



Harnessing AI-generated videos for Bible teaching: a case study of TikTok content

Mariusz Chrostowski¹

Received: 21 February 2026 / Revised: 12 June 2026 / Accepted: 16 June 2026
© The Author(s) 2026

Abstract

This article presents a qualitative case study of AI-generated biblical videos published on the TikTok account @holyvlogsz. It examines how generative AI (GenAI), in interaction with platform logics, reshapes biblical narratives and reconfigures their theological meaning. A corpus of 25 high-visibility videos ($\geq 50,000$ views) was analyzed, revealing four recurring mechanisms of transformation: psychologization, scenic condensation, functional anachronism, and genre formatting. Reinforced by the aesthetic optimization of generative systems and TikTok's algorithmic curation, these mechanisms shift authority from canonical textual coherence toward affective legibility and visibility-driven logic, while reproducing culturally dominant patterns. The study argues that, for Bible teaching within school-based Christian religious education, such materials should not function as straightforward visualizations of Scripture but as interpretive artifacts requiring critical biblical-hermeneutical and media analysis.

Keywords Bible didactics · Generative AI · TikTok · Religious education

1 Introduction

For some time, TikTok has witnessed a growing trend of short AI-generated videos in which biblical figures—Moses, Mary, Joseph, Jesus Christ, and Peter—address the camera in the style of contemporary vlogs. Some have achieved remarkable visibility, surpassing 30 million views (Goswami, 2025). Narratives from the Old and New Testaments are embedded in a fast-paced format incorporating contemporary language, humor, and dramatic elements optimized for algorithmic circulation. The result is a hybrid form that merges the sacred with viral digital culture, aligning with broader processes of the digitization of religion (Evolvi, 2021) and with the media-saturated everyday life of younger generations shaped by short-form platforms such as TikTok, Instagram Reels, and YouTube Shorts (Hohmann, 2024, p. 91).

✉ Mariusz Chrostowski
mariusz.chrostowski@ku.de

¹ Faculty of Theology, Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, Pater-Philipp-Jeningen-Platz 6, 85072 Eichstätt, Germany

At the same time, the rapid development of GenAI tools (ChatGPT, DALL-E, and video models such as Sora 2 Pro and Veo 3) has lowered the threshold for audiovisual production. Biblical texts can be visualized and scenes reconstructed, potentially facilitating access for young audiences less inclined to engage with printed Bibles (Hertlein, 2021, p. 91). Yet this development entails epistemological and theological implications. TikTok's algorithmic logic privileges brevity, emotional intensity, and surprise (Chalfant, 2025), blurring boundaries between interpretation, satire, and misinformation, while responsibility for content—sometimes reproducing stereotypes and prejudices (Zhang et al., 2025)—becomes diffuse. As with deepfakes (Hancock & Bailenson, 2021), viewers may not distinguish between canonical elements and AI-generated additions that appear authentic. Although new media—from Bible translations and illustrations to film adaptations (Hearon & Ruge-Jones, 2009)—have long sparked debates about inculturation and trivialization, GenAI introduces a distinct situation: the medium does not merely transmit or interpret content; it generates it. In doing so, it reconfigures the relationship between text, interpreter, and audience. The issue therefore concerns not only communicative form but also the status of representation, authority, and credibility from the perspective of Christian faith (Chrostowski & Najda, 2025a, 2025b).

Against this backdrop, the present article approaches the phenomenon as a qualitative case study of selected AI-generated TikTok videos related to biblical content. It aims to critically assess both their potential and their limitations for biblical teaching. The article outlines the aims of biblical teaching, the role of audiovisual and AI-generated media, and TikTok as a space for informal biblical learning (2), presents the methodology (3), discusses findings (4), reflects on limitations (5), and concludes with recommendations for further research (6).

2 Theoretical background

Before addressing audiovisual media, AI-generated content, and TikTok as a space for biblical learning, it is necessary to outline briefly the aims and central trajectories of Bible didactics. This ensures that the subsequent analysis remains embedded within the broader framework of religious educational processes.

2.1 Concepts and objectives of Bible didactics

According to Mirjam Schambeck (2026), the principal approaches in Bible didactics include, first, hermeneutical models of textual engagement developed in Protestant theology by Klaus Berg (1993) and Ing Baldermann (1996), and in Catholic theology by Franz W. Niehl (2006). These approaches are strongly text-centered. More recent concepts, however, shift the focus toward students as active constructors of meaning (Schambeck, 2026, p. 1). This includes reception-aesthetic and developmental models (Fricke, 2005; Theis, 2001), the deconstructivist approach (Kropač, 2003), and the biblical-theological approach (Schambeck, 2009). At the same time, reflection on the contemporary formative potential of biblical texts has been further developed (Rendle, 2013)), the findings of biblical didactics have been systematized (Zimmermann & Zimmermann, 2018), and its lines of development have been historically reconstructed (Porzelt, 2012). Nevertheless, empirical research on Bible reading among children and adolescents remains limited (Gennerich & Zimmermann, 2020).

A shared concern across these approaches is to make biblical texts accessible in ways that enable contemporary readers to adopt a responsible stance toward the Christian faith, to justify it critically, and to discover new perspectives for understanding God, the world, and the human condition (Schambeck, 2026, p. 1). Within this framework, the Bible functions both as a “holy book”—“the Word of God in human words” (Berg, 2017, p. 17)—and as a cultural artifact and religious document. From an educational perspective, three dimensions are typically distinguished: learning about the Bible (acquisition of general and religious knowledge), learning with the Bible (development of interpretative, religious, and communicative competences), and learning from the Bible (reflection on the functioning and significance of religious narratives) (Steinkühler, 2019, pp. 1–2). In the context of school-based religious education, this entails fostering understanding and critical evaluation of biblical content without presupposing personal faith, prohibiting indoctrination, and requiring the presentation of controversial perspectives (Christensen & Grammes, 2020). In this sense, school-based religious education is understood here as Christian religious education under educational conditions: it remains related to theological traditions, but is not reducible to catechetical transmission; rather, it aims to enable pupils to understand, interpret, and judge religious texts and representations in a pedagogically responsible way (Schweitzer, 2023). The reference to Catholic and Protestant traditions is therefore limited to the Bible-didactical approaches cited above: despite their different denominational locations, they share the expectation that biblical narratives are to be interpreted as historically mediated, intertextually connected, and theologically significant texts, not as freely detachable material for visual or affective reuse (Schambeck, 2026).

Against this backdrop, it becomes necessary to examine the role of audiovisual media—and particularly AI-generated content—in relation to these educational aims.

2.2 Audiovisual media and AI-generated content in Bible teaching

In the context of Bible teaching, audiovisual media—often subsumed under the term “film”—encompass a broad spectrum of formats, ranging from feature films and documentaries to streaming miniseries and short-form content on social media platforms (Hohmann, 2024, p. 91). In media studies, such formats are understood as technical and artistic modes of expression that integrate image, sound, and narrative into coherent communicative worlds. From a biblical-hermeneutical perspective, film constitutes a distinct cultural medium with its own language of meaning (Rindge et al., 2010, pp. 145–147), constructing a specific “universe of discourse” (Alkier, 2010, p. 89) in which the meaning of biblical content is embedded within the world it presents (Willems, 2012, pp. 145–146). Audiovisual media therefore function not merely as illustrations but as interpretations of biblical tradition. They typically engage, for instance, with the culturally mediated figure of “Jesus Christ” rather than the “historical Jesus” (Willems, 2012, pp. 144–145).

Within Bible teaching, film operates as a narrative commentary on the biblical text. It can initiate a shift in perspective and even a “reversal” of the hermeneutical direction—from contemporary visual representation back to the text itself (Rindge et al., 2010, p. 141). This underlies the methodological distinction between “Bible and Film” and “Bible through Film” (Rindge et al., 2010, p. 145): film should first be interpreted as an autonomous medium before being related to Scripture. Film adaptations may thus be examined in terms of media “exegesis,” uncovering narrative condensations, interpretive emphases, and staging strategies. Given the synesthetic structure of the medium, analysis must attend not only to narrative but also to visual and auditory dimensions (Zwick, 2018). At the same

time, film fosters emotional engagement and may contribute to processes of religious identity formation (Hohmann, 2024). The tension between realism and staging further opens a space for reflection on the ontological status of biblical narratives (Willems, 2012) and situates film work within the broader development of visual literacy and media competence (Hohmann, 2024).

