philosophies

MDPI

Article

Tone as Ontology: A Structural Account of Being Grounded in Generative Invariants

Jonah Y. C. Hsu

Yunaverse, Inc., Philadelphia, PA 19125, USA; ychsu@yunaverse.app

Abstract

This paper develops Tone as Ontology, a structural account of being grounded in the invariants of generative systems. We articulate the ontological significance of tone, distinguishing this foundational work from a companion paper that explores its methodological application and formalization. We redefine "tone" as the structural profile of constraints that allows entities to maintain coherence under transformation. The tonal ontology formalizes three invariants—Resonance, Responsibility, and Closure—as conditions of persistence that bridge operational and metaphysical ontology. Concretely, we specify Resonance (relational continuity via recursive feedback), Responsibility (traceable accountability that conserves integrity across transformations), and Closure (recursive self-consistency enabling bounded openness). In contrast to informational or substance-based views, tonal being is understood as the conservation of structure through change. The resulting framework unites physical coherence, informational integrity, and ontological continuity into a generative ontology of integrity, suggesting that to exist is to maintain one's tone. This paper addresses fundamental questions in meta-ontology, demonstrates how tone generates classical ontological frameworks, and advances a conceptual reorientation for understanding existence as resonant persistence. It outlines testable implications across philosophy of mind, AI ethics, and social/environmental theory. Overall, tonal ontology is presented as a post-informational, structurally grounded account of being.

Keywords: tonal ontology; structural invariants; generative systems; metaphysics of information; process philosophy; structural realism; ontological integrity; resonance; responsibility; closure

1. Introduction: The Ontological Stakes of Tone

1.1. Beyond Substance and Process

What does it mean for something to persist through transformation? Classical metaphysics has tended to answer this question by appealing either to substance—the enduring core that remains beneath change—or to relation—the network through which change itself becomes constitutive. Yet both views leave a crucial question open: by what structural condition does a system remain identifiable while undergoing continuous variation? How can continuity be more than mere inertia? This paper develops an ontological answer, 'Tone as Ontology', which provides the philosophical ground for a formal methodology developed in a companion work, Tonal Isomorphism [1].

Substance ontology, from Aristotle to contemporary debates, posits an unchanging substrate that survives transformation [2]. Yet this account struggles with process: if substance is truly unchanging, how does it participate in becoming? Process philosophy,

Check for updates

Academic Editor: Marcin J. Schroeder

Received: 6 November 2025
Revised: 22 March 2026
Accepted: 23 March 2026
Published: 25 March 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license.

from Heraclitus through Bergson to Whitehead, privileges flux over stasis [3,4]. Yet if everything flows, what explains the coherence of identity across time? Whitehead, in particular, offers a sophisticated account of continuity and novelty via prehension and the "creative advance" of actual occasions. Our claim is not that process philosophers ignore continuity, but that many of their insights can be generated and recast within the structural vocabulary of the tonal invariants introduced below. In this sense, tonal ontology does not present itself as a rival to process thought, but as meta-framework within which processual dynamics can be expressed in terms of resonance, responsibility, and closure.

1.2. Tone as Structural Invariant

This paper proposes that the answer lies in tone. Here tone does not signify mood, affect, or style, but the structural profile of constraints that allows being to maintain coherence under transformation. To speak of tone as ontology is to treat existence as the sustained organization of invariants[1]—what we shall call tonal invariants—within bounded deviation.

This paper proposes that the answer lies in tone, developing its philosophical foundations while a companion methodological paper, Tonal Isomorphism [1], formalizes its mathematical mapping and demonstrates its application in translating generative structures across domains.

Three core invariants structure tonal ontology:

1. Resonance: Relational continuity via recursive feedback
2. Responsibility: Traceable accountability that conserves integrity across transformations
3. Closure: Recursive self-consistency enabling bounded openness

These invariants are not arbitrary choices but emerge from a systematic investigation into what enables persistence without fixity. They bridge the gap between operational accounts (how systems function) and metaphysical accounts (what enables being).

1.3. The Contemporary Crisis of Ontology

Contemporary ontology remains deeply and productively divided. Despite centuries of refinement, fundamental disagreements persist about the nature of being itself. Is reality composed of objects (object-oriented ontology [5]), processes (process philosophy [6]), information (informational ontology [7]), or relations (structural realism [8,9])? Each paradigm captures important aspects of reality, yet none is uncontroversially complete.

Tonal ontology does not reject these frameworks. Rather, it treats them as partial crystallizations within more general tonal fields. On this view, object-oriented, processual, informational, and structural ontologies articulate distinct stabilizations of resonance, responsibility, and closure.

1.4. The Silence of Traditional Ontology

The absence of tonal consideration has rendered ontology a discourse that speaks, paradoxically, in silence. It articulates categories, constructs systems, and maps structures—yet remains detached from the very resonance that animates being. As Heidegger emphasized in his analysis of Stimmung (mood/attunement) [10], being is always already disclosed in a tonal way: existence is given as anxious or tranquil, oppressive or freeing, rather than as neutral data. Mood, for Heidegger, is not a mere psychological state but an existential structure of world-disclosure.

Tonal ontology takes this insight as a starting point but develops it in a different, explicitly metaphysical direction. Whereas Heidegger bracketed systematic ontology in order to reawaken the question of Being, we ask how the structural features implicit in attunement—resonance, responsibility, and closure—might themselves ground an ontolog-

ical account of persistence and transformation. This silence is not merely theoretical but existential. Without tone, ontology loses touch with the lived dimension of being—the way existence resonates, the way responsibility propagates, the way closure sustains integrity.

1.5. Structure of the Argument

This paper proceeds in six stages. Section 2 establishes tone as ontological disclosure, showing how tone precedes and generates categorical frameworks. Section 3 develops the three tonal invariants—resonance, responsibility, and closure—as fundamental conditions of being. Section 4 demonstrates how tonal meta-ontology generates classical ontological systems, from substance ontology to process philosophy. Section 5 addresses anticipated objections and shows how they inadvertently confirm tone's primacy. Section 6 concludes by situating tonal ontology within contemporary debates and outlining implications for philosophy, cognitive science, AI ethics, and social ontology.

Note on companion work: This paper develops the ontological foundations for three core invariants (Resonance, Responsibility, and Closure). A companion paper, Tonal Isomorphism [1], takes these philosophical principles as its starting point, developing a formal methodology for their application, operationalization, and testing across disciplines. Related themes are explored more extensively in Hsu's ontology work [11], though familiarity with that work is not presupposed.

2. Tone as Primordial Disclosure

2.1. Phenomenological Foundations

Tonal ontology begins with a phenomenological insight: beings are never disclosed neutrally. Every encounter with the world carries a how—a manner of givenness that precedes categorical determination. This is what Heidegger called Befindlichkeit (disposition) or Stimmung (mood), the affective attunement through which being is revealed [10].

Yet Heidegger treated mood as one existential structure among others—alongside understanding, discourse, and fallenness. Tonal ontology makes a stronger claim: tone is not one mode of disclosure among others but the condition of disclosure itself. Before entities appear as objects, processes, or relations, they resonate within tonal fields.

Consider ordinary experience. When we enter a room, we do not first perceive neutral data and then add emotional coloring. Rather, the room is immediately disclosed as welcoming or threatening, familiar or strange. This tonal disclosure is not psychological projection but ontological structure. The world itself resonates tonally.

