

Logos of Dao: the primal logic of translatability

Q1

ASHOK GANGADEAN

ABSTRACT *In these reflections I attempt to re-situate the philosophical concerns and challenges of interpretation and translation between worlds in the more expansive context of the global philosophy of worldviews, which probes more deeply into the universal common ground of diverse worlds as they have evolved through the ages. This global space in which widely diverse worldviews (cultures, religions, ideologies, cosmologies, disciplinary narratives, interpretations, translations ...) meet and interact opens new horizons and frontiers in exploring the hermeneutical, logical and ontological conditions for the possibility of interpretation and translation across worldviews and traditions. How is translation possible across widely variant worlds?*

In these brief reflections I attempt to re-situate the philosophical concerns and challenges of interpretation and translation between worlds in the more expansive context of the global philosophy of worldviews which probes more deeply into the universal common ground of diverse worlds as they have evolved through the ages. This global space in which widely diverse worldviews (cultures, religions, ideologies, cosmologies, disciplinary narratives, interpretations, translations ...) meet and interact opens new horizons and frontiers in exploring the hermeneutical, logical and ontological conditions for the possibility of interpretation and translation across worldviews and traditions. How is translation possible across widely variant worlds? What are the challenges and opportunities for genuine interpretation when we approach a great classical text from a different philosophical tradition across millennia?

These summary reflections build further on an earlier essay,¹ and seek to uncover and bring to light the global foundations of human reason which is found to be essentially integral, holistic, non-dualistic and dialogic in nature. In what follows I distill certain key themes from four of my books which present the results of research in this area over the past forty years, and which have direct relevance to the present inquiry. The first two volumes appeared in the Peter Lang *Revisioning Philosophy Series*.² The second two volumes will appear soon.³ These volumes seek to open global space for philosophy in general and more specifically to uncover the fundamental logic and universal grammar of natural reason that is the common generative source of diverse worldviews, of human experience, and the shared conditions of all interpretation and translation in the human condition.

Q2

Prologue on Interpretation and Translation Between Worlds

It is found that when we stand back from any one cultural, philosophical or disciplinary orientation and cross into the global perspective where widely variant worldviews

originate and intersect, striking patterns emerge that are not as readily seen (perhaps cannot be seen) from more localised narrative forms of life. In this global space of diverse cosmologies and grammars of reality it is found, for example, that diverse worldviews through the ages have gravitated to some Ultimate First Principle or Presiding Reality that is the source of its form of life.

This global transformation taps a deeper inter-perspectival dimension of rational consciousness, and it becomes apparent that the vast spectrum of diverse cultural and philosophical narrative attempts through the ages to name and express ‘What is First’ converge on the same Primal Infinite Source. For example, the discourse of *DAO* in classical Chinese thought is one magnificent attempt at ‘First Philosophy’ – the enterprise of developing a grammar and narrative to express the most fundamental Reality. Again, the grammar of *AUM* in the Hindu Vedic tradition is another exemplar of this quest for the primal universal grammar.

This is certainly true of the Judaic Biblical script as it seeks to name the Infinite First Principle – *YAHWEH*; and this tradition unfolds in the emergence of Christianity in its attempt to express an ultimate narrative in the form of *The Infinite Word and Christ*, and in the birth of Islam as it seeks to express the Primal Name of *ALLAH*, and so on. Ranging further, it is clear that in the development of Buddhist thought the radical attempt to disclose ultimate truth as beyond all names and forms, as *Sunyata* – Absolute Emptiness – likewise qualifies as an alternative grammatical strategy in approaching What-is-First.

Of course, it is no accident that a continuing deep drive throughout the birth and evolution of European philosophy since Greek origins to express the fundamental Logos, to uncover the missing primal Logic, to tap the missing universal grammar of Logos ... is yet another great chapter in this perennial and global quest to express what is Ultimate. This certainly appears in the striving of the sciences to uncover the fundamental laws and patterns of the Universe, to name and express the ‘Ultimate Stuff’ – be it ‘Energy’, ‘Force’, ‘First Cause’ ... of Nature.