Setting this context, AI-generated content extends beyond video to include text-to-image systems, text-to-video applications, chatbots, and speech synthesis (Chrostowski, 2023; Chrostowski & Najda, 2025a, 2025b; Papakostas, 2026). The multimodal character of GenAI necessitates institutional procedures for validation and the assessment of pedagogical adequacy (UNESCO, 2023), including in explicitly religious contexts. Recent empirical studies among religious education teachers in Germany and Poland show that attitudes toward GenAI are marked by ambivalence: teachers recognize its pedagogical potential, but also emphasize risks concerning reliability, theological adequacy, professional responsibility, and the need for critical guidance (Chrostowski & Małosa, 2025; Małosa & Chrostowski, 2026). From a didactic perspective, this entails a shift from mere reception toward processes of variation, critical selection, and iterative refinement—often described as a logic of co-creation rather than delegation (Gal-Or, 2025). Analyses of AI-generated products in biblical education highlight both opportunities and limitations. On the one hand, such tools may enhance accessibility and stimulate the imagination; on the other, they risk flattening symbolic depth, introducing anachronisms, and reproducing dominant Western cultural codes (Chrostowski & Najda, 2025b, pp. 7–11). Because these systems generate outputs probabilistically rather than according to criteria of historical or theological truth, the possibility of error and so-called hallucination requires careful verification (Ferrara, 2023) and sustained hermeneutical reflection on the part of users (Lima et al., 2025). GenAI thus represents not simply another medium but an infrastructural framework for the production and circulation of religious representations.

2.3 TikTok as a medium for Bible learning

If GenAI operates within real cultural circulation, its analysis must account for the platform environment in which it is embedded. TikTok functions as an algorithmically curated space of informal learning, where visibility depends on interactive signals and personalized distribution mechanisms (Zhou, 2024). Reception is shaped by exposure-driven dynamics, and the platform privileges short, emotionally charged, and easily remixable formats (Baumann et al., 2026). Religious content is therefore filtered, amplified, or marginalized according to the logic of algorithmic recommendation, while remaining ephemeral in its circulation (Burkett, 2025). Within this environment, the Bible appears as fragmented and reconfigured material. Users encounter not only biblical narratives but also their cultural recirculation and the construction of digital authority (Phillips, 2019). At the same time, young users primarily perceive TikTok as a space for entertainment and are aware of the risks of misinformation (Alatassi et al., 2025). Although the format lends itself to micro- and nano-learning, it also entails the danger of superficial engagement and reliance on popularity metrics as indicators of credibility (Ghosh & Figueroa, 2023; Khlaif & Salha, 2021). Biblical content thus serves functions of visibility and self-branding, and the pressure to monetize contributes to its commodification (Morla, 2024). Consequently, biblical teaching must take into account the transformed conditions of exposure and distribution that shape religious communication on digital platforms. AI-generated TikTok content should not be treated as a source of authoritative knowledge but as material for

critical analysis (Chrostowski, 2024). In this context, the teacher assumes a moderating role, safeguarding historical, literary, and theological criteria, and fostering the capacity to navigate “uncertainty” (Lindner, 2023, p. 61) within digital religion through evidence-based reflection.

3 Method

In light of the theoretical framework outlined above, a methodological approach is required to empirically investigate how AI-generated biblical videos function on TikTok and what implications they hold for Bible teaching.

3.1 Research design and questions

This study adopts a qualitative case study design focusing on the publicly accessible TikTok account @holyvlogsz. The selection of this account is justified, first, by its consistent publication of AI-generated videos featuring biblical characters and narratives, and second, by its comparatively high visibility and engagement (as of February 19, 2026: 433.4 K followers and 9.7 M likes), indicating substantial reach. Although the creator remains anonymous and does not articulate an explicit mission statement, the account exemplifies a broader trend initiated in 2023 by the channel @theaibleofficial. Its rapid growth in 2025 coincides with technological advances in next-generation synthetic video tools. Videos appear to be produced with advanced text-to-video models (e.g., Sora 2 Pro and Google Veo 3), as indicated by technological hashtags such as #sora2 and #veo3. The account thus illustrates a radical lowering of the threshold for audiovisual production. Scripts are typically generated using large language models (LLMs), such as ChatGPT or Google Gemini, based on carefully constructed prompts.

The case study is combined with a qualitative analysis of audiovisual material. The analytical procedure was adapted to the specific affordances of short-form mobile video on social media (Manicki, 2025) and draws on established methodologies for researching TikTok content (Li et al., 2021). Consideration was also given to the platform’s memetic and imitative dynamics (Tereszkiewicz, 2022; Vizcaíno-Verdú & Jaramillo-Dent, 2023). The concept of “playability” (Divon & Ebbrecht-Hartmann, 2025) serves as a contextual lens rather than a primary analytical category. The central focus of the study is the potential for biblical and didactic engagement with the analyzed material.

The following research questions guide the analysis:

1. How are biblical scenes represented in AI-generated videos on the @holyvlogsz account, and to what extent do these representations transform the narrative structure and theological meaning of the source texts?
2. Which formal and media-specific features of the analyzed videos (e.g., brevity, vlog aesthetics, personalized narration, emotionalization) shape the reception of biblical content and contribute to the dissemination of bias through mechanisms of visual legibility?
3. How might these videos be integrated into school-based Christian religious education as material for critical biblical and media-hermeneutical learning, and which conditions and limitations must be considered when incorporating them into such educational settings?

3.2 Data collection and sampling

Data collection followed established standards in interdisciplinary TikTok content research (Divon & Ebbrecht-Hartmann, 2025; Li et al., 2021). The dataset comprised all publicly available videos on the @holyvlogsz account at the time of sample freezing (February 19, 2026), resulting in $n=49$. The unit of analysis was the individual video post. For each item, the audiovisual content, caption, and hashtags were archived, and basic engagement metrics (views, likes, comments, shares) were recorded. These indicators serve descriptive and sampling purposes rather than functioning as statistically analyzed quantitative variables.

In a first step, a thematic filter was applied: only videos that reconstruct, adapt, or reinterpret specific biblical narratives and characters in relation to the canonical text were retained. Thirteen videos were excluded because they were dialogical or polemical, speculative-actualizing, or primarily motivational in nature—for example: “What If Jesus Lived Today? | The Gym...,” “Jesus Advice for 2026...,” “If Heaven Had a Party?,” “Jesus vs Atheists | Part 6...,” “30 Atheists Question Jesus | Part 3...,” “1 Jesus vs 30 Atheists | Part 1...,” “Jesus Ranks His Disciples...,” and “What Would Jesus Say About Tattoos?” Following this step, $n=36$ videos remained. Subsequently, purposive sampling (Tajik et al., 2025) was employed with a focus on high visibility. A threshold of $\geq 50,000$ views was defined as a pragmatic indicator of exceeding niche-level reception (Divon & Ebbrecht-Hartmann, 2025). This threshold functioned as a technical criterion to reduce the corpus to materials demonstrating stable, above-chance exposure, while ensuring internal comparability among the selected cases. It does not imply a judgment of quality, impact, or theological validity, but rather serves as an operational narrowing of the dataset within a single account, enabling in-depth qualitative analysis while maintaining methodological coherence.

This criterion was met by $n=25$ videos, which constitute the final analytical corpus. A full list of the selected videos, including metadata, is provided in Table 1; direct links are included in the reference list.

To make the empirical material accessible before the discussion and analysis, three representative clips are briefly introduced here as orienting examples; direct links to the entire corpus are provided in the reference list:

- V16 (“If Jesus had an iPhone...”): <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogsz/video/7513583185318530335>
- V17 (“If Moses had an iPhone...”): <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogsz/video/7512946044645412127>
- V23 (“If Mary had an iPhone...”): <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogsz/video/7510656011473063198>

V16 reworks the wedding at Cana (John 2:1–12) as a cheerful selfie-style miracle vlog. Jesus is represented as a young, attractive, light-skinned, cinematically styled male figure with long dark hair, a short beard, a white robe, and a red sash; Mary appears beside him in a blue head covering. The visual setting is warm, polished, and celebratory, with golden light, smooth faces, communal dancing, and a Mediterranean village atmosphere. The miracle is therefore rendered less as a Johannine “sign” within the theological structure of the Gospel (John 2:11) and more as an affectively legible moment of surprise, hospitality, and festive abundance. V17 condenses the Exodus narrative

