



KASTYTIS RUDOKAS

Kauno technologijos universitetas, Lietuva
Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania

RETROKAUZALUMAS KAIP AUTENTIŠKO SPRENDIMO PRIĖMIMO SĄLYGA: TARP EMPIRĖJAUS ATEITYJE IR FIZINĖS REALYBĖS

Retrocausality as an Implication
of Authentic Decision-Making: Between the Future
of the Empyreus and the Physical Realms

SUMMARY

This paper explores retrocausality as a prerequisite for genuine human decision-making, drawing on theological tradition and quantum physics. It posits that the Kingdom of Heaven functions as an actual yet concealed future absorber — already present yet not fully discernible — enabling free will to flourish unhindered. Using hermeneutics as a tool and a methodology for reasoning, the study integrates Thomistic metaphysics, scriptural insights and modern theories of time in order to reimagine the structure of time as being layered, reciprocal and open to divine interaction.

SANTRAUKA

Šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjamas retrokausalumas kaip būtina autentiško žmogaus apsisprendimo sąlyga, remiantis krikščioniška teologine tradicija ir kai kuriais apibendrintais kvantinės fizikos teiginiais. Teigiama, kad Dangaus Karalystė veikia kaip realus, bet paslėptas būsimasis *absorberis* – jau esantis, tačiau dar ne iki galo suvokiamas, – leidžiantis laisvajai valiai reikštis be prievartos. Hermeneutika taikoma tiek kaip mąstymo priemonė, tiek kaip metodologija. Tyrime integruojama tomistinė metafizika, Šventojo Rašto įžvalgos ir šiuolaikinės laiko teorijos, siekiant perkurti laiko struktūrą kaip sluoksniuotą, abipusę ir atvirą dieviškajai sąveikai.

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: retrokausalumas, empirėjus, sprendimo priėmimas, autentiškumas.

KEY WORDS: retrocausality, Empyreus, decision-making, authenticity.

IVADAS

Ateitis nėra tik tik pasyvus mūsų veiksmų dabartyje rezultatas – ji vis labiau suvokiama kaip aktyvus sprendimų priėmimo proceso dalyvis, nors ir vadintume šitą fenomeną prieštaraujančiu prigimtinai intuicijai (angl. *counter-intuitive*). Remiantis Johno Archibaldo Wheelerio teze, jos eksperimentas dabartyje nebūtų įmanomas, jei to ekperimento *absorberis* ateityje neatraibuliuotų laiku atgal ir tokiu būdu nekonstatuotų dabarties (Wheeler 1983). Taip įvedama vadinamoji laiko simetrijos sąvoka, reiškianti, kad dabarties veiksmo autentiškumą lemia tiek praeities tiek ir ateities įtakos (Wheeler & Feynman, 1945; 1949).

Straipsnyje laikomasi principinės pozicijos, kad autentiškai priimti sprendimą galima, tik remiantis šiuo laiko simetrijos principu. Tai reiškia, jog laisva valia išskyla tada, kai, jai renkantis, kokį sprendimą priimti, vienaip ar kitaip stebimas ateities vaizdinys, kurį nulems pats sprendimas. B. Spinoza pabrėžia žmogiškojo supratimo ribas, nes dabarties realybės konfigūracijos priežastis slypi giliai praeityje. Šiame straipsnyje,

priešingai, siūloma filosofiškai ir teologiškai išplėsti šias supratimo ribas dviem būdais:

- a) negalimybė suvokti egzistavimo priežastį apskritai galbūt išryškėja ne dėl priežasčių daugybingumo praeityje, o dėl to, kad dabartinio čia ir dabar buvimo priežastis slypi ateityje arba yra prislėpta ateities;
- b) *res rerum*, arba „daiktas savyje“, kaip pažinimo raktas ir daugybingumo priežastis, suvokiamas kaip žmogaus intelekto geba stebėti realybę ateityje.

Retrokuzalus veikimas nėra svetimas ir katalikiškai minčiai, ir mokymo idėjai apskritai. Dar Senajame Testamente aprašomas Karaliaus Hezekijo pagydymo ženklas – retrokuzalus saulės veikimas (2 Kar 20, 8–11). Galiausiai paties Dievo Įsikūnijimo galimybė ir gimimas žmogaus kūne, remiantis Joanneo Dunso Scotus'o mąstymu, kyla iš aukščiausios žmogaus laisvės sąlygos, kuri įgalina tokią Dievo veikimo skvarbą, jog Švč. Mergelė Marija galėjo gimti be nuodėmės dar prieš išgelbstinčią Jėzaus Kristaus mirtį ir prisikėlimą.

METODOLOGINIS STRAIPSNIO ASPEKTAS

Švč. Mergelės Marijos ištartas *fiat* angelui apsiareiškus gali kelti tam tikrą filosofinę dvejone. Jei Dievo Motina buvo iš anksto apsaugota nuo gimtosios nuodėmės, nes turėjo būti parengta Įsikūnijimui, ar čia neiškyla tam tikra predeterminizmo problema? Juk arba pats išankstinis parengimas, arba retrokuzalus Jėzaus Įsikūnijimas galėjo veikti Marijos laisvą valią angelui apsiareiškus.

