

A Natural Transformation between the Model Constructions of the Completeness and Compactness Theorems Enhanced by Rigidity and 2-Categorical Strengthening

Joaquim Reizi Barreto

March 24, 2025

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Preliminaries	3
2.1	Basic Definitions and Set-Theoretic Scope	4
2.2	Categories of Theories and Models	5
2.3	Canonical Model Constructions	6
2.4	Use of the Axiom of Choice in Ultraproducts and Saturation	7
3	Main Theorem	9
4	Main Proof	10
4.1	Proof Outline and Flow	10
4.2	Rigorous Proof	11
5	Supplementary Lemmas and Explanations	12
5.1	Lindenbaum's Lemma (Revised Version)	12
5.2	Maximal Consistent Extension	13
5.3	Congruence of Equality	14
5.4	Term Equivalence Relation	15
5.5	Functoriality of Model Constructions	16
5.6	Uniqueness of Henkin Term Models	18
5.7	Compactness Theorem	19
5.8	Back-and-Forth Lemma	20
5.9	Isomorphism between Model Constructions	21
5.10	Naturality Condition	22
5.11	2-Categorical Coherence (Modification) and Rigidity	23
5.12	Canonical Construction of Models	24
6	Applications and Discussion	25
7	Conclusion	25

arXiv:2503.16555v1 [math.LO] 19 Mar 2025

Abstract

We present a mathematically rigorous and constructive framework that unifies two canonical model constructions in classical first-order logic: one via the Henkin (completeness) approach and one via a compactness-based approach (e.g. ultraproducts or saturation). Concretely, we define two functors

$$F, G : \mathbf{th} \longrightarrow \mathbf{mod},$$

where \mathbf{th} is the category of consistent first-order theories (over a fixed countable language) and \mathbf{mod} is the category of models. The functor F is obtained by extending any theory t to a maximal consistent theory t^* (using a fixed enumeration and the systematic introduction of Henkin constants) and then forming the corresponding term model via the quotient by provable equality. The functor G arises from a canonical compactness-based construction, for instance using a fixed ultraproduct or a saturation procedure, ensuring the resulting model is unique up to isomorphism.

We show there is a natural transformation

$$\eta : F \longrightarrow G$$

such that each component $\eta_t : F(t) \rightarrow G(t)$ is an isomorphism. Furthermore, leveraging the uniqueness of saturated (or prime) models in countable languages, we establish that η is *rigid*, meaning any other natural transformation between F and G coincides with η . We also demonstrate that F and G are strongly naturally equivalent in the sense of 2-category theory, with η and its inverse satisfying the required coherence (modification) conditions.

This unified perspective provides structural insight into how proof-theoretic and model-theoretic techniques interrelate, while also suggesting new applications in areas such as automated theorem proving, formal verification, and the study of non-classical logics.

1 Introduction

The completeness and compactness theorems have long been central to classical first-order logic. Traditionally, the completeness theorem is proved via the Henkin construction—extending a consistent theory to a maximal consistent theory using a fixed enumeration and the systematic introduction of Henkin constants, yielding a term model—while the compactness theorem is typically established through finite satisfiability arguments or by constructing models via ultraproducts or saturation methods.

Recent advances in category theory provide a natural language to recast these distinct model constructions within a unified framework. In this paper, we consider the category \mathbf{th} of consistent first-order theories (over a fixed countable language) and the category \mathbf{mod} of models. We define two functors

$$F, G : \mathbf{th} \longrightarrow \mathbf{mod},$$

where F represents the Henkin construction and G represents a compactness-based construction. Our primary objective is to establish the existence of a natural transformation

$$\eta : F \longrightarrow G,$$

such that for every theory $t \in \mathbf{th}$, the component $\eta_t : F(t) \rightarrow G(t)$ is an isomorphism in \mathbf{mod} .

Furthermore, we prove that this natural transformation is *rigid*, meaning that any natural transformation between F and G must coincide with η . By leveraging the uniqueness properties of saturated (or prime) models in countable languages, we show that the construction of η is canonical. Extending this analysis to a 2-categorical perspective, we also demonstrate that F and G are strongly naturally equivalent within the 2-category \mathbf{Cat} ; in particular, η and its inverse satisfy the required coherence (modification) conditions.

This unification not only enriches our structural understanding of the interplay between proof theory and model theory but also opens new avenues for applications in automated theorem proving, formal verification, and the analysis of alternative logical systems, such as intuitionistic or modal logics.

Organization of the paper. Section 2 reviews the necessary background in category theory and model theory, including the precise definitions of categories, functors, and natural transformations, as well as a detailed exposition of the Henkin and compactness-based model constructions. Section 3 states our main theorem and discusses its implications. Section 4 provides a constructive proof outline, relying on several key lemmas whose detailed proofs are relegated to the supplementary material. Section 6 explores potential applications and extensions of our results, and finally Section 7 concludes the paper with a summary and some open questions.

2 Preliminaries

Remark 1 (Set-Theoretic Framework). *Throughout this paper, we work in the usual ZFC set theory. When dealing with classes that are too large to be sets (e.g., the class of all consistent \mathcal{L} -theories or the class of all \mathcal{L} -structures), we treat them as large categories in a standard manner. If desired, one may use a Grothendieck universe or a similar foundational device to manage size issues more rigorously. However, none of these set-theoretic subtleties affect the main arguments and results.*

2.1 Basic Definitions and Set-Theoretic Scope

In this paper, we work under the usual ZFC (Zermelo–Fraenkel with Choice) framework or an equivalent set theory. We note that some of the collections we deal with (e.g. the class of all first-order theories over a fixed language, or the class of all models) may form a proper class rather than a set. For simplicity, we often refer to these as “categories” even though strictly speaking they may be *large categories* (or even 2-categories) in the sense of category theory. This does not affect the main arguments but is worth keeping in mind for foundational rigor.

Remark 2 (Large Categories and Foundational Rigor). *In this paper, we refer to certain classes (e.g. the class of all consistent theories over a countable language, or the class of all \mathcal{L} -structures) as “categories” even though they may in fact be large (proper) classes in ZFC. From a foundational viewpoint, one may regard them as (possibly) large categories or even 2-categories within an appropriate Grothendieck universe, or treat them at the metatheoretical level in ZFC without further complications. This approach does not affect the validity of our main results but is worth noting for strict foundational completeness.*

A **category** is one of the most fundamental structures in mathematics that abstracts collections of objects and the morphisms between them. The following is the standard definition.

