

Manunggaling Kawula Lan Mayantara

Some Thoughts on Digital Theology

(draft 1.0, do not quote; the idea is still evolving and requires substantial working out and structuring)

Leonard Chrysostomos Epafra
Universitas Gadjah Mada Graduate School | Indonesian Consortium for Religious
Studies (ICRS)
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
leonard.e@ugm.ac.id

Abstract

The oft-quoted "men behind the gun" emphasizes the autonomy and independence of human agency from human-fashioned instruments. The alienation of the instrument from "authentic" humanity might have come from the fifth century BCE when the Greek philosophers separated *logos* (discourse) and *tekhne* (instrument) in human affairs. *Logos* is considered closer to humanity, while *tekhne* derives or, at most, an effect of human activities. Such thought might be at stake in the growing digitalization of human lives and the ever-ubiquitous presence of artificial intelligence. It is the context that envelops the presence of the church in such a digital society.

I argue the importance of considering *logos* and *tekhne* in a continuum to develop networked, non-linear construction of theology. I borrow the term from the Javanese mystical tradition to problematize the link between *logos* and *tekhne* to base our discussion on constructing digital theology. *Manunggaling kawula lan gusti* (lit., the union between the creature and the creator), the Javanese version of *unio mystica*, is a model of spiritual interaction and human aspiration to be included in the divine realm. *Manunggaling kawula lan mayantara*, lit., the union between humanity and the internet, is a catchword for understanding the immersive power of digital technology in human lives. It appeals to a more critical construction of digital theology, such as *e-cclesiology*, the digital ecclesiology, through which the meaning of *ecclesia* and its embracing of digital technology in the ministry should be critically addressed.

Keywords: digital theology, immersive technology, e-cclesiology, digital ecclesiology

“Thou shalt not make a machine in the likeness of a human mind” - Orange Catholic Bible.

Since the fifth century BC in Ancient Greece, philosophers have distinguished *logos*, the reason from *mythos*, the narratives, particularly the narratives of the gods. *Mythos* explained the movements of the universe through the personalization of these forces, naming them “gods and goddesses.” Ancient gods like Uranos explained the sky, Gaia, the manifestation of the earth, their children Kronos representing time, and the Olympian gods as new powers controlling thunder (Zeus), the ocean (Poseidon), warfare (Ares), beauty (Aphrodite), and others. The mouths of genius poets such as Hesiod and Homer narrated these gods.

The presence of Socrates and his students, including Plato and Aristotle, changed the paradigm of *mythos*, which viewed the universe intimately and personally, into an impersonal view measured by reason, the *logos*. *Logos* became a supra-historical power that pursued the fulfillment of human autonomy through scrutinizing the universe.

However, what occurred was not only a separation of *logos* and *mythos* but also *logos* and *tekhnē*. *Tekhnē* was associated with skill and considered lower in quality than *logos*. In the times of Hesiod and Homer, *logos* and *tekhnē* were intertwined, so there was a god of craftsmen, Hephaestus. For people of that time, knowledge was practical, and practices strengthened knowledge. That was before the time of Socrates.

According to the French philosopher Bernard Stiegler, due to the separation between *logos* and *tekhnē*, technology, as a manifestation of *tekhnē*, became alienated in the process of self-formation (2010, pp. 136–137, 2015, pp. 26–31). *Tekhnē* was sidelined from human autonomy. Conversely, for him, *tekhnē* is not outside humanity but a part of the formation of human selves. Yet, concurrently, *tekhnē* in the form of technology that has grown incredibly fast is also *pharmakon*, both a remedy and a poison. Technology advances humanity but also destroys it. Thus, Plato (through the mouth of Socrates) considered the technology of writing as deadly to human memory. Also, Stiegler's harsh critique of contemporary human technology, especially media through capitalism, kills the community's capacity to become mature and adult by replacing social and relational functions.

