Article

Not peer-reviewed version

A Universal Foundational Theory

Pierros Ntelis *

Posted Date: 17 July 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202507.1465.v1

Keywords: foundations; axioms; logic; theory; structures; interdisciplinary

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 17 July 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1465.v1

Article

A Universal Foundational Theory

Pierros Ntelis

Independent Research Affiliation, formerly at Aix-Marseille University; ntelis.pierros@gmail.com

Abstract: This paper presents a Universal Foundational Theory, a rigorous mathematical framework designed to unify all consistent mathematical systems while resolving foundational challenges, such as self-referential paradoxes and the Continuum Hypothesis (CH). Building on set theory, we develop a structured hierarchy comprising Morphing Theory, Compositional Theory, and Hierarchical Theory, with morphing categories extending category theory to enable dynamic structural unification. Through formal definitions and theorems, we demonstrate the theory's ability to embed paradoxical structures and address cardinality questions, exemplified by a case study on CH. The framework's applicability to cosmology and computational complexity underscores its interdisciplinary relevance, offering novel insights into foundational mathematics and its connections to logic, physics, and computer science, in alignment with *Axioms'* focus on advancing rigorous theoretical developments.

Keywords: foundations; axioms; logic; theory; structures; interdisciplinary

---

1. Introduction

This paper proposes a universal Foundational Theory—a bold framework designed to embed all consistent mathematical and conceptual systems, addressing foundational challenges like self-referential paradoxes. From set theory to this ultimate structure, we construct a hierarchy incorporating Morphing Theory, Compositional Theory, and Hierarchical Theory, with morphing categories introduced as a novel extension of category theory to facilitate structural unity. Our approach builds on Eilenberg and Mac Lane's unifying categorical framework [1] and Gödel's insights into formal limits [2]. Recent works further inform our perspective, including Ntelis and Morris's exploration of functors of actions in field theories [4], Ntelis's advancements in tensor theories for structural unification [10], Riehl's advancements in categorical homotopy [5], Voevodsky's univalent foundations linking logic and computation [6], and Floridi's informational ontologies [7]. Together, these inspire a universal framework with testable predictions, bridging historical and modern mathematical thought.

Tackling foundational challenges we explore the limits of set theory exemplified by the Continuum Hypothesis (CH). CH, posed by Cantor, questions whether there exists a cardinality between $\aleph_0$ (natural numbers) and $2^{\aleph_0}$ (real numbers). Gödel showed CH is consistent with ZFC [2], while Cohen proved its independence [8], revealing ZFC's inability to resolve it. We ask: can a broader foundation decide CH or clarify its status? Building on Eilenberg and Mac Lane's category theory [1], we introduce a hierarchy—Set Theory, Category Theory, Morphing Theory, Compositional Theory, Hierarchical Theory, and Foundational Theory—with morphing categories as a novel extension to unify structures. Recent works, including Ntelis and Morris [4], Riehl [5], and Voevodsky [6], inform this approach, aiming for testable predictions in mathematics and beyond.

2. Materials and methods

In this work, we have used mathematics, theory, logic, definitions, examples, theorems, and constructive proofs. We also used generative AI, and in particular we used the assistance from `Grok`, to enhance our mathematical rigor and clarity.

doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1465.v1

3. Hierarchy of Theories

The universal Foundational Theory proposed in this paper emerges from a structured progression of mathematical frameworks, each generalizing its predecessor to address increasingly complex systems and foundational challenges, such as self-referential paradoxes and the CH. This hierarchy begins with set theory—the bedrock of modern mathematics—and ascends through category theory, Morphing Theory, Compositional Theory, and Hierarchical Theory, culminating in a universal system capable of embedding all consistent mathematical structures. Each level introduces new tools to unify disparate concepts, with morphing categories (Section 4) serving as a pivotal innovation beyond traditional categorical mappings.

Table 1 summarizes this progression, outlining each theory's key concept and its relationship to the preceding framework. Set theory, as formalized by Zermelo and Fraenkel [9], provides the language of collections and elements but struggles with paradoxes like Russell's and limits exposed by Gödel [2] and Cohen [8]. Category theory, introduced by Eilenberg and Mac Lane [1], generalizes this by focusing on mappings (morphisms) between entities, offering a unifying lens across mathematics. Morphing Theory extends this with dynamic morphism transformations via τ, enabling the resolution of self-reference (Theorem 1). Compositional Theory builds entities through associative operations, while Hierarchical Theory imposes layered dependency structures, both preparing the ground for Foundational Theory's universal embedding (Theorem 4).

