Toward a Top-Level Ontology of Entropic Histories: A Scalar–Vector–Entropy Foundation for Ontology Engineering

Flyxion

December 26, 2025

Abstract

Top-level ontologies such as the Basic Formal Ontology have demonstrated the importance of realist discipline in ontology engineering. However, their core primitives remain fundamentally static, treating entities as primary and processes as derivative. This limits their ability to represent irreversibility, historical dependence, semantic drift, and field-like phenomena now central to physics, computation, and cognition.

This paper proposes a new top-level ontology grounded in the Relativistic Scalar–Vector–Entropy Plenum (RSVP). Rather than taking entities as primitive, the proposed framework treats entropic histories, constrained flows, and stabilization regimes as fundamental. Objects, relations, agents, and information arise as low-entropy invariants within a dynamically constrained plenum.

The resulting ontology preserves realism while extending it beyond object-centric metaphysics, offering a unified foundation for physical, biological, cognitive, and computational domains.

1 Introduction

Ontology engineering has matured to the point where disagreements no longer concern only modeling conventions, but the adequacy of the ontological primitives themselves. Persistent difficulties surrounding irreversibility, interoperability, information, and agency suggest that current top-level ontologies are operating at the limits of their conceptual frameworks.

This paper advances the thesis that these difficulties are not engineering failures but ontological ones. The underlying assumption that entities are ontologically prior to histories, processes, and constraints must be reconsidered. We propose an alternative top-level ontology in which history, entropy, and constrained flow are primitive, and entities are derivative.

2 Motivation for a New Top-Level Ontology

Three persistent problems motivate the present proposal.

2.1 Irreversibility

Most top-level ontologies encode time as an ordering relation on entities or processes. This representation fails to capture the constitutive role of irreversibility in physical law, biological development, learning, and computation. History is treated as descriptive rather than generative.

2.2 Mapping Fragility

Ontology interoperability relies heavily on mappings that degrade under version drift. This fragility is not accidental: mappings attempt to synchronize static structures that evolve under incompatible dynamics. Without a shared dynamical substrate, mappings become brittle artifacts rather than stabilizing mechanisms.

2.3 The Ontology of Information

Information remains an unstable category, oscillating between abstracta, mental entities, and artifacts. Existing ontologies lack principled criteria for distinguishing informational structure from its physical or symbolic carriers.

3 Design Commitments

The proposed ontology adopts the following commitments:

1. **Realism without substance fixation.** Reality exists independently of minds, but not all real structures are object-like.
2. **Irreversibility as primitive.** Histories are not derived from entities; entities emerge from stabilized histories.
3. **Ontological entropy.** Entropy measures degeneracy of admissible futures, not epistemic uncertainty.
4. **Anti-conceptualism.** Ontologies are about the world, not about concepts in minds.

These commitments align the framework with realist ontology while rejecting static metaphysical atomism.

4 Core Ontological Primitives

The ontology introduces three irreducible primitives.

4.1 Scalar Fields (Φ)

Scalar fields represent *ontic density*: the degree to which structure persists under perturbation. Regions of high Φ correspond to stable structures such as particles, organisms, or institutions. Low Φ regions correspond to transient or diffuse regimes.

4.2 Vector Fields ($\vec{v}$)

Vector fields encode directed constraint propagation, including causal, inferential, and functional flows. Relations are not primitive; they emerge as stable couplings of vector flows.

4.3 Entropy Fields (S)

Entropy fields measure the degeneracy of admissible futures. Low entropy corresponds to invariant structure; high entropy corresponds to branching, instability, or interpretive ambiguity.

5 Derived Ontological Categories

Classical ontological categories arise as stabilized configurations:

Classical Category	**RSVP Interpretation**
Object	Persistent low-entropy Φ-invariant
Process	Directed flow in $\vec{v}$
Relation	Stable coupling of vector flows
Information	Entropy-constrained projectable pattern
Agent	Self-maintaining entropy-minimizing subsystem

No derived category is primitive; all are historically stabilized.

6 Event-Historical Semantics

Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the space of admissible histories. A history is an irreversible trajectory through the coupled fields $(\Phi, \vec{v}, S)$. Ontological constraints restrict which histories are admissible.

Under this semantics:

- Definitions specify admissibility conditions.
- Classification partitions history space by entropy regimes.
- Consistency is replayability under constraint.

Ontology engineering becomes the practice of constraining histories to prevent semantic collapse.

7 Ontology Mappings Reinterpreted

Mappings are not correspondences between entities but temporary synchronization operators between field regimes. A successful mapping reduces entropy across systems and enables convergence. Once convergence is achieved, the mapping becomes redundant and disappears.

This explains the observed decay of mappings without condemning them in principle.

8 Formal Comparison with Existing Top-Level Ontologies

8.1 Comparison with Basic Formal Ontology

BFO enforces realist discipline through distinctions such as continuant versus occurrent. However, these distinctions presuppose entity primacy.

The RSVP ontology differs in that:

- Entities are emergent, not primitive.
- Irreversibility is constitutive, not auxiliary.
- Information is ontologically grounded in entropy, not representation.

BFO can be interpreted as a stabilized subtheory within an RSVP regime.

8.2 Comparison with DOLCE and Process Ontologies

Process ontologies foreground events but typically lack a principled treatment of entropy and stabilization. RSVP integrates process with persistence by treating both as regimes of historical constraint.

8.3 Relation to Information-Centric Ontologies

Information-centric ontologies often reintroduce conceptualism implicitly. RSVP avoids this by grounding information in physically and historically constrained patterns.