For our purposes here in inquiring into the global source and resource of interpretation and translation across and between worldviews, it is essential to acknowledge that these diverse narratives of the Ultimate Ground are alternative co-expressions of *What-is-First*. This can only become clear in entering the multi-perspectival and inter-perspectival rational space of the global perspective. For in crossing into this higher-order dimension of global consciousness there is a ‘dilation’ of rational awareness and a profound ‘inversion’ of perspectivity into an Integral, Nondual and Holistic dynamic of minding (a Primal Logic) that reveals that the Infinite First is and must be the same generative source of all realities – of all perspectives, all worldviews, all cosmologies, grammars, narratives, disciplines ... of all experience.

Indeed, in crossing into this global rational space and technology or logistic of minding another striking pattern becomes evident. It becomes clear that diverse First Narratives – East, West and other – converge towards a global consensus that we humans are as we mind – our experience, our lifeworlds, our cultural identities, our disciplinary narratives, the phenomena that make up our living realities ... are all profoundly co-shaped by our thought processes, by how we conduct our mind. And a potent global theme across worldviews recognises that humans tend to become lodged, ensnared, obsessed, blocked and locked into egocentric or monocentric patterns of minding or processing reality that have devastating consequences for the human condition and is the common source of existential and rational pathologies or all sorts.

This profound rational theme – that we are as we mind – brings into sharp relief the

method, logistic or technology of 'minding' as being of ultimate importance. It becomes clear that 'egocentric' patterns of minding reality typically separates the thinking subject from the 'object' of what-is-thought, perceived or experienced. In thus objectifying all that appears to its consciousness egocentric reason proceeds to 'package' and 'process' all phenomena, including itself, in artificially constructed language, classifications and categorisations that inevitably deform whatever appears. And egocentric minding typically tends to be 'monocentric' (rather than dialogic) – processing its world from its own reductive perspective, ideology, worldview or narrative form of life.

This is true even in (especially in) certain 'postmodern' narrative forms which appear to stress multiplicity and diversity of perspectives and insist that there is no one universal, unifying or valid perspective. The global logistic makes quite clear that any ideology or program of discourse that is lodged in egocentric rationality is 'logocentric' in this degenerate and perniciously reductive, i.e. 'monocentric' way of self-absolutising its own 'logos' or narrative form of life. In this respect, both 'modernist' and 'postmodernist' narratives, to the extent that they are expressed in egocentric minding – stem from and share the same common rational pathology. It becomes clear that the legitimate concern to cultivate genuine multiplicity and diversity of perspectives can only be achieved by advancing beyond egocentric 'rationality' and expanding into the global rational space where multiple perspectives can truly breathe and flourish.

The trouble with /egocentric reason/ is that it has not matured to the Critical Turn in Natural Reason, to global perspectivity that activates the capacity to cope with multiple worldviews or perspectives in One Rational Consciousness. It suffers from a deep pre-Critical tendency of absolutising its own narrative form of life, be it the logocentric/monocentric agenda of certain 'modernist' programmes, or the logocentric agenda of certain 'postmodern' ideologies which privilege 'multiplicity, plurality and difference'. So egocentric reason is not self critically aware that it is a particular modality of Reason, a particular mentality involving deeply entrenched habits of minding that is not the only option for Natural Reason.

Certain 'postmodern' narratives insist, for example, that there can be no 'higher (meta-) perspective' that is not situated in localised, historical, particularised and contingent existential conditions. In this scenario to allege to 'rise' to a higher perspective inevitably falls into the 'modernist' fallacy of reducing real diversity and multiplicity to a 'totalising' and therefore reductive, pernicious 'unified perspective' that inevitably violates difference. Yet, in egocentric minding, egocentric modernism privileges 'unity' while egocentric postmodernism privileges 'difference', and the age-old dialectical war between 'Unity' vs 'Difference' continues today with no hope for Common Rational Ground.

