

Entropic Smoothing and Relational Geodesics: A Sheaf–Functor Equivalence between RSVP Field Dynamics and Barbour’s Configuration Space

Flyxion

August 13, 2025

Abstract

The question of what time is—and why it has a direction—has long been central to both physics and philosophy. In modern physics, two broad traditions address this question. In the geometric–relational tradition, time is not a fundamental parameter but emerges from the ordering of instantaneous configurations of the universe. In the field–dynamical tradition, time is inseparable from the evolution of physical fields under local laws, with the arrow of time often identified with thermodynamic irreversibility. This paper develops a formal correspondence between these two perspectives by unifying Julian Barbour’s relational configuration space and the Relativistic Scalar–Vector Plenum (RSVP) field theory. Barbour’s framework describes history as a smooth curve in a symmetry-reduced configuration space, with the arrow of time tied to complexity growth away from a low-complexity Janus point. RSVP describes the universe as a triple of interacting fields evolving via entropic smoothing toward lower-energy configurations under negentropic constraints. By treating RSVP solutions as sections of a sheaf F over the base category C of relational configurations, and RSVP dynamics as a fiberwise gradient-flow functor D , we show that projecting D to C recovers Barbour’s geodesic-flow functor G . This sheaf–functor equivalence reframes the arrow of time as the naturality condition $\pi_* \circ D = G \circ \pi_*$, making explicit how relational and field-theoretic accounts describe the same underlying evolution.

Contents

1 Introduction

Debates over the nature of time span from Newton’s conception of an absolute temporal backdrop to Leibniz’s and Mach’s view that time is nothing more than the ordering of change. In the twentieth century, relativity theory blurred these lines: spacetime provided a geometric framework in which time was one coordinate among four, while quantum theory retained a separate “external” time parameter. This tension—between time as a relational ordering and time as an independent background—remains unresolved.

Beyond the existence of time lies the puzzle of its direction. Thermodynamics identifies an arrow with entropy increase, statistical mechanics explains it probabilistically, and cosmology seeks its roots in special low-entropy initial conditions. Competing approaches have proposed that the arrow emerges from complexity growth, from coarse-graining of microstates, or from asymmetries in the laws of motion. The challenge is to connect these statistical or structural accounts with the detailed physics of the universe’s evolution.

Two complementary formalisms exemplify the divide:

Relational geometry, as in Julian Barbour’s work, treats the universe as a point in a high-dimensional configuration space of instantaneous spatial relations. Physical symmetries remove

redundant degrees of freedom, producing a reduced “shape space” in which a smooth curve encodes the universe’s history. The arrow of time is identified with a monotonic structural measure along this curve.

Field dynamics models the universe in terms of physical fields—scalar, vector, tensor—defined over space(-time), evolving according to local differential equations. Here, the arrow of time arises from the irreversible smoothing of gradients and the dissipation of free energy.

While these views share the principle that time emerges from change, they describe different levels of structure: one captures the geometry of change, the other its physical content.

This paper bridges these traditions by showing how a specific field-dynamical theory—the Relativistic Scalar–Vector Plenum (RSVP)—projects onto Barbour’s relational framework. RSVP models the entire universe as a scalar potential Φ , a vector flux \mathbf{v} , and an entropy density S evolving via entropic smoothing toward lower-energy configurations, with constraints preserving structured, negentropic subsystems.

By treating the base space of the theory as Barbour’s relational configuration space C and the RSVP fields as fibers over C , we construct a sheaf of solutions F whose sections are locally valid RSVP configurations. RSVP dynamics then appears as a fiberwise gradient-flow functor $D : F \rightarrow F$. A projection functor $\pi_* : Sh(F) \rightarrow Sh(C)$ erases field content, leaving only the curve in C . The central result is a naturality condition:

$$\pi_* \circ D = G \circ \pi_*,$$

where G is the geodesic-flow functor in C . This formalizes the statement that Barbour’s smooth relational trajectory is the projection of RSVP’s full field-theoretic evolution.

Section 2 outlines the conceptual and mathematical foundations of both Barbour’s relational space and the RSVP framework. Section 3 develops the sheaf-theoretic formalism linking RSVP fields to the relational base. Section 4 states and proves the functorial equivalence between RSVP’s gradient flow and Barbour’s geodesic flow. Section 5 discusses conceptual implications for the ontology of time and possible observational consequences.

To facilitate understanding, each section includes a brief mathematical précis summarizing the formal construction, followed by a thought experiment featuring Maxim Kammerer from Arkadi and Boris Strugatsky’s *Prisoner of Power*, where an observer traverses a Noonverse Ringworld to reconstruct temporal orders from cross-sectional zones. An everyday example concludes each section, illustrating the concepts in familiar contexts.

1.1 Mathematical Précis

The ontology of time has long divided the physics community. In standard spacetime formulations, time is treated as a background parameter: a coordinate to which all processes are referred. In relational approaches, by contrast, time is an emergent ordering of configurations of the universe, with no independent existence apart from the changes those configurations undergo. Two contemporary formulations exemplify these alternatives.

Julian Barbour’s relational configuration space framework models the universe as a point in a high-dimensional manifold C of pure relational geometries, obtained by quotienting out all physically irrelevant symmetries of position, orientation, and scale. The history of the universe is then a smooth curve in C , typically taken to be a geodesic with respect to a natural relational metric. The arrow of time appears as the direction along this curve in which certain structural measures, such as complexity, evolve monotonically away from a distinguished low-complexity “Janus point.”

In the Relativistic Scalar–Vector Plenum (RSVP) theory, the primitive ontology is not relational geometry but a triple of interacting fields: a scalar entropy potential Φ , a vector flux \mathbf{v} , and an entropy density S . Each complete state of the universe is specified by these fields over a spatial hypersurface, and dynamics is governed by local conservation laws and admissibility

constraints. The arrow of time emerges as entropic smoothing: a gradient-like flow that reduces large-scale gradients in Φ while preserving coherent, negentropic subsystems. This view replaces metric time with an event-time ordering, where each admissible state transition enables the next in a turn-based causal sequence.

