

Reading Psalm 115: 4-8 In Relation To Artificial Intelligence in Yoruba-African Context

Peter Olanrewaju Awojobi¹ | Nathaniel TeminiJesu Okunade²

¹Department of Religions Kwara State University, Malete, Kwara State, Nigeria

²Department of Religions Kwara State University, Malete, Nigeria

Received 15-01-2025

Revised 16-01-2025

Accepted 21-02-2025

Published 23-02-2025



Copyright: ©2025 The Authors. Published by Publisher. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Abstract:

This study examined Psalms 115:4-8 in relation to artificial intelligence (AI), in Yoruba - African context. The study explored how this text is understood and expressed in ancient Israel and in Yoruba - African tradition. This study considered whether contemporary AI reliance mirrors the misplaced trust condemned by the psalmist and examines how Yoruba spiritual beliefs shape the ethical perception of AI. African biblical hermeneutics that provide useful lens for rereading the text was adopted for the study. It was discovered that the text critiques the reliance on human - made objects devoid of life and the dangers of misplaced trust. AI is presented as a potential “modern idol,” wherein people place faith in a technology that lacks genuine autonomy and spirit. In Yoruba culture, material objects often carry symbolic or spiritual significance, making exploring AI’s role and ethical boundaries particularly significant. While AI can offer profound benefits, it remains a creation of human hands, inherently limited and devoid of proper spiritual agency. A balanced approach to AI that values technological progress without compromising foundational spiritual values is essential for a future where AI complements human dignity and spiritual reverence and faith.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Idolatry, Psalms 115:4-8, African, Yoruba Culture.

Introduction:

The book of Psalm is a cross section of Yahweh’s revelation to Israel and Israel’s response in faith to Yahweh. The Psalms invited its readers to experience how Yahweh related with Israel. One of the unique things about the Psalms is that as Yahweh spoke to his people, Israel also had the opportunity to speak to Yahweh. This is an encouragement to subsequent generation that the content of the Psalm can be applied to parallel or new situations faced by the Church and Christian faithful in any culture or generation (Barker & Kohlenberger III, 1994: 790).

The ancient Israel had been told times without number that the gods of their neighbours are idols and should not be worshipped. Israel was required to only worship and trust in Yahweh who is the only God before whom there is no other (Isa. 43: 10-11; 44: 16; 45: 5; 40: 11; 45: 1-18). Israel is not to worship nor make graven image for themselves. Hebrew prophets taught that Yahweh was not only superior to all other gods, but reigned alone as God, other deities being nonentities (Lev 19:4; Isa 2:8,18,20; 19:1,3; 31:7; 44:9-20).

Psalm 115 is a Psalm of communal confidence and is closely related to communal thanksgiving

songs and communal laments (Barker, & Kohlenberger III, 1994: 790). Verses 1-3 emphasizes the important of prayer for a community that is suffering and verses 4-8 talked about the importance of idols. Our focus in this study is verses 4-8. Psalm 115: 4-8 is a vivid description of an idol and how Israel should respond to it.

This study therefore examines Psalms 115:4-8 in relation to AI in African Yoruba Context. It considers whether AI could be seen as a modern “idol” in biblical or theological framework. It explores whether AI dependence may mirror the misplaced trust that the psalmist criticizes. The study also addresses AI’s unique spiritual and ethical implications for Yoruba society. Moreover, this study encourages further interdisciplinary dialogue integrating theology, technology, and cultural studies to inform AI ethics. Such research could help develop AI policies aligned with biblical and indigenous values, emphasizing preserving human dignity and spiritual agency (Awolalu & Dopamu, 1979:124; Adewoye, 2020:68).

