

The Indefinability of Language

Meaning, Use, and Self-Inquiry

Wim van der Loo

The Indefinability of Language

Meaning, Use, and Self-Inquiry

Wim van der Loo

Wim van der loo © 2026
ISBN 9789403858807
published by Bookmundo.com

Inhoud

Preface.....	33
1 Introduction.....	35
1.1 Methodological Justification and the Use of Artificial Intelligence.....	36
1.2 Methodological Remark	37
2 Introduction to the Thesis.....	38
2.1 Possible Objections to the Thesis and Replies.....	38
The Performative Contradiction Objection	38
The Relativism and Normativity Objection	39
The Philosophy of Science Objection.....	39
The Subjectivity Objection: Does the “I” Disappear?	40
The Distinction Between Meta-Level and Reflection.....	41
The Pragmatic Objection: Does the Thesis Paralyze Itself?	41
3 Logic vs. the semantics of a natural language	42
3.1.1 Logic as formalization $\neq$ foundation	42
3.1.2 The meta-level problem: no Archimedean point.....	42
3.1.3 What logic <i>can</i> do for semantics	43
3.1.4 Summary.....	43
3.2 Model-theoretic vs. use-oriented semantics	43
3.2.1 Model-theoretic semantics	43
3.2.2 Use-oriented (pragmatic / inferential) semantics.....	44
3.2.3 The core contrast (condensed)	45
3.2.4 Philosophical upshot relative to your thesis.....	45
3.2.5 Final conclusion	45
3.2.6 Between model-theoretic and use-oriented semantics.....	45
3.2.7 The problem of self-reference	45
3.2.8 The “I” in model-theoretic semantics	46
3.2.9 The “I” as a speech act (use-oriented)	46

3.2.10	Self-reference reconsidered	46
3.2.11	No meta-level for the “I”	47
3.2.12	Summary contrast	47
3.2.13	Interim conclusion	47
3.3	Self-consciousness and first-person knowledge	47
3.3.1	First-person knowledge: what is distinctive?	47
3.3.2	The classical mental model—and its problems	48
3.3.3	Use-oriented reinterpretation: not observation, but position 48	
3.3.4	Transparency and authority (without mystery)	49
3.3.5	Self-consciousness without a meta-level	49
3.3.6	Summary contrast	49
3.3.7	Final conclusion	49
3.4	Rationality and Agency	50
3.4.1	From self-consciousness to incompleteness	50
3.4.2	From self-consciousness to agency	50
3.4.3	Rationality: not computation, but normativity	50
3.4.4	Brandom: agency as commitment management	51
3.4.5	Davidson: interpretation and rationality	51
3.4.6	No external criterion of rationality	51
3.4.7	Freedom without metaphysical mystery	51
3.4.8	Rationality, agency, and the “I”	52
3.4.9	Summary schema	52
3.4.10	Concluding formulation	52
3.5	Incompleteness and the semantics of natural language	52
3.5.1	What the incompleteness theorems strictly state	52
3.5.2	Why direct application to natural language is a mistake ...	53
3.5.3	Nevertheless: a structural analogy (not a reduction)	53
3.5.4	Self-reference: Gödel vs. use	53

3.5.5	What the incompleteness theorems <i>do</i> mean philosophically for semantics.....	54
3.5.6	Crucial distinction: openness $\neq$ defect.....	54
3.5.7	Summary schema.....	54
3.5.8	Final conclusion	55
3.6	Logic and the Semantics of a Natural Language	55
3.6.1	Can semantics be grounded in logic?.....	55
3.6.2	What “grounding” would have to mean here	55
3.6.3	Why logic cannot be a semantic foundation.....	55
3.6.4	What logic <i>can</i> do for natural language	56
3.6.5	Why Gödel indirectly confirms this	57
3.6.6	The use-oriented conclusion.....	57
3.6.7	Summary schema.....	57
3.6.8	Final formulation.....	57
3.7	Truth and Validity	57
3.7.1	Logic between world-relatedness and practical normativity 57	
3.7.2	Two notions that are often conflated.....	58
3.7.3	The model-theoretic approach: truth prior to validity.....	58
3.7.4	The use-oriented reversal: validity prior to truth.....	58
3.7.5	Brandom: two dimensions of validity.....	58
3.7.6	Davidson: objectivity without foundations	58
3.7.7	Why this is not relativism.....	59
3.7.8	Truth without an external meta-level	59
3.7.9	Schema: truth vs. validity	59
3.7.10	Final conclusion	59
3.8	Truth, Validity, and Scientific Objectivity.....	60
3.8.1	Objectivity without an external meta-level.....	60
3.8.2	The classical conception of scientific objectivity.....	60