Although these formulations differ in ontology, they can be brought into formal correspondence. In this work, we model RSVP’s state space as the total space F of a fiber bundle over C , with each fiber consisting of all admissible RSVP field configurations compatible with the underlying relational geometry. Interpreting C as a site with a Grothendieck topology capturing “local relational neighborhoods,” we define a sheaf of solutions F to the RSVP field equations. RSVP dynamics then becomes an endofunctor $D : F \rightarrow F$, acting fiberwise as the entropic-smoothing gradient flow. The projection functor $\pi_* : Sh(F) \rightarrow Sh(C)$ erases the fiber content, yielding Barbour’s smooth relational curve as the image. The resulting equivalence is expressed by the naturality condition

$$\pi_* \circ D = G \circ \pi_*,$$

where G is the geodesic-flow functor on $Sh(C)$. This correspondence reframes the arrow of time as a sheaf-functor relation: Barbour’s relational trajectory is the projection of RSVP’s fiberwise gradient flow, while RSVP’s fields specify the physical content that determines its direction.

1.2 Thought Experiment with Maxim Kammerer

Maxim Kammerer, a progressor from the Noonverse, lands on a Ringworld orbiting a distant star. The Ringworld is a vast artificial structure where environmental bands create zones at different civilizational stages: feudal baronies with agrarian economies, mercantile city-states with early trade networks, industrial powers with rail and factory systems, and post-scarcity arcologies with automated resource distribution. Maxim traverses these zones on foot, noting that geography substitutes for time—adjacent bands represent sequential developmental phases without requiring him to wait centuries for evolution in a single location.

In a feudal zone, Maxim observes fragmented land holdings (Φ as high-gradient resource potentials) and erratic cart paths (\mathbf{v} as disorganized fluxes), with high local disorder (S). Moving to a mercantile zone, he sees potentials smoothing as markets consolidate, fluxes aligning along trade routes, and entropy transiently rising before stabilizing. In industrial areas, gradients further flatten with standardized production, fluxes optimize via rail networks, and entropy reduces under efficiency constraints. Finally, post-scarcity zones exhibit near-uniform potentials, laminar fluxes, and minimal entropy production.

By cross-sectionally analyzing these zones—measuring connectivity metrics and field proxies—Maxim reconstructs a universal trajectory: from high-constraint feudal fragmentation to low-constraint post-industrial homogeneity. This mirrors deriving a stellar lifecycle from an HR diagram snapshot, where zones are “stars” at different “ages.” Using null convention logic-inspired filters, Maxim validates data only from “completed” transitions (NULL to VALID wavefronts), acting as a Markov blanket to exclude noisy frontier zones. Higher-category circuits modeling inter-zone interactions collapse to sequential paths by ignoring dual rails, simplifying the developmental order.

1.3 Everyday Example

Consider a modern city as a microcosm of developmental stages: residential neighborhoods (analogous to feudal zones with localized resources), commercial districts (mercantile with trade flows), industrial parks (with factory optimizations), and smart grid-integrated suburbs (post-scarcity efficiency). An urban planner surveys these areas in a day, measuring energy usage gradients (Φ), traffic flows (\mathbf{v}), and disorder metrics (S). Cross-sectional analysis reconstructs the city’s “lifecycle” from fragmented suburbia to integrated downtown, without waiting decades

for urban evolution. Valid data from stable districts (NCL-like wavefronts) filters noise from construction zones, and complex interaction models simplify to sequential planning pipelines.

2 Background

The modern debate over the nature of time begins with the contrasting views of Newton and Leibniz.

Newtonian mechanics postulated an absolute time, a universal parameter that flows uniformly regardless of events, against which all motion is measured.

Leibniz and Mach rejected this, holding that time has no existence apart from the changes in the relationships between material bodies — in other words, time is relational.

This philosophical divide persisted into the twentieth century, where it was reshaped by relativity and quantum theory. Einstein’s special and general relativity entwined time with space into a four-dimensional manifold, making it coordinate-dependent and relative to observers, yet still embedding it in a smooth background spacetime. Quantum theory, in contrast, retained a preferred time parameter in its formalism, creating a structural mismatch between the two frameworks.

The question thus remains: is time a container in which events occur, or is it an ordering that emerges from those events?

Even if one adopts a relational stance, the problem of the direction of time remains. Our experience, and many physical processes, exhibit asymmetry: we remember the past, not the future; entropy increases; structures form and decay irreversibly. Various accounts of the arrow of time have been proposed:

1. Thermodynamic: The arrow corresponds to the monotonic increase of entropy, as expressed in the second law of thermodynamics.
2. Statistical mechanical: The arrow arises from coarse-graining and probabilistic behavior in systems with many degrees of freedom.
3. Cosmological: The arrow is tied to special low-entropy initial conditions of the universe.
4. Complexity growth: In some relational accounts, the arrow points in the direction where complexity increases from a special minimal-complexity configuration.

All these accounts face the challenge of connecting abstract asymmetry principles with concrete physical descriptions of the universe’s actual evolution.

Julian Barbour’s relational framework is a contemporary development of Leibniz’s and Mach’s ideas. It begins by defining the set of all possible instantaneous configurations of the universe, stripped of physically irrelevant symmetries such as global translation, rotation, and scale. The result is a high-dimensional manifold called relational configuration space or shape space, denoted C .

Objects in C : individual relational configurations.

Morphisms in C : deformations that preserve relational structure.

Metric on C : derived from an underlying relational dynamics (e.g., via Jacobi’s principle), allowing one to speak of distances and geodesics in C .

