CHAPTER 7

The Grid of Meaning

Presupposes: the self-vindication of difference (Ch. 1); the structural dependence of content on contrast (Ch. 2); the exhaustiveness of the partition (Ch. 3).

Establishes: the biconditional of meaning and difference; the three-grid architecture; the closure of the grid of diffs, in two forms, and the structural floor beneath scepticism.

In brief. Is there anything meaningful that is not a contrast? Whole traditions say yes: Kant's unknowable things-in-themselves, the mystic's ineffable God, the felt quality of music no words capture, what it is like to be a bat. This chapter argues the assumption fails structurally. Meaning and contrast are one domain — meaningful if and only if a diff — and every cognitive act, including the act of pointing "beyond," is a contrast and so stays inside the grid. The closure holds for any possible mind, not just ours, which is what separates it from Kant. But it is carefully bounded: the bat's experience is beyond *our* grid without being beyond *all* grids, and the unknown is a region of the grid, not an exit from it. One consequence: the existence of difference is the one thing doubt cannot coherently target.

---

1 Introduction

Chapter 2 established that any determinate content is a diff — one of two, individuated by contrast. This chapter asks a further question: is there anything meaningful that is not a diff?

The question matters because entire philosophical and theological traditions depend on the assumption that something meaningful lies beyond the reach of contrastive thought — from Kant's noumenal realm to negative theology's ineffable God, from Nagel's bat phenomenology to the mystic's unspeakable experience. If that assumption fails, the consequences ramify across epistemology, philosophy of mind, and philosophy of religion.

The chapter argues that the assumption is structurally untenable.

A biconditional — meaningful if and only if a diff — is defended against three positions that claim meaning beyond contrast and checked against three that seem to (§2). It generates a three-grid architecture tested against linguistic relativism and mathematical constructivism (§3), and yields a closure argument that holds for any possible mind because it is grounded in the nature of meaning (§4). The closure is then distinguished from Kant, Wittgenstein, Hegel, and Nagel, tested against Pyrrhonian scepticism and Priest's dialetheism (§§4–5), then shown to leave a structural floor beneath scepticism (§6).

2 Meaning and Difference: The Biconditional

2.1 The biconditional stated

The biconditional: meaningful if and only if a diff. It has two directions, and each requires argument.

Direction 1: every diff is meaningful. Any unit individuated by contrast carries meaning, since it is one way rather than another, and that determinacy is its meaning. A diff without meaning would be a unit of content that carries no content, which is a contradiction in terms. This direction is relatively uncontroversial. A distinction no mind registers is a member of the ontological grid of §3 and no diff; it is the material a diff takes up, a distinction Chapter 2 (§2.1) keeps apart from content.

Direction 2: everything meaningful is a diff. This is the stronger claim. If something were meaningful but not a diff, carrying content while individuated by contrast with nothing, it would be a content that is no way rather than another. But such a content carries no information, is phenomenally indistinguishable from any alternative, and is not a content.

The argument can be sharpened from the other direction. Anything that differs from something else supplies what registration takes up, since its non-identity with the alternative is the contrast a mind has when it has a diff: the world is this way rather than that. This applies even to what is claimed to lie "beyond meaning", since to identify something as beyond meaning is to distinguish it from what is within

meaning, and that distinguishing is itself a diff. Direction 2 therefore holds twice over: contentless states collapse on inspection, and any item that can be identified at all has already entered the domain of diffs by the act of identification.

One description of Direction 2 should be conceded before the hostile positions are met, because a reader of Chapter 2 will be tempted by it: stated against that chapter's background, the direction can look analytic. If "meaningful" names determinate content and determinacy is contrastive by the determination dilemma, the biconditional consolidates rather than discovers.

The chapter accepts the description. The biconditional's truth Chapter 2 has already secured, so the contribution here lies in what the biconditional closes once stated: the six positions of §2.3, three of them live claims to meaning beyond contrast and three the cases most often mistaken for such claims, and the closure consequences of §4, which no one has drawn from the familiar observation.

The equalisation principle (Chapter 6, §2.2) provides phenomenological confirmation. When the contrasts that individuate a meaningful state are progressively removed, meaning does not diminish toward a residual core of contrast-free content; it disappears. A colour stripped of all chromatic contrast is the blind field rather than a minimal colour, and a thought stripped of all conceptual contrast, excluding no possibility and affirming none, is the absence of thought rather than a minimal thought. There is no layer of meaning beneath contrast, because contrast is not an accidental feature of meaning but its constitutive condition.

2.2 Convergence across theories of meaning

Chapter 2 (§2.2) established that the structural dependence of content on contrast holds across inferentialist, structuralist, and representationalist theories. Two further frameworks extend the convergence to meaning as such.

Crane (2001) is the instructive case, because what he argues and what he presupposes run in opposite directions, and only the second is

enlisted here. He denies that intentional states are, in general, relations to their objects, since the thought of Pegasus has an object that does not exist. He is therefore no witness for any relational construal of content; citing him as one would invert his thesis. What he does hold is that no intentional state can have an object without presenting it under some aspect. Aspectual shape is the contrast requirement under another name: to present an object thus rather than otherwise is to exclude the otherwise, and an intentional state that presented its object under no aspect would be directed at nothing determinate.

Horwich (1998) offers a deflationary alternative on which meaning is exhausted by use. But even deflationism presupposes that distinct uses are distinguishable, and a word with no distinguishable pattern of use has no meaning.

The convergence of five frameworks — Saussurean structuralism (Saussure, 1916/1959), Brandomian inferentialism (Brandom, 1994), Sellarsian epistemology (Sellars, 1956), Crane's aspectual shape, and Horwichian deflationism — corroborates the biconditional rather than establishing it, and the terms Chapter 2 (§2.2) set for the survey travel with it here. Each framework is cited for what it presupposes rather than for what its author would endorse. At least two of the five would decline the enlistment: Horwich, who resists constitutive glosses on principle, and the Sellarsian, who will insist on the autonomy of the space of reasons.

What the convergence shows is that theories built for different purposes cannot all be wrong about their own presuppositional structure. What carries the biconditional is the determination dilemma (Chapter 2, §2.4). The domain of the meaningful is the domain of diffs, and nothing meaningful escapes it.