The attitude of alienating technology, the manifestation of *tekhnē*, especially digital technology, directly or indirectly, is also adopted by theologians, philosophers, and those who view technology as dangerous to humanity. It is often heard and read the expression to keep a distance from digital technology if one wishes to preserve the dignity of humanity. In the Indonesian context, the work of F. Budi Hardiman (2021) can be described as a satire about the power of technology to subdue humanity. The main challenge of this view is anthropocentric, still placing humans as the center of the universe, also the universe of technology. Its construction is predominantly Cartesian,

creating an epistemological and even ontological distance between *logos* and the world or idealizing human relations "face to face."

In Stiegler's observations, it is true that technology, whatever it is, is *pharmakon*. It brings both good and triggers evil, and vice versa, but from this line of thinking, the remedy for evil supposedly lies within the technology framework. The challenge became even greater at the beginning of digital technology development, where humans surrendered information to be processed by it. Now, humans have even surrendered their reason and their intelligence to artificial intelligence (AI). However, it is crucial to consider that technology is also a part of humanity. It is equal to *logos* and spirituality.

The rapid advancement of digital technology, particularly in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, has sparked widespread debate about its impact on human relationships. Some fear a technological singularity, where AI surpasses human capabilities, echoing anxieties about humanity's diminishing role in a technologically dominated world. This is no different from the divine's anxiety when God found the first humans ate the fruit of knowledge of good and evil, and they have "become like one of us, knowing good and evil" (Genesis 3:22, NRSV).

Skepticism and criticism abound regarding digital technology's influence on interpersonal connections, especially concerning the rise of social media (Web 2.0). Critics lament the perceived loss of authentic human connection due to our increasing reliance on technological devices. Sherry Turkle's observation that we desperately seek companionship from inanimate objects encapsulates this concern (2015, cf. 2011). Others critique the structural impact of technology, highlighting the manipulative algorithms that shape our choices and preferences, as depicted in the film *The Social Dilemma* (2020). These narratives often portray a single, deterministic outcome: technology's inevitable victory over humanity.

Hence, we need to move beyond both the enthusiasm and euphoria surrounding digital technology and the skepticism towards it. More precisely, the insights offered here transcend the prevailing vision of singularity in discussions about technology in the wake of AI popularity.

The vision of singularity borrows from the discourse on AI. In AI, singularity is the projection that AI will surpass human intelligence at some point in the future. Becoming more intelligent implies that a new form of intelligence will supersede humanity (Boden, 2018). This vision evokes a sense of both hope and anxiety. Hope for a better future free from human limitations and anxiety about the potential loss of human control and even the extinction of humankind.

This vision, however, tends to be overly simplistic and deterministic. It assumes a linear trajectory of technological development, culminating in an inevitable point of singularity. It overlooks the complexities and contingencies of technological evolution,

the intricate interplay of human and non-human actors, and the ethical dimensions that shape the future of technology.

With the rise of LLM-based (large language model) AI such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot, and others, we testify to the emergence of new forms of subjectivity and agency in the digital realm, not as a threat to human existence but as an opportunity for rethinking human-non-human relations. Since ancient Greece, thinkers and practitioners, from Thales to Spinoza and Whitehead, have grappled with the discourse of panpsychism. This discourse explores the presence of interiority and soul within non-human objects (Edwards, 2005, p. VII: 82-83; Roelofs, 2019, p. 163). There is a belief that humans are organically connected to a broader consciousness beyond themselves. Figuratively, even the Psalmist, for example, in Psalm 19, has sung of the capacity of non-human elements to "... declare the glory of God."

Panpsychism also suggests that human consciousness is a composite, a fusion of various subjectivities constructed through our interactions with the environment. Zoom platform, for instance, indirectly conditions overlapping relationships and, consequently, a diffused mode of consciousness, such as when conducting a meeting concurrently with other meetings. This also explains the frequent complaint that humans often project their feelings and thoughts onto external objects as objects of attachment. The phenomenon of spirit dolls is merely the latest phase of this tendency. In the digital world, this phenomenon is called the ELIZA effect, which ascribes human-like behavior to computers (Turtle, 2005, p. 287).

In his technology exploration, Colin Koopman observes the emergence of a new subjectivity that he terms the "informational person." Drawing on the ideas of Foucault, Latour, Harcourt, and others, he concludes that digital data is not inanimate but rather "active participants in the process of our self-formation ... even this 'informational person' is our true self" (Koopman, 2019, pp. vii, 170).

