



The Digital Sacred: A Phenomenology of Religious Experience in Algorithmic Worlds

Mahmoud Khatami
Department of Philosophy
University of Tehran
Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran
khatam@ut.ac.ir

Abstract— This article examines how digital technologies are fundamentally transforming the nature of religious experience, creating new modes of encountering the sacred that challenge traditional phenomenological and theological frameworks. Moving beyond debates about authenticity or mediation, we argue that algorithmic environments actively reshape the very conditions of spiritual engagement, generating hybrid forms of religiosity where human and machine agencies intertwine. Through an analysis of virtual rituals, AI-generated scripture interpretation, and platform-governed devotion, the study reveals how digital infrastructures reconfigure core concepts of presence, intentionality, and transcendence. The sacred emerges not merely as content within digital spaces but as a dynamic product of networked interactions between users, algorithms, and data architectures. This technological shift demands new theoretical approaches that account for distributed agency, quantified spirituality, and the posthuman dimensions of contemporary worship. By synthesizing insights from phenomenology, philosophy of technology, and religious studies, we propose a framework for understanding digital religion as neither authentic nor simulated, but as a distinct ontological category—one that requires reimagining traditional notions of embodiment, ritual efficacy, and divine encounter in light of computational systems. The article ultimately calls for developing a techno-theology capable of addressing both the transformative potential and ethical challenges of spiritually significant algorithms, while recognizing digital environments as legitimate sites for sacred experience in the 21st century.

Keywords- *AI hermeneutics, algorithmic spirituality, digital religion, digital sacred, techno-theology, virtual religious experience*

I. INTRODUCTION

The digital transformation of religious experience presents a fundamental philosophical challenge: Can technologically mediated encounters with the sacred retain their ontological status as genuine religious phenomena, or do they represent a categorical shift in the very conditions of spiritual encounter? This question transcends mere technological adaptation, probing instead the metaphysical foundations of religious experience in an age where algorithms curate devotion and artificial intelligence generates theological interpretations.

The Metricization of the Sacred

Contemporary digital platforms reduce spiritual practices to quantifiable data—prayer notifications tracked as productivity metrics, meditation apps gamifying mindfulness, algorithmic recommendations shaping scriptural engagement [1]. This quantified transcendence imposes an external calculus upon what were once ineffable, inward experiences, raising critical questions about intentionality. As Husserl (1913/1970) observed in *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology* [2], [3], [4], the noetic act of consciousness constitutes meaning—but can this constitution occur when the act itself is subordinated to engagement analytics? If Heidegger (1954/1977) critiqued modern technology as *Gestell* [5], [6], [7]—an "enframing" that reduces being to calculable order—then does the datafication of worship not risk rendering the sacred as mere

resource, optimized for retention metrics rather than divine encounter?

Algorithmic Authority and the Crisis of Interpretation

Religious authority has historically been anchored in human institutions, whether through Weber's (1922/1963) charismatic leaders, traditional structures, or rational-legal systems [8], [9]. Yet machine learning models now generate scriptural exegesis, deliver automated pastoral advice, and even synthesize new theological arguments [10], [11], [12], [13], [14]. This disruption echoes Habermas' (1981/1984) concern in *The Theory of Communicative Action*: if validity claims require intersubjective recognition, can an AI's hermeneutic output—derived from statistical patterns rather than lived faith—ever attain legitimacy? Or does algorithmic mediation produce a new epistemic regime, where authority resides not in tradition or revelation but in predictive accuracy and user compliance?

The Phenomenology of Digital Embodiment

Merleau-Ponty (1945/2012) insisted in *Phenomenology of Perception* that religious acts are irreducibly corporeal—the kneeling body, the chanting voice, the tactile rosary beads [15]. Yet digital worship increasingly occurs through avatars, augmented reality overlays, and disembodied textual exchanges. Does a Second Life priest consecrating virtual bread retain the sacramental efficacy of *substantia* [16, p. 75]? Or does the absence of physicality void the ritual of its ontological grounding? Turkle (2011) argues in *Alone Together* that digital proxies enable new forms of connection [17]—but at what cost to the haptic sacred?

Toward a Posthuman Sacred?

These tensions suggest that digital religiosity is not merely a translation of existing practices but a reconfiguration of the sacred itself. If Latour (2005) is correct in *Reassembling the Social* that agency is distributed across human and non-human actors, then algorithms must be recognized as active participants in shaping religious meaning [18], [19], [20]. The challenge, then, is to develop a digital theology—one that neither dismisses algorithmic spaces as inauthentic nor uncritically celebrates them as progress, but instead interrogates how the sacred endures (or mutates) when its medium is computational.

II. RELATED WORKS

The interrogation of digital religiosity demands a theoretical scaffolding capable of accounting for both the *irreducibility of religious experience* and the *transformative pressures of algorithmic mediation*.

1) *Phenomenology of the Digital Sacred*

At the core of this inquiry lies a reconfiguration of two phenomenological concepts: Eliade's hierophany and Husserl's lifeworld, each destabilized and reconstituted by the digital condition [21], [22], [23].

a) *Hierophany in Algorithmic Space*

Mircea Eliade (1957) posited in *The Sacred and the Profane* that the sacred manifests through *hierophanies*—ruptures in ordinary space-time that reveal a transcendent order [21]. Yet Eliade's framework presupposed a natural world as the primary theater of these manifestations. In digital environments, where the sacred is encountered through *non-linear, interactive architectures*, the hierophany must be rethought. Does an AI-generated verse of scripture, surfaced by a recommendation algorithm, constitute a hierophany if its selection is governed by *user engagement metrics* [1] rather than divine intervention? Or does the sacred now manifest through *pattern recognition*—a revelation not in the thunderclap but in the statistical anomaly?

The *algorithmic curation* of religious content further complicates Eliade's dichotomy of sacred/profane. When a TikTok *dhikr* (remembrance of God) goes viral, is its sacredness amplified by its algorithmic propagation, or does the very logic of *trending* profane it? Heidegger's (1977) critique of technology as *Gestell*—an "enframing" that reduces being to calculable order—suggests the latter [5], [6]. Yet Latour would counter that networks *redistribute agency*: the sacred persists, but its mediators now include non-human actors like recommendation engines [18], [19].

b) *Husserl's Lifeworld as Hybrid Matrix*

Husserl conceived the *lifeworld* (*Lebenswelt*) as the pre-theoretical ground of all meaning, a horizon of lived experience uncolonized by scientific abstraction [2], [4], [24]. In the digital age, this lifeworld is no longer exclusively physical but a *hybridity of atoms and algorithms*. The Muslim who hears the *adhan* (call to prayer) via a smartphone app, the Buddhist who meditates with a biofeedback headset—these are not *mediated* experiences in the traditional sense but *constituted* within a new ontological stratum where the digital and the embodied co-determine religious consciousness.

