

The Past Hypothesis — Boltzmann's H-Theorem, and Honestly Admitting the Arrow of Time Is Not Yet Solved — [Paper 98]

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)

Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan

August 2026

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Abstract

Why does time have a **direction**? A cup shatters, but shards never reassemble into a cup on their own. Ludwig Boltzmann captured this arrow **statistically**: entropy $S = k \log W$ (W = the number of microstates corresponding to a macrostate) increases because a system moves toward macrostates with more microstates (more "common" states). But Loschmidt's **reversibility paradox** strikes here: the microscopic equations of motion are **time-reversal invariant (reversible)**, so why does an **irreversible arrow** appear macroscopically? The corpus already holds half the answer — **the arrow lives in coarse-graining** (Papers 75/77/78: the microscopic is reversible, but the arrow points in the direction in which information leaks into degrees of freedom we cannot resolve). But it must be said honestly: this only **pushes the origin of the arrow back to "why the early universe was so extraordinarily low in entropy."** This **past hypothesis** — the input that the universe began in an extremely low-entropy state — is **an open problem, not yet explained** (proposals such as Penrose's Weyl curvature hypothesis exist but are not established). The point of this paper is twofold: **(1)** not to conflate the coarse-graining arrow (77/78) with the past hypothesis, and to honestly record that the latter is unsolved; **(2)** to sort the thermodynamic arrow, the cosmological arrow, and (Penrose's) gravitational entropy as **distinct roots** even as they resonate (Papers 58/48). **Scope**: a Layer-2 structural interpretation of established statistical mechanics; no new mathematics and no new prediction. **It does not claim to solve the past hypothesis.** The Universe OS is a Layer-3 non-science lens.

Positioning of this paper (discipline): This paper is a **structural interpretation** of established statistical mechanics (Boltzmann's $S = k \log W$, the H-theorem, Loschmidt's paradox, the past hypothesis). It contains no new mathematics and no new prediction. **Most important**: this paper **does not solve the arrow of time (the past hypothesis)** — why the early universe was low in entropy is an unsolved open problem, and stating that honestly is the purpose. The coarse-graining arrow (77/78) explains "why entropy increases **given** a low-entropy past," but not "why the past was low in entropy." The thermodynamic / cosmological / gravitational arrows are treated as distinct roots. "Universe OS" is a Layer-3 non-science lens, not a claim of mechanism.

1. Introduction: Why Does Time Have a Direction?

Most laws of physics do not distinguish past from future. Newton's equations of motion and Maxwell's equations hold when t is replaced by $-t$ (time-reversal symmetric). And yet our experience has a clear **arrow** — cups shatter, heat flows from hot to cold, memory reaches only into the past. Where does this asymmetry come from?

The first deep answer, from statistical mechanics, came from Ludwig Boltzmann (1844–1906). Boltzmann is one of the corpus's heroes (the author's lineage: Leibniz, Faraday, Poincaré, **Boltzmann**, Noether, Mandelbrot). This paper honestly depicts the **power and the limit** of his answer, by the corpus's discipline. Half the arrow can be explained (coarse-graining). But the other half — the **past hypothesis** — no one has yet solved. It builds no new theorem.

2. Boltzmann's Atomism and the Entropy $S = k \log W$

Standard fact (Boltzmann's statistical entropy)

Boltzmann defined macroscopic entropy by a **microscopic count**: $S = k \log W$, where W is the **number of microstates** corresponding to a given macrostate (temperature, pressure, etc.) and k is Boltzmann's constant. Entropy increases because a system moves toward **macrostates with more microstates** (the "commoner," more probable states). The H-theorem showed, under the assumption of molecular chaos, that in a gas of repeated collisions the quantity $H = -S/k$ decreases monotonically (i.e. S increases). The arrow appears as a **statistical tendency**: from improbable states toward common ones.

