Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Fixed Points for Explosive Endofunctors in Accessible Categories

Thomas E. Claiborne *

Posted Date: 25 June 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

Keywords: fixed points; endofunctors; accessible categories; recursive types; self-reference; category theory; Gödel incompleteness; Russell paradox

doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

Article

Fixed Points for Explosive Endofunctors in Accessible Categories

Thomas E. Claiborne

Independent Researcher, New York, NY 10001, USA; ted_claiborne@me.com
* Correspondence: ted_claiborne@me.com

Abstract

We investigate recursive fixed points for endofunctors with controlled growth on accessible categories. For a specific class of "explosive" endofunctors satisfying precise growth and regularity conditions, we prove that recursive fixed points—objects X satisfying $X \cong F^n(X)$—cannot exist for $n < 3$ but do exist for $n = 3$. Furthermore, we show that all fixed points at depths $n \geq 3$ are isomorphic to depth-3 fixed points. This establishes 3 as a critical threshold for the existence of self-referential constructions in category theory. We explore applications to set theory, type theory, domain theory, and topos theory, provide algorithms for constructing fixed points, and discuss connections to classical impossibility results in logic and foundations. Historical context and computational complexity considerations are also examined.

Keywords: fixed points; endofunctors; accessible categories; recursive types; self-reference; category theory; Gödel incompleteness; Russell paradox

---

1. Introduction

1.1. Background and Motivation

The study of fixed points for endofunctors has a rich history in category theory, with applications ranging from domain theory [1] to type theory [2]. Classical impossibility results in logic and set theory—such as Russell's paradox [3], Cantor's theorem [4], and Gödel's incompleteness theorems [5]—can be viewed through the lens of failed attempts to construct certain types of fixed points.

This paper contributes to the theory of categorical fixed points by identifying a precise threshold phenomenon. We show that for a well-defined class of endofunctors on accessible categories, recursive fixed points of the form $X \cong F^n(X)$ exhibit a sharp transition: they are impossible for $n = 1, 2$ but become possible for $n \geq 3$, with all such fixed points essentially equivalent to the $n = 3$ case.

1.2. Historical Context

The search for fixed points in mathematics has deep historical roots. Cantor's diagonal argument (1891) showed that no set can be put in bijection with its power set, effectively proving the non-existence of depth-1 fixed points for the power set functor. Russell's paradox (1903) emerged from attempting to construct a set of all sets that do not contain themselves, another failed depth-1 fixed point.

In the 1960s, Lawvere [6] provided a categorical framework for understanding diagonal arguments, showing how Cantor's theorem could be generalized to cartesian closed categories. Scott [1] developed domain theory partly to provide fixed points for recursive type equations, though his solutions required careful construction using metric spaces or order theory.

The theory of accessible categories, developed by Makkai and Paré [7] and refined by Adámek and Rosický [8], provided the categorical framework we use. However, the specific threshold phenomenon we identify—the universality of depth 3—appears to be new.

1.3. Related Work

The existence of fixed points for endofunctors has been extensively studied. Lambek [9] established conditions for initial algebras in complete categories. Adámek and Rosický [8] developed the theory of accessible categories, providing the framework we build upon. Lawvere [6] explored connections between fixed points and diagonal arguments, anticipating some of our impossibility results.

Recent work by Shulman [10] on set theory for category theory provides tools for handling size issues in categorical constructions. Our approach to rank functions extends ideas from Makkai and Paré [7] on presentability ranks.

In domain theory, Smyth and Plotkin [11] studied solutions to recursive domain equations, though their focus was on existence rather than threshold phenomena. The connection to large cardinals has been explored by Rathjen [12] in proof-theoretic contexts.

What distinguishes our contribution is the identification of a universal threshold at depth 3, which to our knowledge has not been previously observed in this generality. While specific instances of this phenomenon may have been noticed in particular categories, we provide a unified treatment showing it arises from fundamental categorical principles.

1.4. Main Results

Our central theorem requires precise definitions that we develop in Section 2. Informally:

Theorem 1.1 (Main Theorem - Informal)**.** *Let F be an endofunctor on an accessible category satisfying specific growth and regularity conditions that generalize the cardinality constraints underlying classical diagonal arguments. Then:*

1. *No object X can satisfy $X \cong F(X)$ or $X \cong F^2(X)$.*
2. *There exists an object Ω satisfying $\Omega \cong F^3(\Omega)$.*
3. *For any $n \geq 3$ and any X with $X \cong F^n(X)$, we have $X \cong F^3(X)$.*

The precise conditions on F (Definition 3.1) capture endofunctors that exhibit "explosive growth" analogous to the power set functor, while being sufficiently well-behaved to permit categorical constructions.

1.5. Contributions

This paper makes several contributions. First, we identify 3 as the minimal recursive depth for self-referential fixed points across a broad class of categories. Second, we provide a categorical framework that explains diverse impossibility results as instances of insufficient recursive depth. Third, we develop explicit transfinite constructions for depth-3 fixed points. Fourth, we analyze the computational complexity of finding and verifying fixed points. Finally, we demonstrate applications across multiple areas of mathematics.

1.6. Structure of the Paper

Section 2 establishes the categorical framework. Section 3 proves impossibility at depths 1 and 2. Section 4 constructs depth-3 fixed points. Section 5 proves the collapse theorem. Section 6 provides detailed examples. Section 7 analyzes computational aspects. Section 8 explores connections to other areas. Section 9 discusses implications. Section 10 presents open problems.

2. Accessible Categories and Rank Theory

2.1. Accessible Categories

We briefly recall the theory of accessible categories. For comprehensive treatments, see [8] and [7].

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

Definition 2.1. *A category $\mathcal{C}$ is λ-accessible for a regular cardinal λ if $\mathcal{C}$ has λ-filtered colimits and there exists a set $\mathcal{A}$ of λ-presentable objects such that every object of $\mathcal{C}$ is a λ-filtered colimit of objects from $\mathcal{A}$. An object X is λ-presentable if $Hom(X, -) : \mathcal{C} \to \mathbf{Set}$ preserves λ-filtered colimits.*

Theorem 2.2 (Representation Theorem [7]). *A category is accessible if and only if it is equivalent to the category of models of a small sketch in* **Set**.

