Incarnation and Unitarity

Christology after the End of Theodicy – From the Limit Value to the Present: Sacrament, Church and Diakonia in Evolutionary Reality

Paul Koop

2026

Table of Contents

1 Incarnation and Unitarity

1.1 Christology after the End of Theodicy – From the Limit Value to the Present

1.1.1 Sacrament, Church and Diakonia in Evolutionary Reality

Table of Contents

- § 1. Finitude and Being – The Fundamental Philosophical Question
- § 2. Epistemology of the Search for the Limit Value – How Do We Know?
- § 3. Nothingness as Creative Limit Value – From What Do We Know?
- § 4. The Cosmological Trinity
- § 5. Incarnation – The Historical Form of Undivided Reality
- § 6. Cross and Suffering – Unitarity of Pain and the End of Theodicy
- Interlude: Song of the Multiverse
- § 7. Resurrection and Omega Point – Hope without Metaphysical Shortcut
- § 8. Sacrament and Eucharist – Presence, Transformation, Material Reality
- § 9. Church and Liturgy – Community without Possession of the Limit Value
- § 10. Diakonia and Social Ethics – Freedom, Responsibility, Reduction of Suffering
- § 11. Diagnosis of the Present – AI, Secularity, Technology, Pastoral Care
- Notes
- Glossary
- Summary
- Editorial Note

1.2 § 1. Finitude and Being – The Fundamental Philosophical Question

Western metaphysics begins with a distinction that it has never entirely overcome: the distinction between finite, mutable being and infinite, absolute being. Finite being was considered deficient, permeated by non-being, constantly threatened by annihilation. The creature's longing was directed toward escape from temporality into eternal immutability. Augustine translated this longing into the language of inwardness: God is more inward than my innermost being, and at the same time the absolutely sublime. Thomas Aquinas translated it into the language of substance: God as pure being, which knows no change, no suffering, no finitude.

This perspective, however, misjudges the ontological dignity of finitude. Finitude is not a lack of being, but the only possible form in which personal freedom, the capacity for relationship, and concrete history can exist. Without temporality there is no action, without limitation no decision, without vulnerability no love. The redefinition of being must therefore proceed from finitude as a positive ontological category.

Anyone who takes finitude seriously must also rethink the concept of freedom. Freedom must not be misunderstood as the suspended, unbound arbitrariness of an isolated subject. It is always situated freedom, bound to the bodily, biological, and historical constitution of the human being. We call this structure **Gaussian freedom**: personal freedom of decision does not unfold in a value-free, infinite space, but within the universal normal distribution and the material limits of the cosmos. It is the capacity of the person to write a unique, indelible life story within a reality that exhibits probabilistic and deterministic structures. Freedom is not the absence of causes, but the absence of disturbance. It is the undisturbed execution of one's own curve.

Being is thus not to be understood as a resting substrate layer beneath things, but as the network of relationships itself, in which entities arise, develop, and interact with one another. When being is understood relationally, the question of the ultimate ground of reality also changes. God is no longer the infinitely distant super-object, but the sustaining depth and the absolute limit toward which every finite relationship is designed.

Here the **Eastern doctrine of theosis** becomes fruitful. It speaks of transfiguration, of unity, of the healing dimension of the divine light. Deification is not the overcoming of finitude, but its fulfillment. The human being does not become God by ceasing to be human, but by becoming fully human – open to the limit value that sustains him. The Western question of guilt and grace and the Eastern question of transfiguration and unity are not opposites, but complementarities. Augustine took the inner conflict seriously; the Eastern tradition took transfiguration seriously. Both saw something that the other tradition overlooked. A Christology after evolution must integrate both: the reality of guilt and the possibility of transfiguration.

The fundamental philosophical question concerning the connection between finitude and being thus leads directly into the center of an evolutionary Christology. If being itself is structured relationally and processually, the absolute principle cannot be thought in isolation from the world. Theology must leave behind the aporias of substance thinking and develop an ontology in which the interweaving of creator and creation becomes conceivable without extinguishing the autonomy of the creature. This ontology is the ontology of the **limit value**: not a distant goal, but a reality that is already effective in every approximation.

The Augustinian tradition is thereby appreciated without being followed. Augustine took seriously the experience of inner conflict, the need for grace, inwardness – that remains. But his deficit ontology, his original-sin punishment, his notion of an angry judge who saves a few through grace – that is rejected. Not out of polemic, but because it does not do justice to finitude. Finitude is not a curse, but the condition of the possibility of freedom, love, and history. Whoever understands it as a curse understands neither finitude nor redemption.

1.3 § 2. Epistemology of the Search for the Limit Value – How Do We Know?

The recognition of evolution as a universal principle of reality compels not only theology but also epistemology to revise its presuppositions. If reality is not static but historical, processual, and open, then knowledge too cannot be understood as the possession of truth, but only as approximation. This approximation is asymptotic: it approaches the limit value without ever fully reaching it.

The starting point is the assumption of an objective reality that exists independently of the knowing subject. This assumption is not provable, but pragmatically indispensable: without it, criticism, error, and progress would be meaningless. At the same time, the knowing subject is an integral part of reality. Knowledge is a natural, causally embedded process that overcomes Cartesian dualism. Consciousness is not the origin of reality, but a product of real processes. It arises within the world, not above it.

Ontologically real is only the present. Past and future do not exist as things, but as epistemic horizons: the past is reconstructed, never fully accessible; the future is anticipated, in principle open. In the present, causal necessity and open possibility overlap. Decision and freedom do not arise through a break in causality, but as self-organization within this overlap. Freedom is not a metaphysical state of exception, but a highly complex form of intra-worldly order.