3.8.3	The reversal: objectivity as stabilized validity.....	60
3.8.4	Sellars: no “given,” but normative discipline.....	61
3.8.5	Davidson: objectivity without foundationalism	61
3.8.6	Brandom: science as an explicit practice of reasons.....	61
3.8.7	Tarski and the limits of formalization	61
3.8.8	Kuhn without relativism	61
3.8.9	Schema: reconceived objectivity.....	62
3.8.10	Final conclusion	62
3.9	Natural Sciences vs. Humanities	62
3.9.1	Truth, validity, and differentiated objectivity	62
3.9.2	The classical opposition (and its misleading character).....	62
3.9.3	A shared core: normative validity.....	63
3.9.4	Where, then, does the real difference lie?	63
3.9.5	Natural sciences: highly stabilized validity	63
3.9.6	Humanities: context-sensitive validity	63
3.9.7	Ludwig Wittgenstein and the grammatical difference.....	64
3.9.8	Donald Davidson: one truth, different routes of access	64
3.9.9	Robert Brandom: explicitness vs. implicitness.....	64
3.9.10	Schema: differentiation without hierarchy.....	64
3.9.11	Final conclusion	64
3.10	Mathematics as a Boundary Case between the Natural Sciences and the Humanities.....	65
3.10.1	Truth, validity, and maximal normativity.....	65
3.10.2	Why mathematics is a boundary case.....	65
3.10.3	The classical picture: mathematics as foundation.....	65
3.10.4	Kurt Gödel: objectivity without closure	66
3.10.5	Mathematical truth as stabilized validity.....	66
3.10.6	Mathematics between nature and spirit.....	66
3.10.7	Ludwig Wittgenstein: mathematics as grammar	67

3.10.8	Donald Davidson and Robert Brandom: maximal explicitness.....	67
3.10.9	Schema: mathematics as a boundary practice	67
3.10.10	Final conclusion.....	67
3.11	Mathematical Idealization in Physics	68
3.11.1	Truth, validity, and norm-governed access to the world....	68
3.11.2	What is mathematical idealization?.....	68
3.11.3	Why physics cannot dispense with idealization.....	68
3.11.4	Idealization $\neq$ approximation.....	68
3.11.5	Idealization and validity	69
3.11.6	Mathematics as the normative grammar of physics.....	69
3.11.7	Donald Davidson and structural objectivity.....	69
3.11.8	Idealization and Kurt Gödel: no ultimate model	69
3.11.9	Why idealizations are not fictions.....	70
3.11.10	Summary schema	70
3.11.11	Final conclusion.....	70
3.12	Mathematical Idealization in Physics	70
3.12.1	Newtonian Mechanics and Relativity as a Case Study.....	70
3.12.2	Newtonian mechanics: idealization as a normative framework	71
3.12.3	Why Newtonian mechanics is nevertheless objective	71
3.12.4	Relativity: revising idealization, not rationality.....	71
3.12.5	Why relativity does not “refute” Newton	72
3.12.6	What this implies about truth	72
3.12.7	Mathematics as a changing grammar.....	72
3.12.8	No meta-level decides in advance.....	72
3.12.9	Schema: Newton vs. Einstein.....	73
3.12.10	Final conclusion.....	73
4	Space, Time, and the “I”	74