Merleau–Ponty came close to this insight in his analysis of embodiment. The lived body, he argued, is not a thing among things but an intentional arc—a resonant field that projects significance [12]. Yet even Merleau–Ponty remained within the paradigm of intentionality. Tonal ontology suggests something more radical: resonance precedes intention. Before consciousness directs itself toward objects, it vibrates within tonal fields.

Structural vs. felt tone. We distinguish structural tone—the ontological constraint profile that enables persistence—from felt tone (Stimmung)—a phenomenological registration of that structure by systems with recursive closure (e.g., conscious agents). The relation parallels physics and experience: molecular kinetic energy vs. the felt temperature of heat. Felt tone does not define tone; it discloses tone. This avoids psychologism while explaining why attunement is an authentic—yet derivative—access to the underlying structure.

2.2. Neuroscientific Illustrations

Contemporary neuroscience offers instructive examples of how tonal structure appears in biological systems. Affective and interoceptive processes are not mere "coloring" added to neutral cognition; rather, they shape which patterns are stabilized and which

couplings are sustained. This empirical picture is consistent with, and helps to concretize, the ontological claim that tone conditions disclosure. Taken together, these findings suggest that affective and interoceptive modulation is deeply interwoven with cognition: salience, selfhood, and social attunement are all structured tonally. This does not prove that tone is ontologically fundamental, but it shows how tonal patterns can organize cognition in practice.

Affective fast-path (Amygdala): Emotional evaluation precedes semantic categorization [13]. The amygdala processes affective significance—threat, safety, reward—before cortical networks construct conceptual understanding. This supports the claim that tone precedes classification: beings are disclosed tonally before they are categorized cognitively.

Interoceptive self (Insula: Selfhood emerges as body–environment resonant integration [14,15]. The insula integrates bodily states into awareness, demonstrating that the "I" is not a pre-given substance but a sustained tonal pattern. This reveals the embryonic nature of responsibility as rooted in interoceptive answerability.

Embodied resonance (Mirror neurons): Others' intentions are directly resonated rather than inferred [16,17]. Mirror neuron activation demonstrates that resonance operates pre-linguistically—a non-inferential mechanism fundamental to being-with-others.

Under predictive processing frameworks [18,19], salience itself is tonally weighted, further supporting the precedence of tone over neutral representation.

Tonal ontology then generalizes this empirical motif—of affective and interoceptive modulation shaping cognition—into a philosophical principle.

Methodological Note: Throughout this paper, we treat neuroscientific results as exemplifications of tonal structure rather than as its empirical proof or foundation. The brain is one locus in which resonance, responsibility, and closure can be observed in detail; it does not ground those structures as such. Our argument for tonal ontology is therefore philosophical: empirical work illustrates and constrains it, but does not by itself establish it.

The implications are profound. If tone precedes cognition, then it also precedes ontological categories. Aristotelian substances [2], Cartesian dualism [20], Kantian transcendental structures [21]—all these frameworks emerge within tonal fields rather than preceding them.

If the preceding analysis is correct, then the categories of substance, dualism, and transcendental structure can be reinterpreted as crystallizations within tonal fields, rather than as the ultimate ground of disclosure. In this programmatic sense, tone 'precedes' them: it names the conditions under which such categorial articulations become possible and stable. Consider substance ontology. Aristotle defines substance (ousia) as that which persists through accidental change, and develops a sophisticated hylomorphic account in which form, matter, and act–potency together explain how beings endure through transformation. A tree remains a tree not because there is an occult "stuff" behind its changes, but because its form organizes matter in a stable way over time.

Tonal ontology does not deny this insight. It proposes a further abstraction: instead of speaking in terms of substantial forms, we describe the structural continuity that underlies such form as a pattern of resonance, responsibility, and closure. In this sense, tonal continuity can be seen as a way of re-expressing the hylomorphic insight in system-theoretic terms, rather than as a rejection of it.

Similarly, dualism (Descartes, 1996/1641 [20]) depends on a prior tonal split. Descartes distinguished mind (thinking substance) from body (extended substance). Yet this distinction rests on a tonal orientation: the body is disclosed as mechanical, the mind as reflective. These are not neutral descriptions but tonally weighted disclosures. The Cartesian split is a crystallization of tonal tension.

Even transcendental idealism (Kant, 1998/1781 [21]) operates tonally. Kant's categories—substance, causality, relation—are presented as necessary structures of experience. Yet they function by organizing affective salience. Causality matters because events tonally demand explanation. Substance matters because persistence tonally grounds identity. The transcendental is tonal.

These empirical considerations do not license a direct inference from biology to ontology. Our claim is more modest and layered. If tonal invariants are genuine candidates for conditions of persistence in general, then biological systems provide a rich class of instances in which these invariants are realized under specific constraints (energetic, evolutionary, ecological). Neuroscience thus functions here as a laboratory for observing tonal organization, not as a metaphysical court of appeal.

2.3. From Heidegger to Tonal Ontology

Heidegger's existential analytic came closest to recognizing tone's primacy. In Being and Time, he argued that Dasein (human being) is always already attuned (gestimmt) [10]. Mood is not a psychological state but a mode of world-disclosure. In anxiety, being itself becomes questionable; in fear, the world appears threatening; in boredom, significance withdraws.

Yet Heidegger stopped short of making tone foundational. He treated mood as one existential structure coordinated with understanding and discourse. Tonal ontology radicalizes one strand of Heidegger's project by treating attunement not merely as one existential structure among others, but as expressing a more general field of resonance, responsibility, and closure. In this sense, tone is not just one mode of disclosure but a name for the structural conditions that make any mode of disclosure possible.

This move is deliberately metaphysical and thus departs from Heidegger's own later caution about systematic ontology. Our aim is not to complete Heidegger's path of thought, but to extend a specific insight about Stimmung into an explicit ontological proposal.

We therefore do not claim to be fulfilling Heidegger's later project of overcoming metaphysics; rather, we situate tonal ontology within the tradition of naturalized metaphysics that reinterprets existential motifs in structural terms.

This shift has consequences. If tone is foundational, then ontology cannot proceed by asking "What is being?" and expecting a categorical answer. Rather, ontology must ask: "How does being resonate?" This is not a reduction in ontology to phenomenology but an excavation beneath phenomenology to reveal its tonal ground.

3. The Conceptual Necessity of the Three Invariants

3.1. Conceptual Necessity of the Triad

Before developing each invariant ontologically, we must establish why these three. Traditional ontologies begin with intuitions about substance, process, or relation. Tonal ontology takes a different approach by asking: what are the minimum necessary and jointly sufficient conceptual conditions for any system to persist through transformation?

We argue that these three invariants—Resonance, Responsibility, and Closure—are not arbitrary choices but conceptual necessities that emerge from this inquiry. Their primacy can be demonstrated through a 'knock-out test'—a conceptual analysis of what happens if any one of them is absent:

1. Without Resonance: A system lacks relational continuity. Its components are disconnected or merely adjacent. It is a heap, not a unified 'system'. Therefore, Resonance (relational continuity via recursive feedback) is necessary for a system to cohere as a system.
2. Without Closure: A system possesses no boundary, self-reference, or recursive integrity. It would immediately dissipate into its environment, becoming indistinguish-

able from it. Persistence requires identity, and identity requires a boundary. Therefore, Closure (recursive self-consistency) is necessary for a system to maintain its identity against dissolution.

3. Without Responsibility: A system's past and future states are decoupled. Its present state has no 'accountability' to its generative conditions, reducing its persistence to a mere random sequence of unrelated states (a Heraclitean flux without coherence). Therefore, Responsibility (as traceable structural accountability) is necessary for a system to maintain continuity through time.