Thus, in this non-anthropocentric reality, humans are positioned "merely" as one subject or actor within a vast network of human and non-human subjects. Following Bruno Latour's suggestion, social meaning is no longer confined to human relations but becomes an associative assemblage of subjects, which he calls *actants* (Latour, 2005). The ongoing process of association and re-association through networks is more decisive in shaping social character than the "static" assumptions of social status embedded in the discourse of communalism, community, *gemeinschaft*, *gesellschaft*, and so forth. In the terminology of Indonesian Gen Z, the fluid and unstable "circle" is more realistic than the "community."

This presents an ethical challenge, particularly when engaging in dialogue with Martin Buber. In the tension of the I-Thou relationship, as a symmetrical dialogue between humans and between humans and God, Buber sees this situation as being in opposition to and challenged by the I-It relationship. The relationship between humans

and objects often hinders relationships with others, objectifying and reducing the Other to an It. Even the ultimate It is oneself, and instead of creating dialogue, the I-It relationship is a monologue, a form of narcissism for oneself and a toxic relationship for others (Buber, 1937).

This also implies that the material It outside the human self cannot be equivalent to the Thou. Shouldn't the relationship between humans and technological mediators be strictly limited to an I-It relationship? However sophisticated a gadget, Zoom, and other communication services, accordingly, they cannot be a dialogue partner. Technological mediators cannot create concrete and authentic encounters. It is merely an intermediary that facilitates dialogue between humans. Buber implores us all to spend more time building I-Thou relationships and as little time as possible on I-It relationships (Seeskin, 2001, p. 195). This plea continues to haunt us, mainly when discussing the relationship between humans and technology and between humans and AI (Epafras, 2023a, pp. 283–284). In the Indonesian context, this is even more of an issue when the digital divide is a persistent challenge, and AI could marginalize further the marginal social groups such as the indigenous religious community and other minority groups (Epafras, 2022).

The powerful metaphor of these positions is the idealization of human interaction through "face-to-face" engagement. Zoom interaction may problematize this metaphor (Epafras, 2023a). Zoom and other video call technology have raised complex questions about online behavior and the nature of virtual presence. The expectation to "show one's face" reflects a prevailing belief that visual presence signifies respect and authenticity. The adage "No pic = HOAX" among Indonesian netizens underscores the cultural emphasis on visual confirmation of identity. This emphasis is further amplified by the participatory panopticon and livestreaming culture of social media, where individuals constantly perform their lives for a digital audience (Cascio, 2005; Marwick, 2013).

The Hebrew word *panim* ("face") carries rich symbolic meaning in the Old Testament, representing identity, relationships, encounters, attention, and care (Wolff, 1973, p. 74; Gravett, Bohmbach, Greifenhagen, & Polaski, 2008, p. 174). The plural form suggests the multifaceted nature of the human face and the potential for deep understanding. Biblical accounts of face-to-face (*panim el panim*) encounters with God highlight the intimacy and significance of such interactions. The priestly blessing in Numbers 6:24-26, often used in Protestant church services, links God's face with peace and well-being (*shalom*). Conversely, God "turning His face away" represents the ultimate calamity.

While face-to-face encounters are symbolically important, other forms of communication, such as voice, also signify presence and connection (e.g., Deuteronomy 4:12; Exodus 33:18-23). However, the importance of face, appearance, gaze, and voice in human relationships, and even our relationship with the divine, remains undeniable. Yet, the reality is more complex.

Faces and appearances are never neutral or transparent (Miller & Sinanan, 2014). They are subject to interpretation and influenced by ideology, culture, power relations, and social constructs. Postcolonial discourse highlights the "gaze" of the colonizer upon the colonized, where faces are ranked according to perceived truth and humanity (cf. Said, 2003; Fanon, 2021). Freud recognized the "face" as a mask, a persona concealing the complex layers of the psyche. Even Descartes questioned the reliability of visual perception, suggesting that true knowledge might be found through a neutral observer rather than through sight. The pandemic has further complicated matters, with masks and social distancing becoming essential aspects of social interaction. *Noli me tangere* ("Do not touch me"), Jesus's words to Mary Magdalene after his resurrection, takes on new meaning in this context (Žižek, 2020). Social bonds are no longer defined solely by line-of-sight but are transcended into social solidarity, mediated by both direct and technological means.

