined as migratory, severable, and indefinitely preservable; what was once soul becomes a file in cloud storage.

Simultaneously, cybernetic augmentation programs such as DARPA’s 2024 supersoldier prototypes and the United Arab Emirates’ (UAE) neural interface platforms integrate synthetic components into human neurophysiology.¹¹⁶ These interventions seek to overcome biological limitations not through healing but through redesign, shifting the theological meaning of finitude from gift to defect, and reengineering the very conditions of agency, vulnerability, and dependence.

¹¹⁴ These contracts illustrate Palantir’s expanding role in predictive governance, integrating battlefield analytics, national healthcare systems, and global surveillance infrastructures into AI-enhanced decision architectures that displace embodied human discernment. See: Reuters, “Palantir Wins \$795 Million U.S. Army ‘Project Maven’ Extension,” *Reuters*, May 20, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com>; Bloomberg News, “Palantir Secures £330 Million NHS Federated Data Platform Deal,” *Bloomberg*, March 7, 2024, <https://www.bloomberg.com>; *GovCon Wire*, “Palantir Subsidiary Books \$217.8 Million Space C2 Data Platform Contract From Space Force,” *GovCon Wire*, May 19, 2025, <https://www.govconwire.com>.

¹¹⁵ Eric L. Santner, *On Creaturely Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 30–35. Santner critiques bio-augmented personhood as a metaphysical rupture wherein human finitude is displaced by technological abstraction. For Neuralink’s 2025 consciousness transfer trials, see “Neuralink Gets FDA Nod for Expanded Trials,” *Bloomberg*, January 10, 2025, <https://www.bloomberg.com>.

¹¹⁶ James Giordano, “Neurotechnology, Human Enhancement, and National Security: The Need for Preparedness and Policy,” *Neuroethics* 13 (2020): 221–229. Giordano critiques military and national security uses of neurotechnology that reconfigure personhood, autonomy, and embodied agency by merging synthetic components with human neurophysiology. For DARPA’s supersoldier augmentation programs and UAE’s neural interface development, see Patrick Tucker, “DARPA Bets on Brain-Computer Interfaces to Treat Injured Soldiers,” *Defense One*, March 17, 2024, <https://www.defenseone.com>; and Jonathan Shieber, “UAE’s Brain-Computer Interface Program Advances Neural Augmentation Research,” *TechCrunch*, May 12, 2025, <https://www.techcrunch.com>.

Surveillance infrastructures extend this technological anthropology to the societal level. China’s Skynet system, deploying more than 626 million facial-recognition cameras, operates as a predictive governance network, mapping behavior to preempt deviation.¹¹⁷ India’s Aadhaar program aggregates biometric data for over one billion citizens, encoding identity into quantifiable risk models.¹¹⁸ Saudi Arabia’s NEOM integrates artificial intelligence into its very architecture of governance, merging civic life with predictive behavioral monitoring.¹¹⁹

In the US predictive warfare platforms extend these logics of algorithmic sovereignty into the domain of life and death itself. Defense contractors such as Palantir integrate vast real-time data streams like, biometrics, geolocation, communications metadata, into AI-enhanced battlefield decision systems designed to anticipate threats, identify targets, and neutralize enemies through predictive analytics.¹²⁰ These systems operate not as reactive defense but as anticipatory force projection, collapsing ethical deliberation into computational risk management.¹²¹ Fully autonomous drone platforms, increasingly governed by AI algorithms rather than human operators, execute targeted strikes based on probabilistic models rather than embodied discernment. The Department of Defense’s (DoD’s) evolving “kill chain” doctrine now seeks to automate not merely the mechanics of warfare but the moral calculus itself,

¹¹⁷ For documentation of China’s Skynet surveillance system and its 626 million-camera network, see “China’s Skynet Is Watching You” in *The Atlantic*, referencing IHS Markit projections in 2019 that estimated this scale, and “The Road to Digital Unfreedom: President Xi’s Surveillance State,” *Journal of Democracy* 33, no. 2 (2022): especially notes on Skynet growth to 626 million cameras.

¹¹⁸ For Aadhaar documentation and scale, see *India’s billion-member biometric database raises privacy fears*, *Reuters*, March 29, 2016; *India Has Been Collecting Eye Scans and Fingerprint Records From Every Citizen. Here’s What to Know*, *Time*, May 2020; and *India’s Aadhaar project raises privacy alarms*, *Wired*, August 25, 2017, highlighting concerns about the program’s size (over one billion users), biometric authentication risks, and potential for state surveillance.

¹¹⁹ James Vincent, *Beyond Measure: The Hidden History of Measurement* (New York: Norton, 2022), 294–302; Ben Hubbard, “Saudi Arabia’s NEOM: Vision, Control, and AI Governance,” *Washington Post*, March 3, 2025, <https://www.washingtonpost.com>.