These postmodern voices lodged in egocentric thinking can only 'imagine' that any 'higher unifying narrative' must commit the 'modernist' fallacy of reducing diverse perspectives to one 'unified' perspective – a totalising, hegemonic, 'meta-narrative' that is not healthfully situated in the human condition. It insists that any such 'modernist meta-perspective' must suffer the fatal error of being a 'god's eye view' – a view from 'nowhere' – which of course is not possible for us 'situated' humans. It appears in this egocentric ideology that any good perspective must be an egocentric perspective. This, of course, is another dogma of self-absolutising egocentric reason that is just as hegemonic, totalising and reductive of all rational perspectives to monocentric ones.

Of course such equally reductive postmodern complaints that insist that all legitimate perspectives must be localised in particular historical (egocentric) contexts, in particular worldviews – are uncritically dismissive of great spiritual and philosophical traditions

across cultures and through the ages that have suggested that human rational perspectives are not essentially egocentric and localised in that way. On the contrary, such egocentric perspectives and perspectivity are found to be the originating source of diverse rational pathologies that can only be cured through the awakening power of rational enlightenment. Egocentric ‘perspectives’ are found to lack enlightened or global perspective.

Indeed, the global perspective and perspectivity at the core of Natural Reason that we are speaking of here opens space well beyond the reductive or totalising dynamics of egocentric reason. The Global Perspective is situated in a higher order rational space in which inter-perspectivity flourishes without falling into the egocentric pathologies of violating real diversity or falling into the totalizing tyranny of a reductive and subjective ‘unity’. So the ‘Global Perspective’ is not just another ‘egocentric’ or ‘Iogocentric’ perspective amongst others, but involves a dramatic transformation to a more potent dimension of Natural Reason that is indeed situated in the global context and common grounding of the inter-perspectivity of diverse worldviews and perspectives.

The ‘global perspective’, then, is not yet another egocentric and subjective perspective, not a grand ‘totalising’ meta-narrative, not a self-absolutising fictional ‘view from no-where’ ... So the only option to these postmodern portraits of a legitimate ‘situated’ perspective is not a modernist ‘perspective from nowhere’ or a ‘god’s eye totalising meta-perspective’. Rather, when approached beyond the polarising and pathological dynamics of egocentric reason other powerful higher order options open, which are found to be profoundly situated in a deeper historicity, specificity and unfolding self-revising drama than could have been imagined in egocentric patterns of minding.

In this way, any and every worldview, ideology, discipline or narrative (whatever the content) that is processed in egocentric thought patterns will share the same deep structural rational and existential pathologies. This global perspective also makes clear that there are diverse alternative strategies to advance beyond egocentric reason towards the integral and hologistic dynamics of global reason. Indeed, it becomes evident that the great philosophical and spiritual teachings of the ages all converge on this common rational prescription – that the key to human flourishing and to the authentic encounter with Reality comes with this overcoming of the adolescent and dysfunctional habits of egocentric minding and maturing into the integrative, nondual and dialogical patterns of natural global reason.

In this light I have found it enormously helpful in my teaching, writing and public presentations to introduce and make explicit a contrasting notation to help the listener more readily identify and become aware of these two great ‘technologies’ of minding.

Two Contrasting Dimensions of Reason, Language, Consciousness, Experience

Whenever language is used in egocentric reason (in egocentric or monocentric patterns of thought) we mark such use with ‘single strokes’ (solid):

/X/

So any utterance ‘X’ is ‘enquoted’ so to speak, with / ... / to indicate and remind us that we are speaking or thinking or experiencing in the egocentric voice, mind, rational space

By contrast, whenever we use language in the hologistic dimension of global reason we mark it with ‘double parentheses’:

((X))

In this way any utterance, sign, expression, phenomenon, thought, experience ... expressed in this ((semantic domain)) of global reason is made explicit by these 'hologistic' markers. Thus, for example, in reading the *Bhagavadgita*, it becomes clearer that the voice and speech of ((Krishna)) – the voice of ((AUM)), the meditative and nondual voice that flows from the boundless Field of AUM – speaks in the universal grammar and narrative force of ((AUM)). Here it appears that the warrior, / Arjuna/, is lodged in an egocentric crisis that he does not yet understand and a deep dialogue ensues between ((Krishna)) and / Arjuna/ who both embody these two ways of being and forms of consciousness.

