# T≡M Theory — Time Is Motion: Abductive Consequences of the Tempo Unification

## *If time and motion are the same thing, which problems are simplified?*

**Author:** Mateo Moreira
**Country:** Uruguay
**Email:** mateomoreira@gmail.com
**Version:** Companion Paper v1.1 — Preprint (Zenodo)
**Date:** July 2026

**Dedicated to:** my son and my wife, my guides in the Tempo.

**Successor document to:**

Moreira, M. (2026). *T≡M Theory — Time Is Motion: Abductive Consequences of the Tempo Unification* (Companion Paper v1.0). Zenodo. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20349781

**Companion document to:**

Moreira, M. (2026). *T≡M Theory — Time Is Motion: Cosmological Expansion as the Root Tick* (v2.1). Zenodo. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20779567

Moreira, M. (2026). *T≡M Theory — Time Is Motion: Cosmological Expansion as the Root Tick* (v2.0, corrected by v2.1). Zenodo. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18856653

Moreira, M. (2025). *T≡M Theory — Time Is Motion* (v1.0). Zenodo. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17514234

Moreira, M. (2025). *Tempo Symbol Identity v1.0* [Data set]. Zenodo. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17545235

Moreira, M. (2026). *Coherent Data — Only the Coherent Exists: An Informational Ontology of the Universe* (v1.0) [Preprint]. Zenodo. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21230276

---

## Author's note

This document does not repeat the technical development of v2.1 or the foundational narrative of v1.0. It is a complement: it assumes the reader has access to those versions and focuses on a single question — if the T≡M premise is correct, which open problems in physics are simplified, reinterpreted, or opened as new directions of research?

As with the previous documents, part of the structure and connections to the literature were developed with AI assistance. The intuition, the premise, and the conceptual architecture are mine. The tool helped me express them with greater rigor.

**Limits of the exercise:** What follows is an exercise in abduction, not a demonstration. I identify which problems are simplified under the T≡M premise, but I do not derive quantitative predictions or replace existing physical explanations. Where T≡M offers a new reading, I say so. Where it only reformulates, I say so too. Where it speculates, I mark it explicitly.

**About this version (v1.1):** this update synchronizes the companion with the correction introduced in T≡M v2.1. v2.1 showed that the *constant*-residual ansatz of v2.0 was unobservable — a universal residual cancels in frequency ratios, and a clock-dependent constant residual is absorbed into calibration — so the weak branch moved to a **drift** form with accumulated expansion, and the first numerical bound on the differential residual was obtained. The residual parameter was also renamed $\varepsilon_R$ (formerly $\alpha_R$) to avoid collision with the fine-structure constant $\alpha$. The Metrology section, the abduction table, and the Invitation now reflect that change, and a new direction is added that connects to my companion framework *Coherent Data*.

---

## Abstract

The T≡M theory (Time ≡ Motion) posits that time is not an independent entity but identical to universal motion, identifying cosmological expansion as the root tick ($\Theta = \ln(a/a_0)$). The formal postulates, the nested motion structure, and the minimal experimental program (residual parameter $\varepsilon_R$, denoted $\alpha_R$ in previous versions) are developed in T≡M v2.1, where the weak branch was corrected to a drift form and bounded for the first time at $|\Delta\varepsilon_R| \lesssim 10^{-8}$.

In this companion document I apply an exercise in abduction — inference to the best explanation — on the central premise: I assume the Tempo unification is correct and systematically examine what happens to open problems in physics when the distinction between time and motion is removed.

I organize the result in three levels: (1) problems that the premise dissolves conceptually without additional machinery; (2) already-explained phenomena that are reinterpreted with greater parsimony; and (3) research directions that the premise opens, including speculative extensions. That so many problems simplify under a single premise is not coincidental — it suggests the intuition has real coherence. I close with a systematic abduction table and an open invitation to formalization.

---

## What is abduction and why it matters here

In philosophy of science, abduction (or inference to the best explanation) is the reasoning that says: if I assume this premise is true, how many things fall into place? It is not a demonstration, but it is the type of reasoning that generates productive hypotheses — the ones worth formalizing and testing.

Historically, several unifications in physics followed a similar pattern: eliminating a distinction that was assumed to be real (terrestrial/celestial, electricity/magnetism, space/time) and observing that problems that depended on that distinction were simplified.

I propose something analogous: where physics sees time and motion as two related but distinct things, I see one — the Tempo. What follows is a map of what happens when that simplification is applied.

