

Time: Clocks, Order and the Arrow

IDE-013 · Fundamental Ideas

Concept essays for *The Universe and Its Observers*

Author: Juan Segurolo

Version: v0.10 EN · 19 September 2026

Status: Publication version

Article form: Concept essay

Scale / context: Laboratory clocks to cosmological intervals

Boundary: Time as a physical and operational concept: how it is defined, why it is path-dependent and where its direction comes from. Entropy itself belongs to IDE-003; the uncertainty budget of a clock as an instrument belongs to IDE-014

Related works: IDE-014, IDE-003, IDE-023

Epistemic profile: Established knowledge with interpretive boundaries

Licence at publication: All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

Physics does not define time as a flow. It defines a unit by fixing the frequency of a specified atomic transition, and everything else is comparison against that.[1] From this operational base three results follow that ordinary intuition does not supply. Simultaneity for spatially separated events depends on the state of motion of whoever is judging it, so there is no universal now.[2] Elapsed time is a property of a path through spacetime rather than of the interval between two events, and clocks on different paths genuinely record different totals, which laboratory optical clocks now resolve over a height difference of tens of centimetres.[3,5] And the direction of time is not in the microscopic equations, which are almost entirely reversible; it enters through boundary conditions.[6,7] The article separates coordinate time, proper time and thermodynamic direction, which are routinely conflated.

In 60 Seconds

The SI second is defined by fixing the frequency of a hyperfine transition in caesium-133,[1] which makes duration a reproducible comparison rather than an appeal to an invisible universal clock. Once time is what clocks measure, relativity has consequences that are not optional. Whether two separated events happen at once depends on the observer's motion, so simultaneity is a convention relative to a frame and not a fact about the events.[2] Proper time is accumulated along a worldline, so two clocks that separate and reunite can show different totals with neither malfunctioning, and gravity changes rates too: a clock deeper in a gravitational potential runs slower, which Pound and Rebka detected over a tower and which optical clocks now show over a third of a metre.[3,4,5] The arrow is a separate question. The microscopic laws are essentially symmetric under time reversal, so the observed asymmetry of records, mixing and memory has to come from somewhere else, and the standard answer places it in the boundary conditions of the universe rather than in the dynamics.[6,7]

Why This Question Matters

Coordinate time and proper time are distinct in relativity; thermodynamic and psychological or epistemic arrows are also distinct temporal notions. Coordinate time is a label in a chosen description; proper time is what a particular clock accumulates; thermodynamic direction is an asymmetry of processes; and psychological time is something else again. Time dilation sounds like an illusion until proper time is separated from coordinate time; the arrow sounds mysterious until it is separated from the dynamics; and satellite navigation simply fails if the distinction is ignored.

1. Time Is What Clocks Measure

The modern definition of the second does not describe what time is. It fixes a number: the unperturbed ground-state hyperfine transition frequency of caesium-133 is defined to be exactly 9 192 631 770 hertz, which makes the second a derived consequence of that stipulation.[1] The definition is operational by design, and its virtue is that any competent laboratory can realize it.

This is a deliberate retreat from metaphysics, and it is the same move made for the metre when the speed of light was fixed by definition. Nothing in the SI asserts that time flows, that the present moves, or that the future does not exist. What it provides is a reproducible standard of comparison, and the physics is then about relations among such comparisons.

The retreat has teeth. Because duration is defined by a physical process, any claim about time can be tested by building clocks and comparing them. Questions that would otherwise be untestable, such as whether elapsed time depends on the route taken, become experimental questions with numerical answers and error bars.[5]

Where That Leaves Us

Physics defines the second by fixing an atomic frequency, so time is what clocks measure and duration is a reproducible comparison rather than a description of flow. That operational choice is what makes the harder questions testable. The first of them is whether two separated events can be said to happen at the same moment at all.