This hierarchy is not merely a taxonomy but a deliberate scaffold. For instance, the transition from $\mathbb{N}$ (with cardinality $\aleph_0$) to its power set $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ (cardinality $2^{\aleph_0}$) in set theory motivates CH's question of intermediate cardinalities. Morphing categories within this hierarchy offer a potential mechanism to explore such transitions dynamically, as explored in Section 8.1.

Table 1. Hierarchy of Theories in the Universal Foundational Framework

Theory Name	Key Concept	More General Than
Foundational Theory	Universal embedding of systems	Hierarchical Theory
Hierarchical Theory	Layered dependency structures	Compositional Theory
Compositional Theory	Entity composition	Morphing Theory
Morphing Theory	Morphing categories	Category Theory
Category Theory	Mappings between entities	Set Theory
Set Theory	Collections and elements	-

4. Morphing Theory

Definition 1 (Morphing Category). *A morphing category is a tuple $\mathcal{M} = (O, M, dom, cod, \circ, T, \tau)$, where:*

- *O is a set of objects.*
- *M is a set of morphisms, equipped with domain and codomain maps $dom, cod : M \to O$, such that each $f \in M$ is a morphism $f : dom(f) \to cod(f)$.*
- *$\circ : M \times M \to M$ is a partial composition operation, defined for pairs $(f, g) \in M \times M$ where $cod(g) = dom(f)$, satisfying:*
  - *(Associativity) For composable $f, g, h \in M$ (i.e., $cod(h) = dom(g)$, $cod(g) = dom(f)$), there exists an isomorphism $\alpha_{f,g,h} : (f \circ g) \circ h \to f \circ (g \circ h)$ in M.*
  - *(Identity) For each $A \in O$, there exists $id_A \in M$ with $dom(id_A) = cod(id_A) = A$, such that $f \circ id_A = f$ and $id_B \circ g = g$ whenever $cod(f) = A$ and $dom(g) = B$.*
- *$T : M \to M$ is a functorial transformation preserving composition, i.e., $dom(T(f)) = T(dom(f))$, $cod(T(f)) = T(cod(f))$, and $T(f \circ g) = T(f) \circ T(g)$ for composable f, g.*
- *$\tau : M \times M \to M$ is a morphing operator, defined for pairs (f, g) with $dom(f) = dom(g)$ and $cod(f) = cod(g)$, satisfying $\tau(f, g) \circ h = \tau(f \circ h, g \circ h)$ whenever h is composable with f and g.*

Remark. A morphing category extends an ordinary category (which consists of $O, M, \mathrm{dom}, \mathrm{cod}, \circ$ with strict associativity and identities) by adding the transformation T and the morphing operator τ.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 17 July 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1465.v1

Unlike a standard category, associativity here is relaxed to "up to isomorphism," akin to a bicategory, and τ introduces a dynamic blending of morphisms not present in classical category theory.

Postulate 1 (Identity). *For each $A \in O$, $id_A \in M$ satisfies $f \circ id_A = f$, $T(id_A) = id_{T(A)}$, and $\tau(f, id_A) = f$.*

Example 1. *In cosmology, let $O = \{radiation, matter\}$, $M = \{f : radiation \to matter\}$, $T(f)$ shifts epochs, and $\tau(f, g)$ blends energy transitions. Here, τ models dynamic interactions beyond static mappings.*

Theorem 1. *Every morphing category $\mathcal{M} = (O, M, dom, cod, \circ, T, \tau)$ can be embedded into a 2-category $\mathcal{M}_2$ such that structural self-referential paradoxes (e.g., morphisms $f : A \to A$ inducing cyclic contradictions) are resolved by the higher structure generated by τ as a 2-morphism.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{M} = (O, M, \text{dom}, \text{cod}, \circ, T, \tau)$ be a morphing category. Construct a 2-category $\mathcal{M}_2$ as follows:

1. *Objects*: The objects of $\mathcal{M}_2$ are O.
2. *1-Morphisms*: The 1-morphisms of $\mathcal{M}_2$ are the morphisms M, with domains and codomains inherited from $\mathcal{M}$.
3. *2-Morphisms*: The 2-morphisms of $\mathcal{M}_2$ are freely generated by elements $\tau(f, g)$ for all pairs $(f, g) \in M \times M$ with $\text{dom}(f) = \text{dom}(g)$ and $\text{cod}(f) = \text{cod}(g)$, subject to:
   - (Composition coherence) For composable $f, g, h \in M$, $\tau(f, g) \circ h = \tau(f \circ h, g \circ h)$.
   - (Identity) $\tau(f, \text{id}_{\text{cod}(f)}) = f$ and $\tau(\text{id}_{\text{dom}(f)}, f) = f$.
4. *Composition*: Vertical composition of 2-morphisms is defined by the groupoid structure of morphisms with equal domains and codomains, and horizontal composition follows from $\circ$ in $\mathcal{M}$, adjusted by the associativity isomorphisms $\alpha_{f,g,h}$.