4.1.1	The internal logic of your thesis.....	74
4.1.2	Philosophical positioning	74
4.1.3	The Big Bang as the emergence of language	75
4.1.4	The individual as a local articulation.....	75
4.1.5	Critical sharpening (important)	76
4.1.6	Conclusion	76
4.2	An Analysis Based on Gödel’s Incompleteness Theorems	76
4.2.1	Gödel in One Sentence (the Relevant Part)	77
4.2.2	Translation to Your Thesis (Language / Self without an External Meta-Level).....	77
4.2.3	The ‘I’ as an Internal Object: the Gödelian Knot.....	78
4.2.4	The Big Bang as the “Emergence of Language”: What Gödel Does and Does Not Do.....	78
4.2.5	Where the Analogy Is Sharp (and Where It Breaks).....	79
4.2.6	A Compact Gödelian Reformulation of Your Core Idea ...	79
4.3	The Core Thesis (Clearly Formulated)	80
4.4	Grammar Instead of Representation	80
4.5	Why This Can Never Be Free of a Language Game	80
4.6	A Gödelian Sharpening (Structural, Not Mathematical)	81
4.7	The ‘I’ and the Universe: Not Two Separate Things.....	81
4.8	What Your Position Does Not Say (Important)	82
4.9	Final Condensed Formulation	82
4.10	How Should I Understand the Big Bang?.....	82
4.11	The Big Bang in Physics (Minimal Clarity).....	82
4.12	Philosophical Perspective: The Big Bang as a Limit, Not an Object	83
4.13	Your Perspective: The Big Bang as the Emergence of Grammar 83	
4.14	Why This Is Neither Mysticism Nor Naïve Realism.....	83
4.15	The ‘I’ Within This Framework.....	84

4.16	A Maximally Precise Formulation	84
4.17	What You Do Not Need to Do	84
4.18	Explicit Comparison with Modern Philosophy of Nature (Structural Realism)	85
4.19	What Is Modern Structural Realism?	85
4.20	From Entities to Structure (Crucial for the Big Bang)	85
4.21	The Big Bang Within Structural Realism	85
4.22	Why “Grammar” Is Not a Loose Metaphor Here	86
4.23	Where Your Position Goes Beyond Standard Structural Realism 86	
4.24	The ‘I’ in Structural-Realist Terms	87
4.25	Final Conclusion (Highly Condensed).....	87
4.26	An Analysis Concerning a “Theory of Everything”	87
4.27	What Is Meant by a “Theory of Everything”?	87
4.28	Structural Realism: What a ToE Can Be	88
4.29	Why a ToE Cannot Be an Ultimate Explanation	88
4.29.1	3.1 Grammar $\neq$ Justification	88
4.30	The Gödelian Limit Applied to a ToE	88
4.31	The ToE as Maximal Grammar (Your Reading)	89
4.32	The Big Bang and the ToE	89
4.33	The ‘I’ and the ToE.....	89
4.34	Summary Thesis (Very Sharp)	89
4.35	Where This Positions You	90
4.36	Why Popular Claims by Stephen Hawking (“We Would Know the Mind of God”) Are Philosophically Misplaced.....	90
4.37	Confusion Between Structure and Ground	90
4.37.1	What Hawking Suggests.....	90
4.37.2	Why This Is Misplaced	90
4.38	Confusion Between Theoretical Content and Meta-Statement..	91

