



What Is Philosophy?

What Is Philosophy?

Gilles Deleuze , Félix Guattari , Hugh Tomlinson (Translator) , Graham Burchell (Translator)

[Download now](#)

[Read Online](#) 

What Is Philosophy?

Gilles Deleuze , Félix Guattari , Hugh Tomlinson (Translator) , Graham Burchell (Translator)

What Is Philosophy? Gilles Deleuze , Félix Guattari , Hugh Tomlinson (Translator) , Graham Burchell (Translator)

Called by many France's foremost philosopher, Gilles Deleuze is one of the leading thinkers in the Western World. His acclaimed works and celebrated collaborations with Félix Guattari have established him as a seminal figure in the fields of literary criticism and philosophy. The long-awaited publication of *What Is Philosophy?* in English marks the culmination of Deleuze's career.

Deleuze and Guattari differentiate between philosophy, science, and the arts, seeing as means of confronting chaos, and challenge the common view that philosophy is an extension of logic. The authors also discuss the similarities and distinctions between creative and philosophical writing. Fresh anecdotes from the history of philosophy illuminate the book, along with engaging discussions of composers, painters, writers, and architects.

A milestone in Deleuze's collaboration with Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* brings a new perspective to Deleuze's studies of cinema, painting, and music, while setting a brilliant capstone upon his work.

What Is Philosophy? Details

Date : Published May 23rd 1996 by Columbia University Press (first published 1991)

ISBN : 9780231079891

Author : Gilles Deleuze , Félix Guattari , Hugh Tomlinson (Translator) , Graham Burchell (Translator)

Format : Paperback 253 pages

Genre : Philosophy, Nonfiction, Theory

 [Download What Is Philosophy? ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online What Is Philosophy? ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online What Is Philosophy? Gilles Deleuze , Félix Guattari , Hugh Tomlinson (Translator) , Graham Burchell (Translator)

From Reader Review What Is Philosophy? for online ebook

Jeremy says

Woah. When its clear, its brilliant. The concept, the plane of immanence, conceptual personae, all original and incredibly provocative ideas. I can't help but admire anyone who can create a philosophical system that is so totally its own thing. I don't really have the grounding to understand most of the math and science stuff, and it can get REALLY opaque at times. The stuff on literature and visual art though is really fantastic. For some reason this one line in the conclusion hit me like a brick:

"Philosophy, art, and science are not the mental objects of an objectified brain but the three aspects under which the brain becomes subject."

Damn.

Gracchus Babeuf says

I will certainly be rereading this book at some point, but it is marred by a rather uninteresting and unimpressive philosophy of science in the second half. The aesthetic theory is somewhat better but they really do not spend enough time on what is essential here: The Plane of Immanence.

Montriblood says

Intricate and extremely rich, maybe a wee bit complicated for a rookie philosopher (= me), this book allows to grasp the beauty of Deleuze's complex writing, developing some of the authors' favored themes (the "concept", the "plan d'immanence", and interrelationships between philosophy, science and art).

Asl? Can says

Bilim- Sanat- Felsefe üçünün ortak noktas?, üçünün aras?ndaki farklar temel konusu kitab?n. Kitab?n ilk yar?s?n? baz? yerlerin iki üç kez üstünden geçmem gerekse de anlad?m k?smen. Ama ikinci bölümün ba??nda hem yoruldu ve ikinci kez okumay? da b?rakt???m için pek kavrayamad?m söylemeye çal??t??? ?eyi. Ama son alt bölüm olan ve sanat-felsefe ikilisini ele alan Alg?lam, Duygulam ve Kavram'? okurken özellikle çok zevk ald?m. Bence sanata kafa yoranlar?n okumas? gereken bir bölüm.

Ama genel olarak (anlayabildi'im yerler ad?na konu?ursam) üslubu çok ho?uma gitti kitab?n.

Bir de ?unu ke?fettim ki anlamasam bile bir kitab? okumak zevk veriyor bazen, anlamad???m ?eyler beni çok cezbediyor. Bir ?eyleri anlamakta azl???m? fark etmek ho?uma gidiyor. Anlamak isteyip de anlayamayaca???m -ö?renmeye zaman?m?n ya da alg?m?n yetmeyece?i- çooook ?ey var.

Ne güzel.

Ve de ne ac?.

Ayoub Radil says

???? ????? ? ???? ???? ?????? ? ???? ???? ?????????????? ???? ???? ???? ???? ???? ?????? ???? ????? ???? ????
????? ???? ???? ?????? ??????????

Cristina Chi?u says

Der neue Idiot wird nie die Wahrheiten der Geschichte akzeptieren. Der alte Idiot wollte sich durch sich selbst darüber Aufschluß geben, was verständlich war oder nicht, vernünftig oder nicht, was verloren war oder gerettet, der neue Idiot aber will, dass man ihm das Verlorene, das Unverständliche, das Absurde zurückgibt.

Es ist nicht falsch zu sagen: An der Revolution “sind die Philosophen schuld” (obgleich sie nicht von Philosophen durchgeführt wird).