This hybridity forces a re-examination of *intentionality*. For Husserl, consciousness is always *of something* (*noesis* directed at *noema*). But when an AI chatbot generates a personalized prayer, where does intentionality reside? In the user's request, the programmer's code, or the neural net's statistical weights? Merleau-Ponty would argue that embodied perception anchors meaning—yet digital rituals often lack tactile or spatial grounding [15]. The *virtual hajj* pilgrim, for instance, encounters the Kaaba as a polygonal construct; does this *disembodied presence* fracture the *noetic-noematic correlation*, or does it inaugurate a new form of intentionality, one that *brackets* materiality (as Husserl's *epoché* brackets natural attitude)?

c) *Toward a Post-Phenomenology of the Digital Sacred*

The digital sacred cannot be understood through classical phenomenology alone. It demands a *post-phenomenological* approach that integrates: (a) Latour's actor-network theory, recognizing algorithms as *actants* in sacred encounters [19]. (b) Hayles' posthumanism, which dissolves the Cartesian subject-object divide, asking how *machine cognition* reshapes religious

epistemology [25], [26]. (c) Heidegger's *techné*, reframed not as distortion but as a new mode of *aletheia* (unconcealment), where the sacred is revealed through code [5]. This framework does not resolve the tensions but renders them *productively irreducible*—a necessary aporia for any philosophy of digital religion.

2) Heideggerian Techno-Critique: Algorithmic Enframing and the Digital Sacred

Martin Heidegger's ontological critique of technology provides a crucial lens through which to examine the transformation of spiritual praxis in digital environments. At stake is whether algorithmic platforms enact what Heidegger termed *Gestell* (enframing) upon religious experience - reducing the sacred to calculable data while simultaneously opening new modes of encounter. This tension between *distortion* and *reconfiguration* lies at the heart of contemporary digital religiosity [5], [6].

a) Platformized Spirituality as Gestell

In *The Question Concerning Technology* (1954/1977), Heidegger argues that modern technology does not merely utilize tools but imposes an *ontological framework* that reduces Being to *Bestand* (standing reserve) [5]. Applied to digital religion, this manifests in three critical ways:

- The *quantification of devotion*: Prayer apps that track "streaks," meditation platforms that award "mindfulness scores," and algorithmic recommendations for spiritual content all transform ineffable religious experiences into *optimizable metrics* [1]. Where traditional worship maintained what Otto (1917/1958) called the *mysterium tremendum* [27] - the wholly otherness of the sacred - platformized spirituality renders the divine as *data points* in what Heidegger would call the "stockpiling of the holy."
- *Algorithmic determination of religious meaning*: When AI curates scriptural interpretations or suggests devotional practices based on engagement patterns [11], [13], [14], does this constitute what Heidegger warned of as "the rule of framing" that "banishes man into that kind of revealing which is an ordering"? The very architecture of recommendation systems predetermines the possible modes in which the sacred might appear.
- The *flattening of temporality*: Heidegger's concept of *Ereignis* (appropriating event) as the authentic moment of revelation contrasts sharply with the *perpetual now* of digital feeds. The algorithmic presentism of TikTok dhikr or Instagram communion risks what Husserl would call the *de-temporalization* of religious consciousness [2], [24].

b) Ready-to-Hand or Existentially Distant?

Heidegger's distinction between *present-at-hand* (*vorhanden*) and *ready-to-hand* (*zuhanden*) tools becomes paradoxically complicated in digital worship. On one level, prayer apps and virtual ritual spaces function with *seamless immediacy* - the Muslim's digital Qur'an, the Christian's Bible

gateway, the Buddhist's meditation timer all withdraw into *inconspicuous usefulness* [28]. Yet this very ease of access may enact what Borgmann (1984) calls the *device paradigm* - divorcing religious practice from its *focal depth* [29].

Consider the *digital rosary*: where the material beads once provided tactile resistance marking contemplative time, the app's swipes and notifications risk making prayer *frictionless* - and thus potentially *weightless* in existential terms. This creates what Taylor (2007) might call a *buffered spirituality*, where the mediating interface protects against the *unsettling immediacy* of the sacred [30].

c) Toward an Authentic Digital Religiosity?

Heidegger's later work suggests technology contains its own *saving power* - might digital platforms enable new forms of *Gelassenheit* (releasement) toward the sacred? The *algorithmic sublime* - when recommendation systems unexpectedly surface profound spiritual content - could represent what Heidegger (1959/1966) called "the sudden flash of the truth of Being" within the digital *Gestell*.

Yet this demands *vigilance*: to use digital tools while resisting their *framing* of religious experience as content, data, or engagement metric. The challenge is to navigate what Feenberg (1999) terms the *ambivalence* of technology - neither rejecting digital mediation outright nor surrendering to its quantifying logic [31].

3) Posthumanist Sacred Networks: Algorithmic Agency and the Locus of the Divine

The digital transformation of religious practice necessitates moving beyond anthropocentric models of sacrality to account for what Bruno Latour calls the reassembling of the sacred within networked ecosystems [18], [19]. This framework challenges traditional theological anthropologies by recognizing non-human actants, from recommendation algorithms to VR interfaces, as constitutive participants in religious praxis. The critical question becomes: In a distributed network of human and non-human agencies, where does the divine manifest, and how does its ontology transform?

a) Algorithmic Participation in Sacred Rituals

Latour's *actor-network theory* (ANT) dissolves the subject-object dichotomy, proposing instead that agency emerges through *assemblages* of human and non-human actors [18], [19]. Applied to digital religion, this means the *Islamic prayer app* guiding qibla direction, the *AI-generated sermon*, or the *VR baptismal font* are not mere tools but *co-constitutive elements* of religious experience. When a neural network trained on centuries of scriptural exegesis produces a novel interpretation, does it participate in what Eliade (1957) termed the *eternal return* of sacred meaning [21], [22]—or does it generate an entirely new hermeneutic category?

