Abraka Journal of Religion and Philosophy - **ISSN: 2971-5997 (Online)**
Volume 6, Issue 2 (July – December), 2026, pp. 150-159

Test Everything: AI-Generated Knowledge and the Loss of Human Discernment in Light of 1 Thessalonians 5:21

Uzoukwu Cynthia Nkechi
Imo State University, Owerri
Department of Religion and Peace Studies
Email: mailcynthiauzoukwu@gmail.com

Abstract
The rapid development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has changed the way people search for information, learn, conduct research, and interpret biblical texts. Although AI provides quick access to information, its increasing use raises concerns about human discernment, critical thinking, and the ability to distinguish accurate information from false claims. This paper looks at the relevance of 1 Thessalonians 5:19–22, particularly verse 21, which instructs believers to "test everything" and hold on to what is good. The problem addressed by the paper is the tendency of some students, researchers, pastors, and other users to accept AI-generated information without carefully examining its accuracy, reliability, and ethical implications. The paper aims to interpret Paul's instruction within its biblical context and apply its message to the responsible use of AI-generated knowledge in contemporary society. It adopts a qualitative research method based on historical-grammatical exegesis and documentary analysis of relevant biblical and scholarly literature. Excessive dependence on technology, academic integrity, and the relationship between technological assistance and human judgment are discussed. It argues that AI can support learning, research, and biblical interpretation, but it should not replace independent thinking, careful investigation, or personal responsibility. The paper concludes that the biblical principle of testing everything provides a useful ethical framework for evaluating AI-generated information. It recommends that universities, theological institutions, churches, and individual users promote critical thinking, source verification, and responsible AI use.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, human discernment, AI-generated knowledge, critical thinking, 1 Thessalonians 5: 21.

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become an important part of modern society. It is used in education, healthcare, business, communication, research, and religious activities. Through generative AI applications, users can obtain explanations, summaries, research ideas, translations, and sermon outlines within a short time. These developments have created new opportunities for learning, research, and knowledge production. However, they have also raised important questions about truth, human judgment, intellectual responsibility, and the ability to distinguish reliable information from false claims. Generative AI refers to computer systems that can produce new content, including text, images, audio, and other forms of information. Large language models, which power many AI chatbots, generate responses by learning patterns from large collections of data. Their ability to produce fluent and convincing answers makes them useful for different academic and professional activities. However, a well-written answer is not necessarily a correct answer. Users must therefore distinguish between information that sounds convincing and information that is supported by reliable evidence.

Ji et al. (2023, pp. 1–38) examine the problem of hallucination in natural language generation. They explain that AI-generated content may contain information that is false, unsupported, or inconsistent with the available evidence. Similarly, Farquhar et al. (2024, pp. 625–630) demonstrate that large language models can produce false or unsupported answers despite their impressive language abilities. These findings show that AI can assist human beings in accessing information, but its responses still require careful examination and verification. These problems have important implications for education, academic research, and religious practice. Students may use AI to write assignments, researchers may request literature reviews, and pastors may seek explanations of biblical passages. Although these activities can be useful, difficulties arise when users accept generated information without checking its accuracy. In academic research, this may lead to the use of false quotations, inaccurate claims, or references to publications that do not exist. In theological education, students may accept AI-generated interpretations without examining the historical background, literary context, and original language of biblical passages. Similarly, pastors may use AI-generated sermons without checking whether the interpretations are faithful to the biblical text.

Messeri and Crockett (2024, pp. 49–58) warn that AI can create an illusion of understanding. This means that people may believe they understand a subject because AI has provided a clear and convincing explanation, even when they have not examined the evidence or engaged deeply with the subject themselves. Consequently, excessive dependence on AI may reduce the willingness of users to ask questions, investigate sources, compare arguments, and develop independent judgments. The problem is therefore not simply whether AI is useful or harmful. The more important concern is how people can benefit from AI without losing their ability to think independently, examine evidence, and make responsible judgments. AI can support learning and research, but it should not replace the intellectual effort required to understand a subject. Its responses should be treated as information that requires evaluation rather than as unquestionable truth. Christianity places considerable value on truth, wisdom, knowledge, and discernment. The Bible encourages believers to examine claims rather than accept everything without question.