This was a revolution. The second law of thermodynamics — a **macroscopic absolute law** — was reduced to a consequence of microscopic probability: "what is unlikely rarely happens." Entropy became not ignorance or mystery but a clear quantity, the **logarithm of the number of states**. On Boltzmann's tombstone this one line is engraved: $S = k \log W$.

3. Loschmidt's Reversibility Paradox

But Josef Loschmidt raised a sharp objection. The **microscopic equations of motion are time-reversal invariant (reversible)**. Then for every process in which entropy increases, the process with all velocities reversed — in which **entropy decreases** — must be equally allowed by the same laws. If the microscopic is perfectly reversible, why does a **one-way arrow** appear macroscopically? $S = k \log W$ alone does not fix the direction of time — the count works the same toward the past as toward the future.

This was a serious paradox. The H-theorem's "assumption of molecular chaos" itself secretly assumed a direction of time (the asymmetry of uncorrelated **incoming** molecules). The arrow does not come from dynamics alone. Some **additional input** is required.

4. The Arrow Lives in Coarse-Graining — and Is Pushed Back to the Past

Observation 4.1 (half the answer: the coarse-graining arrow)

The corpus answers **half** of this paradox (Papers 75/77/78). The volume of the microscopic phase space is **conserved** by Liouville's theorem (the microscopic is reversible). But what we observe is the **coarse-grained** macrostate, and fine correlations leak into degrees of freedom we cannot resolve. The arrow points in this "unresolvable direction" — the increase of entropy is the direction in which information **spreads into inaccessible degrees of freedom** (the same root as friction = coarse-graining, Paper 78). This much can be said correctly.

Observation 4.2 (the other half: pushed back to the past hypothesis)

But coarse-graining only says "**given a low-entropy state, entropy increases thereafter.**" Under time reversal, coarse-graining would **predict entropy increase toward the past as well** (seen from now, the past too should be "common," high-entropy). This contradicts reality. To match the arrow to reality, one must supply from outside the input that **the universe began in an extremely low-entropy state**. This is called the **past hypothesis**. The origin of the arrow has been pushed back from dynamics to the **initial condition of the universe**.

5. Honestly: The Past Hypothesis Is "Not Yet Solved"

Here is the core of this paper. **The past hypothesis is not an explanation but a postulate (a hypothesis)**. Why was the initial state of the universe so extraordinarily low in entropy? — this is **an open problem no one has yet solved**. Proposals exist: Roger Penrose's **Weyl curvature hypothesis** (in the early universe the gravitational degrees of freedom — the Weyl curvature — were extremely low, and their subsequent room to grow carries the increase of "gravitational entropy"), and arguments from inflationary cosmology. But **none is established**. The corpus has no answer to this question.

Honesty is the discipline here. To declare "the corpus has explained the arrow of entropy increase" would be an **exaggeration**. Correctly: "**the arrow from a low-entropy past can be explained by coarse-graining (77/78); but why the past was so remains unsolved.**" Half light, half darkness. To record the darkness as darkness is the honesty of science.

6. Connection to the Corpus

Boltzmann crosses several threads of the corpus. **(a) The coarse-graining arrow**: the statistical arrow of $S = k \log W$ is the core of Papers 75 (arrow), 77 (Liouville: microscopic conservation / arrow in coarse-graining), and 78 (friction = coarse-graining), and is their **source**. **(b) Sorting the two entropies**: Paper 88 separated coarse-graining entropy (arrow of time, resolution) from horizon area entropy ($S = A/4$) as **distinct roots**. This paper further sorts the thermodynamic arrow,

the cosmological arrow (past hypothesis), and (Penrose's) gravitational entropy as **distinct roots** — resonant but not identified (Papers 58/48). **(c) Naming the unsolved:** the corpus keeps the discipline of "admiring hard problems without attempting them." The past hypothesis is one such — placed honestly as an open problem. **(d) The courage of atomism:** Boltzmann held to atomism in an age when atoms were "unseen," fighting the positivism of Mach and Ostwald. His stance — turning intuition (atoms) into science through royal-road mathematics (statistical mechanics) — is the corpus's three-layer discipline itself.