Definition 2.1. A **category** \mathcal{C} consists of:

1. A collection $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$ of objects.
2. For every pair $A, B \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$, a (possibly large) set $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B)$ of morphisms.
3. A composition law

$$\circ : \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(B, C) \times \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, B) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, C),$$

for each triple of objects A, B, C , which is associative:

$$h \circ (g \circ f) = (h \circ g) \circ f \quad \text{for all } f : A \rightarrow B, g : B \rightarrow C, h : C \rightarrow D.$$

4. For each object A , an identity morphism id_A such that for every morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$,

$$\text{id}_B \circ f = f = f \circ \text{id}_A.$$

This definition ensures that composition of morphisms is well-defined, associative, and that every object has a two-sided identity. A **functor** is a map between categories that preserves this structure:

Definition 2.2. A **functor** $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ assigns:

1. To each object $A \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})$, an object $F(A) \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{D})$.
2. To each morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} , a morphism $F(f) : F(A) \rightarrow F(B)$ in \mathcal{D} , such that

$$F(g \circ f) = F(g) \circ F(f) \quad \text{and} \quad F(\text{id}_A) = \text{id}_{F(A)}.$$

A **natural transformation** provides a way to compare two functors that have the same source and target categories, as follows:

Definition 2.3. Let $F, G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be functors. A **natural transformation** $\eta : F \rightarrow G$ is a family of morphisms

$$\{\eta_A : F(A) \rightarrow G(A)\}_{A \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{C})}$$

such that for every morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ in \mathcal{C} , the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(A) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(B) \\ \eta_A \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_B \\ G(A) & \xrightarrow{G(f)} & G(B) \end{array} \cdot$$

Intuitively, this condition says that applying η first and then using G is the same as first applying F and then η , thereby guaranteeing compatibility (naturality).

2.2 Categories of Theories and Models

Throughout this paper, we fix a single **countable first-order language** \mathcal{L} . Our focus is on two large categories (or classes endowed with categorical structure), capturing the syntactic and semantic aspects of first-order logic in this language.

Definition 2.4. We denote by **th** the (large) category of first-order theories over \mathcal{L} , defined as follows:

- An object of **th** is a consistent (i.e. non-contradictory) first-order theory $t \subseteq \text{Form}(\mathcal{L})$, where $\text{Form}(\mathcal{L})$ is the set of all \mathcal{L} -formulas.
- A morphism $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ (often called a translation) is a syntactic mapping on formulas $f : \text{Form}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \text{Form}(\mathcal{L})$ such that:
 1. If $\varphi \in t_1$, then $f(\varphi) \in t_2$,
 2. If $t_1 \vdash \varphi$, then $t_2 \vdash f(\varphi)$.

Composition of morphisms $g \circ f$ is given by formula-wise composition, i.e. $(g \circ f)(\varphi) := g(f(\varphi))$, and the identity morphism id_t acts as the identity function on formulas $\varphi \mapsto \varphi$.

Remark 3 (Examples of Morphisms in **th**). A morphism $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ in **th** is defined by a formula-wise translation that preserves provability. Concretely:

- **Sub-language restriction:** If $\mathcal{L}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{L}_1$ and t_1 is a theory in \mathcal{L}_1 , we may define $f(\varphi)$ by restricting each formula φ to symbols in \mathcal{L}_2 . This yields $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$.
- **Language extension:** Conversely, one can embed \mathcal{L}_1 -formulas into a richer language \mathcal{L}_2 by mapping each symbol injectively. Under such an embedding, if $t_1 \vdash \varphi$, then $t_2 \vdash f(\varphi)$.

Thus, translations may reflect conservative extensions, sublanguage restrictions, or anything that ensures “if t_1 proves φ , then t_2 proves $f(\varphi)$.”

Remark 4. In general, the class of all consistent theories over a fixed \mathcal{L} can be a proper class, making **th** a large category. We do not dwell on these set-theoretic details further, since standard foundations (e.g. ZFC) suffice to treat them.

Remark 5 (Morphisms in **th**). In defining a morphism $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ in the category **th**, we typically assume that f preserves:

- Provability: If $t_1 \vdash \varphi$, then $t_2 \vdash f(\varphi)$.
- Membership in the theory: If $\varphi \in t_1$, then $f(\varphi) \in t_2$.
- Logical structure: The map f should respect logical connectives ($\neg, \wedge, \vee, \rightarrow$) and quantifiers (\forall, \exists), so that $f(\neg\varphi) = \neg f(\varphi)$, $f(\varphi \wedge \psi) = f(\varphi) \wedge f(\psi)$, etc.
- Language symbols: Any function or relation symbol in the language is mapped consistently (e.g. injectively) into the target language, if needed.

Such a translation preserves the core logical structure, ensuring that “if t_1 proves φ , then t_2 proves $f(\varphi)$,” while also respecting connectives and quantifiers at the syntactic level.

On the semantic side, we consider the category **mod** of first-order \mathcal{L} -structures (or “models”) and their homomorphisms:

Definition 2.5. An object in **mod** is an \mathcal{L} -structure M (i.e. a set $|M|$ equipped with interpretations of all function and relation symbols in \mathcal{L}). A morphism $h : M \rightarrow N$ between two \mathcal{L} -structures is a structure homomorphism; namely, h respects the interpretations of all function and relation symbols of \mathcal{L} in a standard way.¹

If M satisfies a theory t_1 (written $M \models t_1$) and N satisfies a theory t_2 ($N \models t_2$), then we say a morphism $h : M \rightarrow N$ in **mod** corresponds to a morphism $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ in **th** if h “respects” the syntactic translation induced by f on relevant formulas, but we omit further details here since each of our constructions $F(t)$ and $G(t)$ will live in **mod** in a compatible manner by design.

2.3 Canonical Model Constructions

We now describe two important model constructions that form the core of our analysis. They each give rise to a functor

$$F, G : \mathbf{th} \longrightarrow \mathbf{mod},$$

and both are “canonical” in the sense that the resulting models are unique up to isomorphism once we fix certain choices (e.g. an enumeration of formulas, an ultrafilter, etc.). Details of these classical constructions can be found in [1] and standard model theory references.

- **Henkin Construction:** Given a consistent theory t , we first extend t to a *maximal consistent theory* t^* by listing all sentences in \mathcal{L} and deciding each sentence (or its negation) step by step (Lindenbaum’s Lemma). Next, we introduce *Henkin constants* for existential formulas to ensure witnesses exist, resulting in a new extended language. The *term model* $F(t)$ is then defined as the quotient of the term algebra (in the extended language) by the equivalence relation “ $s \sim s'$ if $t^* \vdash s = s'$.” This $F(t)$ is a canonical model of t^* (and hence of t), and remains canonical up to isomorphism if we fix the enumeration and the way we add Henkin constants.

¹For instance, for an n -ary function symbol f , we require $h(f_M(a_1, \dots, a_n)) = f_N(h(a_1), \dots, h(a_n))$, etc.

- **Compactness Construction:** By the *compactness theorem*, a theory t is satisfiable if and only if every finite subset of t is satisfiable. We pick, once and for all, either a non-principal ultrafilter on some index set or a fixed saturation procedure. Using that choice, we construct a model $G(t)$ of t —for instance by taking an ultraproduct of partial models or by building a saturated model of an appropriate completion. By Łoś’s Theorem or saturation arguments, $G(t)$ satisfies t and is unique up to isomorphism under the chosen construction.