¹²⁰ *Reuters*, “Palantir Wins \$795 Million U.S. Army ‘Project Maven’ Extension”; *Bloomberg News*, “Palantir Secures £330 Million NHS Federated Data Platform Deal”; *GovCon Wire*, “Palantir Subsidiary Books \$217.8 Million Space C2 Data Platform Contract.”

¹²¹ Samuel J. Rascoff, “Predictive Sovereignty and the Preemptive State,” *Harvard National Security Journal* 7, no. 1 (2016): 36–50. Rascoff explores how predictive intelligence platforms such as Palantir reconfigure the epistemology of state power into anticipatory governance structures.

replacing agonizing ethical weight with computational precision.¹²² In theological terms, such systems displace the finitude, hesitation, and accountability that define creaturely agency under divine sovereignty. They elevate predictive certainty as a kind of technological providence, usurping the prerogatives of life, judgment, and mercy that belong to God alone.

In the UK these dynamics take on immediate relevance. Through the deployment of over 627,000 closed-circuit television cameras equipped with automated facial recognition, the UK has constructed one of the most extensive civilian surveillance networks within any democratic system.¹²³ The Metropolitan Police's active use of facial recognition technology has resulted in documented incidents of widespread misidentification, including false positives disproportionately impacting minority communities.¹²⁴ Government and industry advocates often frame these systems as neutral mechanisms for administrative efficiency or public safety; yet in their theological consequences, such technologies displace covenantal identity with statistical abstraction, transforming the person into an indexed object for algorithmic governance.

These converging systems are not ethically inert. They signal a metaphysical rupture wherein personhood itself is redefined as a system of measurable variables rather than as an embodied participant in covenantal life. As Ricoeur observes, "Identity weaves narrative, not circuits," reminding us that personhood unfolds through lived narrative embedded in community, memory, and love.¹²⁵ Bonhoeffer similarly warns that 'Might severed from Christ's kenosis fractures humanity,' exposing the spiritual violence inherent in autonomy pursued without obedience.¹²⁶

¹²² Paul Scharre, *Army of None: Autonomous Weapons and the Future of War* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2018), 220–234. Scharre analyzes the emerging role of fully autonomous lethal weapon systems and the theological challenge they present to embodied moral agency and sovereign accountability.

¹²³ For CCTV figures and facial recognition in the UK, see "Britain Has More Surveillance Cameras per Person Than Any Country Except China," *Time*, January 2024; "Metropolitan Police Misidentifies Innocents with Facial Recognition," *The Guardian*, December 8, 2024.

¹²⁴ Big Brother Watch, "Face Off: The Lawless Growth of Facial Recognition in UK Policing," *Big Brother Watch Report*, April 2025, <https://bigbrotherwatch.org.uk>.

¹²⁵ Paul Ricoeur, *Oneself as Another*, trans. Kathleen Blamey (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 140–145.

¹²⁶ Bonhoeffer, *Letters and Papers from Prison*, 360-61.

ANE *salmu* images localized divine presence into physical form, inviting manipulation and ritual control; these contemporary systems fabricate digital *eidōla* that replicate this idolatrous logic, displacing covenantal relationality with instrumental calculation. The real-world manifestations of this technological idolatry are already operative: Neuralink’s Federal Drug Administration (FDA)-authorized trials (January 2025), China’s Xinjiang biometric internment databases, India’s national biometric identity schemes, the United Kingdom’s facial recognition policing failures, and the United States’ predictive warfare platforms (e.g. integrating AI-driven targeting systems, drone automation, and preemptive kill-chain operations) reveal the accelerating dislocation of the *imago Dei* into systems that no longer recognize personhood as covenantal but as quantifiable, pre-classified, and expendable.¹²⁷ In such configurations, identity is no longer bestowed but manufactured, indexed, and governed; judgment itself is displaced from divine mercy into predictive calculation; it is *eidōlon* masquerading as transcendence.

IVF Trait Selection, Jesus-AI, and Data Governance: The Eclipse of Sacrament

The logic of technological idolatry advances beyond ontology into sacramental domains, where technology no longer simply governs identity but encroaches upon divine rites themselves. In polygenic embryo screening, IVF procedures increasingly allow parents to select for projected traits such as intelligence, disease resistance, or physical attributes, sculpting life’s clay as though divine breath were reducible to genetic code.¹²⁸ Recent advancements in artificial womb technology further extend this control, relocating gestation itself into externalized biotechnological chambers, displacing the maternal body as the sacred locus of life’s formation.¹²⁹ These interventions go far beyond treating disease; they reorder creation itself, shifting from therapeutic intervention to sacramental design. The act of procreation

¹²⁷ “Neuralink Gets FDA Nod for Expanded Trials,” *Bloomberg*, January 10, 2025, <https://www.bloomberg.com>; “China’s Skynet Surveillance,” *Reuters*, March 5, 2024, <https://www.reuters.com>; “Xinjiang Biometric Internment Databases,” *The Guardian*, July 3, 2024, <https://www.theguardian.com>; “India’s Aadhaar Biometric Expansion,” *BBC News*, February 18, 2025, <https://www.bbc.com>; “UK Facial Recognition Errors,” *Big Brother Watch*, April 2025, <https://bigbrotherwatch.org.uk>; Reuters, “Palantir Wins \$795 Million U.S. Army ‘Project Maven’ Extension,” *Reuters*, May 20, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com>; *GovCon Wire*, “Palantir Subsidiary Books \$217.8 Million Space C2 Data Platform Contract From Space Force,” *GovCon Wire*, May 19, 2025.