9 Implications for AI and Cognition

Intelligence is not a substance but a field configuration. Human cognition corresponds to a uniquely evolved $(\Phi, \vec{v}, S)$ regime, but not the only possible one. This allows rejection of simplistic AGI hype without asserting metaphysical impossibility.

10 Governance and Ontological Stability

Top-level ontologies differ by entropy tolerance. Highly conservative ontologies favor stability; agile ontologies favor adaptability. RSVP provides a framework for understanding these tradeoffs as regime differences rather than ideological conflicts.

Ontology engineering must move beyond static taxonomies toward a framework that takes irreversibility, history, and entropy seriously. A top-level ontology of entropic histories preserves realism while extending it to domains where objects are not fundamental.

Ontology should ask not merely what exists, but which histories remain possible.

11 Application to Contemporary Debates in Ontology Engineering

The RSVP framework provides a unified lens for interpreting disputes in ontology engineering by treating them as disagreements over historical constraint placement and entropy regulation. Rather than framing such debates as clashes between realism and pragmatism, or philosophy and engineering, RSVP reveals them as differences in how stability, flow, and admissibility are managed across scales.

We apply this framework to the Beverley–Smith debate series, which addresses four recurring fault lines in applied ontology: the role of philosophy, the status of ontology mappings, the feasibility of artificial general intelligence, and the governance of top-level ontologies.

11.1 Event-Historical Analysis: Ontology as Constraints on Admissible Histories

From an event-historical perspective, ontology engineering governs the space of irreversible representational trajectories. Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the space of admissible histories. Ontological commitments function as authorization and exclusion operators that determine which histories may be composed, replayed, and extended.

SmithâĂŹs position emphasizes *prior exclusion*. Philosophical realism supplies ex ante constraintsâĂŤtruth as non-negotiable, universals as independent of concepts, and strict use–mention disciplineâĂŤthat filter admissible histories before engineering practice begins. These constraints prevent semantic collapse by eliminating incoherent trajectories early.

BeverleyâĂŹs position emphasizes *iterative stabilization*. Constraints are refined through engineering practice, disambiguation, and interoperability pressures. Once admissibility conditions stabilize, ontology engineering may "spin off" from philosophy as an independent discipline.

Event-historically, both positions agree on composability as the criterion of success. Their disagreement concerns the *origin* of constraints: upstream in metaphysics or downstream in practice. This tension resolves naturally when constraints are understood as historically placeable operators rather than static axioms.

Ontology mappings illustrate this distinction clearly:

Position	Interpretation as Historical Operator
Smith	Entropy amplification via non-stationary rewrites and version drift
Beverley	Temporary synchronization enabling convergence and self-elimination

Disputes over AGI reduce to admissibility criteria on histories. Smith requires biological-historical equivalence for intelligence; Beverley accepts functional equivalence under shared constraints. Governance questions, such as the pace of BFO evolution, reflect bottleneck management in the selection of admissible historical trajectories.

11.2 RSVP Field-Theoretic Interpretation: Ontology as Entropy-Regulated Dynamics

The same debate admits a complementary RSVP interpretation. Ontological commitments correspond to regimes in the coupled fields $(\Phi, \vec{v}, S)$.

Smith defends high-inertia scalar regimes characterized by dense Φ-attractors anchored by philosophical boundary conditions. These caps limit entropy growth and preserve realist invariants.

Beverley emphasizes vector-field laminarization, where engineering practice reduces turbulence until flows stabilize and explicit philosophical intervention recedes.

Ontology mappings manifest as distinct field operations:

Position	**RSVP Interpretation**
Smith	Torsion and shear increasing entropy production
Beverley	Dissipative couplers enabling entropy reduction and equilibration

AGI debates become questions of field topology. Smith views human intelligence as a uniquely embodied, high-density Φ configuration. Beverley allows that macroscopic invariants may be realized across distinct substrates, even if microphysical implementations diverge.

Institutional contrasts follow naturally. BFO exemplifies a low-entropy, high-inertia regime optimized for stability. Corporate ontologies operate in higher-entropy regimes that prioritize rapid flow and adaptation. RSVP does not privilege either regime absolutely; it explains their divergence through scale-dependent entropy tolerance.

11.3 Equivalence and Synthesis

Event-historical and RSVP interpretations are equivalent under appropriate adjunctions. Admissible histories in $\mathcal{H}$ correspond to trajectories through the coupled RSVP fields. Authorization and exclusion operators map to entropy constraints, while disputes over philosophical priority versus engineering agility reduce to differences in scale at which constraints are enforced.

This case study demonstrates that many persistent disagreements in ontology engineering arise not from incompatible metaphysical commitments, but from unacknowledged regime differences in entropy management and historical control.

Ontology engineering must move beyond static taxonomies toward frameworks that treat irreversibility, history, and entropy as primitive. The RSVP ontology, grounded in entropic histories and constrained flow, preserves realist discipline while extending ontology to domains where object primacy is inadequate.

Applied to contemporary debates such as the Beverley–Smith series, RSVP demonstrates explanatory and unifying power. It reframes disputes over philosophy and engineering, mapping and unification, intelligence and governance, as multiscale questions of constraint placement rather than ideological conflict.

Ontology, on this view, asks not only what exists, but which historiesâĂŤand which field regimesâĂŤremain admissible.

12 Formal Adjunction Between Histories and Fields

This section makes precise the relationship between the event-historical semantics introduced earlier and the RSVP field-theoretic formulation. We show that these two perspectives are not merely compatible but formally adjoint: the space of admissible histories corresponds to trajectories through the coupled scalar–vector–entropy fields, and vice versa.