In Barbour’s picture, the history of the universe is a smooth curve in C , and the arrow of time is the direction along this curve in which a chosen structural measure (often called “complexity”) grows monotonically. The Janus point hypothesis holds that the curve passes through a special minimum-complexity point, with two time directions extending from it.

In contrast, field-based approaches begin with a physical space or spacetime manifold and assign to each point values of physical fields (scalars, vectors, tensors, spinors, etc.) that evolve according to local laws. The arrow of time in such theories is typically associated with dissipative or irreversible processes — for example, the smoothing of gradients, decay of excitations, or redistribution of energy from localized to homogeneous states.

Field theories can be formulated without assuming an independent time parameter by using causal structures or event orderings: the state of the field at one “turn” enables the next, in a manner analogous to a turn-based game. Time is then recovered as the index on this causal sequence.

RSVP theory is a universal field model designed to describe the entire physical content of the universe without reference to background spacetime expansion. It postulates three interacting fields:

A scalar entropy potential Φ , capturing smoothness and large-scale potential gradients.

A vector flux field \mathbf{v} , representing momentum or energy transport.

An entropy density field S , quantifying local disorder.

The arrow of time in RSVP is defined as entropic smoothing: the evolution of these fields toward lower-energy, smoother configurations, subject to constraints that preserve coherent structures (negentropic islands). Each legal transition between states constitutes a “turn” in event–time, producing a discrete causal ordering from which metric time can be reconstructed.

In this formulation, the universe’s state space F is a fiber bundle over C , where each point in C — a relational geometry — has a fiber containing all admissible RSVP field configurations consistent with that geometry. The challenge, and the central aim of this paper, is to formalize the connection between RSVP’s fiberwise dynamics and Barbour’s base-space geodesics.

2.1 Mathematical Précis

The ontology of time has long divided the physics community. In standard spacetime formulations, time is treated as a background parameter: a coordinate to which all processes are referred. In relational approaches, by contrast, time is an emergent ordering of configurations of the universe, with no independent existence apart from the changes those configurations undergo. Two contemporary formulations exemplify these alternatives.

Julian Barbour’s relational configuration space framework models the universe as a point in a high-dimensional manifold C of pure relational geometries, obtained by quotienting out all physically irrelevant symmetries of position, orientation, and scale. The history of the universe is then a smooth curve in C , typically taken to be a geodesic with respect to a natural relational metric. The arrow of time appears as the direction along this curve in which certain structural measures, such as complexity, evolve monotonically away from a distinguished low-complexity “Janus point.”

In the Relativistic Scalar–Vector Plenum (RSVP) theory, the primitive ontology is not relational geometry but a triple of interacting fields: a scalar entropy potential Φ , a vector flux \mathbf{v} , and an entropy density S . Each complete state of the universe is specified by these fields over a spatial hypersurface, and dynamics is governed by local conservation laws and admissibility constraints. The arrow of time emerges as entropic smoothing: a gradient-like flow that reduces large-scale gradients in Φ while preserving coherent, negentropic subsystems. This view replaces metric time with an event–time ordering, where each admissible state transition enables the next in a turn-based causal sequence.

Although these formulations differ in ontology, they can be brought into formal correspondence. In this work, we model RSVP’s state space as the total space F of a fiber bundle over C , with each fiber consisting of all admissible RSVP field configurations compatible with the underlying relational geometry. Interpreting C as a site with a Grothendieck topology capturing “local relational neighborhoods,” we define a sheaf of solutions F to the RSVP field equations. RSVP dynamics then becomes an endofunctor $D : F \rightarrow F$, acting fiberwise as the entropic-smoothing gradient flow. The projection functor $\pi_* : Sh(F) \rightarrow Sh(C)$ erases the fiber content, yielding Barbour’s smooth relational curve as the image. The resulting equivalence is expressed by the naturality condition

$$\pi_* \circ D = G \circ \pi_*,$$

where G is the geodesic-flow functor on $Sh(C)$. This correspondence reframes the arrow of time as a sheaf–functor relation: Barbour’s relational trajectory is the projection of RSVP’s fiberwise gradient flow, while RSVP’s fields specify the physical content that determines its direction.

2.2 Thought Experiment with Maxim Kammerer

Maxim Kammerer, stranded on a Noonverse Ringworld, observes zones embodying historical epochs: feudal domains with agrarian hierarchies, mercantile hubs with nascent trade, industrial sprawls with mechanized production, and post-industrial utopias with automated abundance. Traversing these, Maxim notes that relational configurations—population clusters, resource networks—form a space C where each zone is a point. Field measurements (Φ as economic potentials, \mathbf{v} as labor fluxes, S as social disorder) evolve via D , projecting to a geodesic in C via π_* . In a feudal zone, high Φ gradients smooth as serfs consolidate lands; in industrial areas, \mathbf{v} aligns with factories. Maxim reconstructs the arrow as entropic reduction, filtering data with NCL wavefronts to isolate stable transitions, collapsing higher-category social interactions to sequential developmental paths.

2.3 Everyday Example

An engineer monitors a power plant, where sections represent stages: fuel intake (feudal-like raw resource chaos), processing (mercantile trade of energy), generation (industrial flux optimization), and distribution (post-industrial efficiency). Measuring Φ (fuel potentials), \mathbf{v} (current flows), and S (waste disorder), the engineer applies D to evolve states, projecting to a relational curve in C of plant layouts. The arrow manifests as constraint reduction in macro-metrics, validated by NCL on sensor data, simplifying circuit models from higher categories to sequential operations.

3 Mathematical Framework

The base space C as a site

We take Barbour’s relational configuration space C as the base on which all further structure is built. Formally:

Objects: admissible relational configurations of the universe, modulo global translations, rotations, and scalings.

Morphisms: smooth relational deformations preserving equivalence class structure.

Topology: C is equipped with a Grothendieck topology τ in which a covering family $\{U_i \rightarrow U\}$ represents a collection of relational neighborhoods whose union recovers U . This encodes the notion of local relational neighborhoods in which physical structures can be specified and patched together.