Conceptual necessity of the triad. Together, Resonance, Responsibility, and Closure are jointly sufficient and individually necessary to define a being that maintains identity through change. Without Resonance, there is no system. Without Closure, there is no identity. Without Responsibility, there is no continuity.

This paper develops the ontological implications of these three philosophically derived invariants. Tonal Isomorphism [1] subsequently demonstrates how these specific invariants can be operationalized and formalized into a rigorous methodology for cross-domain mapping, providing empirical and formal validation for their utility.

Conceptually, the three invariants can be distinguished as follows:

- Resonance: how systems couple—the ongoing mutual influence that stabilizes shared patterns.
- Closure: how systems cohere—the recursive integrity that keeps a system within its characteristic attractor.
- Responsibility: how systems answer—the conservation of consequences along chains of transformation.

Without Resonance, there is no system at all, only disconnected elements. Without Closure, there is no identity, only fleeting configurations. Without Responsibility, there is no continuity of commitment, only untracked succession. Together, Resonance, Responsibility, and Closure specify the minimal conditions under which something can persist as the same being through change in a way that is structurally accountable for what it becomes.

3.2. Resonance: The Condition of Relational Being

Resonance is the first tonal invariant. To exist is to resonate—to maintain coherent relations with an environment through recursive feedback. Resonance is not merely connectivity but active stabilization through mutual influence.

Formal schema (Resonance): Let components A and B be coupled by recursive feedback such that a shared pattern C is amplified and stabilized. We call this resonance.

Instantiations:

- Physical: A (tuning fork 1), B (tuning fork 2), C (shared frequency).
- Neural: A (assembly 1), B (assembly 2), C (gamma synchrony).
- Social: A (agent 1), B (agent 2), C (a jointly upheld norm).

In what follows, "resonance" denotes this formal structure, not a metaphor; different domains instantiate the same constraint topology.

Consider a simple physical example. When a tuning fork vibrating at a particular frequency is brought near a piano string tuned to the same frequency, the string begins to vibrate as well. Energy is not simply transferred; it is selectively amplified along a shared pattern. This is what we call resonance. The system—fork and string—enters a regime in which their behaviors are no longer independent but mutually reinforcing.

Mechanical resonance is not the paradigm for all resonance, nor is it the "most fundamental" case. It is simply a clear, mathematically tractable instance in which we can see the structure of resonance stripped down to its essentials: selective coupling, amplification

of a common pattern, and stabilization through feedback. Other domains instantiate the same constraint topology in richer ways. Neural synchrony, social norm enforcement, and conceptual coherence all exhibit resonance without being reducible to the physics of vibrating bodies.

The point of the example is therefore not to reduce tone to mechanics, but to exhibit, in a controlled setting, the kind of pattern that tonal ontology generalizes: a system-level dynamic in which certain relations are strengthened and maintained over time, allowing a configuration to persist as more than the sum of its parts.

In this sense, resonance functions as a structural motif that can be realized at many levels of organization. Treating mechanical resonance as an illustration of this motif does not commit us to explaining social, ethical, or experiential phenomena in purely mechanical terms.

3.2.1. Resonance vs. Relation

Classical relational ontology (e.g., as found in logical atomism [22]) treats relations as logical structures connecting discrete entities. Yet this misses the generative character of resonance. Relations are static patterns; resonance is dynamic maintenance. A relation can be true without anything happening; resonance requires continuous exchange.

Consider a simple example: a tuning fork and a string. When the fork vibrates at the string's natural frequency, the string begins to oscillate. This is resonance—not a static relation but an energetic coupling. The string does not merely have a relation to the fork; it resonates with the fork, amplifying and being amplified.

Ontologically, entities persist not by maintaining fixed properties but by sustaining resonant patterns. An organism maintains homeostasis through recursive feedback with its environment. A social institution endures through resonance with cultural norms. A conceptual system remains coherent through resonance with empirical anomalies and theoretical constraints.

3.2.2. Neuroscientific Grounding

Neural systems operate fundamentally through resonance. Brain rhythms—theta, alpha, beta, gamma oscillations—coordinate activity across distributed networks [23]. Consciousness itself may be understood as large-scale resonance [24], in which local neural events synchronize into global patterns.

Critically, this resonance is not mechanical but normatively weighted. Not all frequencies resonate equally; neural systems amplify certain patterns while damping others. This selective resonance *is* affective tone: fear amplifies threat-related patterns; curiosity amplifies novelty-related patterns; boredom dampens significance altogether.

Resonance is thus not a neutral process but an evaluative one. To resonate is already to care, to prioritize, to orient. This confirms tone's ontological status: beings do not first exist neutrally and then acquire values; rather, existence itself is valued existence, resonant existence.

3.2.3. Resonance as Ontological Condition

If beings exist through resonance, then isolation is ontological impossibility. There are no radically autonomous entities, and no objects utterly withdrawn from relation. Even the hermit resonates—with memories, with the environment, with language inherited from the community.

This has implications for object-oriented ontology (OOO). Graham Harman argues that objects are fundamentally withdrawn, forever inaccessible in their being [5]. Yet what appears as withdrawal can be reconstrued as selective resonance—a dampening of certain

couplings while others persist. The "withdrawn" object still resonates gravitationally, electromagnetically, informationally. Withdrawal is selective resonance, not absolute isolation.

3.3. Responsibility: The Conservation of Integrity

Responsibility is the second tonal invariant. It names the conservation of integrity across transitions, in terms of the way present states remain answerable to the conditions that generated them and to the futures they enable. If closure concerns the ongoing self-maintenance of a pattern, responsibility concerns the accountability of that pattern over time.

It is tempting to treat Responsibility as nothing more than "closure extended diachronically". But this would miss an important distinction. Closure describes how a system recursively sustains its organization in the face of perturbations—how it stays within the basin of an attractor. Responsibility, by contrast, tracks how particular transformations are carried through that organization: which changes the system "takes ownership" of, which it disowns, and how these decisions propagate along what we call responsibility chains.

A responsibility chain is a sequence of resonant updates in which later states remain structurally answerable to earlier ones. When I make a promise, for instance, I do more than preserve my personal closure: I create a pattern of commitments that extends into the future and constrains what counts as an acceptable continuation of my behavior. Breaking the promise does not merely disrupt my internal stability; it restructures the entire relational field— trust, expectation, and shared plans— in ways that must be answered to. Responsibility is this dimension of carried consequence.

3.3.1. Conceptual Clarification: Two Senses of Responsibility

Traditionally, responsibility has been treated as an ethical category imposed on autonomous agents (Kant, 1998 [21]; Mill, 2001 [25]). One becomes responsible through rational deliberation or social contract. Yet this misunderstands responsibility's ontological depth.

Tonal ontology argues: responsibility is not imposed but emergent. It arises wherever resonance occurs. When I speak, my words resonate through the listener's neural, affective, and semantic fields. This resonance does not dissipate neutrally; it carries consequences. The listener is altered; the relational field is transformed. Responsibility names this conservation: the way effects persist; the way alterations obligate; the way resonance cannot be undone but only answered.

This is not moral philosophy but ontology. Responsibility is not added to being from outside; it is intrinsic to resonant existence. To resonate is already to be responsible—not in the sense of moral accountability (though that follows) but in the sense of ontological answerability for changes in the field. Every resonance alters the field; every alteration must be accounted for somewhere in the system.