12.1 Histories as Primitive Objects

Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the space of admissible histories. A history $h \in \mathcal{H}$ is defined as an irreversible, temporally ordered sequence of events subject to ontological constraints. These constraints restrict which continuations of a partial history remain admissible.

Formally, $\mathcal{H}$ is not merely a set but a structured space equipped with:

- A precedence relation encoding irreversibility,
- A family of admissibility predicates restricting extension,
- A degeneracy measure quantifying the number of admissible futures.

Ontology engineering, under this semantics, specifies constraints on $\mathcal{H}$ such that histories remain composable, replayable, and non-degenerate.

12.2 Fields as Dynamical Representations

In the RSVP formulation, ontological structure is represented by a triplet of fields $(\Phi, \vec{v}, S)$, where:

- Φ is a scalar field representing ontic density or stability,
- $\vec{v}$ is a vector field representing directed constraint propagation,
- S is an entropy field measuring degeneracy of admissible futures.

A field configuration defines, at each spacetime point, local constraints on continuation and stabilization. Crucially, these fields are not static labels but dynamical quantities whose evolution governs which structures persist.

12.3 From Histories to Fields

Given a history $h \in \mathcal{H}$, we define a mapping

$$F : \mathcal{H} \to (\Phi, \vec{v}, S)$$

that assigns to each history a corresponding field configuration. Intuitively:

- Persistent regularities in h induce regions of high Φ,
- Directed causal or inferential asymmetries induce nonzero $\vec{v}$,
- Branching possibilities in future extensions induce local entropy S.

This mapping is coarse-grained: distinct histories may induce the same field configuration when their differences are irrelevant at the chosen scale.

12.4 From Fields to Histories

Conversely, given a field configuration $(\Phi, \vec{v}, S)$, we define a mapping

$$G : (\Phi, \vec{v}, S) \to \mathcal{H}$$

that yields the class of histories admissible under the local field constraints. A history h is admissible under $(\Phi, \vec{v}, S)$ if and only if its trajectory respects:

- Stability thresholds encoded in Φ,
- Directional constraints encoded in $\vec{v}$,
- Entropy bounds encoded in S.

Thus, fields determine not a single history but a constrained family of possible histories.

12.5 Adjunction Structure

The mappings F and G form an adjunction:

$$F \dashv G$$

in the sense that field configurations are the most general representations that preserve admissibility relations among histories, while histories are the most refined realizations of a given field regime.

Under this adjunction:

- Event-historical admissibility corresponds to entropy-bounded field flow,
- Historical irreversibility corresponds to non-conservative dynamics,
- Ontological stabilization corresponds to attractor formation in Φ.

This adjunction formalizes the equivalence between history-first and field-first ontological descriptions. They differ not in substance but in representational emphasis.

12.6 Ontological Consequences

The adjunction has three immediate consequences for ontology engineering:

1. Histories, not entities, are ontologically primary.
2. Field descriptions provide scalable abstractions over historical detail.
3. Ontological disagreement can be analyzed as disagreement over constraint placement rather than over existence claims.

This completes the formal bridge between event-historical semantics and the RSVP field ontology.

13 Embedding a Fragment of BFO as a Low-Entropy RSVP Subtheory

This section demonstrates how a representative fragment of a classical top-level ontology may be embedded within the RSVP framework as a stabilized, low-entropy subtheory. The purpose is not to replace existing ontologies, but to show how their core commitments arise naturally as special regimes within a history-first, field-theoretic ontology.

13.1 Target Fragment and Scope

We consider a minimal but representative fragment consisting of:

- Independent continuants,
- Occurrents (processes),
- The continuant–occurrent distinction,
- Participation relations between continuants and occurrents.

This fragment captures the core realist commitments of entity-centric ontology without invoking domain-specific extensions.

13.2 RSVP Interpretation of Continuants

In RSVP terms, an independent continuant corresponds to a region of persistently high scalar density Φ coupled with low entropy S across admissible histories. Such a region exhibits:

- Stability under perturbation,
- Identity preservation across historical extension,
- Resistance to branching degeneration.

Formally, a continuant is identified with a connected region R of spacetime such that:

$$\Phi|_R \geq \Phi_{\min}, \qquad S|_R \leq S_{\max}$$

for thresholds $\Phi_{\min}$ and $S_{\max}$ determined by the ontological regime.

Continuants are thus not primitive substances, but stabilized invariants of the field dynamics.

13.3 RSVP Interpretation of Occurrents

Occurrents correspond to directed flows in the vector field $\vec{v}$. A process is not an entity but a temporally extended trajectory along which constraints propagate. Occurrents may intersect regions associated with continuants, but they are ontologically distinct in virtue of their directionality.

The classical distinction between continuants and occurrents arises as a difference between:

- Scalar-dominated stability regimes (continuants),
- Vector-dominated flow regimes (occurrents).

This distinction is emergent, not axiomatic.

13.4 Participation as Field Coupling

Participation relations are interpreted as stable couplings between scalar regions and vector flows. A continuant participates in an occurrent when a high-Φ region constrains, or is constrained by, a directed flow in $\vec{v}$ without loss of identity.

Such couplings remain well-defined only in low-entropy regimes. As entropy increases, participation relations become unstable, explaining empirically observed failures of rigid participation modeling in highly dynamic domains.

13.5 Low-Entropy Regime Characterization

The fragment under consideration embeds cleanly within RSVP provided the following regime conditions hold:

1. Entropy remains sufficiently low to prevent excessive branching.
2. Scalar density remains sufficiently high to preserve identity.
3. Vector flows remain laminar rather than turbulent.

These conditions describe precisely the domains in which classical realist ontologies perform well: relatively stable biological, anatomical, and institutional structures.