As we shall see shortly, any sign, any word or utterance, is **systematically ambiguous as between /X/ or ((X))**. Any word, sign or utterance carries a certain 'indeterminacy' or 'multi-vocality' across these contrasting semantic and rational domains. This poses profound challenges in any attempt at interpretation or translation in the human condition. Again, if the script of ((DAO)) is a primal expression of ((Logos)) it cannot be authentically appropriated in the logistic of /ego discourse/ or reduced to /Dao/. If ((Jesus as Christ)) is the ((Logos-made-Flesh)) ... his ((Living Script)) cannot be rendered in/biblical narratives/ that reduce and objectify the ((Infinite Living Word)) ... and so on.

Now, once we have made explicit the contrast between these two great technologies of minding in human evolution, certain astounding consequences immediately follow.

It becomes clear that there is a ((Primal Logic)) of What-is-First and in my earlier work in developing ((**global first philosophy**)) I have suggested that it would help accelerate research, understanding, the rational enterprise and cultural advancement for planetary well-being to introduce a ((global name)) for ((what-is-first)) to help humanity recognise more clearly a recurrent global insight that the ((Primal Infinite Principle)) must be one and the same generative source of all worldviews, perspectives, cultures, traditions, disciplines, narratives, and first philosophies. I have proposed ((**Logos**)) (taken from Greek classical attempts to tap the ultimate structure and dynamics of natural reason and discourse) as such a ((global name)) to help remind us that there is, after all, a fundamental Universal Grammar or ((Logic)) of the Infinite Word that is the universal rational context for all discourse and experience.

This helps us to recognize and remember that ((Logos)) cannot be approached or expressed in the egocentric habits of /minding/. In entering the global space of the ((InfiniteWord)) we cross into a boundless ((Infinite Field)) of multiplicity and diversity that is nevertheless held together in profound ((Unity)). This potent ((Logic)) of ((Logos)) issues in an Infinite Dynamic Unified Field that is ((Integral, Hologistic and Dialogic)). In this way, ((DAO)) is a primal expression of ((Logos)); ((AUM)) is an alternative and ((different)) expression of the ((grammar of Logos)); ((SUNYATA)) is yet another articulation of the ((Infinite Logos)); the ((Infinite Word)) in its ((Infinite)) is precisely the boundless ((multiplicity and diversity)) held together in the abysmal ((Unity)); and this is well beyond the /reductive/ and /polarizing/ dynamics of /egocentric reason/.

Here it becomes clear that the ((Unified Field)) is a boundless and dynamic interplay of interrelations between all things, all signs, all being, all phenomena, all grammatical forms of life. This is why the ((rational space)) of ((Logos)) is ((global, hologistic, integral, dialogic and the sacred space of irreducible individuality, multiplicity and Diversity-in-Unity)). It should be clear that now we are well beyond the older models

of /Perennial/ philosophy which are generalised within egocentric /reason/, and which inevitably have problems honoring the deepest forms of ((diversity)), ((multiplicity)) and ((individuality)) ... in seeking the /common universal truths/ running through all /philosophies/.