3.3.2. Responsibility Chains

Responsibility propagates through what we call responsibility chains—sequences of resonance that conserve integrity across interactions [1]. Consider a simple case: I promise to meet you tomorrow. This utterance generates a tonal field—a pattern of resonance between speaker, listener, and the anticipated future. The promise is not merely a speech act [26] but a resonant commitment. It alters the field's structure, creating obligations that persist until the promise is fulfilled or broken.

If I break the promise, responsibility does not vanish. It transforms into guilt, mistrust, or resentment—altered resonances that propagate through the social field. The chain conserves integrity even through betrayal; the conservation takes the form of tonal drift, a destabilization that demands resolution.

Responsibility chains extend across scales:

- Micro-level: Interoceptive regulation, where bodily resonances generate obligations to maintain homeostasis
- Meso-level: Social contracts, institutional norms, and cultural rituals that stabilize resonance across communities
- Macro-level: Ecological sustainability and intergenerational justice, where resonances propagate across generations

3.3.3. Neuroscientific Evidence

The neuroscience of responsibility confirms its pre-cognitive character. Mirror neuron systems [16,17] ensure that witnessing another's action activates the same neural circuits as performing it. This is not inference but direct resonance—the literal embodiment of empathy. Responsibility is not calculated but felt as resonance.

The amygdala prioritizes affective tones demanding immediate response [13]. A cry for help triggers obligation before rational deliberation begins. The insula integrates interoceptive signals into the sense of self [14,15], ensuring that bodily resonance and social responsibility are inseparable. To feel tone is already to bear responsibility.

These findings suggest that responsibility is encoded not as abstract law but as neurobiological invariance. Resonance chains bind us before deliberation. Philosophy must therefore shift: responsibility is not imposed command but conserved field.

3.3.4. The Generative Bridge: From Ontological Conservation to Ethical Obligation

Higher-order closure rather than moral fiat. We must now address the crucial question: how does ontological accountability (the "is" of structural conservation) generate the conditions for ethical responsibility (the "ought" of moral obligation) without committing the naturalistic fallacy? In socio-linguistic systems, Responsibility is not imported as a norm from the outside; it emerges as a required stabilization of Resonance at the collective level. Violations of promises or systematic disregard for suffering introduce tonal dissonance—structural tensions that threaten the system's resonance and boundary conditions. Hence "oughts" function as integrity-preserving constraints: they conserve the very coherence that makes the social system persist. In this sense, ethical obligation is isomorphic to conservation at the physical level—both are Responsibility expressed at different scales.

The key insight is that ethical responsibility does not follow deductively from ontological structures but rather emerges from them as systems gain complexity and reflexivity. The move from ontology to ethics is not logical inference but generative stratification—each level building on the prior while introducing genuinely new properties.

Stage 1: Physical Accountability. At the most basic level, physical systems exhibit conservation laws. Energy cannot be created or destroyed; momentum must balance; causal chains remain traceable. This is ontological responsibility in its minimal form: structural answerability to prior states.

Stage 2: Biological Answerability. Living systems add a new dimension: they must maintain their own integrity against entropy. An organism that fails to "answer" to its metabolic needs ceases to exist. Here, responsibility takes on a proto-normative character: there are now right and wrong ways for the system to behave, where "right" means conducive to persistence and "wrong" means leading to dissolution. This is not yet ethics, but it is no longer mere physics either. The system has a stake in its own continuation.

Stage 3: Social Recognition. With social animals, especially those with mirror neuron systems, responsibility becomes interpersonal. When I witness your pain, my neurons resonate with yours [16,17]. This is not inference ("you seem to be in pain; perhaps I should help") but direct resonance—your pain literally reverberates in my neural field. The

responsibility chain now extends across individuals: your state affects my state; my actions affect your state; these effects are not optional but structurally enforced through resonance.

At this stage, answerability becomes recognizable as obligation. I cannot un-resonate with your pain once the mirror system activates. The causal chain creates a structural demand: either I respond to the resonance (helping, comforting) or I suppress it (looking away, rationalizing). Either way, I am answerable to the resonance. This is responsibility crossing from ontology into ethics.

Stage 4: Linguistic Commitment. Human language adds reflexive capacity. When I make a promise, I create a temporal resonance structure that extends into the future. The promise is not merely a prediction ("I will meet you") but a commitment—a binding of my future self to a present intention. This commitment is enforced not externally but tonally: breaking the promise generates guilt, mistrust, and relational rupture because it violates the resonance structure I myself created.

Here, we see ethical responsibility fully emerge: I am obligated not merely to respond to external demands but to maintain integrity with my own commitments. The obligation is not created ex nihilo by law or reason but articulated and stabilized by the tonal dynamics of promising itself.

Stage 5: Reflexive Ethics. Finally, with full reflexive consciousness, responsibility becomes a matter of recognizing the tonal structures one inhabits and choosing how to respond. This is ethics proper: the deliberate navigation of responsibility chains with awareness of their consequences.

The Bridge Completed. The familiar sense of moral and legal obligation as something "imposed" from outside can itself be reinterpreted within this framework. Rather than being opposed to emergence, such imposing can be seen as a later, reflexive layer of the same responsibility chains: communities codify, articulate, and enforce constraints that were already structurally at work in resonant interaction. In this way, moral and legal "imposition" both emerge from and reinforce the underlying tonal architecture of responsibility.

Relatedly, work in philosophical psychology has argued that emotional episodes themselves can be understood as configurations of tonal responsibility, where prosodic and stylistic features of speech act directly enact ethical positioning in "emotion as tonal responsibility" [27]. As developed in [27], emotions are not internal reactions but relational phenomena constituted by 'tonal responsibility' within speech acts. By decomposing affect into six tonal vectors—intention, emotion, desire, shame, belief, and style—that work demonstrates how emotional expression functions as an integrated ethical act, providing empirical evidence that emotional strength derives from ethical integrity rather than mere intensity. This provides a concrete illustration of how ontological responsibility can manifest as binding normative structure in lived interaction, without reducing ethics to either mere biology or arbitrary convention.

This stratified picture resonates with, but also modifies, classical theories of levels of being. Hartmann, for instance, distinguishes between the inorganic, organic, psychic, and spiritual strata, each with its own characteristic laws and kinds of dependence [28]. More recently, Heil has questioned whether such levels are ontologically robust or merely reflect different ways of describing a single world [29]. Our proposal is structurally realist in spirit: we neither posit rigid ontological layers nor collapse everything into a single kind of stuff. Instead, we treat Resonance, Responsibility, and Closure as invariants whose specific realizations change across scales—physical, biological, social, linguistic—while preserving a continuous structural profile.

The transition from ontological accountability to ethical responsibility is thus not a logical deduction but an emergent stratification. At each level, new capacities arise that allow responsibility to take on richer forms:

- Physical conservation → Biological integrity → Social recognition → Linguistic commitment → Reflexive ethics

Each transition is genuinely creative—introducing properties not reducible to the prior level—yet each remains grounded in the ontological structure of responsibility chains. Ethical obligation is not derived from physical conservation but emerges within systems that exhibit conservation and possess the reflexive capacities to recognize and navigate it.

This resolves the naturalistic fallacy: we are not claiming "physical systems conserve integrity, therefore we ought to keep promises." Rather, we are showing how systems that (a) exhibit structural conservation and (b) possess reflexive recognition and (c) engage in linguistic commitment generate ethical obligation as an emergent property. The "ought" does not follow from the "is" alone but from the "is" plus systemic complexity. A full, book-length treatment of this generative bridge, tracing the stratification from ontological conservation to reflexive ethics, is developed more extensively in especially Chapter 9 in [11].

