*Ayer*’s first example is refraction. He said that a stick is normally straight but when it is immersed to water the part under water looks bent. He gives two assumptions to this “normally straight” but “looks bent” stick, first is the stick does not change its shape no matter it is placed in water or not, second is the stick can not be both straight and bent. so if we consider the “straight” stick as visual appearance one and “bent” stick in water as visual appearance two we could conclude that at least one of two visual appearances is delusive which means (*Ayer* says) the bent one is sense-datum

*Ayer*’s second example is mirages. A man thinks he is perceiving oasis actually he is just seeing a mirage. However his experience is exactly same as he is perceiving the real oasis. So how does this man perceiving something from nothing? *Ayer* thinks he is experiencing sense-datum.

*Ayer’s* last example is reflections. He said when he is looking himself in a mirror he definitely finds his body appears to be some distance behind the glass whereas he actually stand in the front of the glass with same distance. His confusion is it is impossible that his body could be in two places at the same time, so his perceptions in this case is not true and what he is seeing is sense-datum.

Before *Austin*’s replies to those arguments, he uses a large paragraph to explain the distinction between illusion and delusion and an “argument from illusion”. By imply people think of seeing ghosts then he concluded that delusive comes in a very different suggestion of something being conjured up or unreal. In short, delusive is something not really exist while illusion is something exist in the wrong place even sometimes it is a familiar thing and also illusion is public and delusion is private. Under this theory *Austin* thinks messing up those two concepts will cause trouble.

For the first argument of refraction, *Austin* replies that this stick does not look exactly like a bent stick, but it just looks bent or a bent stick out of water, so only the immersed part in water looks bent. *Austin* insists that this is a different circumstance compared with “a stick is bent and straight at the same time” which causes a contradiction because this is just a straight stick which partly immersed water looks bent. Then *Austin* gives another cases that a church were cunningly camouflaged so that it looked like a barn, still it is just a church looks like a barn but not an immaterial church or immaterial barn, however in “bent stick” case *Ayer* cites another phrase “visual appearance” but this phrase comes from nowhere. Also *Austin* thinks the question from the beginning is completely mad because no one will ask the same question about a church that looks like a barn but never think it is a church and becomes barn.

The second example is reflection. First *Austin* denies the correctness of the *Ayer*’s idea that “any case of seeing something in a mirror an illusion”. Because seeing things in mirrors is perfectly normal occurrence completely familiar so *Austin* does not agree the illusion exist in this case. Then *Austin* wants us to realize the familiarity which is a common ground of reflection and refraction. From *Austin*’ perspective, “see yourself in mirror ” is as common as “there is pain in my toe”, “I heard him on the radio”. To say A is in B does not saying that you can get A when you open B or you can pick it off when A is on B. It is involuntary for us to think that it is likely that another physical or material thing in mirror when *Ayer* says “see yourself in mirror” but actually this phrase mislead us and the truth is it is just a mirror image.

The last example is mirage. Frist *Austin* supposes that this man who seeing the oasis is “to be genuinely deluded” and “not seeing a material thing”. Although *Austin* admitted this phenomenon he still thought that there is no reason to give another name(which is mirage) to name this situation as “experiencing sense-datum”.

I think the first two criticisms from *Austin* is believable. The common point of reflection and refraction is in both example *Ayer* thought there is no way to see s duplicate at the same time(another body in the mirror or new crooked stick) however *Austin* thought it is not another replicate at the same time, they are just normal occurrences in our life and his reasons are also convinced for me. However the reason of Mirage one is relatively weak. If *Austin* think “seeing sense-datum” is an alternate phrase of mirage then we may say that if he is right, we could also call “seeing oasis” is “seeing sense-datum”. In this case how about other situations should we call them all “seeing sense-datum”? if we do that, how to tell the differences among them. So for this example since *Austin* mentioned the “two lines”, “headless woman” example which means what you seeing does not always it is what you think and what you can’t see does not means there is no such thing, so the mirage example could be explained like a man seeing the oasis(first we assume this man is not too exhausted or hopeless to see delusion) and the oasis is not here, but it does not means oasis is not existed. The principle why we can see something is not here is same like when we use telescope to see something far away from there , if we do not use telescope we can not see subject thousands meters away so there is some reasons can explain we seeing oasis but not sense-datum.

Another way to explain mirage could be consider the private feeling. The difference between mirage and other two is people can not see other’s oasis. No matter in reflection and refraction examples since we can see the “bent stick” at the same time and see other’s body in the mirror, but we can not see the same oasis so this example is too abnormal to be used as an argument.

However, even I think the last criticism of *Austin* is not as good as other two, I still think *Austin* is right in terms of this question.