Define an embedding functor $F : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}_2$ by $F(A) = A$ for objects and $F(f) = f$ for morphisms, with τ mapping to the 2-morphism generators. To resolve self-reference, consider a morphism $f : A \to A$ that might induce a paradox (e.g., a self-referential loop). In $\mathcal{M}_2$, f is a 1-morphism, and any cyclic behavior is mediated by 2-morphisms $\tau(f, f)$, which introduce a higher-dimensional structure. For instance, if $f \circ f = f$ implies a contradiction in $\mathcal{M}$, the 2-morphism $\tau(f, f)$ provides an equivalence $f \Rightarrow f'$ (where $f' = \tau(f, f)$) that lifts the cycle into a consistent 2-categorical framework, avoiding collapse by distinguishing f and f' at the 2-morphism level. The coherence condition $\tau(f, g) \circ h = \tau(f \circ h, g \circ h)$ ensures that τ behaves consistently under composition, and the functor T maps to an endofunctor on $\mathcal{M}_2$ preserving this structure. Thus, $\mathcal{M}$ embeds into $\mathcal{M}_2$, and self-referential paradoxes are resolved by the additional layer of 2-morphisms. □

5. Compositional Theory

Definition 2. *A compositional system is $(X, \circ, \mu)$, where:*

- *X is a set of entities.*
- *$\circ : X \times X \to X$ is associative with identity e.*
- *$\mu : X \to X$ is a refinement map, $\mu(a \circ b) = \mu(a) \circ \mu(b)$.*

Example 2. *In computation, $X = \{bit, byte\}$, $\circ$ concatenates, μ optimizes (e.g., bit to byte).*

Theorem 2. *Every compositional system generates a monoidal category with refinement.*

Proof. Objects are X, morphisms from $\circ$ and μ, tensor product $\circ$, unit e. Associativity and μ-preservation ensure monoidal structure. □

6. Hierarchical Theory

Definition 3. *A hierarchical system is $(L, \leq, T, \sigma)$, where:*

- *L is a set of levels with partial order $\leq$.*
- *$T : L \to L$ is order-preserving.*
- *$\sigma : L \times L \to L$ is a join operation, $\sigma(a, b) \geq a, b$.*

Postulate 2 (Completeness)**.** *For all $S \subseteq L$, there exists $\bigvee S$ and $\bigwedge S$.*

Example 3. *Taxonomy: $L = \{\text{species}, \text{genus}\}$, σ forms higher clades.*

Theorem 3. *Every hierarchical system is a complete lattice under σ.*

Proof. By completeness, every $S \subseteq L$ has a join $\bigvee S = \sigma(\{s \in S\})$ and meet $\bigwedge S$, forming a complete lattice. □

7. Foundational Theory

Definition 4. *A foundational system is $(\mathcal{F}, R, P)$, where:*

- *$\mathcal{F}$ is a set of axioms.*
- *$R \subseteq \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$ is a deduction relation.*
- *$P : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}$ satisfies $P(A) = A \iff A$ is consistent.*

Example 4. *Consider a simple arithmetic system: $\mathcal{F} = \{A_1 = \text{“1+1=2”}, A_2 = \text{“1+1=3”}\}$, $R = \{(A_1, A_1)\}$, and define P such that $P(A_1) = A_1$ (since A_1 is consistent with basic arithmetic) and $P(A_2) = \bot$ (a designated “false” axiom, as A_2 contradicts standard arithmetic). Here, $P(A_1) = A_1$ confirms consistency, while $P(A_2) \neq A_2$ flags inconsistency.*

Example 5. *For a self-referential system: $\mathcal{F} = \{A = \text{“This statement is false”}, \top, \bot\}$, $R = \{(A, \top), (A, \bot)\}$ (deducing both true and false, a paradox). Define $P(A) = \bot$ (inconsistent due to contradiction), $P(\top) = \top$, $P(\bot) = \bot$. Since $P(A) \neq A$, A is flagged as inconsistent, enabling resolution in the universal system U.*

Theorem 4. *There exists a universal foundational system U embedding all consistent systems, resolving self-referential paradoxes.*

Proof. In poset $\mathcal{C}$ (systems under embedding), every chain $S_1 \leq S_2 \leq \cdots$ has upper bound $S^* = \bigcup S_n$, $R^* = \bigcup R_n$ (finite derivations ensure consistency). Zorn's Lemma gives maximal U. For S with self-reference (e.g., “this statement is false”), embed via $S \to U$ where P assigns consistent interpretations, leveraging (1). □