4.39	Confusion Between Knowledge and Self-Transparency	91
4.40	The Gödelian Lesson (Applied Structurally)	91
4.41	Unintended Theological Smuggling	91
4.42	What a Correct Formulation Could Have Been	92
4.43	One-Sentence Summary	92
4.44	What Is Inflationary Theory? (Concise and Precise)	92
4.45	Structural Realism: What Inflation Actually Explains	92
4.46	Inflation as a Grammatical Extension (Your Perspective)	93
4.47	Why Inflation Does Not Explain the “Ultimate Beginning”	93
4.47.1	Inflation Already Presupposes Grammar	93
4.47.2	“Eternal Inflation” Intensifies the Problem	93
4.48	The Gödelian Lesson Applied to Inflation	94
4.49	The ‘I’ and Inflation	94
4.50	Why Inflation Undermines Hawking-Style Claims	94
4.51	Summary Thesis (Highly Concentrated)	94
4.52	Final Position	95
4.53	An Explicit Comparison with String Theory and Loop Quantum Cosmology	95
4.54	Overview: Three Theories, Three Grammatical Strategies	95
4.55	Inflation: Extension Within an Existing Grammar	95
4.55.1	Philosophical Status	96
4.56	String Theory: Syntax Prior to Semantics	96
4.56.1	What String Theory Does	96
4.56.2	Grammatical Interpretation	96
4.56.3	Philosophical Limit	96
4.57	Loop Quantum Cosmology: Grammar Becomes Discrete	96
4.57.1	What LQC Does	96
4.57.2	Grammatical Interpretation	97
4.57.3	Philosophical Implication	97

4.58	Comparison with Respect to the Core Question: “The Beginning”	97
4.59	The Gödelian Moral (Structural)	97
4.60	The ‘I’ in All Three Cases	97
4.61	Summary Thesis (Highly Concentrated)	98
4.62	Where This Positions You	98
4.63	A Contrast with Tegmark’s Mathematical Universe Hypothesis 98	
4.64	What MUH Precisely Claims.....	98
4.65	Structural Realism: The Middle Ground Between You	98
4.66	First Rupture: MUH Treats Structure as Language-Independent; You Do Not	99
4.66.1	MUH.....	99
4.66.2	Your View (Grammar / Language Games).....	99
4.67	Second Rupture: MUH Absorbs the “Why”; You Preserve It as a Boundary	99
4.68	Third Rupture: Gödel, Computability, and MUH’s Adaptive Strategy	99
4.69	Fourth Rupture: Empirical Content and Falsifiability	100
4.70	Where Your Position Truly Engages MUH.....	100
4.71	A Sharpened Formulation (Optional).....	100
4.72	A Specific Contrast with Tegmark’s Level-IV Multiverse.....	100
4.73	What Level-IV Precisely Claims	101
4.74	The Measure Problem: Why This Is Fatal (Not Technical, but Principled).....	101
4.74.1	The Problem	101
4.74.2	Your Grammatical Diagnosis.....	101
4.75	The “Typical Observer”: Why SAS Cannot Rescue the Program 101	
4.75.1	Tegmark’s Idea.....	101
4.75.2	The Problem	102

4.75.3	Your Sharpest Point	102
4.76	Selection Principles: Anthropic or Computational?.....	102
4.76.1	Why This Fails	102
4.76.2	Your Grammatical Conclusion.....	102
4.77	Gödel and Self-Reference (Structurally Applied)	102
4.78	The Deepest Contrast in One Table.....	103
4.79	The Core Error of Level-IV (Very Sharp).....	103
4.80	What Your Position Does—and Level-IV Cannot.....	103
4.81	Final Formulation (Definitive).....	103
4.82	How Does My Existence Relate to the Existence or Emergence of the Universe?	104
4.83	Two Meanings of “Coming into Being” (Which Must Not Be Confused).....	104
4.83.1	(A) Physical coming into being.....	104
4.83.2	(B) Coming into being as appearing <i>as a world</i>	104
4.84	Structural Realism: The Universe Before You $\neq$ the Universe for You	104
4.85	Your Grammatical Commitment (This Is Where It Becomes Sharp)	104
4.86	Does the Universe Come into Being at Your Coming into Being?	105
4.86.1	No — not physically	105
4.86.2	Yes — grammatically / existentially.....	105
4.87	Why This Is Not Solipsism	105
4.88	The Big Bang and Your Birth (Parallel, Not Identical).....	106
4.89	A Formulation That Holds Everything Together.....	106
4.90	Where This Places You Philosophically	106
4.91	I Cannot Know the Moment of My Coming into Being — How Does That Relate to Placing Myself in a Calendar?.....	107
4.92	Two Meanings of “the Moment of My Coming into Being” ..	107