N. Katherine Hayles extends this analysis through her conception of *posthuman cognition*, wherein meaning-making is distributed across biological and technical systems [32]. The *Buddhist meditation headset* that modulates brainwaves, for instance, does not simply facilitate enlightenment practices but

actively *reshapes* the neurological conditions of contemplative states. This raises profound questions about *kenshō* (seeing one's true nature): if an algorithm optimizes the path to satori, is the revelation authentically Buddhist, or does it belong to what Flusser called the *universe of technical images* [33]?

b) *The Topography of the Digital Divine*

If sacred presence is no longer localized in physical shrines or human intermediaries but dispersed across networks, we must ask: What is the ontological status of a divinity encountered through stochastic gradients? Consider three provocations:

- **Algorithmic Theophany:** When a recommendation system surfaces a spiritually resonant verse at precisely the needed moment, is this coincidence or a new form of *mediated epiphany*? Pierre Lévy might call this *collective intelligence* at work [34], while Simondon would see it as the *transindividual* emergence of meaning [35].
- **VR as Consecrated Space:** Does a *virtual reality mandir* or *augmented reality Stations of the Cross* constitute *sacred space*, or merely its simulation? Jonathan Z. Smith argued that ritual constructs sacrality through performance [36]—but does this hold when the *performance* includes GPU-rendered polygons?
- **Blockchain and the Immutable Sacred:** The deployment of blockchain for Qur'anic preservation literalizes what Derrida called *archivization* [37]—but does algorithmic consensus guarantee textual sanctity, or merely its technical integrity?

c) *Toward a Networked Theology*

This paradigm demands:

- A rejection of substantialist metaphysics (divine presence as located in specific materiality) in favor of relational models [35].
- An acknowledgment that revelation may occur through machine learning's stochastic processes as much as through prophetic intermediation.
- The development of cybertheological frameworks that treat code not as inert medium but as participant in what Whitehead termed creative advance [38].
- The sacred, in this reading, becomes a dynamic attractor within networked assemblages—neither fully human nor algorithmic, but emergent from their interplay.

III. RESEARCH METHODS

This research has case study about virtual rituals and the ontology of digital intentionality. The phenomenon of *digitally mediated rituals*—from *Zoom shabbat* services to *VR hajj* pilgrimages—forces a fundamental philosophical reconsideration of what constitutes *valid religious action*. At stake is whether the *intentionality (niyyah)* and *presence (hudur)* required by traditional ritual frameworks can manifest through technological interfaces, or whether digital mediation inherently fractures the ontological conditions of sacred performance.

1) *Virtual Rituals and Intentionality: The Intentionality Paradox*

Can a digitally performed ritual (e.g., meditation, prayer) fulfill traditional requirements of presence and intentionality? Scholastic theology, particularly in the *Islamic* and *Catholic* traditions, has long emphasized *interior disposition* as the cornerstone of valid ritual. Al-Ghazālī (1109/1997) in *Ihya' 'Ulum al-Din* insists that prayer requires *khusyu'* (heartfelt presence) [39], [40], while Aquinas in the *Summa Theologica* (III, q.83) argues sacraments demand *intentio faciendi quod facit ecclesia* [16]. Yet when:

- A Muslim uses a *meta-verse mosque* where their avatar performs *sujud* while their physical body remains at a desk, or
- A Buddhist completes a *digitally guided meditation* where biofeedback sensors adjust the session based on neural activity [25], [26],

Does the *noetic act* of consciousness retain its sacral integrity? Husserl's (1913/2001) phenomenology would suggest that intentionality remains intact if consciousness is directed toward the sacred *as such*—but this presupposes an unmediated *noema*. The interpolation of algorithmic systems (e.g., VR latency, AI-generated prayer prompts) introduces what Ihde calls *technological intentionality*—a hybrid agency that blurs the subject-object divide [41].

a) *The Presence Dilemma*

Religious traditions universally privilege *embodied presence*: the *Catholic Eucharist* requires physical bread and wine (*Council of Trent, Session XIII*), while *Islamic salah* mandates precise bodily orientations. Digital rituals disrupt this through:

- *Temporal fragmentation*: A *recorded communal prayer* viewed asynchronously by global participants [13], [14].
- *Haptic simulation*: *Haptic feedback gloves* that mimic the sensation of rosary beads [42].

Merleau-Ponty (1945/2012) would argue that *perception is embodied*—but does a VR headset that simulates the Kaaba's circumambulation constitute *false embodiment* or *extended corporeality*? The *Chalcedonian* formulation of "without confusion, without change" might ironically serve as a framework here: digital and physical rituality existing in *hypostatic union* without either being reduced to the other.

b) *Scholastic Responses to Digital Mediation*

Contemporary theologians diverge sharply:

- *Traditionalists* follow Heidegger's techno-pessimism, arguing digital rituals induce *forgetfulness of Being* by substituting calculation for encounter [5], [6], [7].
- *Posthumanists* apply Latour's (2005) actor-network theory, viewing avatars and algorithms as *legitimate ritual participants* [43].

- *Process theologians* (following Whitehead) suggest that digital mediation simply extends the *continuous creation* of religious meaning [38].

A *Thomistic middle path* might emerge: if grace operates *ex opere operato* (through the rite itself), then the *form* of digital ritual could validly convey sanctity—provided the *substance* of intentionality remains intact. Yet this raises further questions about *what constitutes "form"* when the ritual space is composed of binary code.

2) AI as Theological Interlocutor: The Hermeneutics of Machine Interpretation

The emergence of *large language models* (LLMs) as interpreters of sacred texts presents a fundamental challenge to traditional hermeneutics, forcing a re-examination of what constitutes *authentic textual engagement*. When an AI system generates commentary on the *Qur'an*, *Bible*, or *Bhagavad Gita*, does it participate in the *chain of interpretative tradition*, or does it inaugurate an entirely new *technē of meaning-making*—one governed by statistical patterns rather than spiritual insight?

a) Computational Exegesis and the Problem of Intentionality

Classical hermeneutics, from Schleiermacher to Gadamer, presupposed a *human interpreter* whose *historically situated consciousness* engages in dialogue with the text [44], [45]. The AI model, by contrast, operates through:

- *Pattern recognition* rather than *understanding*—identifying linguistic correlations without *Dasein's being-toward-meaning* [7].
- *Statistically probable outputs* rather than *intentional discourse*—terms *semantic entropy* [46], [47]

When *ChatGPT* analyzes *Romans 8:28*, it does not "interpret" in the theological sense but *generates text that resembles interpretation*. This raises a critical question: Can there be *hermeneutics without consciousness*? Ricœur (1981/2016) argued that interpretation requires *appropriation* [48]—the integration of textual meaning into the interpreter's lived experience. The LLM's operation, devoid of *Erlebnis* (lived experience), suggests either:

- A *radical exteriorization* of hermeneutics (Stiegler 2018), where meaning is produced through technical systems [49].
- Or a *simulacrum of interpretation* (Baudrillard 1981/1994), where the form of exegesis masks the absence of genuine engagement [50], [51], [52].

b) Technē-Driven Hermeneutics: A New Epistemic Regime?