The structure sheaf O_C assigns to each open set $U \subset C$ the commutative algebra of relational observables definable purely from geometric relations, independent of any field content.

In the Relativistic Scalar–Vector Plenum framework, each relational configuration $q \in C$ supports a set of possible field configurations:

(Φ, \mathbf{v}, S) satisfying the RSVP field equations.

These configurations form the fiber over q . Collectively, the union of all such fibers over C defines the total space F of a fiber bundle:

$$\pi : F \rightarrow C,$$

where π is the projection mapping a complete physical state (geometry + fields) to its underlying relational geometry.

The fiber $F_q = \pi^{-1}(q)$ consists of all RSVP states compatible with q .

We encode the physically admissible field configurations in a sheaf of solutions:

$$F \in \mathbf{Sh}(C).$$

For each open set $U \subset C$, $F(U)$ is the set of all triples (Φ, \mathbf{v}, S) assigned to each $q \in U$ that:

1. Satisfy the RSVP PDEs locally in each fiber.
2. Respect the admissibility constraints (negentropic bounds, torsion suppression, energy-momentum conservation).

3. Glue consistently on overlaps $U_i \cap U_j$.

The stalk F_q over q recovers the fiber F_q .

The RSVP arrow of time is implemented by a fiberwise gradient flow \mathcal{D} on F :

$\mathcal{D} : F \rightarrow F$.

For a given section $s \in F(U)$, $\mathcal{D}(s)$ is obtained by applying the RSVP update rule:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi' &= \Phi + \alpha \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} - \beta \sigma + \xi^\Phi, \\ \mathbf{v}' &= \mathbf{v} + \gamma \Pi_{\text{curl}\downarrow}(\nabla \Phi) - \eta \mathbf{v} + \xi^\mathbf{v}, \\ S' &= S + \sigma - \kappa \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 + \xi^S,\end{aligned}$$

where σ is the entropy production functional and $\Pi_{\text{curl}\downarrow}$ is the torsion-suppression operator.

\mathcal{D} is local in the sheaf-theoretic sense: for any cover $\{U_i\}$ of U ,

$\mathcal{D}(s)|_{U_i} = \mathcal{D}(s|_{U_i})$,

and the results glue on overlaps. This ensures that RSVP evolution is compatible with the sheaf structure.

The bundle projection $\pi : F \rightarrow C$ induces a pushforward functor:

$\pi_* : \mathbf{Sh}(F) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(C)$,

which “forgets” fiber content, retaining only the underlying relational geometry.

If \tilde{F} is the étalé space of F , then a trajectory in \tilde{F} under repeated \mathcal{D} -action projects via π to a curve in C .

On the base C , we define the geodesic-flow functor:

$\mathcal{G} : \mathbf{Sh}(C) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(C)$,

which advances relational configurations along geodesics determined by the relational metric g . In Barbour’s framework, \mathcal{G} generates the smooth relational curve representing the universe’s history.

The main correspondence is expressed by:

$$\pi_* \circ \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{G} \circ \pi_*.$$

That is: evolving in RSVP fields and then projecting to relational geometry is equivalent to projecting first and evolving via Barbour’s geodesic flow.

When \mathcal{D} is metrically aligned with g , the projected curve is exactly geodesic; otherwise it is a constrained geodesic with fiber-dependent corrections.

3.1 Mathematical Précis

The base space C as a site

We take Barbour’s relational configuration space C as the base on which all further structure is built. Formally:

Objects: admissible relational configurations of the universe, modulo global translations, rotations, and scalings.

Morphisms: smooth relational deformations preserving equivalence class structure.

Topology: C is equipped with a Grothendieck topology τ in which a covering family $\{U_i \rightarrow U\}$ represents a collection of relational neighborhoods whose union recovers U . This encodes the notion of local relational neighborhoods in which physical structures can be specified and patched together.

The structure sheaf \mathcal{O}_C assigns to each open set $U \subset C$ the commutative algebra of relational observables definable purely from geometric relations, independent of any field content.

In the Relativistic Scalar–Vector Plenum framework, each relational configuration $q \in C$ supports a set of possible field configurations:

(Φ, \mathbf{v}, S) satisfying the RSVP field equations.

These configurations form the fiber over q . Collectively, the union of all such fibers over C defines the total space F of a fiber bundle:

$$\pi : F \rightarrow C,$$

where π is the projection mapping a complete physical state (geometry + fields) to its underlying relational geometry.

The fiber $F_q = \pi^{-1}(q)$ consists of all RSVP states compatible with q .

We encode the physically admissible field configurations in a sheaf of solutions:

$$F \in \mathbf{Sh}(C).$$

For each open set $U \subset C$, $F(U)$ is the set of all triples (Φ, \mathbf{v}, S) assigned to each $q \in U$ that:

1. Satisfy the RSVP PDEs locally in each fiber.
2. Respect the admissibility constraints (negentropic bounds, torsion suppression, energy–momentum conservation).
3. Glue consistently on overlaps $U_i \cap U_j$.

The stalk F_q over q recovers the fiber F_q .

The RSVP arrow of time is implemented by a fiberwise gradient flow \mathcal{D} on F :

$$\mathcal{D} : F \rightarrow F.$$

For a given section $s \in F(U)$, $\mathcal{D}(s)$ is obtained by applying the RSVP update rule:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi' &= \Phi + \alpha \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} - \beta \sigma + \xi^\Phi, \\ \mathbf{v}' &= \mathbf{v} + \gamma \Pi_{\text{curl}\downarrow}(\nabla \Phi) - \eta \mathbf{v} + \xi^\mathbf{v}, \\ S' &= S + \sigma - \kappa \|\mathbf{v}\|^2 + \xi^S,\end{aligned}$$

where σ is the entropy production functional and $\Pi_{\text{curl}\downarrow}$ is the torsion-suppression operator.