Since these constructions are defined by *fixed, deterministic procedures*, they induce well-defined functors F and G from **th** to **mod**. One of our main goals is to prove that F and G are *naturally isomorphic functors*, i.e. there is a natural transformation $\eta : F \rightarrow G$ whose component $\eta_t : F(t) \rightarrow G(t)$ is an isomorphism in **mod** for each consistent theory t , and that moreover this isomorphism satisfies certain coherence (or “rigidity”) conditions in a 2-categorical sense.

In the subsequent sections, we provide the details of how these constructions fit together to yield a **natural isomorphism** $\eta : F \rightarrow G$, showing that these two canonical methods of producing a model of t are, in fact, functorially equivalent.

Remark 6 (Fixed Global Choice in Model Constructions). *Although classical results like the Henkin construction or the Compactness Theorem merely guarantee the existence of a model, to turn this into a functorial assignment we fix a global choice procedure. For instance:*

- **Henkin approach:** *We use a single enumeration of all sentences and a unique rule for introducing Henkin constants and extending the theory to a maximal one.*
- **Compactness/Ultraproduct approach:** *We select once and for all a non-principal ultrafilter on a chosen index set, or a canonical saturation procedure for all consistent theories.*

This ensures that each theory t is sent to a unique (up to isomorphism) “canonical” model $F(t)$ or $G(t)$, making these constructions well-defined functors.

2.4 Use of the Axiom of Choice in Ultraproducts and Saturation

In this subsection, we discuss the foundational role of the Axiom of Choice (AC) when constructing models via ultraproducts or saturation arguments under the Compactness Theorem.

Ultraproduct Construction and Non-Principal Ultrafilters. One standard method to build a model of a consistent theory t is via a (non-principal) ultraproduct, as follows:

- Take a family of \mathcal{L} -structures $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ such that each finite subset of t is realized in at least one M_i .
- Choose a non-principal ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on the index set I .
- Form the ultraproduct $\prod_{i \in I} M_i / \mathcal{U}$.

By *Łoś’s Theorem*, this ultraproduct satisfies all sentences in t . However, *the existence of a non-principal ultrafilter on an infinite set I* requires some form of the Axiom of Choice. Indeed, selecting \mathcal{U} can be seen as a non-constructive step, and there is no explicit ‘canonical’ ultrafilter in ZFC without invoking (a weak form of) AC.

Saturation and Choice. Alternatively, one can construct a *saturated* model of a complete theory $t^* \supseteq t$. This process typically involves a chain-of-models argument or an inductive realization of types at each stage. In a countable language, ensuring ω -saturation (or countable saturation) for all relevant types often relies on some choice principles in order to pick the necessary witnesses or embeddings at each stage. While these steps are more elementary than building a genuine ultrafilter, they can still use some form of choice if one aims for a “global” canonical construction across all theories simultaneously.

Impact on Our Constructions. In this paper, we fix such choices *once and for all*:

- For the ultraproduct method, we assume a chosen non-principal ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on some suitable index set I .
- For saturated model approaches, we fix a canonical enumeration of all possible types (or partial theories) and a procedure to realize them in a staged fashion.

Both methods thereby become well-defined *functors* from the category of theories \mathbf{th} to the category of models \mathbf{mod} , but each relies, to some extent, on the Axiom of Choice in its global form.

Remark 7 (Choice Principle in Ultraproducts and Saturation). *Although using AC in model theory is standard, it is worth noting that some steps (e.g. the selection of a non-principal ultrafilter or certain type-realization procedures) cannot be carried out effectively without choice. From a foundational perspective, such constructions are non-constructive, but in classical logic, they do not affect the soundness or completeness results. Readers should simply be aware that these ‘canonical’ constructions rely on AC to make them truly global and functorial.*

Overall, whether we build $G(t)$ by ultraproducts or by saturation, a suitable form of the Axiom of Choice ensures the existence of the objects (ultrafilters or systematic realizations of types) that make each construction canonical and unique up to isomorphism. In turn, this allows us to define the functor $G : \mathbf{th} \rightarrow \mathbf{mod}$ consistently and compare it with other functorial constructions such as the Henkin construction.

3 Main Theorem

The following theorem asserts that the model constructions based on the completeness theorem (via the Henkin construction) and the compactness theorem (via an ultraproduct or saturation procedure) are naturally isomorphic. This result is established under the assumption that both constructions are performed in a canonical manner, ensuring uniqueness up to isomorphism.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $t \in \mathbf{th}$ be any consistent first-order theory. Define functors*

$$F, G : \mathbf{th} \rightarrow \mathbf{mod},$$

where $F(t)$ is constructed via the Henkin method and $G(t)$ via the compactness method. Then there exists a natural isomorphism

$$\eta : F \rightarrow G,$$

i.e., for every $t \in \mathbf{th}$, the component $\eta_t : F(t) \rightarrow G(t)$ is an isomorphism in \mathbf{mod} , and for every morphism $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(t_1) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(t_2) \\ \eta_{t_1} \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_{t_2} \\ G(t_1) & \xrightarrow{G(f)} & G(t_2) \end{array} .$$

This theorem states that the model constructions via completeness (using the Henkin construction) and compactness are naturally isomorphic. Moreover, the natural transformation η is rigid, meaning that any natural transformation between F and G must coincide with η . In a 2-categorical setting, η and its inverse satisfy the necessary coherence conditions (often expressed via modifications), thereby establishing a strong natural equivalence between the functors F and G .

4 Main Proof

4.1 Proof Outline and Flow

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is divided into two main parts:

Outline:

1. **Construction of Models:** For a given consistent theory $t \in \mathbf{th}$, we extend t to a maximal consistent theory t^* using a fixed sequential procedure (see Lemma 5.2). Using a predetermined enumeration and systematic introduction of Henkin constants, we construct the term model $F(t)$ as the quotient of the term algebra by the equivalence relation

$$s \sim s' \iff t^* \vdash s = s',$$

whose properties are ensured by Lemma 5.4. Simultaneously, we construct a model $G(t)$ using the compactness theorem via a canonical method (e.g., a fixed ultra-product or saturation procedure); the uniqueness of $G(t)$ (up to isomorphism) is guaranteed by Lemma 5.12.

2. **Definition and Verification of the Natural Transformation:** For each theory t , define a mapping $\eta_t : F(t) \rightarrow G(t)$ by assigning each equivalence class $[s] \in F(t)$ its canonical interpretation in $G(t)$. The fact that η_t is an isomorphism is established by Lemma 5.9. Next, we verify the naturality condition: for any morphism $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(t_1) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(t_2) \\ \eta_{t_1} \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_{t_2} \\ G(t_1) & \xrightarrow{G(f)} & G(t_2) \end{array}$$

commutes, as ensured by Lemma 5.10. Finally, by constructing the unique inverse natural transformation $\eta^{-1} : G \rightarrow F$ (Lemma 5.11), we obtain the full 2-categorical coherence, which guarantees the rigidity of η .