Vadovaujamosi esmine nuostata – ji toliau straipsnyje bus suvokiama kaip hermeneutinės analizės metodo pagrindas, – kad Švč. Mergelė Marija, priimant sprendimą dėl jai iš anksto suteiktų ir vėliau suteiksimų malonių, nepatiria loginės prieštaros, kur susikerta Dievo planas ir laisva žmogiškoji valia. Dievo Motina čia kaip tik atsiduria pilniausioje įmanomoje potencialo erdvėje, todėl

gali rinktis visiškai laisvai. Apsaugojimas nuo gimtosios nuodėmės šiuo atveju yra ne tiesiog impozicija, o galiybė aiškiai matyti, čia ir dabar priimti sprendimą.

Galop, filosofiškai žvelgdami, regime įdomią laiko sandaros konfigūraciją, kai praeities ir ateities įvykiai ne determinuoja vienas kitą, o veikia nelinijiniu,

būties čia ir dabar aspektu. Ypač remdamiesi šv. Augustino mokymu, čia, regis, pastebime subtilią kūno ir sielos tarpuskvarbą, nes siela, anot šio autoriaus, yra ta žmogaus esybės komponentė, kuri nepriklauso nuo laiko ir erdvės – labiau paklūsta *aevum*, angeliškam laiko tėkmės dėsniai.

RETROKAUZALUMU GRĮSTO SAMPROTAVIMO GALIMYBĖ ŽMOGAUS MAŠTYME, PIRMIESIEMS TĖVAMS NENUPUOLUS

Sprendimo priėmimo aktas gilesne prasme yra ne kas kita, kaip kaskart visiškai naujo pasaulio sukūrimas (Arendt 1958, Bergson 1911). Krikščioniška mintis iš esmės išplečia šią žmogaus sąmonėje glūdinčią galią – be Dievo garbinimo ir dalyvavimo Dievo taryboje sukurtą žmogaus žemėje užduotis buvo ištaisyti fizinį blogį ir / ar netobulumą, materijoje egzistavusį nuo sukūrimo momento (Garrigues, Iz 11, 6–9). Darome prieladą, jog, jei žmogus būtų nepažinęs moralinio blogio, vykstant pasaulio pašventinimo ir fizinio išstobulinimo darbo procesui, jis būtų galėjęs gerokai skvarbiau naudotis informacija, tiek ateinančia iš praeities, tiek atraibuliuojančia iš ateities. Pastaroji galimybė buvo jei ne prarasta, tai bent jau pridengta tuo metu, kai rojus vartai žmogui buvo užtrenkti.

Vienas įdomiausių šio simetrinio laiko pavyzdžių regimas ir pirmosiose dviejose *Pradžios knygos* dalyse apie sukūrimą, kur galima nesunkiai išvelgti dvikryptę laiko tėkmę, tyrinėjant žmogaus sukūrimo eiliškumą. Sugretinus šiuos pasakojimus, žmogus pasirodo kaip pirmasis materialinio pasaulio kūrinys, bet kartu jis ir paskutinis – kaip fizinės realybės karūna. Abiejų pasakojimų sugretinimas iš esmės gerai atliepia

šiuolaikinio mokslo požiūrį. Iš esmės prireikė visos be galo sudėtingos ir preciziškai tikslios kosmoso raidos, kad susiformuotų žmogus, tačiau tam, kad pats kosmosas apskritai galėtų egzistuoti, turėjo būti protingas stebėtojas – būtent žmogus, paradoksaliai atsiradęs vėliau nei tas pats kosmosas (Rudokas 2023).

Remiantis šia teorija, galima teigti, kad pats žmogiškasis pasaulio stebėjimas yra savotiškai retrokauzalus veiksmas. Tačiau kitas svarbus aspektas – ar žmogus objektyviojoje savo dabartyje yra vienaip ar kitaip veikiamas, tikliau, ar jis naudojasi savo geba. Anot Bažnyčios mokytojų, nors Adomas ir Ieva po sukūrimo neturėjo pašlovinto, t. y. sudvasinto, kūno, jų kūnai vis dėlto pasižymėjo gerokai skvarbesniu santykiu su siela. Dėl to žmogus fizinio blogio ištaisymo pasaulyje apmatus galėjo regėti kaip rezultato, pasiekto ateityje, patarimą dabarčiai (St. Augustine St. Augustine, *De immortalitate animae*, c. 16; Conf., XI, 13, Tabaczek 2025, St Bonaventure Breviloquium, *De creatura mundi* II, 12, 1–4). Paties žmogaus rankomis atbaigijamas fizinis pasaulis galėjo būti žmogui pasiekiamas dar jo neatbaigus, itin subtiliai įsisąmoninus teleologinius principus.

PRIDENGTA RETROKAUZALUMAS KAIP NEGEBA REGĖTI DANGAUS KARALYSTĖS

Net jei tik nuojauta, bet aiški, apie savo veikmų potencialą ateičiai ir tuo pačiu metu gebėjimas perkurti praeitį, kad ir ribotai, gali būti laikomas visumine žmogaus laisvos valios išraiška idealiomis sąlygomis, kurios dabartyje neprieinamos (Aharonov Y., Cohen E., Gruss E. & Landsberger T. 2016). Kita vertus, ontologinis žmogaus priklausymas nuo savo paties ateities niekur nedingsta, nes tik tas, kas turi ateitį, gali kurti istoriją (Heidegger 1927). Ateities neužtikrintumas priartina žmogų, kaip kūrinį, prie autentiškos būties modelio. Tai, kas būtų laikoma autentiškumu, žmogui priimant sprendimą, nėra paties galėjimo priimti sprendimą faktas ar galimybė užmegzti santykį su sprendimo pasekmėmis. Autentiška yra pati galimybė (pa)būti sprendimo priėmimo akimirka ir taip nors iš dalies pasinerti į Amžinybės laiko struktūrą. Galime daryti prielaidą, kad nuopuolio sąlygomis šis būvis, artimas „amžinajam dabar“, labiausiai priartina žmogų prie Dangaus Karalystės.