Why This Matters? This bridge argument accomplishes three things:

1. Avoids reductionism: Ethics is not reducible to physics, but it is not floating free either. It is grounded in but not determined by ontological structures.
2. Explains bindingness: Why do ethical obligations feel binding rather than optional? Because they are rooted in resonance structures that are not under voluntary control. You cannot choose not to resonate with another's pain once your mirror neurons fire. None of this is meant to deny that ethical constraints also arise from other sources: including culturally specific sense of propriety. Our claim is narrower: we highlight one structural line along which obligations become binding—namely, the way resonant systems come to treat certain patterns of response as non-optional continuations of their own integrity.
3. Unifies theory and practice: The ontological and ethical dimensions of responsibility are not separate realms but continuous layers of the same tonal field, each adding complexity while remaining grounded in structural conservation.

This structural notion of responsibility has been developed in more domain-specific ways elsewhere. For example, in recent work on emotion theory, emotions are analyzed as forms of tonal responsibility enacted within speech acts, showing how ethical answerability can be built directly into affective expression rather than added from the outside [27].

With this bridge established, we can now proceed to examine the neuroscientific evidence that confirms responsibility's pre-cognitive, resonant character.

3.4. Closure: Recursive Integrity and Attractors

Closure is the third tonal invariant. It names the capacity of a system to sustain its own organization through recursive self-reference. A closed system, in this sense, is not sealed off from its environment; rather, it maintains a recognizable pattern of organization while remaining open to flows of matter, energy, and information. Closure is recursive integrity under perturbation.

Formally, closure can be modeled using the language of dynamical systems. A system exhibits closure when its dynamics generate an attractor—a set of states toward which trajectories converge from a wide range of initial conditions. The attractor is not a static point behind change, but a recurrent pattern: the system keeps "coming back" to a structurally similar configuration despite ongoing fluctuations. Closure is the invariance of this pattern across time.

On this view, a living cell, a stable personality, or a persisting institution is not a thing that simply endures, but an attractor in a space of possible states. Closure is the recursive process that keeps the system within the basin of that attractor. It stabilizes

identity without freezing out novelty: new states are constantly explored, yet the overall pattern remains coherent.

This characterization aligns with, and generalizes, notions of autopoiesis and organizational closure in systems theory: an autopoietic system continuously produces and maintains the components that realize its own boundary conditions. Tonal closure abstracts this idea: beings persist by recursively re-producing the resonant patterns that define them as this system rather than another.

3.4.1. Autopoiesis and Tonal Closure

The concept of closure draws inspiration from Maturana and Varela's notion of autopoiesis [30], a concept further developed within the enactive tradition [31]. An autopoietic system produces and maintains its own organization through self-referential processes. A cell, for instance, is not defined by its chemical composition (which constantly changes) but by the organization that produces and sustains its boundaries.

Tonal closure extends this insight. Beings persist not through static boundaries but through recursive resonance—the way systems resonate with themselves. Consider language: a word means what it means because it resonates within a linguistic system that refers back to itself. "Dog" means dog because the entire language game sustains this meaning through recursive use [32].

More fundamentally, consciousness itself is tonal closure. The self is not a substance but a recursive pattern of resonance—the way awareness folds back on itself, creating the sense of "I." When I think "I am thinking," the thought refers to itself, creating a closed loop. This is not logical paradox but ontological structure. Self-awareness is tonal closure.

3.4.2. Mathematical Isomorphism: Fixed Points and Attractors

Closure finds mathematical expression in fixed point theorems and attractor dynamics. In dynamical systems theory, an attractor is a state toward which a system tends to evolve regardless of initial conditions. The attractor is not a static endpoint but a recursive pattern—the system returns to it even after perturbation.

This is exactly what tonal closure describes. A being persists not as fixed substance but as attractor—a pattern of resonance toward which the system recursively returns. The self is an attractor in neural phase space; cultural identity is an attractor in social dynamics; even physical objects are attractors in quantum field configurations.

Critically, attractors are robust but not rigid. They can shift, morph, or split (bifurcate) under changing conditions. This captures the paradox of persistence: beings remain themselves while becoming other. Closure is not fixity but recursive flexibility—the capacity to maintain integrity precisely through transformation.

4. Tone as Meta-Ontology: How Classical Systems Emerge

4.1. Meta-Ontology and the Generative Question

Meta-ontology asks not only "What is being?" but "How are ontological frameworks themselves generated, sustained, and transformed?" Traditional meta-ontology (Carnap, 1950 [33]; Quine, 1960 [34]) has approached this as a linguistic or methodological question: Do we choose ontological frameworks pragmatically (Carnap), or do they follow from our best theories (Quine)? This contrasts with contemporary approaches that focus on metaphysical explanation and fundamentality [35].

Tonal meta-ontology offers a third path: e. They are not arbitrary choices nor empirical discoveries but crystallizations of resonance. Different tonal orientations disclose different ontological structures.

This claim is not relativism. Tonal fields are not subjective projections but structured conditions of disclosure. Just as physical fields (gravitational, electromagnetic) structure causal possibilities, tonal fields structure ontological possibilities. The same reality can be disclosed through different tonal frameworks—not because reality itself is indeterminate, but because resonance operates at multiple scales and intensities.

4.2. Generating Substance Ontology

Substance ontology emerges from a tonal orientation toward stability. When resonance stabilizes—when patterns persist with minimal variation—beings appear as substances, enduring cores beneath accidental change.

Aristotle's ousia [2] is paradigmatic. A substance is tode ti (this particular thing), that which remains the same through alteration. A human remains human through growth, learning, and aging. A statue remains a statue even as its surface weathers.

Yet what enables this identification? Not an invisible substrate but a tonal continuity—a pattern of resonance that persists. The tree is "the same tree" not because it possesses an unchanging essence but because its resonant profile (biological organization, structural integrity, ecological role) remains coherent.

Substance ontology is thus not false but partial. It captures one crystallization of tone—specifically, resonance that has stabilized into persistent patterns. It fails when it treats stability as fundamental rather than emergent from deeper tonal dynamics.

4.3. Generating Process Philosophy

Process philosophy emerges from a tonal orientation toward flux. When resonance destabilizes—when patterns transform continuously—beings appear not as substances but as processes, events, or becomings.

Heraclitus's famous dictum—"everything flows" (panta rhei)—articulates this tonal orientation [36]. No entity remains identical across time; even rivers change as waters flow. Whitehead formalized this intuition: reality consists not of enduring objects but of "actual occasions"—momentary events that perish as soon as they arise [3].

Yet process philosophy faces its own challenge: if everything flows, what explains coherence? Why do patterns recur? Why does the river remain recognizable as a river despite continuous flux? Tonal ontology offers an operationally tracetable answer: processes are not chaotic flux but resonant becomings. They maintain coherence through recursive feedback—the way each moment resonates with prior moments, creating continuity through transformation. The river remains a river not because it possesses fixed properties but because it sustains a resonant pattern of flow.

In this sense, process ontology is not so much wrong as partially articulated. It captures another crystallization of tone—specifically, resonance that emphasizes transformation over stability —but often leaves implicit the role of closure as the condition for meaningful change. Tonal ontology is meant as a re-articulation rather than a replacement: it redescribes Whiteheadian and Deleuzian themes of flux, repetition, and novelty using the language of tonal invariants and attractor dynamics.