---

## Level 1 — What T≡M dissolves conceptually

These are the problems where the separation between time and motion is the problem itself. If you remove that separation, the questions lose their meaning — not because I offer a new mechanism, but because the premise dissolves them.

### The arrow of time

The fundamental equations of physics — Newton, Maxwell, Schrödinger — are symmetric in time: they work equally forward and backward. So why do we experience a direction? It is one of the oldest and most

persistent problems in physics.

The standard answer invokes the second law of thermodynamics and an initial condition of low entropy at the Big Bang. But that displaces the question: why did that initial condition exist?

In T≡M, $\Theta = \ln(a/a_0)$ grows because the universe expands, which provides a cosmological root for the orientation of becoming. The arrow of time is interpreted as the direction of the root tick. This does not replace the thermodynamic explanation, but offers a substrate: expansion provides the fundamental direction within which the thermodynamic arrow operates.

*Connection to the literature:* Roger Penrose (2004) proposed that the arrow of time is linked to a special condition of the Big Bang (the Weyl curvature hypothesis). T≡M is compatible with that intuition, and proposes that the cosmological orientation (root tick) reduces the need to introduce additional postulates to explain the direction, without denying the role of initial conditions.

## The problem of time in quantum gravity

In general relativity, time is a dynamic coordinate that curves with matter. In quantum mechanics, time is a fixed external parameter against which everything evolves. This incompatibility is the central obstacle to unifying both theories — the so-called "problem of time."

The conceptual way out I propose is this: neither the time-coordinate of GR nor the time-parameter of QM are fundamental. What is fundamental is Θ — the advance of cosmological expansion, framed within the standard cosmological approximation (FLRW) as a candidate for root tick. Both "times" are different ways of parametrizing local sub-counts within that root tick. They are not in conflict because neither is the primary entity.

*Connection to the literature:* Page and Wootters (1983) demonstrated that time can emerge from quantum correlations between subsystems without an "external time." Connes and Rovelli (1994) proposed that temporal flow emerges from thermodynamic properties of quantum states. Both programs converge toward the idea that time is not fundamental — exactly the premise of T≡M, which further identifies a specific candidate (Θ) as the substrate.

## Empty time

Can time exist without anything happening? The question seems philosophical, but it has technical consequences. In standard physics there is no clear answer — the quantum vacuum has fluctuations, so technically "something is always happening." But the conceptual question remains.

The premise dissolves it by definition: without motion there is no time. It is not that time stops — it is that it does not exist. Total pause is not a stopped clock; it is the absence of the entity itself. The question loses its meaning under the premise, which is a genuine dissolution, not an evasion.

## The nature of a clock

What makes something a clock? In standard physics, a clock is any stable periodic process. But that does not explain why different clocks — atomic, pulsars, nuclear processes — "agree" on the time they measure (once corrected for known effects).

In T≡M, the answer is natural: all clocks are sub-counts of the same root tick Θ. They agree because they are nested within the same cosmological expansion. And they disagree (time dilation) because their local conditions — gravity, velocity, environment — modify the sub-count rate relative to Θ. This is the relation described by equation (7) of T≡M v2.1: $dN_R/d\Theta = F_R$(local conditions).

### The flow of time

Why do we feel that time "passes"? Standard physics describes states at instants, but does not explain the experience of temporal movement.

In T≡M, time "passes" because the universe expands. The temporal flow is the experience of being nested within a root motion that advances. We feel time passing because we participate — as sub-counts — in the advance of Θ. *Note: this is a phenomenological reading; it does not claim to be a neuroscientific mechanism of perceived temporal flow.*

### The time-motion circularity

A classic objection: "motion is defined as change in time, so saying that time is motion is circular." This objection assumes that time and motion are distinct categories.

The premise dissolves the circularity by denying the distinction: there are not two things to define in terms of each other. There is one thing — the Tempo — that physics has been describing with two names. It is analogous to Maxwell showing that electricity and magnetism are not two circular phenomena but one.

---

## Level 2 — What T≡M reinterprets with greater parsimony

Here I am not proposing anything new: current physics already explains these phenomena. What I do is show that T≡M offers a more unified reading, without changing the equations or the results. In each case, I point out what the reinterpretation contributes and what it does not.

### Time dilation

Einstein derived time dilation from the invariance of the speed of light. The mathematics is correct and experimentally confirmed. I do not change the equations — I change the interpretation.