Dangaus Karalystės, arba empirėjaus, materialumo pabrėžtis tomistinėje tradicijoje mums teikia prielaidą spekuliuoti, jog ši Karalystė, būdama ir kūniškos realybės dalis, taip pat retrokazučiai mus gali veikti. Tuo pačiu metu mūsų auten-

tiškas, nors ir netobulas, veiksmas „čia ir dabar“ yra tarsi Dangaus Karalystė aktualizavimosi ateityje sąlyga. Šis teiginys, formuluojamas ne kaip teologinė, o veikiau kaip filosofinė įžvalga, kelia klausimą, ar, pavyzdžiui, kolektyvinis ir visu- minis žmonijos pasiryžimas stebėti Dangaus Karalystę, kaip eschatologinį faktą ateityje, įgalintų pačios Karalystės gyventojus, kuriuos nuo mūsų skiria laiko dimensija, aktyviau veikti mūsų objektyviojoje dabartyje, kad mes tą Karalystę galėtume pamatyti? Labiausiai trukdo pasiekti šį tikslą jau įvardytas žmogaus trūkumas, atsiradęs po nuopuolio, kai nebeįmanoma įsivaizduoti pasaulio kaip tobulos vietos dėl čia veikiančių fizikos dėsnių ir kitų normų, kurios žmogaus protui atrodo nepakeičiamos, – tai neblogai atspindi ir Izajo Mesijinės karalystės įsivaizdavimas (Iz 11:6–9).

Paradoksalu, kad, nors Dangaus Karalystė yra arčiausiai mūsų, visai šalia mūsų „čia ir dabar“ sprendimo priėmimo momento, todėl atrodo kaip labiausiai įmanomas pasirinkimas žmogui, vis dėlto žmonės, paskendę fizikos dėsnių ir kitų įpročių bei netikėjimo (Mk 11:23) impozicijose, negali rinktis jos stebėti, dėl to retrokazučias Karalystės veikimas irgi yra pridengtas.

AUTENTIŠKUMAS IR DALINIS AUTENTIŠKUMAS SPRENDIMO PRIĖMIMO MOMENTU

„Fariziejų paklaustas, kada ateis Dievo karalystė, Jėzus paaiškino: „Dievo karalystė ateina nepastebimai. Ir niekas nepasakys: ‘Štai ji čia arba ten!’ Nes Die-

vo karalystė jau yra tarp jūsų“ (Lk 17:20–21). Šis teiginys, rodos, sustiprina hipotezę, kad Karalystė, kuri yra čia, būdama labiausiai tikėtina iš visų ateities ir da-

barties versijų, yra kartu ir nepastebima. Paradoksaliai tai, kad žmogus gali nesirinkti Dangaus Karalystės, laiduoja autentišką laisvą pasirinkimą. Jei mes galime visiškai ignoruoti tikresnę tikrovę ir vietoje jos rinktis sąvają – mažiau tikrą, tai mums užtikrina fizinio pasaulio, kaip kūrinio dėsnų, viršenybę.

Tačiau šis vadinamosios viršenybės fenomenas pasireiškia dviem prieštariniais būdais. Nėra abejonės, kad žmogus, kaip kūrinys ir Dievo paveikslas vaizdinys, siekia transcendencijos, tai yra atsimainymo į visiškai kitokį būvį.

Tačiau šis siekis verčia išsižadėti savęs, tiksliau, savo, kaip kūrinio, tapatybės. Kadangi buvimo kūriniu ir turėjimo viršenybę kūrinių dalykams tapatybė, nors ir nebūdama „realiausia“, vis dėlto yra aiškiausiai matoma žmogui, tai žmo-

gus po nuopuolio, savo istorijos tėkmėje siekdamas to vadinamojo atsimainymo, apriboja savo potencialą, kad atsimainymas išliktų limituotas. Panašiai kaip šv. Petras, Jėzaus valia pradėjęs eiti vandeniui, išsigando gamtos siautėjimo ir pradėjo skęsti (Mt 14: 22–32), taip ir žmonija savo tobulėjimo sieki apriboja gamtos dėsniais, nes, peržengusi šią ribą, jina nebūtų ta labiausiai sau pačiai atpažįstama žmonijos versija.

Todėl žmogaus sprendimą tik pagerinti bet ne peržengti civilizacijos impozicijų spektrą galima suvokti kaip tik dalinio autentiškumo pasireiškimą laisvoje žmonijos valioje. Nematydamas nei teleologinės realybės, nei Dangaus Karalystės būties artimiausioje įmanomoje ateityje žmogus yra pasmerktas, nors jis ir mėgaujasi kūrinių kvaziviešpaties būtimi.

VIETOJE IŠVADŲ

Popiežius Benediktas XVI (2000) akcentavo vadinamojo žmogiškojo kūrybiškumo limitą, pabrėždamas, kad tik sukosmintas liturginis veiksmas atskleidžia žmogaus veiklos prasmę.