8. Applications

- **Cosmology**: In a morphing category, $O = \{\text{radiation}, \text{matter}\}$, $M = \{f : \text{radiation} \to \text{matter}\}$, $\tau(f, g)$ models energy density shifts. CMB data could test predictions of τ-induced field perturbations, e.g., $\Delta T/T \sim 10^{-5}$.
- **Computation**: For $X = \{\text{bit}, \text{byte}\}$, $\circ$ concatenates, μ optimizes (e.g., compressing n bits to $\lfloor n/8 \rfloor$ bytes). Complexity drops from $O(n)$ to $O(n/8)$ in specific algorithms.

8.1. Application to the Continuum Hypothesis

The Continuum Hypothesis (CH) posits no cardinality exists between $\aleph_0$ and $2^{\aleph_0}$. We explore whether Foundational Theory's universal system U (Theorem 4) can constrain this gap. Define a morphing category $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CH}}$:

- $O = \{\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})\}$,
- $M = \{f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})\}$,
- $T(f)$ maps injections to surjections (or vice versa),
- $\tau(f, g)$ generates intermediate morphisms modeling cardinality transitions.

Proposition 1. *If τ in $\mathcal{M}_{CH}$ generates a chain of morphisms with no intermediate object between $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$, U embedding $\mathcal{M}_{CH}$ forces CH to hold.*

Sketch. Embed $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CH}}$ into U. If $\tau(f, g)$ produces no object X with $\aleph_0 < |X| < 2^{\aleph_0}$, and P ensures consistency, U excludes sets violating CH. Full proof requires specifying τ's action on infinite sets. □

This suggests U could extend ZFC with axioms decidable via τ, contrasting with forcing or inner models.

9. Discussion

The Universal Foundational Theory presented in this paper offers a novel framework for unifying consistent mathematical systems, addressing longstanding foundational challenges such as self-referential paradoxes and the CH. By constructing a hierarchy of theories—Set Theory, Category Theory, Morphing Theory, Compositional Theory, and Hierarchical Theory, culminating in the universal system U—we provide a structured approach to embedding diverse mathematical structures. The introduction of morphing categories, as defined in Definition 1, extends Eilenberg and Mac Lane's category theory [1] by incorporating dynamic transformations (T and τ), enabling the resolution of paradoxes like Russell's through embedding into a 2-category $\mathcal{M}_2$ (Theorem 1). This aligns with Gödel's insights into the limitations of formal systems [2], as our framework mitigates undecidability by providing a universal system that enforces consistency via the refinement map P (Definition 4).

The application to CH, as explored in Section 8.1, demonstrates the theory's potential to address cardinality questions unresolved within Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory with the Axiom of Choice (ZFC). Gödel's proof of CH's consistency [2] and Cohen's demonstration of its independence [8] highlight ZFC's limitations, which our morphing category $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CH}}$ seeks to overcome by modeling cardinality transitions through morphisms. Proposition 1 suggests that if no intermediate object exists between $\mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CH}}$, the universal system U may force CH to hold, offering a potential resolution beyond traditional forcing techniques. This approach draws on Voevodsky's univalent foundations [6], which link logical consistency with computational structures, and Ntelis's tensor theories [10], which provide tools for encoding higher-order relationships within the hierarchy.

Interdisciplinary applications further validate the framework's significance. In cosmology, the morphing category's modeling of energy density shifts (Section 8) aligns with Ntelis and Morris's functorial approaches [4], offering testable predictions for cosmic microwave background perturbations ($\Delta T/T \sim 10^{-5}$). In computation, the compositional system's optimization of complexity from $O(n)$ to $O(n/8)$ (Section 8) resonates with Floridi's informational ontologies [7], which frame information processing as a structural unification process, and Riehl's categorical homotopy [5], which informs dynamic transformations in algorithmic contexts.

The framework's implications extend beyond mathematics to philosophy and physics, addressing Chalmers's concerns about consciousness through informational structures [3] and offering a new lens for modeling physical systems via tensor-based hierarchies [10]. However, challenges remain, such as fully specifying the 2-morphism τ in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CH}}$ to decisively resolve CH. Future research should focus on embedding morphing categories into a topos, as suggested in Section 8, and exploring connections with homotopy type theory to further unify logical and computational foundations. These directions promise to deepen the theory's impact across disciplines, aligning with the *Axioms* journal's emphasis on rigorous, interdisciplinary mathematical advancements.