2.3 Three claimants and three checks

Direction 2 is the claim that will draw the most sustained resistance. Six phenomena in the literature have the shape of counterexamples, and each must be engaged on its strongest terms.

Three carry the claim explicitly, since mystical ineffability, qualitative simplicity, and Heideggerian mood assert content prior to or beyond contrast. Three do not, and are treated because they are the cases most often reached for: Block, Russell, and Bayne identify real phenomena that look like exceptions and, on inspection, are not. Showing that a phenomenon which appears to escape the grid does not is part of what a closure claim owes.

Phenomenal overflow. Block (2007, 2011) argues that phenomenal consciousness outruns cognitive access, so there is more to visual experience than the subject can report or attend to. Could overflow phenomenology be meaningful without being a diff? No. Block's argument establishes that phenomenal content exceeds what the subject can access for report rather than that it lacks contrastive structure.

Even the overflowing experience — the periphery of the visual field, the unattended hue — is one way rather than another, since the peripheral red is not peripheral blue, and is not the blind field. A phenomenal state that occupied no position in any contrast space would have no qualitative character. Block therefore shows that the epistemological grid, what the subject can access, is narrower than the phenomenal field, without showing that the phenomenal field lies outside the grid of diffs. The overflow is within the ontological grid even when it is beyond the subject's epistemological grid — a distinction the three-grid architecture of §3 will sharpen. The dissociation evidence behind Block's argument, together with its no-report refinement, receives systematic treatment at Chapter 13 (§5.2), to which this reply defers for the empirical detail.

Russellian acquaintance. Russell (1912) argues that knowledge by acquaintance — direct awareness of a simple quality, such as a colour or a pain — provides meaningful content without any mediating inference or relation. The response distinguishes the epistemic claim from the structural claim. Russell is right that acquaintance is non-inferential: the subject does not arrive at knowledge of the colour through a chain of reasoning. But the content of the acquaintance is still a diff. To be acquainted with red is to be in a state that differs from being acquainted with blue, from having no visual experience at all. The

phenomenal character of the acquaintance, what makes it an acquaintance with red rather than with something else, is constituted by its position in a contrast space. A Russellian simple that occupied no position in any contrast space would be phenomenally indistinguishable from every alternative, and acquaintance with it would be acquaintance with nothing. The structural dependence thesis is compatible with acquaintance epistemology; it denies only that the content of acquaintance is contrast-free.

Mystical ineffability. Mystical reports across traditions describe states "beyond all distinction", "beyond subject and object", "beyond thought" — meaningful, it is claimed, yet transcending all contrastive articulation. The response operates at two levels.

First, linguistic ineffability is not structural ineffability. A state that is felt, undergone, and remembered is one way rather than another even if no words capture it: a diff in the epistemological grid even if unlabelled in the linguistic grid. Much of what is called "ineffable" is linguistically resistant while remaining structurally determinate.

Second, for the stronger claim, that the experience is truly beyond all contrastive structure, the equalisation principle applies directly. A state without internal distinction is at zero complexity, and zero complexity is the structural boundary of experience rather than a form of it (Chapter 6). If the mystic's experience has phenomenal character, that character is constituted by at least one distinction; if it has none, it is not an experience. The mystic may be reporting a state of extraordinary phenomenological simplicity, minimal but non-zero internal structure, described as "beyond all distinction" because the available linguistic categories are too coarse for its specific quality. Pike (1992) argues that mystical experience is best understood as a distinctive mode of awareness rather than the absence of awareness, and the structural analysis concurs: the mode is distinctive because it differs from ordinary modes, where the difference is a diff.

Qualitative simplicity. A quale — the redness of red, the painfulness of pain — might be thought a simple, unanalysable quality, meaningful without contrast. The equalisation principle refutes this

directly: remove all chromatic contrast and what remains is not a minimal quale but the blind field. The quale's qualitative character is constituted by its position in a contrast space, not by an intrinsic non-relational property. Hardin (1988) demonstrates in detail that colour experiences are constituted by the visual system's differential response to surface reflectance profiles; the differential character of colour experience is structural, not accidental. The same applies to pain, to flavour, and to every other quale: a quale without contrasts is the absence of the modality.

Heideggerian mood. Heidegger (1927/1962) argues that mood (Stimmung) is a form of disclosure prior to any determinate cognition, with anxiety disclosing the world as a whole rather than any particular thing within it. But mood, as Heidegger describes it, is a way of finding oneself in the world: a determination of orientation that differs from other possible orientations.

Anxiety differs from boredom, boredom from joy, and each discloses the world differently. The "as a whole" character of mood therefore does not eliminate contrastive structure; it locates the contrast at a higher level — between the anxious world and the non-anxious world, between disclosure-as-threatening and disclosure-as-inviting. Ratcliffe's (2008) account of "existential feeling" is itself a contrastive phenomenology, since each existential feeling is a way of being situated that differs from other ways. The corpus's harder case, the Nichts of "What Is Metaphysics?", apparently the disclosure of nothing at all, is relocated rather than dismissed at Appendix B (§3.3), to which this reply defers.

Phenomenal unity. Bayne (2010) argues that consciousness has a unity not reducible to the sum of its parts: a holistic character of the phenomenal field as a whole. But the unity is itself a determination, since the field is unified rather than fragmented, integrated rather than scattered, and the difference is a diff. What Bayne identifies is a feature of how the field's diffs are organised, describable in contrastive terms, rather than a content that transcends them. The unity is within the grid.

The six positions converge on the same structural finding: each identifies a real philosophical phenomenon, and each phenomenon, on inspection, turns out to be a diff. The biconditional holds. Everything meaningful is a diff, because meaning requires the determinacy that only contrast provides.

3 Three Grids, One Structural Condition

The biconditional gives rise to a three-grid architecture. The three grids — ontological, epistemological, and linguistic — are structurally aligned because they share a single condition: contrast.

Grid	**Contains**	**Example**	**At zero complexity**
Ontological (G_O)	All real distinctions, registered or not	A boundary between two rock formations	Empty
Epistemological (G_E)	All diffs — contents grasped by some mind	A concept, belief, doubt, or intuition	Empty
Linguistic (G_L)	All labels attached to diffs	The word “red”	Empty

The ontological grid (G_O) is the set of all real distinctions: all instances in which something is one way rather than another, independently of whether any mind registers them. A boundary between two rock formations, a difference in chemical composition between two stellar regions — each is a distinction in the ontological grid. The grid exists wherever diversity exists, and at zero complexity it has no members. The levels of the sciences are nested grids within it, since physics, chemistry, and biology each draw a subset of its distinctions, coarser in tokens and richer in kinds as one ascends (Chapter 4, Appendix), and none of them is a second grid.

