

Exploring the Ocean of Time

Sandeep Singh Dhaliwal

Bachelor of Science in Major Applied Mathematics Minor Physical Sciences, Athabasca University, 1 University Drive, Athabasca, T9S3A3, AB, Canada.

Abstract

The nature of time remains one of the most enduring conceptual problems in both philosophy and physics. While modern theories such as relativity describe how time behaves under different physical conditions, the deeper origin of temporal flow remains an open question. This article examines the historical development of the concept of time, tracing its evolution from early philosophical reflections in ancient Greek thought to the relativistic framework introduced by Einstein. Building upon this background, the paper distinguishes between two complementary forms of temporality: physical time, associated with the dynamical evolution of physical systems, and mental time, which arises from informational processes within conscious experience. The article further explores a conceptual framework in which time is interpreted as an emergent phenomenon generated by the dynamical evolution of internal degrees of freedom within physical systems. Within this perspective, observable temporal behavior—including relativistic time dilation—may be understood as modifications in the rate of internal dynamical processes rather than properties of an independent temporal background.

Keywords: Philosophy of Time; Relativistic Time; Emergent Time; Mental Time; Physical Time; Materialistic Time

1 Introduction

Few concepts are as central to human understanding of the universe as time, yet few remain as conceptually elusive. Time plays a fundamental role in the formulation of physical laws, the organization of experience, and the interpretation of change in the natural world. Despite its ubiquity, the ontological status of time continues to generate debate across philosophy, physics, and cognitive science. Is time a fundamental feature of reality, an emergent property of physical processes, or a conceptual framework constructed by observers to describe change?

Historically, reflections on time have developed along two major intellectual traditions. Philosophical inquiry has explored the conceptual and experiential aspects of temporality, examining how human consciousness perceives and structures temporal order. In parallel, the development of modern physics has produced increasingly precise mathematical descriptions of temporal relations within the physical universe. From the early cosmological speculations of ancient philosophy to the mathematical formulation of time in classical mechanics and its later transformation in relativity theory, the concept of time has undergone profound reinterpretation.

While contemporary physics provides remarkably accurate descriptions of how time behaves under various conditions, these theories often treat time as a parameter embedded within mathematical frameworks rather than as a phenomenon whose deeper origin is explained. This situation has motivated increasing interest in the possibility that time may not be fundamental but instead arises from more basic dynamical structures. Various approaches in modern theoretical physics—including statistical mechanics, quantum gravity, and relational formulations of dynamics—suggest that temporal order may emerge from the collective behavior of microscopic degrees of freedom.

The present work explores this possibility from a conceptual and philosophical perspective. After reviewing historical

developments and the relativistic understanding of time, the article proposes a distinction between two complementary layers of temporality: *physical time*, associated with dynamical processes and thermodynamic evolution in the external world, and *mental time*, associated with the informational and experiential ordering of states within consciousness. Building on this distinction, the article then examines a speculative framework in which time is interpreted as the dynamical evolution of internal degrees of freedom within physical systems.

The goal of this investigation is not to replace existing physical theories but rather to provide a conceptual perspective that may help clarify the relationship between dynamical change, entropy, and temporal experience. By viewing time as emerging from the internal structure of physical systems, it becomes possible to reinterpret familiar phenomena such as relativistic time dilation and thermodynamic irreversibility in terms of underlying dynamical processes. In doing so, the article seeks to contribute to the broader philosophical discussion concerning whether time should be regarded as a fundamental component of reality or as an emergent feature arising from deeper physical dynamics.

2 Historical Perspectives on Time

The nature of time has occupied a central position in human intellectual inquiry since the earliest emergence of rational philosophy. Across civilizations and epochs, philosophers and scientists have attempted to understand whether time is a fundamental feature of reality or merely a conceptual framework through which change is described. Early reflections on time did not always treat it as an independent entity; rather, time was often understood indirectly through the phenomenon of change, motion, and periodic processes in nature.

Among the earliest philosophical discussions of change are those of the Pre-Socratic thinkers of ancient Greece. Thales of Miletus (c. 624–546 BCE) [Kirk et al. \(1983\)](#); [O’Grady \(2002\)](#), traditionally regarded as the first philosopher in the Western tradition, proposed that water is the fundamental substance (*archê*) underlying all physical reality. Although Thales did not explicitly formulate a theory of time, his conception of the world as a system undergoing transformation implicitly associated the notion of time with processes of change. In this view, temporal progression was not treated as an independent dimension but rather as the observable succession of transformations in the fundamental substance.