2. There Is No Universal Now

Einstein's 1905 argument starts from a procedure rather than a philosophy. To say that two separated events are simultaneous, you need a rule for synchronizing distant clocks, and the natural rule uses light signals. Adopting it, and requiring that the speed of light be the same in every inertial frame, forces the conclusion that observers in relative motion disagree about which separated events are simultaneous.[2]

The disagreement is not an error of measurement or a limitation of instruments. Each observer's judgement is correct within their own frame, and there is no experiment that identifies one frame as the true one. Simultaneity for spatially separated events is therefore frame-relative, while the ordering of events connected by a possible signal is not, which preserves causal order.

The consequence for time as a whole is that a universal present cannot be defined. Sequences along a single worldline remain perfectly well ordered, so nothing about personal experience becomes paradoxical. What disappears is the assumption that this ordering extends outward to everything else in a unique way.

Where That Leaves Us

Simultaneity for separated events depends on the frame, so no universal present can be defined, while the ordering of causally connectable events survives intact. Nothing about experience along one worldline is threatened by this. What follows is that elapsed time must be attached to paths rather than to pairs of events, and that turns out to be measurable.

3. Elapsed Time Belongs to a Path

In relativity the quantity a clock accumulates is proper time along its own worldline, computed from the spacetime interval.[3] Two clocks that begin together, follow different routes and reunite can therefore show different totals, and neither has malfunctioned. The asymmetry is geometric: the routes had different lengths in the relevant sense.

Gravity enters the same way. In general relativity a clock lower in a gravitational potential accumulates proper time more slowly than one higher up. Pound and Rebka detected the corresponding frequency shift over the height of a laboratory tower in 1960, using the sharpness of a nuclear resonance to resolve a fractional shift of order a few parts in ten to the fifteenth.[4]

Optical clocks have since made the effect nearly domestic. Chou and colleagues compared two aluminium ion clocks and resolved the gravitational rate difference produced by raising one of them by about thirty-three centimetres, and also measured the effect of relative speeds of less than ten metres per second.[5] Whatever else time is, its rate depends measurably on where a clock sits and how it moves, and satellite navigation systems must correct for both to work at all.

Where That Leaves Us

Clocks accumulate proper time along their own paths, so different routes give different totals, and gravitational potential changes the rate. Pound and Rebka measured this over a tower and optical clocks now resolve it over a third of a metre. That settles rate and path, and leaves untouched the question of why time has a direction at all.

4. The Arrow Is Not in the Dynamics

The fundamental equations of mechanics, electromagnetism and quantum theory are symmetric under reversal of the time coordinate, with one exception. The weak interactions violate charge conjugation and parity in the strongest possible way, and although the combination CP survives in most weak processes it is violated in certain ones involving interference; violation of time reversal has been observed, and is a corollary of that CP violation given that CPT is a symmetry of nature.[7] Run a film of colliding molecules backwards and every frame still obeys the laws. Yet records accumulate in one direction, mixing is not observed to unmix, and we remember the past.

The standard resolution does not add a new law. It observes that the asymmetry we see is an asymmetry of initial conditions: the universe began in a state of very low entropy, and the subsequent behaviour of large systems follows from that boundary condition together with symmetric dynamics.[6] The direction of time, on this account, is inherited from a fact about how things started rather than from the equations.

Price's contribution is to insist on symmetry of reasoning: an explanation that would work equally well applied to the future direction has not explained anything, and much informal reasoning

about the arrow smuggles in a temporal bias at the start.[6] The account is standard, but its status is interpretive rather than settled, and the reason the low-entropy initial state obtained remains an open question rather than a result.

Where That Leaves Us

Microscopic dynamics is essentially time-symmetric, so the observed arrow is attributed to a low-entropy boundary condition rather than to a law. That account is standard but interpretive, and why the initial state was as it was remains open. What is settled is that several distinct things have been called time, and the last task is to keep them apart.