4.92.1	(A) Coming into being as an event in the world.....	107
4.92.2	(B) Coming into being as the appearance of a perspective 107	
4.93	Why You Cannot Know Your Own Coming into Being (in Principle)	107
4.94	What, Then, Does a Calendar Do?	107
4.95	The Core Relation: Calendar $\neq$ Self-Origination	108
4.96	Why This Is Not Relativism.....	108
4.97	Why This Runs Parallel to the Big Bang.....	108
4.98	A Heideggerian Formulation (Optional, but Apt).....	108
4.99	Final Answer (Very Precise).....	109
4.100	Explicitly Connecting Time in Physics and Time in Experience.....	109
4.101	Two Forms of Time That Do Not Coincide	109
4.102	Time in Physics: Time as Structure.....	109
4.103	Time in Experience: Time as a Condition of Possibility	110
4.104	Why You Cannot Experience Your Own Coming into Being 110	
4.105	The Calendar: A Bridge, Not a Solution.....	110
4.106	The Deep Parallel: You and the Big Bang	111
4.107	Why This Is Not Dualism.....	111
4.108	Final Answer (Condensed)	111
4.109	Final Reflection — Beginnings Without a Beginning.....	112
4.109.1	Final Reflection — Beginnings Without a Beginning	112
4.110	The Self: Coming into Being as a Boundary, Not an Event	112
4.111	The Big Bang: Beginning of Time, Not a Beginning in Time 112	
4.112	The Theory of Everything: Maximal Grammar, Not Ultimate Ground	113
4.113	The Deep Parallel (in One Schema).....	113

4.114	What This Means for “Existence”.....	113
4.115	The Final Sentence (Everything Together).....	113
4.116	Explicit Positioning with Respect to the Block Universe vs. Becoming	114
4.116.1	Final Philosophical Comparison.....	114
4.117	Final Comparison — Block Universe, Becoming, and Your Position	114
4.117.1	The Two Classical Positions (Concise and Clear)	114
4.117.2	Why Your Position Is Neither of the Two.....	115
4.117.3	Time in Physics → Block Universe (Legitimate)	115
4.117.4	Time in Experience → Becoming (Unavoidable).....	115
4.117.5	Your Position: Grammatical Differentiation of Time.	115
4.117.6	The Beginning (You ↔ Big Bang ↔ ToE) in This Light	116
4.117.7	Why This Is Philosophically Stronger Than Either Camp	116
4.117.8	Final Position (Definitive).....	116
4.117.9	Final Sentence (Closing).....	116
4.118	“I exist after my father and mother” — how does this relate as a language game?.....	117
4.118.1	“After my parents” belongs to a specific language game	117
4.118.2	Two different “I’s” (grammatically)	117
4.118.3	Why “after” shifts meaning here	118
4.118.4	The crucial inversion (this is the key).....	118
4.118.5	Why this is not solipsism.....	118
4.118.6	Descent as an internal story, not a foundation.....	119
4.118.7	Parallel with the Big Bang and the ToE (closing).....	119
4.118.8	Final formulation (very precise).....	119
4.119	Explicitly connecting birth, death, and mortality as language games	120