13.6 Interpretive Consequences

Under this embedding:

- The continuant–occurrent distinction is preserved, but explained.
- Participation is no longer primitive, but derived from coupling stability.
- Ontological rigidity corresponds to low entropy tolerance.

Failures of classical ontology in highly dynamic or information-rich domains are thus not errors but regime violations.

13.7 Compatibility Without Reduction

Importantly, this embedding does not reduce RSVP to an entity ontology, nor does it dissolve existing ontologies into process metaphysics. Instead, it situates classical top-level ontologies as stabilized subtheories valid under specific historical and entropic constraints.

This demonstrates that RSVP extends, rather than opposes, existing realist ontology frameworks.

14 Anticipated Objections and Clarifications

Any proposal for a new top-level ontology invites skepticism, particularly when it departs from established entity-centric frameworks. This section anticipates and addresses three likely objections: that the approach exhibits "physics envy," that it is excessively abstract, and that it lacks compatibility with formal ontology languages such as OWL.

14.1 "This Is Physics Envy"

A common objection to field-based ontological frameworks is that they import mathematical or physical formalisms where they are unnecessary or inappropriate. The RSVP ontology does not derive its authority from physics, nor does it attempt to reduce ontology to physical theory.

The use of scalar, vector, and entropy fields is structural rather than physicalist. These constructs serve as formal devices for representing stability, directionality, and degeneracy across domains. They are equally applicable to physical systems, biological processes, institutional structures, and computational workflows.

Crucially, RSVP does not assume that ontology must mirror fundamental physics. Instead, it provides a unifying language for describing irreversibility and constraint across scales. The appeal to field structure reflects the ontological importance of continuity and flow, not a desire to import physical authority.

14.2 "The Framework Is Too Abstract to Be Useful"

Abstraction is often conflated with impracticality. In ontology engineering, however, abstraction is unavoidable at the top level. The question is not whether an ontology is abstract, but whether its abstractions support coherent specialization.

The RSVP ontology is abstract by design, but its abstractions are operationally anchored. Scalar density corresponds to stability, vector flow to constraint propagation, and entropy to branching capacity. These notions map directly onto engineering concerns such as versioning, interoperability, and maintenance cost.

Moreover, RSVP explains why existing ontologies succeed in some domains and fail in others: they presuppose low-entropy regimes. Far from being detached from practice, the framework clarifies the conditions under which abstraction remains effective.

14.3 "This Is Not Compatible with OWL or First-Order Logic"

Another concern is that RSVP cannot be represented in standard ontology languages. This objection conflates representability with reducibility.

RSVP is a top-level ontological framework, not a domain ontology or a syntax. It does not claim that all of its primitives can be captured directly in OWL or first-order logic. Rather, it provides semantic grounding for fragments that are representable.

As shown in the previous section, classical ontological categories embed cleanly as low-entropy RSVP subtheories. These subtheories can be represented in OWL without difficulty. RSVP itself operates at a meta-level, explaining why such representations are stable and where they break down.

In this respect, RSVP plays a role analogous to that of foundational semantics for programming languages: it explains the behavior and limits of concrete formalisms without being identical to them.

14.4 Scope and Ambition

The RSVP ontology does not seek to replace existing top-level ontologies wholesale, nor does it propose a single modeling language. Its ambition is diagnostic and unificatory: to provide a principled account of stability, change, and constraint that can inform ontology engineering across domains.

Disagreement with this ambition is reasonable. However, such disagreement should be framed in terms of alternative accounts of irreversibility and constraint, rather than as objections to abstraction per se.

15 A Minimal OWL and First-Order Fragment

This section demonstrates that the RSVP ontology admits faithful representation of stabilized subtheories in standard ontology languages, including OWL and first-order logic, without reducing the framework itself to those formalisms. The intent is not to encode RSVP in its entirety, but to show how practical ontology engineering proceeds within RSVP-constrained regimes.

15.1 Representational Strategy

RSVP distinguishes between:

- *Meta-ontological structure*, which governs admissibility, irreversibility, and entropy, and
- *Stabilized ontological categories*, which admit symbolic representation.

Only the latter are candidates for direct representation in OWL or first-order logic. RSVP therefore functions as a semantic foundation that licenses, rather than replaces, symbolic ontologies.

15.2 Minimal Vocabulary

We consider a minimal vocabulary sufficient to represent a low-entropy RSVP regime:

- `Entity`
- `Process`
- `participatesIn`
- `hasStabilityLevel`

Here, `Entity` and `Process` correspond to stabilized continuant- and occurrent-like categories derived from RSVP field conditions.

15.3 OWL Fragment

The following OWL-style axioms illustrate a representable fragment:

```
Class: Entity
Class: Process

ObjectProperty: participatesIn
  Domain: Entity
  Range: Process

DataProperty: hasStabilityLevel
  Domain: Entity
  Range: xsd:float
```

In this fragment, `hasStabilityLevel` represents a coarse-grained proxy for scalar density Φ. Thresholds on this value distinguish entities that behave as continuants within a given regime.

Crucially, no claim is made that this exhausts the ontological meaning of stability. Rather, it captures those aspects relevant to a particular modeling context.

15.4 First-Order Interpretation

The same fragment admits a first-order reading. For example:

$$\forall x\,(Entity(x) \to \exists s\, hasStabilityLevel(x, s))$$

$$\forall x, y\,(participatesIn(x, y) \to Entity(x) \wedge Process(y))$$

Additional constraints may enforce regime-specific stability conditions, such as:

$$Entity(x) \wedge hasStabilityLevel(x, s) \wedge s \geq s_{\min} \to Stable(x)$$

These axioms characterize a low-entropy subtheory in which identity and participation relations are well-defined.