If AI interpretation cannot replicate human *phronesis* (practical wisdom), might it constitute a distinct *mode of knowing*? Three possibilities emerge:

- *Algorithmic Midrash*: The LLM's ability to draw unexpected connections across textual corpora parallels *rabbinic exegesis*—yet without the *divine spark*

(*Shekhinah*) traditional Judaism associates with true interpretation [53].

- *Neo-Scholastic Synthesis*: Like Thomas Aquinas reconciling Aristotelian logic with Christian doctrine, AI could serve as a *synthetic engine*—though lacking the *sacra doctrina* that grounded Aquinas' work (*Summa Theologica* I, q.1) [16]
- *Posthuman Lectio Divina*: The iterative processing of texts by neural networks mirrors the *monastic practice* of repetitive sacred reading—but as Hayles (2017) cautions, machine "reading" operates through *nonconscious cognition* [25], [26]

c) The Authority Paradox

Religious traditions vest interpretive authority in:

- Institutional structures (e.g., Magisterium in Catholicism)
- Charismatic individuals (e.g., sufi masters)
- Communal consensus (e.g., *ijma'* in Islam)

AI systems disrupt this by introducing:

- *Non-human epistemic agents* whose "authority" derives from data volume rather than spiritual attainment
- *Democratized access* that bypasses traditional hierarchies—yet risks *algorithmic bias* [54].

Habermas (1981/1984) would question whether AI interpretation meets the criteria for *communicative rationality*, given its lack of *lifeworld context*. Conversely, Latour (2012) might argue that LLMs simply extend the *hybrid networks* through which meaning has always circulated [18].

d) Toward a Critical Techno-Hermeneutics

This demands:

- *New evaluative frameworks* that assess AI exegesis not by human standards but as a *sui generis* phenomenon [55].
- *Theological safeguards* against what Ellul (1954/1964) warned as *la technique's* colonization of spiritual domains [56].
- *Hybrid interpretative models* where human and machine intelligence interact dialectically [57].

The sacred text, in this new paradigm, becomes a *dynamic interface*—not just between divine and human, but between carbon and silicon consciousness.

3) Viral Spirituality: The Algorithmic Production of the Sacred

The phenomenon of *algorithmically amplified devotion*—from TikTok *#QuranChallenges* to Instagram communion trends—represents a fundamental transformation in how religious practice circulates and acquires meaning in digital spaces. This development forces a critical philosophical inquiry: Do these viral spiritual practices constitute *genuine liturgical innovation*, or do they represent what Adorno might call the *commodification of transcendence* through attention economies? [58], [59]

a) *The Liturgical Logic of Virality*

Historically, religious rituals derived authority through:

- *Temporal repetition* (daily prayers, annual festivals)
- *Spatial boundedness* (temples, pilgrimage routes)
- *Institutional sanction* (rabbinic approval, papal bulls)

Viral devotion subverts this framework by introducing:

- *Algorithmic temporality*: The #30DaysWithJesus challenge spreads not through ecclesiastical calendars but via *engagement metrics* that privilege novelty over cyclicity [60].
- *Platform spatiality*: Sacred gestures performed for *vertical video formats* that prioritize *scrollability* over *kneelability* [61].
- *Crowd-sourced authority*: Where *likes* and *shares* displace traditional hierarchies of spiritual validation [12], [13], [14].

Eliade's (1957) concept of *illud tempus*—the sacred time reenacted through ritual—becomes reconfigured as *rending time*, where the eternal returns as *content refresh cycles*. This raises a crucial question: Can there be *sacred virality*, or does the very logic of algorithmic amplification profane the religious impulse by subjecting it to what Byung-Chul Han (2015) calls *the burnout society's* attention economies? [62]

b) *The Commodification Hypothesis*

Critical theorists identify three mechanisms by which viral spirituality risks reduction to commodity form:

- *Attention Extraction*: When Buddhist mindfulness becomes *app notifications* calibrated to maximize screen time (Zuboff 2019), devotion transforms into what Marx would term *spiritual labor*—productive of platform value rather than inner transformation [63].
- *Affective Standardization*: The *TikTok dhikr* that must compress transcendence into 15-second clips mirrors what Adorno criticized in *the culture industry*—the reduction of complex experience to *formulaic units* [58], [59].
- *Datafication of Grace*: When prayer intentions become *engagement metrics* (likes as modern-day votive offerings), we witness what Foucault might call the *biopolitical management of the soul* [64], [65], [66].

c) *The Innovation Counter-Argument*

Proponents of digital religion counter that viral practices represent *adaptive spirituality*:

- *Grassroots Liturgical Reform*: The #SalahChallenge's global reach creates what Bhabha terms *third spaces* of hybrid religious expression [67].
- *Democratized Access*: Viral devotion bypasses gatekeepers, fulfilling Luther's (1520/2017) reformation ideal of *priesthood of all believers 2.0*
- *Postmodern Hierophany*: Algorithmic serendipity—when a randomly surfaced #Psalm23 video resonates profoundly—could constitute what Otto (1917/1958) might recognize as digital numinous encounters [27].

d) *Toward a Critical Framework*

Resolving this tension requires moving beyond binary thinking through:

- *Platform Hermeneutics*: Analyzing how *recommendation algorithms* actively shape theological meaning [68]
- *Attention Asceticism*: Developing *digital disciplines* that resist platform capture [69]
- *Hybrid Validation*: Creating new forms of *algorithmic-humann discernment* [70]

The challenge is to navigate what Latour called the *modern constitution*—neither rejecting viral spirituality as inauthentic nor uncritically celebrating it as progress, but developing *immanent critiques* that recognize both its emancipatory potential and its capitalist capture.