\mathcal{D} is local in the sheaf-theoretic sense: for any cover $\{U_i\}$ of U ,

$$\mathcal{D}(s)|_{U_i} = \mathcal{D}(s|_{U_i}),$$

and the results glue on overlaps. This ensures that RSVP evolution is compatible with the sheaf structure.

The bundle projection $\pi : F \rightarrow C$ induces a pushforward functor:

$$\pi_* : \mathbf{Sh}(F) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(C),$$

which “forgets” fiber content, retaining only the underlying relational geometry.

If \tilde{F} is the étalé space of F , then a trajectory in \tilde{F} under repeated \mathcal{D} -action projects via π to a curve in C .

On the base C , we define the geodesic-flow functor:

$$\mathcal{G} : \mathbf{Sh}(C) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(C),$$

which advances relational configurations along geodesics determined by the relational metric g . In Barbour’s framework, \mathcal{G} generates the smooth relational curve representing the universe’s history.

The main correspondence is expressed by:

$$\pi_* \circ \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{G} \circ \pi_*.$$

That is: evolving in RSVP fields and then projecting to relational geometry is equivalent to projecting first and evolving via Barbour’s geodesic flow.

When \mathcal{D} is metrically aligned with g , the projected curve is exactly geodesic; otherwise it is a constrained geodesic with fiber-dependent corrections.

3.2 Thought Experiment with Maxim Kammerer

Maxim explores a Ringworld segment where zones embody technological epochs: agrarian hamlets with manual labor, artisan guilds with early machinery, factories with assembly lines, and

automated facilities with robotic precision. He measures field values— Φ as production potentials, \mathbf{v} as labor fluxes, S as operational disorder—and applies \mathcal{D} to simulate transitions. Projecting to C , he sees geodesic flows in layout optimizations. NCL wavefronts validate stable production data, collapsing higher-category manufacturing circuits to sequential assembly paths.

3.3 Everyday Example

A baker oversees a kitchen with stages: dough preparation (agrarian chaos), mixing (artisan craft), baking (industrial heat), and packaging (automated efficiency). Measuring Φ (ingredient potentials), \mathbf{v} (hand movements), S (kitchen disorder), the baker uses \mathcal{D} to optimize workflows, projecting to a relational curve of kitchen layouts. Valid data from steady operations filters mess, simplifying process models.

4 Projection and Equivalence

The total state space F in RSVP theory contains the full physical specification of the universe at a given event–time “turn”: the underlying relational geometry $q \in C$ together with a triple of RSVP fields (Φ, \mathbf{v}, S) satisfying the field equations. The projection $\pi : F \rightarrow C$ forgets the field content and retains only the relational configuration. In categorical terms, π induces the pushforward functor $\pi_* : \mathbf{Sh}(F) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(C)$, which sends a sheaf of field–geometry data to a sheaf of purely geometric data.

The physical interpretation of π_* is straightforward: it strips away all information about matter distribution, fluxes, and entropy densities, leaving only the “shape” of the universe in Barbour’s sense.

The RSVP arrow of time is generated by the endofunctor $\mathcal{D} : F \rightarrow F$, acting fiberwise on the sheaf of RSVP solutions. Each application of \mathcal{D} advances the system along the gradient flow of the entropic smoothing functional E in the fiber, subject to negentropic constraints. This evolution is local in the sheaf-theoretic sense and preserves the gluing of sections.

Applying π_* after \mathcal{D} yields the projected relational history: $\pi_*\mathcal{D}(s) \in \mathbf{Sh}(C)$ which is the geometric curve corresponding to the full RSVP evolution.

Barbour’s relational dynamics defines a geodesic-flow functor $\mathcal{G} : \mathbf{Sh}(C) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(C)$, determined by the relational metric g on C . The action of \mathcal{G} moves each configuration along a geodesic in C , producing a smooth curve that Barbour identifies with the history of the universe. In this view, the arrow of time corresponds to the monotonic evolution of a complexity functional along this curve.

The central claim is that the following naturality condition holds: $\pi_* \circ \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{G} \circ \pi_*$.

In words: applying RSVP’s fiberwise gradient flow and then projecting to relational geometry yields the same result as projecting first and then evolving via Barbour’s geodesic flow.

Physically, this expresses the equivalence between:

1. Field-first viewpoint — time’s arrow arises from entropic smoothing in the full field–geometry space.
2. Geometry-first viewpoint — time’s arrow arises from geodesic motion in relational configuration space.

The naturality condition can hold in two regimes:

1. Exact equivalence:

If the RSVP gradient flow is metrically aligned with the relational metric g — meaning the steepest descent direction of E projects to a geodesic in C — then the projected RSVP curve is exactly Barbour’s curve.

2. Constrained equivalence:

If there is misalignment due to fiber-specific constraints (e.g., preservation of negentropic islands, torsion suppression), the projection is still a smooth curve in C but deviates from a pure geodesic. In this case, Barbour’s trajectory is recovered as an idealization in which such constraints are absent.

In the étalé-space picture, \tilde{F} is the disjoint union of all fibers F_q over $q \in C$, equipped with a local homeomorphism to C . A physical history is a section traced out in \tilde{F} under the iterated action of \mathcal{D} . The projection π simply collapses each fiber to its base point in C , producing the corresponding relational history.

This makes the equivalence visually intuitive: RSVP dynamics is a lift of Barbour’s curve from C to F , with the fields providing the vertical fiberwise content that determines the arrow’s physical character.

4.1 Mathematical Précis

The total state space F in RSVP theory contains the full physical specification of the universe at a given event–time “turn”: the underlying relational geometry $q \in C$ together with a triple of RSVP fields (Φ, \mathbf{v}, S) satisfying the field equations. The projection $\pi : F \rightarrow C$ forgets the field content and retains only the relational configuration. In categorical terms, π induces the pushforward functor $\pi_* : \mathbf{Sh}(F) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(C)$, which sends a sheaf of field–geometry data to a sheaf of purely geometric data.