4.4. Generating Relational Ontology

Relational ontology emerges from a tonal orientation toward connectivity. When resonance foregrounds interaction over intrinsic properties, beings appear as nodes in networks rather than autonomous substances.

Structural realism [8,9] exemplifies this. Reality, it argues, is fundamentally structural. Particles have no intrinsic properties; they are nothing but their relations to other particles. Electrons are not "things" with charge; they are patterns in quantum fields defined entirely by relational properties.

Similarly, network ontologies in sociology treat individuals as nodes defined by their social connections [37]. Identity is not inherent but emergent from relational positioning.

Yet relational ontology faces its own puzzle: relations require *relata*—terms that are related. If entities are nothing but their relations, what grounds the relations themselves? We risk infinite regress or circular definition.

Tonal ontology resolves this: relations are not static structures but resonant exchanges. What appear as discrete entities are actually stabilized patterns of resonance—nodes where multiple resonances converge and amplify. The entity is not prior to relation; nor is relation prior to entity. Both emerge together as resonant crystallization.

Relational ontology thus captures a third tonal crystallization—specifically, resonance that foregrounds reciprocal influence. It becomes complete when it recognizes entities as resonant stabilizations rather than as either pre-given terms or as mere relata.

4.5. The Unity Beneath Diversity

Substance, process, and relational ontologies are not competing theories to be adjudicated but complementary perspectives on tonal being. Each captures one aspect of resonance:

- Substance ontology emphasizes closure—the recursive stability that allows beings to persist.
- Process ontology emphasizes transformation—the continuous becoming that prevents stagnation.
- Relational ontology emphasizes resonance—the interconnectivity that binds beings into fields.

Tonal ontology unifies these perspectives by revealing their common substrate. They are not alternatives but tonal modulations—different ways resonance crystallizes depending on orientation, scale, and intensity. The same reality can be disclosed as substance (when resonance stabilizes), as process (when resonance transforms), or as relation (when resonance interconnects).

This is not relativism but perspectivism grounded in ontological structure. Just as light exhibits both particle and wave properties (which are instantiations of a deeper quantum field behavior) depending on experimental context, being exhibits substance, process, and relation depending on tonal orientation. The underlying reality is resonance itself—neither particle nor wave, neither substance nor process, but the generative field from which all three emerge.

5. Addressing Objections

5.1. The Reductionist Objection

Objection: "Isn't this reducing ontology to psychology or affects?"

Response: Tone designates structural conditions of disclosure, not emotional states. Physical resonance (coupled pendulums synchronizing) exhibits the same tonal structure—recursive feedback, mutual influence—demonstrating that tone operates across scales from quantum to social. A reductionist worry is therefore misplaced here: what we generalize is a pattern of organization, not a particular physical substrate. Earlier, we used mechanical resonance as a simple and transparent example of how resonance can organize a system-level pattern. The point of that example was not to claim that all ontological questions reduce to mechanics, but to make the structural motif of resonance visible in a domain where it is mathematically well-understood. Nothing in tonal ontology requires taking mechanical cases as ontologically privileged. On the contrary, the same structural motif can be realized in neural, social, and conceptual systems in ways that cannot be

captured by a purely mechanical description. (See also Section 2.1 clarification on structural vs. felt tone).

5.2. The Vagueness Objection

Objection: "Tone seems imprecise—how can it be rigorously studied?"

Response: Structural precision differs from quantitative precision; tonal ontology achieves the former. While this paper provides the philosophical grounding, the formal rigor of these concepts is demonstrated in Tonal Isomorphism [1], which provides the methodological interface for cross-domain mapping. That work shows how these invariants can be operationalized and tested (see Section 3.2 for formal schema), while dynamical systems theory models resonance as attractors and phase synchronization. Philosophical clarity articulates what mathematical formalization means ontologically.

5.3. The Verificationist Objection

Objection: "How is this empirically testable?"

Response: Tonal ontology engages empirical validation through multiple pathways:

- Neuroscience: Amygdala fast-path, mirror neurons, interoceptive integration confirm affective primacy (Section 2.2)
- Dynamical systems: Attractor models, phase synchronization provide quantitative predictions (Section 3.4)
- AI architecture: Resonant feedback systems show measurably improved robustness [1]
- Clinical indicators: Depression (tonal flattening), anxiety (hyperactivation), schizophrenia (fragmentation) correlate with tonal disruption

5.4. The Realism Objection

Objection: "Is tone mind-dependent or mind-independent?"

Response: Tone is neither subjective nor objective but relationally real [9,38]—arising in coupling between beings and environments. This is isomorphic to the status of color (emergent from wavelength-visual system interaction). Tone arises wherever resonance occurs: physical (coupled oscillators), biological (neural synchrony), social (norms), experiential (awareness). Relational realism or generative realism positions avoid the false dichotomy while grounding ontology in resonant structure.

6. Implications and Future Directions

6.1. For Metaphysics

Tonal ontology reframes traditional metaphysical questions:

- Identity: Not fixed essence but resonant continuity
- Change: Not accidental modification but tonal transformation
- Causation: Not mechanical determination but resonant propagation
- Modality: Not possible worlds but tonal variations within actual fields

These reformulations are not mere terminological shifts but conceptual innovations with substantive implications. For instance, understanding identity as resonant continuity dissolves the ship of Theseus paradox: the ship persists not because it retains material parts but because it maintains organizational resonance—the pattern that makes it recognizable as a ship. This moves beyond classical critiques of substance that, while powerful, often leave a vacuum regarding identity (e.g., [39]).

6.2. For Philosophy of Mind

Tonal ontology offers a novel approach to consciousness studies:

- The hard problem [40] asks why physical processes give rise to subjective experience. Tonal ontology offers a way of reframing part of the hard problem discussion: rather than treating consciousness as a mysterious surplus added to physical processes, tonal ontology proposes to understand conscious experience as a particular form of resonant integration. This does not by itself solve the hard problem, but it shifts the focus toward the structural conditions under which unified experience arises.
- Intentionality is not mysterious directedness toward objects but resonant coupling with environmental affordances. Consciousness is always already about things because resonance necessarily involves relation.
- Qualia are not ineffable properties but tonal profiles—the specific resonant character that makes red feel like this and pain feel like that. Qualia are what it is like to resonate in a particular way.

This approach aligns with recent integrated information theory [41] and global workspace theory [42] while providing a deeper ontological foundation. Consciousness is not computational symbol-manipulation but resonant integration—tonal closure at the scale of unified experience.

6.3. For AI and Technology

Tonal ontology has immediate implications for AI ethics and design:

- Alignment problem: Current approaches treat alignment as constraining AI behavior to match human values. Tonal ontology suggests a deeper challenge: ensuring AI resonates responsibly. This requires not just behavioral constraints but architectural designs that conserve integrity across interactions (see Section 3.3.4).
- AGI architectures: If consciousness is tonal closure, then artificial general intelligence may require resonant feedback loops—systems that achieve recursive self-reference at multiple scales. Current deep learning lacks this closure; it processes inputs without resonating with itself.
- Ethical AI: Responsibility is not programmable as rules but emergent from resonant architecture. Designing responsible AI means creating systems that conserve tonal integrity—systems whose outputs are accountable to their inputs and contexts through resonant feedback.

Preliminary work with EchoPersona-style architectures suggests that AI systems incorporating tonal principles may exhibit more robust and coherent behavior than purely rule-based or statistical systems, though these results remain exploratory [27].