Concept of Artificial Intelligence, AI:

the modern era, reshaping industries, governance, and even personal daily practices. It is an emerging field of technology defined as nonbiological intelligence, where a machine is programmed to accomplish complex goals by applying knowledge to the task at hand; its range is extensive, encompassing machine learning, which enables systems to improve over time through data analysis, to autonomous systems, which perform complex tasks without continuous human oversight (Russell & Norvig, 2021: 45; Ogunleye, 2021:123). AI, is technology to create organic experiences. Also, it is technology that enables computers and machines to stimulate human intelligence and problem – solving capacity. Machine learning algorithms, for example, drive recommendation systems on social media and e-commerce platforms. In contrast, autonomous systems govern the functions of self-driving cars and military drones, showcasing AI’s

diverse and intricate roles in society (Adeyemi, 2022: 67).

AI is a human made system that can do what generally only humans can do, such as learning, reasoning, problem solving, and understanding languages. AI, is a transformative force in modern society, it is reshaping numerous fields and redefining our relationship with technology. At its core, AI is an intricate human invention designed to simulate cognitive processes, yet its capabilities often inspire awe and dependency, positioning it as a quasi-autonomous force. This dynamic phenomenon reveals a complex paradox: humans create and control AI. However, its influence on our lives and decisions has reached levels that may challenge or even replace human agency.

The dependence on AI across sectors signals a cultural shift, where AI technologies are increasingly entrusted with tasks that were once in the domain of human judgment, creativity, and ethics. In finance, AI-driven algorithms execute high-speed trading with minimal human intervention, while in healthcare, diagnostic AI systems assist in the early detection of diseases, often outperforming human capabilities (Olupona, 2020: 91). Integrating AI into critical aspects of daily life marks a profound societal transformation, where trust in AI’s “intelligence” influences personal decisions, business strategies, and national policies (Ajayi, 2019: 73). In the African Context, this shift raises unique cultural and ethical concerns as AI technologies interact with established values and worldviews that traditionally emphasize spiritual agency and communal decision-making (Mbiti, 1991:39).

Literary Analysis of Psalm 115:

Psalms 115 unfolds in three primary sections. The opening verses (vv. 1-3) call upon the people to give glory to God alone, not for their own merit but for His steadfast love and covenantal faithfulness. The closing section (vv. 9-18) calls Israel to place exclusive trust in the Lord. It concludes with blessings over the people who adhere to this covenantal faith. Verses 4-8 are pivotal, serving as a literary and theological

fulcrum that contrasts human-made idols with the living God who acts and intervenes in human history (Olagoke, 2018: 61). The immediate Context of verses 4-8 includes a polemical satire that intensifies the critique of idolatry by personifying idols. The psalmist underscores the absurdity of idol worship by ascribing human features—mouths, eyes, ears, and noses—to these objects yet declaring their incapacity to act. This contrast reflects the theological conviction that God alone is the trustworthy source of life and agency, challenging believers to reject dependency on objects that neither see, speak, nor hear (Olanrewaju, 2020: 94; Abogunrin, 2006: 48).

Exegesis of Psalm 115: 4-8

The Text in Hebrew and English Language

עֲצָבִיָּהֶם כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב מַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵי אָדָם: ⁵ פִּה־לָהֶם וְלֹא יִדְבְּרוּ
 עֵינַיִם לָהֶם וְלֹא יִרְאוּ:
⁶ אֲזָנַיִם לָהֶם וְלֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ אֶף לָהֶם וְלֹא יִרְיִחוּן:
⁷ יְדֵיהֶם וְלֹא יִמְיִשּׁוּן רַגְלֵיהֶם וְלֹא יִהְלְכוּ לֹא־יִהְיוּ בְּגִרְוֹנָם:
⁸ כִּמֹּהֶם יִהְיוּ עֹשֵׂיהֶם כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־בָּטַח בָּהֶם:

(Psa 115:4-8 WTT)

But their idols are silver and gold, made by the hands of men. They have mouths, but cannot speak, eyes but they cannot see; they have ears, but cannot hear, noses, but cannot smell; they have hands, but cannot feel, feet, but cannot walk; nor can they utter a sound with their throats. Those who make them will be like them, and so will all who trust in them.