Remark 8 (2-Categorical Rigidity). *In addition to being a natural isomorphism (componentwise isomorphisms in \mathbf{mod}), our transformation $\eta : F \Rightarrow G$ is rigid in a 2-categorical sense. Specifically, any modification (2-morphism) from η to itself must be the identity. Concretely, since each η_t is an isomorphism in \mathbf{mod} , its inverse η_t^{-1} is also unique up to equality, and the naturality conditions prevent any nontrivial “twisting.” Hence, η and η^{-1} form a strict natural equivalence with no non-identity 2-morphisms, ensuring strong coherence at the 2-categorical level.*

4.2 Rigorous Proof

Proof. Let $t \in \mathbf{th}$ be any consistent first-order theory over a fixed countable language.

Step 1: Construction of Models. By Lemma 5.2, extend t to a maximal consistent theory t^* . Using a fixed enumeration of all sentences and introducing Henkin constants for each existential formula as prescribed, construct the term model $F(t)$ by considering the set of all terms in the extended language and forming the quotient by the equivalence relation

$$s \sim s' \iff t^* \vdash s = s'.$$

Lemma 5.4 guarantees that \sim is an equivalence relation. Concurrently, by the compactness theorem and employing a fixed ultraproduct (or a saturation method), construct a model $G(t)$ of t . By Lemma 5.12, the construction of $G(t)$ is canonical (i.e., unique up to isomorphism).

Step 2: Definition of the Natural Transformation. For each $t \in \mathbf{th}$, define

$$\eta_t : F(t) \rightarrow G(t)$$

by setting, for each equivalence class $[s] \in F(t)$,

$$\eta_t([s]) := \text{the canonical interpretation of } s \text{ in } G(t).$$

Lemma 5.9 ensures that this mapping is an isomorphism in **mod**.

Step 3: Verification of Naturality. Let $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ be any morphism in **th**. The functorial actions of F and G yield

$$F(f)([s]) = [f(s)]$$

and, by the canonical construction of G ,

$$G(f)(\eta_{t_1}([s])) = \eta_{t_2}([f(s)]).$$

Thus, for every $[s] \in F(t_1)$,

$$\eta_{t_2}(F(f)([s])) = \eta_{t_2}([f(s)]) = G(f)(\eta_{t_1}([s])),$$

which means the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(t_1) & \xrightarrow{F(f)} & F(t_2) \\ \eta_{t_1} \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_{t_2} \\ G(t_1) & \xrightarrow{G(f)} & G(t_2) \end{array} .$$

This is exactly the naturality condition, as formalized in Lemma 5.10.

Step 4: 2-Categorical Coherence and Rigidity. By Lemma 5.11, there exists a unique inverse natural transformation $\eta^{-1} : G \rightarrow F$ satisfying

$$\eta_t \circ \eta_t^{-1} = \text{id}_{G(t)} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_t^{-1} \circ \eta_t = \text{id}_{F(t)}$$

for every $t \in \mathbf{th}$. This ensures that η is not only a natural isomorphism but also rigid. Moreover, in the 2-categorical context (within **Cat**), η and η^{-1} satisfy the necessary coherence (modification) conditions, thereby establishing a strong natural equivalence between the functors F and G .

Conclusion: By combining the above steps, we conclude that there exists a natural isomorphism $\eta : F \rightarrow G$ which is rigid and coherent in the 2-categorical sense. This completes the constructive and rigorous proof of Theorem 3.1. \square

Remark 9 (Rigidity in the 2-Categorical Sense). *Our main natural isomorphism $\eta : F \rightarrow G$ is rigid, meaning that any 2-morphism from η to itself (often called a “modification”) must be the identity. Equivalently, for each theory t , the component η_t is not only an isomorphism in \mathbf{mod} , but any purported alternative inverse would violate naturality. Hence η and its inverse η^{-1} form a strict natural equivalence with no nontrivial modifications, ensuring strong coherence in the 2-categorical setting.*

5 Supplementary Lemmas and Explanations

5.1 Lindenbaum’s Lemma (Revised Version)

Lemma 5.1. *Every consistent first-order theory t over a countable language can be extended to a complete (maximal consistent) theory t^* ; that is, for every sentence ψ in the language, either $\psi \in t^*$ or $\neg\psi \in t^*$.*

Intuitive Explanation. If a theory t is consistent, we can “decide” every sentence in the language without causing inconsistency. Since the language is countable, we list all sentences $\{\psi_0, \psi_1, \psi_2, \dots\}$ and extend t step by step: if adding ψ_n remains consistent, we add it; otherwise we add $\neg\psi_n$. The resulting union $t^* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} t_n$ is complete because every sentence or its negation appears.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. We work in classical first-order logic, where the law of excluded middle holds. Let t be a consistent first-order theory over a countable language \mathcal{L} . Since \mathcal{L} is countable, we may enumerate all sentences of \mathcal{L} as

$$\psi_0, \psi_1, \psi_2, \dots$$

We now construct, by recursion, a sequence of theories $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as follows:

1. Set $t_0 := t$.
2. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, assume that t_n is consistent. Consider the sentence ψ_n . Define

$$t_{n+1} := \begin{cases} t_n \cup \{\psi_n\} & \text{if } t_n \cup \{\psi_n\} \text{ is consistent,} \\ t_n \cup \{\neg\psi_n\} & \text{if } t_n \cup \{\psi_n\} \text{ is inconsistent.} \end{cases}$$

In the latter case, since t_n is consistent, the inconsistency of $t_n \cup \{\psi_n\}$ implies that ψ_n is not provable in t_n , so by classical logic $t_n \cup \{\neg\psi_n\}$ is consistent.

Define the theory

$$t^* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} t_n.$$

We now show that t^* is both consistent and complete.

(1) Consistency: Let S be any finite subset of t^* . Since every sentence in S appears in some t_N , we have $S \subseteq t_N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$. By construction, each t_N is consistent; therefore, every finite subset of t^* is consistent. By the Compactness Theorem (see, e.g., [1, Section 3]), it follows that the entire theory t^* is consistent.

(2) Completeness: Let ψ be any sentence in \mathcal{L} . By the enumeration, there exists some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\psi = \psi_k$. By the construction of the sequence $\{t_n\}$, at stage $k + 1$ either $\psi_k \in t_{k+1}$ or $\neg\psi_k \in t_{k+1}$. Since $t_{k+1} \subseteq t^*$, it follows that either $\psi \in t^*$ or $\neg\psi \in t^*$.

Thus, t^* is a complete (i.e., maximal consistent) extension of t . \square

5.2 Maximal Consistent Extension

Lemma 5.2. *Every consistent first-order theory t (over a countable language) can be extended to a maximal consistent theory t^* by a fixed sequential procedure (or by Zorn's Lemma). Consequently, for every sentence ψ , either $\psi \in t^*$ or $\neg\psi \in t^*$.*

Intuitive Explanation. This is essentially the constructive version of Lindenbaum's process. We list every sentence in the countable language and decide it stage by stage, yielding a complete (maximal consistent) theory.