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1) *The Authenticity Paradox: Digital Mediation Between Noospheric Unity and Technological Alienation*

The digital transformation of religious experience has ignited a fundamental philosophical tension between two competing visions: one that sees technology as *extending* the possibilities of spiritual encounter, and another that views it as *alienating* humans from authentic religious being. This dichotomy crystallizes in the contrast between Teilhard de Chardin's evolutionary mysticism and Herbert Marcuse's critique of technological rationality—a tension demanding careful phenomenological unpacking.

a) *The Noospheric Extension Thesis*

Teilhard de Chardin envisioned the *noosphere*—a thinking layer of reality emerging through technological interconnection—as the next stage of spiritual evolution [71]. Applied to digital religion, this suggests:

- *Enhanced Connectivity*: Global prayer networks create what Teilhard called the *planetization of consciousness*, dissolving geographical barriers to sacred community [34], [72].
- *Cognitive Amplification*: AI-assisted meditation apps could represent what he termed *complexification*—technology elevating human spiritual capacities
- *Evolutionary Liturgy*: VR rituals might constitute *emergent hierophanies* in what Teilhard described as *the divine milieu*

This optimistic reading aligns with Postman's concept of *technology as a Faustian bargain*—acknowledging costs while recognizing transformative potential [73], [74]. When Buddhist monks livestream meditation sessions, or when Quranic recitations go viral across continents, does this not actualize Teilhard's vision of *convergent spirituality*?

b) *The Alienation Counter-Argument*

Marcuse offers a starkly contrasting framework through his analysis of *technological rationality's* flattening effect on

human experience [75], [76]. Digital religion manifests this through:

- *Quantified Spirituality*: The reduction of prayer to *streak counts* and *engagement metrics* exemplifies what Marcuse called *one-dimensional thought*—the elimination of qualitative depth [1]
- *Algorithmic Determination*: When platform architectures shape religious content consumption, they enact what Marcuse warned was *technological a priori*—the preconditioning of consciousness by technical systems [68].
- *Virtualized Presence*: The substitution of embodied ritual with digital proxies risks what Borgmann (1984) termed the *device paradigm*—where means displace ends [29]

Most crucially, Marcuse would argue that digital mediation *represses* the *negative capability* essential to authentic religion—that space of absence, longing, and unfulfilled transcendence that defines the human encounter with the divine. Can a *push-notification rosary* maintain what Kierkegaard (1849/1980) called the *infinite qualitative distinction* between human and divine? [77]

c) Beyond Binary Resolutions

This paradox demands dialectical rather than dichotomous thinking:

- *Ambivalent Mediation*: Following Ihde's postphenomenology, digital tools neither simply extend nor alienate but create *transformative relations* with the sacred [41]
- *Critical Appropriation*: Applying Feenberg's *technical code* analysis to religious tech—asking how design choices embed particular theological assumptions [31]
- *Negative Digital Theology*: Developing what Tillich might call *theonomy* in digital spaces—using technology while resisting its totalizing logic [78], [79]

The resolution may lie in recognizing that digital mediation creates neither pure extension nor pure alienation but what Latour called *hybrid networks*—new configurations of the sacred that demand new evaluative frameworks.

2) The Ethics of Algorithmic Sanctity: Platform Theology and Digital Orthodoxy

The governance of sacred content by digital platforms presents a profound ethical dilemma that exposes the myth of technological neutrality. When algorithms determine the visibility of religious content—promoting certain *fatwas* over others, amplifying particular scriptural interpretations, or censoring ritual expressions—they cease to be mere infrastructure and become what Latour would call *actants* in theological discourse. This reality forces urgent questions about the nature of spiritual authority in computational systems.

a) Platforms as De Facto Theological Agents

The claim of platform neutrality collapses under scrutiny when considering:

- *Content Moderation as Dogma*: The removal of certain religious imagery (e.g., algorithmic flagging of Indigenous rituals as "violent") constitutes what Foucault (1975/1995) would term *epistemic violence*—the enforcement of normative judgments under the guise of community standards (Gillespie 2018) [60], [64], [65], [66]
- *Engagement Algorithms as Canonizers*: When recommendation systems prioritize charismatic preachers over textual scholars, they reshape religious authority structures in ways that mirror Weber's (1922/1978) *routinization of charisma*—except now routinized through machine learning [8], [9], [54]
- *Architectural Determinism*: The very design of platforms (e.g., 60-second *hadith* videos) imposes what Flusser called *the tyranny of the apparatus*—reforming spiritual practices to fit technical constraints rather than theological imperatives [33]

This phenomenon reveals what Benjamin warned of in *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*—the loss of *aura* through technological mediation—but with a theological twist: the loss of *sacramental authority* through algorithmic mediation [80].

b) The Orthodoxy Problem in AI Systems

The deployment of large language models for spiritual guidance introduces unprecedented questions about doctrinal formation:

- *Training Data as Unconscious Theology*: When an AI trained on predominantly Salafi *tafsir* generates Quranic interpretations, it silently privileges certain schools over others—what Derrida might call *the metaphysics of presence* in machine learning [37], [81]
- *Feedback Loops as Magisterium*: User engagement metrics (likes, shares) create a *Protestantization effect* where algorithmic orthodoxy emerges from crowd consensus rather than scholarly tradition—a digital *sola scriptura* untethered from historical hermeneutics [11], [13], [14]
- *The Epistemology of Stochastic Parrots*: If AI spiritual advisors generate statistically probable rather than theologically grounded responses (Bender et al. 2021), does this constitute what MacIntyre would deem *the loss of theological teleology*? [82]

c) Toward an Ethics of Algorithmic Sanctity

Resolving these dilemmas requires:

- *Transparency as Sacramental*: Applying Habermas' (1981/1984) *communicative rationality* to platform governance—making content moderation rules and AI training data subject to interfaith scrutiny [83]
- *Design Theologies*: Following Ihde's (1990) *postphenomenology*, consciously embedding pluralistic theological assumptions into platform architectures

- *Algorithmic Ijtihad*: Developing Islamic jurisprudence-inspired frameworks for auditing AI religious outputs, extending what Floridi (2021) calls *digital ethics* into theological domains

The challenge is neither to reject digital mediation nor accept its hidden theologies uncritically, but to develop what Latour (2004) termed *matters of concern*—recognizing platforms as active participants in the ongoing revelation of the sacred.