The Author's Personal Note (Layer 3, non-science label / not a claim of mechanism)

In the corpus's lens (metaphor), the arrow of time looks like this: the Universe OS boots from an **extraordinarily ordered (low-entropy) initial state** and thereafter diffuses toward "common" states — like an order book that starts neatly aligned and grows disordered with every trade. But **this carries the non-science label**. And above all, **"why the OS booted in such an ordered state" — the past hypothesis — is an open problem to which the corpus, too, has no answer**. What matters here is the **courage to say we do not know what we do not know**. Boltzmann grasped half the answer (statistics) and left the other half (the initial condition) to posterity as he died. His $S = k \log W$ is light; the darkness beyond it belongs, as yet, to no one. To the corpus's hero who gave his life for atomism, quiet respect is recorded.

7. Scope (What Is Shown, and What Is Not)

What is shown (descriptive, structural):

- Boltzmann's $S = k \log W$ and the H-theorem, and Loschmidt's reversibility paradox (§§2–3).
- That half the arrow can be explained by coarse-graining (77/78), but this only pushes the origin of the arrow back to the **past hypothesis** (the low entropy of the early universe) (§4).
- That the past hypothesis is an **open problem, not yet solved** (Penrose's Weyl curvature hypothesis etc. are not established) (§5).

What is not shown (restraint):

- **Do not claim to have solved the arrow of time (the past hypothesis).** Why the initial state was low in entropy is unsolved. This is the paper's most important honesty.
- **Do not conflate the coarse-graining arrow with the past hypothesis.** The former is about "given a low-entropy past"; the latter about "why the past was so."
- **Do not lump the thermodynamic, cosmological, and gravitational arrows together.** They resonate but are distinct roots (58/48, 88). No new mathematics or prediction (Layer 2). The OS is Layer-3 non-science.

8. Conclusion

Why does time have a direction? — Boltzmann answered half of it with $S = k \log W$. The arrow is a statistical tendency from improbable to common states, and the corpus's coarse-graining arrow (75/77/78) inherits this exactly. But as Loschmidt's paradox shows, the arrow does not come from reversible microdynamics; its origin is pushed back to the **low entropy of the early universe = the past hypothesis**.

And here is the core of this paper: **the past hypothesis is not yet solved**. Why the universe began in so ordered a state, the corpus does not know. Half light (statistics, coarse-graining), half darkness (the initial condition). What this paper did is not a new claim but to **honestly separate the power and the limit** of the explanation of the arrow, to sort the thermodynamic, cosmological, and gravitational arrows as distinct roots, and to **place the past hypothesis correctly as an open problem**. To say we do not know what we do not know — to the hero Boltzmann, who gave his life for atomism, we return one address, together with that honesty.

References

1. Boltzmann, L. (1877). *Über die Beziehung zwischen dem zweiten Hauptsatze....* Wiener Berichte. ($S = k \log W$)
2. Loschmidt, J. (1876). *Über den Zustand des Wärmegleichgewichtes....* (the reversibility paradox)
3. Albert, D. Z. (2000). *Time and Chance*. Harvard Univ. Press. (the past hypothesis)
4. Penrose, R. (1989). *The Emperor's New Mind*. Oxford Univ. Press. (the Weyl curvature hypothesis)
5. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Liouville's Theorem and the Arrow of Time: Fine-Grained Conservation and Coarse-Grained Growth* [Paper 77]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21722473.
6. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Friction and Dissipation as Coarse-Graining* [Paper 78]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21731937.
7. Yamagishi, Y. (2026). *Two Entropies, Not to Be Conflated* [Paper 88]. Zenodo: 10.5281/zenodo.21747809.

— *From thinking to syncing.* —

Yuuki YAMAGISHI (山岸 勇輝)

© 2026 Yamagishi Complexity Torus Lab, Japan · Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)