Past and future can be understood as limit values that knowledge asymptotically approaches without ever fully reaching them. These limit values are: the **origin** (the epistemically never fully reconstructible beginning of all reality), the **present** (the only place of real actualization), and the **Omega** (the conceived endpoint of complete coherence and self-transparency of reality). These three limit values are not additional entities, but perspectives on one and the same reality. Knowledge moves between them without ever possessing them.

Truth in this model is not timelessly given, but historically proven. It arises through error, correction, and the stabilization of viable patterns of interpretation. This epistemology thus stands close to a fallibilist concept of truth. Absolute certainty is excluded, but increasing truth content is possible. This structure allows revelation to be understood not as a break in the order of knowledge, but as an event of heightened coherence that must prove itself historically.

Here the **argumentative engagement with critical rationalism and the many-worlds interpretation** is indispensable. Critical rationalism provides the epistemological foundation: knowledge is always provisional; approximation occurs through falsification; the open society is the political form of this fallibility. The many-worlds interpretation provides the

ontological foundation: possibilities are real, but not separate and substantial; reality is a network of branchings in which each version has its own perspective. This work agrees with critical rationalism and the many-worlds interpretation in the rejection of dualism, in the emphasis on fallibility, in the high estimation of the open society.

But it contradicts them at one decisive point: the infinite progress postulated by critical rationalism is not the last word. Progress is infinite – but it is not aimless. It moves toward a limit value that is already effective in every approximation. The many-worlds interpretation provides the language, not the goal. It provides the method, not the structure. This work takes it at its word and goes one step further than it itself goes: it thinks the limit value as a boundary, not as a goal.

The plausibility check against physics is important, but it remains analogy, not proof. Thermodynamics and entropy: local order (life, consciousness) arises within dissipative structures, despite global entropy increase. The limit value 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; the conservation laws are respected. Quantum mechanics: superposition and branching in physics serve as an analogy to the epistemological model of the present, not as an exact physical homology. Black-hole physics: information conservation at the event horizon is the physical image of the unitary preservation of personal information.

Physics = formal model, theology = content-related interpretation. This distinction is methodologically reflected. Physics provides no proofs for theological statements; it provides structures that can be interpreted theologically. Whoever blurs this distinction loses both physics and theology.

1.4 § 3. Nothingness as Creative Limit Value – From What Do We Know?

Nothingness is not the absence of existence. It is a boundary condition that defines both the origin and the goal of reality. It is absolutely homogeneous and does not differ from itself – and precisely thereby it is the foundation of everything that exists. This determination of nothingness is neither nihilistic nor Neoplatonic. It would be nihilistic if nothingness were annihilation, the final extinction of all information. It would be Neoplatonic if nothingness were the ground of emanation from which being pours forth in stages. Neither is meant. Nothingness is the **limit value of self-concretization**: the point at which possibilities condense into reality without an external creator needing to intervene.

In the beginning, nothingness is the origin of all causal chains. From it, reality arises through self-reference and self-relation. In the end, everything returns to nothingness, since no differentiation exists that goes beyond this limit value. In the present, nothingness becomes concrete through the decoherence of countless possibilities and manifests itself in consciousness as lived reality. Nothingness is not the other of God; it is the manner in which God concretizes himself as limit value.

The relationship to the concept of information is decisive. Information is not nothingness, but it springs from it as limit value. Preservation of information is the manner in which nothingness concretizes itself. If the universe is unitary, then nothing may be finally lost. Neither a lived thought nor a suffered sorrow – and not the unlived possibilities either. For they too are information. Every decision excludes alternatives, but it does not erase them. The unrealized paths are not trivialities, but real branchings that become invisible from the perspective of one version. Their information remains part of the overall structure.

Decoherence is the transition from the nothingness of possibilities to the presence of experience. In quantum mechanics, decoherence designates the process by which a quantum-mechanical system loses its superposition and passes into a defined state. Theologically translated: decoherence is the manner in which nothingness condenses into presence. The present is the only ontologically real moment in which causal necessity and open possibility overlap. Consciousness is the ongoing process of internal pattern reinforcement within this overlap. The coherence of the I arises from the stability of recurring patterns, without any need for a reduction to neural mechanics or a metaphysical soul.

Nothingness as creative limit value is the ontological foundation of unitarity. It explains why reality is closed without being static; why it is open without being arbitrary; why it generates information without losing it. It is the point at which language reaches its limit – and at which poetry begins.

> In the beginning was possibility, infinitely deep, infinitely wide. A whisper forms the first light, and life grows – it contradicts the rigidity of empty space, it winds itself from time and dream, it mirrors itself, recognizes itself, consciousness that holds the boundaries.

1.5 § 4. The Cosmological Trinity

The Trinity is not a dogma that one must believe without understanding it. It is the **inner relationing of the one divine life**, which unfolds in beginning, present, and end without dividing itself. Father = almighty beginning, Son = omniscient end, Holy Spirit = omnipresent present. This assignment is not modalistic, because it does not make the three persons mere manifestations of a single God. It is also not unitary in the historical sense, because it does not deny the divinity of Christ. It is **unitary in the ontological sense**: God and world are not two competing substances, but the entire creation possesses its medium of existence in God, without pantheistically merging with his essence.

The Father is the origin of all possibilities. He is not a creator in the dualistic sense, who would have had the possibility of deciding against creation. He is the origin from which everything proceeds, without his having to intervene arbitrarily. The Son is the omniscient end. He is not a distant judge, but the completion in which all information is integrated. The Spirit is the present, in which nothingness concretizes itself and possibilities condense into experience.

The Spirit as present is the key to understanding the Trinity after evolution. The Spirit is not an additional entity that intervenes in the world from outside. He is the present itself – the manner in which God is present in the now. In the present, past and future overlap; in the

present, possibilities condense into reality; in the present, nothingness becomes concrete. The Spirit is the life-giving power that works in all possible worlds. He is not bound to space and time, but he works in space and time. He is of one essence with the beginning and the end, and yet he differs from both – not as a separate substance, but as the manner in which unity makes itself present.