The epistemological grid (G_E) is the set of all diffs: all units of determinate content individuated by contrast, as grasped by some mind. Every concept, proposition, belief, doubt, and intuition is a diff. The epistemological grid is a subset of the ontological grid, since every diff is a real event — a thought occurring against the background of its absence, as Chapter 1 established — while not every ontological distinction has been registered as a diff.

The linguistic grid (G_L) is the set of all labels: all symbols, words, or signs attached to diffs or to objects. A label is not itself a diff; it is a vehicle that names one. For natural and perceptual distinctions, language does not generate the diffs it names but labels pre-existing meaning. What holds universally is weaker and sufficient: no label attaches to no diff, with institutional distinctions, which labelling acts do create, treated in §3.1. Language without pre-existing diffs is sound without meaning.

Containment. G_L ⊆ G_E ⊆ G_O. Every label names a diff, but not every diff has been labelled. Every diff is a real event, but not every real distinction has been registered as a diff. In practice the ontological grid always exceeds the epistemological, which always exceeds the linguistic. Read as a norm, the first containment says that labels transmit content and registration creates it, so a vocabulary circular at its base must exit somewhere into a grasped contrast or contribute nothing. The inclusions themselves are not in dispute with the idealist, for whom the ontological grid just is the grasped. What such an idealist denies is that they fail to reverse, and the non-reversal rests where Chapter 1 placed it (§§5.3, 6.4): difference obtains without being entertained, so the ontological grid outruns any grid of grasp.

Alignment. At zero complexity all three grids simultaneously have no members: no distinctions, no diffs, no labels. The termination is a single structural boundary viewed from three angles.

Two levels of containment. The chain just stated holds at two levels, and the difference between them carries argumentative weight. At the level of vehicles it holds unconditionally: every diff is a real registering-episode, an occurrence differing from its own absence

(Chapter 1), and therefore a distinction in the ontological grid, while every label is a real inscription naming a real diff.

At the level of content the relation is an achievement rather than a theorem. A diff's content targets an ontological distinction, and the targeting either succeeds, registering a distinction that obtains, or fails, positing one that does not. The hallucinated object, the false belief, and the theory of phlogiston are diffs in good standing whose posited distinctions are nowhere in the ontological grid.

Far from embarrassing the architecture, the gap between vehicle-reality and content-success is what makes error possible within it. A false belief is a real event whose posited distinction fails to obtain, and a framework in which content-level containment were guaranteed would make every thought veridical — a position refuted by the existence of mistakes. Ordinary error is thereby successful thought with unsuccessful content, and belongs, correctly, to none of the failure types of §3.3, which classify failures of thought rather than failures of truth.

3.1 Labelling, language, and the influence of the linguistic grid

A clarification is needed: the claim is not that language is epistemically inert. Labelling is a powerful cognitive act, since it enables communication, memory, systematic inference, and the sharing of knowledge across minds and across time. What the claim denies is that the label generates the diff it names.

Colour-term research (Berlin & Kay, 1969; Winawer et al., 2007) shows that linguistic categories can sharpen perceptual distinctions. Russian speakers, with separate basic terms for light and dark blue, discriminate these shades faster than English speakers. The accommodation: labelling sharpens a diff that is already available at a sub-linguistic level, since the contrast between 400nm and 500nm light is a physical distinction regardless of whether anyone has a word for it.

The strong Sapir-Whorf hypothesis — that language determines thought, so that G_L determines G_E rather than being contained in it — has been empirically discredited by the very colour-term research that supports the weak version. The weak thesis, that language

influences attention, categorisation, and memory without creating or destroying perceptual distinctions, is compatible with containment. The influence is real. It bears on which diffs are registered and how finely rather than on whether the ontological distinctions exist. The linguistic grid is a tool for navigating the epistemological grid, which is a partial registration of the ontological grid.

Institutional facts. An apparent counterexample is stronger than the Whorfian one and must be met on its strongest ground. Institutional facts — money, marriage, promises, checkmate — are distinctions that exist because of labelling acts rather than prior to them (Searle, 1995; the performative analysis descends from Austin). Before the rules of chess existed there was no fact about checkmate waiting to be named. When a legislature declares a piece of paper legal tender, the distinction between a valid and a counterfeit note — a real distinction enforced by courts — comes into existence with the declaring practice. Searle's status functions, "X counts as Y in context C", just are distinctions constituted by collective representation.

Here the doctrine that a new word never creates a new diff is false as stated; the chapter corrects it rather than defending it. The correction leaves the containment intact, because the institutional case is a loop within the grids rather than a leak from them. The declaring act is itself a diff, an event real at the vehicle level (§3), and therefore within the ontological grid. Its performance creates a new ontological distinction, the status function, which is then registered as diffs and labelled in turn.

The linguistic grid can therefore add distinctions to the ontological grid through the acts that deploy it. What it cannot do, and all the containment ever required, is attach a label to no diff, or generate the possibility-space of contrast as such. Every declaration presupposes contrast by being one. The Whorfian claim and the Searlean fact are thus distinct. Language determining what can be thought is refuted by the colour-term research; language constituting what is instituted is accommodated as a feedback of the grids into one another rather than an exception to them.

3.2 Mathematical content and the containment relations

Mathematical platonism provides a further test. If mathematical objects exist mind-independently, so that G_O includes mathematical distinctions, while mathematical knowledge requires proof, so that G_E includes only proven or grasped mathematical diffs, then the containment G_E ⊆ G_O has substantive mathematical content: there are mathematical truths we have not yet discovered. A constructivist (Brouwer, 1912; Heyting, 1956) challenges the containment in the mathematical case, since if mathematical objects are constituted by epistemic acts then G_O ⊆ G_E for mathematical content, because mathematical objects come into existence only through construction.

The structural response: the constructivist may be right that mathematical objects are constituted by epistemic acts, while even on the constructivist view the acts of construction are themselves real events — thoughts occurring against the background of their absence — and these events are within the ontological grid. The containment is therefore preserved at the level of events even if it is challenged at the level of mathematical objects: the vehicle/content distinction of §3, applied to the mathematical case, with the constructivist challenge confined to the content level.