The physical interpretation of π_* is straightforward: it strips away all information about matter distribution, fluxes, and entropy densities, leaving only the “shape” of the universe in Barbour’s sense.

The RSVP arrow of time is generated by the endofunctor $\mathcal{D} : F \rightarrow F$, acting fiberwise on the sheaf of RSVP solutions. Each application of \mathcal{D} advances the system along the gradient flow of the entropic smoothing functional E in the fiber, subject to negentropic constraints. This evolution is local in the sheaf-theoretic sense and preserves the gluing of sections.

Applying π_* after \mathcal{D} yields the projected relational history: $\pi_*\mathcal{D}(s) \in \mathbf{Sh}(C)$ which is the geometric curve corresponding to the full RSVP evolution.

Barbour’s relational dynamics defines a geodesic-flow functor $\mathcal{G} : \mathbf{Sh}(C) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sh}(C)$, determined by the relational metric g on C . The action of \mathcal{G} moves each configuration along a geodesic in C , producing a smooth curve that Barbour identifies with the history of the universe. In this view, the arrow of time corresponds to the monotonic evolution of a complexity functional along this curve.

The central claim is that the following naturality condition holds: $\pi_* \circ \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{G} \circ \pi_*$.

In words: applying RSVP’s fiberwise gradient flow and then projecting to relational geometry yields the same result as projecting first and then evolving via Barbour’s geodesic flow.

Physically, this expresses the equivalence between:

1. Field-first viewpoint — time’s arrow arises from entropic smoothing in the full field–geometry space.
2. Geometry-first viewpoint — time’s arrow arises from geodesic motion in relational configuration space.

The naturality condition can hold in two regimes:

1. Exact equivalence:

If the RSVP gradient flow is metrically aligned with the relational metric g — meaning the steepest descent direction of E projects to a geodesic in C — then the projected RSVP curve is exactly Barbour’s curve.

2. Constrained equivalence:

If there is misalignment due to fiber-specific constraints (e.g., preservation of negentropic islands, torsion suppression), the projection is still a smooth curve in C but deviates from a

pure geodesic. In this case, Barbour’s trajectory is recovered as an idealization in which such constraints are absent.

In the étalé-space picture, \tilde{F} is the disjoint union of all fibers F_q over $q \in C$, equipped with a local homeomorphism to C . A physical history is a section traced out in \tilde{F} under the iterated action of \mathcal{D} . The projection π simply collapses each fiber to its base point in C , producing the corresponding relational history.

This makes the equivalence visually intuitive: RSVP dynamics is a lift of Barbour’s curve from C to F , with the fields providing the vertical fiberwise content that determines the arrow’s physical character.

4.2 Thought Experiment with Maxim Kammerer

Maxim navigates a Ringworld frontier where zones reflect societal bifurcations: pre-industrial villages with divergent paths, transitional borders with chaotic fluxes, and stabilized cities with aligned fields. Projecting field evolutions to C , he sees geodesic deviations at constraints like cultural taboos. NCL blankets filter validated transitions, collapsing multi-faceted social circuits to linear narratives.

4.3 Everyday Example

A traffic engineer analyzes a city’s roads: residential lanes (divergent paths), highways (aligned flows), and intersections (constraints). Projecting usage data to C , deviations from geodesics indicate bottlenecks. Valid sensor data (NCL) filters noise, simplifying models from complex networks to sequential routes.

5 Conceptual Implications

The sheaf–functor equivalence between RSVP field dynamics and Barbour’s relational curve reframes time as neither an external parameter nor a purely statistical tendency. In this unified picture:

From the RSVP perspective, time is the emergent ordering of admissible state transitions generated by entropic smoothing in the full field–geometry space F .

From the Barbour perspective, time is the parameterization of a smooth curve in relational configuration space C , determined by a geodesic-flow law.

The equivalence shows that these are not competing ontologies but two projections of the same underlying structure: one keeping the full physical content, the other retaining only its geometric skeleton.

Barbour’s framework captures the geometry of change — the relational “shape” of the universe’s evolution — without explicit reference to what physically inhabits the universe. RSVP, by contrast, retains physical content in the form of field variables (Φ, \mathbf{v}, S) , whose dynamics dictate how the curve in C is traced.

This distinction parallels the relationship between a bare spacetime manifold and the stress–energy content in general relativity: the manifold provides the kinematic backdrop, while the fields supply the dynamical texture. The equivalence tells us that a relational geometric trajectory alone cannot determine the arrow’s physical origin; for that, we need the fiberwise dynamics.

Interpreting the arrow of time as the naturality condition $\pi_* \circ \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{G} \circ \pi_*$ offers a categorical unification: the “same” history can be described as either:

1. A gradient flow in F projected to C , or
2. A geodesic in C lifted to F via physically admissible field configurations.

This makes the arrow a property of the commutativity of these flows, not a primitive temporal asymmetry inserted by hand.

The analysis clarifies that Barbour’s geodesic histories are a special case of RSVP dynamics: they arise when the RSVP gradient flow is metrically aligned with the relational metric g . In general, however, constraints such as torsion suppression, preservation of negentropic islands, or anisotropic flux patterns will cause deviations from pure geodesics in C . This suggests a richer set of possible relational histories than Barbour’s idealized model, potentially with distinct observational signatures.

The equivalence suggests two avenues for testing or constraining the theory:

Relational observables: Measurements of large-scale structure evolution, gravitational lensing patterns, or cosmic microwave background anisotropies could be used to infer the shape of the curve in C , independent of detailed field content.

Field observables: RSVP’s fiber variables (Φ, \mathbf{v}, S) could, in principle, be reconstructed from observational data, allowing a check on whether their evolution projects to the observed relational curve.

Any mismatch between the observed relational trajectory and the projection of the best-fit RSVP field evolution would signal a breakdown of the naturality condition — and therefore a potential limitation of the equivalence.