Rather, it should be more apparent that a genuine ((Perennial or Global Narrative)) is able to tap the fundamental ((Unifying Conditions)) of all forms of life without in the least requiring that they be /reduced/ to /one narrative/ or /unifying truth/. On the contrary, the ((Global Narratology)) of ((Logos)) enhances and encourages the flourishing of irreducible ((differences)) between the Narratives of ((DAO)), ((AUM)), ((CHRIST)), ((SUNYATA)), ((ENERGY)) ... So the ((Hermeneutic)) of ((Logos)) is able to advance beyond the /reductive/ tendencies inscribed within both /Modernist/ and /Postmodernist/ strategies which tend to be lodged in /egocentric reason/. To privilege either /Unity/ or /Multiplicity/ is to commit the same ((logical)) fallacy. The great breakthrough of the ((Logic of Logos)) is that it can truly recognise and process the simultaneous ((primacy)) of ((Unity)) and ((Multiplicity)) in the ((Infinite Dynamics of Logos)). Indeed, any and every ((item)) that ((appears)) in the ((Logosphere)) overflows with boundless ((Unity-in-Diversity)).

((Reality is a Primal Script): All Experience is Interpretation/Translation

Another astounding consequence of this transformation into the ((Rational Space of Logos)), the **((Logosphere))**, is to see that this ((Unified Field of Reality)) is the ((Dynamic Infinite Script)), the ((Originating and Original Text)) that is generative of all scripts, all narratives, all grammatical forms of life. The ((recognition)) that this **((Infinite Word))** situates, contextualises and presides in all realities brings forth a radical ((inversion)) in perspectivity:

It means that any and every /egocentric narrative or perspective/ is already ((situated)) in the ((Rational Space of Logos)) which is the ((Primal Text)) that presides in all forms of discourse. There is not a word, sign, utterance, thought, experience, phenomenon ... that is not situated in the ((Universal Grammar/Unified Field)) hence under its sway and Infinite Logical/Semantic Force. This ((Logosphere)) is the primary ground and ((context)) of all hermeneutical life, of all thought, experience, interpretation ... translation. ((This)) is the ((common ground and context)) of all interpretation.

This **((hermeneutical inversion))** implies that all human life, all experience, thought, language ... is ((interpretation)), is a take on the ((Primal Text of Logos)) – to be human, to experience, to think, is to ((interpret)); we may call this the **((Hermeneutical Thesis))**, and it means that the art of being ((human)) is the ((art of interpretation)) – to exist is to be situated in the hermeneutical ((forcefield)) of the ((Living Primal Script of Logosphere)). Even when (especially when) we are in /egocentric minding/ ... we are still always situated within the presiding ((semantic force)) of the ((Logosphere)). We may formulate this global truth of discourse in the simple ((formula)):

((... /X/ ...)) : ((Every /x/ is ((x))))

Let us call this the fundamental **((law of universal relativity))**. It expresses a global truth of all hermeneutical, rational life.

This means of course that any great ‘script’ – whether of ((DAO)) or ((AUM)) or ((YAHWEH)) or ((CHRIST)) or ((ENERGY)) ... are all renderings of the ((Original

Script of Logos)). The Text of *Dao* is an expression of the ((script of Logos)) ... that may to a greater or lesser extent formulate and express the ((logic of Logos)). Similarly, the Judaic Biblical Script may well be an authentic expression of the ((Infinite Word)); and the Gospels may well capture the ((Living Logos made Flesh)) ... and so too with all the great 'scripts'.

The obvious point here is that if our great ((sacred scripts)) are ((expressions)) of ((Infinite Logos)) ... this would suggest that all /egocentric interpretations/ or /translations/ of these ((Scripts)) would be fatally flawed. If ((DAO)) expresses the ((Grammar of Logos)) then any /interpretation/ or /translation/ that is lodged in the /hermeneutic/, /semantic/, /logic/ of /egocentric reason/ would be compromised. **((DAO)) cannot be rendered in the hermeneutic of /Dao/.** The ((Word of God)) cannot be rendered in the /egocentric word/, and is violated by reducing it to the /Word of God/ ... and so on.