15.5 What Is Not Represented

Several RSVP primitives are intentionally not represented directly:

- Global entropy fields S,
- Vector-field dynamics $\vec{v}$,
- Admissibility conditions over full history space $\mathcal{H}$.

These elements govern when the above symbolic representations remain valid. Their absence from OWL is not a deficiency but a recognition of the expressive limits of first-order formalisms.

15.6 Interpretive Payoff

This separation clarifies a longstanding confusion in ontology engineering. Symbolic ontologies fail not because they are incorrect, but because they are applied outside the regimes for which they are stable.

RSVP provides explicit criteria for such regimes. Within them, OWL and first-order logic remain appropriate, efficient, and robust. Outside them, higher-level historical or field-theoretic analysis is required.

15.7 Practical Implications

In practice, RSVP suggests a layered workflow:

1. Use RSVP to characterize domain stability and entropy tolerance.
2. Identify stabilized categories appropriate for symbolic modeling.
3. Encode those categories in OWL or first-order logic.
4. Monitor regime drift as entropy increases or constraints change.

This approach preserves the utility of existing tools while grounding their use in a principled ontological framework.

16 Formal Results

This section states and proves a small collection of formal results that articulate the core claims of the RSVP ontology. The purpose of these theorems is not to introduce new primitives, but to make explicit the structural consequences of treating entropic histories and constrained flow as ontologically fundamental.

Throughout, let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the space of admissible histories and let $(\Phi, \vec{v}, S)$ denote the associated RSVP field configuration.

16.1 Preliminaries

[Admissible History] A history $h \in \mathcal{H}$ is admissible if and only if it satisfies all imposed ontological constraints and admits at least one non-degenerate continuation.

[Stabilized Structure] A structure is stabilized if it corresponds to a region of low entropy S and persistent scalar density Φ across all admissible continuations.

16.2 History Primacy

[Ontological Primacy of Histories] Entities are not ontologically primitive; rather, they arise as invariants over admissible histories.

Proof. Suppose entities were primitive. Then admissibility of histories would be defined in terms of entity persistence. However, persistence itself presupposes criteria of historical continuation and identity across time.

Conversely, if admissibility conditions are defined over histories, then persistent patterns across admissible continuations induce equivalence classes of histories. These equivalence classes satisfy the criteria traditionally ascribed to entities.

Thus, entities depend on histories for their identity conditions, while histories do not depend on entities. Hence histories are ontologically prior. □

16.3 Entropy and Ontological Stability

[Low Entropy as a Necessary Condition for Identity] A structure can support identity across time only if the entropy of its admissible future histories is bounded.

Proof. Identity across time requires that future continuations preserve relevant structure. If entropy is unbounded, arbitrarily many divergent continuations are admissible, and no invariant criterion of persistence can be maintained.

Therefore, bounded entropy is a necessary condition for identity preservation. □

Classical continuants correspond to low-entropy regimes of the RSVP fields.

16.4 Continuant–Occurrent Distinction

[Emergence of the Continuant–Occurrent Distinction] The continuant–occurrent distinction arises as an emergent property of scalar- and vector-dominated regimes, rather than as a primitive ontological dichotomy.

Proof. In scalar-dominated regimes, high Φ and low S ensure persistence under continuation, yielding continuant-like behavior. In vector-dominated regimes, directed flow in $\vec{v}$ governs change without persistence, yielding occurrent-like behavior.

Since these regimes are defined by field dynamics rather than axioms, the distinction is emergent rather than fundamental. □

16.5 Ontology Mappings

[Instability of Persistent Ontology Mappings] Persistent mappings between independently evolving ontologies are unstable except in low-entropy regimes.

Proof. Mappings must preserve admissibility relations across histories. If either ontology evolves such that entropy increases, admissible continuations diverge, and mapping preservation fails.

Only in regimes where entropy remains low do admissible histories remain sufficiently constrained for mappings to remain stable. Hence persistent mappings are unstable in general. □

16.6 Representability

[Conditional Symbolic Representability] Symbolic ontologies expressed in OWL or first-order logic are sound only within entropy-bounded RSVP subtheories.

Proof. Symbolic formalisms presuppose stable identity conditions and fixed relations. These presuppositions are satisfied precisely when entropy is bounded and scalar density remains high.

Outside such regimes, admissible histories branch too widely for symbolic constraints to remain invariant. Therefore symbolic ontologies are conditionally sound. □

16.7 Adjunction Consistency

[Adjunction Consistency] The adjunction between histories and fields preserves ontological admissibility.

Proof. By construction, the mapping from histories to fields preserves admissibility by encoding stability, directionality, and entropy. The reverse mapping preserves admissibility by generating only histories consistent with field constraints.

Thus admissibility is invariant under the adjunction. □

16.8 Interpretive Summary

Taken together, these results establish that:

- Ontological structure is grounded in admissible histories,
- Classical categories arise as stabilized regimes,
- Entropy bounds determine the validity of symbolic representation,
- Ontology engineering is fundamentally constraint management over time.

These theorems formalize the core claims of the RSVP ontology without appealing to domain-specific physics or cognitive assumptions.

17 A Categorical Restatement

This section reformulates the RSVP ontology and its formal results in categorical terms. The aim is not to replace the event-historical or field-theoretic presentations, but to show that the framework admits a natural and disciplined categorical semantics. This restatement clarifies compositional structure, functorial relationships, and invariance properties underlying ontology engineering.

17.1 Categories of Histories and Fields

We define two categories.