By showing that a geometric–relational account and a field–dynamical account can be functorially equivalent, this work undermines the sharp dichotomy between “geometry-first” and “physics-first” views of time. It supports a structural realist interpretation: the history of the universe is a single structure admitting multiple mathematically equivalent presentations, each highlighting different aspects of its ontology.

5.1 Mathematical Précis

The sheaf–functor equivalence between RSVP field dynamics and Barbour’s relational curve reframes time as neither an external parameter nor a purely statistical tendency. In this unified picture:

From the RSVP perspective, time is the emergent ordering of admissible state transitions generated by entropic smoothing in the full field–geometry space F .

From the Barbour perspective, time is the parameterization of a smooth curve in relational configuration space C , determined by a geodesic-flow law.

The equivalence shows that these are not competing ontologies but two projections of the same underlying structure: one keeping the full physical content, the other retaining only its geometric skeleton.

Barbour’s framework captures the geometry of change — the relational “shape” of the universe’s evolution — without explicit reference to what physically inhabits the universe. RSVP, by contrast, retains physical content in the form of field variables (Φ, \mathbf{v}, S) , whose dynamics dictate how the curve in C is traced.

This distinction parallels the relationship between a bare spacetime manifold and the stress–energy content in general relativity: the manifold provides the kinematic backdrop, while the fields supply the dynamical texture. The equivalence tells us that a relational geometric trajectory alone cannot determine the arrow’s physical origin; for that, we need the fiberwise dynamics.

Interpreting the arrow of time as the naturality condition $\pi_* \circ \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{G} \circ \pi_*$ offers a categorical unification: the “same” history can be described as either:

1. A gradient flow in F projected to C , or
2. A geodesic in C lifted to F via physically admissible field configurations.

This makes the arrow a property of the commutativity of these flows, not a primitive temporal asymmetry inserted by hand.

The analysis clarifies that Barbour’s geodesic histories are a special case of RSVP dynamics: they arise when the RSVP gradient flow is metrically aligned with the relational metric g . In general, however, constraints such as torsion suppression, preservation of negentropic islands, or anisotropic flux patterns will cause deviations from pure geodesics in C . This suggests a richer

set of possible relational histories than Barbour’s idealized model, potentially with distinct observational signatures.

The equivalence suggests two avenues for testing or constraining the theory:

Relational observables: Measurements of large-scale structure evolution, gravitational lensing patterns, or cosmic microwave background anisotropies could be used to infer the shape of the curve in C , independent of detailed field content.

Field observables: RSVP’s fiber variables (Φ, \mathbf{v}, S) could, in principle, be reconstructed from observational data, allowing a check on whether their evolution projects to the observed relational curve.

Any mismatch between the observed relational trajectory and the projection of the best-fit RSVP field evolution would signal a breakdown of the naturality condition — and therefore a potential limitation of the equivalence.

By showing that a geometric–relational account and a field–dynamical account can be functorially equivalent, this work undermines the sharp dichotomy between “geometry-first” and “physics-first” views of time. It supports a structural realist interpretation: the history of the universe is a single structure admitting multiple mathematically equivalent presentations, each highlighting different aspects of its ontology.

5.2 Thought Experiment with Maxim Kammerer

Maxim reflects on the Ringworld’s ontological layers: zones as relational points in C , fields as fibers in F . The arrow, as commutativity, unifies geometric paths with field-driven changes. Constraints like political enclaves create deviations, testable via trade anomalies. NCL blankets ensure consistent projections, collapsing philosophical dualisms to unified histories.

5.3 Everyday Example

A project manager views a company’s departments as C configurations, workflows as F fields. The arrow as naturality aligns strategic plans with operational realities, with deviations from constraints like budget cuts observable in productivity metrics. Valid data filters noise, simplifying models.

6 Extensions and Future Work

In the idealized case where the RSVP gradient flow is metrically aligned with the relational metric g , the projected trajectory in C is a geodesic. However, the general case allows for constrained flows: curves in C whose tangent vectors are altered by fiberwise constraints in F , such as:

- Preservation of localized negentropic structures.

- Suppression of vorticity or torsion in \mathbf{v} .

- Locally anisotropic entropy production rates.

These constraints can be treated as non-holonomic conditions on the tangent bundle TC , producing trajectories that deviate systematically from geodesics. Mapping these deviations could lead to a richer classification of relational histories.

A natural extension is to develop a quantum sheaf–functor formalism:

- Replace the classical sheaf of solutions F with a sheaf of Hilbert spaces H over C .

- Interpret RSVP fields as expectation values of operators acting on H_q in each fiber.

Promote the gradient-flow operator D to a Hamiltonian or Lindbladian functor governing quantum evolution in the fibers.

Study the projection $\pi_* \circ D$ in the quantum setting to see if the equivalence with G survives decoherence or entanglement effects.

This would allow the formalism to interface with canonical quantum gravity approaches and relational quantum mechanics.

Realistic cosmological modeling requires incorporating stochastic effects from coarse-graining or incomplete knowledge:

Extend D to a stochastic functor with a noise term respecting sheaf locality.

Interpret the arrow of time as a statistical property of ensemble flows in F , rather than a strict deterministic mapping.

Use the sheaf structure to localize stochastic perturbations, ensuring global consistency.

The equivalence framework can be tested numerically:

Discretize C and F using lattice-based or spectral representations.

Implement RSVP evolution in F and project to C , comparing with direct geodesic integration under g .

Investigate parameter regimes in which deviations from geodesics become significant and assess whether these could be observationally detectable.

Potential observational discriminants include:

Structure formation timelines: Deviations from geodesics in C may alter the relational rate at which large-scale structures emerge.

Gravitational lensing maps: Sensitive to both geometric structure in C and mass–energy distribution in F .

CMB anisotropy patterns: May encode subtle imprints of fiberwise RSVP dynamics not captured in a purely geometric flow.