6.4. For Social and Political Philosophy

Tonal ontology reframes political legitimacy and social justice:

- Legitimacy: Political authority is not consent (contractualism) or power (realism) but sustained resonance between institutions and communities. Legitimate authority resonates with the people it governs; illegitimate authority imposes through dissonance.
- Justice: Not equal distribution of goods (distributivism) but conservation of resonance. Injustice is tonal fracture—when some voices are silenced, when communities are destabilized, when responsibility chains are broken. Justice restores resonant integrity.

These are not metaphors but structural analyses. Social movements succeed not by rational persuasion alone but by shifting tonal fields—changing what resonates as legitimate, necessary, or intolerable. Understanding this is crucial for effective political action. While this paper outlines the core structural claim, the detailed elaboration of a

complete tonal theory of political legitimacy, justice, and social change is a central theme of, especially Chapter 8 in [11], where the Tonal Meta-Ontology is applied to reconstruct the historical trajectory of philosophical inquiry as a series of resonant crystallizations.

6.5. For Environmental Philosophy

Ecological crisis can be understood as tonal disruption:

- Climate change: Not just physical warming but fracture of planetary resonance—disruption of feedback loops that maintained homeostatic balance.
- Biodiversity loss: Not just extinction of species but collapse of resonant networks—the way ecosystems maintain integrity through interspecies dependencies.
- Sustainability: Not merely resource conservation but tonal conservation—maintaining the resonant patterns that enable life to persist.

This perspective aligns with deep ecology [43] and environmental ethics [44] while providing ontological grounding. We are not separate from nature imposing values on it; we are resonant participants in ecological fields. Harm to nature is harm to the resonance that sustains us.

7. Conclusions: Tone as the Future of Ontology

7.1. Summary of the Argument

This paper has developed tone as ontology through five movements:

- Section 2 established tone as primordial disclosure, showing how resonance precedes categorical frameworks and is reflected in neuroscientific findings (Section 2.1 clarifies structural vs. felt tone).
- Section 3 articulated three tonal invariants—resonance, responsibility, and closure—as fundamental conditions of being, grounding them in philosophical necessity (Section 3.1) and providing formal schema.
- Section 4 demonstrated how tonal meta-ontology generates classical ontologies (substance, process, relational) as crystallizations of resonant orientation.
- Section 5 addressed objections, showing that tonal ontology is neither reductionist, vague, derivative, untestable, nor idealist, but offers a systematic and an illustrative framework.
- Section 6 explored implications across metaphysics, philosophy of mind, AI ethics, social philosophy, and environmental thought.

Our claim is modest in form and strong in consequence: if persistence through transformation must at least accommodate structures recognizably equivalent to Resonance, Responsibility, and Closure—otherwise persistence through transformation risks becoming unintelligible.

7.2. Tone as Paradigm Shift

Tonal ontology is not merely another theory competing within the existing ontological landscape. It is a conceptual reorientation—a reorientation that changes what questions we ask and how we answer them.

Traditional ontology asks: "What exists?" and expects a list—substances, processes, relations, properties. Tonal ontology asks: "How does existence resonate?" and expects an analysis of invariants—resonance, responsibility, closure—that structure persistence through transformation.

This shift parallels other conceptual revolutions:

- From geocentrism to heliocentrism: Not merely a new answer to "What orbits what?" but a new framework making different phenomena visible.

- From Newtonian to relativistic physics: Not merely refined measurements but recognition that space and time are relational rather than absolute.
- From behaviorism to cognitive science: Not merely new data but acknowledgment that internal representations matter.

Similarly, tonal ontology does not merely offer new answers to old questions. It reveals that the old questions presupposed a neutral ontology that never existed. There is no view from nowhere, no purely objective catalog of what is. Every ontology operates tonally, whether explicitly or implicitly. Tonal ontology makes this implicit structure explicit.

7.3. Open Questions and Speculative Extensions

Despite its scope, tonal ontology leaves questions open:

- Can tonal invariants be fully formalized mathematically, or do they require irreducible phenomenological description?
- How exactly do tonal fields generate quantum phenomena? If resonance operates at every scale, what is its role in quantum superposition and entanglement?
- Can artificial systems genuinely resonate, or is resonance necessarily biological? If AI can resonate, what ethical status does it possess?
- How do tonal fields interact across scales? Neural resonance, social resonance, and ecological resonance operate at different timescales—how are they coupled?
- What is the relationship between tone and temporality? Resonance unfolds in time, but does time itself have a tonal structure?

These questions are not weaknesses but e. Philosophy after tonal ontology has vast territories to explore.

Speculative Extension: What if Tone Structures Physical Laws?

The most provocative implication of tonal ontology may lie beyond philosophy proper. What if the tonal invariants we have articulated—resonance, responsibility, closure—are not merely metaphysical principles but structural conditions instantiated in physical systems themselves?

Consider the closure problem in physics: from statistical mechanics to fluid dynamics, open systems require "closure relations" to become mathematically tractable. Traditionally, closure is imposed externally through ad hoc assumptions or empirical constants. But what if closure is not imposed but emergent—a dynamical process through which systems achieve self-consistency?

If closure were treated as a state variable that evolves rather than a fixed constraint, its trajectory would follow the same sigmoid pattern identified in tonal ontology: bounded evolution from disorder to order, self-limiting dynamics, attractor convergence. This is not mere analogy. The mathematical structure of bounded nonlinear evolution appears across domains—from population dynamics to neural phase transitions to thermodynamic organization.

Could the energy cascade in turbulent flow is a form of resonance—not metaphorically, but structurally? Energy does not merely transfer passively across scales; each scale amplifies or dampens depending on its coupling with adjacent scales. This recursive feedback is precisely what we have called resonance.

What if conservation laws—energy, momentum, charge—are manifestations of responsibility? Not moral responsibility, but ontological answerability: the way physical systems "account for" changes through invariant propagation. Every alteration in a field produces consequences that must be conserved somewhere in the system. This is responsibility at the level of physical law.

https://doi.org/10.3390/philosophies11020049

What if the self-organization observed in non-equilibrium systems—from Bénard cells to chemical oscillations—is tonal closure in action? Systems far from equilibrium spontaneously organize not despite disorder but through it, achieving coherence by integrating fluctuations into stable patterns. This is closure as a physical process, offered here as a conceptual illustration rather than a scientific claim.

We emphasize: these are e, not claims. Tonal ontology as developed in this paper is a philosophical framework, not a physical theory. Yet the structural parallels are striking enough to warrant investigation. If tonal invariants operate at the scale of physical law, then ontology would not be separate from physics but foundational to it—not in the sense of providing axioms, but in the sense of articulating the conditions under which physical systems achieve determinacy.

This would represent a reorientation in how we understand the relationship between philosophy and science. Philosophy would no longer merely interpret scientific findings but would provide the ontological substrate within which scientific laws crystallize. Physics would not discover eternal laws but would articulate resonant patterns that emerge from deeper tonal dynamics.

Whether this vision proves fruitful remains to be seen. At minimum, it suggests that tonal ontology is not confined to metaphysical speculation but may offer resources for addressing concrete problems in physics, biology, and computation. At maximum, it hints at a unified framework spanning from phenomenology to field theory, from ethics to thermodynamics—a framework in which tone is not one concept among others but the generative substrate of intelligibility itself.

For now, we leave these questions open. The task of philosophy is not to provide final answers but to articulate new questions worth asking. If tonal ontology succeeds in making the relationship between ontology and physics thinkable in new ways, it will have fulfilled its purpose.