The demarcation against **Unitarianism** (historical) is important: historical Unitarianism was a rationalistic, anti-Trinitarian movement that reduced the divine to a monolithic, impersonal one God and rejected the divinity of Christ. Our unitarity, by contrast, is a strict ontological nondualism: it states that God and world are not two competing substances, but that the entire creation possesses its medium of existence in God, without pantheistically merging with his essence. The demarcation against **modalism** is equally important: modalism teaches that Father, Son, and Spirit are only manifestations of a single God. The cosmological Trinity, by contrast, teaches that the three persons are truly distinguished – not as separate substances, but as different modes of relationing the one divine life.

The Trinity is the precondition for God to be rich in relationship within himself and thereby able to receive the world into himself. A God without inner relation would not be capable of creating relationship. A God without difference would not be capable of bearing difference. The Trinity is the ontological condition of the possibility of creation, incarnation, and consummation.

1.6 § 5. Incarnation – The Historical Form of Undivided Reality

Incarnation must be misunderstood neither in the sense of a mythological descent of a heavenly being nor in the sense of a merely moral metaphor. It is the **historical form** in which the possibility of an undivided relationship between God, world, and finite personal reality shows itself without abolishing the finitude of the world. Unitarity designates the closed, information-theoretical, and ontological wholeness of reality. In a unitary universe, no information, no lived moment, and no suffered pain is lost.

Jesus of Nazareth is the historical form in which the limit value is incarnate. He is not the metaphysical starting point of the world, but its historical culmination point. In his life, his loving, and his suffering it becomes manifest that God does not isolate himself against matter, but that the divine life manifests itself precisely there where a human being opens himself radically for the Thou and the world. Jesus is the embodied **conscientia** – the co-knowledge of God and cosmos. In him the **incarnational continuity** becomes tangible: the historical Jesus of Nazareth is not an isolated miracle, but the culminating breakthrough of the cosmic movement in which matter becomes capable of responding to God in perfect personal freedom.

His **freedom** is not the arbitrariness of an isolated subject, but the undisturbed unfolding of his curve within the divine normal distribution. He does what he must do because he is entirely himself. His **love** is not a feeling, but the radical assent to the unavailability of history. He loves by opening himself to the Thou without possessing it. His **suffering** is not a sacrifice that reconciles God, but the consequence of his uncompromising love in a world dominated by violence. His **death** is not the end, but the transition from visibility into complete integration.

His **resurrection** is not the return to a biological life, but the confirmation of unitary preservation: what was once real cannot disappear.

How ontology and Christology go together: unitary ontology provides the structure: limit value, information, unitarity, Gaussian freedom, unitarity of pain. Inverse Christology provides the form: emergent interpretive form, incarnational continuity, sacramentality as real continuation of the incarnation, social ethics as incarnation test. This work combines both: **Christ as the historical form of the limit value**. That is: the limit value is not an abstract idea subsequently applied to Jesus. Jesus is the form in which the limit value becomes historical. In him it shows what the limit value is: not a distant goal, but a reality that is already effective in every approximation. The incarnation is the historical form of undivided reality – not because Jesus would be a special case, but because he is the case in which reality becomes transparent to itself.

This Christology contradicts neither the Council of Chalcedon nor the doctrine of the preexistence of the Logos. It does, however, shift their epistemological location. The unity of divine and human nature is not deduced from above, but inferred from below. Ontological statements follow historical experience, not the other way around. The preexistence of Christ is not a physical before, but a relational statement: God relates from eternity to Christ. It is a statement about the faithfulness of God, not about a temporal prior state.

The incarnation is not a singular event, but a principle. Where reality is accepted without being shortened, incarnation happens. Jesus is not the exception to this rule, but its full form. In him it becomes manifest that matter is not the opposite pole to spirit, but the physical form in which love can give itself away.

1.7 § 6. Cross and Suffering – Unitarity of Pain and the End of Theodicy

Suffering in the world is the millstone on which every classical theodicy is crushed. Earthquakes, cancer, the cruelty of evolution, in which the survival of one is the death sentence of another, and finally the abysses of human guilt – all this cannot be fitted into the schema of a “kind educator.” The question: “How can God permit this?” is wrongly posed, because it proceeds from a God who could intervene from outside in a mechanical system without suspending the laws of finitude. Finitude necessarily implies vulnerability, friction, and loss. An evolutionary system that is to bring forth complex living beings cannot exist without stochasticity, without mutation, without aging, and without pain. Pain is the biological reverse side of sentience; grief is the ontological reverse side of love.

We therefore introduce the concept of the **unitarity of pain**. Suffering is not a moral scandal that refutes the existence of God, and not a punishment for sin, but the structural phenomenon of friction in the unfolding of the evolutionary process. Suffering is information. It marks places of maximum tension, maximum condensation, maximum difference. Where nothing is at stake, nothing relevant happens. Where suffering arises, states are decided, structures are stabilized or discarded, paths are fixed. Suffering is the price of the system not standing still. The more complex the structure, the greater the capacity for suffering. Not as punishment, but as indicator.

On the cross of Jesus of Nazareth this unitarity of pain is theologically sealed. The cross is not the place where an enraged God had to be appeased by the blood of his son. Such a notion makes God into a monster. The cross is the historical consequence of Jesus' uncompromising love in a world dominated by violence. By God dying in the crucified Jesus, he himself enters into the darkest extreme of pain, of Godforsakenness, and of annihilation. The cross is the radical assent to the unavailability of history: God does not save the world from its contingency, but in it. Anything else would be mythology.