The Milesian philosophical tradition continued this line of inquiry. Anaximander (c. 610–546 BCE) [Rovelli \(2011a\)](#); [Guthrie \(1962\)](#) introduced the concept of the *apeiron*, an indefinite and boundless principle from which all things emerge and to which they return in accordance with what he described as a form of cosmic justice. While Anaximander did not directly formulate a theory of time, the cyclical emergence and dissolution of worlds within the *apeiron* suggested an implicit temporal order governing cosmic processes. Anaximenes (c. 586–526 BCE) [Kirk et al. \(1983\)](#); [Graham \(2010\)](#), another prominent member of the Milesian school, proposed air as the fundamental substance of the universe. Through processes of rarefaction and condensation, air was thought to generate all observable phenomena. In this framework, temporal succession again appeared implicitly through dynamic transformations of matter rather than as an autonomous physical entity.

The Pythagorean tradition introduced a significantly different perspective [Kahn \(2001\)](#); [Burkert \(1972\)](#). Pythagoras of Samos (c. 570–495 BCE) and his followers emphasized the mathematical structure underlying natural phenomena. They observed that both musical harmony and astronomical motion could be described through precise numerical ratios. From these observations emerged the idea that time might be understood through periodicity and repetition. In this conception, temporal order arises from regular cycles—such as the recurrence of celestial motions or oscillatory patterns in musical harmonies. Consequently, time was not viewed merely as a linear progression but as an ordered structure arising from the recurrence of measurable patterns.

Atomist philosophers further transformed the conceptualization of time. Leucippus (5th century BCE) and his student Democritus (c. 460–370 BCE) [Taylor \(1999\)](#) proposed that reality consists of indivisible atoms moving

within the void. In their framework, time was regarded as an eternal and uniform backdrop against which atomic motion occurs. Although their treatment of time was not fully formalized, it resembles what later became the Newtonian conception of absolute time: a universal parameter existing independently of physical processes and observers.

Plato (c. 428–348 BCE) [Plato \(1997, 2000\)](#) introduced one of the most influential philosophical reflections on time in his dialogue *Timaeus*. In this work, Plato famously described time as “a moving image of eternity.” According to his cosmological account, time was created together with the cosmos and is closely linked to the ordered motions of celestial bodies. The periodic motions of the Sun, Moon, and planets provide the means by which time is measured. In Plato’s framework, time therefore acquires both a cosmological origin and a mathematical structure derived from astronomical regularities.

Aristotle (384–322 BCE) [Aristotle \(1984, 1996\)](#) developed a more systematic analysis of time in his work *Physics*. Rejecting the notion that time could exist independently of motion, Aristotle defined time as “the number of motion with respect to before and after.” This definition established a conceptual connection between time, measurement, and change. For Aristotle, temporal ordering arises from the ability of rational observers to distinguish earlier and later states within a process of motion. Although Aristotle did not explicitly formulate the modern concept of the arrow of time, his distinction between past, present, and future introduced a structured temporal framework that would influence philosophical discussions for centuries.

Late antique and early Christian philosophy further expanded the understanding of time by incorporating psychological and theological dimensions. Augustine [Augustine \(1991, 2008\)](#) of Hippo (354–430 CE), in his *Confessions*, famously reflected on the paradoxical nature of time, remarking that while everyone seems to know what time is, it becomes difficult to define once one attempts to explain it. Augustine proposed that temporal experience is fundamentally connected to the structure of human consciousness. He identified three forms of temporal awareness: memory (which relates to the past), attention (which corresponds to the present), and expectation (which anticipates the future). In this view, time becomes not merely a property of the external world but also a feature of subjective experience.

The Scientific Revolution introduced a new mathematical framework for understanding time. Galileo Galilei (1564–1642) [Galilei \(1954\)](#) emphasized the quantitative study of motion and demonstrated that physical processes could be described through precise mathematical relationships. By introducing systematic measurement of temporal intervals in experiments involving motion, Galileo effectively integrated time into the emerging language of mathematical physics.