In 1 Thessalonians 5:21, Paul instructs Christians to “test everything; hold fast what is good”. This instruction forms part of Paul's discussion of spiritual life, the treatment of prophetic utterances, and the need to distinguish what is good from what should be rejected in 1 Thessalonians 5:19–22. Although Paul was addressing the concerns of the early Christian community, his instruction provides a useful starting point for discussing the responsible evaluation of information in contemporary society. The instruction to test everything does not mean rejecting every new idea or accepting every claim. Rather, it encourages careful examination before making a judgment. Applied to AI-generated information, this principle calls for users to verify facts, examine evidence, consult reliable sources, and take responsibility for the conclusions they reach. It also encourages Christians to recognise that technological tools may be useful without becoming final authorities on truth, biblical interpretation, or moral decisions.

The central problem addressed by this study is the possibility that excessive and uncritical dependence on AI may weaken human discernment and reduce people's willingness to examine information independently. Although AI is increasingly used in universities, theological institutions, research, preaching, and everyday decision-making, access to information does not automatically produce knowledge, understanding, or wisdom. Zhai et al. (2024) discuss concerns about the relationship between AI dialogue systems and human cognitive activities, including critical thinking and decision-making in educational and research settings. These concerns make

it necessary to consider how people can use AI while maintaining independent reasoning and responsible judgment. The Paper therefore examines the relationship between AI-generated knowledge and human discernment in the light of 1 Thessalonians 5:21. Its main aim is to investigate how Paul's instruction to test everything can provide a biblical and ethical basis for evaluating AI-generated information. Specifically, the study seeks to explain the meaning and nature of AI-generated knowledge; examine the relationship between AI use, critical thinking, and human discernment; interpret 1 Thessalonians 5:19–22 within its historical and literary context; explain the relevance of Paul's instruction to contemporary AI use; identify the ethical implications of uncritical dependence on AI in academic and religious settings; and recommend practical ways of promoting responsible AI use through biblical wisdom and critical evaluation.

AI Dependence and Critical Thinking

Another important area of scholarship concerns the relationship between AI use and critical thinking. AI can support learning by explaining difficult concepts, suggesting research questions, summarising information, and helping students organise their ideas. However, its benefits may be reduced when students use it as a substitute for independent thinking.

Zhai et al. (2024) conducted a systematic review of research on the effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities. The review considered 14 studies and examined concerns involving critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and decision-making. The authors identified risks associated with accepting AI-generated recommendations without checking their reliability. Their discussion is important because educational activities are intended not only to produce answers but also to develop the student's ability to understand, question, and evaluate information. For example, a student who asks AI to explain a biblical passage and then compares the explanation with the original text and recognised commentaries remains actively involved in learning. A student who copies the generated explanation without examining it may complete an assignment without developing a clear understanding of the passage. This distinction shows that the problem is not necessarily the use of AI but the manner in which it is used. The findings of Zhai et al. (2024) support the need for AI literacy and responsible learning practices. Students should be taught to use AI as an aid to understanding rather than as a replacement for intellectual effort. This position also connects with 1 Thessalonians 5:21. Testing requires active examination. It is inconsistent with the principle of testing everything to accept an answer simply because it is convenient. Messeri and Crockett (2024, pp. 49–58) examine the relationship between AI and scientific understanding. They argue that AI tools can create situations in which researchers believe they understand more than they actually do. However, the same advantages can create new problems when researchers depend on generated explanations without examining the evidence behind them. This concern is particularly relevant to academic writing.

A researcher may request a literature review and receive a well-organised discussion of different theories. However, if the researcher has not consulted the original publications, the apparent understanding may be incomplete. A summary is not always a substitute for reading the source. An AI-generated explanation may leave out important qualifications, misunderstand an author's argument, or fail to recognise disagreement among scholars. In theological research, these problems may affect biblical interpretation. A generated explanation may sound convincing while overlooking the historical setting, literary structure, or original-language meaning of a passage. Messeri and Crockett's (2024, pp. 49–58) discussion therefore strengthens the argument that producing information and understanding information are not the same thing. The biblical principle of testing everything challenges researchers to examine the foundations of their conclusions rather than being satisfied with the appearance of knowledge.