Instead of "time stretches when you move fast," the reading is: your local motion is redistributing your participation in the root tick. More spatial motion, fewer local temporal ticks. Dilation ceases to be a counterintuitive effect and becomes expected: if time is motion, more motion in one direction means less in the other.

I am not introducing a new mechanism: it is a way of describing the same relativistic invariant (proper time) from the premise Tempo ≡ Motion.

### Entropy and the second law of thermodynamics

Why does entropy increase? Boltzmann explained that there are more disordered microstates than ordered ones. But that does not explain why the universe started in a low-entropy state.

What I suggest is that the advance of Θ and the increase in entropy may be coupled: not necessarily as linear cause and effect, but as co-oriented manifestations of the same root motion. In this framework, the thermodynamic arrow and the cosmological arrow align under the same Tempo. This is a coupling and co-orientation hypothesis, not a demonstrated identity.

*Connection to the literature:* Carlo Rovelli (2018) proposed in *The Order of Time* that time emerges from entropy. My proposal reformulates the point: beyond seeing time and entropy as related, it proposes that both can be understood as expressions of the root motion.

### Dark energy

We know that the expansion of the universe is accelerating. We do not know what causes that acceleration — we call it "dark energy" as a placeholder for our ignorance.

I do not claim to explain the mechanism of dark energy. But the premise reformulates the question: if expansion is the root tick of the Tempo, then the acceleration of expansion is an acceleration of the Tempo. The question shifts from "What pushes the universe outward?" to "Why is the root tick accelerating?" — which is a reformulation, not a solution, but potentially clearer conceptually.

### The event horizon

From the outside, an object falling into a black hole appears to "freeze" at the horizon — its time seems to stop infinitely.

In T≡M, the reading is: from the point of view of a remote observer, the sub-count associated with the object approaches zero relative to the root tick, at the horizon limit. There is no paradox of "existing without time" because, in this reading, without local motion there is no local temporal existence. It is local pause within the advance of the root tick.

### The quantum measurement problem

In quantum mechanics, a system exists in superposition until it is "measured," at which point it "collapses" to a definite state. What counts as a measurement? When does it occur? These questions define the measurement problem, open since the 1920s.

If time is motion, then measurement — an event that occurs "in" time — requires a tick, a minimal motion. In this reading, the "measurement event" is thought of as a minimal physical count (a tick), rather than as an abstract "instant." The E_min (minimal event) of T≡M could be the conceptual bridge between superposition and classical realization. It is a reframing, not a complete solution.

---

## Level 3 — What T≡M opens as new directions

Here I do not have answers — I have questions. These are territories where the premise generates new directions or reformulates existing questions. I mark each with its degree of speculation.

### Fundamental physics and cosmology

None of the readings that follow add degrees of freedom to the formalism of v2.1. They are conceptual intuitions intended to orient future formalization.

### Quantum gravity

If Θ is the root tick shared by GR and QM, then unification could proceed by formalizing how quantum sub-counts relate to Θ. Instead of quantizing spacetime or making spacetime emerge from something more fundamental, I propose a third angle: connecting quantum counts directly with the cosmological advance.

*Connection to the literature:* Compatible with the Page-Wootters program (1983) and with Rovelli's proposal of "relational time" in loop quantum gravity. T≡M adds a specific element: Θ as shared reference. *Degree of speculation: medium. Conceptually coherent direction, without formalization.*

## Time metrology

If atomic clocks are sub-counts of Θ, the conceptual basis of metrology could be revised. Today the second is defined by the transition frequency of cesium-133 — an operational definition that works but says nothing about what time is.

Under T≡M, the second could be conceptually reinterpreted as a ratio between local counts and the advance of Θ. This is an ontological reading, not a proposal for operational change or metrological redefinition of the SI. It would not change the numerical value, but would open new consistency tests between clocks and cosmology — exactly the direction of the parameter ε_R in equation (8) of T≡M v2.1.

v2.1 put a number on that direction. It showed that a *constant* residual is unobservable (a universal residual cancels in frequency ratios; a clock-dependent constant one is absorbed into calibration), so the minimal form with observable content is a **drift** of clock rates with accumulated expansion. Translating existing optical-clock constraints yields the first numerical bound on the **differential** residual (the difference between clock species):

> $|\Delta\varepsilon_R| \lesssim 10^{-8}$

It is worth retaining the distinction v2.1 makes explicit: frequency ratios only see the **differential** part of ε_R; a **universal** residual cancels in every ratio measurement and may even amount to a pure reparametrization. *Degree of speculation: low. Directly connected to the experimental program of v2.1.*

## Most promising direction: coherence susceptibility and the metrological signature of ε_R

Of all the directions in this document, this is the one that matters most to me, because it is the only one that could turn T≡M from an elegant synthesis into physics with content of its own. I frame it with every reservation: it is a working hypothesis, not a claim.

