

FRAMES VERSUS MINIMALLY RESTRICTED STRUCTURES

JACK C. BOUDREAUX

0 Introduction I have argued in [2] that the semantic theory of higher-order languages should be based on what I called the class of minimally restricted structures, *cf.* definition (4) below, rather than the more conventionally acceptable class of frames, *cf.* definition (9) below. In this paper, I will prove that these superficially similar classes of higher-order structures are in fact *semantically* distinguishable from one another and that the latter is isomorphically representable as a *proper subclass* of the former.

1 Syntactic preliminaries Let **ST** denote the type-theoretic language which is based on the following system of *type indices*: **i** is the primitive index, i.e., the index assigned to individuals; and if **B** is a finite, but unempty, sequence of indices, then **(B)** is a nonprimitive index. The primitive, i.e., unabbreviated, *lexicon* of **ST** admits the following symbols:

- (1) variables of type **a**: $u^a, v^a, x^a, y^a, z^a, \dots$, with and without numeric subscripts
- sentential connectives: $\sim$ (negation), $\rightarrow$ (conditional)
- universal quantifier: $\forall$
- punctuation: (,)

I will say that $\overline{X}$ (read: *X bar*) is a **B**-sequence of variables iff **B** is a finite, but unempty, sequence of indices; the length of **B** (i.e., $\text{lh}(\mathbf{B})$), is equal to the length of $\overline{X}$ (i.e., $\text{lh}(\overline{X})$); and for all j , $0 \leq j < \text{lh}(\mathbf{B})$, $\overline{X}(j)$ is a variable of type **B**(j).

- (2) *Well-formed formula, wff*

- (i) if $\overline{X}$ is a **B**-sequence of variables, then $x^{(\mathbf{B})}(\overline{X})$ is an atomic wff
- (ii) if p is a wff, then $\sim p$ is a wff
- (iii) if p and q are wffs, then $(p \rightarrow q)$ is a wff
- (iv) if p is a wff, then $\forall x^a p$ is a wff
- (v) and nothing is an unabbreviated wff unless its being so follows from (i) through (iv).