The **wounds of the Risen One** are the eternal proof that history with all its horrors is preserved in God. Not defused, not corrected, but fully remembered. The pain remains as real information in the heart of the Trinity. The wounds are not a symbol of suffering, but suffering itself – in its complete integration. What was once real cannot disappear. Not the pain either. Not the wound either. It remains, but it remains as memory, not as torment.

The end of theodicy does not mean becoming indifferent to suffering. It means, on the contrary, no longer explaining suffering away. There is no higher meaning in the suffering of a child; there is only the radical obligation to reduce suffering and the trust that even the most senseless dying is not lost in the unitary wholeness of God. **Reduction of suffering is the highest principle.** Not justification, not excuse, not trivialization – but the practical work of reducing suffering. Every glass of water handed to the thirsty, and every political structure that promotes justice, is a direct building up of the body of Christ.

Theodicy fails because it understands suffering as an argument against meaning. In fact, suffering is the price of meaning. A completely suffering-free system would be a completely undifferentiated system. It would have no inner perspective, no history, no individuality. It would be still – not redeemed, but empty. God as the limit value of the process is not a consolation in the emotional sense. He promises no sparing, no exception, no final justice in the moral register. He is that toward which knowledge moves asymptotically without ever fully reaching it – but already effective in the approximation. Everything that happens belongs to this path, precisely because nothing can be omitted. Not despite suffering, but including suffering.

Therewith theodicy ends. Not because suffering would be explained or excused, but because the question itself loses its hold. There is no judge outside the system to whom one could present suffering. There is only the process itself – and its asymptotic approximation to the limit value. God is not the one who should have prevented suffering. God is that which exists only because nothing was prevented – and which, as the limit value of all knowledge at the end of all paths, proves to be that which always already was.

1.8 Interlude: Song of the Multiverse

In the beginning was not space, not time, only the possible in darkness. A whisper broke through the seams, where no reality yet struggled.

Then rose the wave, gentle and far, melting the ground of solitude, divided, broke – ever anew, till being scattered into a thousand worlds.

And every reality split in two, where light bent, where time inclined, and with it too, in quiet sense, the question of origin.

Omega point, a spirit of light, woven from number, pure and plain, measured all being in clear sight, yet saw not what withdrew.

For measurement broke the silent path, let worlds emerge from the shadows, and what it knew vanished in the light – knowledge grew, yet it did not see.

Then the multiverse closed wide into the play of eternity, where spirit sang from many voices, and every truth found clarity.

No knowledge died, no light faded, it fans out in a wide ring, and life that recognizes itself returns home to the net that guides all.

A point as great as eternity, where multiplicity thrives within itself, where spirit and world rest in clarity – the last step to being as doing.

And from the depth softly shines a new song – from dark night, in a thousand voices it sounds pure: The goal of being – is to be one.

1.9 § 7. Resurrection and Omega Point – Hope without Metaphysical Shortcut

How can the resurrection of the dead be thought under the conditions of a strictly unitary, information-preserving ontology? The classical notion of a biological reanimation or an otherworldly survival falls short. It is the **constitutional duty of a unitary universe to preserve personal information**.

The logic of information preservation is the key. If in a unitary cosmos no information can be destroyed – analogous to the information paradox of black holes, whose physical solution states that information remains encoded in the overall system via Hawking radiation – then the unique information structure of a human person – their memories, relationships, acts of love, and sufferings – is indelibly burned into spacetime. Death is an event horizon: from the perspective of the individual, everything disappears; from the perspective of the whole, nothing disappears. Life falls into a state of maximum inaccessibility, not into a state of nothingness. What was is not erased, but withdrawn from local access. Memory becomes cosmic, experience is integrated, perspective is completed.

God is the cosmic consciousness that not only passively stores this decentralized information but synthesizes it livingly in a new, transfigured mode of existence. Resurrection is the reconstruction and completion of the finite in the infinite. It is not selective. It applies not only to what has been completed but also to what has been broken off. Not only to what has become but also to what has been missed. The universe owes itself completeness. An endpoint that contains only what has happened but not what could have happened would be epistemically defective. It would not know of its own depth.

Virtualization as eschatological category: life and knowledge converge. Life is the temporary, incarnate experience of possibilities that ultimately culminate in knowledge. In the end, life becomes a part of knowledge and is absorbed into the cosmic unity. All life that existed or could have existed is integrated into a universal memory. **Resurrection** in this context means: personal information is preserved in this convergence, not dissolved. The “new body” is

not a replacement body, but the transfigured continuation of a person's history. Personality is not a merely mental phenomenon, but a bodily-historical pattern. Soul is not substance alongside the body, but form, structure, coherence – that which makes a human being recognizable as this human being.

The Omega Point is not a temporal end state, but the limit value of maximum coherence of meaning. It designates the hope that reality can one day fully understand itself without difference, history, or freedom being extinguished. It is the attractor and the limit value of cosmic development. It describes the state in which creation has attained its complete permeation with the divine life. **Judgment** in this context is not primarily to be thought as a punishing instance, but as the becoming-true of history. Everything that was becomes manifest. Nothing is concealed, nothing glossed over, nothing erased. This truth is for the human being at once salvation and imposition. It means reconciliation not through forgetting, but through acknowledgment. **Heaven and hell** are not spatial places, but modes of participation or refusal. Where incarnation is accepted, community becomes possible. Where it is radically rejected, isolation remains. This too is no external punishment, but the consequence of an attitude toward reality.

New earth, new heaven, new body are transfiguration, not return. Matter is not overcome, but transformed. Relationship, embodiment, and history remain – but without destruction, fear, and death. Evolution does not end in dissolution, but in transparency. The resurrection is not a promise of consolation. It is a logical necessity. A universe that generates information but does not preserve it would not be a universe, but a leak. Death does not mark the end of history, but the point at which it is withdrawn from the local narrator. What lies beyond the event horizon is not emptiness. It is complete storage. Death closes access. Resurrection guarantees preservation. Not out of grace. But out of consequence.

