The Great or Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed	My interpretation
I believe in one God,	I believe in the One and All is One.
the Father Almighty, who created everything, heaven and earth, the visible and the invisible world.	The almighty potential of all possibilities, the beginning, of our world and all possible worlds, before all time and outside of space and time, invisible to one another, visible to itself. All form of the same form and all substance of the same substance.
And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, born of the Father before all ages, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, of one being with the Father; through him all things were created. For us humans and for our salvation he came down from heaven, took on flesh through the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary and became man. He was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, rose again on the third day according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven. He sits at the right hand of the Father and will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead. Of his kingdom there will be no end.	And to the omniscient end outside of space and time. Knowing all (indistinguishable from knowing and risen, therefore, like us, begotten, not created, born, knowing, conscientious, lived, loved, suffered, risen, of one being and indistinguishable from the beginning.
I believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and giver of life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified, who spoke through the prophets,	And I believe in the all-living (co-knowing, realizing) and dominating possible worlds (possibilities, superimposing, reinforcing), before all time and outside of space and time, of one being and indistinguishable from beginning and end.
and one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.	And the one, holy, universal community, born of the incarnation of the omniscient End, which raises us up anew.
I await the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come.	I await the resurrection of all those who have lived and could have lived (omniscient, all possibilities, co-knowledge, conscientia) and eternal life on a new earth and under a new heaven in new bodies.
Amen.	Amen.

Epistemology of Limit Search: From Cognition to Being – A Synthetic Perspective

Based on the assumption that rational knowledge and sustained faith need not be adversaries, the text develops an epistemological model that engages in dialogue with the natural sciences. This model does not assert any new metaphysical truth, but rather seeks coherence and argumentative consistency.

Against this background, the text dares to pose a hermeneutical challenge: Can the creed be read in such a way that it is compatible with a reason-guided, present-day worldview? The interpretation presented here is thus neither a replacement nor a rejection, but rather an offer of a bridge—for those who long for a credible synthesis of rational thought and Christian confession.

Whether this bridge holds is something each reader should examine for themselves. Its value lies not in dogmatic commitment, but in the courageous question of whether faith can face the challenges of modern reason without giving up on itself.

Abstract

Faith and religion are often understood in such a way that they claim that consciousness creates reality – and that each person therefore bears responsibility for the whole of reality. Anyone who does not see it this way is acting irresponsibly because they are thereby also creating evil. If it were actually the case that consciousness creates reality, then one would have to bear this responsibility. However, I see it the other way around: For me, reality is objective, and we have no direct access to it. Rather, reality creates space, time, and especially the present – and from this, conscientia, consciousness, emerges. For me, consciousness is a product of reality and not its origin. In an endless process, this consciousness, produced by reality, approaches reality ever closer until it finally becomes identical with it. This is what I trust in – that this is the kingdom of God, in which man, the world, and God become one.

For me, faith and religion must not contradict reason.

This article therefore develops a coherent epistemological model that can be metaphysically extrapolated. It grounds cognition, consciousness, and freedom as processes within a real, superimposed present. Past and future are understood as epistemic projections asymptotically approaching a limit, while the present represents the real interface. The uncountable set of possible chains of events allows for a fallibilist stance toward knowledge. The model integrates processual dynamics, causal necessity, and emergent self-organization, offering a bridge between scientific rationality and metaphysical speculation. It provides a robust framework for analyzing freedom, consciousness, and time without presupposing absolute determination or mystical entities.

1. Introduction: Starting point and pragmatic fruitfulness

The model is based on the hypothesis of an objective reality independent of the subject. This assumption creates a stable reference point for criticism and progress. At the same time, the knowing subject is understood as an integral part of reality. Cognition is thus a natural, causally embedded process that overcomes Cartesian dualism and enables the investigation of cognition itself.

At this point, however, a central starting hypothesis suggests itself: One can very well argue that the collapse in the Copenhagen Interpretation (CCI) presupposes genuine chance. Genuine chance is epistemically indistinguishable from a consciousness that decides about possibilities. Thus, the CCI appears dualistic because it imposes a second, non-deterministic layer on physical reality. The model developed here avoids this dualism by conceiving consciousness not as an entity superior to physics, but as a causally embedded, natural process within the unified reality. The "decision" about possibilities is thus not a mysterious act of an extra-worldly consciousness or chance, but an emergent process of pattern reinforcement within the superimposed present. The Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) avoids a similar dualism but postulates a different metaphysical structure. We are thus faced with a genuine choice:

KD: Dualism between deterministic physics and non-deterministic chance/consciousness.
MWI : Monism, multiverse logically necessary.
The epistemology presented here: monism, consciousness as an emergent, causally embedded process within the one reality.