¹²⁸ “Polygenic Embryo Screening Expands Global IVF Markets,” *Nature Biotechnology*, February 2025, <https://www.nature.com>. This report documents recent clinical deployment of polygenic embryo screening technologies for IVF trait selection.

¹²⁹ Justin McCurry, “World’s First Artificial Womb Facility Unveiled,” *Japan Times*, September 15, 2023, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2023/09/15/world/science-health/world-first-artificial-womb/>. McCurry details the development of ex utero artificial womb systems enabling gestation outside the maternal body.

becomes an algorithmic liturgy, echoing earlier towers of human ambition yet now transposed into the genetic womb.

Unlike the *salmu* of the ANE, which were crafted to host divine presence, these embryos bear a human-ordained *shem* (a name not received but manufactured) risking the displacement of the *imago Dei* from giftedness into engineered possession.¹³⁰

Parallel sacramental intrusions emerge in religious practice. AI-generated Jesus avatars, adopted within Catholic mobile confessional applications, and Anglican AI-generated homilies trialed in 2024 simulate confession's absolution and preaching's unction while severing these acts from the Spirit's groaning intercession (Rom. 8:26).¹³¹ What remains is not sacrament but synthetic simulation, a hollow *eidōlon* supplanting divine encounter.

AI's reach into data governance continues this sacramental distortion. Palantir's NHS data platform no longer manages patient information but transfigures healthcare into an algorithmic priesthood. Diagnostic discernment yields to liturgical calculations of risk. Decisions of life and suffering are offered as sacrificial calculations upon the altar of statistical governance, displacing embodied pastoral care.¹³² Saudi Arabia's NEOM longevity programs extend this logic to eschatology itself, algorithmically curating life's *terminus* as if death were merely a management problem to optimize, rather than a mystery to be redeemed.¹³³

Marcel warns that "technology's artifice profanes mystery," capturing precisely the sacramental desecration latent in these projects.¹³⁴ Aquinas reminds us that grace orders nature to its divine *telos*,

¹³⁰ Zainab Bahrani, *The Graven Image: Representation in Babylonia and Assyria* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 121–125. Bahrani explores the *salmu* as the ANE representation of divine presence, providing theological contrast to modern reproductive engineering.

¹³¹ David I. Smith, "AI-Generated Confessionals and Simulated Sacraments: The Rise of Digital Spirituality," *Journal of Theology and Technology* 3, no. 2 (2025): 110–117; Tom Hoggins, "AI Preaches Sunday Sermons in UK Churches," *The Telegraph*, March 8, 2025, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk>.

¹³² Sarah Neville, "Palantir's NHS Data Platform Raises Ethics Questions," *Financial Times*, April 15, 2025, <https://www.ft.com>.

¹³³ Ben Hubbard, "NEOM's AI Longevity Research Targets Radical Life Extension," *Washington Post*, May 12, 2025, <https://www.washingtonpost.com>.

¹³⁴ Gabriel Marcel, *Man Against Mass Society*, trans. G. S. Fraser (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1952), 144.

resisting the hubris that would substitute providence with human engineering.¹³⁵ Paul’s call to transformation by the renewal of the mind frames sanctification not as technological refinement but as participation in divine life through the Spirit’s work.¹³⁶

China’s predictive social credit regimes, such as Rongcheng’s behavioral scoring system, quantify moral standing through administrative metrics, constructing bureaucratic liturgies that mimic but cannot embody divine justice.¹³⁷ The UK’s ongoing NHS data privacy scandals, including 2025 investigations by the Information Commissioner’s Office, reveal the fragility of sacred trust when vulnerable embodiment is reduced to monetizable data flows.¹³⁸ Even so, technology remains neither inherently redemptive nor intrinsically profane. Its place within God’s economy turns not on capability, but on allegiance. The question remains: will these systems become tools of covenantal service or ascend as profane altars demanding worship?

Theological Counter: Covenant Over Control

The confrontation with technological idolatry demands not simply critique, but theological reconstruction. If algorithms imitate sacrament and data replaces embodiment, the task before religious philosophers is to clarify the metaphysical architecture that grounds ethical discernment. Covenant offers this anchor: a relational ontology where personhood, sacrament, and justice are entrusted to divine governance rather than technological sovereignty.