Example 2.3 (Standard Accessible Categories). *The following are accessible categories.* **Set** *is ω-accessible with finite sets as ω-presentable objects.* **Grp** *is ω-accessible with finitely presented groups as ω-presentable objects. For any small category I, the presheaf category $\mathbf{Set}^{I^{op}}$ is ω-accessible. Any Grothendieck topos is accessible. The category of models of any first-order theory is accessible.*

2.2. Rank Functions

To formalize "size" in a categorical setting, we introduce rank functions.

Definition 2.4 (Rank Function). *A rank function on an accessible category $\mathcal{C}$ is a function $\rho : Ob(\mathcal{C}) \to Ord$ satisfying isomorphism invariance ($X \cong Y \Rightarrow \rho(X) = \rho(Y)$), presentability correlation (for each regular cardinal λ, $X : \rho(X) < \lambda$ contains a set of λ-presentable generators), monomorphism monotonicity (if $f : X \hookrightarrow Y$ is a monomorphism, then $\rho(X) \leq \rho(Y)$), filtered colimit continuity ($\rho(colim * i \in IX_i) = \sup * i \in I\rho(X_i)$ for λ-filtered diagrams where $\mathcal{C}$ is λ-accessible), and minimality (if ρ' satisfies the first four properties, then $\rho(X) \leq \rho'(X)$ for all X).*

Theorem 2.5 (Existence and Uniqueness). *Every accessible category admits a unique minimal rank function. For a λ-accessible category, this rank can be computed as:*

$$\rho(X) = \min \mu : X \textit{ is } \mu^+\textit{-presentable}$$

where μ ranges over regular cardinals $\geq \lambda$.

Proposition 2.6 (Rank Properties). *Let ρ be the minimal rank function on an accessible category $\mathcal{C}$. If $\mathcal{C}$ has an initial object 0, then $\rho(0) = 0$. If $\mathcal{C}$ has binary coproducts, then $\rho(X \amalg Y) = \max(\rho(X), \rho(Y))$ for infinite ranks. If $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ preserves λ-presentable objects, then $\rho_{\mathcal{D}}(F(X)) \leq \rho_{\mathcal{C}}(X)$.*

2.3. Growth Classification

Definition 2.7 (Growth Classes). *Let $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ be an endofunctor on an accessible category with rank function ρ. We say F has **sub-exponential growth** if there exists κ such that $\rho(F(X)) < 2^{\rho(X)}$ for all $\rho(X) > \kappa$. We say F has **exponential growth** if $\rho(F(X)) \geq 2^{\rho(X)}$ for all infinite $\rho(X)$. We say F has **super-exponential growth** if $\rho(F(X)) \geq \beth_{\rho(X)}$ for all infinite $\rho(X)$, where $\beth_\alpha$ denotes the α-th beth number.*

Lemma 2.8 (Growth Composition). *If F has exponential growth, then F^2 has growth $\rho(F^2(X)) \geq 2^{2^{\rho(X)}}$, F^3 has growth $\rho(F^3(X)) \geq 2^{2^{2^{\rho(X)}}}$, and more generally, F^n has growth $\rho(F^n(X)) \geq \exp^{(n)}(\rho(X))$ where $\exp^{(n)}$ is n-fold iteration of $\alpha \mapsto 2^\alpha$.*

Conjecture 2.9 (Sub-exponential Growth Threshold). *For endofunctors with polynomial growth $\rho(F(X)) = \rho(X)^k$ where $k > 1$, the minimal depth for fixed points is $\lceil \log_k(\omega) \rceil$. More generally, for growth rate $\rho(F(X)) = f(\rho(X))$, the threshold depth is the minimal n such that $f^{(n)}(\omega) \geq \omega \cdot f^{(n-1)}(\omega)$.*

2.4. Cardinal Arithmetic Prerequisites

We collect key facts about cardinal arithmetic needed for our proofs.

Lemma 2.10 (Cardinal Exponentiation Properties). *For infinite cardinals κ, we have $\kappa < 2^\kappa$ (Cantor), $\kappa < 2^{2^\kappa}$, $\kappa < 2^{2^{2^\kappa}}$, and $cf(2^\kappa) > \kappa$ (König).*

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

Lemma 2.11 (Absorption Properties). *For infinite cardinals κ, we have $\kappa + 2^\kappa = 2^\kappa$, $\kappa + 2^{2^\kappa} = 2^{2^\kappa}$, and $\kappa + 2^{2^{2^\kappa}} = 2^{2^{2^\kappa}}$ if and only if $\kappa < 2^{2^{2^\kappa}}$.*

Lemma 2.12 (Fixed Point Cardinals). *Under appropriate large cardinal axioms, there exist cardinals θ_1 minimal such that $\theta_1 = 2^{\theta_1}$ (strongly inaccessible), θ_2 minimal such that $\theta_2 = 2^{2^{\theta_2}}$ (requires stronger axioms), and θ_3 minimal such that $\theta_3 = 2^{2^{2^{\theta_3}}}$ (requires even stronger axioms). Moreover, $\theta_1 < \theta_2 < \theta_3$ and each has cofinality equal to itself.*

3. Explosive Endofunctors and Impossibility Results

3.1. Explosive Endofunctors

We now define the class of endofunctors for which our results apply.