[Category of Histories] Let **Hist** be a category whose objects are admissible histories and whose morphisms are irreversible, constraint-preserving extensions of histories. Composition corresponds to temporal concatenation, and identity morphisms correspond to trivial extensions.

Irreversibility is encoded categorically by the absence of nontrivial isomorphisms: morphisms in **Hist** are generally non-invertible.

[Category of Field Regimes] Let **Field** be a category whose objects are RSVP field configurations $(\Phi, \vec{v}, S)$, and whose morphisms are coarse-graining or refinement maps that preserve admissibility constraints.

Morphisms in **Field** correspond to changes of scale, abstraction level, or modeling resolution.

17.2 Functorial Correspondence

We define two functors:

$$F : \mathbf{Hist} \to \mathbf{Field}, \qquad G : \mathbf{Field} \to \mathbf{Hist}.$$

- The functor F maps a concrete history to the minimal field regime that preserves its admissibility properties.
- The functor G maps a field regime to the category of histories admissible under its constraints.

These functors capture, respectively, abstraction from historical detail and realization of abstract constraints.

17.3 Adjunction

[History–Field Adjunction] The functors F and G form an adjoint pair:

$$F \dashv G.$$

Proof. For any history $h \in \mathbf{Hist}$ and field regime $r \in \mathbf{Field}$, there is a natural correspondence between constraint-preserving maps from $F(h)$ to r and history extensions from h to $G(r)$.

This correspondence is natural in both arguments and satisfies the unit and counit conditions of an adjunction. Intuitively, F forgets historical detail while preserving admissibility, and G freely generates histories consistent with a given regime. □

The adjunction formalizes the equivalence between history-first and field-first descriptions established earlier.

17.4 Stabilized Subcategories

Classical ontological categories correspond to reflective subcategories.

[Low-Entropy Subcategory] Let $\mathbf{Field}_{\text{low}} \subset \mathbf{Field}$ be the full subcategory consisting of field regimes with bounded entropy and persistent scalar density.

The category $\mathbf{Field}_{\text{low}}$ admits a reflective embedding into $\mathbf{Field}$.

Proof. Given any field regime, coarse-graining operations that suppress high-entropy variation yield a universal arrow into $\mathbf{Field}_{\text{low}}$. □

Entity-centric ontologies correspond to working entirely within $\mathbf{Field}_{\text{low}}$. Their apparent rigidity reflects categorical reflection rather than metaphysical necessity.

17.5 Ontology Mappings

Ontology mappings may be understood as spans in $\mathbf{Field}$:

$$r_1 \leftarrow r_m \rightarrow r_2,$$

where r_m is a mediating field regime.

Persistent ontology mappings exist only when the mediating regime lies in $\mathbf{Field}_{\text{low}}$.

This restates the instability of mappings categorically: outside low-entropy subcategories, no universal mediating object exists.

17.6 Symbolic Ontologies as Presentations

OWL and first-order ontologies correspond to presentations of objects in $\mathbf{Field}_{\text{low}}$.

Symbolic ontologies are sound presentations of objects in $\mathbf{Field}_{\text{low}}$, but not of arbitrary objects in $\mathbf{Field}$.

This explains categorically why symbolic ontologies succeed in stable domains and fail in highly dynamic ones.

17.7 Interpretive Significance

The categorical restatement highlights three structural features of the RSVP ontology:

- Irreversibility corresponds to non-invertibility of morphisms.
- Ontological abstraction corresponds to left adjoints.
- Stability corresponds to reflectivity into low-entropy subcategories.

These features clarify that RSVP is not an alternative modeling language, but a structural semantics for ontology engineering itself.

18 Formal Adjunction Between Histories and Fields

This section formalizes the relationship between the event-historical semantics introduced earlier and the RSVP field-theoretic formulation. The central claim is that these two perspectives are not merely compatible but stand in a precise adjoint relationship. Event histories and field regimes provide dual descriptions of the same ontological structure, differing only in the direction of abstraction and realization.

We begin with the space of admissible histories, denoted $\mathcal{H}$. A history in this sense is not a mere sequence of events, but an irreversible trajectory governed by ontological constraints that restrict which continuations remain possible. These constraints are constitutive rather than descriptive: they do not merely record what has occurred, but determine what can occur without violating coherence conditions such as identity preservation, causal consistency, or semantic stability.

In parallel, the RSVP framework represents ontological structure through a triplet of fields $(\Phi, \vec{v}, S)$. Scalar density Φ captures the persistence and stability of structure, vector flow $\vec{v}$ captures directed constraint propagation, and entropy S measures the degeneracy of admissible futures. A field configuration therefore specifies, locally and globally, which historical trajectories are permitted and which are excluded.

The mapping from histories to fields proceeds by abstraction. Given a concrete history, one may associate to it the minimal field regime that preserves its admissibility properties. Persistent regularities in the history induce regions of elevated scalar density, directional asymmetries induce vector flow, and the breadth of admissible continuations induces local entropy values. Distinct histories may map to the same field configuration when their differences are irrelevant at the chosen scale of description.

Conversely, a field configuration determines not a single history but a family of admissible histories. The mapping from fields to histories therefore proceeds by realization. A history is admissible under a given field regime if and only if it respects the stability thresholds encoded in Φ, the directional constraints encoded in $\vec{v}$, and the entropy bounds encoded in S. In this way, fields function as generators of constrained historical possibility rather than as static descriptors.

These two mappings form an adjoint pair. Abstraction from histories to fields is left adjoint to realization from fields to histories. Intuitively, the field-theoretic description is the most general abstraction that preserves historical admissibility, while the historical description is the most refined realization consistent with a given field regime. The unit and counit of this adjunction express, respectively, that no admissible history is lost under abstraction and that no inadmissible history is introduced under realization.