The platonist and the constructivist disagree about the scope of the mathematical ontological grid, while neither disagrees about the structural relationship between meaning and contrast. The biconditional holds on both views, since a mathematical object, whether discovered or constructed, is meaningful in virtue of its contrastive structure — its distinguishability from other mathematical objects.

3.3 The taxonomy of impossible thought

The three-grid architecture generates a taxonomy of structural failures in which meaningful thought cannot occur.

Ontological impossibility. At zero complexity, all grids terminate together — the structural boundary of meaning. No distinctions exist; no diffs can be formed; no labels can be attached. This is the structural zero identified in Chapter 6.

Epistemological impossibility from ignorance. The ontological grid contains distinctions the epistemological grid has not yet registered: undiscovered truths. Ontology leads; epistemology lags. The mind holds an empty placeholder for something currently unknown but not self-contradictory.

Epistemological impossibility from contradiction. The linguistic grid contains labels that overshoot the ontological grid — "round square," "married bachelor" — words that combine without a corresponding distinction. Language overshoots ontology. The mind attempts to combine two mutually exclusive meanings and stalls.

Why the taxonomy is exhaustive. The taxonomy is exhaustive: any failure of thought is one of these three types. The exhaustiveness is derived rather than stipulated, and the derivation is the architecture itself. A failure of thought is a failure somewhere in the three-grid structure, and the structure offers exactly three places to fail.

Either the grids themselves are empty, so no distinctions exist to be thought: the ontological cell. Or the ontological grid contains what the epistemological grid has not reached, registration lagging: the ignorance cell. Or the attempted diff's content posits what no ontological distinction answers to, positing overshooting: the contradiction cell. Nothing else in the architecture can fail, because registration and positing are the only two relations a diff's content bears to the ontological grid (§3), and each fails in exactly one direction.

The standard awkward cases sort accordingly. The category mistake, "the number seven is green", is overshoot, since it combines determinations from mutually exclusive determination-spaces, positing a distinction nothing answers to, as "round square" does at one remove. Presupposition failure, "the present king of France is bald", is overshoot at the presupposed layer, since "the present king of France" posits an ontological distinction that fails to obtain, and the whole thought is a diff whose posit rides on a failed posit. The Liar is the one case that belongs to no cell, and correctly so: the thought of the Liar is a successful diff, individuated from the Truth-teller without strain, whose truth-evaluation oscillates — a failure of stable truth-assignment rather

than of thought, and therefore outside the taxonomy's subject matter by the same boundary that files ordinary error (§3).

A caveat: Priest (2005) argues that we can think about impossible objects by entertaining impossible propositions without asserting them. The taxonomy does not deny this; what it denies is that the entertainment escapes the grid. Even the thought of a round square is a diff, individuated by contrast with other thoughts, and located within the epistemological grid. An entertained impossibilium is a successful diff about a failed posit — a result the two-levels distinction of §3 delivers as a theorem rather than a concession.

One case the taxonomy's own vocabulary invites should be run explicitly, because it has the shape of a revenge problem. Consider the thought this very thought is not a successful diff. If the thought succeeds, it is a diff, and what it says is false; if it fails, there is no thought there to have said anything.

The case is treated as the entertained impossibilium was. The thinking of it is a successful diff, individuated by contrast with the thought that it is a successful diff among others, whose content ascribes to itself a status it cannot have while being entertained. The result is a necessarily false self-ascription, a well-formed occupant of the epistemological grid, and no revenge. Unlike the semantic Liar, which oscillates, the present case is stably false, because the grid membership it denies is secured by the very entertaining, and no strengthened variant changes this: any variant determinate enough to be entertained is determinate enough to be gridded. The closure has no outside from which a revenge sentence could be launched, which is what closure means.

4 The Closure of the Grid

4.1 The argument

Premise 1. Every cognitive act is meaningful. Assertion has content (what is asserted). Negation has content (what is denied). Questioning has content (what is asked). Doubt has content (the possibility that

something could be different). Intuition has content (what is intuited). The instinct to reach beyond has content (the contrast between here and beyond). Even intentional silence, the deliberate refusal to speak, has content (the contrast between speaking and not speaking). A cognitive act without content is the absence of a cognitive act.

Premise 2. Everything meaningful is a diff (the biconditional, §2). If something carries meaning, it is a unit individuated by contrast.

Conclusion. Every cognitive act is a diff. Therefore no cognitive act escapes the grid of diffs. The grid cannot be transcended from within. Every transcendence-attempt is an act within the grid.

The closure extends across all three grids simultaneously. When a mind performs a cognitive act, the act is a diff (epistemological grid); the act's occurrence is itself a distinction (ontological grid, by the vehicle-level containment of §3); its content registers a distinction that obtains or posits one that does not; and the act may receive a label (linguistic grid).

The closure stands either way, because it runs on the vehicle: even a wholly erroneous transcendence-attempt is an event within all three grids. If the act asserts "there is something beyond all diffs", the assertion is itself a diff, the content it posits is a posited distinction between what is within and what is beyond, while the words used to express it are labels attached to diffs. The assertion does not escape; it illustrates the inescapability.

A terminological clarification: the closure is structural, not transcendental. A transcendental argument (Kant, Stroud) establishes that certain features are conditions of *our* experience: conditions that might not hold for minds structured differently from ours. The closure argument claims that the grid is a consequence of what meaning *is*: any mind that grasps a determinate content is operating within the grid, because a content is a diff. The scope is determined by the nature of meaning; the architecture of human cognition plays no part in fixing it.

The closure's two forms deserve separate names and separate bookkeeping, because they sit at different tiers and later chapters draw on them differently.

The exhibitive closure. Call the first result the exhibitive closure: no meaning can be exhibited — specified, grasped, deployed, denied — that is not a diff. This form is established, and the grading must be strict here, because the chapter's vocabulary invites an inflation the architecture cannot support. The mechanism is self-vindicating in form, since every attempt to refute the closure supplies the refutation, while the form is not the tier: the step from specification to contrast is (S2), Chapter 2's thesis, which that chapter grades established, and a result is at most as secure as the premise it runs through.