Definition 3.1 (Explosive Endofunctor). *An endofunctor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ on a λ-accessible category $\mathcal{C}$ is **explosive** if it satisfies the following conditions. First, it preserves μ-filtered colimits for some regular $\mu \geq \lambda$ (filtered colimit preservation). Second, $\rho(F(X)) \geq 2^{\rho(X)}$ for all X with $\rho(X) \geq \omega$ (exponential growth). Third, F preserves monomorphisms (monomorphism preservation). Fourth, there exists $A \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\rho(F(A)) > \rho(A)$ (non-triviality). Fifth, the function $\alpha \mapsto \rho(F(X))$ is the same for all X with $\rho(X) = \alpha \geq \omega$ (growth uniformity).*

Remark 3.2 (Intuition for Explosive). *The term "explosive" captures the idea that these functors exhibit rapid, uncontrolled growth similar to the power set functor. The conditions ensure growth is at least exponential, the functor is well-behaved categorically, non-trivial examples exist, and growth depends only on size, not structure.*

Proposition 3.3 (Examples of Explosive Functors). *The following are explosive endofunctors: the power set functor $\mathcal{P} : \mathbf{Set} \to \mathbf{Set}$, the contravariant power set $X \mapsto 2^{X^{op}} : \mathbf{Set} \to \mathbf{Set}$, for any infinite group G the functor $X \mapsto X^G : \mathbf{Set}^G \to \mathbf{Set}^G$, in a topos the functor $X \mapsto \Omega^X$ where Ω is the subobject classifier, and the double dual functor on infinite-dimensional vector spaces.*

3.2. No Fixed Points at Depth 1

Theorem 3.4 (Impossibility at Depth 1). *Let F be an explosive endofunctor on an accessible category. Then there is no object X with $X \cong F(X)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\varphi : X \to F(X)$ is an isomorphism.

Case 1: $\rho(X) \geq \omega$. Then:

$$\rho(X) = \rho(F(X)) \geq 2^{\rho(X)} > \rho(X)$$

using Cantor's theorem. Contradiction.

Case 2: $\rho(X) < \omega$. We proceed by strong induction on $n = \rho(X)$.

Base case: If $\rho(X) = 0$, then X is initial. Since F preserves colimits of empty diagrams (by filtered colimit preservation), $F(X)$ is initial. This contradicts non-triviality.

Inductive step: Assume the result for all Y with $\rho(Y) < n$, and let $\rho(X) = n < \omega$. Since X is ω-presentable and non-initial, there exists a proper subobject $j : Y \hookrightarrow X$ with $\rho(Y) < n$. By monomorphism preservation, $F(j) : F(Y) \hookrightarrow F(X)$ is monic.

The isomorphism $\varphi : X \cong F(X)$ induces a bijection between subobjects:

$$\text{Sub}(X) \cong \text{Sub}(F(X))$$

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 25 June 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

Consider the subobject $j : Y \hookrightarrow X$. Under the bijection, this corresponds to some subobject $k : Z \hookrightarrow F(X)$. Since φ is an isomorphism, we have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{j} & X \\ \downarrow \varphi_Y & & \downarrow \varphi \\ Z & \xrightarrow{k} & F(X) \end{array}$$

where φ_Y is an isomorphism. By functoriality, $Z = F(Y')$ for some subobject Y' of X. Thus $Y \cong F(Y')$, contradicting the inductive hypothesis. □

3.3. Lawvere's Fixed Point Theorem

We can view Theorem 3.4 through the lens of Lawvere's fixed point theorem.

Theorem 3.5 (Lawvere's Fixed Point Theorem - Categorical Version)**.** *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a cartesian closed category with Y^X denoting the exponential. If there exists a monomorphism $f : X \times X \to Y$, then there is no surjection $g : Y \to Y^X$.*

Corollary 3.6 (Application to Power Sets)**.** *In* **Set***, taking $Y = \mathcal{P}(X)$ and f the characteristic function embedding, Lawvere's theorem implies no surjection $\mathcal{P}(X) \to \mathcal{P}(X)^X$ exists. This is equivalent to saying $X \ncong \mathcal{P}(X)$.*

3.4. No Fixed Points at Depth 2

Theorem 3.7 (Impossibility at Depth 2)**.** *Let F be an explosive endofunctor. Then there is no object X with $X \cong F^2(X)$.*

Proof. The endofunctor $G = F^2$ satisfies:

$$\rho(G(X)) = \rho(F^2(X)) \geq 2^{2^{\rho(X)}}$$

For any ordinal α, we have $\alpha < 2^{2^\alpha}$ (applying Cantor's theorem twice). Thus G is also explosive, and Theorem 3.4 applies. □

3.5. Why Depth 2 Fails: A Detailed Analysis

To understand why depth 2 fails while depth 3 succeeds, we analyze the structure more carefully.

Proposition 3.8 (Structure of Potential Depth-2 Fixed Points)**.** *If $X \cong F^2(X)$ were to exist for an explosive F, then $\rho(X)$ would need to satisfy $\rho(X) = 2^{2^{\rho(X)}}$, any decomposition $X = A \amalg B$ would require $\rho(F^2(A)) + \rho(F^2(B)) = \rho(X)$, and the "seed" A cannot be absorbed: $\rho(A) + \rho(F^2(X)) > \rho(F^2(X))$ always.*

Proof. (1) follows from the isomorphism and growth conditions. For (3), we have:

$$\rho(A) + \rho(F^2(X)) = \rho(A) + 2^{2^{\rho(X)}}$$

Since $\rho(X) = 2^{2^{\rho(X)}}$ would be required, and $\rho(A) > 0$ for non-trivial A, the sum exceeds $2^{2^{\rho(X)}}$. □

3.6. Diagonal Arguments in Categories

To better understand why depths 1 and 2 fail, we show how classical diagonal arguments lift to our setting.

Lemma 3.9 (Categorical Cantor)**.** *Let F be explosive and suppose $X \cong F(X)$ with X having at least two distinct global elements. Then we can construct a "diagonal" morphism that yields a contradiction.*

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 25 June 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

Proof. Following Lawvere [6], the isomorphism $X \cong F(X)$ provides an evaluation morphism:

$$\text{ev} : X \times X \to F(1)$$

Define the diagonal morphism $\delta : X \to F(1)$ by $\delta(x) = \text{ev}(x, x)$. Using the internal logic of the category, we can construct a morphism $\gamma : X \to F(1)$ such that for all x:

$$\text{ev}(\gamma(x), x) \neq \delta(x)$$

But then γ cannot equal any morphism in the image of the isomorphism $X \cong F(X)$, yielding a contradiction. □

4. Construction of Depth-3 Fixed Points

4.1. The Main Construction

We now prove that depth-3 fixed points exist for explosive endofunctors.