Proverbs 14:15 states that the simple believe everything, while the prudent consider their steps. The proverb contrasts careless acceptance with thoughtful examination. First John 4:1 instructs believers not to believe every spirit but to test the spirits to determine whether they are from God. In its immediate context, the passage addresses spiritual claims and the need to recognise false prophets. It does not directly address technology, but it establishes the principle that spiritual claims should be examined rather than accepted without question. Philippians 1:9–10 connects growing knowledge and insight with the ability to discern what is best. This suggests that knowledge should contribute to mature judgment rather than remain a collection of disconnected facts. Hebrews 5:14 describes mature people as those whose powers of discernment have been trained through practice to distinguish good from evil. The emphasis on training suggests that discernment develops through deliberate effort and experience.

These passages provide a wider biblical background for understanding 1 Thessalonians 5:21. Together, they show that discernment involves examination, maturity, and the ability to distinguish between what is trustworthy and what is misleading. However, each passage must be interpreted in its own context. These biblical texts should not be presented as direct predictions about modern AI. Rather, their teachings can be applied carefully to contemporary questions concerning truth, authority, and judgment. This paper adopts biblical ethical discernment as its main analytical framework. The framework is based on the biblical principle that information and claims should be examined before they are accepted or acted upon. The main biblical foundation is 1 Thessalonians 5:21, where Paul instructs believers to test everything and hold on to what is good. Related passages, including Proverbs 14:15, Philippians 1:9–10, and 1 John 4:1, also emphasise the importance of wisdom and discernment.

EXEGESIS OF 1 THESSALONIANS 5:19–22

This paper examines 1 Thessalonians 5:21, which states, “Test everything; hold fast what is good” RSV (2021). The passage is particularly relevant to contemporary discussions about Artificial Intelligence (AI), AI-generated knowledge, and the possible weakening of human discernment. As AI becomes increasingly involved in education, academic research, biblical interpretation, and sermon preparation, there is a growing need to examine the information it produces rather than accept it without question.

Sciberras (2013,p.76) explains that Paul's use of the Greek verb *dokimazō* in 1 Thessalonians 5:21 involves examining something carefully to determine whether it should be approved or rejected. The process of discernment requires more than receiving information; it involves making a responsible judgment about its value and truthfulness. The First Letter to the Thessalonians is one of Paul's earliest surviving letters. It was written to a Christian community in Thessalonica, a major city in Macedonia. The letter addresses the experiences of believers who were learning to live according to the Christian faith while facing social pressure, uncertainty, and questions about their future hope. According to Green (2002), Paul's instructions in 1 Thessalonians are closely connected to the practical life of the Christian community. Looking at the Literary Context of 1 Thessalonians 5:21. First Thessalonians 5:21 belongs to a short section covering verses 19–22. “Do not quench the Spirit. Do not despise the words of prophets. Test everything; hold fast to what is good; abstain from every form of evil” (1 Thessalonians 5:19–22). The four verses form a connected argument. Paul does not want the believers to reject spiritual expressions without consideration, but neither does he want them to accept every claim without examination. Verse 19 says, “Do not quench the Spirit.” The Greek verb used here is sbennymi (σβέννυμι), meaning to extinguish, put out, or suppress. The expression suggests that the community should not suppress the work of the Spirit through an unwillingness to listen to spiritual expressions.

Verse 20 continues, "Do not despise the words of prophets." The important Greek verb is exoutheneō (ἐξουθενέω), which means to treat something as worthless, despise it, or reject it contemptuously. Paul therefore warns against dismissing prophetic messages simply because they are unfamiliar or difficult to understand.

Verse 21 introduces the need for examination: "Test everything; hold fast to what is good." Paul balances openness to spiritual expressions with the responsibility to evaluate them. The community must neither reject everything nor accept everything blindly.

Verse 22 completes the instruction: "Abstain from every form of evil." The Greek expression apo pantos eidous ponērou (ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ) can be understood as keeping away from every form or kind of evil. The verse calls believers to distinguish what is good from what is harmful and act accordingly.