Psalm 115 may be classified as a Psalm of communal confidence. Psalms 115 is part of the Egyptian Hallel collection (Psalms 113-118), a significant subset of hymns traditionally recited during key Jewish festivals, especially Passover, to emphasize themes of divine deliverance, faithfulness, and sovereignty (Berlin & Brettler, 2014: 215). This psalm stands as a theological polemic, juxtaposing the omnipotence of Yahweh with the profound impotence of idols, which are critiqued as mere human artefacts devoid of spirit

or power. Scholars recognize this contrast as a foundational aspect of Israelite monotheism, warning against misplaced trust in material constructs (Goldingay, 2008: 347; Okoh, 2019: 45).

Psalms 115:4-8 constitutes the central critique of idolatry, displaying a vivid polemical tone that exposes the absurdity of idol worship and calls Israel to reaffirm loyalty to the living God. Idolatry originally meant the worship of idols, or the worship of false gods by means of idols, but came to mean among the Old Testament Hebrews any worship of false gods, whether by images or otherwise, and finally the worship of Yahweh through visible symbols (Hos 8:5,6; 10:5); and, ultimately, in the New Testament, idolatry came to mean, not only the giving to any creature or human creation the honour or devotion which belonged to God alone, but the giving to any human desire a precedence over God's will (1 Cor 10:14; Gal 5:20; Col 3:5; 1 Pet 4:3). This text addresses a timeless human tendency: the inclination to trust human-made objects, attributing to them qualities and powers they inherently lack. In this psalm, idols are depicted as material artefacts crafted by human hands yet devoid of actual life or agency. Though capable of being seen and touched, these idols lack spirit and autonomy, illustrating the futility of human dependency on lifeless constructs.

The psalmist described idols as powerless and inert, emphasizing their anthropomorphic yet futile features, such as mouths that cannot speak and eyes that cannot see (Olupona, 2017: 89). According to the Psalmist their idols are “silver and gold, made by the hands of men” עֲצָבִיָּהֶם כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב מַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵי אָדָם. In other words, it was men that created idols and not Yahweh. Idols are limited in power because they are human artifacts. They were produced from earthly materials (Barker & Kohlenberger III, 1994: 911). The Hebrew word, Idols עֲצָבִיָּהֶם is noun common masculine plural construct suffix, 3rd person masculine plural. The Israelites were enjoined by Yahweh not to make or worship images or idols. The psalmist continued in verses 5- 7 to describe the human

anatomical features of the idols as having mouths, but cannot speak” *עַיְנֵיהֶם וְלֹא יִדְבְּרוּ*, “eyes”, *אֲזְנוֹתֵיהֶם וְלֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ*, “ears”, and cannot hear. They have “nose” *אֲפָסֵיהֶם*, but cannot smell. They do have “hands” *יָדֵיהֶם*, but they cannot feel and “feet” *רַגְלֵיהֶם* but cannot walk nor can they a sound from their throat. The Psalmist concluded that “those who made them are like them” *וְעֹשֵׂיהֶם יִהְיוּ עִשְׂתֵיהֶם* and so will those who trust in them.

The first and second commandments are directed against idolatry of every form. Individuals and communities were equally amenable to the rigorous code. The individual offender was devoted to destruction (Ex 22:20). His nearest relatives were not only bound to denounce him and deliver him up to punishment (Deut. 13:20-10), but their hands were to strike the first blow when, on the evidence of two witnesses at least, he was stoned (Deut. 17:2-7). To attempt to seduce others to false worship was a crime of equal enormity (Deut. 13:6-10). An idolatrous nation shared the same fate. No facts are more strongly declared in the Old Testament than that the extermination of the Canaanites was the punishment of their idolatry (Ex 34:15,16 De 7:1 12:29-31 20:17) and that the calamities of the Israelites were due to the same cause (Jer 2:17).