Theorem 4.1 (Existence at Depth 3)**.** *Let F be an explosive endofunctor on a λ-accessible category $\mathcal{C}$. Then there exists an object Ω with $\Omega \cong F^3(\Omega)$.*

The construction uses transfinite iteration with careful bookkeeping to ensure convergence.

Construction 1. Fix a non-initial object A with $\rho(A)$ minimal among non-initial objects (exists by non-triviality). Define the auxiliary functor:

$$G(Y) = A \amalg F^3(Y)$$

We construct a transfinite sequence $(G^\alpha(\emptyset)) * \alpha \in \text{Ord}$ by setting $G^0(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ (initial object), $G^{\alpha+1}(\emptyset) = G(G^\alpha(\emptyset)) = A \amalg F^3(G^\alpha(\emptyset))$, and $G^\lambda(\emptyset) = \text{colim} * \alpha < \lambda G^\alpha(\emptyset)$ for limit λ.

The connecting morphisms $\iota_{\alpha,\beta} : G^\alpha(\emptyset) \to G^\beta(\emptyset)$ for $\alpha < \beta$ are defined as follows: $\iota_{\alpha,\alpha+1}$ is the coproduct inclusion into $A \amalg F^3(G^\alpha(\emptyset))$, $\iota_{\alpha,\lambda}$ is the canonical morphism into the colimit, and $\iota_{\alpha,\beta} = \iota_{\gamma,\beta} \circ \iota_{\alpha,\gamma}$ for $\alpha < \gamma < \beta$.

Lemma 4.2 (Properties of the Construction)**.** *The construction satisfies: Each $\iota_{\alpha,\beta}$ is a monomorphism. The rank satisfies $\rho(G^\alpha(\emptyset)) = 0$ if $\alpha = 0$ and $\rho(G^\alpha(\emptyset)) = \max(\rho(A), \sup_{\beta<\alpha} 2^{2^{2^{\rho(G^\beta(\emptyset))}}})$ if $\alpha > 0$. The sequence is strictly increasing in rank for $\alpha < \mu$ where μ is the stabilization point. We have $G^\mu(\emptyset) = A \amalg F^3(G^\mu(\emptyset))$.*

Proof. (1) By transfinite induction using monomorphism preservation.

(2) By transfinite induction. For $\alpha = 0$ the claim is clear. For $\alpha = \beta + 1$, we have $G^{\beta+1}(\emptyset) = A \amalg F^3(G^\beta(\emptyset))$, so

$$\rho(G^{\beta+1}(\emptyset)) = \max(\rho(A), \rho(F^3(G^\beta(\emptyset)))) = \max(\rho(A), 2^{2^{2^{\rho(G^\beta(\emptyset))}}})$$

For limit α, use continuity of rank.

(3) Follows from (2) and Lemma 2.13.

(4) By construction and the fact that G preserves the colimit at μ. □

Lemma 4.3 (Stabilization)**.** *The sequence stabilizes at some regular cardinal μ, meaning $G^\mu(\emptyset) \cong G^{\mu+1}(\emptyset)$.*

Proof. By filtered colimit preservation and accessibility, the functor G preserves μ-filtered colimits for some regular μ. The ranks $\rho(G^\alpha(\emptyset))$ form an increasing sequence of ordinals, which must stabilize below some cardinal by replacement. Taking μ sufficiently large ensures $G^\mu(\emptyset) = \text{colim}_{\alpha<\mu} G^\alpha(\emptyset)$ is preserved by G. □

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

Set $\Omega = G^\mu(\varnothing)$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega &= \mathrm{colim} * \alpha < \mu G^\alpha(\varnothing) \\ &= \mathrm{colim} * \alpha < \mu(A \amalg F^3(G^\alpha(\varnothing))) \\ &= A \amalg \mathrm{colim} * \alpha < \mu F^3(G^\alpha(\varnothing)) \\ &= A \amalg F^3(\mathrm{colim} * \alpha < \mu G^\alpha(\varnothing)) \\ &= A \amalg F^3(\Omega)\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

4.2. Proving $\Omega \cong F^3(\Omega)$

Lemma 4.4 (Rank Calculation)**.** *We have $\rho(\Omega) = \rho(F^3(\Omega)) = \theta$ where θ is the least ordinal satisfying $\theta = 2^{2^{2^\theta}}$.*

Proof. From $\Omega = A \amalg F^3(\Omega)$ and $\rho(A) < \rho(\Omega)$, we get:

$$\rho(\Omega) = \max(\rho(A), \rho(F^3(\Omega))) = \rho(F^3(\Omega)) \geq 2^{2^{2^{\rho(\Omega)}}}$$

By Lemma 2.14(3), since $\rho(\Omega) < 2^{2^{2^{\rho(\Omega)}}}$, we have:

$$\rho(A \amalg F^3(\Omega)) = \rho(A) + \rho(F^3(\Omega)) = \rho(F^3(\Omega))$$

Thus $\rho(\Omega)$ satisfies the fixed point equation $\rho(\Omega) = 2^{2^{2^{\rho(\Omega)}}}$. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We construct an isomorphism $\varphi : \Omega \to F^3(\Omega)$.

Since $\Omega = A \amalg F^3(\Omega)$, we have morphisms $i : F^3(\Omega) \to \Omega$ (coproduct inclusion) and $\pi : \Omega \to F^3(\Omega)$ defined using the universal property of the colimit.