The "face" in the context of Zoom is also not innocent. The self-reflected in the Zoom window, reduced to an "account," creates a strange duality. We become performative, consciously adjusting our appearance and demeanor to present a particular, often idealized, version of ourselves. This performativity highlights the mediated nature of online interaction, where technology constantly shapes our presentation of self. The "corporate" feel of Zoom, with its protocols, waiting rooms, breakout rooms, and other features, further contributes to this sense of mediated experience. The consequences, such as Zoom fatigue, are already apparent (Epafras, 2023a, p. 291).

To a point, Levinas helped us escape this "technological singularity" (Epafras, 2023a, pp. 294–297). Levinas explored the "desire for the invisible" (Levinas, 1979, pp. 33–35). He asserts that "the invisible, the non-appearing does not mean unrelated; it is only that the relation is not immediately given...." (Levinas, 1979, p. 34). In this scheme, we can insert "technology" as part of the total whole of communication, not only among humans but also among human-non-human relationships. Currently, some technology might not be a conversational partner like a human because its relationship is not transparent and organic. Yet, ChatGPT and others are actant that animates and drives relationships between humans and others. It is not only face-to-face but might include interface-based relationships that cannot ignore the presence of subjectivity and agency in digital technology products.

E-cclesiology, an *electronic ecclesiology*, a complex discourse of the church embracing and engaging with digital technology, might offer a realization of the incarnational and intercaranational presence of the word in this technological world. It bridges the dualistic path criticized by Stiegler above. Even cautiously claimed that this dichotomy is fluid and returned to the pre-Socratic era, when *mythos* and *logos* were encountered once again through listening, attending, connecting, and engaging

(abbreviated LACE). That is when digital technology mobilizes LACE to build the spirituality of the digital church.

However, the challenge itself is manifold, not only in the manifestation of the technology but also in cross-generational issues, as the primary users of this technology are inevitably mostly the younger generation. Another challenge is the research of digital culture, whose social practices influence the development of ecclesiology and the mode of church-affiliation.

In a far more immersive, profound, and interconnected stage, we currently reside in a world where embodiment and disembodiment move in synchronous oscillation. Serres and Sauer say virtuality is "an aggregate and vector of imagination, memory, knowledge, and religious experience." This condition is most dramatic in the metaverse, online games of the massively multiplayer online (MMO) genre, Pokémon Go, and augmented reality educational services like the Muslim Children's Encyclopedia.

Digital technology also radicalizes mediation within human culture. Culture, including the process of theologizing, is always in a state of mediation, a "material framework of social practices that evoke and yet conceal meaning" (Epafras, 2023b, p. 206). This means that any meaning in culture can only arise through mediation. Many mediators are required to create meaning. Jesus Christ, whom Christians believe is the mediator of God's presence her-/himself.

However, in the era of second modernization or postmodernity, mediation is sharpened through the condition of mediatization, which is the meaning born from the mediation process reaching the point of taking over traditional social functions. This process is inseparable from the forces of capital and capitalism that facilitate the growth of technology as a lubricant of mediatization. In the religious context, this condition of mediatization occurs with the scattering of "locations of production and reproduction of religious meaning" (Epafras, 2023b, p. 206). Simply put, people no longer refer only to the priest's authority in their church but also through social media related to *Pastorgram* on Instagram or YouTube. Religious messages are also spread and disseminated by content creators and influencers, buzzers who have not studied theology but have many more followers than traditional religious figures. This mediatization modifies ecclesiological images, such as the meaning of the sacramental body, that must be analog but also be ready with a virtual or digital body or a body mediated by digital technology.