Reading Psalm 115: 4-8 in Relation to Artificial Intelligence in African (Yoruba) Context

The aim of most African biblical interpreters is to bring real-life interest into the text for a better interpretation and understanding in African context. The life interest include security, provision, health services, worship and protection (Adamo 2015:31–52). The Africans engage biblical text with the view that it will address their challenges (Adamo 2015:31–52). This mode of reading the biblical text is called “reading in front of the text” (West, 2003: 6-10). The main aim of this reading is to make the text under consideration relevant in any generation, culture and traditions (Awojobi, 2021: 11). Therefore, engaging African scholars on AI’s potential risks and responsibilities may yield ethical frameworks that prioritize both technological innovation and

cultural fidelity (Abiodun, 1989: 46; Oluwole, 2021: 101).

Psalm 115 is classified as a Psalm of communal confidence. It is also closely related to communal thanksgiving songs and communal laments (Barker & Kohlenberger III, 1994: 911). This Psalm is divided into six parts: (i) Community prayer for help vv1-3, (ii) Impotence of Idols vv4-8, (iii) Confidence in the Lord vv9-11, (iv) Blessing of the Lord vv12-15, (v) Power of the Lord v.16 and (vi) Community Praise vv17-18. Our concern in this study is to examine Psalm 115:4-8 in relation to Artificial Intelligence in African - Yoruba Context.

In verses 1- 4, the psalmist informed his audience who appears to be asking questions about the God of Israel that the real God resides in heaven but he is concern about his people even in the time of adversity. This is in response to the nations around Israel that held that Yahweh has forgotten his people. The psalmist submitted that whereas, Yahweh has the creative power but the gods of other nations are idols from silver and gold made by mortals (Barker & Kohlenberger III, 1994: 911). This suggests that the psalmist is referring to those who trust in idols. The depiction of idols in verses 4-8 conveys an idea of idolatry by characterizing idols as powerless and lifeless. African scholars held that this anthropomorphism underscores the ironic futility of trusting in objects that resemble humans yet lack any divine spark (Ogunleye, 2021: 78). Satirically, the psalmist likens idols to objects with “mouths,” “eyes,” and “ears,” without the capacity to function or respond (Goldingay, 2008: 348). This theme resonates within African cosmologies, where objects often possess symbolic meanings but do not usurp divine agency, reflecting a similar caution against attributing undue power to human artefacts (Mbiti, 1991:36).

Also, the psalmist’s disapproval of idol worship is not merely about the objects but about the people who depend on them. The phrase, “Those who make them will become like them, everyone who trusts in them” (Ps. 115:8), suggests a reciprocal process of spiritual degradation, as worshipers

who depend on lifeless idols become spiritually inert (Abogunrin, 2006: 49; Adewale, 2018: 56). This concept aligns with African philosophical thought, where the dependency on lifeless objects is often viewed as spiritually limiting, reinforcing the value of aligning with life-giving forces (Olupona, 2017: 91).

Furthermore, this Psalm offers a nuanced discourse on the limits of human autonomy by condemning the attempt to create and venerate objects of worship. While humans have the creative ability to craft idols, these creations ultimately remain subordinate to divine Creator, reinforcing the principle that true sovereignty and life are exclusive to God (Berlin & Brettler, 2014: 216). This principle resonates in African theological thought, where the God of all creation possesses ultimate control, and human efforts to manufacture deities are regarded as inherently flawed (Mbiti, 1991:39; Idowu, 2005:66). The psalmist's submission about idols in this text reveals an implicit warning that true worship should be directed to the one sovereign God beyond human manipulation (Olanrewaju, 2020: 97).