All Translation is a Form of Interpretation

The more ((generic)) point here is that all human experience is ((hermeneutical)) ... is interpretive activity, and it is more apparent that all 'translation' is a form of interpretation. To 'experience' is to 'interpret' or 'translate' within the ((Text of Logos: the Logosphere)). The hermeneutical insights of global philosophy have made it quite clear that we humans are always situated in certain perspectives, worldviews, conceptual ecologies ... that colour and shape all that appear to us. To experience is to inhabit a 'lifeworld' or 'worldview', which is a universal conceptual space that makes phenomena possible. Whatever appears to me is co-shaped by the conceptual ecology of my worldview (culture, ideology, religion ...). So this raises still another potential barrier or challenge to approaching any 'text', especially one situated in a 'remote' culture, tradition, time ... To allege, for example, to 'translate' a great classical ((Text)), like the ((Dao)), across millennia, across worldviews, not to mention the major challenge of being mindful of the shift from /egocentric minding/ to the ((hermeneutic of Logos)) ... raises serious concerns, to say the least.

Two Kinds of Fatal Flaws in Interpretation/Translation

The first and ultimate concern of good translation in approaching any ((Script)) is to become ((mindful)) of the ((logic and hermeneutic of Logos)), to become competent and ((literate)) in the global ((grammar of Logos)). This also requires that we become ((critical thinkers)) who are keenly mindful of our the 'conceptual ecologies' or 'worldviews' that we inhabit and bring to this ((sacred text)). So there are **two kinds of fatal flaws** in approaching a ((Text)): one is the fallacy of approaching a ((Logos Script)) in the mentality of /egocentric minding/; the other is the fallacy of unwittingly imposing my own /mental ecology/, /worldview, /ideology/ ... on the ((Text)) which may be rendered in a very different ((conceptual space/ecology)). Here we see that /egocentric reason/ falls into both 'fallacies' in its /hermeneutical activities/. Since we humans are always in modalities of interpretation/translation – as we encounter our 'Significant Other' ... we are all placed under the ((Critical Review)) of ((Natural Reason)) in all our 'hermeneutical' activities.

This means, of course, that if I am to 'interpret' my 'Other' – be it my friend or partner, be it my 'enemy' or estranged 'other', be it a different worldview, or religion, or culture or ideology, or any ((Sacred Text)) ... it is imperative that I become 'mindful' of not imposing my monocentric worldview on the 'Text of the Other'; I must

become hermeneutically sensitive in not reducing the ‘hermeneutic of this Other’ to my habits of mind, to my worldview, to my hermeneutical ecology. Of course, this means that I must take the ((critical turn)) in stepping back from privileging my worldview, and imposing my /mentality/ on this ‘Other’.

So the art of authentic interpretation/translation inevitably takes us into the deep dialogue of entering the ((global mentality and logistic)) in the art of interpretation – the art of being human. Indeed, this turns out to be the rational force of the great ((Texts)) – and certainly of the ((Text of Dao)). Here it is easier to see that in all of our interpretive activity – from everyday common sense experience, to the sophisticated theorica of the sciences ... we are always in some degree of encounter with the ((Script of the Logosphere)).

Nor, of course, is it a matter of ‘translating’ from contemporary ‘English’ into ancient Chinese, Hebrew, Greek or Sanskrit and *vice versa*. That is challenging enough. Even within ‘English’, we face the transformations from /English/ to ((English)) and of course the diverse alternative worldviews or conceptual ecologies and ideologies that morph sense and meaning within ‘English’. It is hard enough translating across worldviews and mentalities ‘within’ a given natural language; it is perhaps even more challenging translating across and between diverse natural languages across worldviews, across millennia, and across the dimensional divide between egocentric /reason/ and the ((Hermeneutic of Logos)).

On the other hand, although I may be situated in ((English)), I may well have more direct access to the ((Logos)) in an ‘ancient’ ((Logos Script)), like ((Dao)), even across these distant times, places and linguistic challenges. As we become ((literate)) in the ((logic and language of Logos)) we become more aware of the deeper dimensions of learning ((**English**)) as a qualification for competence in translatability. Thus, a scholar may know /Chinese/ and not reach the ((Text of Dao)), while another might be ((literate)) in ((English)) and be in ((communion)) with ((Dao)), and be qualified to render it well.