2. The processual model: superposition in the present

Reality is understood not as static, but as a dynamic result of superimposed possibilities. The present is the only ontologically real moment in which causal chains from the past overlap with the open potential of future possibilities.

Decision and freedom: Freedom is understood as emergent self-organization within the superimposed present. The subject itself is a superposition—a complex pattern of values, experiences, and impulses—in which certain patterns are reinforced and others attenuated.
Consciousness: Consciousness is the ongoing process of internal pattern reinforcement. The coherence of the self arises from the stability of recurring patterns, without the need for reduction to neural mechanics or a metaphysical soul.

3. Horizons of Knowledge: Past, Present, Future

Past and future exist only epistemically. They can be described as open intervals that asymptotically approach a limit:

Past: approach to the origin, reconstructable only fragmentarily.
Future: approaching an end goal, fundamentally open and not determined.

The set of possible chains of events is assumed to be uncountable. This principle ensures epistemic fallibility and protects against the illusion of complete comprehensibility. Knowledge is thus understood as a continuous approach to epistemic horizons.

4. Metaphysical implications: unity of limits
The three limits—origin, present, omega—can be combined into a single real limit, the present. They constitute different perspectives:
1. Origin: Source of all potentiality.
2. Present: Place of actualization and self-realization.
3. Omega: State of complete self-transparency of reality, integration of all information in a coherent structure.
This circular logic combines epistemic projection and metaphysical speculation and demonstrates how reality recognizes itself.

5. Plausibility check: Interface to the natural sciences

Thermodynamics and Entropy: Local order (life, consciousness) emerges within dissipative structures, despite global entropy increases. The Omega point can be interpreted as a metaphysical maximum order without violating the physical framework.
Conservation of energy: cognitive processes are embedded in the existing energy of the universe; conservation laws are respected.
Quantum mechanics (KD vs. MWI): The superposition and branching in physics serves as an analogy to the epistemological model of the present, not as an exact physical homology.

6. Conclusion

The epistemology of limit-seeking offers a precise, coherent framework that integrates knowledge, consciousness, freedom, and time into a unified model. It is fallibilist, compatible with scientific rationality, and provides a bridge to metaphysical considerations. Past and future become epistemically manageable as projections that asymptotically approach the present, while the present itself remains the real interface of all dynamics.

Summary basic idea

Many religious people believe that consciousness creates reality. Those who think this way also believe that every person is jointly responsible for everything good and evil in the world.
That's wrong. The text says it the other way around:
Reality exists independently of us.

Consciousness only arises from this reality – not the other way around.

Space, time and the experience of the present are products of reality.

Consciousness is a part of this and is constantly evolving, becoming ever closer to reality. In the end, in the "Kingdom of God," humanity, the world, and God will be one.

Important: Faith must not contradict reason.

The model
The model attempts to explain consciousness, knowledge and freedom in a way that is compatible with natural science.
Reality is objective: It exists independently of us. We ourselves are part of this reality.

Knowledge is a process: our knowledge of the world grows, but we never have a complete overview.

The present is the only real moment: past and future exist only as ideas in our minds. We reconstruct the past fragmentarily, and the future always remains open.

Freedom: Decisions are not mysterious actions, but arise from the interplay of many influences in the present. Freedom means: Within an open space, certain patterns (thoughts, values, experiences) can become stronger than others.

Consciousness: It is not a thing, but a process in which inner patterns are stabilized. The "I" emerges from these recurring patterns.

Reference to physics
In quantum physics, there is the Copenhagen interpretation, which assumes genuine chance or a decisive consciousness → this appears dualistic (two levels: matter + consciousness).

There is also the many-worlds interpretation, which explains everything as a unified multiverse → this is more monistic (one level).

The model avoids both problems.

Horizons of Knowledge
Past: We approach it through memories and traces, but it remains fragmentary.

Future: It is open, can only be guessed at, never determined with certainty.

Present: The only real intersection point where all influences come together.

Past and future are therefore more like models of thought, while the present is the only reality.