Table 1 Corpus overview of analysed videos

ID	Title (Caption)	Views	Likes	Comments	Shares	Hashtags (shortened)
V1	If the Bible was filmed like TikTok...	91.4 K	8.7 K	179	1.5 K	#jesus #biblical #vlog #ai #sora2
V2	What if News Existed in Biblical Times?	103.5 K	8.9 K	244	691	#hope #biblical #jesus #news #faith
V3	If Esther had an iPhone...	71.6 K	7.1 K	66	451	#hope #biblical #jesus #vlog #esther
V4	If Satan had an iPhone...	93 K	7.6 K	320	1.2 K	#hope #biblical #jesus #satanism #vlog
V5	If David went on a Podcast...	79.1 K	7.2 K	117	563	#hope #jesus #biblical #podcast #david#goliath #faith
V6	If Noah went on a Podcast...	192.2 K	17.8 K	235	2.3 K	#hope #jesus #biblical #podcast #faith #noah #ark
V7	If Jesus went on a Podcast...	382.6 K	35.6 K	730	4.9 K	#hope #jesus #biblical #podcast #faith #money
V8	What if Judas went on a Podcast...	101 K	7 K	153	841	#hope #jesus #judas #biblical #podcast #faith
V9	If the Bible had street interviews...	53.5 K	3.4 K	40	277	#hope #jesus #faith #biblical #moses #vlog
V10	If Peter had an iPhone...	54 K	4 K	50	260	#hope #jesus #faith #biblical #peter #vlog
V11	If Ruth was an influencer...	102.8 K	8.3 K	99	581	#hope #jesus #faith #biblical #ruth #vlog
V12	If Cain and Abel were influencers...	1.8 M	170.2 K	1.2 K	16.2 K	#hope #jesus #faith #biblical #cain #mandabel #vlog
V13	If Abraham was an Influencer...	170.4 K	13.4 K	216	1.6 K	#hope #jesus #faith #abraham #isaac #vlog #biblical
V14	If Goliath had an iPhone...	137 K	9 K	145	688	#hope #jesus #faith #goliath #vlog
V15	If Pharaoh had an iPhone...	3 M	338.9 K	2.6 K	41.1 K	#hope #jesus #faith #pharaoh #moses #vlog
V16	If Jesus had an iPhone...	6.4 M	694 K	8.3 K	152.1 K	#hope #jesus #faith #wine #vlog #biblical #veo3
V17	If Moses had an iPhone...	30.7 M	3.7 M	32.3 K	892.6 K	#hope #jesus #faith #moses #vlog #biblical #veo3
V18	If Lot's Wife had an iPhone...	1.8 M	179.9 K	1.9 K	25.3 K	#hope #jesus #faith #biblical #lotswife #vlog #veo3
V19	If Judas had an iPhone...	1.5 M	131 K	2.4 K	28.4 K	#hope #jesus #faith #biblical #judas #vlog #veo3
V20	If Noah had an iPhone...	2.9 M	290.6 K	3.1 K	71.5 K	#hope #jesus #faith #biblical #noah #ark #veo3
V21	If Adam and Eve had an iPhone...	996.8 K	87.7 K	3 K	16.2 K	#hope #jesus #faith #biblical #adam #eve #veo3
V22	If Jonah had an iPhone...	5.3 M	751.5 K	6.3 K	116 K	#hope #jesus #faith #biblical #jonah #veo3
V23	If Mary had an iPhone...	7.4 M	1.2 M	8.3 K	278.2 K	#hope #jesus #faith #mary #biblical #veo3
V24	If Daniel had an iPhone...	8.9 M	1.4 M	10.3 K	273.4 K	#hope #jesus #faith #daniel #lion #ionsden #biblical
V25	If David had an iPhone...	3 M	409.5 K	4.3 K	55.2 K	#hope #jesus #faith #david #goliath #biblical #veo3

(especially Exod 5–14; Exod 14:5–31) into a first-person crisis and rescue sequence. Moses is depicted as a rugged, muscular, heroic male figure with long hair, a full beard, a headband, and a rough linen garment; the surrounding male figures are similarly coded through age, seriousness, and desert hardship. The aesthetic moves from monumental Egyptian architecture and harsh desert light to dark, dramatic, almost blockbuster-like scenes of danger, water, and deliverance. In this format, the theology of liberation and covenantal promise (Exod 6:6–8) is translated into an intense spectacle of fear, action, and rescue. V23 draws on the infancy narratives, especially the annunciation and birth traditions (Luke 1:26–38; Luke 2:1–20; cf. Matt 1:18–25), and reframes them through a maternal vlog aesthetic. Mary is represented as very young, light-skinned, and idealized, with long wavy hair, soft facial features, and later a beige head covering; Joseph appears as a gentle, dark-haired, bearded companion within an intimate family scene. The clip uses soft light, close-ups, pregnancy imagery, warm candlelit Nativity scenes, and idealized expressions of wonder and tenderness, producing the impression of private family documentation rather than theological narration. Across the three examples, biblical narratives are made recognizable through first-person address, cinematic realism, emotional intensification, idealized bodies and faces, and platform-compatible visual condensation.

3.3 Data analysis

The analysis was conducted as a qualitative examination of audiovisual content, with methodological adjustments reflecting TikTok’s character as a memetic and interactive platform (Vizcaíno-Verdú & Jaramillo-Dent, 2023). In methodological terms, the study treats the @holyvlogsz account as a bounded case rather than as a representative sample of AI-generated biblical content on TikTok; the aim is to examine how one highly visible account combines biblical narration, generative audiovisual production, and platform-specific formatting (Yin, 2018). AI-generated videos were therefore approached as a contemporary form of audiovisual biblical adaptation: they continue older practices of visualizing and dramatizing biblical scenes, but differ through prompt-based generation, serial production templates, synthetic realism, and algorithmically optimized circulation. The procedure was iterative and applied systematically to each video across three analytical dimensions aligned with the research questions:

1. *Analysis of biblical representation* This dimension examined the relationship to the biblical source text (specific passages and characters), narrative abbreviations, anachronisms, and potential theological transformations. Particular attention was given to the degree of narrative personalization. The predominance of single-character self-presentation—typical of vlog formats and conducive to subjectivization and psychologization—was explicitly considered (Manicki, 2025). Each video was assigned to the relevant biblical passage(s), allowing omissions, additions, shifts in narrative focus, and changes in theological emphasis to be traced more precisely.
2. *Analysis of media form* This dimension focused on narrative condensation, emotionalization, and the audiovisual configuration (image–sound–subtitles), as well as the use of hashtags and alignment with platform aesthetics. Mechanisms of visual legibility were examined, including potential bias (e.g., aestheticization or beauty bias, phenotypic coding, gender role stereotypes, and the dominance of the “narrator-face”). This included attention to how biblical figures were visually rendered through phenotype, age,

attractiveness, clothing, facial expression, bodily presentation, and gender coding, since such features shape the recognizability and credibility of AI-generated religious images. The guiding question was whether the formal design fosters a deeper engagement with the biblical text or instead promotes simplification and fragmentation (Chrostowski & Najda, 2025b; Tereszkievicz, 2022; Vizcaíno-Verdú & Jaramillo-Dent, 2023).

3. *Didactic interpretation* The findings were embedded within the framework of biblical didactics to assess both the potential and the limitations of integrating such materials into religious education (Schambeck, 2026; Zimmermann & Zimmermann, 2018). This step asked whether the videos can function as material for critical biblical and media-hermeneutical learning, rather than as straightforward visualizations of Scripture.

To avoid vagueness in the analytical procedure, each video was examined in three complete viewing passes. The initial viewing served to identify narrative structure and dominant representational strategies. A second viewing compared the video with the relevant biblical passage(s), focusing on omissions, additions, anachronisms, narrative shifts, and possible theological transformations. A third viewing concentrated on the media layer, including camera perspective, lighting, sound, subtitles, bodily and facial presentation, hashtags, and visual markers of bias or recognizability. Analytical notes were recorded in a matrix including video ID, biblical reference, narrative focus, omissions and additions, genre format, affective framing, visual coding, metadata, and didactic relevance.

The analytical categories were developed through a combined deductive and inductive procedure, following principles of qualitative content analysis (Mayring, 2014; Schreier, 2012). The three main dimensions—biblical representation, media form, and didactic interpretation—were derived deductively from the research questions and theoretical framework. Within these dimensions, recurring observations were then compared across the corpus and refined inductively. Patterns were retained as analytical categories when they appeared in several videos and clarified how biblical text, audiovisual form, and platform logic interacted. This process led to the four categories used in the findings: psychologization, scenic condensation, functional anachronism, and genre formatting. These categories are not statistical variables, but interpretive constructs describing recurring mechanisms of narrative and theological transformation within the selected case. This iterative process supported the transparent refinement and consistent application of analytical categories across the entire corpus (n = 25).

4 Key findings and discussion

Rather than offering a sequential description, the analysis is structured around recurring patterns in the representation of biblical narratives (4.1), the media form of AI-generated videos within TikTok's platform logic (4.2), and the resulting implications for biblical teaching (4.3).

4.1 Recurring patterns in the representation of biblical narratives

The corpus reveals a consistent compositional model in relation to the biblical text. AI-generated video does not treat Scripture as a canonical narrative characterized by internal theological coherence (Collins & Oller, 2000). Instead, it approaches it as a repository of episodes with high visual and affective potential. The selected pericopes lend themselves to

dramatic condensation, rapid intertextual recognition, and compelling short-form scenes. Equally significant are omissions: extended discursive passages, sustained theological argumentation, and processual salvation-historical dynamics. This pattern is particularly pronounced in videos drawing on Old Testament narratives.