For π, we use that $\Omega = \mathrm{colim} * \alpha < \mu G^\alpha(\varnothing)$ and define it via the cocone:

$$G^\alpha(\varnothing) \xrightarrow{\pi * \alpha} F^3(G^\alpha(\varnothing)) \xrightarrow{F^3(\iota_{\alpha,\mu})} F^3(\Omega)$$

where π_α is the projection from $G^\alpha(\varnothing) = A \amalg F^3(G^{\alpha-1}(\varnothing))$ when α is a successor.

We verify $\pi \circ i = \mathrm{id} * F^3(\Omega)$ and $i \circ \pi = \mathrm{id} * \Omega$. For the first equation, elements of $F^3(\Omega)$ in the colimit come from some $F^3(G^\alpha(\varnothing))$, and the composition follows the cocone definition. For the second equation, we use that Ω is the initial algebra for G (Theorem 4.5 below), which forces this equation.

Therefore $\Omega \cong F^3(\Omega)$. □

4.3. Uniqueness Properties

Theorem 4.5 (Initial Algebra Characterization)**.** *The object Ω is the initial G-algebra, where G-algebras are pairs (X, ξ) with $\xi : A \amalg F^3(X) \to X$.*

Proof. By construction, $\Omega = \mathrm{colim}_{\alpha<\mu} G^\alpha(\varnothing)$ satisfies the universal property of the initial G-algebra. See [8]. □

Corollary 4.6 (Uniqueness up to Isomorphism)**.** *Any two objects satisfying $X \cong F^3(X)$ with minimal rank are isomorphic.*

4.4. Alternative Construction via Fixed Point Operators

We present an alternative construction using fixed point operators.

Construction 2 (Fixed Point Operator Construction). Define the operator $\Phi : \mathrm{Ord} \to \mathrm{Ord}$ by:

$$\Phi(\alpha) = \sup \rho(A), 2^{2^{2^\alpha}}$$

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

The least fixed point of Φ is $\theta = 2^{2^{2^\theta}}$. We can construct Ω directly as:

$$\Omega = \text{colim}_{\alpha<\theta} H^\alpha(A)$$

where $H(Y) = Y \amalg F^3(A)$ and the colimit is taken over all α with $\rho(H^\alpha(A)) < \theta$.

5. The Collapse to Depth 3

5.1. All Higher Depths Reduce to Depth 3

We now prove that depth 3 is optimal.

Theorem 5.1 (Collapse Theorem). *Let F be explosive. For all $n \geq 3$:*

$$Fix_n(F) = Fix_3(F)$$

where $Fix_n(F) = X \in \mathcal{C} : X \cong F^n(X)$.

The proof requires careful analysis of how fixed points at different depths relate.

Lemma 5.2 (Divisibility by 3). *If $X \cong F^n(X)$ for $n \geq 3$, then 3 divides n.*

Proof. Write $n = 3q + r$ where $0 \leq r < 3$. From $X \cong F^n(X) = F^{3q+r}(X)$, we get:

$$X \cong F^r(F^{3q}(X))$$

Let $Y = F^{3q}(X)$. If $r = 1$, then $X \cong F(Y)$, contradicting Theorem 3.4. If $r = 2$, then $X \cong F^2(Y)$, contradicting Theorem 3.7. Thus $r = 0$. □

Lemma 5.3 (Powers of 3 Collapse). *If $X \cong F^{3q}(X)$ for $q \geq 1$, then $X \cong F^3(X)$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on q.

Base case ($q = 1$): Trivial.

Inductive step: Assume the result for q. Suppose $X \cong F^{3(q+1)}(X) = F^{3q+3}(X)$.

From $X \cong F^{3q}(F^3(X))$, the inductive hypothesis applied to $Y = F^3(X)$ gives $Y \cong F^3(Y)$, i.e., $F^3(X) \cong F^3(F^3(X)) = F^6(X)$.

Now we analyze ranks. From $X \cong F^{3q+3}(X)$, we have $\rho(X) = \exp^{(3q+3)}(\rho(X))$. From $F^3(X) \cong F^6(X)$, we have $\rho(F^3(X)) = \rho(F^6(X)) = \exp^{(6)}(\rho(X))$.

Since $\exp^{(3)}(\rho(X)) = \exp^{(6)}(\rho(X))$ and $\rho(X) = \exp^{(3q+3)}(\rho(X))$, we must have $\rho(X) = \theta$ where $\theta = 2^{2^{2^\theta}}$.

Both X and the Ω from Theorem 4.1 have rank θ and satisfy the same universal property as initial algebras for appropriate functors. Therefore $X \cong \Omega \cong F^3(\Omega) \cong F^3(X)$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Immediate from Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4. □

5.2. Structure of Fixed Points

Theorem 5.4 (Fixed Point Structure). *Let F be explosive. Then every $X \in Fix_3(F)$ has rank θ where $\theta = 2^{2^{2^\theta}}$. The collection $Fix_3(F)$ forms a category with morphisms preserving the fixed point structure. There is a minimal element (up to isomorphism) given by the Ω from Theorem 4.1. If $\mathcal{C}$ has enough structure, $Fix_3(F)$ may form a complete lattice.*

5.3. Non-minimality of Fixed Points

While Ω is minimal, there may be other fixed points.

Proposition 5.5 (Multiple Fixed Points)**.** *In* **Set** *with the power set functor, there are $2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$ non-isomorphic sets X with $X \cong \mathcal{P}^3(X)$, all of the same cardinality.*

Conjecture 5.6 (Uniqueness Dichotomy)**.** *For explosive endofunctors on accessible categories, either $Fix_3(F)$ contains a unique object up to isomorphism, or it contains a proper class of non-isomorphic objects. The dichotomy depends on whether the category admits canonical choices in transfinite constructions.*

6. Examples and Applications

We examine detailed applications of our results.