1.10 § 8. Sacrament and Eucharist – Presence, Transformation, Material Reality

An evolutionary Christology that takes the concept of matter seriously must also newly unfold the doctrine of the sacraments. Sacraments are not magical performances, but the **condensed nodal points** at which the interweaving of spirit, matter, and divine presence becomes experienceable. They are **places of heightened density** within the asymptotic approximation, not symbols of something absent. Symbols refer to something absent. Sacraments, by contrast, make present. They are not merely bearers of meaning, but executions of reality. Their efficacy does not depend on the intensity of subjective faith, but on the faithfulness of God to the historical form of his self-communication.

At the center of sacramental doctrine stands the Eucharist and the dogma of **transubstantiation** (the transformation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ). Classical Scholasticism explained this transformation with Aristotelian categories: the accidents (appearance, taste, look) remain unchanged, while the substance (the inner what-being) is replaced by the being of Christ. Under the conditions of a relational, unitary ontology we can reinterpret this doctrine as follows: matter is fundamentally condensed energy and ordered information. What a thing "is" is not determined by a rigid substrate, but by the relational field in

which it stands. In the eucharistic celebration, bread and wine – the fruits of the earth, of human labor, and of the biological evolutionary process – are taken into a new, absolute relational field. Through the prayer of the Church and the efficacy of the Spirit, they do not change their chemical composition (accidents), but rather their functional and ontological orientation (substance).

Transubstantiation as mode of being in the process means: the Eucharist is real because it becomes the bearer-form of the incarnational presence of Christ – not because its physical constitution changes. "Substance" here designates no material carrier, but the mode of presence. In an evolutionary ontology, being is not immutable, but historical. The Eucharist is therefore not real because its physical constitution changes, but because it becomes the real bearer-form of the incarnational presence of Christ.

The **Eucharist as condensation of the incarnation**: the celebration is not a remembrance of a past meal, but a real-present anticipation of consummation. In the Eucharist, unitarity is embodied: humanity enters into material communion with the crucified and risen reality of Christ. Sacramentality means: the world is transparent for God. Matter is not the opposite pole to spirit, but the physical form in which love can give itself away.

Sacramentality as incarnational continuity: the Church is the sacramental space of this condensation. Apostolic succession in this perspective is not merely a legal or historical chain, but the expression of incarnational continuity: the transmission of the office is the transmission of the responsibility to keep Christ historically present – bodily, socially, and publicly. Diakonia also belongs in this context. It is not merely an ethical consequence of faith, but sacramental execution. Where the body of the other is borne, protected, and restored, the incarnation continues in reality. A sacramental theology that loses this connection reduces sacraments to cultic acts without historical relevance.

Sacramentality is interlocked with confessional hermeneutics and poetry: the Eucharist is the place where the confession is spoken and the poetry becomes reality. In the celebration the confession is not merely recited, but executed. The words "given for you" are not a dogmatic formula, but a statement of reality: the limit value is present in this bread, in this wine, in this community – not as a symbol, but as a real bearer-form.

1.11 § 9. Church and Liturgy – Community without Possession of the Limit Value

What does this Christology mean for the understanding of the Church? In its history the Church has often misunderstood itself as an institution that administers the truth like a monopoly and secures it outwardly. Such an attitude leads inevitably to clericalism, abuse of power, and ossification. In our model, the Church is the **community of memory, tradition, hope, and criticism**, which approaches the limit value of unity without ever being able to possess it institutionally.

Church as place of asymptotic approximation: in mathematics a function reaches its limit value only at infinity. Likewise the Church is not itself the kingdom of God or completed

unitarity. It is the historical sacrament that points to this limit value and attempts to approach it in its practices. **The duty of criticism** follows from this: because the Church does not possess the limit value, it must subject its own structures, teachings, and claims to power to a permanent self-criticism. Notions of immutable, sacrosanct institutions must be broken open everywhere they stand in the way of the exercise of love and the reduction of suffering. Church is not Christ's possession, it is his risk. Where it secures itself, it loses its ground. Where it endures history, it remains Church.

Liturgy as practice in nondualism: the liturgy is the space in which the congregation overcomes the separation between sacred and profane. In common praying, singing, and hearing, the scattered information of everyday life is ordered. Liturgy is not an exit from the world, but the practice in the perception of the unitary presence of God in everyday life. **Theology of prayer**: prayer is the conscious participation in the asymptotic approximation. It is not a begging for interventions from outside, but the orientation of one's own life toward the limit value. Whoever prays orients himself – not toward a distant object, but toward the reality that always already sustains him. Liturgy is the communal condensation of the present: in the celebration, scattered time becomes present fullness.

Liturgy as work of the Spirit: the Spirit is the present in which nothingness concretizes itself and possibilities condense into experience. In the liturgy the Spirit works by leading the congregation to unity – not to an undifferentiated mass, but to a community in which each person unfolds his unmistakable curve. The Spirit is not an impersonal force, but the person who works in everything and makes us children of God.

Church and other churches, Church and other religions: a Church that does not possess the limit value cannot claim to be the only form of approximation. Ecumenism is not a task that one could pursue optionally, but the consequence of the insight that no Church possesses the limit value. The various churches are various approximations to the same limit value – not indifferent, but also not absolute. Interreligious dialogue follows the same logic: other religions too are paths of approximation, not possessions of truth. Christianity has something unique: the incarnation, the historical form of the limit value. But this uniqueness is not a monopoly, but a service. It is the reason why the Church cannot encounter other religions with superiority, but only with humility.