4.1.1 The dominance of Old Testament narratives: the structure of extreme situations

The Old Testament passages (Torah, historical books, prophetic books) largely follow one pattern: action in extreme situations. The selection focuses on danger, conflict, or spectacular rescue, reducing complex theological content to visually evocative scenes readily condensed into short videos. Exodus (Exod 5–14) is rewritten as emblematic images: plagues (Exod 7–12), pursuit (Exod 14:5–9), and Red Sea crossing (Exod 14:21–31). Across variants—V9 (vox pop), V15 (Pharaoh’s vlog), and V17 (Moses’ vlog)—the theology of liberation (Exod 6:6–8) is compressed into the climactic parting of the waters (Exod 14:21–22). AI-generated video reinforces this by privileging “powerful shots,” shifting from theological narrative toward experiential identification with protagonists.

A similar mechanism applies to the flood (Gen 6–9). V6 (Noah’s podcast) and V20 (ark vlog) foreground isolation, fatigue, and survival, marginalizing covenant theology (Gen 9:8–17). Generative images and voices enhance existential “realism,” again shifting emphasis from theology to experience. The same reduction occurs in shorter passages: Jonah (Jonah 1–2; V22) is confined to the fish episode (Jonah 2:1), omitting the mission (Jonah 3); Daniel (Dan 6; V24) is reduced to a single night of danger (Dan 6:17–23) without broader context; Lot’s wife (Gen 19:26; V18) becomes a purely visual climax, detached from moral-theological warning. The most striking example is David and Goliath (1 Sam 17), repeated in several variants (V5, V14, V25; briefly in V2), yet consistently centered on the duel (1 Sam 17:49–51). Contexts such as anointing (1 Sam 16), political dynamics, and theological interpretation of victory are removed; the canonical narrative is replaced by an individualized triumph structure. This comparable principle applies to entire books: Esther (Esth 1–10; V3) is reduced to personal risk (Esth 4:16), Ruth (Ruth 1–4; V11) to loyalty (Ruth 1:16–17), marginalizing genealogical significance (Ruth 4:18–22). Foundational pericopes such as Eden (Gen 3; V21) and Cain and Abel (Gen 4; V2, V12) are rewritten through rivalry and visibility, weakening themes of sin and responsibility. In its most extreme form, the Bible becomes a montage of recognizable scenes (V1). Overall, high-intensity episodes dominate—immediately recognizable, requiring little sustained theological reflection, and “materializable” through generative audiovisuality (face, expressions, background, voice) in ~60 s. The same model applies, on a smaller scale, to the New Testament.

4.1.2 New Testament: reduction to iconic scenes

New Testament narratives likewise exclude extended discursive passages (e.g., Matt 5–7; the parables in Matt 13; the polemical discourse in John 8). Instead, scenes with a clearly defined dramatic structure are selected. Jesus appears as a miracle worker (Cana in Galilee, John 2:1–12; V16—vlog/tutorial), as a partner in existential dialogue (the rich young man, Matt 19:16–30; Zacchaeus, Luke 19:1–10; V7—podcast), or as an agent intervening in crisis situations (Matt 14:22–33; Acts 12:1–19; V10 – Peter’s vlog). Mary (Luke 1–2; Matt 1–2; V23—mom vlog) is framed primarily through the lens of motherhood, and the story of Judas (Matt 26; Mark 14; Luke 22; John 13 and 18; V8 and V19) undergoes marked

psychologization or is reframed within a “transactional” logic. The New Testament thus functions, analogously to the Old Testament, as a collection of vivid scenes rather than as a sustained sequence of theological arguments. Doctrinal, theological, and ecclesiological dimensions are attenuated, while the affective dimension is amplified and further intensified. AI-generated video enhances this tendency by optimizing facial expressions, lighting, and first-person narration through generative techniques, making affect a privileged vehicle of meaning (Zhang, 2025).

4.1.3 Transformative mechanisms of biblical narratives

Based on the above observations, four consistent mechanisms can be identified through which biblical content is transformed into AI-generated videos on TikTok:

- a) *Psychologization* A shift from divine action to the protagonist’s emotional experience (V5, V6, V20, V23). This category applies when (1) narration is consistently first-person self-expression (vlog/podcast/selfie monologue), (2) affect carries meaning, and (3) God’s agency is marginalized or only indirectly implied. This aligns with platform logics privileging rapid affective entry and first-person narration. AI-generated video intensifies it via simulated face-to-face interaction (selfie aesthetics), making emotion a basic unit of credibility. In terms of “affective publics” (Papacharissi, 2016), emotion organizes both narrative and circulation, enabling identification at the expense of sustained theological development.
- b) *Scenic condensation* Reduction to a single climactic moment (e.g., Gen 22; V13). This reflects platformization of cultural production (Nieborg & Poell, 2018), incentivizing modular, recirculable content. Condensation “crops the canon” to maximum recognizability in minimal time; in TikTok’s ecosystem it supports replication in appealing variants rather than linear continuity (Vizcaíno-Verdú & Jaramillo-Dent, 2023).
- c) *Functional anachronism* Contemporary codes (Google Maps, ratings, transactional logic; V16, V17, V19) operate as semantic translation, reframing events (Cana, Exodus, Judas) in the language of tools, rankings, and measurable outcomes—categories with strong cognitive authority. Within platform logic, this aligns with datafication: an event becomes “real” insofar as it can be expressed through metrics (van Dijck & Poell, 2013). Generative realism strengthens plausibility, while anachronism functions as a memetic marker enabling recognition and variation (Vizcaíno-Verdú & Jaramillo-Dent, 2023).
- d) *Genre formatting* Narrative structure is subordinated to vlog/podcast/news/vox pop conventions (V2–V25). The text’s hermeneutics yields to format performativity: the genre dictates how the pericope must “function” (hook–emotion–punchline). Platform logics shape content selection (Hase et al., 2023); creators optimize for recommendation, and algorithms amplify high-engagement formats. In the corpus, genre formatting also supports generative compatibility: characters and scenes are designed for serial AI production within templates (Kang & Lou, 2022).

Together, these mechanisms shift authority from institutional exegesis toward algorithmically amplified visibility and audience-centered experience. Consequences include (1) weakening traditional interpretive authority (Evolvi, 2021), (2) stabilizing culturally dominant readings through AI (Chrostowski & Najda, 2025a, 2025b), and (3) functional sacralization of platform logic, where reach can be read as religious effectiveness (Reinis & Laughlin, 2025).

4.2 Analysis of the media form of AI-generated video within the logic of the TikTok platform

Building on these findings, “form” does not refer merely to the visual layer but to a comprehensive infrastructure of meaning aligned with platform logic. This infrastructure operates as a pre-hermeneutic mechanism that shifts interpretive authority toward visual credibility even before explicit content reflection. It is this credibility—rather than theological coherence or fidelity to the canon—that shapes what can be articulated and how (Chrostowski & Najda, 2025b; Fehr et al., 2026). The following subsections specify how this infrastructure manifests in production aesthetics and algorithmic operation, bias as visual legibility, and hashtag ecologies and circulation.

4.2.1 Production aesthetics and algorithms

In contemporary digital production, algorithmic editing templates dominate, alongside increasingly explicit markers of GenAI. Tools such as CapCut or Final Cut promote seriality and aesthetic standardization. The most prominent videos combine visual monumentalization with selfie conventions, producing a hybrid of “epic hero” and “influencer”. Heroization is reinforced through systematic rejuvenation and aesthetic enhancement—even where the biblical text stresses ambivalence or weakness (cf. Sun et al., 2024). In this setting, attractiveness functions as a credibility cue. A similar mechanism shapes antagonists: their optimization weakens normative unambiguity and contributes to ethical polarization.

TikTok operates as a formatting device: its algorithm rewards aesthetically coherent, emotionally intense, and reproducible content. Higher perceptual realism correlates with higher perceived credibility (Jin et al., 2025). The combination of realistic imagery and synthetic voice also reshapes the structure of testimony: technical “lisse” may be read as an indicator of truth (Chion, 2019), with epistemic consequences in synthetic media environments.