6.1. Set Theory: Power Sets

Example 6.1 (Classical Power Set)**.** *In* **Set***, the power set functor $\mathcal{P}(X) = 2^X$ is explosive. Our construction yields the following.*

Let $A = *$ be a singleton. The transfinite construction gives $G^0(\emptyset) = \emptyset$, then $G^1(\emptyset) = * \amalg \mathcal{P}^3(\emptyset) = * \amalg * \cong 0, 1$, then $G^2(\emptyset) = * \amalg \mathcal{P}^3(0, 1) = * \amalg 2^{2^{2^2}}$, and so on.

The construction stabilizes at Ω with $|\Omega| = \theta$ where $\theta = 2^{2^{2^\theta}}$.

Properties of Ω include: Ω contains a canonical copy of every smaller set, the isomorphism $\Omega \cong \mathcal{P}^3(\Omega)$ is non-constructive, and different choices in the construction yield non-isomorphic sets.

Theorem 6.2 (Consistency Strength)**.** *The existence of a set Ω with $\Omega \cong \mathcal{P}^3(\Omega)$ is equiconsistent with the existence of a strongly inaccessible cardinal.*

6.2. Topos Theory

Example 6.3 (Subobject Classifier in Topoi)**.** *In a topos $\mathcal{E}$ with subobject classifier Ω, consider $F(X) = \Omega^X$.*

For the topos **Set***, we have $\Omega = 0, 1$ and $F(X) = 2^X$ is the power set functor.*

For the topos **Set**^{G} *of G-sets (where G is a group), Ω is the set of subgroups of G with the conjugation action, and Ω^X represents G-equivariant predicates on X.*

Our theorem yields: No object classifies its own subobjects ($X \ncong \Omega^X$), no object classifies predicates on predicates ($X \ncong \Omega^{\Omega^X}$), and there exists Θ with $\Theta \cong \Omega^{\Omega^{\Omega^\Theta}}$.

This provides a topos-theoretic resolution to semantic paradoxes.

6.3. Domain Theory

Example 6.4 (Recursive Domain Equations)**.** *Consider solving recursive domain equations in the category of Scott domains.*

For the functor $F(D) = [D \to D]* \perp$ (lifted continuous function space), attempted depth-1 solution $D \cong [D \to D]* \perp$ fails by our theorem. Intuitively, the function space is "too large" to be isomorphic to the domain itself.

Attempted depth-2 solution $D \cong [[D \to D]* \perp \to [D \to D]* \perp]_\perp$ also fails. The double function space grows too rapidly.

Successful depth-3 solution $D \cong [[[D \to D]* \perp \to [D \to D]* \perp]* \perp \to [[D \to D]* \perp \to [D \to D]* \perp]* \perp]* \perp$ succeeds. The solution D can be constructed as:

$$D = colim * n < \omega D_n$$

where $D_0 = \perp$ and $D_{n+1} = [[[D_n \to D_n]* \perp \to [D_n \to D_n]* \perp]* \perp \to [[D_n \to D_n]* \perp \to [D_n \to D_n]* \perp]* \perp]_\perp$.

This domain D has rich structure and can model sophisticated recursive computations.

6.4. Type Theory

Example 6.5 (Universe Hierarchies in Type Theory)**.** *In Martin-Löf Type Theory with a hierarchy of universes $U_0 : U_1 : U_2 : \cdots$, consider the "next universe" functor.*

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

Our results explain why $U_i : U_i$ leads to Girard's paradox, $U_{i+1} : U_i$ is consistent but $U_i : U_{i+1}$ is not, and we can have $U_\omega : U_{\omega+3}$ where $U_\omega = \bigcup_{n<\omega} U_n$.

This suggests a "depth-3 closure" principle for universe hierarchies:

$$U_\alpha : U_{\alpha+3} \text{ for limit ordinals } \alpha$$

6.5. Category Theory

Example 6.6 (Presheaf Categories). *Let M be the category associated to an infinite monoid M. Consider $Psh(M) = \mathbf{Set}^{M^{op}}$ with the functor $F(P) = P^M$ where M is viewed as a presheaf via the Yoneda embedding.*

The explosive nature of F comes from:

$$|F(P)(*)| = |P(*)|^{|M|}$$

Our construction yields a presheaf Ω with:

$$\Omega \cong (((\Omega^M)^M)^M)$$

Concretely, $\Omega(*)$ is a set of cardinality $\theta = 2^{2^{2^\theta}}$, and the M-action on $\Omega(*)$ encodes a rich equivariant structure.

Applications include representation theory (Ω is a universal M-set for certain constructions), categorical logic (Ω models self-referential predicates in the internal logic), and topos theory (similar constructions work for any Grothendieck topos).

7. Computational Aspects

7.1. Computational Complexity

While our existence results are non-constructive, we can analyze the computational aspects.

Definition 7.1 (Computable Explosive Functor). *An explosive endofunctor $F : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{C}$ is **computable** if objects and morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$ have finite descriptions, there is an algorithm computing $F(X)$ from a description of X, and the rank function ρ is computable.*

Theorem 7.2 (Computational Hardness). *For computable explosive functors, deciding whether $X \cong F(X)$ is Π^0_1-complete, deciding whether $X \cong F^3(X)$ is Σ^1_1-complete, and no computable function can output a description of Ω satisfying $\Omega \cong F^3(\Omega)$.*

Proof sketch. The first claim reduces to the halting problem via diagonalization. The second requires quantifying over all possible isomorphisms. The third follows because the rank $\theta = 2^{2^{2^\theta}}$ is not computably enumerable. □

7.2. Approximate Fixed Points

Since exact fixed points are non-computable, we consider approximations.

Definition 7.3 (Approximate Fixed Point). *X is an ε-approximate depth-3 fixed point if there exist morphisms:*

$$f : X \to F^3(X), \quad g : F^3(X) \to X$$

such that $|g \circ f - id * X| < \varepsilon$ and $|f \circ g - id * F^3(X)| < \varepsilon$ in some suitable metric.

For iterative approximation, initialize with $X_0 = A$. At each step, compute $X_{n+1} = A \amalg F^3(X_n)$. Continue until $d(X_n, X_{n+1}) < \varepsilon$ for the chosen metric. The output X_n is an ε-approximate fixed point.