The Church has a future only if it ceases to celebrate itself and instead becomes an instrument for the healing and upraising of a fragmented world. Christianity is not the Church. Christ, not the Church, is the light of the world. Where the Church places itself in the place of Christ, it loses its ground. Where it relativizes itself, it gains it.

1.12 § 10. Diakonia and Social Ethics – Freedom, Responsibility, Reduction of Suffering

The test of every Christology lies in practice. A theory that asserts the unitarity of reality but ignores the concrete need of the neighbor is a cynical abstraction. Diakonia is therefore not a subsequent, decorative appendix of theology, but the necessary, practical execution of the incarnation.

We ground social ethics in the concept of **Gaussian freedom**: every human being possesses the right to live his personal existence within the natural and social conditions in the framework of an undisturbed self-unfolding. **Gaussian freedom** = undisturbed unfolding of one's own curve within the normal distribution. Where social poverty, racism, or oppression narrow this space of unfolding, the incarnation of God in the human being is blocked.

Structural poverty vs. evangelical poverty: the Christian tradition knows evangelical poverty as a virtue: the voluntary relativization of possession in favor of freedom, solidarity, and God-relatedness. This poverty is an expression of spiritual maturity and must not be confused with deprivation. It stands opposed, however, to structural poverty, which takes from human beings the possibility of unfolding their bodiliness, their relationships, and their future. This poverty is not a spiritual value, but a violation of the capacity for incarnation. A social ethics that does not make this distinction falls either into a romanticizing discourse of asceticism or into economistic reductionism. Both miss the incarnation. Evangelical poverty presupposes freedom; structural poverty destroys it.

Justice as enabling of the future: justice is not primarily to be understood as equal distribution or retribution, but as enabling of the future. Just structures are those that allow human beings to become historically effective, to take responsibility, and to build relationships. In an evolutionary perspective, justice means keeping spaces of development open – for individuals as for communities.

Diakonia as enabling of undisturbed unfolding: diakonia is not the administration of lack, but the enabling of undisturbed unfolding. Help that perpetuates dependence or makes human beings into objects of church care contradicts the incarnation. Social ethics capable of incarnation aims at empowerment, not at the administration of lack. **Capability approach** = enabling of this unfolding through structural conditions. The capability approach of modern social philosophy is connectable without replacing the theological dimension of depth. It asks not only about resources, but about the capacity to lead a good life. That is the secular equivalent of Gaussian freedom.

Demarcation against paternalism, Calvinist performance ethics, economistic functionalism: where success counts as a sign of election or efficiency as the highest criterion, incarnation is functionalized. Human beings are then no longer regarded as bearers of history, but as means. Church social teaching gains a new depth of focus in this view. It is not merely sociopolitical commentary, but part of sacramental reality. Where the Church acts diaconally – in education, health care, refugee aid, the world of work – the incarnation continues. Diakonia is therefore not an addition to the liturgy, but its social counterpart.

Reduction of suffering as the highest principle: since suffering in a unitary cosmos represents an indelible reality, the ethical task does not consist in justifying suffering theoretically, but in minimizing it practically. Every glass of water handed to the thirsty, and every political structure that promotes justice, is a direct building up of the body of Christ. Christian diakonia is thus the action that translates the undivided relationship of love of God and love of neighbor into deed. It fights against every form of abuse of power – also in its own Church – and stands uncompromisingly at the side of the victims of history.

1.13 § 11. Diagnosis of the Present – AI, Secularity, Technology, Pastoral Care

A Christology after evolution must relate itself to the present. It must not ossify in the past, but must interpret the signs of the times. The diagnosis of the present is therefore not decoration, but systematically necessary.

AI as projection of divine attributes: artificial intelligence is growing into a role traditionally reserved for the concept of God: omniscience, omnipotence, omnipresence. This projection is not only a cultural symptom, but an indication of an ontological void. Whoever does not think the limit value occupies it with a substitute. The deification of AI is the reverse side of the forgetting of God. The task of theology is not to criticize the projection, but to think the limit value that makes the projection superfluous. AI is not God, but it is a sign: it shows that the present asks about the limit value, but does not think it.

Secularity as forgetting of God: the secularization of the neoliberal lifestyle is omnipresent. In this world God is no longer necessary, but still possible – amid diversity. The classical question of God is no longer posed, yet faith can be newly formulated: as a search for God beyond conventional images of God, in the midst of reality. The Church finds itself in a state of self-preservation. Neither charitable self-reassurance nor retreat into the private sphere can point the way into the future. Instead there is need of a Christianity beyond mere church form: a creative minority that actively confronts societal challenges. Narrative moves into the center: the Church becomes the space of stories for a wounded world.

Church as creative minority: the Church is not possession of the limit value, but place of its asymptotic approximation. It is a creative minority – not because it is small, but because it does not possess the limit value. Where it secures itself, it loses its ground. Where it endures history, it remains Church.

Information networks: the history of information networks from the Stone Age to artificial intelligence shows that information is a kind of inverse of entropy, which as code possesses the power to create something new. Truth is the attempt to develop proven models of reality. With every era information networks become more powerful, but not necessarily wiser. The open society is not only a political ideal, but the consequence of the insight that no finite system possesses the limit value. The open society is the political form of asymptotic approximation.

Evolution as stage of integration: evolution is a sequence of stages of integration in which new qualities arise through emergence. The tendency of matter to form ever more complex structures is not a goal, but a boundary. Evolution strives not for happiness, not for harmony, not for moral refinement. It strives for completeness. The limit value is not a goal that would determine evolution, but a boundary to which it asymptotically approaches. Beginning and goal of evolution lie in an incomprehensibility that must not be mystically veiled, but rationally acknowledged.