Weima (2014) explains that verses 19–22 form a connected unit in which openness to prophecy is balanced by the testing of spiritual claims. The instruction to test everything prevents believers from accepting every purportedly spiritual message without discernment. This literary context is important for the present study. Paul does not encourage uncritical acceptance, but neither does he encourage the automatic rejection of new claims. Instead, he calls for careful evaluation. Applied to AI, this principle means that users should neither assume that every AI-generated answer is true nor reject every AI-generated answer simply because it comes from technology. They should examine each claim and determine whether it is supported by evidence and suitable for use.

The Greek Text of 1 Thessalonians 5:21

πάντα δὲ δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε·

Transliteration: Panta de dokimazete, to kalon katechete. A simple translation is: "But test everything; hold fast to what is good." The Greek text contains six words that are central to understanding Paul's instruction. These words are panta, de, dokimazete, to, kalon, and katechete. Their grammatical forms and meanings help explain the relationship between testing information and retaining what is good. Looking at the Exegetical Analysis of the Key Greek Words, Πάντα (Panta): "Everything" The Greek word panta comes from pas (πᾶς), meaning all, every, or the whole. In 1 Thessalonians 5:21, it is an accusative neuter plural form meaning "all things" or "everything." It functions as the object of the verb dokimazete, which means "test" or "examine." The word communicates that the community should examine the relevant claims rather than accept them without consideration. However, the immediate context is important. Paul has just spoken about prophetic messages in verses 19–20. Therefore, panta primarily refers to the spiritual expressions and claims under discussion, rather than providing an unlimited instruction about every possible subject in existence. The expression nevertheless establishes a broad principle of discernment: claims should be examined before they are accepted. Sciberras (2013) explains that Paul's teaching connects testing with the ability to distinguish truth from falsehood and to recognise what deserves approval. In relation to AI-generated knowledge, panta provides a useful starting point for critical evaluation. AI-generated explanations, historical claims, quotations, references, and biblical interpretations should not be accepted merely because they are presented confidently. They should be examined in relation to reliable evidence.

For example, when an AI system provides an explanation of 1 Thessalonians 5:21, a student should compare the explanation with the Greek text, consult recognised biblical commentaries, and examine the passage in its literary context. If the system attributes an argument to a biblical scholar, the student should check the original publication before citing that scholar. The word panta therefore supports an attitude of careful examination. It does not mean that every claim is false or that every claim must be rejected. Rather, claims must be considered before a judgment

is made. Δὲ (De): "But"The Greek conjunction de connects Paul's instruction in verse 21 with the preceding verses. It may be translated as "but," "and," or "now," depending on the context. In this passage, "but" effectively communicates the contrast between verses 19–20 and the instruction that follows. Paul tells the believers not to suppress the Spirit or despise prophetic messages. He then instructs them to test everything. The movement is from openness to examination. Believers must not reject spiritual expressions merely because they are unfamiliar, but neither should they accept them without careful consideration. This conjunction contributes to the balance of Paul's teaching. He opposes both careless rejection and uncritical acceptance. The community must remain open to what may be good while retaining the responsibility to evaluate what it hears. In the context of AI, this balance is important. Some people may reject all AI-generated information because they fear its possible dangers. Others may accept AI responses without questioning their accuracy. Neither attitude provides a sufficient basis for responsible use. A balanced approach recognises that AI can provide useful assistance while acknowledging that its outputs may contain errors. Users should evaluate the information, accept what is supported by evidence, and reject what is false or misleading. This is a contemporary ethical application of the contrast expressed by de, rather than a claim that Paul was directly discussing modern technology. Δοκιμάζετε (Dokimazete): "Test" or "Examine" The Greek verb dokimazete comes from dokimazō (δοκιμάζω), which means to test, examine, evaluate, or determine whether something is genuine or worthy of approval. The word is particularly important because it expresses the central command of the passage. In this context, testing involves more than asking whether a claim sounds convincing. It requires examining the claim to determine whether it should be accepted. The process includes evaluation and judgment, not merely the collection of information.

