

4. English logic and English rethoric are based on cultural patterns; straight line of argumentaion from the beginning to the end of the text

Arabic and Persian: construction of sequence is rather parallel with many coordinators

Asian: indirct approach; not stating argument directly

Spanish: fill paragraphs with digressions which don't have to be related to the topic directly

3.Approaching a text of another language does not only mean to master the language but also the diffeing logic behind the writing

6. Logic, scientific as well as philosophical logic, is expressed through language

Language furthermore influences the comprehension of content

5. Aristotle= Mexican: raised with another language; maybe thought about things in a different way, but also according to the culture he was raised by

Philosophy might have changed

1. Use and expression of language are culturally determined. Expressions of one culture are not used in another or stated in a different (indirect) way

2. Following this, the logic, the way of thinking one thought are mastered differently by different cultures.

in order to understand each other's implications, we have to try to understand the background of that particular culture.

Expressing Culture Through Language

The expression of language, as well as the use of the same are culturally determined. 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 another speaker with different cultural background. According to this, logic, the way of thinking are mastered differently by different cultures. Dufrenne refers to this circumstance by stating Peirce'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 it is legitimate to say that language, as a matter of fact, changes our approach to the world according to our cultural background, does that mean that it actually has such great influence or is it just our will to understand each other thoroughly, which determines the comprehension of another one's thought?

In their text "Writing Academic English" Oshima and Hogue discuss 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 straight forward and follow a straight line of argumentation, Arabic, Persian, Asian, and Spanish texts follow another, very different, pattern. Oshima and Hogue emphacize, that the comprehension of a text written in another language not only provide the problem of understanding this language, but also to follow the different strain of thoughts.

If we follow Oshima's and Hogue's argument, it should also be right to agree with Peirce's argument. Had Aristotle been Mexican, he also would have expressed himself in a whole different way. He would have stated his thoughts differently and his philosophy might have been more or less difficult to approach. However, thinking about the expression of thoughts through language also means that we have to include the culture as such.