

Literature Review Essay

Sample

It is difficult, if not impossible, to define philosophy with one sentence. Here, however, I'm going to try it, but before we get that sentence, we need some preliminary analysis. Usually it begins with an etymological analysis: the word philosophy is a Greek compound consisting of a verb *filein* (likes) and a noun *sofia* (wisdom). Therefore, philosophy simply defines it as a love of wisdom but there is still something to be said about love and the wisdom that make up philosophy. Unlike our language where love is expressed with the help of one verb, the Greek had four words for love: The first was *era* (literally craving), hence the noun *eros*, which means to love something for aesthetic reasons, because it is beautiful, attractive senses (and does not decrease to the erotic in modern sense). The second is *storgē* love, which marks the family love of parents and children, brothers, and sisters. The third *gap* is love which, for the old Greeks, meant practically the same thing that *storgē* (only in the New Testament gains the meaning of unconditional divine love), with *agapē* love, also pointing to those who are not relatives. To love *agapē* means to love someone as a member of their own family. The *file* (hence the name *filos* - friend) means to love something not for the outside but for interior beauty and it does not necessarily need to be directed to a person (as *storgē*), but also to something abstract - for example, wisdom. Wisdom for Old Greeks is the unity of a complete theoretical understanding of the world and practical life according to that knowledge. Being wise means to know the world and to live what is known. Only Plato possesses such wisdom for Plato, because man neither fully realizes the world nor lives on it. Philosophy for this is, on the one hand, a man's confession of his own imperfection, but on the other hand, a call to reach this cognitive-ideological ideal. The philosophical philosophy itself appears for the first time in the form of a philosopher: it is claimed that Pythagoras responded to this question - philosopher, the philosopher. But, historically, a more reliable word is attributed to the philosopher Heraclitus, who stated (fragment 35) that philosophers must be knowledgeable of many things. This statement makes it clear that philosophy implies education and learning: the philosopher does not become simply placing a finger on the forehead and persistent thinking. The philosopher must have a wide education as well as an education in philosophy, which means knowledge of the history and issues of philosophy. The perceived notion of unnecessary education in philosophy is witty commenting on Hegel: This science often experiences contempt that even those who did not bother with it express the conviction that they understand the philosophy of understanding from the ground and that, as such, they are, as usual, with their usual education, from religious feelings, capable of philosophizing and judging her. For others, science admits that they have to study in order to know each other, and that only with the help of such knowledge can a person have the right to judge them. It is recognized that a man first had to study and practice if he wanted to make a shoe, though each on his foot has a scale for it, his hands, and in them the natural skill needed for that job. Only philosophy would not require such study, learning, and effort. Encyclopedia of philosophical sciences, §5, explanation. This introductory discussion has not yet defined philosophy, since it should be defined only after we consider her relationship with other, close fields of human spiritual activity. Philosophy, art, science and religion have a common trait to realize that this visible reality, the phenomenon (Greek *fainomenōn* - what appears) is neither a final nor a real, mental reality (*noumenōn* - what is understood, understood). They stand opposite the ordinary, common sense (*sensus communis*) by transcending reality - behind the visible one they seek an invisible cause and bite. We have already said that both art and philosophy transcend reality. It also means that they seek out the general, although they always depart from the individual. Both of them in the sensory search for the supernatural, in that

changeable for the immutable. In addition, philosophy has something artistic in itself, it is, as the postmodern thinkers Deleuze and Guattarie point out, "the art of designing, finding and producing concepts. Art is non-meticulous, it comes directly to the world; philosophy approaches the world by reflecting on the method by which this knowledge is possible.³ The philosopher can be convinced that this method really exists, or be extremely skeptical about the need for such a method, but he must nevertheless base his stance on the method, which is not an issue at all .