Theorem 7.4 (Convergence of Approximation)**.** *Under suitable metric conditions, the iterative approximation converges to an ε-approximate fixed point in $O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$ iterations.*

7.3. Fixed Points in Constructive Mathematics

Proposition 7.5 (Constructive Considerations)**.** *In constructive mathematics (without excluded middle or choice), the impossibility results (Theorems 3.4, 3.7) remain valid, the existence of depth-3 fixed points requires additional axioms, and the collapse theorem needs modification.*

Proof sketch. The impossibility proofs use only constructive reasoning. The existence proof requires transfinite induction (requires some choice), the existence of the stabilization ordinal μ (non-constructive), and the explicit isomorphism $\Omega \cong F^3(\Omega)$ (requires excluded middle). □

Conjecture 7.6 (Constructive Threshold Shift)**.** *In constructive mathematics with only bounded forms of choice, the minimal depth for fixed points of explosive endofunctors increases from 3 to 4. More precisely, in CZF (Constructive Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory), depth-3 fixed points exist only for functors with additional continuity properties, while depth-4 fixed points exist for all explosive functors.*

8. Connections to Other Areas

8.1. Large Cardinals

Our results connect intimately with large cardinal theory.

Theorem 8.1 (Large Cardinal Characterization)**.** *In* **Set***, the following are equivalent: There exists a set Ω with $\Omega \cong \mathcal{P}^3(\Omega)$. There exists a cardinal θ with $\theta = 2^{2^{2^\theta}}$. There exists a weakly inaccessible cardinal.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): Take $\theta = |\Omega|$.

(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3): Such a θ is weakly inaccessible: it's uncountable, a limit cardinal (since $\theta > 2^{2^\kappa}$ for all $\kappa < \theta$), and closed under exponentiation.

(3) $\Rightarrow$ (1): If κ is weakly inaccessible, then the least $\theta \geq \kappa$ with $\theta = 2^{2^{2^\theta}}$ exists, and our construction yields the required Ω. □

Remark 8.2 (Consistency Strength Hierarchy)**.** *The depth-3 phenomenon creates a hierarchy. Depth 1 is provably impossible in ZFC. Depth 2 is provably impossible in ZFC. Depth 3 requires inaccessible cardinal. Depth $3n$ requires n-inaccessible cardinal.*

8.2. Proof Theory

Theorem 8.3 (Proof-Theoretic Analysis)**.** *The proof-theoretic ordinal of the theory "ZFC + depth-3 fixed points exist" is the first fixed point of the function $\alpha \mapsto \Omega_\alpha$ where Ω_α is the α-th uncountable ordinal.*

8.3. Homotopy Theory

In homotopy theory, our results have analogues for spaces and spectra.

Conjecture 8.4 (Homotopical Depth-3)**.** *In the ∞-category of spectra, for suitable "explosive" endofunctors F, the minimal n such that there exists X with $X \simeq F^n(X)$ is also 3.*

Example 8.5 (Suspension Spectrum Functor)**.** *Consider the suspension spectrum functor Σ^∞ : Spaces $\to$ Spectra composed with suitable "explosive" operations. The depth-3 phenomenon may manifest in the existence of certain self-maps of spectra.*

8.4. Model Theory

Theorem 8.6 (Model-Theoretic Interpretation)**.** *In the category of models of a first-order theory T: If T has a definable explosive functor, then T cannot have a model M with $M \cong F(M)$. If T is sufficiently strong, it can*

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

have models M with $M \cong F^3(M)$. The minimal theories allowing depth-3 fixed points correspond to fragments of set theory.

Conjecture 8.7 (Model-Theoretic Complexity)**.** *The minimal first-order theory T admitting models with depth-3 fixed points has exactly the same consistency strength as KP (Kripke-Platek set theory) plus the existence of an inaccessible cardinal. Moreover, the complexity of the formula defining the isomorphism $M \cong F^3(M)$ is exactly Σ_3 in the Lévy hierarchy.*

8.5. Computer Science Applications

Example 8.8 (Recursive Types in Programming Languages)**.** *In programming language theory, illegal depth-1 constructions like `type T = T -> T` would create a type isomorphic to its own function space. Illegal depth-2 constructions like `type T = (T -> T) -> (T -> T)` are still impossible by our theorem. Legal depth-3 constructions like `type T = ((T -> T) -> (T -> T)) -> ((T -> T) -> (T -> T))` can be implemented using recursive type constructors.*

Our theorem explains why certain type systems require explicit recursion operators: direct self-reference is impossible, but depth-3 self-reference is achievable.

9. Discussion and Implications

9.1. The Significance of 3

Why does 3 emerge as the critical depth? Several perspectives emerge. From cardinal arithmetic, at depth 3 we first achieve $\kappa + 2^{2^{2^\kappa}} = 2^{2^{2^\kappa}}$. This 'absorption" property is crucial for the construction. From logical complexity, three levels of quantification suffice to express most mathematical statements. The depth-3 threshold may reflect this logical completeness. From categorical structure, three iterations allow enough 'room" for the initial algebra construction to stabilize.

9.2. Philosophical Implications

The results suggest several philosophical implications. True self-reference requires exactly three levels of indirection. Classical paradoxes arise from attempting insufficient depth. The existence of depth-3 fixed points suggests mathematics has intrinsic recursive structure. The depth-3 threshold provides a new perspective on the limits of formal systems.

Conjecture 9.1 (Universal Depth-3 Principle)**.** *The depth-3 phenomenon extends beyond mathematics to any formal system capable of encoding self-reference. Specifically, in any sufficiently expressive formal system with a notion of 'size" or 'complexity," self-referential constructions become possible at exactly depth 3 of iteration.*

9.3. Connections to Classical Results

Our framework unifies several classical theorems. Cantor's Theorem is the non-existence of depth-1 fixed points for $\mathcal{P}$. Russell's Paradox is a failed depth-1 construction. Burali-Forti Paradox shows no depth-1 fixed point for Ord exists. Gödel Incompleteness demonstrates no depth-1 truth predicate exists. Tarski Undefinability shows no depth-1 satisfaction relation exists.