4.2.2 Bias as a mechanism of visual readability

Across the corpus, several systemic biases optimize readability and relatability in short-form video:

- a) *Beauty bias/aestheticization* Representations are idealized (symmetry, smooth skin, styled costumes, cinematic lighting). Even catastrophes retain visual appeal. This goes beyond neutral aestheticization: credibility and sanctity become coded through attractiveness, youthfulness, and media charisma, shifting from textual hermeneutics to a hermeneutics of impression. In AI-generated content, this is structurally embedded: image generation statistically favors culturally recognizable, aesthetically coherent representations, often treated as conditions of legibility and credibility (Manovich, 2018). Diffusion-model research indicates reinforcement of dominant norms alongside attempts to audit and correct them (e.g., Fair Diffusion; Friedrich et al., 2025).
- b) *Eurocentric/phenotypic bias* Depictions of Jesus (V1, V7, V16) stabilize a relatively light complexion and features aligned with the Western “cinematic Christ”. Beyond historical realism, Christology becomes aesthetically mediated, and “truth” and “holiness” are rendered as functions of appearance. This draws on the long-standing consolida-

tion of a white, European Jesus within the religious imaginary (Blum & Harvey, 2012; Chrostowski & Najda, 2025a, 2025b). Generative models reproduce these patterns, privileging Eurocentric traits and indirectly producing unequal performance quality across diverse user groups (Doh et al., 2025).

- c) *Gender bias* Formatting follows a binary matrix (“woman = relationality/affect/aesthetics”; “man = action/agency/leadership”). Rather than modernizing figures, it rewrites theological tensions into stereotypical scripts, stabilizing culturally privileged interpretations (Hamidieh et al., 2024). In AI video regimes, such stereotypes are reproduced at the input level through statistically dominant training-data patterns. Audits distinguish representational bias (who is absent) from presentational bias (how groups are depicted), enabling more precise visual critique (Sun et al., 2024).
- d) *Platform bias* Close-ups, highly legible facial expressions, direct eye contact, and exposed emotion dominate. This aesthetic fosters homogenization and privileges what is immediately recognizable within the interface. The literature frames this as the “algorithmized self”: self-presentation co-shaped by metrics and recommendation systems, with identification algorithmically optimized (Bhandari & Bimo, 2022).

Taken together, these biases are constitutive elements of deep mediatization, not peripheral additions. Within platform ecosystems, complex theological narratives are rewritten into visually optimized images in which aestheticization, phenotypic homogenization, gender stereotyping, and affect-driven legibility shape religious imagination. Visual appeal thus becomes an epistemic condition of credibility, reconfiguring the relation between the “sacred” and the visually consumable (Nieborg & Poell, 2018).

4.2.3 Hashtag ecology and modes of circulation

Despite the predominance of Old Testament passages, most videos are tagged #jesus and #hope. Texts such as Exodus 14, Daniel 6, and Jonah 2 thereby undergo a secondary Christological reframing: the Old Testament is integrated into a unified, affectively oriented semantics of faith and hope. This entails recontextualization in which platform logic precedes exegetical logic. Hashtags function infrastructurally: they not only classify content but construct a recognizable religious niche and position material within recommendation pathways. Christological indexing should therefore be read primarily as a visibility strategy rather than only as a theological choice. An “ecology of hashtags” (#jesus, #hope, #biblical, #faith) emerges in which meaning is co-produced by metadata, algorithmic architecture, and reception (Morla, 2024; Reinis & Laughlin, 2025). Technological hashtags (#sora2, #veo3) signal generativity and enhance infrastructural appeal.

Regarding engagement—without detailed analysis—two circulation modes can be distinguished: (1) viral circulation, optimized for spectacle and a strong affective “hook”, and (2) discussion-based circulation, generating more sustained comment exchange in morally ambivalent contexts. In both, visibility is driven by attention-economy compatibility rather than canonical coherence (Nieborg & Poell, 2018). Platform infrastructure thus co-shapes the theological profile, privileging inspirational-Christological readings and fragments translatable into an affectively effective micro-format (Bhandari & Bimo, 2022). This dynamic exemplifies platform framing of religion, where algorithmic visibility reconfigures conditions for theological discourse (Reinis & Laughlin, 2025).

4.3 Didactic implications

The analysis carries significant implications for biblical teaching engaging AI-generated TikTok videos. The decisive shift concerns not methods but the conceptualization of teaching material itself. Such videos should not function as visual “aids” to Scripture but as interpretive forms requiring simultaneous attention to content, form, and media conditions of production and circulation. The central didactic question is therefore not adaptive accuracy but constructive logic: what vision of God, the human person, and the world is generated by a given narrative form, and which hermeneutical competences can be cultivated through its analysis (Pollefeyt, 2020; Schambeck, 2026). AI-generated videos may serve as a “laboratory” of mediated meaning, enabling critical examination of how genre, rhythm, image, and affect shape signification. Teaching thus extends the classic triad of text–context–biography (Pollefeyt, 2020) to include reflection on media conditions. The aim is critical appropriation: students must learn to recognize how biblical meaning is reconfigured under platform-mediated epistemic conditions.

4.3.1 Didactic potential: from a hermeneutics of suspicion to a hermeneutics of engagement

The educational value of AI-generated videos lies not in their visual appeal but in their status as interpretive constructions. They render visible the mechanisms of meaning production within algorithmic culture. Students are thus prompted to ask not only what is presented, but how, why, and with what implications (Kirchschlaeger, 2025). The collision between sacred content and entertainment-driven format generates interpretive dissonance (Wolf, 2021), exposing the tension between the logic of revelation and the logic of platform visibility. Methodologically, this analysis can begin with Ricoeur’s hermeneutics of suspicion and move toward a hermeneutics of regained meaning through renewed engagement with the canonical text. Suspicion fulfills a critical-epistemic function; engagement assumes a formative one, in which interpretation becomes a responsible dialogue with tradition (Gadamer, 1984).

Within this framework, it must be acknowledged that the micro-format intensifies selectivity: highlighting certain elements necessarily entails the omission of others, in accordance with the logic of attention retention (Khlaif & Salha, 2021). Didactically, this can be operationalized through structured analysis: perceptual description, identification of additions, and examination of omissions in relation to the pericope. Systematic comparison with the biblical text according to explicit criteria—semantic coherence, theological shifts, reduction of complexity, narrative supplementation—strengthens exegetical competence (Chrostowski & Najda, 2025a). A central methodological principle remains the hermeneutical primacy of the canonical text over its algorithmic simulation. AI may support learning through personalization and cognitive load reduction (Adiyono et al., 2025), but only within a framework of guided scaffolding; otherwise, it risks generating an illusion of competence and prematurely truncating the interpretive process (Martin et al., 2025).

The anthropological dimension further deepens the analysis. Within the TikTok environment, young users negotiate identity and frameworks of meaning (Burkett, 2025; Hohmann, 2024). AI-generated videos thus become sites in which implicit anthropologies and theologies are performed and stabilized. The question of which vision of the human person and of God is encoded in these representations opens space for existential-theological differentiation. Empirical research on Generation Z religiosity indicates

that media representations exert measurable influence on religious practices and orientations (Liu et al., 2025). Moreover, generative systems enable critical examination of the visual religious imaginary itself. Models reproduce default aesthetic and cultural patterns (Manovich, 2018; Sun et al., 2024), thereby shaping theological anthropology and conceptions of embodiment. The systemic character of these biases (Chrostowski & Najda, 2025b) demands explicit ethical and theological reflection. In light of phenomena such as algorithmic conspiratorality (= conspiratorial interpretation patterns amplified through recommendation systems) and deepfakes (Jin et al., 2025; Yessengarayeva, 2024), this analysis justifies integrating AI literacy into the core of religious education—understood as the capacity to understand, use, critically evaluate, and co-shape AI within socio-religious contexts (Chrostowski, 2025).

4.3.2 Restrictions: algorithmic amplification of simplification

A structural limitation lies in the reduction of theological complexity to a dominant affect or a clear-cut punchline (Schmitt, 2023). The logic of retention favors translating categories such as covenant, grace, or conversion into forms of mood psychology (Khlaif & Salha, 2021). Without systematic confrontation with the biblical text, the micro-format reinforces superficial reception (Zwick, 2018). The attention economy privileges emotional intensity and dramatization, while the perceptual realism of AI-generated content may be mistaken for epistemic credibility (Jin et al., 2025), thereby blurring the distinction between representation and referential truth. A further risk concerns the delegation of interpretation to generative systems. Effects of cognitive economy encourage acceptance of the first plausible response produced by AI (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). In a media environment lacking stable gatekeeping structures, repetition normalizes particular framings, and algorithmic amplification stabilizes simplifications and ideologically charged narratives (Fianto & Ghofur, 2023; UNESCO, 2023). Religious content may also be instrumentalized for commercial or ideological purposes, especially under conditions of weak moderation (Kirchschlaeger, 2025). For these reasons, religious education must extend beyond content analysis to include critical examination of the infrastructural conditions under which meaning is produced, circulated, and legitimized.