5. Which Time Is Being Talked About

Coordinate time is a label attached to events by a chosen description. It is a bookkeeping device, and different choices are equally valid, which is why a coordinate-time statement carries no physical content until the coordinate system is named. Proper time is what a specific clock on a specific path accumulates, and it is invariant: everyone agrees on how much a given clock recorded.[3]

Thermodynamic direction is neither of these. It is a property of processes rather than of the time axis, and it is what licenses the distinction between before and after in a macroscopic system.[6] Psychological time is different again, involving memory, attention and the construction of experience, and it is not a physical quantity at all.

Inference: some apparent temporal paradoxes arise from conflating these notions. The twin puzzle mixes coordinate time with proper time. The claim that relativity abolishes the present mixes frame-dependent simultaneity with the ordering along a worldline. The suspicion that physics has no place for the flow of time mixes the thermodynamic and psychological senses with the geometric one.

Where That Leaves Us

IDE-014 takes up what a clock is as an instrument, where the reading must be turned into a value with an uncertainty.

What We Know, and How

- The SI second is defined by fixing the caesium-133 hyperfine transition frequency.[1] That this makes duration a reproducible comparison rather than a description of flow is how this article reads the definition, and is not a statement the brochure makes.
- Simultaneity for spatially separated events is frame-dependent, while the ordering of causally connectable events is not, so causal structure survives the loss of a universal present.[2]
- Elapsed time is proper time along a worldline, and it depends on both motion and gravitational potential; the effect has been measured over a laboratory tower and over a height of about a third of a metre with optical clocks.[3,4,5]
- Microscopic dynamics is symmetric under time reversal except in the CP-violating weak processes, so the observed thermodynamic arrow is standardly attributed to a low-entropy boundary condition rather than to the equations.[6,7]

What We Still Don't Know

- Why the early universe was in a state of such low entropy, which the boundary-condition account of the arrow requires but does not explain.
- Whether time retains a fundamental role in a successful quantum theory of gravity, or emerges from a structure in which it is not a primitive.
- How the psychological experience of temporal flow relates to the physical quantities, which is currently a question about cognition rather than one physics answers.

What Could Change Our Minds

- A clock comparison showing no gravitational rate difference at a height separation where the predicted fractional shift is well within the demonstrated resolution, with systematic effects controlled as in the optical-clock experiments, would contradict general relativity's account of proper time.[3,5]
- A reproducible experiment identifying a preferred frame in which separated events are absolutely simultaneous, consistent with existing null results, would overturn the relativity of simultaneity.[2]
- A demonstrated time-asymmetry in the fundamental dynamics able to account for the observed macroscopic arrow, rather than the time asymmetry already known in the CP-violating weak processes, would remove the need for a boundary-condition explanation.[6,7]

If You Remember Only One Thing

Time in physics is what clocks accumulate along their own paths, and its direction comes from how things started rather than from the equations.

Related Articles

- IDE-014 — Measurement
- IDE-003 — Entropy
- IDE-023 — What Is Observation?

References

- [1] Bureau International des Poids et Mesures. The International System of Units (SI), 9th edition, updated 2026. DOI 10.59161/AUEZ1291.
- [2] Albert Einstein. On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies. Annalen der Physik 17, 891-921 (1905). DOI 10.1002/andp.19053221004.
- [3] Charles W. Misner; Kip S. Thorne; John Archibald Wheeler. Gravitation. W. H. Freeman (1973), chapters 1 and 25.
- [4] R. V. Pound; G. A. Rebka Jr. Apparent Weight of Photons. Physical Review Letters 4, 337-341 (1960). DOI 10.1103/PhysRevLett.4.337.
- [5] C. W. Chou; D. B. Hume; T. Rosenband; D. J. Wineland. Optical Clocks and Relativity. Science 329, 1630-1633 (2010). DOI 10.1126/science.1192720.
- [6] Huw Price. Time's Arrow and Archimedes' Point: New Directions for the Physics of Time. Oxford University Press (1996).

[7] Particle Data Group. CP Violation in the Quark Sector, in Review of Particle Physics, 2024 edition, revised August 2023 by T. Gershon and Y. Nir. <https://pdg.lbl.gov/2024/reviews/rpp2024-rev-cp-violation.pdf>