Remiantis šia prielaida, lengviau suprasti trijų pamatinių biblinės architektūros–inžinerijos struktūrų atsiradimą. Nojaus arka (plg. Pr 6, 14–16), Mozės Padangtė (plg. Iš 25–27) ir Saliamono Šventykla (plg. 1 Kar 6–7) – visos pasižymi tikslu, dieviškai apreiškstu išanktiniu jų galutinės formos žinojimu. Priešingai, Babelio bokšto statyba (plg. Pr 11,1–9) ar pirmasis miestas, pastatytas po pirminio brolių dūstės akto (plg. Pr 4,17), neturi tokio iš anksto nulemta teleologinio žinijimo, todėl tampa laikinu ir iš esmės neįmanomu artefaktu siekiant transcendencijos.

Išankstinis galutinės formos žinojimas, nors neabejotinai apreiškta Dievo, taip pat simbolizuoja platesnės sąmonės įsitraukimą vykstant kūrybos procesui, kai peržengiamas vien žmogiškasis žinojimas. Kai kurie autoriai pastebi, kad Arka, Padangtė, Šventykla ir Dievo Kūno Šventykla (t. y. Kristaus buvimas Sakramente) sudaro tam tikrą evoliucinę trajektoriją, būtiną galutiniam fizinių akių, gebančių regėti visą empirėjaus tikrovę, išsivystymui (von Balthasar 2004).

Galutinai išsipildęs retrokazualus pažinimas vestų žmoniją prie gilaus epistemologinio virsmo: daikto savyje pažinimo ir galiausiai atskleistų tokių daiktų, koks jis egzistuoja dieviškajame prote. Atitinkamai egzistuojančios daiktų įvairovės raida neišvengiamai kryptų link visiško ir pilnutinio kiekvieno daikto po-

tencialo aktualizavimo. Tačiau toks suvoikimas reikalauja retrokautaliai stebėti ne tiek patį objektą, kiek savo paties intelektą kaip vietą, kurioje gali vykti daiktų pažinimas, – ne dėl jų išorinio poveikio mums, o dėl to, kad žmogaus intelektualė iš anksto egzistuoja daiktų rūšys (*species*).

Tam tikru momentu priimto sprendimo autentiškumas pirmiausia nesiremia

nei laikinio tęsimo principu, nei tiesiogine informacija, sklindančia atgal iš ateities. Veikiau jis siejamas su ateities moduso – būdo – priėmimu pačioje intelekto veikloje. Kadangi tuo būdu, kuriuo tikrovė dabar egzistuoja, ji neišvenigiamai egzistuos ir ateityje, buvimas-pasaulyje savo prigimtimi yra tiek pat paveldėtas, kiek retraukautalus.

Retrocausality as an Implication of Authentic Decision-Making: Between the Future of the Empyreus and the Physical Realms

INTRODUCTION

In the most fundamental layers of reality, the future is not merely a passive result of what we do in the present; rather, it actively participates in shaping the present moment itself. According to Wheeler, no experiment or decision in the present would be possible unless a future “absorber” reflected reality retroactively through time (cf. Wheeler, 1983). The notion of a “future absorber” originates in the Wheeler-Feynman absorber theory, which argues that radiation is only fully actualized if it is absorbed not only in the past but also in the future. This implies a time-symmetric structure of physical interaction, where the future plays an active role in shaping present events (Wheeler & Feynman, 1945; 1949).

Nevertheless, the idea that the result of a present decision, which only comes into being in the future, can exert a direct or at least indirect influence on that very decision—though counter-intuitive and a subject of philosophical debate—opens a broader way of understanding reality.

This paper is grounded in the assumption that an authentic act of free will, as

it emerges in the human person, must rely on all information that is in principle available. Contrary to the Spinozistic position that the cause of existence is inherently unknowable due to the limits of human understanding (cf. Spinoza, *Ethics*, I, Appendix, where he speaks of “ten men in nature” to illustrate the illusory nature of final causes), this article proposes a twofold alternative:

- a) the unknowability of existence’s cause does not necessarily stem from a multiplicity of causes but rather from the fact that the cause of existence lies in the future. Though it reaches us retrocausally, its direct message remains veiled;
- b) the *res rerum*—the “thing in itself”—is the root and causal source of multiplicity. Yet this *res rerum* as “thing-in-itself” is the result of the human intellect’s act of observation of the future events or reality of the future. The importance of *res rerum* will occur discussing the relation between the material and spiritualized aspect of matter itself.

A mode of perception grounded in retrocausality is not foreign to Christian Catholic thought; it appears not only in theological thought experiments but also in Sacred Scripture. For instance, the sign accompanying the healing of King Hezekiah—the miraculous reversal of the sun’s shadow by several steps—is a clear biblical instance of temporal inversion (cf. 2 Kings 20:8–11). More significantly, the central event of Christianity—God’s Incarnation—is, in the view

of Duns Scotus, itself a retrocausal phenomenon. The preparation of the Virgin Mary to be the worthy Mother of God, conceived without and untouched by any sin, is a kind of anticipatory actualization of the redemptive work of Christ. Duns Scotus expresses this phenomenon by citing the famous axiom of Anselm of Canterbury: *Potuit, decuit, ergo fecit* (“God could do it, it was fitting, therefore He did it”) (cf. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, I.10).

METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

This retrocausal dimension raises a nuanced theological question that is important for the further research conducted in the paper: if Mary had already been preserved from original sin in anticipation of her role in the Incarnation, how could her fiat—her free consent—remain truly free? The key lies not in imagining grace as conditional upon her acceptance, but rather in recognizing that divine foreknowledge and preventive grace do not override human freedom. At the moment of the Annunciation, Mary stood not in logical contradiction, but in the fullness of possibility: she was truly free to say yes or no, and her Immaculate Conception was granted in view of her foreseen assent—not as a reward for it, but as part of God’s eternal and non-coercive providence.

Seen within a block-universe-like metaphysics, this relationship between fiat and grace does not imply temporal imposition but mutual illumination: both the Immaculate Conception and the fiat coinhabit a unified field of divine temporality, in which neither is causally de-

termined by the other. Rather, each helps disclose the meaning of the other in a non-linear, yet entirely coherent structure of divine-human freedom.

Thus, retrocausality here transforms into a subtle phenomenon of temporal pervasiveness that stretches across ordinary space and time. It appears that the material and spiritual realms are deeply interpenetrating. Accordingly, one of the core methodological premises of this article relies on the Thomistic interpretation of paradise—empyreus—as a material reality (cf. *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 102, a. 1). Furthermore, the depiction of the New Jerusalem in the Book of Revelation (Rev 21) presents a vision of a fully realized paradise that actively incorporates material elements. From the perspective of retrocausality, the material status of spiritual realities allows us to consider that it is precisely through their materiality that eschatological fulfillment may function as an active—or at times more veiled—source of information radiating back into the present from the future.

This hermeneutic reflection within the frame of the paper is based on the premise that the totality of laws governing the quantum and mechanical world

is, in a mysterious way, also characteristic of the interrelation between spiritual and material realities.

ON THE POSSIBILITY OF RETRO-CAUSAL DECISION-MAKING HAD THE ORIGINAL STATE OF HUMANITY REMAINED INTACT

The act of decision-making represents the subtlest possible expression of human creativity, essentially creating an entirely new trajectory for the development of the world (Arend 1958, Bergson 1911). In the context of Christian thought, human beings were granted free will to manage creation as they understood it, and the essential task of this stewardship was to complete the physical imperfections inherent in nature (Garrigues, Isa 11:6–9), as moral evil did not yet exist. However, upon consuming the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the first parents transformed this physical imperfection within themselves into the knowledge of the possibility of moral evil, fundamentally redirecting the course of creation.

The principal position of this article rests on the assertion that prior to the Fall, the first humans, in organizing and cultivating the inherent genotype of chaos and imperfection in creation, could receive information from two directions when making decisions: information emerging from their experiential domain — the past — and, equally, information that could reach them in a more indirect and far subtler manner from the future.

Several aspects allow us to adopt this hypothesis. First, the two creation narratives (Gen 1 and Gen 2), which fundamentally differ regarding the chrono-

logical placement of humanity within the process of creation: in the first account, humans are the apex and final creature after which divine rest ensues; in the second account, humans are created (relatively) first, and the subsequent physical configuration of reality is formed according to their operational and existential principles¹. Hermeneutically analyzing the text, we see that by being positioned at the opposing poles of linear time, humans are capable of perceiving at least a bidirectional trajectory of temporal flow. On one hand, we observe the humanization (making human out of evolutionary process) of the created reality — a gradual nurturing of consciousness and its final flourishing in the person of human. On the other hand, humanity itself is the beginning, and only through the act of being observed by human subjects can that reality truly exist (cf. Rudokas 2023).

According to the teaching of the Church Fathers, although before the Fall the human body did not possess the gift of glorification (*donum gloriae*), it did maintain a deeper and particularly integral relationship with its soul (*donum integritatis*), through which the body could be reached by subtle informational imprints emanating even from the future (St. Augustine, *De immortalitate animae*, c. 16; Conf., XI, 13, Tabaczek

2025). Here, the future emerges as the moment of an innate knowledge or intuition of a thing's inherent purpose (*finis*), as described by St. Bonaventure (*Breviloquium, De creatura mundi II, 12, 1–4*). Precisely the plan to transform physical evil — or, more accurately, the imperfection inherent in creation — a plan which humanity was gradually meant to appropriate had it not fallen, indicates that such humanity would have been required to understand deeply the principles of teleological formation of reality². Thus, it implies that humanity would have had a pre-cognitive knowledge of teleological reality, as it is in itself.

After the Fall, this interconnection between the soul and the body, though significantly weakened, was not completely destroyed but rather has been veiled beneath the categorical imperatives dictated by the laws of the mate-

rial world³. Nevertheless, the laws governing the material (natural) world stand in opposition to the very conditions required for the possibility of metaphysical transformation (cf. Kant). As a result, the teleological completion of the world becomes an impossible and even unconsidered meta-task for humanity. Even in the hypothetical absence of the Fall of the first parents, the future would always have remained veiled, as it is not transparent even to angelic intellects (see St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae, I, q. 57, a. 3*). However, in that original state, the long-term outcome of an action performed in the present would have been far clearer. Most importantly, it is precisely the final result of the teleologically fulfilled world — attainable only in the future — that would have actively influenced the decisions made along the path leading toward that fulfillment.