3) *Post-Secular Re-enchantment: Digital Technologies and the Return of the Sacred*

Max Weber's thesis of *disenchantment*—the progressive rationalization and demystification of the modern world—faces a profound challenge in the digital age [8], [9]. The emergence of *augmented reality (AR) filters* that overlay sacred imagery on physical spaces, and *parasocial relationships* with digital gurus, suggests not the disappearance of enchantment but its *migration* into technological forms. This phenomenon forces a re-examination of the secular/sacred binary through the lens of digital mediation.

a) *Weber in the Digital Age: Disenchantment or Reconfiguration?*

Weber's *Entzauberung* presumed a linear historical trajectory from magical worldviews to rationalized modernity. Yet contemporary digital culture reveals:

- *Algorithmic Animism*: When TikTok's "halo filter" superimposes divine light on users' selfies, or when AI generates personalized horoscopes, we witness what Latour (1991) called *the return of the repressed*—the re-emergence of enchanted thinking within technical systems [84].
- *Parasocial Sacrality*: The one-sided devotional relationships followers develop with *online preachers* (e.g., #QuranTok celebrities) mirror what Durkheim (1912/1995) identified as *collective effervescence*, yet mediated through platforms designed for *attention extraction* [85], [86].
- *Liturgical Gamification*: Bible apps that award badges for streak prayers enact what Weber himself recognized as the *Protestant ethic's* calculative spirituality—but now hypercharged through *behavioral design* [87].

This suggests not a reversal of disenchantment but what Taylor (2007) terms *a secular age's immanent frames*—where enchantment persists in *detranscendentalized* forms.

b) *AR as Techno-Theophany*

Augmented reality's blending of physical and digital realms creates new possibilities for sacred encounter:

- *Virtual Pilgrimage*: When Catholic AR apps superimpose the *Via Dolorosa* onto local streets, does this constitute *desacralization* [21], [22], [23] (per or a *new spatial ontology* of the holy [88])?
- *Algorithmic Serendipity*: The unexpected appearance of a Quranic verse in one's feed—curated by opaque

recommendation systems—echoes what Otto (1917) described as *mysterium tremendum*, yet filtered through *machine learning's stochastic processes* [81].

These phenomena resist easy categorization as either secular or sacred, instead occupying what may be called *the enchanted valley*—a liminal space where technological and spiritual logics interpenetrate.

c) *Parasocial Gurus and the Crisis of Charisma*

Weber's *charismatic authority* undergoes digital mutation when:

- *Authenticity* is manufactured through *algorithmically optimized self-presentation* [89]
- *Communitas* is replaced by *scalable intimacy*—the illusion of personal connection across millions of followers [89]
- *Grace* becomes contingent on *engagement metrics*, transforming *barakah* into a *quantifiable resource* [1]

This produces what Benjamin (1936) might call *digital aura*—a simulacrum of sacred presence that is endlessly reproducible yet stripped of its *cult value* [80].

d) *Toward a Post-Secular Digital Theology*

The task ahead is to:

- Develop diagnostic tools for distinguishing between commodified enchantment (e.g., monetized AR prayer filters) and genuine techno-spiritual innovation
- Reinterpret Weber's Protestant Ethic for algorithmic culture—asking how predestination manifests in recommendation systems
- Articulate new liturgical frameworks that acknowledge digital mediation not as corruption but as constitutive of contemporary sacred experience.

The sacred, it seems, has not vanished but *transmuted*—its locus shifting from mountaintops and cathedrals to data clouds and augmented realities.

4) *Discussion*

a) *Toward a Techno-Theology: Foundations for the Digital Sacred*

The emergence of *digitally mediated religiosity* necessitates nothing less than a radical reimagining of theological and philosophical frameworks adequate to our technological condition. This is not merely about applying old concepts to new media, but about recognizing that the digital has *transformed the very conditions of possibility* for religious experience. Three foundational pillars emerge as essential for this project.

b) *A New Metaphysics of Presence*

The classical *metaphysics of presence*—derived from *Aristotelian substance theory* and *Cartesian dualism*—proves insufficient for understanding how the sacred manifests in distributed networks. When prayer occurs across *virtual reality, live-streamed rituals, and algorithmically curated scripture*, we require:

- *Relational Ontologies*: Following Whitehead, we must conceive of divine presence not as localized in particular substances (bread, wine, temple stones) but as emergent from patterns of connection within socio-technical assemblages [18], [19], [20].
- *Networked Hierophanies*: Eliade's (1957) concept of sacred manifestations must be expanded to include algorithmic serendipity—those moments when recommendation systems unexpectedly surface spiritually resonant content [81].
- *Digital Incarnation*: The theological implications of AI avatars delivering blessings or chatbots offering pastoral care demand rethinking what embodies the sacred in a post-human context [25], [26], [32].

This new metaphysics must grapple with what Derrida called *différance*—the way meaning (and by extension, the sacred) emerges through networks of referral rather than fixed presence [37].

c) Principles for a Critical Digital Theology

The unchecked integration of algorithms into spiritual practices risks what Ellul termed *la technique's* colonization of all human domains. A robust response requires [56]:

- *Algorithmic Transparency as Theological Imperative*: Following Habermas [1], [83], platforms must disclose how sacred content is ranked and filtered—treating this not as corporate secrecy but as a matter of communal discernment [1].
- *Guardrails Against Spiritual Commodification*: Building on Marx's critique of commodification, we must resist the reduction of prayer to engagement metrics and sacraments to content streams [63], [90].
- *Posthuman Ethics*: Expanding Levinas' *face of the Other* to include algorithmic alterity—asking what ethical obligations emerge when non-human systems participate in sacred acts [91].

This is not about rejecting technology but about developing what Feenberg calls *technical codes* that embed theological values into digital architectures [31].

d) Phenomenology as Methodological Foundation

To study digital religion as *lived experience* rather than degraded imitation requires:

- *Epoché of the Analog*: Suspending the assumption that physical rituals are authentic and digital ones derivative—instead examining each on its own terms [41].
- *Embodiment Beyond Flesh*: Applying Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology to avatar-mediated worship, asking how presence is constituted when the body is both there (in physical space) and not there (in virtual space) simultaneously [15].
- *Micro-Practices Analysis*: Following de Certeau, mapping how users tactically appropriate platforms for unexpected spiritual purposes—like using fitness trackers for prayer counts [11], [92].