4.119.1	Three concepts, three language games	120
4.119.2	Birth: a date without a beginning (language game of objects)	120
4.119.3	Death: an event without experience (language game of others)	120
4.119.4	Mortality: not an event, but a structure.....	121
4.119.5	The decisive coherence (this is the core)	121
4.119.6	Parallel with the Big Bang and the ToE (explicit)	121
4.119.7	What this does to “after my parents”	122
4.119.8	Final formulation (book-worthy).....	122
4.119.9	Closing remark (important).....	122
4.120	“The universe does not exist without me, but neither does it exist because of me; it exists in me as a grammatical phenomenon” — clarified	123
4.120.1	Three distinct claims that are often confused	123
4.120.2	What does “existence under the condition of language” mean?	124
4.120.3	The Moon: not part of you, yet grammatically bound	124
4.120.4	What does it mean to say “the universe exists in me”?	125
4.120.5	The connecting role of natural language.....	125
4.120.6	A sharper reformulation of your sentence	126
4.120.7	Final synthesis	126
4.121	“The universe is not mine, but neither is it independent of me; it is that which can appear only where language is in use.”	126
4.121.1	What this means for me as a researcher in astrophysics	126
4.121.2	Core reformulation (applied to research)	126
4.121.3	First consequence — What you actually investigate... ..	127
4.121.4	Second consequence — What explanation means for you	127

4.121.5	Third consequence — How you treat limits and singularities	127
4.121.6	Fourth consequence — Your role as a researcher.....	128
4.121.7	What this does <i>not</i> mean (important).....	128
4.121.8	Final formulation (researcher’s version).....	128
4.122	Contrasting with the self-image of the physicist as a “discoverer of what really is”.....	129
4.122.1	The classical self-image: the physicist as discoverer..	129
4.122.2	The core weakness of this self-image (conceptual)....	129
4.122.3	Your position: the physicist as explicator of grammar	129
4.122.4	Discovering vs. articulating (the decisive difference)	130
4.122.5	Why your position is stronger (not weaker).....	130
4.122.6	The role of the physicist: from witness to participant.	130
4.122.7	Re-reading claims like “we now know how things really are”	131
4.122.8	Final formulation (book-ready)	131
4.122.9	Final positioning.....	131
5	Evolution – brain – “I”	132
5.1.1	The eye: description from within	132
5.1.2	Language as a language game.....	132
5.1.3	Why there can be no external meta-level	132
5.1.4	Where the eye example does and does not apply.....	133
5.1.5	5The ‘I’ as a linguistic function	133
5.1.6	Summary	133
5.2	Can I ultimately explain or describe the functioning of my eye?	133
5.2.1	What would “ultimate” mean?.....	133
5.2.2	Why an ultimate explanation of the eye is impossible	134
5.2.3	The Wittgensteinian point	134

5.2.4	Why the eye seems different from language.....	134
5.2.5	Conclusion	135
5.3	Deepening the Analysis via Contemporary Neurophilosophy	135
5.3.1	What are neural correlates?.....	135
5.3.2	Why correlation is not explanation.....	135
5.3.3	The category mistake	136
5.3.4	Why reduction fails here.....	136
5.3.5	The language-game argument (connecting to your earlier point)	136
5.3.6	Contemporary positions (briefly).....	137
5.3.7	7. Conclusion.....	137
5.4	How should I understand Broca's area, Wernicke's area, and the homunculus as a language game?.....	137
5.4.1	First: what does "as a language game" mean here?.....	137
5.4.2	Broca and Wernicke as diagnostic grammar	138
5.4.3	Why this is not a localization of meaning	138
5.4.4	The homunculus: an explicitly grammatical object.....	138
5.4.5	The perspective problem (first vs. third person).....	139
5.4.6	Why this is not relativism.....	139
5.4.7	Summary.....	139
5.5	Why connectivism does not "eliminate" Broca's and Wernicke's areas, but reinterprets them	140
5.5.1	What "elimination" would mean (and why it does not happen)	140
5.5.2	The shift: from place to role	140
5.5.3	Why this is a language-game issue.....	140
5.5.4	Why Broca's and Wernicke's areas continue to function	141
5.5.5	What connectivism explicitly rejects	141
5.5.6	Philosophical core.....	141

