

1) The criteria of a person obeying a rule concern how he acts. ~~Imagine~~ ^{on an island} Suppose a child ~~A~~ left alone from birth. The child survives and develops a complex way of life, even though this way of life ~~could~~ does not involve any other people. He lives in natural caves in the area, and often moves around. When he enters into ~~a~~ caves he has never been in before, he makes marks, like arrows, pointing along the path ~~he~~ he takes. Sometimes, he follows the arrows back out. That in so following the arrows, backwards, he is obeying a rule is a grammatical statement. (And that such behavior is not possible would be a hypothesis, and does not concern the philosophical point).

2) ^{On (1) A} The person ~~will~~ obeys a rule, but does he obey a rule privately? If ~~A~~ were obeying a rule privately, then ^{his} obeying the rule would be the same as ^{his} thinking ~~he~~ is obeying the rule. (PS 203.) Does the person in 1) think he is obeying a rule? So far, nothing has been said about this. So far, nothing has been said about whether it is possible to obey a rule privately.

3) Suppose a mental picture occurs to A when he sees the mark on the cave floor. (So far it hasn't been said what the criteria for a person having a mental image are, but ignore this for now.) The mental picture cannot

determine how A is to move in order to obey the rule. ^{movement} Every direction can be made to accord with the mental picture, hence ~~so~~ the mental picture does not determine what movements will count as obeying the rule.

~~Thinking you are obeying a rule ~~is to~~ may be thought of here as having certain mental picture — a picture~~

~~in which the projection of the rule upon action is part of the picture.~~

~~But the pictured action is not actual action.~~

~~The pictured action can be made to accord with various actual actions. A may have such a picture and yet not be obeying a rule. Obeying a rule ^{as} in 1) is not obeying a rule privately.~~

4) Does thinking you are obeying a rule consist in having a certain mental picture? Someone who claims a private language is possible ~~to~~ must think so. He thinks of sensations, memory, ^{image} intentions, thoughts, ~~as~~ as mental pictures. He cannot be mistaken about ~~the~~ ^{what} sensations, ~~sequence~~ memory images, intentions, and thoughts he has. Sensations, memory image, intentions, and thoughts, are so to speak immediately before his middle eye.

5) Thinking you are obeying a rule is thought of as having a certain mental picture — a picture in which the projection of the rule upon action is part of the picture. But the pictured

action is not an actual action. The pictured action can be made to accord with various actual actions. A may have such a picture and not be obeying a rule. Obeying a rule as in 1) is not obeying a rule privately.

6) In 1), A obeys a rule, ^{but} could A have a language? ~~All the languages we use~~ ~~are familiar~~ Everything we have called language has been used by a community, never by a lone individual. However, sometimes an individual might be separated from the community and continue to use language. If A developed a certain kind of behavior, it would be the most natural extension of the use of the word "language" to say that he had a language. His use of language would resemble ^{that of an individual} separated from his community more than the use of an individual living in a community. (PI 243)

7) Could A have a private language? What is the difference between the language A can have in 6 and a private language? What is a ~~private language~~? But could we also imagine a language in which a person could write down or give vocal expression to his inner experience - his feelings, moods, and the rest - for his private use - Well, can't we do so in our ordinary language? - But that is not what he means. The individual words of this

language are to refer to what can only be known to the person speaking) to his immediate private sensations; so another person cannot understand the language." (PI 243)

- 8) A could use words which it would be most natural for us to translate as ~~words for~~ sensation words. But then we would understand the language.
- 9) What would make it natural for us to translate a word A could use as a sensation word? If a person, raised to speak English, became isolated, he could continue to use sensation words ^{in some of the} in contexts he learned to use the word.
~~But~~ A person, never having contact with other language users, could use words similarly to some of these uses. (Exhibit animal behavior) It would be most natural to call these words sensation words.
- 10) ~~After~~ Defoe Crusoe could use language in some ways which Aysa Crusoe could not. Aysa Crusoe could not write a diary ~~with the purpose~~ for others to find, although he could write a diary.

- 11) There is a difference ^{between} the use of "I recognize A" and "He recognizes it" ^{analogous} to the difference between the use of "I know how to go on" and "He knows how to go on."
- 12) A could recognize objects, and he could also recognize his sensations. His behavior could satisfy the criteria for recognizing an object, or recognizing a sensation. It is a grammatical proposition that ~~such~~ ^{exhibiting such} behavior that ~~is~~ ^{is} criteria for recognizing an object or recognizing a sensation. That such behavior is not possible would be a hypothesis.
- 13) A could have ~~words~~ ^{words} to express. The proposition "I recognize it" could have a place in A's language, but not the proposition "He recognizes it." ~~It is not possible~~ ^{It is not possible} the proposition "He recognizes it" which exist for us, could exist for A.
- 14) Many of the uses of "I recognize it" also could not be used by A. However enough uses could exist to justify this translation of it. A might use this expression when entering into caves he had been in before, but not recently. (He could occasionally be mistaken.) Then he doesn't bother to mark his path. If he later discovers he was mistaken, he may say "I thought I recognized it."

15 There is a difference between in the grammar of "I recognize it" and "I recognized it" as used by A, analogous to the difference between "I recognize it" and "I recognized it" in English. ~~The criteria for whether I recognized something are the same as the criteria for whether someone else recognizes something, and both differ. The grammar of "I recognized it" and "He recognizes it" both differ from the grammar of "I recognize it" similarly. The present and the ~~past~~ tense functions of the word "recognize" ~~do~~ ^{also} exist in A's language, although "he recognized it" ~~does~~ ^{has} no use in A's language. "I recognized it" ~~does~~ ^{has} have a use in A's language.~~

16 There are criteria for the use of "I recognized it" and "He recognized it", but there are ~~no~~ ^{no} criteria for the use of "I recognize it".

KTS

17 A can recognize sensations, and can have a language containing sensation words, but is this a private language? As ~~it~~ has been explained, we can understand A's sensation-words. We could learn the language. A's language isn't a private language, as mentioned in (7).

18