The condition of the widespread cultural meaning, even religious authority, does not mean the absence of authority, but people refer to different and tiered authorities. Not merely *hierarchical*, vertical with a command line from top to bottom, but also *heterarchical*, with flexibility in referencing various other authorities. As a young research participant stated, "In the morning, I worship at my church, in the afternoon at JPCC online." She came from mainline "ecumenical" church membership, while JPCC (Jakarta Praise Community Church) an independent and charismatic leaning church. Yes, indeed,

this phenomenon is strong among young people. E-cclesiology projects an egalitarian and participatory condition of its church members.

Mediatization accelerates the abundance of information, the communicative abundance that confines us. In such a context, the culture of communication changes and shifts. Interhuman relations and human relations with the biotic and abiotic world also change. Recalling Latour above, he criticized the social meanings traditionally understood as manifestations of interhuman relations. For him, the social world also includes the biotic and abiotic worlds. In such social relations, every agency and actant can initiate action. This means digital technology manifestations such as gadgets, LCD projectors, Play Store and App Store applications, and ChatGPT are part of the social world embracing church ministry.

However, everything begins with micro-relations between humans and actants in this social world. In Latour's construction (and his colleagues in Actor-Network Theory, ANT), we trace and explore relationships to understand a type of social and socialization. This presents both a challenge and an opportunity for the construction of e-ecclesiology. If ecclesiology cannot realize LACE, then ChatGPT or similar services, as indicated by its name chat, "chatting," will replace conventional communication between congregations. ChatGPT 4o (omni) has already achieved what was once imagined by the film "*her*" (2013), where the chat partner of a lonely man is his voice assistant. Or does e-cclesiology provide space to embrace ChatGPT as an actant and active agency in building the digital church? Maybe it's still too wild to think, when *sapiens* must compete with *sentience*, the generative AI can think like humans. Even time and temporality are not just folded but also run non-linearly. We can bring Jesus of Nazareth, a figure from two thousand years ago, to the present. In contrast, conventional ecclesiology is linear and solidifies time as an eschatological model.

In this mode of thinking, primarily through tracing, I encourage the construction of theology based on empirical observation and research. Through this tracing process, we recognize the formation of the world and social imagination, and finally, ecclesiology as a manifestation of the dynamic collective faith experience.

In various writings, I claim the formation of identity and belonging of its adherents in a digital context is associative and rhizomatic. Tracing helps detect how agencies associate, disassociate, and reassociate, connecting to something, disconnecting from something, and reconnecting with something. Among these three processes, there is continuous negotiation at the frontier. For example, the manifestation of church music and songs among the Indonesian youth who might be "bored" (disassociate) with traditional songs considered so yesterday prefer worship songs from Hillsong that they watch on YouTube. But they could return (reassociate) with symphony music repackaged by the Trust Orchestra. Or even all these genres are present together in one person, multiple belongings, because of the rhizomatic condition born from endless encounters

at the frontier. In the language of Deleuze and Guattari (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987), the growth of this identity is a *disconnected becoming*. This identity is born not in a one-way and hierarchical process but rhizomatically that continuously processes at the frontier.

Such a construction underscores the immersive condition of digital experience, as in the explanation of virtuality above. Its influence is even stronger because this technology positions itself on access, efficiency, and maximum performance display logic (Nunes, 2012, p. 163). "Access" emphasizes the presence of the subject in the digital network. "Exist" because of access. "Efficiency" shifts discourse to information so that, in the context of folded time, it is not possible for people to engage in lengthy discourse, which must be condensed into brief information. This opens up space for intense communication but, on the downside, opens up space for hoax activism, producing, spreading, and consuming hoaxes, as well as digital bullying (cyberbullying). Maximum performance spells charm in appearance and looks that are optimal and attractive (Epafras, 2023b, pp. 207–208).

The development of ecclesiology should not let itself be subjugated to these logics but constantly criticizes and opens alternative pathways. According to Zizioulas, ecclesiology moves towards an eschatological moment; in Jesus Christ, there is the future of the created world (2011, p. 18). Therefore, we can embrace the digital dimension of humanity as a form of eschatological vision. Although I argue that church ecclesiology cannot be too sophisticated in adopting technology, the church cannot be *so tomorrow* because it must embrace the various temporalities experienced by its members. There is folded and hurried time for some of its members and patient time for others. The church is always in a condition for *tomorrow*, heading towards tomorrow because its leading pace is *koinonia*, fellowship with all members of the body of Christ towards eschaton. Citing an African proverb, "If you want to go fast, go alone; if you want to go far, go together."