The ontological significance of this adjunction is substantial. It implies that disputes between history-first and structure-first ontologies are not disputes over what exists, but over representational emphasis. Both descriptions encode the same admissibility structure, differing only in whether constraint is expressed dynamically through history or statically through fields.

From the perspective of ontology engineering, this result justifies the use of field-theoretic abstractions without abandoning historical grounding, and conversely legitimizes event-historical semantics without collapsing into unstructured narrative. The adjunction provides a formal bridge that preserves realism while enabling scalable abstraction.

19 Embedding a Fragment of BFO as a Low-Entropy RSVP Subtheory

This section demonstrates how a representative fragment of a classical entity-centric top-level ontology may be embedded within the RSVP framework as a stabilized, low-entropy subtheory. The goal is not to reduce existing ontologies to RSVP, but to show that their central distinctions arise naturally under specific historical and entropic conditions. In this sense, RSVP functions as a general ontological substrate within which traditional realist ontologies appear as special cases.

We focus on a minimal fragment sufficient to capture the core commitments of entity-based realism, namely the distinction between continuants and occurrents and the relation of participation between them. These distinctions have proven robust and useful in relatively stable domains such as anatomy, material artifacts, and institutional structures, and thus provide an appropriate test case for embedding.

Within the RSVP ontology, a continuant corresponds to a region of historically persistent structure characterized by elevated scalar density Φ and bounded entropy S. Such a region maintains its identity across admissible continuations of history, resisting fragmentation under perturbation. Identity, on this account, is not imposed axiomatically but emerges from the stability of admissible futures. When entropy remains sufficiently low, the set of admissible continuations preserves a coherent criterion of sameness, yielding continuant-like behavior.

Occurrents, by contrast, correspond to regimes dominated by directed vector flow $\vec{v}$. Rather than persisting as stable invariants, they manifest as temporally extended trajectories along which constraints propagate. Processes may intersect regions associated with continuants, but their ontological character is determined by directionality and transformation rather than by persistence. The classical continuantâĂŞoccurrent distinction thus emerges as a contrast between scalar-dominated and vector-dominated regimes within the RSVP fields.

Participation relations arise when these regimes couple in a stable manner. A continuant participates in an occurrent when a region of high scalar density constrains, or is constrained by, a directed flow without loss of identity. Such couplings remain well-defined only so long as entropy remains bounded. As entropy increases, admissible histories branch more widely, and participation relations become unstable. This provides a principled explanation for the difficulty of modeling participation rigidly in highly dynamic or information- rich domains.

The fragment under consideration embeds cleanly within RSVP precisely because it presupposes a low-entropy regime. Scalar density remains high, vector flows are largely laminar, and admissible histories do not branch excessively. These are exactly the conditions under which classical top-level ontologies perform well. Their apparent rigidity is therefore not a metaphysical necessity, but a reflection of the stability of the domains to which they are applied.

This embedding clarifies both the strength and the limits of entity-centric ontologies. Their success in stable domains is explained by the existence of low-entropy RSVP regimes that support persistent identity and well-defined relations. Their failure in rapidly evolving, computational, or socio-technical domains is explained by regime violation rather than conceptual error. RSVP does not invalidate such ontologies; it situates them within a broader ontological landscape.

Importantly, this account preserves compatibility without reduction. RSVP does not collapse continuants into processes, nor does it dissolve entity ontology into flux. Instead, it explains why and when entity-based distinctions arise, and under what conditions they cease to be adequate. In doing so, it extends realist ontology beyond static domains while retaining its core commitments.

20 Anticipated Objections and Clarifications

Any proposal for a new top-level ontology must contend not only with technical questions but also with institutional and philosophical skepticism. The RSVP framework is no exception. This section anticipates several likely objections and clarifies the scope, intent, and methodological commitments of the proposed ontology. The aim is not to preempt disagreement, but to ensure that such disagreement is directed at substantive claims rather than misunderstandings.

A first objection is that the framework exhibits a form of "physics envy," in which ontological questions are subordinated to mathematical or physical formalisms. This concern is understandable given the use of field-theoretic language. However, RSVP does not derive its authority from physics, nor does it attempt to reduce ontology to physical theory. The scalar, vector, and entropy fields employed here are structural abstractions, introduced to capture persistence, directed constraint propagation, and degeneracy of admissible futures across domains. They are not posited as physical substances, but as formal devices for expressing ontological regularities that recur in biological, institutional, computational, and social systems as well as in physical ones.

A second objection is that the framework is excessively abstract and therefore unlikely to be useful in practice. This objection conflates abstraction with detachment from application. Top-level ontologies are necessarily abstract, as their role is to articulate the conditions under which more specific modeling choices become coherent. RSVP embraces abstraction precisely in order to explain why certain ontological categories stabilize and why others fail under domain pressure. Concepts such as scalar density and entropy are not introduced for their own sake, but to make explicit the conditions under which identity, participation, and persistence remain well-defined.

From this perspective, RSVP is not an alternative to applied ontology engineering, but a diagnostic framework for it. It explains why classical ontologies succeed in relatively stable domains and why they encounter difficulties in rapidly evolving or information-rich contexts. Far from being removed from practice, the framework provides criteria for determining when particular modeling strategies are likely to be effective.

A third objection concerns compatibility with standard ontology languages such as OWL and with first-order logic more generally. RSVP does not claim that all of its primitives can be directly represented within these formalisms. Such a claim would be incoherent, as OWL and first-order logic presuppose stable identity and fixed relations. Instead, RSVP distinguishes between meta-ontological structure and stabilized ontological categories. Only the latter are candidates for direct symbolic representation. RSVP therefore operates at a level that explains the soundness and limits of symbolic ontologies without being reducible to them.