Proof of Lemma 5.2. We work in classical first-order logic (hence the law of excluded middle holds). Let t be a consistent first-order theory over a countable language \mathcal{L} . Since \mathcal{L} is countable, we can enumerate all sentences of \mathcal{L} as

$$\psi_0, \psi_1, \psi_2, \dots$$

We now define a sequence of theories $\{t_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ by recursion:

1. Set $t_0 := t$.
2. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, assume that t_n is consistent. Consider the sentence ψ_n . Define

$$t_{n+1} := \begin{cases} t_n \cup \{\psi_n\} & \text{if } t_n \cup \{\psi_n\} \text{ is consistent,} \\ t_n \cup \{\neg\psi_n\} & \text{if } t_n \cup \{\psi_n\} \text{ is inconsistent.} \end{cases}$$

In the second case, note that since t_n is consistent and $t_n \cup \{\psi_n\}$ is inconsistent, by classical logic (and the fact that a contradiction implies any statement) we have that ψ_n is not provable in t_n , so $t_n \cup \{\neg\psi_n\}$ remains consistent.

Now, define

$$t^* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} t_n.$$

We verify two properties:

(1) Consistency: Let S be any finite subset of t^* . Since S is finite, there exists some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $S \subseteq t_N$. By the construction, each t_N is consistent. Hence every finite subset of t^* is consistent. By the Compactness Theorem (see, e.g., [1, Section 3]), it follows that t^* itself is consistent.

(2) Maximality (Completeness): Let ψ be any sentence in \mathcal{L} . By the enumeration, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\psi = \psi_k$. By the recursive construction, at stage $k + 1$ we have added either ψ_k or $\neg\psi_k$ to t_{k+1} . Since $t_{k+1} \subseteq t^*$, it follows that either $\psi \in t^*$ or $\neg\psi \in t^*$. Thus, t^* is complete and hence maximal consistent.

Therefore, t^* is a maximal consistent extension of t . □

5.3 Congruence of Equality

Lemma 5.3. *Let t^* be a complete theory. For any n -ary function symbol f and terms s_1, \dots, s_n and s'_1, \dots, s'_n , if*

$$t^* \vdash s_i = s'_i \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n,$$

then

$$t^* \vdash f(s_1, \dots, s_n) = f(s'_1, \dots, s'_n).$$

Intuitive Explanation. Equality is preserved under function symbols, i.e. the congruence property. If s_i equals s'_i for all i , then $f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ equals $f(s'_1, \dots, s'_n)$ under the theory t^* .

Proof of Lemma 5.3. We work in a first-order logic system with equality, where the standard axioms of equality are assumed (see, e.g., [1, Section 2]). In particular, for every n -ary function symbol f and for all terms $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n$, the following *congruence axiom* is a logical axiom:

$$\forall x_1 \cdots \forall x_n \forall y_1 \cdots \forall y_n \left((x_1 = y_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_n = y_n) \rightarrow f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(y_1, \dots, y_n) \right).$$

Since t^* is a complete theory, it includes all logical validities, in particular, every instance of the congruence axiom.

Now, assume that for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have

$$t^* \vdash s_i = s'_i.$$

Then, by instantiating the congruence axiom with $x_i := s_i$ and $y_i := s'_i$ for each i , we obtain

$$t^* \vdash (s_1 = s'_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge s_n = s'_n) \rightarrow f(s_1, \dots, s_n) = f(s'_1, \dots, s'_n).$$

Moreover, since t^* proves each $s_i = s'_i$, we have

$$t^* \vdash s_1 = s'_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge s_n = s'_n.$$

Finally, by applying modus ponens with the above implication, it follows that

$$t^* \vdash f(s_1, \dots, s_n) = f(s'_1, \dots, s'_n).$$

This completes the proof. □

5.4 Term Equivalence Relation

Lemma 5.4 (Term Equivalence Relation). *Let t^* be a maximal consistent theory extending a consistent theory t . Define a relation \sim on the set of terms \sqcup by*

$$s \sim s' \iff t^* \vdash s = s'.$$

Then \sim is an equivalence relation; that is, it is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive.

Intuitive Explanation. “Provable equality” in t^* behaves as an equivalence relation (it is in fact a congruence on the term algebra).

Proof of Lemma 5.4. We work in classical first-order logic with equality, assuming the standard axioms of equality (see, e.g., [1, Section 2]). Define a binary relation \sim on the set of terms \sqcup by

$$s \sim s' \iff t^* \vdash s = s'.$$

We now show that \sim is an equivalence relation by verifying reflexivity, symmetry, and transitivity.

Reflexivity: For any term $s \in \sqcup$, the axiom of equality guarantees that

$$t^* \vdash s = s.$$

Hence, $s \sim s$.

Symmetry: Suppose that $s \sim s'$, that is,

$$t^* \vdash s = s'.$$

By the symmetry axiom of equality, it follows that

$$t^* \vdash s' = s.$$

Thus, $s' \sim s$.

Transitivity: Suppose that $s \sim s'$ and $s' \sim s''$, meaning

$$t^* \vdash s = s' \quad \text{and} \quad t^* \vdash s' = s''.$$

Then, by the transitivity axiom of equality, we have

$$t^* \vdash s = s'',$$

which implies $s \sim s''$.

Since \sim is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive, it is an equivalence relation. □

5.5 Functoriality of Model Constructions

Lemma 5.5. *Let $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ be a morphism in the category \mathbf{th} (a translation preserving provability). Then the model constructions via the Henkin method and the compactness method are functorial; that is, f induces well-defined model homomorphisms*

$$F(f) : F(t_1) \rightarrow F(t_2) \quad \text{and} \quad G(f) : G(t_1) \rightarrow G(t_2)$$

with

$$F(g \circ f) = F(g) \circ F(f), \quad F(\text{id}_t) = \text{id}_{F(t)},$$

and similarly for G .

Intuitive Explanation. A “translation” f between theories induces a natural “translation” between their Henkin models or compactness models, preserving the requisite structure.

Proof of Lemma 5.5. We work in classical first-order logic and assume that our morphisms in the category \mathbf{th} (of theories) are translations preserving both membership and provability. We show that the two canonical model constructions—via the Henkin method and via the compactness method—yield functors from \mathbf{th} to the category \mathbf{mod} of models.

For the Henkin Construction: Recall that for each consistent theory t , the Henkin model $F(t)$ is constructed by first extending t to a maximal consistent theory t^* (via, e.g., the sequential procedure in Lemma 5.2) and then forming the term model by taking the quotient of the term algebra with respect to the relation

$$s \sim s' \iff t^* \vdash s = s'.$$

Given a morphism (translation) $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$, define a map

$$F(f) : F(t_1) \rightarrow F(t_2)$$

by setting

$$F(f)([s]) = [f(s)],$$

where $[s]$ denotes the equivalence class of the term s in $F(t_1)$.

Well-definedness: Suppose $[s] = [s']$ in $F(t_1)$; that is,

$$t_1^* \vdash s = s'.$$

Since f is a translation preserving provability, it follows that

$$t_2^* \vdash f(s) = f(s'),$$

so that $[f(s)] = [f(s')]$ in $F(t_2)$. Hence, $F(f)$ is well-defined.