Metaphysical interpretation

One can think of the three “limit values” (origin, present, destination) together:

Origin = source of all possibilities.

Present = the place where reality happens.

Target point = a kind of highest order in which everything fits together.

The whole thing leads to the idea that reality recognizes itself.

Scientific plausibility

Thermodynamics: Life and consciousness arise despite a general increase in disorder because local structures exist.
Conservation of energy: Everything remains within the framework of the known laws of nature.

Quantum mechanics: Serves only as a comparison, not as a direct explanation.

Conclusion

The model explains:
Reality, consciousness, knowledge, freedom and time are connected.

Everything takes place in the present; the past and future are merely our mental constructions.

It avoids the dualism of “spirit versus matter” and remains close to science, but open to religious interpretation.

The goal is a kind of unity of world, humanity and God.

Impact on Various Groups – Adapted for an International Audience

1. Evangelical / Charismatic Christians
- Many Evangelicals and Charismatics emphasize a personal relationship with God, heart-over-mind faith, and often harbor skepticism toward philosophy.
- This text may challenge them because it understands consciousness not as a creative force but as a product of reality.
- Some may find it "too philosophical" or "too intellectual."
- Positively, the clear rejection of "mystical consciousness" and the emphasis on an objective, God-created reality may resonate with those who hold a strong doctrine of creation.

2. Mainline Protestants (e.g., Anglican, Lutheran, Methodist)
- Protestants who value the integration of faith and reason (e.g., in the tradition of liberal theology or process thought) may find this text engaging.
- The emphasis on faith not contradicting reason aligns with Protestant commitments to education and intellectual integrity.
- However, some may find the speculative elements (e.g., "Kingdom of God as unity of humanity, world, and God") too abstract. More biblically conservative Protestants may see it as overly philosophical and detached from Scripture.

3. Roman Catholics
- Catholics are familiar with the synthesis of theology and philosophy (e.g., Thomas Aquinas, scholasticism).
- They may see parallels to Catholic tradition: faith and reason complementing each other.
- The idea of "approaching God through a process" resonates with Catholic concepts of sanctification, sacraments, and eschatological fulfillment.
- Critically, some Catholics may find the lack of emphasis on a personal relationship with Christ or the institutional Church unsatisfactory.

4. Eastern Orthodox Christians
- Orthodox Christians emphasize the mystery of God, liturgy, and theosis (deification/union with God).
- The model may interest them due to its trajectory toward unification of humanity, world, and God – reminiscent of theosis.
- However, they may critique the text as overly rationalistic and "Western," attempting to explain divine mystery through philosophical-scientific models rather than preserving it as mystery.

5. Secular Humanists / Atheists
- Atheists and secular thinkers may interpret the text in two ways:
  - Open-positive reading: It takes science seriously, avoids mystical explanations, and describes consciousness as an emergent process – appealing to scientifically minded atheists.
  - Critical reading: The conclusion of a "Kingdom of God" and unity of humanity, world, and God may seem like an unnecessary religious overlay. They might argue: the model is interesting, but the metaphysical extrapolation is superfluous.

6. Buddhists / Eastern Philosophies
- Those familiar with non-dualistic traditions (e.g., Advaita Vedanta, Mahayana Buddhism) may appreciate the emphasis on unity, process, and the non-substantial nature of the self.
- However, the teleological goal (Omega point) may conflict with non-theistic or non-goal-oriented worldviews.
- The rationalistic approach may also be seen as overly conceptual compared to experiential or meditative paths.

7. Interfaith / Spiritual but Not Religious (SBNR)
- This group may appreciate the non-dogmatic, integrative approach that draws from science, philosophy, and spirituality.
- The model offers a framework for discussing consciousness, reality, and meaning without requiring traditional religious allegiance.
- Some may still desire more emphasis on experiential or contemplative dimensions.

Summary of Impact (International Version)

Evangelicals	Mixed	Appreciate creation emphasis; dislike abstraction
Mainline Protestants	Generally positive	Value reason-faith integration
Roman Catholics	Favorable	aligns with tradition of faith and reason
Eastern Orthodox	Reserved interest	Theosis-like, but too rationalistic
Atheists / Secular	Split	Like science-friendly parts; dislike religious conclusions
Buddhists / Eastern	Cautiously open	Non-duality appreciated; teleology may conflict
SBNR / Interfaith	Positive	Holistic, non-dogmatic, bridge-building