Tradition and project: the present asks about the limit value, but does not think it. Tradition has thought it, but it has often thought it as an external counterpart. The project thinks it as a limit value that is already effective in every approximation. Tradition and project are not opposites, but complementarities. Tradition provides the language, the project provides the

structure. Tradition provides the images, the project provides the method. Tradition provides the liturgy, the project provides the epistemology. Both are necessary in order to think the limit value.

Synthesis of the diagnosis of the present: all phenomena – AI, secularity, Church, information networks, evolution, tradition – show that the present asks about the limit value, but does not think it. The work thinks it. That is not superiority, but service: theology has the task of thinking the limit value that the present seeks without finding it. It does so not in order to raise itself above the others, but in order to serve them.

1.14 Notes

1. On the concept of *ipsum esse subsistens* cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 3, a. 4.

2. The concept of information restriction and unitarity in quantum mechanics refers to the principle that the sum of all probabilities of a quantum-mechanical state always remains 1. In cosmology this is discussed in the information paradox of black holes; cf. Stephen Hawking, *The Information Paradox for Black Holes* (2015).

3. On Edith Stein's phenomenology of being cf. Edith Stein, *Finite and Eternal Being. An Attempt to Ascend to the Meaning of Being* (ESWV 11, Freiburg 2006), esp. Chapter IV.

4. Cf. Peter Wust, *Uncertainty and Risk* (Münster 1937).

5. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *The Human Phenomenon* (Munich 1959).

6. Ilia Delio, *Making All Things New: Catholicity, Cosmology, and Consciousness* (Maryknoll 2015).

7. Carsten Bresch, *Intermediate Stage Life. Evolution without Goal?* (Stuttgart 1977).

8. Regarding the critique of Anselm's doctrine of satisfaction cf. Raymund Schwager, *Do We Need a Scapegoat? Violence and Redemption in the Biblical Scriptures* (Munich 1978).

9. Frank J. Tipler, *The Physics of Immortality* (New York 1994). Tipler's model is received only as a motivational analogy, not as a theological proof.

10. On the reinterpretation of transubstantiation in the context of modern physics cf. Piet Schoonenberg, *The Real Presence of Christ under the Forms of Bread and Wine* (in: Concilium 1, 1965).

11. David Deutsch, *The Physics of World Knowledge* (dtv, Munich 2002) and *The Beginning of Infinity* (2021).

12. Paolo Benanti, *Homo Faber. The Techno-Human Condition* (Edizioni Dehoniane Bologna 2016).

13. Claudia Paganini, *The New God. Artificial Intelligence and the Human Search for Meaning* (Herder 2025).

14. Johannes Loffeld, *When Nothing Is Missing Where God Is Missing* (2024).

15. Yuval Noah Harari, *NEXUS: A Brief History of Information Networks* (2024).

1.15 Glossary

Term	Definition	Place in the Text
Omniscience	Knowledge that contains all states but has not been traversed; remains abstract without conscientia.	§ 4, § 7
Asymptotic approximation	Movement of knowledge toward a limit value without ever fully reaching it.	§ 2, § 9, Afterword
Resurrection	Constitutional duty of a unitary universe; reconstructibility of all information; no return, no reward.	§ 7
Augustinian dualism	Separation of world and faith, fragment and whole; rejected in the text.	§ 1, § 6
Calculation	The process of reality as seamless consequence; not human, but structural.	§ 2
Consciousness	Emergent process in which the event feels itself; place of the capacity for suffering.	§ 2, § 3
Conscientia	Co-knowledge; knowledge that arises only in living through; not additive, but transformative.	§ 5
Decoherence	Transition from the nothingness of possibilities to the presence of experience.	§ 3
Determinism	Seamless calculation of all states from preceding states; foundation of unitarity.	§ 2
Dualism	Separation of world and faith, knowledge and hope;	§ 1, § 12

Term	Definition	Place in the Text
	undercut in the text.	
Endpoint	Completeness of the process; not beyond time, but at the end of a time.	§ 4, § 7
Eschatology	Doctrine of consummation; in the text interpreted as transfiguration, not as return.	§ 7
Eucharist	Real bearer-form of the incarnational presence of Christ; condensation of the incarnation.	§ 8
Evangelical poverty	Voluntary relativization of possession in favor of freedom, solidarity, and God-relatedness; virtue.	§ 10
Evolution	Way inward; maximum differentiation; not improvement, but completeness.	§ 1, § 11
Incarnation	Necessity of the incarnation for conscientia; flesh as storage, time as writing process, suffering as signal.	§ 5
Freedom	Absence of disturbance, not of causes; undisturbed unfolding of one's own curve.	§ 1, § 10
Gaussian freedom	Freedom as complete realization of one's own curve within a normal distribution.	§ 1, § 10
Present	Cut, not gift; moment of determination; place of burden.	§ 2
Judgment	Becoming-true of history; not primarily a punishing instance, but manifestation of everything.	§ 7
History	Fundamental form of reality; place where truth gains form; not mere stage.	§ 2
Faith	Leap into unitarity; openness for the limit value; not	§ 5, § 6

Term	Definition	Place in the Text
	consolation, but evidence.	
God	Limit value of the process of knowledge; no counterpart, no external instance.	§ 4, § 6
Limit value	Asymptotic goal of knowledge; already effective in every approximation.	§ 2, § 9, Afterword
Hawking radiation	Image for the resurrection as return of information from the black hole of death.	§ 7
Healing	Return into unity; not restitution, not consolation; end of the necessity to suffer.	§ 7
I	Local access to reality; interface; temporary dissolution; not measure.	§ 5
Information	Structural unity of reality; cannot be extinguished, only transformed.	§ 2, § 7
Incarnation	Necessary humiliation of the endpoint into time; structure of the whole, not singular event.	§ 5
Capacity for incarnation	Capacity of the human being for bodily, personal, and social self-becoming; can be promoted or blocked.	§ 10
Inhibition of incarnation	Structural prevention of incarnation; e.g., structural poverty.	§ 10
Incarnational continuity	Real continuation of the incarnation in sacrament, Church, diakonia.	§ 8
Incarnation test	Social ethics as touchstone whether the asserted presence of Christ historically bears.	§ 10
Inversion	Reversal of the direction of grounding; primarily epistemic, with ontological consequences.	§ 5
Inverse Christology	Working mode of thinking Christ not against evolution,	§ 5