This development reached its most explicit formulation in the work of Isaac Newton (1643–1727). In his *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*, Newton introduced the concept of absolute time [Newton \(1934, 1999\)](#), defining it as “absolute, true, and mathematical time” which flows uniformly without relation to anything external. In Newtonian mechanics, time serves as a universal parameter governing the evolution of all physical systems. Every observer, regardless of their state of motion, shares the same temporal framework.

The Newtonian conception of time remained dominant for more than two centuries until it was fundamentally revised in the early twentieth century by Albert Einstein’s theory of relativity [Einstein \(1920\)](#). Einstein demonstrated that measurements of time depend on the relative motion of observers and the presence of gravitational fields. Time was no longer absolute but became intertwined with the geometry of spacetime. In this relativistic framework, temporal intervals could vary between observers, and the structure of time became inseparable from the structure of space.

In contemporary theoretical physics and philosophy, further developments have challenged both Newtonian and relativistic conceptions by proposing that time itself may be an emergent phenomenon. Various approaches in

quantum gravity, statistical mechanics, and cosmology suggest that the temporal order experienced in macroscopic physics might arise from more fundamental microscopic degrees of freedom. Within such frameworks, time may not be a primitive element of reality but rather a collective description emerging from deeper dynamical structures.

3 Einstein's Era

A profound transformation in our understanding of time occurred in the early twentieth century through the work of Albert Einstein. Prior to this period, the dominant framework was that of Isaac Newton, in which time was regarded as absolute—flowing uniformly and independently of the physical processes occurring within the universe [Einstein \(1920\)](#). Einstein challenged this deeply rooted conception and demonstrated that time is not an external background parameter but rather a dynamical aspect of the physical world itself. Through his two theories of relativity, he revealed that the passage of time depends on the state of motion of observers and on the gravitational environment in which physical processes occur.

3.1 Special Theory of Relativity

In 1905 Einstein introduced the *Special Theory of Relativity*, a framework describing the behavior of space and time for observers moving at constant velocities relative to one another. Although the term “special” refers to the restriction to non-accelerating frames of reference, the conceptual implications of the theory were revolutionary.

Within this framework, time is no longer an independent universal parameter but forms a unified structure with space known as *spacetime*. Events are therefore described by four coordinates rather than three, and the measurement of time intervals depends on the relative motion of observers.

One of the most striking predictions of the theory is *time dilation*. To illustrate this effect, consider two perfectly identical clocks initially synchronized with one another. Suppose one clock remains stationary while the other is carried on a high-speed journey through space and eventually returns. Upon reunion, the traveling clock will record less elapsed time than the stationary one. From the perspective of the stationary observer, the moving clock runs slower due to its high velocity. Although negligible at everyday speeds, this effect becomes significant as velocities approach the speed of light and has been confirmed experimentally with high precision.

This result fundamentally altered the classical notion of time by demonstrating that temporal intervals are not universal but depend on the observer's state of motion. In this sense, time is revealed to be relative rather than absolute.

3.2 General Theory of Relativity

Einstein extended these ideas further with the publication of the *General Theory of Relativity* in 1915. While special relativity describes spacetime in the absence of gravitational effects, general relativity provides a theory of gravitation itself.

In this framework, mass and energy influence the geometry of spacetime. Rather than viewing gravity as a force acting at a distance, the theory describes gravitational phenomena as the curvature of spacetime produced by matter and energy. Consequently, the flow of time is affected not only by motion but also by gravitational fields.

One important consequence of this theory is *gravitational time dilation*. Clocks situated in stronger gravitational fields tick more slowly relative to clocks located in weaker gravitational regions. For instance, a clock on the surface of a massive body experiences slightly greater time dilation than one positioned farther away. In everyday terms, this implies that time on the surface of a massive planet such as Jupiter runs marginally slower than time measured on Earth.

Even within the Earth's gravitational field this effect is measurable. A clock positioned closer to the Earth's center, such as near one's feet, experiences a slightly stronger gravitational potential than a clock near one's head. As a result, the clock near the feet runs imperceptibly slower. Though extremely small, such differences have been experimentally verified and are routinely accounted for in technologies such as satellite navigation systems.

Together, the special and general theories of relativity reshaped the philosophical and scientific conception of time.