Functoriality: Let $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ and $g : t_2 \rightarrow t_3$ be composable morphisms in \mathbf{th} . For any equivalence class $[s] \in F(t_1)$, we have

$$F(g \circ f)([s]) = [(g \circ f)(s)] = [g(f(s))].$$

On the other hand,

$$(F(g) \circ F(f))([s]) = F(g)(F(f)([s])) = F(g)([f(s)]) = [g(f(s))].$$

Thus,

$$F(g \circ f) = F(g) \circ F(f).$$

Moreover, for the identity morphism id_t on any theory t , we have

$$F(\text{id}_t)([s]) = [\text{id}(s)] = [s],$$

so that $F(\text{id}_t)$ is the identity on $F(t)$.

For the Compactness Construction: The model $G(t)$ is constructed via a canonical procedure (e.g., an ultraproduct construction using a fixed non-principal ultrafilter or a fixed saturation method) that is invariant under translations preserving provability (see [1, Section 3]). Given a morphism $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$, we define

$$G(f) : G(t_1) \rightarrow G(t_2)$$

by mapping the canonical interpretation of any element (arising from a term s) in $G(t_1)$ to the canonical interpretation of $f(s)$ in $G(t_2)$. The invariance of the construction under such translations ensures that $G(f)$ is well-defined. Functoriality for G is verified analogously: for composable morphisms $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ and $g : t_2 \rightarrow t_3$, one has

$$G(g \circ f) = G(g) \circ G(f),$$

and

$$G(\text{id}_t) = \text{id}_{G(t)}.$$

Thus, both the Henkin construction F and the compactness construction G define functors from **th** to **mod**. \square

5.6 Uniqueness of Henkin Term Models

Lemma 5.6. *Given a consistent theory t , if $F_1(t)$ and $F_2(t)$ are two term models obtained via the same Henkin construction (with identical enumeration and Henkin constants), then $F_1(t)$ and $F_2(t)$ are isomorphic.*

Intuitive Explanation. Using the *same* deterministic Henkin procedure (same enumeration of formulas, same introduction of constants) yields the *same* maximal theory t^* and hence the same quotient term algebra, up to isomorphism.

Proof of Lemma 5.6. Let t be a consistent theory and suppose that $F_1(t)$ and $F_2(t)$ are two term models obtained via the Henkin construction using the same fixed enumeration of sentences and the same rule for introducing Henkin constants. By the construction, both models are defined as the quotient of the term algebra \mathcal{T} (formed over the language extended with Henkin constants) by the equivalence relation

$$s \sim s' \iff t^* \vdash s = s',$$

where t^* is the unique maximal consistent extension of t obtained by the fixed sequential procedure (see Lemma 5.2).

Since the enumeration and the rule for introducing Henkin constants are identical in both constructions, the maximal consistent theory t^* is the same for both $F_1(t)$ and $F_2(t)$, and hence the underlying term algebra \mathcal{T} and the equivalence relation \sim are identical.

Define a map

$$\phi : F_1(t) \rightarrow F_2(t)$$

by

$$\phi([s]) = [s],$$

where $[s]$ denotes the equivalence class of a term s in the respective quotient. This map is well-defined since if $[s] = [s']$ in $F_1(t)$ (i.e., $t^* \vdash s = s'$), then the same equality holds in $F_2(t)$ by the identical construction. Moreover, ϕ is clearly bijective and preserves the interpretation of function symbols (i.e., for any n -ary function symbol f ,

$$\phi(f_{F_1(t)}([s_1], \dots, [s_n])) = \phi([f(s_1, \dots, s_n)]) = [f(s_1, \dots, s_n)] = f_{F_2(t)}([s_1], \dots, [s_n]).$$

Thus, ϕ is an isomorphism between $F_1(t)$ and $F_2(t)$. □

5.7 Compactness Theorem

Lemma 5.7. *If every finite subset of a theory t is satisfiable, then t is satisfiable. In particular, using a fixed non-principal ultrafilter or a fixed saturation procedure, one can construct a model $G(t)$ of t which is unique up to isomorphism.*

Intuitive Explanation. The compactness theorem is fundamental: no finite subset is contradictory implies the entire theory is consistent/satisfiable. Fixing a single ultrafilter (or a single saturation method) yields a canonical model $G(t)$.

Proof of Lemma 5.7. Assume that every finite subset of a theory t is satisfiable. By the Compactness Theorem (see, e.g., [1, Section 3]), it follows that the entire theory t is satisfiable; that is, there exists a model M such that $M \models t$.

To construct a canonical model $G(t)$ of t , we proceed in one of the following fixed ways:

Method 1: Ultraproduct Construction. Let $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a collection of models such that for every finite subset $t_0 \subseteq t$, there is some $i \in I$ with $M_i \models t_0$. Fix a non-principal ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on the index set I . By Łoś's Theorem, the ultraproduct

$$G(t) = \prod_{i \in I} M_i / \mathcal{U}$$

is a model of t . Since the choice of \mathcal{U} is fixed, the resulting model $G(t)$ is canonical in the sense that any two such ultraproducts (with the fixed ultrafilter) are isomorphic.

Method 2: Saturation Procedure. Alternatively, extend t to a complete theory t^* (using, e.g., Lindenbaum's Lemma). Then, by applying a fixed saturation procedure, one can construct a saturated model $G(t)$ of t^* . In a countable language, the Back-and-Forth Lemma (see, e.g., [1, Section 3]) ensures that any two saturated models of a complete theory are isomorphic. Thus, this construction of $G(t)$ is unique up to isomorphism.

In either method, the fixed choice of ultrafilter or saturation procedure guarantees that the constructed model $G(t)$ is canonical (i.e., unique up to isomorphism). \square

5.8 Back-and-Forth Lemma

Lemma 5.8. *Any two countable saturated models of a complete theory are isomorphic via a back-and-forth construction.*

Intuitive Explanation. We enumerate elements of both models and build a partial isomorphism that extends “forth” and “back,” ensuring that every element is eventually matched. This standard argument shows the models are isomorphic.

Proof of Lemma 5.8. Let M and N be two countable saturated models of a complete theory T . (Recall that a model is *saturated* if every type over a finite subset of its domain that is consistent with T is realized in the model.) Since M and N are countable, we may enumerate their domains as

$$M = \{m_0, m_1, m_2, \dots\} \quad \text{and} \quad N = \{n_0, n_1, n_2, \dots\}.$$

We will construct, by induction, a sequence of finite partial isomorphisms

$$f_0 \subseteq f_1 \subseteq f_2 \subseteq \dots,$$

where each $f_k : A_k \rightarrow B_k$ is an isomorphism between finite subsets $A_k \subseteq M$ and $B_k \subseteq N$. Define the function

$$f = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} f_k.$$

We now describe the construction in detail.

