Sellers key idea: Language is thought, and more-so, **thinking itself is in some way a use of language.**

Language is the articulation or manifestation of something “inner” into something explicated onto the world by speaking.

In the “Descartes Mindset”, Descartes first has the issue of the external world, because the only thing he claims to know is that he himself has thoughts, and he has to figure out a way to prove the external world, and more-so other minds.

If you have Descartes idea of “Thinking is just internal, private, subjective, that you could be ‘locked in’ with only your thoughts” then you generate these worries.

There are many ways to get around the issue of other minds. One is behaviorism:

- Behaviorism to “What does it mean to “be thinking that” “ – To be disposed to act in a certain way
- Dave: If you’re a behaviorist, you might simply identify thinking with linguistic behavior. “To think that P, is to simply be disposed to say That P.”

Sellers: Thinking is purely identical with linguistic behavior. (identical meaning perfect identity)

- Challenges
  - We have thoughts that we don’t say.
    - Response: Linguistic control is manifested in your refraining what you are naturally inclined to say.
  - Lying: Sellers would say that lying is difficult because we have to suppress our natural inclination to think through what **should** be said (because it’s true) and then start to think something that is false in order to say it.

Dave talking about some guy who he rode in a car with who kept talking… something about Dave being a Sellersian… a joke about the guy “not thinking” before he spoke, which of course since Sellers’ thinks that thinking and language (or speaking) is identical, “Not thinking before you speak” is a non-sequitur. Philosophical puns! Punosophy!

Dave didn’t bring a marker to class, and made us all aware that he sucks at typing.
- Also, his left shoe was untied for all of the class.

- For Sellers, *Linguistic Behavior* also covers things other than speaking, like typing, reading, writing, sign language, etc.

- Sellers: The language itself is conventional, and you must be ‘trained up’ to effectively speak the language. The children learning the language are governed by the ought-to-be and are being taught by teachers, who are in charge of teaching them these conventions or rules.

- If you believe sellers completely, thinking is something that you LEARN. Other people are now responsible for teaching you how to learn to think. Thinking itself is a social practice. (which seems incredibly counterintuitive)

- If we apply this to the Cogito, it becomes “I think, therefore WE ARE.” A Sellarsian doesn’t have the problem of other minds.

- Dave’s mom apparently talks to herself all the time, and Dave tries to rationalize that his mother isn’t crazy, and says that you don’t have to be shipped to a rubber room just because someone talks to themselves.

- You acquire the ability to think through social norms.
- Dave: Your philosophical indoctrination begins. You can resist it if you like... but... uhh... yea.

- The animating idea behind Articulating Reasons is:
  - What is a concept?
  - A concept is a thing, but it's not a thingy out here *Dave hits desk* and it’s not a thingy in here *Dave points to his brain to symbolize his mind*, and you don’t have to be a Platonist either.
    - A concept is conceptual activity. That is a shift of focus away from self-subsisting things to kinds of activity
    - A conceptual activity is thinking or reasoning.
    - The units of conceptual activity are inferences. This will privilege reasoning over representation.

- Bob Brandom in the book announces how he’s going to approach the philosophical problems that there are, and show the kinds of tools that he will use in order to solve these philosophical issues, such as “What is a concept?”
  - Dave: he is going to focus on what distinguishes concept-mongering creatures from the rest of creation. That is, he is going to focus on the distinctive features (what is exceptional) about reasoning, as opposed to what unites concept-mongering creatures with the rest of creation.
    - Many other approaches try to do the opposite.
      - Dave: There is a threat that if you make concept-mongering TOO exceptional, then you will excavate a chasm between us and the rest of creation, that by good Darwinian lights, you might not see how that chasm might be crossed. There is a threat in here that it might become anti-naturalistic by talking about how exceptional we are, and that we are SO far apart from everything else, and not being able to explain how we evolved. Brandom says that we must remain mindful of this.
  - Brandom thinks we should understand what concepts are in terms of conceptual activity is. He calls this a pragmatist version of understanding concepts, rather than a platonic one.
Dave: intuitions are like assholes. (talking about your intuitions if starfish engage in reasoning)

- Fodor believes that certain concepts or abilities to grasp concepts are innate. In his most polemic days he says things like “We have an innate concept of a Carburetor”
  - Dave: How the fuck did we have the innate concept of a Carburetor? That doesn’t seem to make any sense whatsoever.

- Dave: “There is tea in this cup.” By saying this, it gives you a reason or justification to believe that there is tea in the cup.

- Conceptual activity is the social transformation between what you are committed and what you are entitled to say. They seem to be social in this sense. By Dave saying that “There is tea in the cap.” Gives reason or justification to think or say “There is tea in the cup.” Conceptual activity is now being understood in terms of reasoning.
  - This kind of understanding completely removes the notion of representation.
    - Dave’s ability to say “There is tea in the cup” is the product of great skillful knowhow, and that in turn allows others to say things like “there is tea in the cup.”