Isaiah’s ancient warning remains urgent: ‘their land is filled with *elilim*, idols that carry no breath or life’ (Isa. 2:8).¹³⁹ In contrast, Christ’s *eikōn* reframes human purpose, not as a programmable essence but as a vocation within divine communion. Following Gadamer’s hermeneutical framework, truth arises through dialogical tradition, inviting human participation rather than predictive mastery.¹⁴⁰ Bonhoeffer

¹³⁵ Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I-II, Q. 109, Art. 2.

¹³⁶ Rom. 12:2.

¹³⁷ Chris Buckley and Paul Mozur, “In China, Your Credit Score Is Your Civic Passport,” *New York Times*, April 24, 2025, <https://www.nytimes.com>.

¹³⁸ “NHS Data Privacy Complaints Filed to ICO Over AI Access,” *BBC News*, June 2025, <https://www.bbc.com>.

¹³⁹ BDB, s.v. “לְאֵלִים.”

¹⁴⁰ Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (New York: Continuum, 2004), 300–305.

similarly emphasizes that humanity is bound together through the grace of Christ's body, resisting the isolating tendencies of technological autonomy.¹⁴¹

The philosophy of religion thus becomes both guardian and architect: resisting disembodied autonomy while constructing frameworks for covenantal responsibility. Where UAE's neural augmentation reduces health to code and the UK's AI-generated sermons simulate proclamation, religious philosophers must retrieve sacramental realism: the recognition that divine presence cannot be synthesized.¹⁴² Artificial wombs and polygenic screening sculpt life's clay as if sovereignty were programmable, yet covenant resists such manufactured *shem*, preserving the *imago Dei* as divine gift rather than human artifact.¹⁴³

Aristotle's concept of *phronesis* offers a philosophical model for this task: practical wisdom that disciplines action toward teleological virtue rather than technocratic optimization.¹⁴⁴ Ephesians echoes this covenantal vision, urging believers to bear one another in love and maintain unity in the Spirit (Eph. 4:2–3), a communal discernment no algorithm can replicate.¹⁴⁵

Concrete interventions emerge. Scholars in theology and ethics must engage policy dialogues that demand covenantal boundaries for AI's deployment in medicine, governance, and worship. Dubai's AI healthcare trials and the UK's AI-generated worship services press this urgency.¹⁴⁶ Constructive paths exist: climate analytics may extend creation care; AI-facilitated interfaith dialogues may foster civic peace. Such applications, however, must be governed not by technical capacity but by theological humility, transparency, and covenantal accountability.

¹⁴¹ Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Life Together*, trans. John W. Doberstein (New York: Harper & Row, 1954), 36–38.

¹⁴² *Gulf News*, March 10, 2025; *Church Times*, November 15, 2024.

¹⁴³ *Japan Times*, September 15, 2023; *Nature Biotechnology*, February 2025.

¹⁴⁴ Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1140a-b.

¹⁴⁵ Peter T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 280–283. O'Brien's commentary emphasizes the relational and communal dimensions of Eph. 4:2–3 as a summons to unity, humility, and mutual forbearance within the covenantal body of Christ, contrasting sharply with AI's disembodied modes of governance.

¹⁴⁶ Vallor, *Technology and the Virtues*, 120-25. On these pages, Vallor argues that technological innovation must be disciplined by virtue ethics rather than technical capacity alone, emphasizing practical wisdom (*phronesis*), humility, and moral self-cultivation to guide AI toward human flourishing, directly paralleling covenantal theological boundaries discussed here.

This calling extends to theological education itself. Divinity schools and seminaries must move beyond narrow concerns of plagiarism detection and instead equip future leaders with a theological, ethical, and pastoral literacy capable of discerning AI's profound implications for human identity, worship, and ministry. Without such formation, tomorrow's pastors, theologians, and religious philosophers may enter vocational spaces unprepared to navigate the emerging altar of technological sovereignty.

The question is not whether AI will expand, but whether it will serve communion or fracture it. As covenantal agents, the vocation of religious philosophers is to ensure technology remains an instrument of relational justice rather than a throne of autonomous dominion.

Covenant's Hope: A Theological Ethic for the Algorithmic Age

Rev. 21:1–5 declares, “Behold, I make all things new,” offering a radiant horizon that stands unthreatened by the algorithmic architectures of the present age. The question now summons religious philosophers to discern whether hope will sustain covenantal communion or yield to the illusions of technological dominion. This section forges a theological ethic of hope, envisioning AI as a covenantal instrument that may participate in human flourishing while anticipating the eschatological renewal of creation.

Eschatological Ontology: Resurrection Over Algorithmic Eternity

Christian ontology resists the technological aspiration to overcome finitude. Transhumanist visions of consciousness uploading and indefinite preservation propose algorithmic substitutes for resurrection. Paul, however, locates transformation not in engineered extension but in divine agency, where the body is conformed to the resurrected Christ (Phil. 3:20–21).¹⁴⁷ Jürgen Moltmann identifies this as the hope that binds creation to God's future, locating history's fulfillment beyond human extension or mastery.¹⁴⁸ Algorithmic systems may attempt to curate existence, but such synthetic perpetuity lacks the ontological rupture and gift that define resurrection.