Any counterexample to the closure must be exhibited, since a meaning outside the grid must be specified as that meaning rather than another. But specification individuates, individuation contrasts, and contrast is the grid's own currency. The exhibited counterexample arrives already gridded, as the denial of difference arrives already differentiated (Chapter 1).

The ontic closure. Call the second result the ontic closure: there is no ungridded meaning at all, exhibitable or otherwise. This form is established rather than self-vindicating, since it rests on the biconditional (§2), which the only remaining escape must reject. The claim that ungridded meanings exist while being unexhibitable even in principle is not an evasion of the biconditional but a violation of it, since a meaning no possible mind could distinguish from any alternative is a label without a diff — the position §5.4 examines and states the cost of.

The division matters most for the book's metaethics, whose results run through the exhibitive closure alone (note 2): in every such use the closure operates on an attempted saying — a philosopher characterising a favouring, giving a clause content, advancing a thesis — and attempted sayings are exhibitions.

A realist who retreats from exhibition, granting that he can give the clause no content and insisting the content exists beyond all grasping, has stopped asserting the clause and begun gesturing at it. What

survives the retreat is the meta-claim that something ungraspable exists, whose cost §5.4 states, together with the object-clause itself, which is now, by its own defender's admission, deployed as a label with nothing behind it.

4.2 Distinction from Kant

Kant (1781/1998) argues that the human mind cannot think beyond the conditions of possible experience: the forms of sensibility and the categories of the understanding. Kant's argument is transcendental, since it concerns the structure of our minds. The noumenal world, things as they are in themselves, is beyond our cognitive reach; this is a limitation of our particular cognitive apparatus rather than a structural feature of what meaning is.

The present closure argument is structural rather than transcendental. It holds for any possible mind — not because all minds share our forms of sensibility but because meaning as such requires contrast. A divine mind that means something is operating within the grid, because a cognitive act with content is a diff regardless of whose cognitive act it is. The consequence: Kant's argument leaves open the possibility that things in themselves have properties we cannot know. The present argument does not leave this open in the same way. If the grid of diffs is structurally inescapable, not just for us but for any mind, then what lies beyond the grid is not unknowable things with unknowable properties but the structural boundary at which meaning dissolves. There is no noumenal realm of meaningful properties beyond our reach; there is only the point at which the conditions for meaningful properties are absent. The difference between Kant's conclusion and this one is arguably among the most consequential in the book.

The transcendental-idealist reply. A Kantian may respond that the present argument begs the question against transcendental idealism, assuming that meaning is mind-independent rather than mind-constituted. If meaning is constituted by the mind's own activity, the closure argument establishes only that our minds cannot escape their own grid, which is Kant's conclusion rather than a stronger one.

The response: the self-vindication argument of Chapter 1 establishes that at least one difference is real, not merely constituted by human cognitive activity but instantiated by the very act of denial, regardless of who denies. The structural dependence thesis (Chapter 2) establishes that any content, in any possible mind, is a diff. These results are structural, derived from what content is, rather than transcendental, derived from the conditions of our experience, so the biconditional inherits their scope.

Allison (2004) develops the most sophisticated defence of transcendental idealism, reading the distinction between appearances and things in themselves as epistemological rather than ontological. Even on Allison's reading the present argument applies: if the distinction is epistemological, it is a diff — a distinction between what we can know and what we cannot — and the diff is within the grid. The noumenon, understood epistemologically, is a concept individuated by contrast, and therefore within the grid.

Understood ontologically it fares no better, and the point should be made without the shelter of a parenthesis. A realm of mind-independent properties is a realm of determinations, things being one way rather than another, and determinations are distinctions in the ontological grid whether or not any mind registers them as diffs, just as the contrast between two unobserved rock formations is structural difference (Chapter 2, §2.1). What the closure leaves open is what it should leave open: that reality contains diffs no mind has registered and perhaps none ever will — which is most of what a two-aspect Kantian wanted, since unregistered ontological determinations may exist forever unregistered. What it closes is the Kantian picture on which meaningful properties could obtain beyond the reach of contrast as such. The unknown is a region of the grid rather than an exit from it.

4.3 Distinction from Wittgenstein

Wittgenstein (1922, prop. 7) concludes the *Tractatus*: "Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent." The later Wittgenstein (1953) relocates the limits of language to the limits of language games, so that

meaning is use within a practice, and where the practice has no application, language has no grip.

One reading of the *Tractatus* bears directly on "showing". On the resolute reading (Diamond, 1991; Conant, 2000), the ladder's rungs are not attempts to say what can only be shown; they are plain nonsense, recognised as such by the reader who has climbed; no ineffable content is gestured at. So read, Wittgenstein is the closure's ally: the resolute reader holds, with the closure, that no meaningful item stands outside the grid, and that the appearance of a something-beyond is produced by sentences that only seem to say. What the closure adds is the mechanism — a sentence that seems to say and does not is one whose materials compose no diff — and the account of why the appearance recurs (Chapter 8, §3). The traditional reading, on which the *Tractatus* points at an ineffable content it cannot state, is the one the paragraph above meets; the resolute reading has already granted the closure's conclusion and owes it only the mechanism.

The present framework agrees that language has limits and disagrees about the character of the limit. Language is silent at zero complexity not because words lose their use but because there are no diffs for labels to name. The silence is therefore the absence of the material that language labels rather than a limitation of language's expressive power.

The early Wittgenstein's "showing" — the idea that what cannot be said can make itself manifest — encounters the same structural problem, since manifestation is determination, something manifesting itself as this rather than that, and determination requires contrast. If there is an "it" that is shown, it is determinate, a diff, and therefore within the grid; if there is no "it", the showing/saying distinction gestures not at content beyond the grid but at the absence of content.

4.4 Distinction from Hegel

Hegel (1812) holds that thought can think its own limits and, in thinking them, transcend them, so that the boundary of thought is always already thought's own content. The present framework agrees

that thought can think its own limits, since the closure argument is itself a thought about the grid. But it denies that thinking the limit transcends it. Thinking the limit produces a diff — the contrast between the grid and what lies at its boundary — which is within the grid. The Hegelian spiral of self-transcendence is, on this analysis, an indefinite expansion of the grid's content rather than an escape from its structure. The grid grows; it is never left behind.