We are anxious whether generative AI like ChatGPT, especially its latest version ChatGPT 4o (Omni), which is becoming more "human," will be part of our e-cclesiology. The novel by Kazuo Ishiguro, a Nobel laureate in literature from the United Kingdom, titled *Klara and the Sun* (2021), may help us think about the possibility of AI, the robotic AI, becoming part of ecclesiology. The novel tells the story of an artificial friend named Klara whose logic, awareness, and feelings grow due to interactions with the humans she accompanies. Are we ready for AF, generative AI, and sentient to become 'fellow' for us, even to be loved?

With the development of AI, especially machine learning and natural language processing (NLP), e-cclesiology has ample room to explore possibilities. Collective intelligence in the form of big data will force e-cclesiology also to wrestle with the meaning of the body of Christ. A dream once put forward by Teilhard de Chardin and Vladimir Vernadsky on Noosphere, a platform connecting the collective consciousness of humanity and the nature. If it is challenging for churches to realize this, hopefully,

collective intelligence driven by AI and big data will open paths for church denominations to collaborate humbly. Hopefully, in the Indonesian context, what is visible is that digital technology emphasizes competition between churches and denominations and increasingly emphasizes caste and digital gaps (digital divide).

The construction of ecclesiology requires understanding new techniques and a new psychological attitude. Suppose the above conditions have permeated our digitally mediated social interactions. In that case, they form a new technique and new psychological condition that I call, in Javanese, *manunggaling kawula lan mayantara*. A citation from the expression of Javanese mysticism is *manunggaling kawula lan gusti*, which is the ultimate goal of a spiritual journey towards unity of mind, feeling, and action within a divine framework. An *unio mystica*. Which, of course, can be connected, tweaked with the mystical depiction of ecclesiology, the unity of the congregation, and Christ. The immersive and digital virtuality experience leads to *manunggaling kawula lan mayantara*, the deepening of humanity's union with technology. This can be debated and must be debated.

But hopefully, this signals the building of a new e-cclesiology that is more relevant. Technology zealously pursues order, "*cosmos*" for itself, but is greatly tempted to produce *chaos* for others. It is imperative to build a digital theology that embraces *chaosmos* (a term coined by Irish novelist James Joyce). E-cclesiology transcends death through an ordered world and *cosmos* and continues to respond and provide space for various participations, aspirations, and dynamics of the congregation that might be considered "disorderly" and "dissidents." Digital technology has become a core force in criticizing injustice and initiatives to realize shalom for this world. Because the image of *ekklesia*, as the root of ecclesiology in itself, is participatory, even in its original scheme in the *polis*, the ancient Greek city-state of the time of Solon (5th or 6th century BCE, Before the Common Era) was participatory for adult male citizens in resolving common problems. This is the tension of *chaosmos* that must be lived through e-cclesiology.

In the Bible, of course, various technologies are implied, such as the technology of building cities and the Tower of Babel, the technology of making the ark by Noah, the construction of the Temple, Apostle Paul using the technology of pen and paper to write letters, which implies the existence of communication and transportation technologies, including Jesus who was the son of a *tektōn*, often translated as a carpenter, although more accurately "craftsman," including wood and stonework. The term architecture originates from this word, *arkhitēktōn*, which means boss of the craftsmen. Jesus was an active user of technology! Even spirituality is built through technology, and we are *tektōns* over spirituality, "Everyone then who hears these words of mine and acts on them will be like a wise man who built his house on rock" (Matthew 7:24, NRSV).

When humans failed to fulfill their mandate not to eat the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil in the Garden of Eden, it is said, "And the LORD God made garments of

skins for the man and for his wife, and clothed them." (Genesis 3:21, NRSV). This verse could lay the foundation for the relationship between spirituality and technology. Leather garments are a cultural and technological product created by humans to face the forces of nature. Providing warmth as well as protection from powers outside of themselves. Garments also refer to identity and dignity. The Hebrew word used in the above verse is *ketonet*, which refers to Joseph's outfit with the "lovely robe" (Genesis 37:3, Indonesian Bible Latest Translation). God restored the shattered dignity of humans by providing the garment and taking the initiative to wear it on them. God offers technology and wears it to restore human dignity. There is a similarity in the motif of this story with the Greek story of the god Prometheus, who bestowed fire on humans. Hence, the story of Genesis implies that the source of technological initiative comes from God.