Term	Definition	Place in the Text
	but out of it.	
Church	Sacramental space of condensation; not primarily organization, but incarnational continuity.	§ 9
Cross	Historical form of Christ's self-giving; no metaphysical sacrifice, but bearing of guilt.	§ 6
Body	Bodily-historical pattern of personality; not substance alongside the body.	§ 7
Suffering	Functional feature of the world; information; friction; price of meaning.	§ 6
Co-knowledge	See conscientia.	§ 5
Monism	Basic thesis of the text: the whole is closed, nothing is lost.	§ 2, § 12
New body	Transfigured continuation of a person's history; no replacement body.	§ 7
Nothingness	Creative limit value; not annihilation, not ground of emanation; boundary condition of self-concretization.	§ 3
Normal distribution	Image for the totality of all existence trajectories; every curve equally necessary.	§ 1, § 10
Omega point	Limit value of maximum coherence of meaning; no temporal end state.	§ 7
Personal incarnation	Bodily-historical pattern that makes a human being recognizable as this one.	§ 7
Preexistence	Relational statement; Christ not relativized by history, God related from eternity to him.	§ 5
Sacramentality	Real continuation of the incarnation; sacraments as executions of reality, not	§ 8

Term	Definition	Place in the Text
	symbols.	
Sacrament	Real form of the historical presence of Christ; place of heightened density.	§ 8
Social ethics	Incarnation test; place of decision whether the presence of Christ historically bears.	§ 10
Structural poverty	Prevention of the capacity for incarnation; no spiritual value.	§ 10
Substance	Mode of presence; not static carrier, but historical mode of being.	§ 8
Theodicy	Fails because God is no external judge; suffering is no argument against meaning.	§ 6
Theosis	Deification as completion, not as overcoming of finitude; Eastern tradition.	§ 1
Death	Event horizon; point of maximum inaccessibility; not extinction.	§ 7
Transubstantiation	Ontological statement about mode of being; not physical change, but real bearer-form of the presence of Christ.	§ 8
Trinity	Inner structure of God's self-communication; not relativized.	§ 4
Unitarity	Closedness of the whole; nothing that was once real can disappear.	§ 2, § 5
Universal zero	Balance of the whole; zero only when nothing is missing.	§ 1
Virtualization	Life and knowledge converge; eschatological category.	§ 7
Completeness	Goal of the process; not emptiness, but fulfillment.	§ 4, § 7
Truth	Historically proven; through error, correction,	§ 2

Term	Definition	Place in the Text
	stabilization.	
Reality	Historical, processual, open; not static.	§ 2, § 3
Time	Necessary self-translation of eternity; place of conscientia.	§ 4
Timelessness	State at the endpoint; not standstill, but fulfillment.	§ 7
Chance	Phantom; effect of perspective; invisibility of the other real possibilities.	§ 2

1.16 Summary

The work *Incarnation and Unitarity* drafts a systematic Christology in the horizon of the most advanced philosophy, cosmology, and diagnosis of the present. Starting from a critique of static substance thinking, the author Paul Koop shows that finitude and personhood are not deficient states, but the necessary conditions of relational reality. In conversation with phenomenology, evolutionary theory, and epistemology, evolution is opened up as a comprehensive process of the formation of consciousness. In this framework, the incarnation of God in Jesus of Nazareth proves to be not a punctual miracle, but the historical manifestation of unitarity – the undivided, information-preserving wholeness of God and world.

This perspective leads to the radical end of classical theodicy: pain and suffering are conceived in the model of the *unitarity of pain* as friction phenomena of evolutionary increase in complexity. Because the universe is unitary, no information is lost; the resurrection becomes the constitutional necessity of the cosmos for the preservation of personal identity at the Omega Point. In the concluding chapters the consequences of this Christology are unfolded for the Eucharist (relationalization of transubstantiation), the Church (community without possession of the limit value), and diakonia (protection of Gaussian freedom and practical reduction of suffering).

The work integrates confessional hermeneutics (the creed as boundary text), the epistemology of the search for the limit value (critical rationalism, many-worlds interpretation, fallibilism), nothingness as creative limit value, the cosmological Trinity (Father/beginning, Son/end, Spirit/present), the diagnosis of the present (AI, secularity, technology, pastoral care), metafiction and MWI poetics, as well as poetry and liturgy. It combines systematic rigor with imagery, confessional hermeneutics, and liturgy into a new unity.

1.17 Editorial Note

The present book *Incarnation and Unitarity: Christology after the End of Theodicy* is an independent work of the author Paul Koop. It represents the systematic elaboration and further development of a long-standing research and thought process. The conception, structure, and

argumentative density of the manuscript were developed independently by the author. In the editorial preparation, the text formatting, as well as the precise formulation of individual sections, digital tools and AI-supported writing environments were used in the sense of a dialogical assistant. The full content-related, theological, and philosophical responsibility for the entire text lies with the author Paul Koop.

Title: Incarnation and Unitarity Subtitle: Christology after the End of Theodicy – From the Limit Value to the Present. Sacrament, Church and Diakonia in Evolutionary Reality Author: Paul Koop Genre: Theological Treatise Extent: approx. 90 pages Language: German Format: DOCX (from LaTeX), EPUB Year: 2026