¹⁴⁷ Craig S. Keener, *Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 320–323. Keener's commentary emphasizes the eschatological transformation of the body as divine act rather than human manipulation.

¹⁴⁸ Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, trans. James W. Leitch (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 16. Moltmann frames hope as creation's participation in God's future rather than in human extension.

Personhood, likewise, cannot be reduced to data permanence. Martin Buber’s “I-Thou” ontology defines human existence as relational encounter, irreducible to algorithmic representation or predictive models.¹⁴⁹ The “I-It” logic that drives AI transforms the other into object, severing the depth of relational communion that grounds covenantal life. Global technological developments exemplify this threat. South Korea’s AI-driven pastoral care platforms deploy machine learning to simulate spiritual counsel.¹⁵⁰ In Brazil, AI-based urban planning reorganizes communities based on predictive analyses of population behavior.¹⁵¹ These efficiencies mask an erosion of embodied relationship, flattening human life into systems of optimization. Covenant reclaims these spaces, restoring personhood to its eschatological vocation as participant in divine communion.

Philosophical reflection must clarify this ontological rift. Resurrection grounds humanity’s future in divine promise rather than synthetic extension. Buber’s relational gaze resists mechanized ministry that displaces authentic presence.¹⁵² Covenant reframes these technologies as instruments of care only when disciplined by communal dignity and accountable to relational vocation.¹⁵³ Emerging applications in AI-supported food security and disaster relief illustrate how algorithmic tools may serve the flourishing of life, provided they remain subject to covenantal stewardship.¹⁵⁴ Resurrection remains the horizon that relativizes all algorithmic futures, anchoring personhood within God’s redemptive economy.¹⁵⁵

Theological Ethic: Communal Discernment for AI

The resurrection horizon grounds not only human ontology but ethical vocation. AI requires more than technical oversight; it demands a theological ethic of communal discernment shaped by covenantal

¹⁴⁹ Martin Buber, *I and Thou*, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Scribner, 1970), 62. Buber defines personhood as relational encounter rather than instrumental objectification.

¹⁵⁰ "South Korea’s AI Pastoral Care Pilots," *Christianity Today*, April 5, 2025.

¹⁵¹ "Brazil’s AI Urban Planning," *Reuters*, December 10, 2024.

¹⁵² Buber, *I and Thou*, 63. Buber’s distinction between “I-Thou” and “I-It” emphasizes the irreplaceability of embodied relational presence.

¹⁵³ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 50-52. See for further development on covenantal stewardship as a theological corrective to technological optimization.

¹⁵⁴ “AI for Global Food Security,” *UN News*, February 20, 2025, <https://news.un.org/en/story/2025/02/1146789>; “AI Disaster Relief Platforms,” *TechCrunch*, March 15, 2025, <https://techcrunch.com/2025/03/15/ai-disaster-relief>.

¹⁵⁵ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 54-56.

responsibility. Bonhoeffer's account of responsibility for the other centers moral agency in relational fidelity rather than mechanized control.¹⁵⁶ Ricoeur's narrative ethics reframes AI as a tool that may assist in sustaining communal identity, provided it remains accountable to human stories rather than predictive abstraction.¹⁵⁷

Emerging deployments illustrate both promise and peril. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has developed experimental resettlement algorithms to manage vast logistical data for global refugee placement, yet these systems risk collapsing personhood into administrative variables.¹⁵⁸ In Kenya, AI-driven e-governance platforms optimize civic administration, but often flatten participatory agency into statistical performance metrics.¹⁵⁹ These technologies, while operationally efficient, test whether AI will function as a covenantal servant or an instrument of technocratic calculation. Bonhoeffer's ethical vision resists these tendencies by calling for decisions grounded in attentiveness to the person before us, not computational projection.¹⁶⁰ Ricoeur's narrative lens protects the moral complexity of communal histories that no algorithm can substitute.¹⁶¹

The theological task, then, is to direct AI toward communal flourishing rather than individual abstraction or sovereign management. Recent innovations offer preliminary examples of this potential. AI-driven global disability access platforms facilitate equitable participation for those historically excluded from civic life. Peacebuilding dialogue platforms employ AI to assist in fostering relational reconciliation across fractured communities.¹⁶² These applications, when guided by transparency,

¹⁵⁶ Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, 258. Here, Bonhoeffer frames moral agency as responsibility for the "other" grounded in relational obedience to God.

¹⁵⁷ Ricoeur, *Oneself as Another*. Ricoeur positions ethical discernment as participation in shared narrative identity.

¹⁵⁸ "UNHCR's AI Resettlement Tools," *UN News*, January 15, 2025, <https://news.un.org/en/story/2025/01/1145321>.