Sciberras (2013) explains that dokimazō is associated with discernment and the evaluation of claims. Its use in 1 Thessalonians 5:21 points to an examination through which something may be recognised as worthy of approval or rejected as unsuitable. The verb therefore connects the process of testing with the outcome of judgment. This verb is central to the argument of the present study. AI systems can generate explanations that appear authoritative, but their fluency does not guarantee accuracy. Testing AI-generated information requires users to examine its evidence, identify unsupported assumptions, compare alternative explanations, and consult reliable sources.An AI-generated interpretation of a biblical passage should be examined in relation to its historical background, literary structure, grammar, and theological context. Where the original Greek is relevant, the student should consult the Greek text and reliable grammatical or lexical resources. The command *dokimazete* therefore provides a biblical basis for intellectual responsibility. It encourages users to question information, examine evidence, and make judgments rather than surrendering their reasoning to a technological system.

Τὸ Καλόν (To Kalon): "What Is Good" *The expression to kalon combines the definite article to (τὸ) with the adjective kalon (καλόν). The adjective kalos (καλός) can mean good, noble, fine, worthy, or beneficial, depending on the context.* In this verse, the expression refers to what is good and worthy of being retained after examination. The word is significant because Paul's instruction does not end with testing. Testing is directed towards a decision about what should be accepted. The purpose is not to criticise everything or to remain permanently doubtful. Rather, the community must recognise what is good and respond appropriately. In the original context, *to kalon* refers to what is found worthy of approval through the discernment of the spiritual claims under consideration. The word should not be reduced to whatever a person finds attractive or personally agreeable. Its meaning is shaped by Paul's wider Christian teaching and the responsibility to reject evil in verse 22. Sciberras (2013) highlights the connection between

testing and the positive recognition of what is worthy of approval. Discernment is therefore not simply a negative activity; it enables believers to identify and retain what is good.

Applied to AI-generated knowledge, *to kalon* suggests that users should retain information that has been examined and found reliable, relevant, and appropriate. An AI system may provide a useful summary of a scholarly argument, suggest questions for further research, or assist with translating a passage. Such assistance can be valuable when it is checked against appropriate sources. However, a response that contains fabricated references, inaccurate quotations, misleading interpretations, or harmful recommendations should not be accepted simply because the rest of the answer appears useful. The good must be distinguished from the false or misleading. The expression also reminds researchers that the quality of information is not determined by convenience alone. A quick answer is not necessarily a good answer. Information should be evaluated in terms of its accuracy, evidence, relevance, and ethical implications.

Κατέχετε (Katechete): "Hold Fast" The Greek verb katechete comes from katechō (κατέχω), meaning to hold firmly, retain, keep, or hold fast. In 1 Thessalonians 5:21, it is another present active imperative addressed to the Christian community. The command follows directly from the instruction to test everything. Paul expects the believers not only to examine claims but also to retain what proves good. The two commands are therefore closely connected: testing determines what is worthy of approval, while holding fast describes the appropriate response to what has been approved. The verb also communicates commitment. Discernment should lead to action rather than remain an intellectual exercise. Once the community identifies what is good, it should preserve and practise it. In relation to AI, katechete means that users should retain verified information and incorporate it responsibly into their work. A student who checks an AI-generated explanation against the biblical text and reliable scholarship may use the accurate parts of that explanation. However, the student should correct or discard errors rather than reproduce them. For researchers, this principle includes keeping accurate records of sources, distinguishing their own arguments from AI-generated suggestions, and ensuring that quotations and references are genuine. For pastors, it involves retaining sound biblical insights while correcting interpretations that are inconsistent with the passage being studied. The verb therefore emphasises responsible selection. The goal is not simply to use AI, but to identify and retain what is genuinely useful and trustworthy. In the same way, Christian discernment requires believers to preserve what is good while refusing to hold on to what is false or harmful.