Besides, Psalms 115:4-8 extend beyond ancient Israel and bear implications for contemporary engagements with technology and other human constructs. The Psalmist in this text, reminds readers that reliance on human-made objects can lead to spiritual numbness, an idea that parallels concern about modern dependency on technological artefacts like Artificial Intelligence (Okoh, 2019: 46). In both ancient and modern contexts, there exists a theological danger in elevating human creations to a level of reverence that rivals or replaces the divine (Adewale, 2018: 57). In Yoruba culture, such creations are valued when they serve humanity but not when they threaten to replace or diminish divine agency or human integrity (Olaniyan, 2018: 92; Adeyemi, 2019:102). Applying this to technological advancements today, calls for discernment regarding the limitations of AI and other artificial constructs. Just as idols are powerless and incapable of actual agency, so are AI systems

limited by their programming and lack of intrinsic life (Ogunleye, 2021: 81). To this end, African theologians argue that while AI serves practical purposes, the dependence on these constructs should not obscure humanity's ultimate reliance on God as the trustworthy source of wisdom and power (2006: 50).

To this end, this Psalm is an attempt to prioritize divine sovereignty above all human-made constructs. It encourages its readers to resist the allure of idolatry, whether in ancient or contemporary forms and to put their trust in the God of creation. This psalm does not only warn against misplaced veneration of idols objects but also provides a theological foundation for understanding the role and limitations of human creations in spiritual life (Idowu, 2005: 67). It should be noted that through an exploration of Yoruba spirituality, which values human agency and reverence for spiritual beings, this analysis has shown the cultural dissonance between traditional beliefs and the potential "spiritualization" of AI (Ogunleye, 2021:126; Adeoye, 1989: 132). Ultimately, the text offers a framework for evaluating ancient idols and modern technologies, encouraging a balanced approach that honours the primacy of divine agency.

In view of this, the question is: can reliance on AI echo the idolatry as presented in Psalms 115: 4-8? This becomes relevant in the African Yoruba context, where modern technological advancements intersect with deep-rooted spiritual beliefs. For the Yoruba, material objects often carry symbolic or spiritual significance, blurring the tangible and spiritual boundaries. Thus, examining AI as a potential "modern idol" is vital, significantly, as it may heighten tensions between the spiritual beliefs held in traditional Yoruba culture and the reliance on technology. Thus, in Yoruba culture, objects such as idols and technological constructs are only given meaning when they serve as conduits for legitimate spiritual power (Olupona, 2014: 59).

In this biblical passage, idols are depicted as lifeless entities crafted by human hands yet devoid

of agency, awareness, or divinity. They have “mouths, but cannot speak; eyes, but cannot see” (Psalm 115:5-6, NIV), embodying humanity’s propensity to create objects that mirror its image but lack the spirit that characterizes true life. This depiction parallels AI in its functional limitations—AI can “perceive” and “act” in specific ways, but it lacks consciousness, moral judgment, and autonomous will (Goldingay, 2008:354). The anthropomorphic design of AI, often described as “intelligent” or “learning,” risks attributing qualities to AI that imply autonomy or wisdom, mirroring the veneration of idols mentioned in Psalms 115 (Adewale, 2018: 58; Oluwole, 2021:62). While AI can process information, it fundamentally operates on human-defined algorithms and cannot independently form values or ethical judgments (Russell & Norvig, 2021:47). This reality raises ethical concerns about the increasing delegation of authority to AI systems, as these technologies often replace human agency in significant domains. In governance, for instance, AI algorithms decide eligibility for loans, evaluate job applications, and, in some jurisdictions, aid in criminal sentencing. Such reliance suggests a shift from human to technological decision-making, where AI’s perceived “neutrality” and efficiency obscure its limitations (Ayoade, 2020: 105).

