"There is nothing in reference that is not in behaviour." This could be true of a language simpler than English. Imagine a society which uses the language described as follows. There is a one-word sentence for each species of animal hunted by the tribe. The children are taught these one-word sentences by the adults of the tribe. An adult of the tribe points to a specimen of the species and pronounces the corresponding word, in the presence of the child. The child comes to pronounce the proper words in the presence of a specimen of the species, which he has been taught the word for. When a child does so in the presence of an adult of the tribe, the adult responds with the utterance "Enet". If the child pronounces an improper word in the presence of an animal, a adult, also present, will say "ajok". (The one-word sentences for animals are used in some way, by the adults in hunting the animals.) A linguist studying this tribe would ~~find~~ state the stimulus meanings of the words for animals in terms of disposition to say "Enet" or "ajok" in various circumstances (including the querying of the scene in question). ~~The language cannot be mapped onto itself in such a way as to preserve the stimulus meaning of the one-word sentences for animals, and yet shift reference.~~ "But it could be translated into English in various ways." Of course, English can be mapped onto itself in various ways, preserving

everything

~~of~~ the reference which is for behaviorism.

"But there really isn't any reference in this language at all." Why? Because there isn't any word for referring? Consider the following addition to the above language. The teacher points to animals which the child already knows the name for, and says "— refers to that." The teacher also does this with words for animals which the child does not yet know. If the child does not guess the use the word correctly, when the teacher uses the original method of teaching after a while, most of the children of the class immediately make the correct association between word and object in most cases, after being once told "— refers to that" when the teacher points to a specimin of the species, yet, if the original way of teaching is used, a number of specimins are needed to make the association. The few children who have come to make an immediate association upon being told "— refers to that" are treated as inferior. Again, this ~~[redacted]~~ language cannot be mapped onto itself in any preserving relations, but not preserving reference.

What bearing to have examples have upon ~~[redacted]~~ logical relations? By gradually adding more ~~[redacted]~~ functions to the above examples, a language could (I hope)

be described in which the language could be mapped exactly without changing the similar meanings of the [redacted] occurring within sentences, yet shifting references as reference is used in that language. If this were done carefully, and the case simple enough, then it could be seen that sameness depends upon a similar [redacted] use of 'reference' [redacted] and other words in the language, not described in the language above. This use does not correspond to any fact, but is just the way we use the word. Thus, indeed, there is no fact of the matter to determine which of two translations is correct. On the other hand, this does not mean that anything is wrong [redacted] without reference to the language we do use. In this way, we can make sense of agreeing in the home language.