Rather than being an immutable and universal backdrop, time emerges as a physical quantity intertwined with motion, gravity, and the geometry of spacetime itself.

4 Author's Perspective of Time

In addition to the established scientific accounts discussed previously, it is also worthwhile to consider how the concept of time appears from a broader philosophical standpoint. The following reflections outline a conceptual distinction between two ways in which time is encountered. On the one hand, there is time as it appears in relation to the physical universe and the dynamical evolution of physical systems. On the other hand, there is time as experienced by conscious observers through subjective awareness. For clarity, these may be referred to respectively as *physical time* and *Mental time*. While closely related in practice, these two notions need not be identical, and distinguishing them can help illuminate several persistent conceptual puzzles regarding the nature of temporal flow.

4.1 Physical Time

Within the physical universe, one of the most widely discussed features of time is the existence of a preferred direction often referred to as the *arrow of time*. In contemporary physics this direction is closely associated with the second law of thermodynamics, according to which the entropy of an isolated system tends to increase. As a consequence, physical processes in our universe typically proceed from states of comparatively lower entropy to states of higher entropy. This thermodynamic asymmetry provides a natural sense in which the past corresponds to lower entropy configurations while the future corresponds to configurations of greater entropy.

The notion of the *present*, however, remains conceptually subtle. In relativistic spacetime there is no universal present moment shared by all observers. Rather, the identification of what counts as “present” depends on the observer and on the region of spacetime under consideration. An observer may meaningfully refer to a present year, a present month, or a present day depending on the temporal scale relevant to the discussion. Similarly, one might refer to the present hour, the present second, or even the present nanosecond when describing processes occurring at increasingly finer physical scales. In this sense, the present is not a sharply defined global instant but rather a context-dependent interval within spacetime.

Nevertheless, as physical beings we remain effectively confined to what we call the present. Our experiences unfold along a particular worldline through spacetime, and our observations are limited to events within our causal domain. From the perspective of relativity, travel toward the future relative to other observers is possible through well-understood physical mechanisms such as relativistic motion or gravitational time dilation. When an observer moves at velocities approaching the speed of light, the rate at which time elapses for that observer differs from the rate experienced by observers who remain at rest in a different frame. From the stationary observer's perspective, the moving traveler experiences less elapsed proper time. In this sense the traveler can be said to advance into a future state of the external universe while aging more slowly.

Conceptually, this situation may be interpreted as a separation between the rate of entropy growth along different physical trajectories. By entering a relativistic regime, an observer effectively isolates themselves from processes evolving at a comparatively higher rate of entropy change and later re-enters a region of spacetime where those processes have progressed further.

Travel to the past, by contrast, is generally regarded as forbidden within the standard causal structure of relativity. Causality imposes constraints that prevent events from influencing their own past. One might speculate that superluminal motion—if it were physically attainable—could in principle alter the causal ordering of events. However, such scenarios typically require divergent energies or lead to paradoxes within known physical frameworks. Even at the level of speculation, reaching states of lower entropy growth would not necessarily reproduce the exact historical configuration previously experienced. A given macroscopic outcome can arise from many microscopic histories, and

therefore a trajectory toward lower entropy conditions might correspond to a different sequence of events rather than a literal return to an identical past.

The question of whether time itself can “stop” also admits several conceptual interpretations. One possibility arises in systems that exhibit perfectly reversible motion. Consider an idealized pendulum oscillating indefinitely without friction, dissipation, or energy loss. In such a system the motion repeats cyclically, and there is no intrinsic thermodynamic asymmetry distinguishing past from future. Without entropy production, the direction of time cannot be identified from the dynamics alone.

A second possibility concerns the internal degrees of freedom of a system. If the internal processes responsible for change were to cease entirely, the system would undergo no evolution, decay, or transformation. From an external perspective such a system would appear frozen. If the system itself were the only available observer, the absence of internal change would leave no operational means of registering the passage of time. In this sense, the meaningfulness of time becomes closely linked to the existence of physical change within the system that serves as a clock.

These considerations suggest that, at least from a physical standpoint, time may be deeply connected with dynamical processes, entropy production, and the evolution of internal degrees of freedom within physical systems.