4.3.3 Implications for lesson design

A pedagogical model for working with AI-generated video should integrate classical textual hermeneutics with systematic reflection on algorithmic mediation, in line with the concept of “augmented pedagogy” (Adiyono et al., 2025). While AI can facilitate access to information and reduce cognitive load, responsibility for theological interpretation remains with the teacher. Instruction may begin with identifying the format and dominant affective framing of the video, proceed to a structured comparison with the biblical text—examining narrative condensation, theological shifts, and embedded biases—and conclude with normative reflection on the interpretive consequences. More concretely, this can be organized as a sequence of four tasks: first, describing the video without immediate evaluation; second, comparing it with the relevant biblical passage; third, analyzing its media aesthetics, visual coding, and platform logic; and fourth, discussing what understanding of God, the human person, and the biblical narrative is generated by this representation. In this way, a triple hermeneutic is enacted: text—media context—student biography (Schambeck, 2026).

In sum, the primary educational value of AI-generated video does not lie in the transmission of biblical narratives, but in creating a learning situation in which students develop the capacity to recognize mediations of meaning and to critically assess the role of platform infrastructures in shaping religious imagination (Chrostowski, 2025; Chrostowski & Najda, 2025b). Such clips should therefore be used neither as substitutes for biblical texts nor as neutral motivational openers, but as objects of guided analysis. Their didactic value emerges precisely when students learn to distinguish between biblical narration, aesthetic staging, AI-generated supplementation, and algorithmically favored forms of religious visibility. Only within such a framework can technological innovation be reconciled with theological integrity.

5 Limitations of the study

As a qualitative case study of a single account (@holyvlogsz), this research does not permit statistical generalization to the broader population of creators producing AI-generated biblical content on TikTok. The conclusions are analytical rather than representative; the aim was not to measure frequency but to identify recurring patterns of narrative transformation and interpret them in light of biblical didactics.

The dataset represents a sample “frozen” at a specific moment (February 19, 2026) within TikTok’s dynamic and ephemeral environment, where content and engagement metrics are subject to constant change. The study does not reconstruct long-term circulation dynamics or format evolution. Engagement metrics served only as sampling criteria, not explanatory variables, and do not allow direct insight into algorithmic mechanisms (cf. Divon & Ebbrecht-Hartmann, 2025; Vizcaíno-Verdú & Jaramillo-Dent, 2023).

Selecting videos based on high visibility ($\geq 50,000$ views) means the analysis focuses on content already privileged by algorithmic amplification. This may overrepresent platform-aligned formats while excluding less prominent alternatives. The study analyzes content and form but does not include systematic reception analysis (e.g., comment discourse) or empirical classroom implementation. Consequently, no claims can be made about actual educational impact; findings concern structural characteristics and potential didactic implications. These remain heuristic and require empirical validation.

The study is interpretive and conducted by a single researcher. No intersubjective validation procedures (e.g., double coding) were applied, limiting inter-coder reliability assessment. Although categories were developed iteratively and applied consistently, interpretation remains situated within a Christian normative framework grounded in Catholic and Protestant traditions. This perspective represents one interpretive approach and does not exhaust the plurality of religion-and-media research. Finally, the study is limited to English-language content, restricting transferability to other linguistic and cultural contexts.

6 Final conclusions and outlook

This article has examined AI-generated biblical videos on TikTok as both a challenge and a potential field of development for biblical teaching. The qualitative case study of @holyvlogsz reconstructs how biblical content is transformed within platform environments and assesses implications for religious education. Findings can be synthesized along three dimensions: narrative transformation, algorithmic mediation of meaning, and didactic

consequences. The videos display recurring patterns of psychologization, scenic condensation, functional anachronism, and genre formatting. These mechanisms shift emphasis from theological architecture to affective perspective and reduce complexity in favor of visual and emotional legibility. Media form is not neutral: TikTok imposes genre templates and retention logics, while AI-generated video intensifies these dynamics through aesthetization, bias reproduction, and generative optimization. The result is a platform-based infrastructure of meaning that filters biblical content prior to theological reflection. Under these conditions, the decisive shift in biblical teaching is epistemological. AI-generated videos should not function as simple visual aids but as interpretive artifacts requiring critical analysis. The proposed three-phase model—format deconstruction, systematic confrontation with the canonical text, and normative reflection with transfer—offers a heuristic framework integrating classical hermeneutics with analysis of algorithmic mediation.

Future research should include empirical studies on how young audiences receive AI-generated biblical content and how they perceive generative and algorithmic conditioning. Comparative analyses across channels and cultural contexts, as well as the development of pedagogical tools integrating visual and AI literacy into religious education, are equally necessary. Further theological reflection is required on the status of generatively produced representations and the anthropological assumptions they encode.

AI-generated biblical videos represent neither a straightforward threat nor a simple evangelizing instrument. They are embedded in a transforming media infrastructure that reshapes how religious meaning is produced and circulated. Their educational relevance lies not primarily in content transmission but in cultivating critically reflective engagement with contemporary media—including GenAI—as formative elements of digital culture.

Research Corpus (TikTok, @holyvlogs; n = 25; archived February 19, 2026)

- V1. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7558238412029889822>.
- V2. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7550050118020435231>
- V3. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7548462087438175518>
- V4. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7546336210248125726>
- V5. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7532525275503004959>
- V6. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7530673601746373918>
- V7. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7529650949430824223>
- V8. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7527752284474805534>
- V9. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7524509802068856095>
- V10. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7519256775372049695>
- V11. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7517534957686869279>
- V12. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7517054542593150239>
- V13. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7515892796465646878>
- V14. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7515061448385498399>
- V15. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7514322985692433694>
- V16. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7513583185318530335>
- V17. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7512946044645412127>
- V18. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7512514140808695071>
- V19. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7512094003551112479>
- V20. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogs/video/7511772345183341855>

- V21. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogsz/video/7511377790147611934>
 V22. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogsz/video/7511034899210439966>
 V23. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogsz/video/7510656011473063198>
 V24. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogsz/video/7510415344738127134>
 V25. <https://www.tiktok.com/@holyvlogsz/video/7510326515805031711>
 For the content of the manuscript.

Author contributions The author is solely responsible for all aspects of this study.

Funding Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

Data availability The dataset consists of publicly accessible TikTok videos from the account @holyvlogsz (archived on 19 February 2026). The video IDs are listed in the reference section. Archived copies are available from the author upon reasonable request.

Code availability Not applicable.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The author declares that he has no financial or non-financial competing interests relevant to the content of this article.

Use of AI tools DeepL and ChatGPT were used exclusively for language editing and stylistic refinement. No generative content or analytical contributions were produced by these tools. The author takes full responsibility.

Ethical Approval This study analyzed only publicly accessible TikTok videos and publicly visible metadata. No participants were recruited, no private data were collected, and no intervention was conducted. Therefore, ethics approval and informed consent were not required.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Adiyono, A., Al Matari, A. S., Patimah, L., & AS, A. A. N. (2025). Can AI-optimized YouTube videos enhance Islamic religious education? A quantitative study on student learning outcomes. *Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 22(1), 175–194. <https://doi.org/10.14421/jpai.v22i1.11100>
- Alatassi, L., Hölig, S., & Kessling, P. (2025). *Zwischen Wertschätzung und Widerstand: Algorithmische Kompetenz junger Menschen am Beispiel der Kurzvideoplattform TikTok [Between appreciation and resistance: Young people's algorithmic competence using the short-video platform TikTok as an example]*. Verlag Hans-Bredow-Institut. <https://doi.org/10.21241/ssoar.106121>
- Alkier, S. (2010). *Neues Testament [New Testament]*. Mohr Siebeck. <https://doi.org/10.36198/9783838534046>
- Baldermann, I. (1996). *Einführung in die biblische Didaktik [Introduction to biblical didactics]*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Baumann, F., Arora, N., Rahwan, I., & Czaplicka, A. (2026). Dynamics of algorithmic content amplification on TikTok. *EPJ Data Science*, 15, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-026-00629-2>