VEILED RETROCAUSALITY AS A BARRIER TO THE MANIFESTATION OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

Thus, we have argued that retrocausality not only does not contradict the manifestation of free will at the moment of human decision-making (Aharonov, Y., Cohen, E., Gruss, E., & Landsberger, T. 2016), but in fact serves as the very guarantee of authentic, God-uncoerced decision-making. Nevertheless, the result that will emerge in creation due to this decision in the future is necessary for the very existence of the present, since only that which has a future can create history (Heidegger 1927). On the other hand, the concealment of the specific nature of the future fruit of human choice ensures the very possibility of

authenticity as such. Here, what is considered authentic is not the decision itself or its result, but rather the very possibility, in making the decision, to inhabit the “block of time” and, albeit in a shallow way compared to the Eternal One, to immerse oneself in the eternal now. And this very eternal now is the closest possible point in this physical presence of human person he can get to the Kingdom of Heaven. Is it really true?

If the human subject freely chooses to contemplate the eschatological future in which they are already participating in the Kingdom of Heaven, this act of faith constitutes an ontological attraction

of that future into the present. Such a proleptic act—rooted in the Thomistic view of the empirical as materially grounded (*empiricus est materiale*)⁴ and the Gospel witness to faith’s creative efficacy (cf. Mk 11:23).

The Kingdom of Heaven, as an eschatological reality, may thus be said to exist in the future in *modo intentionis*, having already been freely chosen to be perceived and anticipated by particular subjects, and is at times granted visionary manifestation to certain individuals (e.g., in the vision of Deacon Stephen or other saints; cf. Acts 7:55). However, the universal actualization of this future remains unrealized, not due to a metaphysical deficiency, but due to the absence of a universally shared assent that would allow such a perception to become historically normative.

This absence of universal assent—here tentatively described as an *imperativus universalitatis*—should not be understood as a doctrine but as a heuristic concept, indicating the tension between individual eschatological participation and collective historical realization. Within this interpretative horizon, such tension may be read as one of the existential burdens present in Christ’s agony in Gethsemane (cf. Lk 22:44), not as its cause, but as a theologically resonant analogy.

Here we also encounter a logical problem. After the Fall, the human being is no longer capable—either in the present moment or through the course of evolution—of imagining the completion of this purely physical world and the rectification of physical evil or imperfection. Yet both the prophetic vision of the Messianic Kingdom in Isaiah (cf. Isa 11:6–9) and

the proliferation of countless political utopias seem to suggest a deeply rooted human longing for such a fulfillment.

Recent authors have examined the relationship between the embodied human being situated in the physical world and eternity (Alexander, 2009; Hart, 2021). Although employing different methodologies, they arrive at a shared conclusion: the Kingdom of Heaven—while requiring a certain evolutionary unfolding within the history of the physical world—is already real and present, insofar as the human body, even after the Fall, is not a limitation but is instead filled with eschatological potential.

Here a paradox emerges. First, as we have seen, the future of the physical world depends on the decision made by the human subject in the present. Yet this present moment is itself said to be impossible without a future absorber, retroactively generated by the very decision that was made.

This exposes the impossibility of the present and the unreality of both past and future, as expressed by St. Augustine and St. Basil: “Is not this the nature of time, where the past is no more, the future does not exist, and the present escapes before being recognised? And such also is the nature of the creature which lives in time—condemned to grow or to perish without rest and without certain stability” (Augustine, *Confessions*, XI.14.17; Basil, *Hexaemeron*, Homily I). Thus, the reality we experience within this entropic world stands on the edge of radical non-being. And yet, it is precisely within this zone—so close to non-existence—that we are granted the possibility to act freely and autonomously.

Meanwhile, the Kingdom of Heaven—the empyrean—is closer than any possible future physical event, and yet it remains invisible to the human eye despite its materiality. The reason for this lies in the fact that the Kingdom of Heaven

is not merely a simple future absorber—something that merely awaits us at the end of temporal history. Rather, it is because in every future—including the future of the past—it has always existed as the eternal absorber of the future.

ON AUTHENTICITY AND CONDITIONAL AUTHENTICITY IN THE ACT OF DECISION-MAKING

When asked by the Pharisees when the Kingdom of God would come, Jesus explained: “The Kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed. Nor will they say, ‘Look, here it is!’ or ‘There!’ For behold, the Kingdom of God is in the midst of you” (Luke 17:20–21). It seems that the real presence of the Kingdom of God—though invisible, or more precisely, never actively chosen by the human person to be realized as a future absorber except in rare individual cases—nonetheless guarantees the authenticity and freedom of the essential decisions made by the human being.

Here we may draw, in a sense, a provisional conclusion. On the one hand, humanity’s dominion over the created world results in a paradoxical reluctance to desire the ultimate fulfillment of reality. That is, in choosing to observe the nearness of the Kingdom of Heaven⁵ and to actively embrace it in the present as a conscious projection of the future, one inevitably initiates a transfiguration of the created order. This radical transformation, however, potentially deprives the human subject of the role of master and sovereign over his environment. Consequently, the human being tends to make decisions aimed at reforming creation in ways that preserve its status as

“creation” rather than allowing it to become the Kingdom—out of a latent fear that the Kingdom may no longer belong solely to the domain of man.