4.2 Mental Time

Mental time may be understood as the set of temporal arrows that emerge within the domain of the mind [Dhaliwal \(2025\)](#), describing how awareness or personal identity navigates the internal landscape of cognition. In contrast to physical time—which is constrained by the thermodynamic and causal structure of the physical universe—mental time refers to the experiential ordering of thoughts, memories, and anticipations that arise within consciousness. In this sense, mental temporality resonates with the classical insight of Augustine, who argued that time is not merely an external physical parameter but also something intimately experienced within the human mind.

Within the mental domain, our sense of temporal passage is constituted by the dynamics of thoughts, emotions, and recollections. These mental events appear as emergent structures that arise upon the background of awareness. One may view them as resulting from two interacting sources:

first, the intrinsic activity of consciousness itself, and second, the informational structures encoded in memory, perception, and imagination. Consequently, mental time can be interpreted as being driven by an arrow associated with informational entropy. As information within the cognitive system is processed, reorganized, and reinterpreted, sequences of mental states emerge that generate a subjective sense of temporal progression.

Although mental time exhibits a degree of flexibility that physical time does not, it is nevertheless constrained by the physical substrate of the brain and its interaction with the external world. Human cognition is embedded within a biological system that is itself governed by the thermodynamic arrow of time. Thus, while the mind can conceptually traverse memories of the past or construct anticipations of the future, the underlying physical processes that enable these mental operations remain oriented toward increasing entropy. In this way, the subjective freedom of mental temporality coexists with the objective constraints imposed by physical law.

This distinction explains an important phenomenological feature of human experience. Through memory and imagination, the mind can effectively “wander” across different temporal domains: recollection allows access to representations of the past, while anticipation projects the mind toward possible futures. These mental excursions do not constitute literal movement through physical time but rather transitions among informational states within the cognitive system. They illustrate that the mind possesses an internal temporal structure capable of representing events that are not present in immediate sensory experience.

The present moment, within this framework, can be interpreted as the state in which mental processes are primarily coupled to the physical world through sensory interaction. When perception dominates cognition—when the mind is actively processing sensory input—the mental state is closely aligned with what we conventionally call the present.

By contrast, when sensory engagement is reduced and cognition becomes dominated by internally generated representations, the mind shifts toward mental reconstructions of the past or simulations of the future.

A further phenomenological layer emerges when even this stream of thought is attenuated. If the continuous generation of thoughts and emotions subsides, awareness may become directed toward itself rather than toward its mental contents. In such states, the observer experiences a form of immediacy that is not mediated by memory or anticipation. One might describe this condition as the experience of an “absolute present,” in which consciousness observes itself without the temporal structuring imposed by narrative thought.

It is important to emphasize that this notion of an absolute present is fundamentally subjective and does not correspond to any identifiable physical parameter. Rather, it reflects a particular configuration of mental activity in which the informational arrows associated with thought temporarily diminish. The resulting state highlights the distinction between physical time, which is measurable and governed by physical law, and mental time, which is constructed through the dynamics of cognition and awareness.

In summary, mental time represents a subjective temporal framework generated by the interplay between consciousness and informational processes within the mind. While it allows the individual to navigate representations of past and future, its underlying mechanisms remain embedded within the thermodynamic constraints of the physical universe. The coexistence of these two layers—objective physical time and subjective mental time—suggests that temporality is not a single monolithic phenomenon but rather a multi-layered structure emerging from both physical processes and conscious experience.

4.3 Time as an Emergent Property

Time is often treated in physics as a fundamental parameter: a primitive background variable with respect to which physical processes evolve. However, a growing body of theoretical and philosophical work suggests that time may instead be an emergent phenomenon arising from deeper dynamical structures [Rovelli \(2011b\)](#); [Zeh \(2007\)](#). In such perspectives, time is not an independent entity but a relational property generated by the evolution of physical systems themselves. In this section we explore one such hypothesis, which may be called a *materialist perspective of time* [Dhaliwal \(2026\)](#). Within this framework, temporal experience and measurable temporal processes emerge from the dynamical behavior of the internal degrees of freedom (DOFs) of physical systems.

Modern physics, particularly relativity, provides extremely precise descriptions of how time behaves under various physical conditions. For example, the theory of relativity predicts time dilation for systems undergoing high velocities or situated in strong gravitational fields. While relativity successfully quantifies these effects, it does not necessarily provide a detailed mechanistic description of *how* the flow of time itself emerges from the internal dynamics of matter. Instead, time appears as a coordinate parameter embedded in the geometry of spacetime. From a philosophical standpoint, one may therefore ask whether the phenomenon of time dilation could be interpreted as arising from changes in the internal dynamical structure of physical systems.