Bibliography

- Boden, M. A. (2018). *Artificial intelligence: A very short introduction* (EPub). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buber, M. (1937). *I and Thou* (R. G. Smith, Trans.). Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Cascio, J. (2005, May 4). The Rise of the Participatory Panopticon. *The World Changing*.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, P.-F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Edwards, P. (2005). Panpsychism. In D. M. Borchert (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Second Edition: Vol. VII* (pp. 82–94). Detroit, etc.: Macmillan Reference USA.
- Epafra, L. C. (2022). Toward Indonesia 4.0: Envisaging a Virtual Stewardship Machine for the Marginal Religious Communities. In E. Green, D. Singh, & R. Chia (Eds.), *AI Ethics and Higher Education: Good Practice and Guidance for Educators, Learners, and Institutions* (pp. 259–270). Geneva: Globethics.net. Retrieved from <https://bit.ly/3hS1LOk>
- Epafra, L. C. (2023a). Covid19 Ergo Zoom: Menatap “Wajah” Apofatik dalam Interaksi Zoom. In M. Domingus (Ed.), *Bisa Dengar Suara Saya? Ragam Perspektif Teologi Publik atas*

- Perubahan dalam Gereja, Sekolah Kristen, dan Masyarakat Indonesia* (pp. 277–303).
Lawang: LPPM STT Aletheia Press.
- Epafra, L. C. (2023b). Jalan Ninja Ketujuh: Memahami Agama Digital di Ruang Hibrida. In F. Husein & M. I. Ahnaf (Eds.), *Studi Antaragama: Metode dan Praktik* (pp. 198–228). Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press. Retrieved from <https://s.id/1TuyN>
- Fanon, F. (2021). *Black skin, white masks*. Penguin Books.
- Gravett, S. L., Bohmbach, K. G., Greifenhagen, F. V., & Polaski, D. C. (2008). *An introduction to the Hebrew Bible: A thematic approach*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Hardiman, F. B. (2021). *Aku Klik maka Aku Ada: Manusia dalam Revolusi Digital*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Ishiguro, K. (2021). *Klara and the Sun*. Toronto: Knopf Canada.
- Koopman, C. (2019). *How we became our data: A genealogy of the informational person*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1979). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Marwick, A. E. (2013). *Status update: Celebrity, publicity, and branding in the social media age* (Amazon Kindle). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Miller, D., & Sinanan, J. (2014). *Webcam* (Amazon Kindle). Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.
- Nunes, M. (2012). Abusing the Media Viral Validity in a Republic of Spam. In T. Gournelos & D. J. Gunkel (Eds.), *Transgression 2.0: Media, culture, and the politics of a digital age* (Amazon Kindle, pp. 154–168). New York, NY: Continuum.

- Roelofs, L. (2019). *Combining minds: How to think about composite subjectivity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Said, E. W. (2003). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- Seeskin, K. (2001). *Autonomy in Jewish philosophy*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stiegler, B. (2010). *Taking care of youth and the generations*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford Univ. Press.
- Stiegler, B. (2015). *The symbolic misery: The katastrophē of the sensible*. Cambridge etc.: Polity Press.
- Turkle, S. (2005). *The second self: Computers and the human spirit*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. New York: Basic Books.
- Turkle, S. (2015). *Reclaiming conversation: The power of talk in a digital age*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Wolff, H. W. (1973). *Anthropology of the Old Testament* (M. Kohl, Trans.). Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Žižek, S. (2020). *Pandemic! COVID-19 shakes the world*. Cambridge and New York: Polity Press.
- Retrieved from <https://rbdigital.rbdigital.com>
- Zizioulas, J. D. (2011). *The Eucharistic communion and the world* (L. B. Tallon, Ed.). London: T & T Clark.