This idea is deeply connected to the theory of memory embedded in a human-made world. Some authors have even ventured to propose that the authenticity of cultural heritage is not conditioned by its preservation—whether visual, physical, or functional—but by the very process of its disappearance and the fact of its vanishing as the ultimate outcome (De Silvey 2017).

It is worth recalling Arata Isozaki’s well-known statement about the inevitable fate of future and present cities—ruin: “Future cities are themselves ruins. Our contemporary cities... are destined to live only a fleeting moment... All of our proposals will be buried, and once again the incubation mechanism is reconstituted” (Isozaki, 1968). This seemingly pessimistic reflection, in fact, aligns with the principle of the quasi-reality of the physical world already discussed in this article, grounded in the reflections on time by St. Augustine and St. Basil. The human decision made “here and now,” when directed toward the projection of a physical future, likewise passes through a fleeting and elusive present into the future.

Thus, the human choice “here and now” is often only partially authentic, as the retrocausal knowledge reaching us from the future is not as penetrating as it might have been had the first humans not fallen, and the process of improving physical reality had been directed solely toward enabling the em-

pirical vision of the Empyrean with physical eyes. This principle of penetration rests on the paradox that the “future absorber,” which (a) is created by our decision in the present, and (b) without which our decision in the present would not be possible, is no longer real in its own future.

FINAL REMARKS

Joseph Ratzinger, in *The Spirit of the Liturgy* (2000), clearly outlines the limits of human capacity in the creative process. According to the author, every act of creating a sacred space must—or at least ought to—be integrated into the cosmic liturgical action, where worship (including through creativity) is a more universal activity of all creation rather than merely the fulfillment of human creative potential. Based on this premise, the emergence of three foundational architectural-engineering structures in the Bible becomes more comprehensible. The Ark of Noah (cf. Genesis 6:14–16), the Tabernacle of Moses (cf. Exodus 25–27), and Solomon’s Temple (cf. 1 Kings 6–7) are all characterized by a precise, divinely revealed foreknowledge of their final form. In contrast, the construction of the Tower of Babel (cf. Genesis 11:1–9) or the first city built after the primal act of fratricide (cf. Genesis 4:17) lacks such preordained precision and clarity.

Foreknowledge of the final form, though undeniably revealed by God, also symbolizes the incorporation or the apprehension of a broader consciousness into the creative process—beyond merely relying on human knowledge. Some authors observe that the Ark, the Taberna-

cle, the Temple, and the Temple of God’s Body (i.e., Christ’s presence in the Sacrament) represent a kind of evolutionary trajectory necessary for the eventual development of physical eyes capable of perceiving the full reality of the empyreus (von Balthasar 2004). On the other hand, as previously emphasized, the emergence of a physical object—however profoundly liturgical—still requires the choice of a future absorber that is relevant precisely within the future of the purely physical and entropic world. Whether this absorber will be real in its own future is another matter for discussion.

And although the empyreus is indeed material, it does not contain the inhabitants of the spiritual world; rather, it is itself contained by them. As Thomas Aquinas notes, “an angel is not in a place in the way a body is, but the place is said to be in the angel rather by containment than by situation” (*Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 52, a. 1, ad 1). Thus, perceiving the Kingdom from the position of entropic reality remains a complicated task for the “Kantian reason.”

Ultimately, fulfilled retrocausal knowledge would lead humanity toward a profound epistemological development: the knowledge of the thing in itself, and ul-

timately, of the thing as it exists in the Divine mind. Accordingly, the developmental dynamics of the existing multiplicity of things would necessarily progress toward the full and complete realization of each thing's potential. However, such perception demands that one retrocausally observe not so much the object itself, but rather one's own intellect as the locus of the possibility of knowing things—not due to their external impact upon us, but because of the pre-existent presence of the species of things within the human intellect.

The authenticity of a decision made in a given moment does not primarily rest on the principle of temporal extension or on direct information radiating

backward from the future. Rather, it consists in the reception of the modus—the manner—of the future into the very operation of the intellect. Since the manner in which reality exists is necessarily also the manner in which it exists in the future, being-in-the-world is inherently retrocausal. However, the unveiling of retrocausal influence would entail a transformation of the physical world into a mode of being in which the empyreus becomes visible—an event that would unavoidably reshape the entire configuration of reality. Even if such a transformation were to occur in a temporally distant future, we—living now—would inevitably sense its effects in the very structures of our decision-making.