Ethically, this reliance raises issues reminiscent of the idolatry described in Psalms 115:4-8, where misplaced trust in AI’s “intelligence” potentially supplants the divine authority and human discernment traditionally upheld in African and Judeo-Christian contexts. Ogunleye (2021:125) asserts that placing faith in artificial constructs risks elevating human-made creations to a reverence typically reserved for the divine. Misplaced trust can foster an illusion of objectivity and moral authority, despite AI’s lack of autonomy or ethical awareness (Abogunrin, 2006: 52). It is held that by grounding AI ethics in biblical teachings and cultural traditions, societies can cultivate a responsible technology that enhances rather than erodes human and spiritual relationships (Adewale, 2019, p. 63; Ogunleye, 2021, p. 129).

Moreover, the growing dependency on AI reflects a societal inclination to prioritize technological solutions over spiritual or moral guidance, echoing the psalmist’s warning against the dangers of idolatry. This reliance is particularly evident in decision-making, productivity, and control, where AI is increasingly positioned as an “objective” mediator (Idowu, 2005: 69; Berlin & Brettler, 2014: 220). In Africa, integrating AI into security systems, such as facial recognition in policing, has sparked debates about the ethical implications of relying on non-human agents to make life-altering decisions (Adewale, 2018:59).

From a theological perspective, this dependency risks undermining the recognition of human limitations and the necessity of divine wisdom, as encapsulated in Psalms 115. As humans turn to AI for guidance, there is a risk that technology may gradually replace divine reverence with a reliance on artificial judgment. This is the reason why, the psalmist warning about trusting in human-made entities reflects a timeless concern about misplaced dependence—a caution that resonates with AI’s growing influence on decision-making, judgment, and human interactions (Adewale, 2019: 65; Idowu, 1991:111). In this context, AI embodies modern idolatrous tendencies, where human agency and divine authority are increasingly substituted by artificial constructs (Mbiti, 1991: 143).

Olupona (2020:93) cautions that such dependency may obscure the essential role of spiritual discernment and ethical reasoning in guiding human decisions. Furthermore, as Ayoade (2020:107) observes, AI’s “intelligence” is often perceived as impartial and authoritative despite its fundamental dependency on human programming and data biases, mirroring the lifeless and unresponsive nature of idols presented by the psalmist.

This technological dependency challenges theological principles and raises critical questions about the nature of agency and human autonomy. In African societies, where spiritual interconnectedness remains integral, the elevation of AI as a decision-maker introduces an external

authority that may disrupt traditional modes of communal decision-making and spiritual engagement (Ogunleye, 2021:128). In essence, the dependency on AI as a modern “idol” reflects a broader cultural and spiritual shift that risks distancing humanity from divine wisdom and undermining the primacy of ethical agency in the pursuit of progress. So, by analyzing AI through the lens of Psalms 115:4-8 and Yoruba ethics, this study highlights the importance of maintaining a balanced perspective on technology, warning against undue reliance on artificial intelligence that could shift society’s foundational values (Babatunde, 2016: 77).

Conclusion:

It is vivid from the foregoing that this study has illuminated the theological and cultural complexities of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the African - Yoruba context. As examined, the psalmist’s condemnation of idolatry, particularly lifeless objects that cannot “see, hear, or speak”, parallels AI’s limitations as a human-made construct devoid of spiritual autonomy. This study opens new pathways for examining AI’s role in African - Yoruba cultural and religious contexts, where traditional values and spirituality offer unique insights into ethical technology use.

As society navigates the complexities of AI, this study underscores the importance of a reflective, faith-informed approach to technology. Theological insights, such as those from Psalms 115:4-8, remind us that while AI can offer profound benefits, it remains a creation of human hands, inherently limited and devoid of proper spiritual agency.

Consequently, a balanced approach to AI that values technological progress without compromising foundational spiritual values is essential for a future where AI complements human dignity and spiritual reverence and faith and caution guide the path forward.