The problem, stated plainly, is the one v2.1 itself acknowledges: today ε_R is operationally identical to a "temporal variation of fundamental constants." Any differential drift one measured could be attributed to either. For T≡M to have a **signature of its own**, it needs a rule for *how* ε_R depends on the type of transition — and that rule must be **different** from the pattern predicted by standard constants variation. If the dependence coincides, T≡M is an elegant relabeling; if it differs and is testable, it is new physics. That is, literally, the point where the program is decided.

This is where the bridge with *Coherent Data*, my companion framework (now published as v1.0), comes in. That framework proposes that how long a structure persists depends on its **type of closure**, not on its size or complexity: a compact closure resists the wear of expansion better than an extended coherence. Let us call **coherence susceptibility** χ_R how exposed the pattern of a clock-species R is to that stretching of the field (the wear rate, which in cosmology is of the order of the Hubble parameter H). A clock based on a nuclear transition — compact closure — would have low χ_R; one based on an electronic transition — more extended coherence — would have higher χ_R.

The linking hypothesis, avowedly tentative, is:

> $\varepsilon_R \approx \lambda \cdot \chi_R$

that is, the residual drift of a clock would be proportional to its coherence susceptibility. That would give ε_R a **structure ordered by closure compactness**. And here is the key: if that ordering (nuclei vs. electronic, by compactness) **does not coincide** with the ordering predicted by constants variation (which ranks transitions by their sensitivity coefficients to α, μ, etc.), then the differential residual Δε_R

between a nuclear-transition clock and an electronic-transition clock would carry a T≡M-specific signature — testable, in principle, with data that already exist on clock comparisons and decoherence times.

The two faces of the same corpus meet right here. *Coherent Data* looks at $\varepsilon_R$ from two sides: from **inheritance** (laws are inherited from the primordial pixel and should therefore be invariant — that is the *universal* face, which pushes the common residual toward zero or renders it unobservable, in line with what v2.1 already says about the universal branch), and from **differential wear by closure type** (which produces the *differential* face, the signature). The signature of $\varepsilon_R$ by transition type and the wear that scales with the fragility of coherence could therefore be the same idea seen from both sides.

Reservations, because they are large: $\varepsilon_R \approx \lambda \cdot \chi_R$ is a conjecture, not something derived; $\chi_R$ is stated as a variable in *Coherent Data* (Section 19), but still without a formal definition; $\lambda$ is unknown; and as long as that differential structure is not measured, none of this is distinguishable from constants variation. *Degree of speculation: high. But it is the high-value high — the only direction in this document that points to a falsifiable, concrete consequence. That is why I plant it, with a date, as the next real leap if there is one.*

## The origin of the universe

"What happened before the Big Bang?" — Stephen Hawking compared this question to "What is north of the North Pole?", suggesting it makes no sense.

I arrive at the same conclusion by a different path: if time is expansion, there is no "before" the Big Bang because there is no root tick prior to the first motion. The Big Bang is the first tick of the Tempo. It is not an evasion; it is a dissolution of the question. *Degree of speculation: medium. Conceptually clean, without new observational consequences.*

## Speculative extensions

The following points are more speculative than the previous ones. I include them because the T≡M premise touches them in a non-trivial way, but they are the furthest from current formalization. The reader may skip this section without losing the central thread of the abductive argument, and treat them as a long-term program.

## The heat death of the universe

Thermodynamics predicts a final state of maximum equilibrium. In standard physics, the answer is ambiguous: time "would continue to exist" but "nothing would happen." In T≡M, the reading is direct: if there is no motion, there is no time. Heat death is not the end in an empty time — it is the last tick. After that, total pause. *Degree of speculation: medium.*

## Consciousness and temporal perception

In T≡M, the temporal experience would be read as perception of neuronal sub-ticks: neuronal activity would be time at biological scale. Compatible with Tononi's Integrated Information Theory (2004). *Degree of speculation: high. Conceptual reading, not a new biological mechanism.*

## Quantum entanglement

Two entangled particles show instantaneous correlations regardless of distance. Quantum physics describes this perfectly but does not explain it intuitively.