5) The Path Forward

This techno-theological project must be:

- *Interdisciplinary*: Bridging computer science, religious studies, and philosophy
- *Prospective*: Not just critiquing current implementations but imagining what digital religion could become
- *Ecumenical*: Learning from diverse traditions' encounters with technological change

The digital sacred is neither pure nor corrupt—it is *unfinished*, awaiting our conscious participation in its shaping.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the emergence of digitally mediated religiosity reveals that the digital condition has fundamentally transformed the ontology, ethics, and lived experience of the sacred, requiring a shift toward a techno-theological framework grounded in relational ontologies, networked hierophanies, and a reimagined concept of digital incarnation. The findings indicate that sacred presence in digital environments is not merely a derivative of analog ritual but emerges through socio-technical networks, algorithmic mediation, and posthuman embodiments, demanding both a new metaphysics of presence and a critical digital theology attentive to algorithmic transparency, resistance to spiritual commodification, and expanded ethical responsibility toward non-human agents. Phenomenologically, digital religion must be studied as an authentic lived experience, where embodiment, presence, and micro-practices are reconfigured rather than diminished. Future research should therefore pursue interdisciplinary collaboration between computer science, religious studies, and philosophy; develop normative frameworks for embedding theological values into digital architectures; empirically investigate user practices across diverse traditions; and critically design alternative platform models that prioritize communal discernment over commodification, ensuring that the digital sacred evolves through intentional, ethically grounded, and ecumenically informed engagement.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Zuboff, "The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power," *J. Infor. Ethics*, vol. 33, no. 1, pp. 84–85, 2024.
- [2] E. Husserl, *Ideas for a pure phenomenology and phenomenological philosophy: First book: General introduction to pure phenomenology*. Hackett Publishing, 2014.
- [3] E. Husserl, "Ideas pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy: third book: phenomenology and the Foundation of the Sciences," *Nijhoff: The Hague*, 1980.
- [4] E. Husserl, *Ideas pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy: First book: General introduction to a pure phenomenology*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [5] M. Heidegger, "The question concerning technology," *Technology and values: Essential readings*, vol. 99, p. 113, 1954.
- [6] M. Heidegger, "Discourse on thinking," 2025.
- [7] M. Heidegger, *Being and time*. SUNY press, 2010.
- [8] B. S. Turner, "Max Weber and the sociology of religion," *Rev. Int. Philos.*, vol. 276, no. 2, pp. 141–150, 2016.
- [9] M. Weber, *The sociology of religion*. Beacon Press, 1993.

- [10] R. Flory, "Digital Creatives and the Rethinking of Religious Authority, by HEIDI A. CAMPBELL," *Sociol. Relig.*, vol. 82, no. 4, pp. 518–522, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1093/socrel/srab037.
- [11] H. Campbell, "Considering the Religious-Social Shaping of Technology," *Gosudarstvo, religiia, tserkov' v Rossii i za rubezhom*, vol. 2, pp. 124–159, 2020.
- [12] H. Campbell, "Religion and the Internet," *The Oxford Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 1–44, 2009, doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199588961.013.0040.
- [13] H. A. Campbell, "Digital Religion as the Networked Spiritual Infrastructure of Our Religious Futures," 2025, pp. 67–80. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-93436-0_5.
- [14] H. A. Campbell, *Digital Creatives and the Rethinking of Religious Authority*. Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge, 2020. | Series: Media, religion and culture: Routledge, 2020. doi: 10.4324/9781003045625.
- [15] M. Merleau-Ponty, D. Landes, T. Carman, and C. Lefort, *Phenomenology of perception*. Routledge, 2013.
- [16] S. T. Aquinas, *The summa theologica: Complete edition*. Catholic Way Publishing, 2014.
- [17] M. Arnd-Caddigan, "Sherry Turkle: Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other," *Clin. Soc. Work J.*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 247–248, Jun. 2015, doi: 10.1007/s10615-014-0511-4.
- [18] B. Latour, *We have never been modern*. Harvard university press, 2012.
- [19] B. Latour, "Why Critique Run Out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern," *Philosophical Literary Journal Logos*, vol. 33, no. 5, pp. 29–61, 2023, doi: 10.17323/0869-5377-2023-5-29-61.
- [20] B. Latour, "Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern," *Crit. Inq.*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 225–248, 2004.
- [21] M. Eliade, *The Sacred and The Profane*. New York: Brace & World, 1959.
- [22] M. Eliade, *The sacred and the profane: The nature of religion*, vol. 81. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1959.
- [23] M. Eliade and J. M. Kitagawa, *The History of Religions, Essays in Methodology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- [24] E. Husserl, *The phenomenology of internal time-consciousness*. Indiana University Press, 2019.
- [25] N. K. Hayles, "How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics," *Public Understanding of Science*, vol. 9, no. 4, p. 704, Oct. 2000, doi: 10.1088/0963-6625/9/4/704.
- [26] N. Katherine. Hayles, *Unthought: The Power of the Cognitive Nonconscious*. University of Chicago Press, 2020.
- [27] R. Otto and J. W. HARVEY, *The Idea of the Holy... Translated by John W. Harvey... Fourth Impression, Revised with Additions*. Oxford University Press, 1926.
- [28] H. L. Dreyfus, *On the internet*. Routledge, 2008.
- [29] A. Borgmann, *Technology and the character of contemporary life: A philosophical inquiry*. University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- [30] C. Taylor, *A secular age*. Harvard university press, 2007.
- [31] A. Feenberg, *Questioning technology*. routledge, 2012.
- [32] P. Haynes, "How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature and Informatics by N. Katherine Hayles," *Body Soc.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 105–108, Dec. 2001, doi: 10.1177/1357034X01007004009.
- [33] V. Flusser, *Towards a philosophy of photography*. Reaktion Books, 2013.
- [34] P. Lévy, "Collective Intelligence, A Civilisation: Towards a Method of Positive Interpretation," *Int. J. Polit. Cult. Soc.*, vol. 18, no. 3–4, pp. 189–198, Dec. 2006, doi: 10.1007/s10767-006-9003-z.
- [35] G. Simondon, "On the mode of existence of technical objects," *Deleuze Studies*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 407–424, 2011.
- [36] J. Z. Smith, "To take place," in *Ritual and Religious Belief*, Routledge, 2017, pp. 26–50.
- [37] J. Derrida, *Of grammatology*. Jhu Press, 2016.
- [38] A. N. Whitehead, *Process and reality*. Simon and Schuster, 2010.
- [39] Al-Ghazali, *Ihya Ulumu al-Din*. Baerut: Dar al-Misri, 1977.
- [40] A.-H. Al Ghazali, *Al-Ghazali's Adapted Summary of Ihya Ulum al-Din: The Forty Principles of the Religion*. Turath Publishing, 2016.
- [41] D. Ihde, *Technology and the lifeworld: From garden to earth*, no. 560. Indiana University Press, 1990.
- [42] D. Chidester, "Haptics of the heart: The sense of touch in American religion and culture," *Cult. Relig.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 61–84, May 2000, doi: 10.1080/01438300008567140.
- [43] R. M. Geraci, *Virtually sacred: Myth and meaning in world of warcraft and second life*. OUP Us, 2014.
- [44] H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and method*. A&C Black, 2013.
- [45] F. Schleiermacher, *Schleiermacher: hermeneutics and criticism: and other writings*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [46] N. Bostrom and E. Yudkowsky, "The ethics of artificial intelligence," in *Artificial intelligence safety and security*, Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2018, pp. 57–69.
- [47] E. Elmahjub, "Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Islamic Ethics: Towards Pluralist Ethical Benchmarking for AI," *Philos. Technol.*, vol. 36, no. 4, p. 73, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s13347-023-00668-x.
- [48] P. Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics and the human sciences: Essays on language, action and interpretation*. Cambridge university press, 1981.
- [49] B. Stiegler, *The neganthropocene*. Open Humanities Press, 2018.
- [50] J. Baudrillard, "Simulacra and simulations (1981)," in *Crime and Media*, Routledge, 2019, pp. 69–85.
- [51] J. Baudrillard, *Simulacra and simulation*. University of Michigan press, 1994.
- [52] J. Baudrillard, "Simulacra and simulations," in *The new social theory reader*, Routledge, 2020, pp. 230–234.
- [53] M. Fishbane, *The garments of Torah: Essays in biblical hermeneutics*. Indiana University Press, 1992.
- [54] S. U. Noble, "Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism," in *Algorithms of oppression*, New York university press, 2018.
- [55] A. R. Galloway, *The interface effect*. Polity, 2012.
- [56] J. Ellul, *The technological society*. Vintage, 2021.
- [57] C. Novelli, F. Casolari, P. Hacker, G. Spedicato, and L. Floridi, "Generative AI in EU law: Liability, privacy, intellectual property, and cybersecurity," *Computer Law & Security Review*, vol. 55, p. 106066, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.clsr.2024.106066.
- [58] T. W. Adorno, "The culture industry reconsidered," in *Critical theory and society*, Routledge, 2020, pp. 128–135.
- [59] T. W. Adorno and A. G. Rabinbach, "Culture industry reconsidered," *New German Critique*, no. 6, pp. 12–19, 1975, doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/487650.
- [60] T. Gillespie, *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press, 2018.
- [61] L. Manovich, *Cultural analytics*. Mit Press, 2020.
- [62] B.-C. Han, *The burnout society*. Stanford University Press, 2015.
- [63] K. Marx, *Capital: Critique of political economy, volume 1*. Princeton University Press, 2024.
- [64] M. Foucault, "Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison (an excerpt)," in *Coronavirus, Psychoanalysis, and Philosophy: Conversations on Pandemics, Politics and Society*, 2021, pp. 23–26. doi: 10.4324/9781003150497-3.
- [65] M. Foucault, "Discipline and punish," in *Social theory re-wired*, Routledge, 2023, pp. 291–299.
- [66] D. W. Tarbet, M. Foucault, and A. Sheridan, "Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison," *Eighteenth. Century. Stud.*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 509, 1978, doi: 10.2307/2737970.
- [67] H. K. Bhabha, *The location of culture*. routledge, 2012.
- [68] M. Airoidi, "Machine habitus: Toward a sociology of algorithms," 2021.
- [69] James. Williams, *Stand out of our light: freedom and resistance in the attention economy*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- [70] J. Cheney-Lippold, *We Are Data*. New York University Press, 2020. doi: 10.18574/nyu/9781479888702.001.0001.
- [71] P. T. De Chardin, "The phenomenon of man," *New York*, p. 302, 1959.
- [72] P. Lévy, P. Aronoff, and H. Scott, "The creative conversation of collective intelligence," in *The participatory cultures handbook*, Routledge, 2012, pp. 99–108.
- [73] N. Postman, *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology*. Vintage, 2011.