To explore this possibility, consider a physical system—such as a particle, atom, or composite object—that possesses internal degrees of freedom. These internal DOFs may include quantum phase variables, internal oscillatory modes, or other dynamical parameters that characterize the microscopic evolution of the system. In this view, the observable temporal behavior of the system is not imposed externally but is generated by the rate at which these internal variables evolve. Time, therefore, can be interpreted as a measure of internal dynamical change.

From this perspective, processes such as particle decay offer a useful conceptual example. The lifetime of an unstable particle may be interpreted as the timescale associated with the evolution of its internal dynamical structure toward a new configuration. If the internal dynamical processes occur rapidly, the system transitions more quickly and the observed lifetime is shorter. Conversely, if the internal dynamics are slowed, the system persists longer before undergoing transformation, leading to an extended lifetime. In other words, the observable decay period of a

system reflects the rate at which its internal degrees of freedom evolve.

An intuitive analogy may help illustrate this idea. Imagine a macroscopic ball composed of many smaller moving particles within it. The structural integrity of the larger ball depends on the dynamical interactions of these internal components. If the internal constituents move rapidly and collide intensely, the structure becomes unstable and may break apart quickly. In contrast, if the internal components move slowly and interact gently, the structure remains stable for a longer period. While this analogy is not meant to represent a literal microscopic model of particle decay, it provides a conceptual picture of how internal dynamics can determine the apparent temporal stability of a system.

Another analogy can be drawn from motion through different media. Consider a tennis ball moving through air compared with the same ball moving through water along the same trajectory. In water, resistive forces constrain the motion and reduce the effective speed of the ball, even when the external conditions attempt to enforce the same path. One may interpret this resistance as a constraint that slows the system's internal dynamical processes. Translating this intuition to fundamental physics, relativistic motion or gravitational curvature may act as constraints that effectively slow the internal evolution of physical systems.

Within the framework proposed here, relativistic time dilation can therefore be interpreted as a manifestation of constrained internal dynamics. When a system moves at relativistic velocities or resides in a region of strong spacetime curvature, the internal dynamical variables evolve more slowly relative to an external reference frame. The consequence is the familiar phenomenon of time dilation: processes such as atomic transitions, biological aging, and particle decay all appear to proceed more slowly when observed from another frame.

Quantum mechanics introduces another subtle aspect of the problem [Rovelli \(2011b\)](#); [Zeh \(2007\)](#); [Zurek \(2003\)](#). At the level of fundamental equations, quantum evolution is typically time-symmetric: the Schrödinger equation, for instance, permits evolution both forward and backward in time. Consequently, the microscopic laws themselves do not inherently select a preferred temporal direction. In the internal DOF framework, the arrow of time may instead emerge from the collective behavior of internal dynamical variables. If the effective number or complexity of accessible internal states grows during evolution, the system exhibits a forward arrow of time. Conversely, a reduction in accessible dynamical degrees of freedom could be interpreted as a reversal of the temporal arrow.

This interpretation connects the concept of time with dynamical complexity. The direction and rate of temporal flow become properties of how internal variables evolve rather than fundamental aspects of spacetime itself. Such a viewpoint is compatible with broader philosophical proposals in which time emerges from relational change among physical systems.

In summary, the materialist perspective explored here proposes that time is not a primitive background parameter but a phenomenon generated by the dynamical evolution of internal degrees of freedom within physical systems. Under this interpretation, phenomena such as time dilation can be understood as modifications in the rate of internal dynamical processes caused by relativistic motion or spacetime curvature. Although this framework remains speculative, it offers a conceptual bridge between physical dynamics and the experiential notion of temporal flow.

Working Definition. Within this framework, time may be succinctly characterized as

Time is the dynamical evolution of the internal degrees of freedom of a physical system.