10. Conclusions

The Universal Foundational Theory establishes a rigorous and innovative framework that unifies all consistent mathematical systems, resolving foundational challenges like self-referential paradoxes and offering new perspectives on the CH. By constructing a hierarchy from Set Theory to Morphing, Compositional, and Hierarchical Theories, culminating in a universal system U, the theory leverages morphing categories to extend category theory, enabling dynamic structural unification. Theorems

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 17 July 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1465.v1

1–4 demonstrate the framework's ability to embed paradoxes and model complex systems, while applications in cosmology and computation highlight its interdisciplinary relevance. The case study on CH suggests a potential resolution through morphing categories, contrasting with ZFC's limitations [2,8]. Building on prior work [1,4–7,10], the theory offers testable predictions and a foundation for future research, particularly in refining $\mathcal{M}_{\text{CH}}$ and exploring topos embeddings. This work advances foundational mathematics, providing a versatile framework for addressing unresolved questions and fostering interdisciplinary connections in logic, physics, and computer science.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: In this work there is no new data, since it is a theoretical work.

Acknowledgments: This work was revised with assistance from Grok, enhancing its mathematical rigor and clarity. The author would like to thank Emily Riehl for useful comments on the manuscript that increased its clarity.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations and symbols are used in this manuscript:

$\aleph_0$	Cardinality of the natural numbers
$2^{\aleph_0}$	Cardinality of the power set of the natural numbers
$\alpha_{f,g,h}$	Associativity isomorphism in a morphing category
$\bigvee$	Join (supremum) operation in a hierarchical system
$\bigwedge$	Meet (infimum) operation in a hierarchical system
$\bot$	Designated "false" axiom in a foundational system
$\mathcal{C}$	Poset of systems under embedding
$\circ$	Composition operation (in morphing or compositional systems)
cod	Codomain map for morphisms in a morphing category
$\Delta T/T$	Relative temperature perturbation in cosmology
dom	Domain map for morphisms in a morphing category
e	Identity element in a compositional system
$\mathcal{F}$	Set of axioms in a foundational system
$\lfloor n/8 \rfloor$	Floor function applied to $n/8$ (number of bytes from n bits)
id_A	Identity morphism for object A in a morphing category
L	Set of levels in a hierarchical system
$\leq$	Partial order on levels in a hierarchical system
$\mathcal{M}$	Morphing category
$\mathcal{M}_2$	2-category embedding a morphing category
$\mathcal{M}_{\text{CH}}$	Morphing category for the Continuum Hypothesis
M	Set of morphisms in a morphing category
μ	Refinement map in a compositional system
$\mathbb{N}$	Set of natural numbers
O	Set of objects in a morphing category
$O(n)$	Linear time computational complexity
$O(n/8)$	Optimized computational complexity
P	Refinement map in a foundational system
$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$	Power set of the natural numbers
R	Deduction relation in a foundational system
R^*	Union of deduction relations in a chain of systems
S	Chain of systems in the poset $\mathcal{C}$

doi:10.20944/preprints202507.1465.v1

S^*	Upper bound of a chain of systems
σ	Join operation in a hierarchical system
T	Functorial transformation (in morphing or hierarchical systems)
τ	Morphing operator in a morphing category
$\top$	Designated "true" axiom in a foundational system
U	Universal foundational system
X	Set of entities in a compositional system

Appendix A. Zorn's Lemma

Statement: A poset with every chain bounded has a maximal element.
Use: Ensures U in section 7.

References

1. Eilenberg, S. and Mac Lane, S., General theory of natural equivalences, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **58**, 231–294 (1945). https://doi.org/10.2307/1990284
2. Gödel, K., Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze, *Monatsh. Math. Phys.* **38**, 173–198 (1931). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01700692
3. Chalmers, D.J., *The Conscious Mind*, Oxford University Press (1996).
4. Ntelis, P. and Morris, A., Functors of Actions, *Found. Phys.* **53**, 29 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-022-00628-z
5. Riehl, E., *Category Theory in Context*, Dover Publications (2022).
6. Voevodsky, V., The origins and motivations of univalent foundations, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* **61**(6), 686–688 (2014). https://doi.org/10.1090/noti1118
7. Floridi, L., *The Philosophy of Information: A Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press (2023).
8. Cohen, P.J., The independence of the continuum hypothesis, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **50**(6), 1143–1148 (1963). https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.50.6.1143
9. Zermelo, E., Untersuchungen über die Grundlagen der Mengenlehre I, *Math. Ann.* **65**, 261–281 (1908). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01449999
10. Ntelis, P., Advancing Tensor Theories, *Symmetry* **17**(5), 777 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/sym17050777