

SYNTACTICALLY FREE, SEMANTICALLY BOUND  
 (A NOTE ON VARIABLES)

HUGUES LEBLANC

*Apparent variables.* The symbol " $(x). \phi x$ " denotes one definite proposition, and there is no distinction in meaning between " $(x). \phi x$ " and " $(y). \phi y$ " when they occur in the same context.

*Principia Mathematica*, Introduction, Ch. I.

The old distinction between an *apparent variable* and a *real* one was never too clearly drawn. Passages from *Principia Mathematica* and earlier logic treatises suggest, though, that an individual variable  $X$  *apparently* occurs in a formula  $A$  if  $X$  occurs in  $A$  just for form, i.e., if  $X$  can be replaced *salvo sensu* in  $A$  by some individual variable foreign to  $A$ , and that  $X$  *really* occurs in  $A$  if  $X$  does not *apparently* occur in  $A$ . Thus, ' $x$ ' *apparently* occurs in Russell's ' $(\forall x) f(x)$ ' (= ' $(x). \phi x$ '), since ' $x$ ' can be replaced *salvo sensu* in ' $(\forall x) f(x)$ ' by ' $y$ ', whereas ' $x$ ' *really* occurs in ' $f(x)$ '. The distinction between a bound variable and a free one, which eventually displaced that between an apparent variable and a real one, does not match it, all assertions to the contrary notwithstanding. An individual variable may—by current standards—occur free in a given formula, and yet not *really* occur therein by the above criterion. ' $x$ ', for example, though it occurs free in ' $(\forall x) f(x) \& f(x)$ ', does not *really* occur in ' $(\forall x) f(x) \& f(x)$ ', since it can be replaced *salvo sensu* in ' $(\forall x) f(x) \& f(x)$ ' by any one of ' $y$ ', ' $z$ ', ' $x'$ ', ' $y'$ ', ' $z'$ ', and so on, or—as we prefer to put it—since ' $(\forall x) f(x) \& f(x)$ ' is semantically equivalent to any one of ' $(\forall y) f(y) \& f(y)$ ', ' $(\forall z) f(z) \& f(z)$ ', and so on.<sup>1</sup>

Because of this discrepancy we would urge that an individual variable  $X$ , when it occurs bound (free) in a formula  $A$  by current standards, be said to occur *syntactically bound* (*syntactically free*) in  $A$ , and that a fresh distinction be introduced according to which: (i)  $X$  is said to occur *semantically bound* in  $A$  if  $A$  is semantically equivalent to any (hence, to

*Received October 13, 1967*