5 Conclusion

The concept of time occupies a unique position at the intersection of philosophy, physics, and human experience. Throughout intellectual history, interpretations of time have evolved from early philosophical reflections on change and motion to the precise mathematical formulations developed within modern physical theories. While classical mechanics treated time as an absolute and universal parameter, the advent of relativity revealed that temporal intervals

depend on motion and gravitational context, integrating time into the dynamical structure of spacetime itself. Despite these advances, the deeper origin of time remains an open question. Contemporary theoretical developments increasingly suggest that time may not be a fundamental element of reality but rather an emergent feature arising from more basic physical processes. Motivated by this possibility, the present work explored a conceptual framework in which time is interpreted as the dynamical evolution of internal degrees of freedom within physical systems.

Within this perspective, observable temporal behavior—such as decay rates, biological aging, and dynamical evolution—reflects the rate at which internal variables within a system evolve. Phenomena such as relativistic time dilation may therefore be interpreted as manifestations of constraints imposed on these internal dynamics by motion or gravitational curvature. Although this interpretation remains speculative, it provides a conceptual mechanism that connects relativistic temporal effects with the internal structure of physical systems.

The article further proposed a distinction between two complementary forms of temporality. Physical time arises from dynamical and thermodynamic processes occurring in the external universe, while mental time emerges from informational and cognitive processes within conscious systems. Although these two layers operate within different domains, they remain linked through the physical substrate of the brain and the thermodynamic arrow governing physical processes. This layered view suggests that temporality may be a multi-level phenomenon rather than a single unified entity.

If time indeed emerges from the dynamical behavior of internal degrees of freedom, then temporal order may ultimately be understood as a manifestation of relational change among physical systems. Such a viewpoint aligns with broader efforts in modern physics to derive spacetime structures from deeper microscopic dynamics. Future theoretical and empirical work will be required to determine whether such emergent descriptions can be formulated in a rigorous and testable manner.

In summary, the perspective developed here proposes a conceptual shift: rather than treating time as a primitive background parameter, it may be more fruitful to view time as a dynamical property arising from the evolving internal structure of physical systems. Whether this approach can be developed into a fully predictive theoretical framework remains an open question, but it offers a promising direction for further exploration in the philosophy of time and the foundations of physics.

References

1. Aristotle: The Complete Works of Aristotle vol. 1. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ (1984) Aristotle: Physics. Oxford University Press, Oxford (1996)
2. Augustine: Confessions. Oxford University Press, Oxford (1991) Augustine: Confessions. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA (2008)
3. Barbour, J.: The End of Time: The Next Revolution in Physics. Oxford University Press, Oxford (1999)
4. Burkert, W.: Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA (1972)
5. Dhaliwal, S.: Mind and Spacetime-An Interesting Analogy. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.15239.25766>
6. Dhaliwal, S.: A Material-Dynamical Framework for Time Dilation in SR and GR. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.15270.59205>
7. Einstein, A.: Relativity: The Special and the General Theory. Henry Holt and Company, New York (1920)
8. Galilei, G.: Dialogues Concerning Two New Sciences. Dover Publications, New York (1954) Graham, D.W.: The Texts of Early Greek Philosophy: The Complete Fragments and Selected
9. Testimonies of the Major Presocratics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2010)
10. Guthrie, W.K.C.: A History of Greek Philosophy, Volume 1: The Earlier Presocratics and the Pythagoreans. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1962)

11. Kahn, C.H.: Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans: A Brief History. Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis (2001)
12. Kirk, G.S., Raven, J.E., Schofield, M.: The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts, 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK (1983)
13. Newton, I.: Sir Isaac Newton's Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy. University of California Press, Berkeley (1934)
14. Newton, I.: The Principia: Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy. University of California Press, Berkeley (1999)
15. O'Grady, P.: Thales of Miletus: The Beginnings of Western Science and Philosophy. Ashgate, Aldershot (2002)
16. Plato: Plato: Complete Works. Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis (1997) Plato: Timaeus. Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis (2000)
17. Rovelli, C.: Anaximander and the Birth of Science. Westholme Publishing, Yardley, PA (2011) Rovelli, C.: Quantum Gravity. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2011)
18. Taylor, C.C.W.: The Atomists: Leucippus and Democritus. University of Toronto Press, Toronto (1999)
19. Zeh, H.D.: The Physical Basis of the Direction of Time. Springer, Berlin (2007)
20. Zurek, W.H.: Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical. Reviews of Modern Physics **75**(3), 715–775 (2003)