The goal of art is beautiful (as defined by this term), while the goal of philosophy is the truth. For philosophy, what is important is, and for art it is how. The philosopher can be a good artist, so we have a group of philosophers of very expressive feathers (Plato, Nietzsche, Sartre, etc.), but the evaluation of one's philosophy never depends on the beauty of the expression. And the artist can be a good philosopher, but the quality of the work depends on the way in which something is shown, not the power of arguments and the depth of the idea. Art gives reality in sensory images or images. The artistic picture is not and must not be a copy of reality, it can be extremely abstract, like abstract painting or music - so we prefer talking about symbols, not about literal images. But she must use sensibility (and in that sense, we are talking about the picture at all). But behind this sensation, the supernatural is hiding, and importantly - behind the image of a raven in Poe's poem hides the very death, the inevitability of a permanent cease of existence. Contrary to art, philosophy is expressed in concepts, abstract terms that need to be understood through their use. As far as terminology is concerned, the philosopher is most often faced with the choice of several options: it can be used as a common word but gives her a new meaning. Still, have to have in even though the philosopher uses everyday words, they have a much more complicated meaning than every day (such as Marx's concept of work or Heidegger's term Dasein). It can create complexes that impose headaches not only on philosophical beginners (such as Heidegger's definition of art as self-in-work-set-truth-beings).

The next option would be to use already established, eminently philosophical terms (transcendence, epistemology, intersubjectivity, etc.), which mainly derive origin from Greek and Latin. The last possibility, which philosophers also resort to, is forging new words. So, for example, Derrida concludes a new term *différance*. In some way (but not absolutely), it could be said that philosophy and science have more in common than philosophy and art. First, both philosophy and science are methodological and reflect on the way in which reality is to be approached. Second, both claim truthfulness. In addition, both are abundantly used in abstract terms. Scientists can also use common terms in unusual meaning (eg, force) and design new terms (eg quantum), not to speak of the Greek-Latin roots of the word. There are also strong historical reasons for linking philosophy and science. The fact is that many sciences have been started by philosophers (Greek physicists, Aristotle, Leibniz). That is why some 20th-century philosophers (the so-called logical positivists, e.g. Carnap) expects that all philosophical questions will take over science, so that philosophy will disappear into that shaping of science. Science does not raise questions about values and purpose - It is true that sometimes a scientist may be aware that his finding can improve or destroy the world, but it is the individual problem of scientists, not the scientific problem per se scientific facts are what they are and it does not matter what is good and what is bad. Philosophy, as a matter of priority, raises the question of the value of everything, every knowledge, and finding. Moreover, it also raises the question of its own meaning and value, as a matter of greatest importance. The philosopher meets with this question at the beginning of his philosophy-what can I do when I

become a philosopher? The area is often tempted to ask philosophers a question that will never be addressed to miners, doctors, soldiers, or anyone else – what do you serve? It is no wonder that philosophers in the twentieth century often ask a question – what else is philosophy? When a scientist poses the question of what science does, then he goes to a (good or bad) society of philosophers. Science Does Not Discuss Their Own Presumptions – The Scientist approaches this world without discussing the favorite philosophical question whether it is all just obsessed or stolen by any evil demons. The scientist departs tensely from the philosophical assumption that this world is governed by some absolutely valid laws that can be perceived on the basis of experience and reason. Science rests even on the theological assumption that any divinity does not interfere with cosmic law (either because it does not exist or because it is not interested in the world). The scientist deeply believes in his own methods and he thinks he is the only person invited to make a statement on all matters of nature and man. On the contrary, the philosophy of philosophy is that all must be critically examined – *de omnibus dubitandum est* (Descartes). The truth is for the philosopher a secret and a source of curiosity – he prepares Plato's philosophy and begins with the awakening (*thaumadzein*). Plato's perception is related to Descartes's suspicion, because basically it means that nothing is acceptable for granted. It is not irrational accentuation (as philosophers often accuse), but finding that generally accepted views (the so-called obvious truths) become after a close examination of the unsustainable. Science deals only with parts or aspects of reality, while the philosopher tries to understand the reality as a whole – Science sees reality from different aspects – Physics only researches such bodies as such and not nature as such, biology deals with living bodies, man's medicine as a body of mind, psychology with man's mentality, sociology of human society. Scientific questions are the average temperature in Himalayas in June, how spores are propagated, how many World War I victims are, what are the advantages of treating hydrotherapy, etc.

Science becomes so fragmented and branched that in some "branches" science understands just a few people. Philosophical questions encompass everything (that is *pan*), so its questions are ultimately abstract. Scientists are interested in some historical events, the philosopher asks what this is all about, whether it is a logically linked entity for its own purpose. The scientist can be asked what a word means, the philosopher is interested in what this is all about. The philosopher finally poses such general questions as why there is anything at all (would it be easier for nothing to exist)? Although philosophy has its own spheres or disciplines, it also in these areas raises the whole question (*totus*).