All natural languages arise from ((Logos)) and meet in its ((Universal Grammar)) as their ((common ground)). It is through this very ((global common ground of Logos)) that authentic translation across worlds, traditions and linguistic forms of life is possible. ((English)) has direct contact with ((DAO)), with ((Logos)); indeed, all grammars, (be it ((Hebrew, Sanskrit, Arabic, Swahili, Chinese, English ...)) ...) are profoundly linked in the ((generative source)) of the ((Grammar of Logos)). In this respect the ((Grammar of Dao)) is directly accessible to diverse ((natural languages)) in the global space of ((natural reason)). Thus, a ((thinker)) situated in ((English)) has access to ((AUM)), to ((DAO)), to ((SUNYATA)), to ((CHRIST))

The Inescapable Conclusion: ((Logos of Dao))

The foregoing reflections on the universal conditions of interpretation and translation across worlds are obviously addressed to any and every initiative in interpretation or translation. It has been suggested that we humans are always engaged in the hermeneutical arts of interpretation, which are inscribed in everyday experience and consciousness.

In my other writings I explore in great detail the ((hologistic dynamics)) of the ((Logic of Logos)) and attempt to show that the ((Logosphere)) – the ((Primal Script of Reality)) – involves a profound ((**Categorical Continuum**)) wherein all fundamental ((categories)) – ((space, time, cause, being, becoming, thought, mind, matter ...))

are all immediately implicated in one another in this ((deep structure)) of any ((world-view)). Thus, if the ((Text of Dao)) is an expression of ((Logos)), then it unfolds in **((Time))**, **not in /Time/**, and any /scholarship/ that approaches the ((Narrative of Dao)) in the egocentric mentality of /time/ is bound to be **ana((chronistic))** and reduce the ((temporality of Dao)) to the projection of egocentric /time/ and /scholarship/.

In sum, it should be apparent that **((literacy)) in the ((grammar of Logos))** is a qualification for competent interpretation and translation of ((Logos Texts)). Given that all words, signs, languages ... are situated in a certain indeterminacy and multivoicity across the dimensions of reason and discourse, this places all our hermeneutical activity under the ((Critical Review)) of ((Global Natural Reason)) and the ((Hermeneutic of Logos)).

Ashok Gangadean, Department of Philosophy, Haverford College, Haverford, PA 19041–1392, USA

NOTES

- [1] GANGADEAN, ASHOK (1995) The quest for the primal word, *Parabola* 20(3), . Q3
- [2] GANGADEAN, ASHOK (1994) *Meditative Reason: Towards Universal Grammar* (New York, Peter Lang); GANGADEAN, ASHOK (1997) *Between Worlds: The Emergence of Global Reason* (New York, Peter Lang). Q4
- [3] GANGADEAN, ASHOK (2003 forthcoming) *Meditations of Global First Philosophy: The Quest for the Missing Grammar of Logos* (Albany, NY, The State University of New York Press); GANGADEAN, ASHOK (forthcoming) *The Awakening of the Global Mind* (—). Q5 Q6

Author Query Sheet

Manuscript Information	
Journal Acronym	CASP
Volume and issue	12 (3)
Author name	Gangadean
Manuscript No. (if applicable)	

AUTHOR: The following queries have arisen during the editing of your manuscript. Please answer the queries by marking necessary corrections at the appropriate positions on the PROOFS. Do not answer the queries on the query sheet itself. Please also return a copy of the query sheet with your corrected proofs.

QUERY NO.	QUERY DETAILS
AQ1	The Editor changed <i>Tao</i> to <i>Dao</i> in title (<i>Dao</i> is used throughout the special issue), so I have changed all references to <i>Dao</i> or DAO throughout—OK?
AQ2	Style is to included references in Notes Section, so titles deleted here—OK?
AQ3	Please journal page numbers.
AQ4	“2003 forthcoming” OK or published?
AQ5	“forthcoming” OK?
AQ6	Is publisher and location known? If so please supply.