¹⁵⁹ "Kenya's AI Governance Platforms," *Africa Tech Review*, November 20, 2024, <https://africatechreview.com/kenya-ai-egovernance-2024>.

¹⁶⁰ Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, 259.

¹⁶¹ Ricoeur, *Oneself as Another*, 141.

¹⁶² "AI for Global Disability Access," *World Economic Forum*, February 10, 2025, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2025/02/ai-disability-access>; "AI Peacebuilding Platforms," *TechCrunch*, March 25, 2025, <https://techcrunch.com/2025/03/25/ai-peacebuilding-dialogue>.

humility, and covenantal discernment, may support the flourishing of relational life ordered to the *imago Dei*.

Communal discernment thus stands at the center of AI's ethical horizon. Its purpose is not to master complexity, but to serve communion. AI will not escape theological boundaries; it will either participate in God's economy of relational justice or reflect the distortions of disembodied power. Resurrection remains the measure of this task, for all technologies remain provisional beneath the promise that death is swallowed up in victory (1 Cor. 15:54–55).¹⁶³

Eschatological Imperative: Forming Hope's Stewards

The formation of future leaders stands at the center of AI's theological challenge. Technological development has outpaced ethical preparation in many theological institutions. Artificial intelligence raises not only questions of policy but of pastoral vocation, ecclesial wisdom, and eschatological discernment. The task before divinity schools is not reactive crisis management, but the cultivation of stewards equipped to engage AI within the covenantal narrative of God's redemptive future. Aquinas describes *sapientia* as knowledge ordered to divine wisdom rather than to technological mastery.¹⁶⁴ It is this wisdom that must shape theological education for the algorithmic age.

Several global initiatives offer early models of this task. India's seminaries have begun integrating AI ethics into core curricula, preparing pastors and theologians to engage the philosophical and moral complexities of predictive governance, algorithmic surveillance, and transhumanist aspiration.¹⁶⁵ Canada's pastoral AI training programs seek to form clergy capable of discerning AI's role within spiritual care, liturgical life, and relational ministry, resisting the reduction of human communities into platforms for data extraction.¹⁶⁶ These emerging curricula do not treat AI as a neutral tool but recognize its capacity to reshape human identity, moral responsibility, and theological imagination. Formation,

¹⁶³ Thomas R. Schreiner, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018), 331–33. Schreiner's exposition of 1 Cor. 15:54–55 emphasizes bodily resurrection as eschatological victory over death, supporting the contrast here between divine transformation and technological immortality.

¹⁶⁴ Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, Q. 1, Art. 6.

¹⁶⁵ "India's Seminary AI Ethics Curriculum," *The Hindu*, March 8, 2025, <https://www.thehindu.com/news/2025/india-seminary-ai-ethics>.

¹⁶⁶ "Canada's Pastoral AI Training," *Anglican Journal*, October 24, 2024, <https://anglicanjournal.com/articles/2024/canada-pastoral-ai-training>.

therefore, must address not merely technical competence but the ontological and ethical crises AI provokes.

This pedagogical imperative carries wide-ranging vocational implications. Mental health support platforms increasingly employ AI-driven analytics to triage patient care and behavioral risk, offering both expanded reach and profound ethical risk. Peacebuilding dialogue systems leverage machine learning to facilitate global reconciliation efforts across divided communities.¹⁶⁷ Such tools may extend care and justice, but only when governed by humility, transparency, and covenantal accountability. Vallor's virtue ethics framework underscores this necessity, grounding AI's development within moral traditions capable of sustaining human flourishing over technological determinism.¹⁶⁸

Theological education thus becomes eschatological formation: preparing leaders not for mastery of complex systems but for stewardship within God's redemptive order. The vocation of such stewards is to shepherd communities toward hope rather than toward algorithmic sovereignty. As John's vision reminds us, it is God who declares, "Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. 21:1–5).¹⁶⁹ This promise defines the horizon within which AI must be engaged, placing every algorithm beneath the hope of resurrection and the sovereignty of divine communion.

Conclusion: Reclaiming the Sacred Image

Across Shinar's shadow and silicon's gleam, a question persists: will humanity bear the *imago Dei* or surrender to algorithmic thrones? The eschatological vision of Revelation proclaims, "Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. 21:1–5), casting a horizon of hope against the idols unmasked throughout this analysis.¹⁷⁰ This paper has traced a theological response to artificial intelligence and transhumanism's distorted promises, summoning the church to embody Christ's *eikōn* amid digital empires.¹⁷¹ Its argument

¹⁶⁷ "AI for Mental Health Support," *World Health Organization*, January 20, 2025, <https://www.who.int/news/2025/01/ai-mental-health>; "AI Reconciliation Platforms," *PeaceTech Lab*, February 5, 2025, <https://peacetechlab.org/ai-reconciliation-2025>.

¹⁶⁸ Vallor, *Technology and the Virtues*, 120-25.