- Berg, H. K. (1993). *Grundriss der Bibeldidaktik: Konzepte, Modelle, Methoden [Outline of biblical didactics: Concepts, models, methods]*. Kösel.
- Berg, H. K. (2017). *Gottes Wort braucht keinen Vormund: Wege zur selbstständigen Auslegung der Bibel [God's word needs no guardian: Paths toward independent interpretation of the Bible]*. Kohlhammer.
- Bhandari, A., & Bimo, S. (2022). Why's everyone on TikTok now? The algorithmized self and the future of self-making on social media. *Social Media + Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051221086241>
- Blum, E. J., & Harvey, P. (2012). *The color of Christ: The son of God and the saga of race in America*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Burkett, K. M. (2025). Generation Z and faith: A thematic analysis of #AsburyRevival TikTok content. *Critical Research on Religion*, 13(2), 204–221. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20503032251344340>
- Chalfant, E. (2025). "I don't chase, I attract": TikTok, new thought, and the algorithms of divination. *Religion*, 55(3), 638–657. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0048721X.2025.2502289>
- Chion, M. (2019). *Audio-vision: Sound on screen*. Columbia University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7312/chio18588>
- Christensen, A. S., & Grammes, T. (2020). The Beutelsbach consensus: The approach to controversial issues in Germany in an international context. *Acta Didactica Norden*. <https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.8348>
- Chrostowski, M. (2023). Anwendung von Künstlicher Intelligenz im Religionsunterricht: Möglichkeiten, Grenzen und Brennpunkte. *Religionspädagogische Beiträge*, 46(1), 79–95. <https://doi.org/10.20377/rpb-267>
- Chrostowski, M. (2024). Förderung kritischen Denkens durch den Einsatz von ChatGPT im Religionsunterricht: Sinn oder Unsinn? [Promoting critical thinking through the use of ChatGPT in religious education: Sense or nonsense?]. *Österreichisches Religionspädagogisches Forum*, 32(2), 166–181. <https://doi.org/10.25364/10.32:2024.2.10>
- Chrostowski, M. (2025). Auf dem Weg zur , AI literacy 'im Religionsunterricht: Versuch einer religionsdidaktischen Konzeptualisierung [Toward AI literacy in religious education: An attempt at a religious-didactical conceptualization]. *Zeitschrift Für Pädagogik und Theologie*, 77(4), 394–412. <https://doi.org/10.1515/zpt-2025-2036>
- Chrostowski, M., & Małosa, P. (2025). Ambivalent perceptions of artificial intelligence in religious education: A comparative study among teachers in Germany and Poland. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, 28(2), 110–123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/teth.70020>
- Chrostowski, M., & Najda, A. J. (2025a). ChatGPT as a modern tool for Bible teaching in confessional religious education: A German view. *Journal of Religious Education*, 73(1), 75–94. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16081051>
- Chrostowski, M., & Najda, A. J. (2025b). From verse to vision: Exploring AI-generated religious imagery in Bible teaching. *Religions*, 16(8), Article 1051. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16081051>
- Collins, S., & Oller, J. W., Jr. (2000). Is the Bible a true narrative representation? *Global Journal of Classical Theology*, 2(2), 1–26.
- Divon, T., & Ebbrecht-Hartmann, T. (2025). "On TikTok, everything needs to be playful, even the Holocaust!": Playability, memes, and participatory memory culture. *New Media & Society. Advance Online Publication*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448251356453>
- Doh, M., Canali, C., & Oliver, N. (2025). What TikTok claims, what Bold Glamour does: A filter's paradox. In *Proceedings of the 2025 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 1902–1915). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3715275.3732126>
- Evolvi, G. (2021). *Religion, new media, and digital culture*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199340378.013.757>
- Fehr, C., Rodriguez, L. G. V., & Ringrose, J. (2026). *From hot-girls to femcels: Algorithmic logics and (popular) feminist fatigue on TikTok*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-025-00620-6>
- Ferrara, E. (2023). Should ChatGPT be biased? Challenges and risks of bias in large language models. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.03738>
- Fianto, L., & Ghofur, M. A. (2023). Commodification of religion: Disruption and shallowing of religious values in the digital era. *The Sunan Ampel Review of Political and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.15642/sarpas.2023.3.1.33-44>
- Fricke, M. (2005). *Schwierige“ Bibeltex te im Religionsunterricht: Theoretische und empirische Elemente einer alttestamentlichen Bibeldidaktik für die Primarstufe [“Difficult” biblical texts in religious education: Theoretical and empirical elements of an Old Testament biblical didactics for primary education]*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

- Friedrich, F., Brack, M., Struppek, L., Hintersdorf, D., Schramowski, P., Luccioni, S., & Kersting, K. (2025). Auditing and instructing text-to-image generation models on fairness. *AI and Ethics*, 5(3), 2103–2123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00531-5>
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1984). The hermeneutics of suspicion. *Phenomenology and the human sciences* (pp. 73–83). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-5081-8_6
- Gal-Or, S. (2025). *Garden of wisdom: Timeless teachings in an AI era*. Springer Nature Switzerland. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-83085-3>
- Gennerich, C., & Zimmermann, M. (2020). *Bibelwissen und Bibelverständnis bei Jugendlichen: Grundlegende Befunde—theoriegeleitete Analysen—bibeldidaktische Konsequenzen* [Biblical knowledge and biblical understanding among adolescents: Basic findings, theory-guided analyses, and consequences for biblical didactics]. Kohlhammer. <https://doi.org/10.17433/978-3-17-038911-3>
- Ghosh, S., & Figueroa, A. (2023). Establishing TikTok as a platform for informal learning: Evidence from mixed-methods analysis of creators and viewers. In T. X. Bui (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 56th Hawaii international conference on system sciences (HICSS 2023)* (pp. 2431–2440). ScholarSpace.
- Goswami, C. (2025). Millions are watching these bizarre AI Bible videos on TikTok. Should you be worried or encouraged? *Premier Christianity*. Retrieved February 11, 2026, from <https://www.premierchristianity.com/opinion/millions-are-watching-these-bizarre-ai-bible-videos-on-tiktok-should-you-be-worried-or-encouraged/19850.article>
- Hamidieh, K., Zhang, H., Gerych, W., Hartvigsen, T., & Ghassemi, M. (2024). Identifying implicit social biases in vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society* (vol. 7(1), pp. 547–561). <https://doi.org/10.1609/ai.es.v7i1.31657>
- Hancock, J. T., & Bailenson, J. N. (2021). The social impact of deepfakes. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 24(3), 149–152. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2021.29208.jth>
- Hase, V., Boczek, K., & Scharkow, M. (2023). Adapting to affordances and audiences? A cross-platform, multi-modal analysis of the platformization of news on Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, and Twitter. *Digital Journalism*, 11(8), 1499–1520. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2022.2128389>
- Hearon, H., & Ruge-Jones, P. (Eds.). (2009). *The Bible in ancient and modern media: Story and performance* (Vol. Vol. 1). Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Hertlein, K. (2021). Liest die Jugend die Bibel? [Do young people read the Bible?]. *Bibelreport*, 1, 4–5.
- Hohmann, C. (2024). Identität und Intersektionalität im Film: Der Film als Medium (inter-)religiösen Lernens im Religionsunterricht [Identity and intersectionality in film: Film as a medium of interreligious learning in religious education]. *Nomos*. <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783987401428-91>
- Jin, X., Zhang, Z., Gao, B., Gao, S., Zhou, W., Yu, N., & Wang, G. (2025). Assessing the perceived credibility of deepfakes: The impact of system-generated cues and video characteristics. *New Media & Society*, 27(3), 1651–1672. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448231199664>
- Kang, H., & Lou, C. (2022). AI agency vs. human agency: Understanding human–AI interactions on TikTok and their implications for user engagement. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 27(5), Article zmac014. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmac014>
- Khlaif, Z. N., & Salha, S. (2021). Using TikTok in education: A form of micro-learning or nano-learning? *Interdisciplinary Journal of Virtual Learning in Medical Sciences*, 12(3), 213–218. <https://doi.org/10.30476/ijvlms.2021.90211.1087>
- Kirschschlaeger, P. G. (2025). Jesus, Noah und Moses als Influencer? Experte warnt vor KI-Bibel-Videos [Jesus, Noah, and Moses as influencers? Expert warns against AI Bible videos]. Retrieved February 10, 2026, from <https://www.blick.ch/ausland/jesus-noah-und-moses-als-influencer-experte-warnt-vor-ki-bibel-videos-sie-weisen-einen-manipulativen-charakter-auf-id21033926.html>
- Kropač, U. (2003). Bibelarbeit als Dekonstruktion: Neue Perspektiven für das biblische Lernen [Bible work as deconstruction: New perspectives for biblical learning]. *Katechetische Blätter*, 128(5), 369–374.
- Li, Y., Guan, M., Hammond, P., & Berrey, L. E. (2021). Communicating COVID-19 information on TikTok: A content analysis of TikTok videos from official accounts featured in the COVID-19 information hub. *Health Education Research*, 36(3), 261–271. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyab010>
- Lima, B. C., Omar, N., Avansi, I., & de Castro, L. N. (2025). Artificial intelligence applied to the analysis of biblical scriptures: A systematic review. *Analytics*, 4(2), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/analytics4020013>
- Lindner, K. (2023). Professionalität von Religionslehrer:innen: Anmerkungen aus einer religionsdidaktischen Perspektive [Professionalism of religious education teachers: Remarks from a religious-didactical perspective]. In M. Hailer, A. Kubik, M. Otte, M. Schambeck, B. Schröder, & H. Schwier (Eds.), *Religionslehrer:in im 21. Jahrhundert: Transformationsprozesse in Beruf und theologisch-religionspädagogischer Bildung in Studium, Referendariat und Fortbildung* [Religious education teacher in the 21st century: Transformation processes in the profession and

