**Djilali bounaam university.**

**Social department.**

**Philosophy branch.**

**Read the text and answer the following questions :**

THE conceptions of life and the world which we call "philosophical" are a product of two factors: one, inherited religious and ethical conceptions; the other, the sort of investigation which may be called "scientific," using this word in its broadest sense. Individual philosophers have differed widely in regard to the proportions in which these two factors entered into their systems, but it is the presence of both, in some degree, that characterizes philosophy.

"Philosophy" is a word which has been used in many ways, some wider, some narrower. I propose to use it in a very wide sense, which I will now try to explain. Philosophy, as I shall understand the word, is something intermediate between theology and science. Like theology, it consists of speculations on matters as to which definite knowledge has, so far, been unascertainable; but like science, it appeals to human reason rather than to authority, whether that of tradition or that of revelation. All *definite* knowledge--so I should contend-- belongs to science; all *dogma* as to what surpasses definite knowledge belongs to theology. But between theology and science there is a No Man's Land, exposed to attack from both sides; this No Man's Land is philosophy. Almost all the questions of most interest to speculative minds are such as science cannot answer, and the confident answers of theologians no longer seem so convincing as they did in former centuries. Is the world divided into mind and matter, and, if so, what is mind and what is matter? Is mind subject to matter, or is it possessed of independent powers? Has the universe any unity or purpose? Is it evolving towards some goal? Are there really laws of nature, or do we believe in them only because of our innate love of order? Is man what he seems to the astronomer, a tiny lump of impure carbon and water impotently crawling on a small and unimportant planet? Or is he what he appears to Hamlet? Is he perhaps both at once? Is there a way of living that is noble and another that is base, or are all ways of living merely futile? If there is a way of living that is noble, in what does it consist, and how shall we achieve it? Must the good be eternal in order to deserve to be valued, or is it worth seeking even if the universe is inexorably moving towards death? Is there such a thing as wisdom, or is what seems such merely the ultimate refinement of folly? To such questions no answer can be found in the laboratory. Theologies have professed to give answers, all too definite; but their very definitenesscauses modern minds to view them with suspicion. The studying of these questions, if not the answering of them, is the business of philosophy.
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Questions :

1. What is the main problem in the text ?
2. What is the position of the author hier in the text ?
3. What do you think about his point of view ?
4. What is the conclusion deduced from the text ?
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**Read the text and answer the following questions :**

THE Greeks were not addicted to moderation, either in their theories or in their practice.Heraclitus maintained that everything changes; Parmenides retorted that nothing changes. Parmenides was a native of Elea, in the south of Italy, and flourished in the first half of the fifth century B.C. According to Plato, Socrates in his youth (say about the year 450 B.C.) had an interview with Parmenides, then an old man, and learnt much from him. Whether or not this interview is historical, we may at least infer, what is otherwise evident, that Plato himself was influenced by the doctrines of Parmenides. The south Italian and Sicilian philosophers were more

inclined to mysticism and religion than those of Ionia, who were on the whole scientific and sceptical in their tendencies. But mathematics, under the influence of Pythagoras, flourished more in Magna Grecia than in Ionia; mathematics at that time, however, was entangled with mysticism. Parmenides was influenced by Pythagoras, but the extent of this influence is conjectural. What makes Parmenides historically important is that he invented a form of metaphysical argument that, in one form or another, is to be found in most subsequent metaphysicians down to and including

Hegel. He is often said to have invented logic, but what he really invented was metaphysics based on logic.
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Questions :

1. What is the main problem in the text ?
2. What is the position of the author hier in the text ?
3. What do you think about his point of view ?
4. What is the conclusion deduced from the text ?
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**Read the text and answer the following questions :**

THOMAS AQUINAS (b. 1225 or 1226, d. 1274) is regarded as the greatest of scholastic

philosophers. In all Catholic educational institutions that teach philosophy his system has to be taught as the only right one; this has been the rule since a rescript of 1879 by Leo XIII. Saint Thomas, therefore, is not only of historical interest, but is a living influence, like Plato,

Aristotle, Kant, and Hegel --more, in fact, than the latter two. In most respects, he follows

Aristotle so closely that the Stagyrite has, among Catholics, almost the authority of one of the

Fathers; to criticize him in matters of pure philosophy has come to be thought almost impious. \*

This was not always the case. In the time of Aquinas, the battle for Aristotle, as against Plato,

still had to be fought. The influence of Aquinas secured the victory until the Renaissance; then Plato, who became better known than in the Middle Ages, again acquired supremacy in the opinion of most philosophers. In the seventeenth century, it was possible to be orthodox and a Cartesian; Malebranche, though a priest, was never censured. But in our day such freedoms are a thing of the past; Catholic ecclesiastics must accept Saint Thomas if they concern themselves with philosophy.

Bertrand Russell – A HISTORY OF WESTERN PHILOSOPHY – page 452

Questions :

1. What is the main problem in the text ?
2. What is the position of the author hier in the text ?
3. What do you think about his point of view ?
4. What is the conclusion deduced from the text ?

Example of philosophical text analyse

A short analyse of the text /

The text discuss the role of thomas aquinas in the meddle ages , and how he influenced the forcoming civilisations

The main problem of the text consists on the importance of thomas aquinas in the occidental philosophy , and what is the source of his philosophy, did the greek philosophers influenced him ?

