First, I think this is very well written (even if I do not agree with lots of things here). But of course I have lots of comments! :)

~~In the header you say this is "procedurally generated high stakes tactical adventure simulator". Are all of these really necessary, though, and do they form a coherent philosophy?~~

The "living, reactive world" section seems to be mostly the only section that motivates the "adventure simulator" part. You argue against non-modality, while non-modality is a big component of both immersion (i.e., adventure) and emergent complexity. Otherwise, simulationism is only mentioned when referring to Caves of Qud, and also in Dwarf Fortress and KeeperRL, where it appears that simulationism causes these games to be hybrids. Your other examples seem to go against the adventure simulation (for example, Balatro is a rare example of a game which is not an adventure).

I feel that the procedurally generated high-stakes tactical philosophy, and the adventure simulator philosophy, are rather distinct things. DCSS truly shines in the first one, while not being exceptional in the second. Caves of Qud is the other way around. Older roguelikes have the 'mystery' aspect which is great for adventure simulation but bad for tactics.

One aspect of the tactical philosophy is that roguelikes are fast (as in, you are making interesting tactical decisions all the time and immediately see their effects). The Berlin Interpretation totally skipped this one, but pre-Berlin interpretations would highlight this (including a section of Rogue manual which explains what was innovative about it). Examples of fast-gameplay aspects: there is no animation, or adaptative animations; auto-exploration or auto-combat features (some people argue against these and instead favor concise levels, but both approaches favor speed). Necessity of context switching makes games slow – this happens, for example, in games combining deckbuilding with grid combat (which are slower than both roguelikes and more pure deckbuilders), or featuring multiple units (such as Into the Grid).

One aspect of the adventure-simulationist philosophy is that it favors simple graphics, similar to reading a book. Simplicity of graphics lets the developer to easily go high on simulationism. Currently you mention graphics from the tactical view, as in, that they should be clear. Likewise, procedural generation seems to be more about tactical benefits than adventure simulationist ones.

~~There is also a third roguelike philosophy, which is that the purpose of creating roguelikes is to create a game that you would want to play yourself. This has direct links to procedural generation (obvious and even mentioned in the Rogue manual which says that even the authors find it fun), simple graphics (out of necessity you have game design and programming skills, but graphics is seen as a unnecessary luxury), being turn-based (easier to create for programmers and more matching their mathematical minds), being free (you are not doing this for money), emergent complexity (you want to see the emergent consequences of your design decisions, and also you add lots of stuff in a manner that would not be possible in a commercial project), and community developed. You ignore this pillar, as BI did, but this is clearly apparent in pre-Berlin roguelike definitions, which would highlight things such as "all the best~~

~~roguelikes are free".~~

~~So I would say that you are describing the philosophy of the genre (rather than the genre itself which I would define more mechanically), and more precisely, one of three philosophies — the tactical philosophy, acknowledging the existence of the simulationist philosophy, and not caring about the do-it-yourself philosophy.~~

~~More specific comments:~~

~~* 'The Berlin Interpretation, established in 2008, was a milestone for defining roguelikes'~~

~~Yeah, but there were roguelike definitions before that.~~

~~* Permadeath section:~~

~~I like how your interpretation reduce the focus on permadeath.~~

~~I think optional permadeath should be mentioned — it is one possible way of learning the game. Also, all or nothing (likely optional) permadeath in longer games is still good from adventure simulationist philosophy.~~

~~* 'Strict Non-Modality'~~

~~Of course modal systems may work well from tactical perspective, but, as mentioned above, they go against the adventure simulation philosophy.~~

~~* 'In fact, if I recall correctly, one of the unspoken reasons for specifying non-modality was to differentiated roguelikes from JRPGs.'~~

~~I think you took this from our discussion, but this is more of my interpretation of the reason for specifying non modality, I do not know whether it was indeed a motivation for the people in Berlin. Maybe 'one of possible reasons'?~~

~~* 'Traditional roguelikes represent the direct descendants of early genre-defining titles like Rogue itself, NetHack, and ADOM'~~

~~I do not think this sentence is clear, because direct descendants of Rogue would include Kingdom of Kroz (a rare example of a game created by someone who loved Rogue but thought that procedural generation was its weakness) and Impossible Mission.~~

~~* 'Roguelike vs roguelite'~~

~~You focus on how roguelites are easier, but being reflex-based does not make them easier, it just makes them different. You say 'reflex-driven gameplay or extensive meta-progression' but definitions using 'or' are not very useful, would be better to introduce two separate words for that — for example, you could call the first kind "action roguelikes" and emphasize that, by the red herring principle, "action roguelikes" are not roguelikes (because they break the "tactical" part), if you want.~~ In fact all your examples of "roguelites" are action games, so the mention of extensive meta-progression seems unjustified (the fact that they are action games should be enough). BTW I would recommend Unexplored as an action game which feels very much like a roguelike.

Since your philosophy prominently features high stakes, it makes sense to separate low-stake games and call them "roguelite" (although I personally consider such focus on high stakes to be gatekeepy and thus do not put high stakes in the philosophy and not differentiate between roguelikes and roguelites, or maybe call the later low-stake roguelikes). So Hades and Rogue Legacy would be "action roguelites" while Spelunky and Diablo would be "action roguelikes".

Diablo has no long-term character upgrades (it is a relatively short game without metaprogression). You could say that Diablo II has them, but that is simply because it is quite a long game – but still, not more than Caves of Qud or Angband. And a roguelite (in fact, traditional roguelite) would be then something like Sproggiwood, Dungeonmans, or Crown Trick.

* 'Roguelite: [...] and often more accessible mechanics'

Accessibility should always be a positive.

* Vampire Survivors

It appears that the reason why Vampire Survivors is called a roguelike is mysterious for people who played real roguelikes, but it makes sense for people who did not. Vampire Survivors is an engine builder (as in, a game heavily focused on synergizing upgrades). It appears that people who got introduced to roguelikes by The Binding of Isaac intuitively associate the genre with engine building, so calling games such as Risk of Rain, Vampire Survivors, Slay the Spire, or Balatro 'roguelike' feels appropriate to them, even though these games generally are NOT procedurally generated (so not matching the 'procedural death labyrinth' interpretation of roguelike which is often pushed), and VS has nothing resembling permadeath.

* Balatro, Slay the Spire:

Please explain what roguelike principles/progression these games share that are not also deckbuilder principles. (They seem to be called roguelike deckbuilders because they combine deckbuilding with non-deck engine building.)

~~* Angbad~~

~~typo~~

~~* 'Clear distinctions, such as those provided by frameworks like the Berlin Interpretation or this one, help clarify these boundaries.'~~

~~Berlin Interpretation does not provide clear distinctions.~~

~~* 'Player preferences have also shifted, with many seeking more approachable or visually engaging experiences.'~~

~~I do not think they did. People generally were always seeking more approachable or visually engaging experiences. Greater approachability and better graphics of newer roguelikes made them accessible to more people, and thus broadened the community, which is a good thing. But that does not mean that the preferences of individual players have shifted.~~

~~* 'Loop Hero'~~

~~You casually mention this game as one extending the roguelike genre, but that is more of a metaprogression-heavy deck construction game, how is it relevant?~~

~~* 'Exclusion of Pure Reflex Combat'~~

~~I think most, if not all, rogueish games feature a significant element of decision making, so there is no 'Pure Reflex Combat'.~~

I know I am mostly criticizing above, but it was a great read! :)