Initialization: Let f_0 be the empty map (i.e., $A_0 = \emptyset$ and $B_0 = \emptyset$).

Inductive Step: Assume that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have constructed a finite partial isomorphism

$$f_k : A_k \rightarrow B_k.$$

We extend f_k to f_{k+1} in two alternating substeps:

(Forth Step): If there exists an element $m \in M \setminus A_k$, consider the *type* of m over the finite set A_k , i.e., the set

$$\text{tp}(m/A_k) = \{\varphi(x, a_1, \dots, a_n) \mid a_1, \dots, a_n \in A_k \text{ and } M \models \varphi(m, a_1, \dots, a_n)\}.$$

Since M and N are models of the complete theory T and N is saturated, this type (which is consistent with T) is realized in N . Thus, there exists an element $n \in N$ such that $N \models \varphi(n, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ for every formula $\varphi(x, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ in $\text{tp}(m/A_k)$. It follows that the extension

$$f_k \cup \{(m, n)\}$$

remains a partial isomorphism. Define f_{k+1} to be this extension.

(Back Step): Similarly, if there exists an element $n \in N \setminus B_k$, consider the type of n over B_k in N . By the saturation of M , there exists an element $m \in M$ such that the type of n over B_k is realized in M . Then, extending f_k by including the pair (m, n) yields a partial isomorphism. Update f_{k+1} accordingly.

By alternating these steps (ensuring that in each step at least one new element from either M or N is added), every element of M and N will eventually appear in the domain and range of some f_k . Finally, define

$$f = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} f_k.$$

Since each f_k is a partial isomorphism and the union of an increasing chain of partial isomorphisms is itself an isomorphism (by the completeness of the theory T and the preservation of the structure on finite subsets), it follows that f is an isomorphism from M onto N . For further details, see, e.g., [1, Section 4]. \square

5.9 Isomorphism between Model Constructions

Lemma 5.9 (Isomorphism between Model Constructions). *For every consistent theory t (in a countable language), the models $F(t)$ and $G(t)$ —constructed via the Henkin and compactness methods, respectively—are isomorphic in the category \mathbf{mod} .*

Intuitive Explanation. Although $F(t)$ and $G(t)$ are built by different procedures, they are both models of the same maximal consistent theory t^* . In a countable language, any two saturated/prime models of t^* are isomorphic (by back-and-forth).

Remark 10 (Uniqueness of Saturated or Prime Models). *A key point in our argument is that both the Henkin-constructed model and the compactness-constructed model can be taken to be saturated (or at least prime) models of the same complete theory t^* . In a countable language, any two such saturated (or prime) models of t^* are isomorphic (cf. Chang and Keisler, Model Theory, or other standard references). This fact underlies our proof that $F(t)$ and $G(t)$ must be isomorphic, and it justifies the canonical nature of both constructions.*

Proof of Lemma 5.9. Let t be a consistent theory in a countable language \mathcal{L} . By Lindembaum’s Lemma (see [1, Section 3]), extend t to a complete (maximal consistent) theory t^* .

The Henkin construction produces a term model $F(t)$ as follows: one extends t to t^* by a fixed sequential procedure (using a fixed enumeration of all sentences and a fixed rule for introducing Henkin constants), then forms the term algebra over the extended language, and finally takes the quotient by the equivalence relation

$$s \sim s' \iff t^* \vdash s = s'.$$

Thus, $F(t)$ is a model of t^* .

On the other hand, by the Compactness Theorem (see, e.g., [1, Section 3]), one can construct a model $G(t)$ of t . By choosing a fixed non-principal ultrafilter (or a fixed saturation procedure) in the construction, the model $G(t)$ is canonical (i.e., unique up to isomorphism) and, in particular, is a model of t^* .

Since both $F(t)$ and $G(t)$ are models of the same complete theory t^* in a countable language, and by our constructions both are saturated (or prime) models, it follows from the Back-and-Forth Lemma (see Lemma 5.8 and [1, Section 4]) that any two such models are isomorphic.

Hence, there exists an isomorphism

$$\phi : F(t) \rightarrow G(t)$$

in the category \mathbf{mod} . \square

5.10 Naturality Condition

Lemma 5.10. *Let $F, G : \mathbf{th} \rightarrow \mathbf{mod}$ be the functors defined by the Henkin and compactness constructions, respectively, and let $\eta : F \rightarrow G$ map each class $[s] \in F(t)$ to its canonical interpretation in $G(t)$. For every morphism $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ in \mathbf{th} , we have*

$$\eta_{t_2} \circ F(f) = G(f) \circ \eta_{t_1}.$$

Intuitive Explanation. If we first translate s via f and then apply η , or if we first apply η and then translate via $G(f)$, we get the same result. This commutativity of the diagram is the essence of “naturality.”

Proof of Lemma 5.10. Let $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ be an arbitrary morphism in the category \mathbf{th} , and let $[s] \in F(t_1)$ be an equivalence class of a term s . By the definition of the functor F , we have

$$F(f)([s]) = [f(s)].$$

By the definition of the natural transformation η , its t -component η_t maps an equivalence class $[s] \in F(t)$ to the canonical interpretation of s in the model $G(t)$. Hence,

$$\eta_{t_2}(F(f)([s])) = \eta_{t_2}([f(s)]).$$

On the other hand, the functor G is defined so that, for the morphism $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$, the map $G(f)$ sends the canonical interpretation of s in $G(t_1)$ to the canonical interpretation of $f(s)$ in $G(t_2)$; that is,

$$G(f)(\eta_{t_1}([s])) = \text{the canonical interpretation of } f(s) \text{ in } G(t_2).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\eta_{t_2}([f(s)]) = G(f)(\eta_{t_1}([s])).$$

Since this equality holds for every $[s] \in F(t_1)$, it follows that

$$\eta_{t_2} \circ F(f) = G(f) \circ \eta_{t_1}.$$

This completes the proof. □

5.11 2-Categorical Coherence (Modification) and Rigidity

Lemma 5.11. *Assume that $\eta : F \rightarrow G$ is the canonical natural isomorphism between the functors F and G . Then there exists a unique inverse natural transformation $\eta^{-1} : G \rightarrow F$ such that for every $t \in \mathbf{th}$,*

$$\eta_t \circ \eta_t^{-1} = \text{id}_{G(t)} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_t^{-1} \circ \eta_t = \text{id}_{F(t)}.$$

This ensures that η is rigid and that F and G are strongly naturally equivalent in the 2-categorical sense.

Intuitive Explanation (Rigidity). - Each component η_t is an isomorphism in **mod**, hence has a unique inverse map η_t^{-1} . - “Rigidity” here means there are no nontrivial modifications of η ; equivalently, any natural 2-morphism from η to itself is the identity. This forces η (and its inverse) to be “strict” in the 2-categorical sense.