The answer is clear in the text so ; russells said that thomas aquinas has influenced the occdental philosophy for long time , and he built his philosophy on the greek philosopher such aristotle and plato , then he has influenced many forcominh philosopher for instance , hegel , malebranche and descartes in the earlier of seventeenth century .

Even that thomas aquinas has a high place in the occidental culture as priest , we have to remember that his philosophy was seriously criticised by his followers and those agreed his conception of relgion principles .

In the end we should say that thmoas aquinas is one of the most important philosopher of seventeenth century ; who has contributed in the building of new thinking of religion .
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**Read the text and answer the following questions :**

THE intellectual life of the nineteenth century was more complex than that of any previous age. This was due to several causes. First: the area concerned was larger than ever before; America and Russia made important contributions, and Europe became more aware than formerly of Indian philosophies, both ancient and modern. Second: science, which had been a chief source of novelty since the seventeenth century, made new conquests, especially in geology, biology, and organic chemistry. Third: machine production profoundly altered the social structure, and gave men a new conception of their powers in relation to the physical environment. Fourth: a profound revolt, both philosophical and political, against traditional systems in thought, in politics, and in economics, gave rise to attacks upon many beliefs and institutions that had hitherto been regarded as unassailable. This revolt had two very different forms, one romantic, the other rationalistic. (I am using these words in a liberal sense.) The romantic revolt passes from Byron, Schopenhauer, and Nietzsche to Mussolini and Hitler; the rationalistic revolt begins with the French philosophers of the Revolution, passes on, somewhat softened, to the philosophical radicals in England, then acquires a deeper form in Marx and issues in Soviet Russia.
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Questions :

1. What is the main problem in the text ?
2. What is the position of the author hier in the text ?
3. What do you think about his point of view ?
4. What is the conclusion deduced from the text ?
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**Read the text and answer the following questions :**

SCHOPENHAUER ( 1788-1860) is in many ways peculiar among philosophers. He is a

pessimist, whereas almost all the others are in some sense optimists. He is not fully academic, like Kant and Hegel, nor yet completely outside the academic tradition. He dislikes Christianity, preferring the religions of India, both Hinduism and Buddhism. He is a man of wide culture, quite as much interested in art as in ethics. He is unusually free from nationalism, and as much at home with English and French writers as with those of his own country. His appeal has always been less to professional philosophers than to artistic and literary people in search of a philosophy that they could believe. He began the emphasis on Will which is characteristic of much nineteenth- and twentieth-century philosophy; but for him Will, though metaphysically fundamental, is ethically evil--an opposition only possible for a pessimist. He acknowledges three sources of his philosophy, Kant, Plato, and the Upanishads, but I do not think he owes as much to Plato as he thinks he does. His outlook has a certain temperamental affinity with that of the Hellenistic age; it is tired and valetudinarian, valuing peace more than victory, and quietism more than attempts at reform, which he regards as inevitably futile.

Both his parents belonged to prominent commercial families in Danzig, where he was born. His father was a Voltairian, who regarded England as the land of liberty and intelligence. In common with most of the leading citizens of Danzig, he hated the encroachments of Prussia on the independence of the free city, and was indignant when it was annexed to Prussia in 1793-so indignant that he removed to Hamburg, at considerable pecuniary loss. Schopenhauer lived there with his father from 1793 to 1797;
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Questions :

1. What is the main problem in the text ?
2. What is the position of the author hier in the text ?
3. What do you think about his point of view ?
4. What is the conclusion deduced from the text ?
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**Read the text and answer the following questions :**

NIETZSCHE ( 1844-1900) regarded himself, rightly, as the successor of Schopenhauer, to whom,however, he is superior in many ways, particularly in the consistency and coherence of hisdoctrine. Schopenhauer's oriental ethic of renunciation seems out of harmony with his metaphysicof the omnipotence of will; in Nietzsche, the will has ethical as well as metaphysical primacy.Nietzsche, though a professor, was a literary rather than an academic philosopher. He invented nonew technical theories in ontology or epistemology; his importance is primarily in ethics, and

secondarily as an acute historical critic. I shall confine myself almost entirely to his ethics and hiscriticism of religion, since it was this aspect of his writing that made him influential.

His life was simple. His father was a Protestant pastor, and his upbringing was very pious. He wasbrilliant at the university as a classicist and student of philology, so much so that in 1869, beforehe had taken his degree, he was offered a professorship of philology at Basel, which he accepted.His health was never good, and after periods of sick leave he was obliged to retire finally in 1879.After this, he lived in health resorts in Switzerland; in 1888 he becameinsane, and remained sountil his death. He had a passionate admiration for Wagner, but quarrelled with him, nominallyover Parsifal, which he thought too Christian and too full of renunciation. After the quarrel he criticized Wagner savagely, and even went so far as to accuse him of being a Jew. His general outlook, however, remained very similar to that of Wagner in the *Ring*; Nietzsche's superman is very like Siegfried, except that he knows Greek. This may seem odd, but that is not my fault.
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Questions :

1. What is the main problem in the text ?
2. What is the position of the author hier in the text ?
3. What do you think about his point of view ?
4. What is the conclusion deduced from the text ?

* It is possible now to practise analysing philosophical text . you shall base on the general method that you’ re used to do in arabic . you have to respect the steps of analysis . try to use your own dictionnary