The Relationship between Testing, Retaining Good, and Rejecting Evil

First Thessalonians 5:21 should be interpreted alongside verse 22. The three instructions form a connected process: test what is presented, retain what is good, and abstain from evil. The first instruction concerns examination. The second concerns the decision to retain what has been found good. The third concerns the rejection of what is evil. Together, they present discernment as a process that involves judgment and action. The Greek text of verse 22 reads: ἀπὸ παντὸς εἴδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε. Transliteration: Apo pantos eidous ponērou apechesthe. "Abstain from every form of evil." The expression eidous ponērou refers to a form or kind of evil. In this context, verse 22 complements verse 21 by showing that discernment requires both positive acceptance of what is good and refusal of what is evil. This relationship is relevant to the use of AI-generated information. A user may encounter an answer containing both accurate and inaccurate statements. Responsible evaluation requires identifying which claims are supported, retaining what can be verified, and correcting or rejecting the rest. Where the information is seriously misleading or harmful, the user should not use it merely because it is convenient. The passage also challenges the idea that technology should determine truth on behalf of its users. AI

can assist the process of gathering and organising information, but it cannot remove the user's responsibility to judge the reliability and suitability of the material.

Human Discernment and AI-Generated Knowledge

The relationship between 1 Thessalonians 5:21 and AI-generated knowledge becomes clearer when the biblical command is applied to the way people receive and evaluate information. AI systems can produce explanations, summaries, translations, and interpretations within seconds. This ability can save time and assist research. However, AI-generated information may also contain errors, invented references, incomplete arguments, and misleading explanations. Ji et al. (2023) identify hallucination as an important challenge in natural language generation, while Messeri and Crockett (2024) warn that AI can create an illusion of understanding. These concerns raise an important question: what happens when users accept AI-generated information without examining it? One possible consequence is a decline in independent intellectual effort. When students depend on AI to explain every difficult concept, they may become less willing to read original texts, compare scholarly arguments, or develop their own interpretations. This does not mean that every use of AI weakens critical thinking. Rather, the danger arises when assistance becomes a substitute for independent engagement.

Another concern is the confusion of information with knowledge. Information becomes reliable knowledge only through appropriate examination, evidence, and understanding. An AI-generated answer may be accurate, but its accuracy should not be assumed merely because it is well written. Users must determine whether its claims are supported.

The passage also raises questions about accountability. A pastor remains responsible for the biblical accuracy of a sermon even when AI has assisted its preparation. Paul's instruction provides a framework for addressing these concerns. The command to test everything encourages examination; the command to hold fast to what is good encourages the retention of verified information; and the following instruction to abstain from evil encourages the rejection of false or harmful material. The application can be expressed in three practical stages:

1. Examine: Identify the claims made by the AI system and determine what evidence supports them.
2. Verify: Compare the claims with primary sources, reliable academic publications, and the biblical text where relevant.
3. Retain or reject: Use information that has been adequately verified, correct incomplete material, and reject claims that are false or unsupported.

These approach does not require Christians to reject AI. Instead, it encourages them to use it responsibly without surrendering their intellectual and moral judgment. AI should assist the process of learning rather than replace the work of understanding. The relevance of 1 Thessalonians 5:21 is particularly clear in biblical studies because interpreting Scripture requires careful attention to language, history, literary context, and theological meaning. An AI system may provide a Greek word study, explain a biblical passage, or summarise the position of a commentator. Such assistance may be useful as an initial step in research. However, the student must verify the information against recognised Greek lexicons, grammars, commentaries, and the biblical text. AI may also generate references to biblical scholars. These references should be checked against library catalogues, academic databases, or the publications themselves. A researcher should not include a source in the reference list unless its existence and relevant bibliographic details have been confirmed. In sermon preparation, AI can assist pastors by suggesting outlines, identifying related passages, or organising ideas. Nevertheless, the pastor should examine every interpretation and ensure that the sermon communicates the meaning of

the biblical text responsibly. The convenience of an AI-generated sermon does not remove the need for personal study and theological judgment.

Furthermore, human discernment is not infallible. People can misunderstand Scripture, accept false information, or make judgments based on prejudice. Therefore, the solution to AI-related problems is not to assume that human judgment is always correct. Rather, responsible use requires humility, willingness to learn, openness to correction, and appropriate methods of verification. The passage is best applied as a guiding principle for responsible evaluation, not as a claim that all questions about AI can be answered by a single biblical verse. Its contribution is to remind readers that information must be examined and that accepting or rejecting a claim carries responsibility.

RECOMMENDATIONS

First, educational institutions should promote AI literacy. Students and researchers should be taught how generative AI works, what its limitations are, and how to evaluate its output. Training should include source verification, fact-checking, critical thinking, and ethical responsibility.