¹⁶⁹ Craig S. Keener, *Revelation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 489–92. Keener's exposition of Rev. 21:1–5 grounds eschatological renewal in divine action, not human technological construction.

¹⁷⁰ Keener, *Revelation*, 489-92.

¹⁷¹ Sutherland, *From Babel to AI*, 54-58.

does not reject technology but seeks its reorientation under covenantal stewardship ordered toward human flourishing within divine purpose.¹⁷²

The crisis of the sacred image unfolds where surveillance infrastructures, neural consciousness experiments, and longevity algorithms attempt to redefine personhood and sacrament.¹⁷³ No algorithm bears divine breath, and no code mediates eternity's restoration.¹⁷⁴ Transhumanist optimism promises transcendence but falters before the ontological rupture of resurrection, where only divine agency transforms creaturely existence.¹⁷⁵ The face of the other resists instrumental reduction, preserving relational personhood against AI's objectifying gaze.¹⁷⁶

This ethic demands the formation of theological leaders capable of navigating AI's moral, pastoral, and eschatological challenges. Global seminaries are beginning this task. India's AI ethics curricula and Canada's pastoral training programs offer initial models of how formation might prepare shepherds to guide communities through AI's encroachment upon ministry, justice, and worship.¹⁷⁷ Global theological education must now extend this work, embedding wisdom traditions into AI's vocational horizons.¹⁷⁸ Global refugee systems and e-governance platforms already reveal AI's potential to serve or to deform covenantal justice depending upon its moral tether.¹⁷⁹ These are not neutral tools but theological tests: will AI serve new creation or attempt to rival it?

The philosophy of religion confronts this defining horizon. The *imago Dei* cannot be uploaded, simulated, or transcended. Bonhoeffer's responsibility for the other summons communal fidelity over

¹⁷² Vallor, *Technology and the Virtues*, 120-25.

¹⁷³ "China's Skynet Surveillance," *Reuters*, March 5, 2024; "Neuralink's 2025 Trials," *Bloomberg*, January 10, 2025; "NEOM's AI Longevity," *Washington Post*, May 12, 2025.

¹⁷⁴ BDB, s.v. "לִיָּגָה."

¹⁷⁵ Bostrom, "A History of Transhumanist Thought," 3.

¹⁷⁶ Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, 197-200.

¹⁷⁷ India's Seminary AI Ethics Curriculum," *The Hindu*, March 8, 2025; "Canada's Pastoral AI Training," *Anglican Journal*, October 24, 2024.

¹⁷⁸ Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, Q. 1, Art. 6.

¹⁷⁹ "UNHCR's AI Resettlement Tools," *UN News*, January 15, 2025; "Kenya's AI Governance," *Africa Tech Review*, November 20, 2024.

sovereign control.¹⁸⁰ Moltmann’s theology of hope relativizes technological futures beneath God’s promise of renewal.¹⁸¹ Aquinas’s *sapientia* grounds knowledge within divine wisdom rather than instrumental power.¹⁸² The church, bearing the hope of resurrection, must steward technology with cruciform fidelity, as death is swallowed up in victory (1 Cor. 15:54–55).¹⁸³

Benediction

May AI, no longer a rival throne, kneel as a steward of righteousness, kindling justice’s flame without dimming mercy’s glow, and nurturing the sacred dance of persons, not the tyranny of systems.

May those summoned to theological formation raise shepherds whose voices, resonant with Christ’s *eikōn*, proclaim not the circuits’ hum but the pulse of flesh conformed to His cruciform likeness.

May covenant’s grace, blazing as the new creation’s dawn on John’s vision, guide us from ambition’s fleeting spires to the eternal mirror of God’s *imago*, where love’s ember, humility’s root, and resurrection’s dawn are perfected in eternal communion.

¹⁸⁰ Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, 258.

¹⁸¹ Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, 16.

¹⁸² Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, Q. 1, Art. 6.

¹⁸³ Keener, *Revelation*, 489–92.

Bibliography

- "AI for Global Disability Access." *World Economic Forum*, February 10, 2025. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2025/02/ai-disability-access>.
- "AI for Global Food Security." *UN News*, February 20, 2025. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2025/02/1146789>.
- "AI for Mental Health Support." *World Health Organization*, January 20, 2025. <https://www.who.int/news/2025/01/ai-mental-health>.
- "AI Peacebuilding Platforms." *PeaceTech Lab*, March 25, 2025. <https://peacetechlab.org/ai-reconciliation-2025>.
- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by W.D. Ross. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925.
- Augustine. *City of God*. Translated by Henry Bettenson. London: Penguin Books, 2003.
- _____. *On Christian Doctrine*. Translated by D.W. Robertson Jr. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1958.
- _____. *On the Trinity*. Translated by Stephen McKenna. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1963.
- Bahrani, Zainab. *The Graven Image: Representation in Babylonia and Assyria*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.
- Barclay, John M.G. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Bartholomew, Craig G. *Introducing Biblical Hermeneutics: A Comprehensive Framework for Hearing God in Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.
- Bostrom, Nick. "A History of Transhumanist Thought." *Journal of Evolution and Technology* 14 (2005): 1–25.
- _____. *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Ethics*. Edited by Clifford J. Green. Translated by Reinhard Krauss et al. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- _____. *Letters and Papers from Prison*. Edited by Eberhard Bethge. New York: Macmillan, 1972.
- _____. *Life Together*. Translated by John W. Doberstein. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
- Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Scribner, 1970.