The constitutive instantiation argument (Chapter 3) provides the structural reason why the spiral cannot escape: the grid's subject matter, distinction, is instantiated by the operation, distinguishing, by which any thought — including a thought about the grid's limits — is performed. Every step of the dialectical spiral is an act of distinguishing: thesis from antithesis, both from synthesis. Hegel's insight that thought can take its own limits as objects is correct, while the further claim that self-reflexion constitutes escape is what the constitutive instantiation of subject matter by operation rules out.

4.5 Nagel, the bat, and the scope of the closure

Nagel (1974) argues that there is something it is like to be a bat: a fact about the bat's experience that is meaningful while inaccessible to human cognition. Does the closure argument deny this? No, and the distinction is essential. The closure claims that nothing meaningful lies permanently beyond all possible grids; it does not claim that everything meaningful lies within our grid. Bat phenomenology is a set of diffs in the bat's epistemological grid, since the bat's echolocatory experience is one way rather than another, structured by the contrasts the bat's sensory apparatus detects. These diffs are within the bat's grid and not within ours. The closure holds for both, while the two grids differ in content.

Nagel (1986) develops "the view from nowhere": the aspiration to a standpoint transcending any particular perspective. The closure explains why the aspiration is structurally unrealisable in its strongest form, since a cognitive act without a perspective would be a cognitive act that is no way rather than another, which is not a cognitive act. A viewless view has no content.

But a weaker version of the aspiration — identifying structural features that hold across all possible perspectives — is what the closure achieves, since the biconditional is a structural feature that holds for any possible mind, regardless of its specific apparatus. The closure delivers one thing the aspiration wanted and not the aspiration: a claim true from every perspective, reached by identifying what all perspectives share rather than by escaping perspective. That is a view from nowhere about the form of any view rather than about the world the views are of — which is the objectivity Nagel was after, and which the closure does not supply.

The distinction between "beyond our grid" and "beyond all possible grids" also resolves the apparent tension with epistemic humility. The closure denies that something meaningful lies permanently beyond all possible concepts; it does not deny that our particular concepts may be inadequate to specific domains. Our concepts are revisable: replaceable, expandable, refinable. What cannot happen is that a meaningful domain lies permanently beyond the reach of all possible concepts, because a meaningful domain is a domain of diffs, and diffs are within the grid of any mind that registers them.

4.6 Pyrrhonian scepticism and the structural floor

The closure argument establishes a structural floor beneath scepticism — Chapter 1's result with "doubt" in place of "denial", so what follows applies that result to the sceptic's act, with the derivation left where Chapter 1 made it. The floor is this: the existence of difference is the one thing doubt cannot coherently target.

To doubt P is to entertain the possibility that not-P obtains — that something different from P is the case. This entertainment is itself a diff: it distinguishes P from not-P and holds the two apart as distinct possibilities. A doubt that did not distinguish the doubted state from an alternative (no contrast, no "otherwise," no competing possibility) would not be a doubt. It would be semantic noise. If doubt is constitutively dependent on difference, then to doubt that difference exists is to posit a contrast between the presence and absence of

difference — and that contrast is itself a difference. The doubt instantiates what it seeks to deny.

The structural element is uniform across the major sceptical traditions. For Descartes (1641/1996), doubt is the methodological entertainment of an alternative. For Sextus Empiricus (c. 200 CE/2000), doubt is epochē: the suspension of judgement between equipollent alternatives. Friedman (2017) develops a systematic account in which suspension is a real attitude directed at a question rather than at a proposition, so to suspend about Q is to be in an inquiring state with respect to Q.

The structural dependence thesis provides the foundation Friedman's account presupposes: entertaining P and not-P as live options requires distinguishing them, and the distinction is a diff. The Pyrrhonist can suspend judgement about any particular claim; what she cannot do is coherently extend her suspension to the existence of difference itself, because the very act of suspension, regardless of what is suspended, instantiates difference.

The floor is distinct from Descartes's cogito, which secures a subject and is compatible with solipsism, as Chapter 1 (§2.2) records under the operational form; the self-vindication of difference secures a feature of reality, with which solipsism is incompatible. Frankfurt (1970) argues for a reading on which the cogito establishes a standing fact about the doubter's nature; even so, it secures a fact about the doubter. The two results are complementary and differ in scope, content, and implications.

Where the argument stands: the biconditional has been stated, confirmed across theories of meaning, and defended against three claimants and three checks (§2); the three grids have been drawn and their containments fixed (§3); the closure has been argued, distinguished from Kant, Wittgenstein, Hegel, and Nagel, and shown to leave a structural floor beneath scepticism (§4). What follows meets the objections.

5 Objections and Replies

5.1 The performative objection

Objection. The chapter is full of thoughts about zero complexity. If zero complexity is beyond the grid, the chapter cannot reach it either, so its own descriptions of zero complexity are meaningless, and the chapter undermines itself by speaking about what it claims cannot be spoken about.

Reply. The reply draws on Priest's (2002) analysis of performative tension at the limits of thought. The chapter describes the structural profile of zero complexity from within diversity, using diffs. The description is diverse, since it uses diffs, while the described state is not. This is no more paradoxical than using sound to describe silence: the word "silence" is a sound, while silence is not noisy. The distinction between describing the boundary, which is legitimate, and crossing it, which is impossible, is the resolution of the tension Priest correctly identifies.

Priest's Inclosure Schema. Priest's book is owed more than the tension, since it contains the argument that this reply cannot work. The Inclosure Schema he develops there holds where a totality Ω exists, where a diagonaliser δ lands within Ω (Closure), and where δ lands outside any suitable subset of it (Transcendence); where all three hold, the limit is contradictory rather than merely describable. Applied here, Ω is the grid, and the schema casts the boundary-describing this section calls legitimate as the diagonaliser itself.

The reply is that Transcendence fails, and fails by demonstration rather than fiat. The exhibitive closure (§4.1) is the result that every attempted specification of a meaning outside the grid arrives already gridded, so δ has no outside to reach. Section 3.3's revenge case is that failure worked through, since the thought denying its own grid-membership is stably false rather than oscillating, because the membership it denies is secured by the entertaining that denies it. The disagreement with Priest therefore reduces to one condition of a schema both accept, which is the cleanest shape it could take.