I suggest a reading: entangled particles could be understood as sub-ticks synchronized within the same Θ. This reading does not require imagining a classical "signal": it proposes thinking of it as co-participation in the same root tick. The correlation would not be information transmission but synchrony within the Tempo. *Degree of speculation: high. Intriguing direction without current formalization.*

### Biological aging

I do not propose a new biological mechanism, but a conceptual reading: biological processes can be understood as counts of motion at the molecular scale, nested within the root tick. Degradation does not happen "with time"; degradation is time at that scale. *Degree of speculation: high. Interpretive framework, not a biological model.*

---

## Why it matters that it is a single premise

The value of this exercise is not in any individual point — it is in the disproportion between the simplicity of the premise and the number of problems it touches.

I am not proposing a different mechanism for each problem. I am proposing a single simplification — eliminating the distinction between time and motion — and I observe that six problems dissolve conceptually, five are reinterpreted with greater parsimony, and eight open as new directions — including extensions marked as speculative. All from the same premise, without additional machinery.

This is what distinguishes a productive intuition from arbitrary speculation: correct ideas simplify; incorrect ones complicate. If you remove a distinction and new problems appear, the distinction was real. If you remove it and old problems disappear without creating new ones, the distinction was probably false.

> *"Correct ideas simplify; incorrect ones complicate. T≡M simplifies."*

---

## Abduction table — Systematic summary

The following table summarizes the complete abductive exercise. For each problem: the standard explanation, the T≡M reading, and — critically — what T≡M does not yet solve.

### Level 1 — Dissolves conceptually

| Problem | Standard explanation | T≡M reading | What it does NOT solve yet |
|---|---|---|---|
| Arrow of time | Entropy + low-entropy initial condition | The direction of Θ orients becoming | Why expansion has the direction and magnitude it has |
| Problem of time (GR/QM) | Open: t is dynamic in GR, fixed in QM | Neither t-GR nor t-QM are fundamental; Θ is | Formal derivation of how QM emerges from Θ |
| Empty time | Ambiguous: vacuum has fluctuations | No motion = no time (total pause) | Connection to quantum vacuum energy |
| Nature of clocks | Any stable periodic process | Sub-counts nested in Θ | Deriving specific rates from Θ |
| Flow of time | No clear standard explanation | Experience of participating in the advance of Θ | Neuronal/perceptual mechanism |
| T/M circularity | Recurring philosophical objection | Dissolved: one entity with two names | — |

### Level 2 — Reinterprets with parsimony

| Problem | Standard explanation | T≡M reading | What it does NOT solve yet |
|---|---|---|---|
| Time dilation | Spacetime geometry (SR/GR) | Redistribution of participation in Θ | It is a reading, not a new mechanism |
| Entropy | Statistics + initial condition | Θ and entropy co-oriented | Formal bridge cosmology-thermodynamics |
| Dark energy | Unknown (Λ or scalar field) | Acceleration of Θ = acceleration of Tempo | Does not explain the mechanism |
| Event horizon | Extreme curvature (GR) | Local sub-count → 0 relative to Θ | Consistency with black hole interior |
| Quantum measurement | Open: multiple interpretations | Measurement as minimal tick (E_min) | It is a reframing, not a complete solution |

### Level 3 — Opens new directions

| Problem | Standard explanation | T≡M reading | What it does NOT solve yet |
|---|---|---|---|
| Quantum gravity | Open: GR and QM incompatible | Θ as shared reference | Complete formalization |
| Metrology | Second = Cs-133 transition | Second as ratio of Θ; drift ε_R bounded at $\lvert\Delta\varepsilon_R\rvert \lesssim 10^{-8}$ | Dedicated re-analysis with per-pair sensitivity coefficients |
| ε_R signature / coherence susceptibility | None (degenerate with constants variation) | $\varepsilon_R \approx \lambda\, \chi_R$: drift ordered by closure type (bridge to *Coherent Data*) | Everything: form of $\chi_R$, value of λ, and whether the ordering differs from varying constants |
| Origin of universe | Big Bang + "what came before?" | Big Bang = first tick. No "before." | Observational consequences |
| Heat death | Maximum equilibrium in infinite time | Last tick. Total pause. | Connection to long-term cosmology |
| Consciousness | Neuroscience: brain construction | Neuronal sub-ticks (speculative) | Everything: it is a conceptual reading |
| Entanglement | Non-local quantum correlations | Co-participation in Θ (speculative) | Formalization; distinguish from standard QM |
| Aging | Molecular mechanisms (telomeres, etc.) | Molecular counts in Θ (speculative) | Not a new biological model |

## Invitation to formalization

This document is a map — an honest inventory of what opens up if the T≡M premise is correct. My background is in technology, not physics, and I do not have the tools to derive quantitative predictions from this premise.