5.5.7	One-sentence summary	141
5.6	Aphasia is a speech disorder in some sense — how should this be understood as a language game?	142
5.6.1	What does “speech disorder” mean within a language game?	142
5.6.2	Aphasia as a disturbance of participation	142
5.6.3	Why aphasia is recognizable only within a language game	142
5.6.4	Clinical tests as regulated language games	143
5.6.5	Relation to Broca’s and Wernicke’s aphasia (brief)	143
5.6.6	Why this is not a denial of reality	143
5.6.7	Summary	143
5.7	Is schizophrenia a disturbed capacity to participate in language practices?	144
5.7.1	What “participation in language practices” means here..	144
5.7.2	The crucial difference from aphasia.....	144
5.7.3	Where the disturbance lies (in language-game terms).....	145
5.7.4	Why this is not a “language disorder”	145
5.7.5	Why the “language-game” perspective helps — and where it stops	145
5.7.6	One sharp formulation.....	146
5.7.7	Conclusion	146
5.8	I experience consciousness — how should I interpret consciousness in relation to myself and the world in which I exist? ..	146
5.8.1	Consciousness is not a thing you possess.....	146
5.8.2	Consciousness as relation, not as content.....	147
5.8.3	You are not a spectator, but a participant	147
5.8.4	The “I” and consciousness	147
5.8.5	Why consciousness cannot be grounded	148
5.8.6	A precise formulation.....	148

5.8.7	Summary.....	148
5.9	Why the “hard problem” of consciousness may be a grammatical problem.....	148
5.9.1	What the hard problem claims	148
5.9.2	The grammatical illusion.....	149
5.9.3	Comparison: the “hard problem” of meaning.....	149
5.9.4	First-person vs third-person: not a gap, but two grammars 149	
5.9.5	Why explanation reaches its limit here	150
5.9.6	What remains, then?.....	150
5.9.7	One sharp formulation.....	150
5.10	Sharpening why “qualia” derail grammatically.....	151
5.10.1	What “qualia” purport to do.....	151
5.10.2	How experience-words normally function	151
5.10.3	What “qualia” do wrong grammatically	151
5.10.4	A comparison that sharpens the problem.....	152
5.10.5	Why this does <i>not</i> mean experience is “not real”.....	152
5.10.6	One sharp formulation.....	153
5.10.7	What remains without “qualia”?	153
5.11	Describing a “déjà vu” as a language game.....	153
5.11.1	What we do when we say “déjà vu”	153
5.11.2	The grammar of déjà vu	154
5.11.3	What “familiarity” means here	154
5.11.4	Why “déjà vu” does not name an object.....	154
5.11.5	The social aspect of the language game	154
5.11.6	Relation to science (secondary)	155
5.11.7	Summary.....	155
5.12	How does the desire for a complete description and explanation of myself as an individual relate to the incompleteness theorems?	155

5.12.1	What your desire is really asking.....	155
5.12.2	What Gödel actually shows	156
5.12.3	The parallel with self-understanding (not an identity claim) 156	
5.12.4	Why a complete self-description is impossible	156
5.12.5	The missing meta-level	157
5.12.6	Incompleteness is not a defect, but constitutive	157
5.12.7	A precise formulation.....	157
5.12.8	What is possible	157
5.12.9	Final sentence	158
5.13	A comparison with standard neurological models of meaning 158	
5.13.1	What standard neurological models of meaning aim to do 158	
5.13.2	What these models <i>do</i> explain	158
5.13.3	The crucial shift: function $\neq$ meaning.....	159
5.13.4	The structural limit (Gödel-like).....	159
5.13.5	Where the model depends on what it explains.....	159
5.13.6	Why this does not justify eliminating meaning	160
5.13.7	The Wittgensteinian correction	160
5.13.8	Summary comparison.....	160
5.13.9	Final formulation	160
5.14	A comparison with enactivism vs. predictive processing	161
5.14.1	What is at stake: what is perception/meaning?	161
5.14.2	Predictive processing (PP)	161
5.14.3	Enactivism	162
5.14.4	The real difference: where is normativity located?	162
5.14.5	The link with incompleteness	162
5.14.6	Why PP does not replace enactivism.....	163