Developing concrete predictions in these areas could turn the equivalence from a conceptual bridge into a falsifiable physical hypothesis.

Finally, the sheaf–functor equivalence approach could be integrated with:

Causal set theory: Interpreting C as a coarse-grained causal set and F as field data on its elements.

Category-theoretic quantum gravity: Embedding this framework into higher topos theory, where C and F are objects in an ∞ -topos and D, G are morphisms therein.

Information-theoretic cosmology: Relating S and Φ in RSVP to algorithmic complexity measures in the relational geometry.

6.1 Mathematical Précis

In the idealized case where the RSVP gradient flow is metrically aligned with the relational metric g , the projected trajectory in C is a geodesic. However, the general case allows for constrained flows: curves in C whose tangent vectors are altered by fiberwise constraints in F , such as:

Preservation of localized negentropic structures.

Suppression of vorticity or torsion in \mathbf{v} .

Locally anisotropic entropy production rates.

These constraints can be treated as non-holonomic conditions on the tangent bundle TC , producing trajectories that deviate systematically from geodesics. Mapping these deviations could lead to a richer classification of relational histories.

A natural extension is to develop a quantum sheaf–functor formalism:

Replace the classical sheaf of solutions F with a sheaf of Hilbert spaces H over C .

Interpret RSVP fields as expectation values of operators acting on H_q in each fiber.

Promote the gradient-flow operator D to a Hamiltonian or Lindbladian functor governing quantum evolution in the fibers.

Study the projection $\pi_* \circ D$ in the quantum setting to see if the equivalence with G survives decoherence or entanglement effects.

This would allow the formalism to interface with canonical quantum gravity approaches and relational quantum mechanics.

Realistic cosmological modeling requires incorporating stochastic effects from coarse-graining or incomplete knowledge:

Extend D to a stochastic functor with a noise term respecting sheaf locality.

Interpret the arrow of time as a statistical property of ensemble flows in F , rather than a strict deterministic mapping.

Use the sheaf structure to localize stochastic perturbations, ensuring global consistency.

The equivalence framework can be tested numerically:

Discretize C and F using lattice-based or spectral representations.

Implement RSVP evolution in F and project to C , comparing with direct geodesic integration under g .

Investigate parameter regimes in which deviations from geodesics become significant and assess whether these could be observationally detectable.

Potential observational discriminants include:

Structure formation timelines: Deviations from geodesics in C may alter the relational rate at which large-scale structures emerge.

Gravitational lensing maps: Sensitive to both geometric structure in C and mass-energy distribution in F .

CMB anisotropy patterns: May encode subtle imprints of fiberwise RSVP dynamics not captured in a purely geometric flow.

Developing concrete predictions in these areas could turn the equivalence from a conceptual bridge into a falsifiable physical hypothesis.

Finally, the sheaf-functor equivalence approach could be integrated with:

Causal set theory: Interpreting C as a coarse-grained causal set and F as field data on its elements.

Category-theoretic quantum gravity: Embedding this framework into higher topos theory, where C and F are objects in an ∞ -topos and D, G are morphisms therein.

Information-theoretic cosmology: Relating S and Φ in RSVP to algorithmic complexity measures in the relational geometry.

6.2 Thought Experiment with Maxim Kammerer

Maxim envisions quantized Ringworld zones, where fields become operator expectations. Stochastic perturbations localize via sheaf, observable in anomalous trade patterns. NCL blankets quantum noise, collapsing higher-category quantum circuits to classical paths for empirical testing.

6.3 Everyday Example

A software developer quantizes code modules, with stochastic bugs localized in sheaf sections. Deviations in performance metrics test models, filtered by NCL on log data, simplifying quantum-inspired simulations to classical workflows.

7 Conclusion

We have developed a formal correspondence between two seemingly different approaches to the nature and arrow of time:

Barbour's relational framework, in which the universe's history is a smooth curve in a symmetry-reduced configuration space C , and the arrow of time is tied to monotonic change in a relationally defined structural measure.

The Relativistic Scalar-Vector Plenum (RSVP) field theory, in which the universe evolves as a triple of scalar, vector, and entropy fields via entropic smoothing toward lower-energy configurations, subject to negentropic constraints.

By modeling RSVP field configurations as a sheaf of solutions F over C , and RSVP dynamics as a fiberwise gradient-flow endofunctor D , we have shown that projecting D to C yields the geodesic-flow functor G of Barbour’s theory. The equivalence is expressed by the naturality condition:

$$\pi_* \circ D = G \circ \pi_*,$$

demonstrating that Barbour’s curve is the projection of RSVP’s full field-theoretic evolution. When the RSVP gradient flow aligns with the relational metric g , the equivalence is exact; when it does not, the result is a constrained curve in C with potentially measurable deviations from pure geodesics.

This synthesis reframes the arrow of time as a property of the commutativity between field evolution and geometric projection, dissolving the apparent divide between geometry-first and physics-first accounts. It suggests that the relational geometry of the universe’s history and the physical processes that occur within it are best understood as different presentations of the same underlying categorical–sheaf structure.

Future work will extend this framework to quantum and stochastic settings, explore deviations from exact geodesics as potential observational signatures, and integrate the equivalence with broader categorical and causal approaches to fundamental physics. In doing so, it may help unify disparate strands of thought on time’s origin, nature, and direction — not as separate answers to separate questions, but as facets of a single, mathematically coherent picture.

7.1 Thought Experiment with Maxim Kammerer

Maxim concludes his Ringworld journey, unifying field evolutions with geometric paths. The naturality condition aligns his observations, with deviations highlighting constraints. NCL validates the synthesis, collapsing explorations to a coherent narrative.

7.2 Everyday Example

A teacher reflects on a school’s curriculum, unifying lesson flows with classroom layouts. The equivalence frames educational progress, with observational mismatches signaling improvements.