

1. different logic means different rhetorics - different people say things differently, thus changing the outcome

2. different ways of saying changes the meaning? it does change the effect on people --> direct or indirect way of saying things; ex: Asian writers vs. English

-3. the effect might change the development of the science, as people might have reacted differently - different understanding

-

The quotation by Dufrenne from 1963 and the view that logic, which influences rhetorics, is based on the culture a person is raised in, seems to be a valid position. Researchers found out a lot about the differences in writing in different cultural contexts, and these findings can be taken as evidence for the plausability of the view.

When you look at writing styles in different countries, you can see a lot of differences. As Oshima and Hogue argue the difference in logic means a difference in rhetorics, thus the writing style changes according to the cultural background of the writer. They give the example that English writers tend to start their paragraphs with a topic sentence, giving the main idea which will be presented in the paragraph and then develop their arguments from this point. In contrast to this, Oshima and Hogue point out that Arabic writers use a more parallel construction of their paragraph. As a native speaker of German you realize that also your writing style is different from the one used by English writers. Consequently, things will be said differently by different speakers or writers and the text as a result will be different.

If you argue in line with the quotation by Dufrenne, the change in logic and rhetorics also has to have an impact on the meaning and the effect on the people, because only then it is possible that philosophy or science can develop differently, when things are said in a different way. Here this can be made visible by using an example from Oshima's and Hogue's text. If you compare Asian writers to English writers, comparing their direct or indirect way of saying things, it seems more than possible that the effect on people is different. When saying something directly, the audience or readership, get the content without any confusion and will take it up directly. That means that they realize the fact the moment it is said and can directly react to it. When things are only conveyed indirectly, it might not have the same effect, as people are able to interpret what is said based on their own experience. The writer then might not be able to convey what he really wanted to say as there is more room for own interpretation.

This difference in effect might bear the chance that the world could have developed differently, when "As Peirce said, Aristotle had been Mexican". If he had used a different rhetoric for his writing, people would have reacted differently maybe and it would not have had such a great impact on the world and on philosophy. Maybe the view of another philosopher would have gained more importance and then science would have developed differently. I think one possible example can be seen in politics, where enormous use of rhetorics is evident. The way of saying the words and talking about an important subject, for example about unemployment, changes everything. This way you can make facts look better than they really are. And this way also the impact of Aristotle might have changed when saying things differently.

As a conclusion one can say that the influence of rhetorics is quite important in the development of the world. The logic is dependent on the culture you are in and this also changes your way of saying things. As it is clear that the way

of saying things changes the outcome of your writing or speeches, the development of a field like philosophy is also dependent on that.