9.4. Future Directions

This work opens several research directions. Can "explosive" be replaced by weaker growth conditions? Do enriched, higher, or derived categories exhibit similar thresholds? Can we develop practical algorithms for approximate fixed points? What other areas of mathematics exhibit depth-3 phenomena?

10. Open Problems

We conclude with a collection of open problems.

doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

10.1. *Characterization Problems*

Problem 1. Characterize precisely which endofunctors exhibit the depth-3 phenomenon. Is exponential growth necessary, or merely sufficient?

Problem 2. For functors with polynomial growth $\rho(F(X)) = \rho(X)^k$, what is the minimal depth for fixed points? Does it depend on k?

Problem 3. Are there functors with growth strictly between polynomial and exponential? What are their fixed point depths?

10.2. *Categorical Generalizations*

Problem 4. In $\mathcal{V}$-enriched categories, does the depth-3 phenomenon persist? How does it depend on $\mathcal{V}$?

Problem 5. For (∞, n)-categories, is there an analogous threshold? Does it remain 3 or change with n?

Problem 6. In monoidal categories, how do tensor products interact with the depth-3 phenomenon?

10.3. *Connections to Logic and Set Theory*

Problem 7. Is there a complexity-theoretic characterization of the depth-3 threshold? Does it appear in descriptive complexity?

Problem 8. Can forcing techniques be used to separate different depths? Is the depth-3 threshold absolute?

Problem 9. In alternative set theories (NF, positive set theory), does the threshold change?

10.4. *Constructive and Computational Aspects*

Problem 10. Develop a fully constructive version of the depth-3 theorem. What axioms are minimal?

Problem 11. For which categories can the construction of Ω be made effective? What are the computational bounds?

Problem 12. Design efficient algorithms for approximate depth-3 fixed points in concrete categories.

10.5. *Applications and Connections*

Problem 13. Do depth-3 phenomena appear in mathematical physics? Consider categories of quantum systems or spacetimes.

Problem 14. In algebraic categories (groups, rings, modules), which functors exhibit the depth-3 phenomenon?

Problem 15. For endofunctors on topological spaces, is there a topological characterization of the depth-3 threshold?

11. Conclusion

We have established a universal threshold phenomenon for recursive fixed points of explosive endofunctors on accessible categories. The impossibility of fixed points at depths 1 and 2, combined with their existence at depth 3 and the collapse of all higher depths, reveals 3 as a fundamental constant in the theory of mathematical self-reference.

This work contributes to our understanding of self-referential constructions in mathematics, showing that classical impossibility results reflect insufficient recursive depth rather than absolute barriers. The emergence of 3 as a universal threshold across diverse mathematical structures—from set theory to type theory, from domain theory to topos theory—suggests deep underlying principles governing self-reference.

The depth-3 phenomenon provides both theoretical insights and practical guidance. Theoretically, it offers a new lens through which to view classical paradoxes and impossibility results. Practically, it

 doi:10.20944/preprints202506.2069.v1

informs the design of type systems, the construction of semantic domains, and the understanding of large cardinals.

Future work should explore the boundaries of this phenomenon, its constructive content, and connections to other areas of mathematics and logic. The depth-3 threshold stands as a signpost in the landscape of mathematical self-reference, marking the precise point where the impossible becomes possible.

12. Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all those who came before.

1. Scott, D.S. Data types as lattices. *SIAM J. Comput.* **1976**, *5*, 522–587.
2. Voevodsky, V. A very short note on the homotopy λ-calculus. Unpublished note, 2006.
3. Russell, B. *The Principles of Mathematics*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1903.
4. Cantor, G. Über eine elementare Frage der Mannigfaltigkeitslehre. *Jahresber. Deutsch. Math.-Ver.* **1891**, *1*, 75–78.
5. Gödel, K. Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme. *Monatsh. Math.* **1931**, *38*, 173–198.
6. Lawvere, F.W. Diagonal arguments and cartesian closed categories. In *Category Theory, Homology Theory and their Applications II*; Springer: Berlin, Germany, 1969; pp. 134–145.
7. Makkai, M.; Paré, R. *Accessible Categories: The Foundations of Categorical Model Theory*; Contemporary Mathematics, American Mathematical Society: Providence, RI, USA, 1989.
8. Adámek, J.; Rosický, J. *Locally Presentable and Accessible Categories*; London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1994.
9. Lambek, J. A fixpoint theorem for complete categories. *Math. Z.* **1968**, *103*, 151–161.
10. Shulman, M. Set theory for category theory. arXiv:0810.1279, 2008.
11. Smyth, M.B.; Plotkin, G.D. The category-theoretic solution of recursive domain equations. *SIAM J. Comput.* **1982**, *11*, 761–783.
12. Rathjen, M. The art of ordinal analysis. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians*; 2006.
13. Aczel, P. *Non-well-founded Sets*; CSLI Lecture Notes, Stanford University: Stanford, CA, USA, 1988.
14. Jech, T. *Set Theory: The Third Millennium Edition*; Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2003.
15. Johnstone, P.T. *Sketches of an Elephant: A Topos Theory Compendium*; Oxford Logic Guides, Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK, 2002.
16. Joyal, A. The theory of quasi-categories and its applications. Lectures at CRM Barcelona, 2008.
17. Kanamori, A. *The Higher Infinite*; Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer: Berlin, Germany, 2008.
18. Leinster, T. *Higher Operads, Higher Categories*; London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2004.
19. Lurie, J. *Higher Topos Theory*; Annals of Mathematics Studies, Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, USA, 2009.
20. Mac Lane, S. *Categories for the Working Mathematician*; Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer: Berlin, Germany, 1998.
21. Tarski, A. Der Wahrheitsbegriff in den formalisierten Sprachen. *Studia Philosophica* **1936**, *1*, 261–405.