References:

1. Abiodun, R. (1989). *Understanding Yoruba Art and Aesthetics*. *African Arts*, 24(3).

2. Abogunrin, S. O. (2006). *African Traditional Religion and Christianity in Dialogue: An Exploration*. *African Journal of Biblical Studies*, 2(1).
3. Abogunrin, S. O. (2008). *Yoruba Religion and Christian Theology: A Comparative Study*. *Nigerian Journal of Theology*, 14(2).
4. Adegbola, K. (2021). *Modernity and Tradition: Technology and African Values*. *African Technology Review*, 7(1).
5. Adeoye, C. L. (1989). *Ancestral Reverence in Yoruba Religion*. *African Journal of Religion*, 9(1).
6. Adamo, D.T. (2005). *Reading and Interpreting the Bible in African Indigenous Churches*. Benin City: Justice Jeco Press & Publishers Ltd.
7. Adewale, A. J. (2018). *The Theology of Psalms and Its Relevance to Contemporary African Worship Practices*. *Journal of African Religious Traditions*, 8(2).
8. Adewale, T. (2019). *The Role of Technology in African Ethical Thought: A Yoruba Perspective*. *Journal of African Philosophy*, 11(2).
9. Adewoye, A. (2020). *The African Conception of Technology and Ethical Responsibility*. *Nigerian Journal of Technology*, 10(1).
10. Adeyemi, S. (2019). *Ethics of Technology in Yoruba Philosophy*. *Nigerian Journal of Ethical Studies*, 10(1).
11. Ajayi, A. (2019). *Artificial Intelligence in African Economies: Opportunities and Ethical Challenges*. *African Technology Review*, 4(2).
12. Awolalu, J. O., & Dopamu, P. A. (1979). *West African Traditional Religion*. Onibonoje Press.
13. Awojobi, P.O. (2021). Reading Psalm 121 in an African (Yoruba) Context, *Integrity Journal of Arts and Humanities* Vol. 2 (1): 8-15
14. Ayoade, T. (2020). *Ethics and Technology: Artificial Intelligence in African*

- Governance*. Journal of African Technology and Ethics, 9(3).
15. Babatunde, T. (2016). *Religion and Society in Yoruba Culture*. African Studies Journal, 18(2).
 16. Barker, K.L & Kohlenberger III, (1994) *The Expositor's Bible Commentary (Abridged Edition) Old Testaent*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
 17. Berlin, A., & Brettler, M. Z. (2014). *The Jewish Study Bible*. Oxford University Press, 2nd ed.
 18. Goldingay, J. (2008). *Psalms, Volume 3: Psalms 90-150*. Baker Academi.
 19. Idowu, B. (2005). *Olodumare: God in Yoruba Belief*. Longmans.
 20. Mbiti, J. S. (1991). *African Religions and Philosophy*. Heinemann.
 21. Ogunleye, M. (2021). *African Cosmology and the Critique of Idolatry in the Psalms*. African Theological Journal, 11(3).
 22. Ogunleye, M. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence and African Cultural Ethics: The Case of the Yoruba*. Journal of African Technology and Ethics, 9(3).
 23. Okoh, A. (2019). *Reimagining Idolatry in Psalms 115: An African Perspective*. Nigerian Journal of Biblical Exegesis, 14(1).
 24. Olagoke, T. (2018). *Psalms and the Theology of Divine Sovereignty*. African Journal of Religion and Theology, 6(4).
 25. Olaniyan, M. (2018). *Cultural Challenges of AI in African Societies*. African Journal of Technological Ethics, 8(2).
 26. Olanrewaju, F. (2020). *The Impact of Idolatry in Ancient Israel and Its Lessons for African Christianity*. West African Theological Review, 5(2).
 27. Olupona, J. K. (2020). *African Religions: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
 28. Oluwole, S. (2020). *Technology and Spirituality in African Philosophy*. African Journal of Philosophy, 13(1).
 29. Oluwole, S. B. (2021). *The African Concept of Divinity and Technology*. African Journal of Philosophy, 12(1).
 30. Russell, S & Norvig, P. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. Pearson, 4th ed.
 31. West, G (2003) *Contextual Bible Study* Pietermaritzburg: Cluster Press.