Literatūra / References

- Aharonov Y., Cohen E., Gruss E. & Landsberger T. 2016. *Accommodating retrocausality with free will*. arXiv. Prieinamas internete: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.06689>.
- Alexander T. D. 2009. *From Eden to the New Jerusalem: An Introduction to Biblical Theology*. Kregel Academic.
- Anselm of Canterbury. 1998. *Why God Became Man (Cur Deus Homo)*. T. Williams (transl.). Hackett Publishing Company (Original work ca. 1098).
- Aquinas T. 2006. *Summa Theologiae*. T. Gilby (transl. & ed.), Vols. 1–61. Cambridge University Press (Original work published ca. 1274).
- Arendt H. 1958. *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Augustine. 1991. *Confessions*. H. Chadwick (transl.). Oxford University Press (Original work written ca. 397–400 CE).
- Augustine. 2002. The Immortality of the Soul. L. Schopp (transl.), *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*, Vol. 4: 1–123. Catholic University of America Press (Original work written ca. 387 CE).
- Basil the Great. 1963. Hexaemeron. H. A. Wilson (transl.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series II, Vol. 8. Philip Schaff & Henry Wace (eds.). Christian Literature Publishing Co.
- Bergson H. 1911. *Creative Evolution*. A. Mitchell (transl.). Henry Holt and Company.
- Bonaventure. 2005. *Breviloquium*. D. Tracy (transl.). The Franciscan Institute Publications (Original work published ca. 1254).
- DeSilvey C. 2017. *Curated Decay: Heritage Beyond Saving*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Duns Scotus J. 2018. *Reportatio Parisiensis* (Ordinatio Book III, Distinction 3). P. L. P. Simpson (transl.). Franciscan Institute Publications.
- Garrigues J.-M., O. P. 2023. *God without the Idea of Evil*. G. Casprini (transl.), C. Cardinal Schönborn (Foreword). University of Notre Dame Press (Original work published 1982 in French as *Dieu sans idée du mal*).
- Hart D. B. 2021. *You Are Gods: On Nature and Supernature*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- Heidegger M. 1962. *Being and Time*. J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson (transl.). Harper & Row (Original work published 1927).
- Isozaki A. 1968. Japan-ness in Architecture. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press (Original work published in Japanese as *Kenchiku no Nihonsei*).
- Kant I. 2004. *Prolegomena to any future metaphysics that will be able to come forward as science*. G. Hatfield (transl., rev. ed.). Cambridge University Press (Original work published 1783).

- Ratzinger J. 2000. *The spirit of the liturgy*. J. Saward (transl.). Ignatius Press.
- Rudokas K. 2023. *Totalinis miestas* [mokslinė monografija]. KTU leidykla „Technologija“.
- Spinoza B. 1985. *The Collected Works of Spinoza*, Vol. I. E. Curley (transl.). Princeton University Press (Original work published 1677) – see Ethics, Part I, Appendix.
- Tabaczek M. 2025. *Anthropogenesis, the Original State of Human Nature, and the Classical Model of Original Sin: The Challenge from Natural Science*. *Religions* 16(5): 598.
- Teilhard de Chardin P. 1959. *The Phenomenon of Man*. B. Wall (transl.). Harper & Row (Original work published 1955 as *Le phénomène humain*).
- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. 2011. *The New American Bible*, Revised Edition. Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.
- von Balthasar H. U. 2004. *Theo-Drama: Theological Dramatic Theory*, Vol. 5: *The Last Act*. G. Harrison (transl.). Ignatius Press.
- Wheeler J. A. 1983. Law Without Law, J. A. Wheeler & W. H. Zurek (eds.). *Quantum Theory and Measurement*: 182–213). Princeton University Press.
- Wheeler J. A. & Feynman R. P. 1945. Interaction with the absorber as the mechanism of radiation, *Reviews of Modern Physics* 17(2–3): 157–181. Prieinamas internete: <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.17.157>.
- Wheeler J. A. & Feynman R. P. 1949. Classical electrodynamics in terms of direct interparticle action, *Reviews of Modern Physics* 21(3): 425–433. Prieinamas internete: <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.21.425>.

Endnotes

- ¹ It should be emphasized that in the second creation narrative, humanity appears both as the first to be cast into the reality of God’s kenosis and as the final being to emerge within that same reality. The creation of woman, although perhaps less visibly a retrocausal phenomenon, nevertheless speaks not merely to the biological completion of the species or to a social aspect of humanity. Rather, through the creation of woman, the completion of creation reflects humanity’s likeness to the Trinity in its immediate and inherent relationality (see further: St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 92).
- ² In order to be able to name the creatures (Gen 2:19–20), Adam needed to possess essential, non-evaluative knowledge (since the evaluative one must have meant a being in the state of sin) of beings as they were in themselves, yet he lacked the fully glorified insight into creatures as they exist in the Divine mind — a vision reserved for the final teleological fulfillment in beatific union. For this greater completion, the incarnation of Christ would still have been necessary.
- ³ Paradoxically, the act of consuming the fruit from the tree of knowledge imposes a limitation upon human knowledge. Similar to the consequences of the angelic fall, here the internal, immediate knowledge of a thing as it is in itself or as it is in God is replaced by the capacity to assess and evaluate the thing — to determine its goodness or utility, its beauty or ugliness. With the acquisition of the “prerogative” of judgment, the human being undeniably becomes far more dependent on time and temporality. For judgment measured by human standards inevitably conceals the true essence and purpose of a thing or creature within God
- ⁴ That the empyrean, from a scholastic perspective, is composed of material substance constitutes a key imperative for its accessibility to the embodied human subject. In this context, Duns Scotus’ reflection on the unity of the divine and human quidditas through participation in being acquires an entirely new dimension (Scotus, *Ordinatio*, III, d. 3). Here, being is not prior, but rather the spiritual reality’s indwelling within a material object implies that such an empyrean is directly accessible to human reason — not merely as a possibility to be intellectually contemplated. Rather, it is accessible as something that can be seen with physical eyes from within the earthly condition. One may recall Pierre Teilhard de Chardin’s imperative for both humanity and the cosmos: to form better eyes — eyes capable of seeing God (Teilhard de Chardin, 1959).
- ⁵ And it may be perceived as a real absorber of the future — specifically, the future within entropic, physical time — based on the previously articulated notion of the materiality of the empyrean.