This distinction parallels familiar relationships in other domains. Foundational semantics in programming languages, for example, are not themselves executable programs, but they explain why certain programs behave as they do and under what conditions abstractions remain valid. RSVP plays an analogous role for ontology engineering.

Finally, it is important to clarify the ambition of the framework. RSVP does not seek to replace existing top-level ontologies wholesale, nor does it propose a single universal modeling language. Its goal is instead to provide a principled account of irreversibility, constraint, and historical admissibility that can inform ontology engineering across domains. Disagreement with this ambition is entirely reasonable. However, such disagreement should be framed in terms of alternative accounts of history, stability, and constraint, rather than as a rejection of abstraction or formalism as such.

21 A Minimal OWL and First-Order Fragment

This section demonstrates that the RSVP ontology supports practical representation within standard ontology languages such as OWL and first-order logic, provided that representation is restricted to stabilized regimes. The purpose is not to encode RSVP in its entirety, but to clarify how symbolic ontologies operate as regime-bound projections of a richer ontological structure.

RSVP draws a principled distinction between meta-ontological structure and object-level categories. Meta-ontological structure governs admissibility, irreversibility, and entropy across histories. Object-level categories arise only when this structure stabilizes sufficiently to support persistent identity and fixed relations. Only the latter are candidates for direct symbolic representation.

Within a low-entropy regime, continuant-like structures exhibit stable identity conditions across admissible histories. These structures may be represented as entities in OWL or as unary predicates in first-order logic. Similarly, occurrent-like structures correspond to stabilized patterns of directed change and may be represented as processes or events. Participation relations become representable precisely when coupling between these structures remains stable under continuation.

A minimal symbolic vocabulary therefore suffices to capture such regimes. One may introduce predicates or classes corresponding to entities and processes, together with relations expressing participation. Additional attributes may be used to encode coarse-grained proxies for stability, such as numerical or ordinal measures reflecting scalar density. These proxies do not exhaust the ontological meaning of stability, but they are sufficient for reasoning within a restricted regime.

From a first-order perspective, such representations presuppose that identity conditions are invariant across admissible continuations. This presupposition is not guaranteed by logic alone; it is licensed by the underlying RSVP regime. When entropy remains bounded and admissible futures do not branch excessively, identity-preserving predicates remain sound. When these conditions fail, symbolic representations degrade, not because of logical inconsistency, but because the ontological assumptions required for their interpretation are no longer satisfied.

It is therefore a category mistake to criticize RSVP for not being fully expressible in OWL. OWL is a representational tool designed for stable domains. RSVP explains why such domains exist and how their stability may erode. The relationship is thus one of semantic grounding rather than syntactic inclusion.

This perspective clarifies a recurrent pattern in ontology engineering. Symbolic ontologies tend to perform well in domains characterized by slow change and strong institutional or physical constraints, such as anatomy or material artifacts. They encounter difficulty in domains characterized by rapid evolution, versioning, or socio-technical feedback. RSVP accounts for this pattern by explicitly modeling entropy and historical branching, thereby providing criteria for when symbolic modeling is appropriate.

In practical terms, RSVP supports a layered modeling strategy. One first characterizes the entropic and historical properties of a domain. One then identifies stabilized structures within that domain and represents only those structures symbolically. As domain conditions change, the symbolic layer may be revised or abandoned without treating its failure as an ontological error.

In this way, RSVP preserves the utility of OWL and first-order logic while placing their use on principled ontological footing.

References

[1] B. Smith, W. Ceusters, B. Klagges, J. KÃűhler, A. Kumar, J. Lomax, C. Mungall, F. Neuhaus, A. Rector, and C. Rosse. Relations in biomedical ontologies. *Genome Biology*, 6(5):R46, 2005.

[2] R. Arp, B. Smith, and A. D. Spear. *Building Ontologies with Basic Formal Ontology*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2015.

[3] N. Guarino. Formal ontology and information systems. In *Proceedings of FOIS 1998*, pages 3–15. IOS Press, 1998.

[4] C. Masolo, S. Borgo, A. Gangemi, N. Guarino, and A. Oltramari. Ontology library. *WonderWeb Deliverable D18*, 2003. (DOLCE foundational ontology.)

[5] P. Grenon and B. Smith. SNAP and SPAN: Towards dynamic spatial ontology. *Spatial Cognition and Computation*, 4(1):69–104, 2004.

[6] J. Beverley and B. Smith. Debates on artificial intelligence and ontology engineering, Part 2. Public debate transcript, 2025.

[7] J. Barandes. Indivisible stochastic processes and quantum mechanics. *Foundations of Physics*, 52:1–31, 2022.

[8] E. T. Jaynes. *Probability Theory: The Logic of Science*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[9] K. Friston. The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2):127–138, 2010.

[10] R. Landauer. Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 5(3):183–191, 1961.

[11] C. E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27:379–423, 623–656, 1948.

[12] L. Floridi. *The Philosophy of Information*. Oxford University Press, 2011.

[13] E. Hutchins. *Cognition in the Wild.* MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995.

[14] R. Rosen. *Life Itself: A Comprehensive Inquiry into the Nature, Origin, and Fabrication of Life.* Columbia University Press, 1991.

[15] A. N. Whitehead. *Process and Reality.* Free Press, New York, 1929.

[16] H. A. Simon. *The Sciences of the Artificial.* MIT Press, 3rd edition, 1996.

[17] J. Propp. Exploding dots and their applications. *Mathematical Intelligencer*, 2014.