A related concern — that the conceivability of zero complexity establishes its possibility as a contentful state — is met by the constraints on the conceivability–possibility link already deployed at Chapter 6 (§6.3). The prima facie conceivability of a state whose very nature precludes the conditions for imagistic representation does not establish the possibility of that state having content (Chalmers, 2002; Yablo, 1993), which is the very performative tension the closure argument identifies.

5.2 The dialetheist objection

Objection. Priest (2006) argues that some contradictions are true. If dialetheism is correct, the claim "difference both exists and does not exist" might be coherent, and the floor would dissolve.

Reply. Even in a dialetheist framework, the claim "difference both exists and does not exist" has content. It is a diff, distinguishable from the claim that difference only exists, from the claim that it only does not, and from the absence of any claim. A dialetheist expansion of the logical space does not escape the grid; it enriches it. Every true contradiction is a diff, individuated by contrast with non-contradictory alternatives and with other contradictions, and Priest himself would not deny this: his paraconsistent logic preserves the meaningfulness of contradictions rather than dissolving it. The floor is therefore preserved even under dialetheism. The existence of difference cannot coherently be denied — not because contradictions are impossible but because the denial, even if true (as the dialetheist allows), instantiates what it denies. The self-vindication argument does not depend on the law of non-contradiction; it depends on the structural dependence of content on contrast. Dialetheism expands what can be true; it does not contract what must be meaningful.

5.3 The epistemological externalism objection

Objection. Williamson (2000) argues that knowledge is a mental state, that evidence is knowledge, and that the external world is partly constitutive of mental content. On epistemological externalism, the content of a perceptual state may be partly constituted by its causal

history, by external relations the subject does not possess as diffs in her epistemological grid. Could such externally constituted content be meaningful without being a diff for the subject?

Reply. The response distinguishes the content's individuation from the content's constitution. The externalist is right that the constitution of a perceptual state's content may involve external factors: causal chains, environmental conditions, evolutionary history. But the content, however constituted, is a determination, since the perceptual state is one way rather than another. The causal history determines which diff the state is; it does not determine whether the state is a diff.

H. Putnam's (1975) Twin Earth case provides the classic argument, since the content of a subject's thought about water differs from her twin's thought about twater even though the two are internally identical, and Burge (1979) carried the point from natural-kind terms to mental content at large. On the present analysis both thoughts are diffs, each meaningful in virtue of its contrastive structure, where the external constitution determines which diff each is. The biconditional is therefore compatible with externalism: the claim is not that content is internally constituted but that content is contrastively structured, and the two are orthogonal. The biconditional concerns the latter rather than the former.

5.4 The ineffability objection

Objection. Some things are truly ineffable, beyond the reach of language and thought. Mystical experience, aesthetic absorption, the felt quality of consciousness: these are meaningful states that resist articulation as diffs.

Reply. Section 2.3 addressed the mystical case in detail, and a further consideration applies to the aesthetic case. The felt quality of a piece of music may resist complete articulation, while the experience is not thereby outside the grid: this passage moves in a way that passage does not, this performance differs from that one, the moved state differs from the unmoved state. The felt quality is linguistically resistant,

receiving no adequate label in the linguistic grid, without falling outside the epistemological grid.

The distinction between linguistic ineffability, the linguistic grid's limitations, and structural ineffability, the absence of contrastive structure, is essential. The former is common and unproblematic for the biconditional, while the latter, as §2.3 argued, collapses into the structural boundary of experience. The contemporary defences of ineffability sort by the same line. Kukla (2005) argues that some truths are ineffable in principle for minds of the human kind; Jonas (2016) locates the ineffable in a mode of acquaintance no proposition captures. Both describe items that are structurally determinate, since Kukla's truths differ from one another and Jonas's acquaintance is with one thing to the exclusion of others, so neither claims a content that contrasts with no alternative. Ineffability of their kind is a fact about the linguistic grid's reach, which the biconditional never denied. Chapter 12 develops this distinction into a full engagement with negative theology, showing that the apophatic tradition's retreat to ineffability is structurally foreclosed: what is truly beyond the grid is not an ineffable fullness but the boundary at which meaning dissolves.

6 Conclusion

The chapter yields three results.

The biconditional of meaning and difference. Meaningful if and only if a diff: the biconditional holds across five independent theories of meaning and is tested against six positions. Three of them — Russellian acquaintance, mystical ineffability, and qualitative simplicity — claimed contrast-free meaning and are met; three — Block's phenomenal overflow, Heideggerian mood, and Bayne's phenomenal unity — never did and are shown consistent with it; each identifies a real phenomenon that turns out, on inspection, to be a diff. The equalisation principle confirms it phenomenologically: wherever contrast is removed, meaning is removed with it.

The three-grid architecture. Three grids — ontological (distinctions), epistemological (diffs), and linguistic (labels) — are

structurally aligned through a shared dependence on contrast. The containment G_L ⊆ G_E ⊆ G_O is preserved against the strong Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, is compatible with both platonism and constructivism about mathematical content, and holds at the level of vehicles, with content-level correspondence an achievement rather than a guarantee (§3).

Language labels pre-existing natural diffs, while institutional distinctions it generates through labelling acts that are themselves diffs (§3.1) — a loop within the grids rather than an exception to them. The taxonomy of impossible thought the architecture generates is exhaustive relative to the architecture (§3.3): its completeness is the three grids' completeness restated, and it inherits that grade rather than adding to it.

The closure of the grid. Every cognitive act is a diff, and no cognitive act escapes the grid, with the closure holding for any possible mind because it is grounded in the nature of meaning rather than in human cognitive architecture. The closure divides into an exhibitive form, on which no meaning can be exhibited that is not a diff, and an ontic form, on which no ungridded meaning exists at all; their tiers and the metaethical chain are fixed at §4.1 and note 2.

It differs from Kant's transcendental limits, from Wittgenstein's language-game boundaries, and from Hegel's self-reflexive transcendence, which the closure classifies as expansion within the grid rather than escape from it. The distinction between "beyond our grid" and "beyond all possible grids" resolves the tension with epistemic humility and with Nagel's bat, since bat phenomenology is within the bat's grid without being within ours, so the closure applies to both without claiming they share their content. The structural floor beneath scepticism — the existence of difference as the one thing doubt cannot coherently target — is preserved against Pyrrhonian suspension and against Priest's dialetheism, because the denial of difference instantiates what it denies whether or not contradictions can be true.