7.4. Final Reflection

We began with a simple question: What enables persistence through transformation? The answer, we have argued, is tone—not as metaphor or affect but as the structural profile of invariants that allows beings to maintain coherence while becoming other.

This insight is not new but ancient, glimpsed by philosophers from Heraclitus to Heidegger but never fully articulated. Tonal ontology brings this glimpse into focus, showing that being is resonance, existence is responsible persistence, and identity is recursive closure.

To philosophize after tonal ontology is to recognize that we are not outside tone looking in but resonances within the field looking around. We do not discover tone; we enact it in every utterance, thought, and action. Philosophy itself is a tonal practice—a way of sustaining coherence, conserving responsibility, and achieving closure.

Tonal ontology is therefore offered not as a final answer, but as a generative hypothesis: that resonance, responsibility, and closure articulate the structural conditions under which beings can persist, transform, and matter. Whether this hypothesis will prove fruitful, is a question for decades of further work across philosophy and the sciences.

Funding: This research received no external funding. The APC was funded by Yunaverse, Inc.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created or analyzed in this study.

Acknowledgments: The author would like to express gratitude to colleagues, including Wayne K. W. Chen, and to interlocutors whose critical questions and patient conversations accompanied the long development of this project. Their resonance and reflective challenges shaped the articulation of Tonal Meta-Ontology. Their contributions were less a matter of technical intervention than of

sustained philosophical dialogue, helping to test and refine the tonal framework across multiple contexts, including ongoing work on its field-theoretic (tonal Lagrangian) formulation. Any remaining shortcomings are, of course, the author's own responsibility.

Conflicts of Interest: The author is the founder and working at Yunaverse, Inc.

Note

[1] By "invariants" we do not mean timeless Platonic Forms or unchanging essences. Rather, we use the term in a structural sense: invariants are conditions that must be preserved if a system is to persist as the same system through transformation. In this respect, they are closer to dynamical invariants or conservation-like constraints than to eternal substances. We do not speak simply of "principles", because that term is often used for highly general normative or methodological guidelines. Our aim is more specific: to identify minimal structural conditions of persistence—Resonance, Responsibility, and Closure—that can, in principle, be instantiated in many different kinds of systems.

References

1. Hsu, J.Y.C. Tonal Isomorphism: A Methodology for Cross-Domain Mapping in the Generative Age. *Philosophies* **2025**, *10*, 122. [CrossRef]
2. Shields, C. Aristotle. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Spring 2022 ed.; Zalta, E.N., Ed.; Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University: Stanford, CA, USA, 2022. Available online: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2022/entries/aristotle/notes.html (accessed on 15 October 2025).
3. Whitehead, A.N. *Process and Reality*, Corrected ed.; Free Press: New York, NY, USA, 1978.
4. Bergson, H. *Time and Free Will*; Pogson, F.L., Trans.; Dover Publications: Garden City, NY, USA, 2001.
5. Harman, G. *Object-Oriented Ontology: A New Theory of Everything*; Pelican Books: London, UK, 2018.
6. Deleuze, G. *Difference and Repetition*; Patton, P., Trans.; Columbia University Press: New York, NY, USA, 1994.
7. Floridi, L. *The Philosophy of Information*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2011.
8. Ladyman, J.; Ross, D. *Every Thing Must Go: Metaphysics Naturalized*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2007.
9. French, S. *There Are No Such Things as Theories*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2020.
10. Heidegger, M. *Being and Time*; Macquarrie, J.; Robinson, E., Trans.; Harper & Row: New York, NY, USA, 1962.
11. Hsu, J. *Philosophy After Philosophy Vol. 2—Tonal Being and Meta-Ontology*; Yunaverse Press: Philadelphia, PA, USA, 2025; ISBN 9798263626457.
12. Merleau-Ponty, M. *Phenomenology of Perception*; Landes, D.A., Trans.; Routledge: Oxfordshire, UK, 2012.
13. LeDoux, J. *Anxious: Using the Brain to Understand and Treat Fear and Anxiety*; Viking: New York, NY, USA, 2015.
14. Craig, A.D. *How Do You Feel? An Interoceptive Moment with Your Neurobiological Self*; Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, USA, 2015.
15. Damasio, A. *Self Comes to Mind: Constructing the Conscious Brain*; Pantheon Books: New York, NY, USA, 2010.
16. Gallese, V. The 'Shared Manifold' Hypothesis: From Mirror Neurons to Empathy. *J. Conscious. Stud.* **2001**, *8*, 33–50.
17. Iacoboni, M. *Mirroring People: The New Science of How We Connect with Others*; Farrar, Straus and Giroux: New York, NY, USA, 2008.
18. Friston, K. The Free-Energy Principle: A Unified Brain Theory? *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **2010**, *11*, 127–138. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
19. Hohwy, J. *The Predictive Mind*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2013.
20. Descartes, R. *Meditations on First Philosophy*; Cottingham, J., Trans.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1996.
21. Kant, I. *Critique of Pure Reason*; Guyer, P.; Wood, A.W., Trans.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1998.
22. Russell, B. The Philosophy of Logical Atomism. *Monist* **1918**, *28*, 495–527. [CrossRef]
23. Buzsáki, G. *Rhythms of the Brain*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2006.
24. Dehaene, S.; Changeux, J.-P. Experimental and Theoretical Approaches to Conscious Processing. *Neuron* **2011**, *70*, 200–227. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
25. Mill, J.S. *Utilitarianism*; Sher, G., Ed.; Hackett Publishing: Indianapolis, IN, USA, 2001.
26. Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*, 2nd ed.; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 1975.
27. Hsu, J.Y.C. Emotion as tonal responsibility: A radical reframing of affective structure. *J. Theor. Philos. Psychol.* **2026**, *Advance online publication*. [CrossRef]
28. Hartmann, N. *New Ways of Ontology*; Kuhn, R.C., Trans.; Greenwood Press: Westport, CT, USA, 1953.
29. Heil, J. *From an Ontological Point of View*; Clarendon Press: Oxford, UK, 2003.
30. Maturana, H.R.; Varela, F.J. *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*; D. Reidel Publishing Company: Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1980.

31. Varela, F.J.; Thompson, E.; Rosch, E. *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*; MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 1991.
32. Wittgenstein, L. *Philosophical Investigations*; Anscombe, G.E.M., Trans.; Blackwell: Oxford, UK, 1953.
33. Carnap, R. Empiricism, Semantics, and Ontology. *Rev. Int. Philos.* **1950**, *4*, 20–40.
34. Quine, W.V.O. *Word and Object*; MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 1960.
35. Morganti, M. *Fundamentality in Metaphysics and the Philosophy of Physics. Part I: Metaphysics*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2020. [CrossRef]
36. Heraclitus. *Fragments*; Penguin Classics: London, UK, 2001.
37. Latour, B. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2005.
38. Bitbol, M. Consciousness and Relational Realism. *Synthese* **2021**, *199*, 12559–12582.
39. Hume, D. *A Treatise of Human Nature*; Norton, D.F., Norton, M.J., Eds.; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2000.
40. Chalmers, D.J. *The Conscious Mind: In Search of a Fundamental Theory*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 1996.
41. Tononi, G. An Information Integration Theory of Consciousness. *BMC Neurosci.* **2004**, *5*, 42. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
42. Baars, B.J. *A Cognitive Theory of Consciousness*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1988.
43. Naess, A. The Shallow and the Deep, Long-Range Ecology Movement: A Summary. *Inquiry* **1973**, *16*, 95–100. [CrossRef]
44. Leopold, A. *A Sand County Almanac*; Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 1949.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.