

[Start] [09:09.208] English logic and English rhetoric are based on cultural patterns; straight line of argumentation from the beginning to the end of the text. Arabic and Persian: construction of sequence [13.162] is rather parallel with many coordinators. Asian: indirect approach; not stating argument directly. Spanish: [28.985] fill paragraphs with digressions which don't have to be related to the topic directly. Approaching a text of another language does not only mean to master the language but also the differing logic behind the writing [01:16.511]. Logic, scientific as well as philosophical logic is expressed through language. Language furthermore influences the [12.243] comprehension of content [01:37.207]. Aristotle = Mexican: raised with another language; ex maybe thought about things in a different way, but also according to the culture he was raised by. Philosophy might have changed [26.223]. [22.053] Use and expression of language are culturally [13.444] determined. Expressions of one culture are not used in another or stated in a different (indirect) way. Following this, the logic, the way of thinking one thought are mastered differently by different cultures. In order to understand each other's [24.149] implications, we have to try to understand the background of that particular culture. 1, [10.319] 2, [10.915] 3, 4, 5, 6, [13.745] [53.610] The expression, of language, as well as the use of the same are determined culturally. [15.622] Expressions and descriptions which are used by a speaker of one language might not be used in the same way or for the same purpose as by one of another language speaker with

different cultural background. [24.522] According to this *****,
the way of thinking [10.025] logic
c, the way of thinking are mastered differently by different cultures.
Dufrenne refers to this circumstance by stating Peic's
force's argument that Aristotle's logic would
have been different and would have changed our philosophical
and scientific perspectives differently, had he been Mexican.
Although language as a matter of fact changes our approach
to the world according to our cultural background, [10.788]
does it actually have such great influence or is it just
the way our [18.105] will to understand each other thoroughly,
which determines a [12.156] comprehension of each
another one's thought? [01:02.157] [18.866] [16.800] →, *, [25.417] it is legitimate to
say that * [22.459] that mean that
[14.142] [22.612] In their text "Writing Academic English"
Oshima and Hogue [16.855] discuss [10.880] the difficulties
of mastering texts of another language, and therefore another
logical pattern. According to the writers, English texts vary
in more than one way from texts of other languages. Whereas
English texts seem to be very straightforward and follow a straight
line of argumentation, Arabic, Persian, Asian, and Spanish texts follow
another, very different pattern. Oshima and Hogue emphasize, that the
comprehension of a text written in another language not only provide the problem
of understanding the language, but also to follow the different strain
of thoughts. [18.966] Expression of culture through language [C→→→→→T→→→→→

→→L[⁰] If we follow Oshima's and Hogue's argument, [11
 .556] it should also be right to agree with Peirce's argument.
 Had Aristotle been Mexican, he also would have expressed himself in a w
 hile different way. He would have states his thoughts differently
 and it might his philosophy might have been more
 or less difficult to approach. However, if thinking
 about the expression of thoughts through language also i
 so includes the [17.340] means that
 we have to include the culture as such. [12.226] [Stop]