But the premise is planted, with a date, a name, and a DOI. And the map of consequences shows it is worth taking seriously.

**Open for those who have the tools:**

- Formalize the relationship between Θ and relativistic proper time in non-FLRW regimes (near black holes, gravitational waves, early universe).

- Connect T≡M with the Page-Wootters mechanism (1983) to derive how quantum sub-counts emerge from the cosmological root tick.
- Search for the **signature of its own** of ε_R: a rule for how the residual depends on the type of transition (closure compactness: nuclear vs. electronic), and test whether that ordering differs from the one predicted by variation of fundamental constants. It is the step that would turn T≡M from reparametrization into physics, and the one that connects to the coherence susceptibility χ_R of *Coherent Data*.
- Explore whether the acceleration of Θ (dark energy) has measurable implications for the rate of local sub-counts.
- Investigate whether quantum entanglement can be formally described as synchronization of sub-ticks within Θ.

---

## Closing (in my own way)

There is a reason why no one has been able to explain time in a completely satisfactory way: because time is not something separate that needs explaining. It is the motion of the universe, the Tempo, and it always was.

The arrow of time, time dilation, entropy, aging, the event horizon, quantum measurement — all these "problems" exist because physics separated time and motion into two categories. If you unify them into Tempo, they are not solved with tricks: they are simplified.

That does not prove that T≡M is correct. But it shows that the piece fits. And when a piece fits in so many places at once without forcing anything, it is worth paying attention.

The seed is planted. The Tempo will tell.

---

## References


[1] Moreira, M. (2026). *T≡M Theory — Time Is Motion: Cosmological Expansion as the Root Tick* (v2.1). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20779567

[2] Moreira, M. (2026). *T≡M Theory — Time Is Motion: Cosmological Expansion as the Root Tick* (v2.0). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18856653

[3] Moreira, M. (2025). *T≡M Theory — Time Is Motion* (v1.0). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17514234

[4] Moreira, M. (2025). *Tempo Symbol Identity v1.0* [Data set]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17545235

[5] Moreira, M. (2026). *Coherent Data — Only the Coherent Exists: An Informational Ontology of the Universe* (v1.0) [Preprint]. Zenodo. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21230276

[6] Page, D. N., & Wootters, W. K. (1983). Evolution without evolution: Dynamics described by stationary observables. *Physical Review D*, 27(12), 2885–2892.

[7] Connes, A., & Rovelli, C. (1994). Von Neumann algebra automorphisms and time-thermodynamics relation in generally covariant quantum theories. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 11(12), 2899–2917.

[8] Rovelli, C. (2018). *The Order of Time*. Riverhead Books. (Original: *L'ordine del tempo*, Adelphi, 2017.)

[9] Barbour, J. (1999). *The End of Time: The Next Revolution in Physics*. Oxford University Press.

[10] Penrose, R. (2004). *The Road to Reality*. Jonathan Cape.

[11] Tononi, G. (2004). An information integration theory of consciousness. *BMC Neuroscience*, 5, 42.

[12] Bloom, B. J., et al. (2014). An optical lattice clock with accuracy and stability at the $10^{-18}$ level. *Nature*, 506(7486), 71–75.

[13] Sherrill, N., et al. (2023). Analysis of atomic-clock data to constrain variations of fundamental constants. *New Journal of Physics*, 25, 093012.

# Appendix — Minimal notation

| Symbol | Meaning |
|---|---|
| $\Theta = \ln(a/a_0)$ | Root tick (cosmological Tempo) |
| a | Cosmological scale factor |
| z | Redshift |
| X, dX | Universe state; elemental change |
| E_min, N_min | Minimal event; minimal counter |
| R, N_R | Local clock-process; process count |
| ε_R | Residual drift parameter (if it exists); denoted α_R in previous versions |
| Δε_R | Differential residual between two clock species; bounded at $\lesssim 10^{-8}$ |
| κ_R | Intrinsic scale of clock R |
| δ_R | Corrections from local conditions |
| χ_R | Coherence susceptibility (hypothesis, via *Coherent Data*): exposure of R's pattern to the wear of expansion |

**Suggested citation:** Moreira, M. (2026). *T≡M Theory — Time Is Motion: Abductive Consequences of the Tempo Unification* (Companion Paper v1.1) [Preprint]. Zenodo.