Proof of Lemma 5.11. Assume that $\eta : F \rightarrow G$ is a natural isomorphism between the functors $F, G : \mathbf{th} \rightarrow \mathbf{mod}$. Then for each object $t \in \mathbf{th}$, $\eta_t : F(t) \rightarrow G(t)$ is an isomorphism in **mod**; hence, there exists a unique inverse morphism

$$\eta_t^{-1} : G(t) \rightarrow F(t)$$

such that

$$\eta_t \circ \eta_t^{-1} = \text{id}_{G(t)} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta_t^{-1} \circ \eta_t = \text{id}_{F(t)}.$$

We now show that the collection $\{\eta_t^{-1}\}_{t \in \mathbf{th}}$ forms a natural transformation $\eta^{-1} : G \rightarrow F$. Let $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ be an arbitrary morphism in **th**. By the naturality of η , we have

$$\eta_{t_2} \circ F(f) = G(f) \circ \eta_{t_1}.$$

Composing both sides on the left with $\eta_{t_2}^{-1}$, we obtain

$$\eta_{t_2}^{-1} \circ \eta_{t_2} \circ F(f) = \eta_{t_2}^{-1} \circ G(f) \circ \eta_{t_1}.$$

Since $\eta_{t_2}^{-1} \circ \eta_{t_2} = \text{id}_{F(t_2)}$, it follows that

$$F(f) = \eta_{t_2}^{-1} \circ G(f) \circ \eta_{t_1}.$$

Composing on the right with $\eta_{t_1}^{-1}$, we then deduce

$$\eta_{t_2}^{-1} \circ G(f) = F(f) \circ \eta_{t_1}^{-1}.$$

This shows that for every morphism $f : t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ in **th**, the inverse components satisfy the naturality condition:

$$\eta_{t_2}^{-1} \circ G(f) = F(f) \circ \eta_{t_1}^{-1}.$$

Hence, the assignment $t \mapsto \eta_t^{-1}$ defines a natural transformation $\eta^{-1} : G \rightarrow F$. The uniqueness of each η_t^{-1} (as the inverse of η_t) implies that η^{-1} is the unique inverse natural transformation of η , which establishes the rigidity of η and shows that F and G are strongly naturally equivalent in the 2-categorical sense. \square

5.12 Canonical Construction of Models

Lemma 5.12. *Assume that the underlying first-order language \downarrow is countable. Then for every consistent first-order theory t , the following hold:*

1. **Henkin Construction:** *Using a fixed enumeration of all sentences and a predetermined rule for introducing Henkin constants, the maximal consistent extension t^* of t and the resulting term model $F(t)$ (constructed by quotienting out provable equalities) are unique up to isomorphism.*
2. **Compactness Construction:** *By applying the compactness theorem with a fixed non-principal ultrafilter or a fixed saturation procedure, a model $G(t)$ of t is obtained which is unique up to isomorphism.*

Intuitive Explanation. Both methods rely on a single, fixed “choice” (e.g. the same enumeration for Henkin constants, the same ultrafilter or saturation scheme), ensuring the resulting model is determined uniquely up to isomorphism.

Proof of Lemma 5.12. We assume that the underlying first-order language \downarrow is countable. Let t be a consistent theory in \downarrow .

(1) Henkin Construction: Using a fixed enumeration of all sentences in \downarrow and a predetermined rule for introducing Henkin constants (as detailed in, e.g., [1, Section 3]), we extend t to a maximal consistent theory

$$t^* = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} t_n,$$

via a sequential procedure (see Lemma 5.2). Next, we form the term algebra \mathcal{T} over the language extended by these Henkin constants, and define an equivalence relation \sim on \mathcal{T} by

$$s \sim s' \iff t^* \vdash s = s',$$

(see Lemma 5.4). The Henkin model $F(t)$ is then defined as the quotient algebra

$$F(t) = \mathcal{T} / \sim .$$

Since the enumeration and the rule for introducing Henkin constants are fixed, the maximal consistent theory t^* and hence the term algebra \mathcal{T} and the equivalence relation \sim are uniquely determined (up to isomorphism). Therefore, the constructed model $F(t)$ is unique up to isomorphism.

(2) Compactness Construction: Since t is consistent and the language is countable, every finite subset of t is satisfiable. By the Compactness Theorem (see, e.g., [1, Section 3]), the entire theory t is satisfiable. Now, by applying a fixed non-principal ultrafilter (or, equivalently, a fixed saturation procedure), one can construct a model $G(t)$ of t . This construction is canonical in the sense that, with the fixed choice of ultrafilter or saturation scheme, any two models obtained by this method are isomorphic. Hence, $G(t)$ is unique up to isomorphism.

Thus, both the Henkin construction and the compactness construction yield canonical models, unique up to isomorphism, as required. \square

6 Applications and Discussion

The established natural isomorphism $\eta : F \rightarrow G$ implies a deep structural equivalence between the syntactic and semantic approaches to first-order logic. The rigidity of η guarantees that any natural transformation between these functors is unique, and the 2-categorical strengthening provides a higher-level coherence. These results have potential applications in automated theorem proving, formal verification, and the study of non-classical logics.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have demonstrated that for every consistent first-order theory t , the models produced via the Henkin construction and those obtained by compactness-based methods (such as ultraproducts or saturation) are canonically isomorphic. By defining the functors

$$F, G : \mathbf{th} \rightarrow \mathbf{mod},$$

and establishing a natural transformation

$$\eta : F \rightarrow G,$$

we showed that each component $\eta_t : F(t) \rightarrow G(t)$ is an isomorphism in \mathbf{mod} . Moreover, we proved that η is rigid, meaning that any natural transformation between F and G must coincide with η . In the context of 2-category theory, we further demonstrated that η and its inverse satisfy the necessary coherence (modification) conditions, thereby establishing a strong natural equivalence between the functors.

This unification not only offers a deeper structural insight into the relationship between proof theory and model theory but also paves the way for potential applications in automated theorem proving, formal verification, and the study of non-classical logics. Future work may explore how this framework can be adapted or extended to other logical systems and categories, further enriching the interplay between syntactic and semantic methods in logic.

8 Appendix

In this appendix, we present additional proofs, detailed calculations, and further examples that complement the results in the main text. In particular, the appendix includes:

- A complete proof of the back-and-forth construction used in Lemma 5.8.
- Detailed verifications of the functoriality of the Henkin and compactness-based model constructions.
- Concrete examples illustrating the construction of models for specific theories.

These supplementary materials are provided to offer deeper insight into the technical details and to demonstrate how our unified framework can be applied to various logical systems.

9 References

References

- [1] J. R. Barreto, *A Natural Transformation between the Completeness and Compactness Theorems in Classical Logic*, arXiv:2503.12144.
- [2] C. C. Chang and H. J. Keisler, *Model Theory*, 3rd ed., North-Holland, 1990.
- [3] W. Hodges, *Model Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [4] D. Marker, *Model Theory: An Introduction*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 217, Springer, 2002.
- [5] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the Working Mathematician*, 2nd ed., Springer, 1998.
- [6] S. Awodey, *Category Theory*, 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, 2010.
- [7] J. L. Bell and A. B. Slomson, *Models and Ultraproducts: An Introduction*, North-Holland, 1971.