- theological-religious-pedagogical education in studies, teacher training, and continuing education*] (pp. 61–68). Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Liu, Z., Ghouri, A. M., Wang, J., & Lin, C. (2025). Digital religion and Generation Z: An empirical study in the context of China. *Frontiers in Psychology, 16*, 1536644. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1536644>
- Małkosa, P., & Chrostowski, M. (2026). Attitudes of religious education teachers in Poland and Germany towards generative artificial intelligence. *British Journal of Religious Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01416200.2026.2655253>
- Manicki, J. (2025). Mobilne społecznościowe media audiowizualne na platformach TikTok, YouTube Shorts, Instagram Reels: Ilościowa analiza zawartości. *Studia Medioznawcze, 26*(3), 246–260. <https://doi.org/10.33077/uw.24511617.sm.2025.3.838>
- Manovich, L. (2018). *AI aesthetics*. Strelka Press.
- Martin, A. J., Collie, R. J., Kennett, R., Liu, D., Ginns, P., Sudimantara, L. B., & Rüschenpöhler, L. G. (2025). How Is TikTok #Interreligious?: An inductive thematic analysis. *Poligrafija*. <https://doi.org/10.35469/poligrafi.2024.465>
- Mayring, P. (2014). *Qualitative content analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution*. Klagenfurt.
- Morla, A. V. (2024). How is TikTok# interreligious? An inductive thematic analysis. *Poligrafija, 29*(113–114), 77–107. <https://doi.org/10.35469/poligrafi.2024.465>
- Nieborg, D. B., & Poell, T. (2018). The platformization of cultural production: Theorizing the contingent cultural commodity. *New Media & Society, 20*(11), 4275–4292. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818769694>
- Niehl, F. W. (2006). *Bibel verstehen: Zugänge und Auslegungswege. Impulse für die Praxis der Bibelarbeit [Understanding the Bible: Approaches and paths of interpretation. Impulses for the practice of Bible work]*. Kösel.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2016). Affective publics and structures of storytelling: Sentiment, events and mediality. *Information, Communication & Society, 19*(3), 307–324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1109697>
- Papakostas, C. (2026). Artificial intelligence in religious interpretation: Challenges and opportunities. In A. Krouska, P. Mylonas, & J. Caro (Eds.), *Novel & Intelligent Digital Systems Conferences* (pp. 275–285). Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Phillips, P. M. (2019). The Bible, social media and digital culture. *Routledge*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429000997>
- Pollefeyt, D. (2020). Hermeneutical learning in religious education. *Journal of Religious Education, 68*(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40839-020-00090-x>
- Porzelt, B. (2012). *Grundlinien biblischer Didaktik [Basic lines of biblical didactics]*. Klinkhardt. <https://doi.org/10.36198/9783838536569>
- Reinis, S., & Laughlin, C. (2025). “GOD IS MY SPONSORED AD!! MY ALGORITHM!”: The spiritual algorithmic imaginary and Christian TikTok. *New Media & Society. Advance Online Publication*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448251315128>
- Rendle, L. (Ed.). (2013). *Zur bildenden Kraft der Bibel: Argumente – Zugänge – Rezeptionen [On the formative power of the Bible: Arguments, approaches, receptions]*. Deutscher Katecheten-Verein.
- Rindge, M. S., Runions, E., & Ascough, R. S. (2010). Teaching the Bible and film: Pedagogical promises, pitfalls, and proposals. *Teaching Theology & Religion, 13*(2), 140–155. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9647.2009.00567.x>
- Schambeck, M. (2009). *Bibeltheologische Didaktik: Biblisches Lernen im Religionsunterricht [Biblical-theological didactics: Biblical learning in religious education]*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schambeck, M. (2026). Grundfragen der Bibeldidaktik [Basic questions of biblical didactics]. Retrieved February 10, 2026, from https://cms.ibep-prod.com/app/uploads/sites/18/2023/08/Bibeldidaktik_Grundfragen_2020-09-17_15_05.pdf
- Schmitt, J. B. (2023). TikTok als Shooting Star unter den sozialen Medien bei der Generation Z: Und medienpädagogische Herausforderung [TikTok as the rising star among social media for Generation Z—and a challenge for media education]. Retrieved February 10, 2026, from https://www.bpb.de/system/files/dokument_pdf/230907_bpb_Hintergrund_TikTok_fin.pdf
- Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Sage.
- Schweitzer, F. (2023). ‘Education after Auschwitz’: Perspectives from Germany. *Religious Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0034408000950402>
- Steinkühler, M. (2019). Bibeldidaktik, diskursiv [Biblical didactics, discursive]. Retrieved February 10, 2026, from https://cms.ibep-prod.com/app/uploads/sites/18/2023/08/Bibeldidaktik_diskursiv_2020-09-17_14_55.pdf

- Sun, L., Wei, M., Sun, Y., Suh, Y. J., Shen, L., & Yang, S. (2024). Smiling women pitching down: Auditing representational and presentational gender biases in image-generative AI. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 29(1), Article zmad045. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmad045>
- Tajik, O., Golzar, J., & Noor, S. (2025). Investigating differentiated instruction and the contributing factors to cater EFL students' needs at the collegial level. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00299-5>
- Tereszkiewicz, A. (2022). TikTok: przegląd badań naukowych. *Media i Społeczeństwo*, 16, 211–231. <https://doi.org/10.53052/MiS.2022.16.13>
- Theis, J. (2001). Verstehen von Bibeltexten [Understanding biblical texts]. In T. Schreijäck (Ed.), *Christwerden im Kulturwandel: Analysen, Themen und Optionen für Religionspädagogik und Praktische Theologie* (pp. 309–622). Herder.
- UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. Retrieved February 10, 2026, from https://unesco.org.uk/site/assets/files/10375/guidance_for_generative_ai_in_education_and_research.pdf
- van Dijk, J., & Poell, T. (2013). Understanding social media logic. *Media and Communication*, 1(1), 2–14. <https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v1i1.70>
- Vizcaíno-Verdú, A., & Jaramillo-Dent, D. (2023). (Re)coding TikTok: The memetic interactivity codebook for content analysis. *Cultural Science*, 15(1), 63–81. <https://doi.org/10.2478/csaj-2023-0006>
- Willems, J. (2012). Religion deuten lernen und religiös deuten lernen: Chancen von Jesus-Filmen im Religionsunterricht am Beispiel der Versuchung Jesu [Learning to interpret religion and to interpret religiously: Opportunities of Jesus films in religious education using the example of the temptation of Jesus]. *Theo-Web. Zeitschrift Für Religionspädagogik*, 11(2), 143–167.
- Wolf, K. D. (2021). Informelles Lernen mit Performanzvideos und Tutorials auf TikTok [Informal learning with performance videos and tutorials on TikTok]. In *Mikroformate: Interdisziplinäre Perspektiven auf aktuelle Phänomene in digitalen Medienkulturen* [Microformats: Interdisciplinary perspectives on current phenomena in digital media cultures] (pp. 171–190).
- Yessengarayeva, G. (2024). *Relocating the sacred to the algorithmized self: Construction of algorithmic spirituality on TikTok from the perspective of human–AI interaction*. Retrieved February 10, 2026, from <https://repositori.upf.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/f0437196-f3be-4622-a545-cb4851b14536/content>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Sage.
- Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16, Article 39, 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>
- Zhang, L. (2025). The digital age of religious communication: The shaping and challenges of religious beliefs through social media. *Studies on Religion and Philosophy*, 1(1), 25–41. <https://doi.org/10.71204/de63mn10>
- Zhang, J., Song, W., & Liu, Y. (2025). Cognitive bias in generative AI influences religious education. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1), 15720. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-15720-0>
- Zhou, R. (2024). Understanding the impact of TikTok's recommendation algorithm on user engagement. *International Journal of Computer Science and Information Technology*, 3(2), 201–208. <https://doi.org/10.62051/ijcsit.v3n2.24>
- Zimmermann, M., & Zimmermann, R. (Eds.). (2018). *Handbuch Bibeldidaktik*. Mohr Siebeck. <https://doi.org/10.36198/9783838549217>
- Zwick, R. (2018). Bibel im Film [The Bible in film]. In M. Zimmermann & R. Zimmermann (Eds.), *Handbuch Bibeldidaktik [Handbook of biblical didactics]* (pp. 627–633). Mohr Siebeck.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.