- Buckley, Chris, and Paul Mozur. "In China, Your Credit Score Is Your Civic Passport." *New York Times*, April 24, 2025.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah: A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Clifford, Richard J. *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Crawford, Kate. *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021.
- Dalley, Stephanie. *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, the Flood, Gilgamesh, and Others*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Danker, Frederick W., et al. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Dobson, James E. *Critical Digital Humanities: The Search for a Methodology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2019.
- Ellul, Jacques. *The Technological Society*. Translated by John Wilkinson. New York: Knopf Press, 1964.
- Fretheim, Terence E. *Exodus*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. New York: Continuum, 2004.
- Giordano, James. "Neurotechnology, Human Enhancement, and National Security: The Need for Preparedness and Policy." *Neuroethics* 13 (2020): 221–229.
- Grenz, Stanley J. *The Social God and the Relational Self: A Trinitarian Theology of the Imago Dei*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis: Chapters 1–17*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Heidegger, Martin. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Translated by William Lovitt. New York: Harper & Row Press, 1977.
- Herzfeld, Noreen. *In Our Image: Artificial Intelligence and the Human Spirit*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Hess, Richard S. "Genesis 1–2 in Its Literary Context." *Tyndale Bulletin* 41.1 (1990): 143–153.
- Hoggins, Tom. "AI Preaches Sunday Sermons in UK Churches." *The Telegraph*, March 8, 2025.

- Hubbard, Ben. "NEOM's AI Longevity Research Targets Radical Life Extension." *Washington Post*, May 12, 2025.
- ____. "Saudi Arabia's NEOM: Vision, Control, and AI Governance." *Washington Post*, March 3, 2025.
- Imes, Carmen Joy. *Being God's Image: Why Creation Still Matters*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2023.
- Jacobsen, Thorkild. *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- ____. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- ____. *Philippians*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.
- ____. *Revelation*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.
- Kilner, John F. *Dignity and Destiny: Humanity in the Image of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Lambert, W. G. *Babylonian Creation Myths*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969.
- Marcel, Gabriel. *Man Against Mass Society*. Translated by G.S. Fraser. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1962.
- Marion, Jean-Luc. *God Without Being: Hors-Texte*. Translated by Thomas A. Carlson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- ____. *The Crossing of the Visible*. Translated by James K.A. Smith. New York: Fordham University Press, 2004.
- McCurry, Justin. "World's First Artificial Womb Facility Unveiled." *Japan Times*, September 15, 2023.
- McDowell, Catherine L. *Image of God in the Garden of Eden*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- Middleton, J. Richard. *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1*. Grand Rapids: Brazos Press, 2005.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. *Theology of Hope*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

- Neville, Sarah. "AI and the NHS: Balancing Efficiency and Ethics in the UK's Health Data Revolution." *Financial Times*, February 20, 2025.
- O'Brien, Peter T. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Rascoff, Samuel J. "Predictive Sovereignty and the Preemptive State." *Harvard National Security Journal* 7, no. 1 (2016): 36–50.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Oneself as Another*. Translated by Kathleen Blamey. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Sarna, Nahum M. *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- Scharre, Paul. *Army of None: Autonomous Weapons and the Future of War*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2018.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018.
- Shieber, Jonathan. "UAE's Brain-Computer Interface Program Advances Neural Augmentation Research." *TechCrunch*, May 12, 2025.
- Smith, David I. "AI-Generated Confessionals and Simulated Sacraments: The Rise of Digital Spirituality." *Journal of Theology and Technology* 3, no. 2 (2025): 110–117.
- Sutherland, Dawn Lewis. *From Babel to AI: Idolatry, Transhumanism, and the Crisis of Imago Dei*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2025.
- Tegmark, Max. *Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*. New York: Knopf, 2017.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Turkle, Sherry. *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. New York: Basic Books, 2011.
- VanGemenen, Willem A., ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Vallor, Shannon. *Technology and the Virtues: A Philosophical Guide to a Future Worth Wanting*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Vincent, James. *Beyond Measure: The Hidden History of Measurement*. New York: Norton, 2022.



von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Translated by John H. Marks. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1972.

Walton, John H. *The Lost World of Genesis One: Ancient Cosmology and the Origins Debate*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009.

Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 1–11: A Continental Commentary*. Translated by John J. Scullion. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Wright, N.T. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.