The grid is closed. But one of the concepts the grid operates on, perhaps the most consequential concept in all of philosophy and theology, harbours an ambiguity that has persisted for millennia. The

standard definition of infinity, "without limits", picks out two structurally opposite conditions under a single name. Chapter 8 disentangles them, where the disentangling shows the something-from-nothing question to name, by "nothing", no state at all, with the question the mind substitutes for it — why being is differentiated rather than undifferentiated — carrying a remainder the framework owns.

Grades and Dependencies

1. **Tiers.** The biconditional and the three-grid architecture are graded *established*; the architecture's first containment (G_L ⊆ G_E), read as a norm, is the anchoring requirement Chapter 14 (§3.6) uses. The closure divides across two tiers: the *exhibitive closure* is established at the tier of Chapter 2's thesis, which it inherits (its mechanism is self-vindicating in form, but a result is at most as secure as the premise it runs through); the *ontic closure* is established, adding the biconditional. The structural floor beneath scepticism is established. The Premise Register records the full chain.

2. **Where the closures are used.** The exhibitive closure carries the book's metaethical load: Chapter 14 closes the third horn of its trilemma and empties the response-independence clause (§3.6) through it, and the chain — Chapter 1's self-vindication → exhibitive closure → Chapter 14's partition (§3.5, true by logical form) — contains no constructed link; the vacancy result adds to that path one commitment Chapter 14 (§3.6) states rather than derives. Chapter 12's engagement with negative theology draws on the exhibitive form likewise. The ontic closure is used nowhere downstream: no later result needs it, which is itself worth an auditor's notice — the book's superstructure runs entirely on the weaker, better-secured form.

References

Allison, H. E. (2004). *Kant's transcendental idealism: An interpretation and defense* (Rev. ed.). Yale University Press.

Bayne, T. (2010). *The unity of consciousness*. Oxford University Press.

Berlin, B., & Kay, P. (1969). *Basic color terms: Their universality and evolution*. University of California Press.

Block, N. (2007). Consciousness, accessibility, and the mesh between psychology and neuroscience. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 30(5–6), 481–499.

Block, N. (2011). Perceptual consciousness overflows cognitive access. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 15(12), 567–575.

Brandom, R. (1994). *Making it explicit: Reasoning, representing, and discursive commitment*. Harvard University Press.

Brouwer, L. E. J. (1912). *Intuïtionisme en formalisme*. Clausen.

Burge, T. (1979). Individualism and the mental. *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 4(1), 73–121.

Chalmers, D. J. (2002). Does conceivability entail possibility? In T. S. Gendler & J. Hawthorne (Eds.), *Conceivability and possibility* (pp. 145–200). Oxford University Press.

Conant, J. (2000). Elucidation and nonsense in Frege and early Wittgenstein. In A. Crary & R. Read (Eds.), *The new Wittgenstein* (pp. 174–217). Routledge.

Crane, T. (2001). *Elements of mind: An introduction to the philosophy of mind*. Oxford University Press.

Descartes, R. (1641/1996). *Meditations on first philosophy* (J. Cottingham, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Diamond, C. (1991). *The realistic spirit: Wittgenstein, philosophy, and the mind*. MIT Press.

Frankfurt, H. G. (1970). *Demons, dreamers, and madmen: The defense of reason in Descartes's Meditations*. Bobbs-Merrill.

Friedman, J. (2017). Why suspend judging? *Noûs*, 51(2), 302–326.

Hardin, C. L. (1988). *Color for philosophers: Unweaving the rainbow*. Hackett.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1812). *Wissenschaft der Logik*. Translated as Science of logic (A. V. Miller, Trans.). Allen & Unwin, 1969.

Heidegger, M. (1927/1962). *Being and time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Harper & Row.

Heyting, A. (1956). *Intuitionism: An introduction*. North-Holland.

Horwich, P. (1998). *Meaning*. Oxford University Press.

Jonas, S. (2016). *Ineffability and its metaphysics: The unspeakable in art, religion, and philosophy*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Kant, I. (1781/1998). *Critique of pure reason* (P. Guyer & A. W. Wood, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (B edition published 1787.)

Kukla, A. (2005). *Ineffability and philosophy*. Routledge.

Nagel, T. (1974). What is it like to be a bat? *Philosophical Review*, 83(4), 435–450.

Nagel, T. (1986). *The view from nowhere*. Oxford University Press.

Pike, N. (1992). *Mystic union: An essay in the phenomenology of mysticism*. Cornell University Press.

Priest, G. (2002). *Beyond the limits of thought* (2nd ed.). Clarendon Press.

Priest, G. (2005). *Towards non-being: The logic and metaphysics of intentionality*. Clarendon Press.
Priest, G. (2006). *In contradiction: A study of the transconsistent* (2nd ed.). Clarendon Press.
Putnam, H. (1975). The meaning of 'meaning'. In *Mind, language and reality: Philosophical papers* (Vol. 2, pp. 215–271). Cambridge University Press.
Ratcliffe, M. (2008). *Feelings of being: Phenomenology, psychiatry and the sense of reality*. Oxford University Press.
Russell, B. (1912). *The problems of philosophy*. Williams and Norgate.
Saussure, F. de. (1916/1959). *Course in general linguistics* (W. Baskin, Trans.). Philosophical Library.
Searle, J. R. (1995). *The construction of social reality*. Free Press.
Sellars, W. (1956). Empiricism and the philosophy of mind. In H. Feigl & M. Scriven (Eds.), *Minnesota studies in the philosophy of science* (Vol. 1, pp. 253–329). University of Minnesota Press.
Sextus Empiricus. (c. 200 CE/2000). *Outlines of scepticism* (J. Annas & J. Barnes, Eds. & Trans.; 2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
Williamson, T. (2000). *Knowledge and its limits*. Oxford University Press.
Winawer, J., Witthoft, N., Frank, M. C., Wu, L., Wade, A. R., & Boroditsky, L. (2007). Russian blues reveal effects of language on color discrimination. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(19), 7780–7785.
Wittgenstein, L. (1922). *Tractatus logico-philosophicus* (C. K. Ogden, Trans.). Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner.
Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). Blackwell.
Yablo, S. (1993). Is conceivability a guide to possibility? *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 53(1), 1–42.