Second, universities should develop clear AI-use policies. Institutional guidelines should explain acceptable uses of AI, requirements for disclosure, and expectations concerning academic honesty.

Third, researchers should verify academic references. Authors should consult the original publications they cite and confirm that the references exist and support the claims attributed to them. AI-generated references should never be accepted without checking.

Fourth, theological schools should strengthen biblical interpretation skills. Students should be trained to examine historical context, literary structure, biblical languages, and relevant scholarly commentaries. AI should assist this process rather than replace it.

Fifth, churches should promote responsible AI use in ministry. Pastors and church leaders should review AI-generated sermons, devotionals, and theological explanations before using them. They should avoid treating technological output as divine revelation.

Sixth, individuals should practise the principle of testing everything. Before accepting or sharing AI-generated information, users should examine its accuracy, reliability, and possible consequences.

Seventh, AI developers and institutions should promote transparency and reliability. AI systems should communicate uncertainty where possible, support verification, and reduce the presentation of unsupported information as established fact.

Finally, further research should investigate AI use in Nigerian universities and theological institutions. Empirical studies could examine how students, lecturers, researchers, and religious leaders use AI and how their practices affect critical thinking, academic integrity, and biblical interpretation.

CONCLUSION

The development of Artificial Intelligence has created new opportunities for education, research, communication, and religious activities. AI can help users obtain information quickly, organise ideas, explain difficult concepts, and explore possible solutions to problems. Nevertheless, these benefits do not remove the need for human discernment.

Research on generative AI has identified concerns about hallucinations, unsupported claims, excessive dependence, and the possibility that users may mistake the appearance of understanding for genuine knowledge. These concerns are particularly important in academic and theological settings, where accuracy, evidence, and responsible interpretation are essential.

This Paper has examined these issues in the light of 1 Thessalonians 5:19–22, especially verse 21, which instructs believers to test everything and hold on to what is good.

Applied to AI, these principles mean that generated information should be checked before it is accepted, published, taught, or used in decision-making. Students should develop their own understanding, researchers should verify their sources, and religious leaders should examine AI-generated interpretations before using them in ministry. The central argument of this study is that technological advancement should not lead to the abandonment of human responsibility. AI can support knowledge production, but users must remain responsible for evaluating information and deciding how it should be applied.

Ultimately, the instruction to "test everything" offers a relevant biblical principle for navigating an age of AI-generated knowledge. Responsible engagement with AI requires more than access to information. It requires wisdom, critical thinking, truthfulness, and the willingness to examine claims before accepting them. When technology is used in this manner, it can support human learning and understanding without replacing the discernment needed for responsible living.

References

Facione, P. A. (1990). Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction. Research findings and recommendations. American Philosophical Association.

Farquhar, S., Kossen, J., Kuhn, L., & Gal, Y. (2024). Detecting hallucinations in large language models using semantic entropy. Nature, 630, 625–630. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07421-0

Green, G. L. (2002). The letters to the Thessalonians. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Ji, Z., Lee, N., Frieske, R., Yu, T., Su, D., Xu, Y., Ishii, E., Bang, Y. J., Madotto, A., & Fung, P. (2023). Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. ACM Computing Surveys, 55(12), Article 248. https://doi.org/10.1145/3571730

Messeri, L., & Crockett, M. J. (2024). Artificial intelligence and illusions of understanding in scientific research. Nature, 627, 49–58. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07146-0

New Revised Standard Version Updated Edition Bible. (2021). National Council of Churches.

Russell, S. J., & Norvig, P. (2021). Artificial intelligence: A modern approach (4th ed.). Pearson.

Sciberras, P. (2013). Discernment in 1 Thessalonians. Acta Theologica, 33(Supplement 17), 151–169. https://doi.org/10.4314/actat.v33i2.8S

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO.

Weima, J. A. D. (2014). 1–2 Thessalonians. Baker Academic.

Zhai, C., Wibowo, S., & Li, L. D. (2024). The effects of over-reliance on AI dialogue systems on students' cognitive abilities: A systematic review. Smart Learning Environments, 11, Article 28. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00316-7