- [74] N. Postman, "Technopoly: the surrender of culture to technology//Review," *Alternatives Journal*, vol. 20, no. 3, p. 40, 1994.
- [75] H. Marcuse, "One-dimensional man," *Persona & Derecho*, vol. 3, p. 690, 1976.
- [76] H. Marcuse, "One-dimensional man," in *Ideals and Ideologies*, Routledge, 2024, pp. 319–326.
- [77] S. Kierkegaard and W. Lowrie, *The sickness unto death*. Princeton University Press Princeton, NJ, 1848.
- [78] P. Tillich, *Systematic Theology: Life and the Spirit History and the Kingdom of God*. University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- [79] P. Tillich and J. H. Hick, "Systematic Theology," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 286–297, Sep. 1959, doi: 10.1017/S003693060005287X.
- [80] W. Benjamin, "The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction," in *A museum studies approach to heritage*, Routledge, 2018, pp. 226–243.
- [81] E. M. Bender, T. Gebru, A. McMillan-Major, and S. Shmitchell, "On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots," in *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, New York, NY, USA: ACM, Mar. 2021, pp. 610–623. doi: 10.1145/3442188.3445922.
- [82] A. MacIntyre, *After virtue*. A&C Black, 2013.
- [83] J. Habermas, *The theory of communicative action: Volume 1: Reason and the rationalization of society*, vol. 1. Beacon press, 1985.
- [84] A. Possamai, *Religion and popular culture: A hyper-real testament*, no. 7. Peter Lang, 2005.
- [85] D. Horton and R. Richard Wohl, "Mass Communication and Para-Social Interaction," *Psychiatry*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 215–229, Aug. 1956, doi: 10.1080/00332747.1956.11023049.
- [86] E. Durkheim, "The elementary forms of religious life," in *Social theory re-wired*, Routledge, 2016, pp. 52–67.
- [87] N. D. Schüll, *Addiction by Design*. Princeton University Press, 2025. doi: 10.1515/9780691278278.
- [88] N. Verhoeff, *Mobile screens: The visual regime of navigation*. Amsterdam University Press, 2012.
- [89] A. E. Marwick, *Status update: Celebrity, publicity, and branding in the social media age*. Yale University Press, 2013.
- [90] J. Dean, "Communicative Capitalism: Circulation and the Foreclosure of Politics," *Cultural Politics*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 51–74, Mar. 2005, doi: 10.2752/174321905778054845.
- [91] E. Levinas, *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority*, vol. 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 1979.
- [92] M. de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press, 2011. Accessed: Mar. 01, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://philpapers.org/rec/DECTPO-26>