In dieser Hinsicht sind die Künstler wie die Philosophen: Sie haben häufig eine fragile Gesundheit, aber dies nicht aufgrund ihrer Krankheiten oder Neurosen, vielmehr weil sie im Leben etwas für jeden von uns viel zu Großes gesehen haben, etwas zu Großes für sie, das ihnen das diskrete Zeichen des Todes auferlegt hat. Aber dieses Etwas ist zugleich auch die Quelle oder der Atem, die sie über die Krankheiten des Erlebten hinweg leben lassen (was Nietzsche Gesundheit nennt). “Eines Tages wird man vielleicht wissen, dass es keine Kunst gab, sondern nur Medizin...”

Die Phänomenologie muss sich—wie wir gesehen haben—zur Phänomenologie der Kunst machen, weil die einem transzedentalen Subjekt gegebene Immanenz des Erlebens sich in transzendenten Funktionen ausdrücken muss, die nicht nur die Erfahrung im allgemeinen bestimmen, sondern hier und jetzt das Erleben selbst durchqueren und sich in ihr inkarnieren, indem sie lebendige Empfindungen bilden.

Vielleicht liegt darin das Eigentümliche der Kunst: das Endliche zu durchlaufen, um das Unendliche wiederzufinden, zurückzugeben.

Doch Kunst, Wissenschaft, Philosophie fordern mehr: sie ziehen Ebenen auf dem Chaos (...), wollen, dass wir das Firmament zerreißen und uns ins Chaos stürzen. Nur um diesen Preis werden wir es besiegen. (...) Der Philosoph, der Wissenschaftler, der Künstler scheinen vom Land der Toten zurückzukehren. Vom Chaos mitgebracht hat der Philosoph Variationen (...), der Wissenschaftler (...) Variablen (...), der Künstler Varietäten.

Die Ebene der Philosophie ist solange vor-philosophisch, als man sie an sich selbst unabhängig von den Begriffen betrachtet, die sie besetzen; die Nicht-Philosophie aber befindet sich dort, wo die Ebene dem Chaos trotzt. Die Philosophie bedarf einer Nicht-Philosophie, die sie umfaßt, die bedarf eines nicht-philosophischen Verständnisses, so wie die Kunst der Nicht-Kunst bedarf und die Wissenschaft der Nicht-Wissenschaft. Nicht als Beginn brauchen sie sie, und auch nicht als Endzweck, in dem sie durch ihre Verwirklichung verschwinden müßten, sie brauchen sie vielmehr in jedem Moment ihres Werdens oder ihrer Entwicklung.

Tyler says

The question of what philosophy even is recurs often. Few thinkers can leave it alone for long, least of all the French. In a complete rethinking of the problem, Deleuze and Guattari turn to the world of experience: our sensations, which build into percepts that build out our concepts that build out our propositions. So located, the authors identify philosophy as the creation of the concept. They further identify and describe two other fields of human endeavor, science and art.

Two parts make up the book. The first develops the authors' views of philosophy. The second describes science (plus logic) and art. Confronting the world, the authors tell us, we first find chaos. Oh ... uhh ... I knew that! To make sense of it, man transects chaos by means of a "plane of immanence." Chaos can also be cut by other planes connected with science or art, but only a plane of immanence can yield a *concept* and constitute the proper home of philosophy. Spinoza is in fact the ultimate philosopher, having most closely described this state. What do we gain from thinking about the world this way?

For one thing, it allows us to compare philosophy directly with science and art. The authors identify immanence as the focus of philosophy and the foundation for any concept, even a transcending one. Science, by contrast, occurs on a plane of coordinates and its avatar is the function, or proposition. That is, science identifies functions, not concepts. Art, for its part, employs figures rather than concepts. We now have a way to distinguish among the three endeavors.

The authors expound a singular worldview but, as with so much French philosophy, they don't stop to answer many questions. A decent general understanding of philosophy, such as an awareness of sense and reference, will thus prove helpful. While the often technical engagement of ideas affects my rating, the authors' investigation brings with it a delightful enthusiasm I don't normally find in philosophy. Readers will enjoy this book, whose pages recall what it is that interests people in philosophy in the first place.

??v?? *εααα* says

Brilliant, excellent and captivating...!

the gift says

later addition: another text i tried to read cold, 3 years ago. not easy. i have read much philosophy since, some Bergson is useful as deleuze refers to him, but i cannot yet say i understood it all this time. i did enjoy reading it, and must simply say i am 'confused on a higher plane...', and planes are what they are about here, 'planes of immanence', 'planes of transcendence', various sort of 'thought planes', populated by 'concepts'. i was able, this time, to think of these 'planes' not simply like the images of space-time where on a wrinkled plane dimpled by various planets or suns, represents the infinite topography modelled by mass and lightspeed lines distorted... i understood it more as used in usual conversation, at least in English, as if referring to some level of terminology, ideas, impressions, though it means in French also 'plan'... i do not know if this is correct, but it freed my mind from literalizing or reifying 'planes' in a geometric way...

first review: and the answer to the title question, is that philosophy is about the creation of concepts. which is essentially compared to sciences, where concepts are put to work, where abstraction tries to avoid chaos, tries to order the universe. or art, where concepts are irrelevant but allowing some chaos in, and it is all about creating, affecting, the moment. philosophy is not able to do science, science is not able to do philosophy. or either way for art and philosophy. or something like that... admit that while I could follow the first part of the

book, 'what is a concept?' 'plane of immanence', 'conceptual personae', 'geophilosophy', could even believe I understood them- the second part of the book was much harder, when they start to describe what exactly is philosophy, logic, science, and art. it is this part where my comprehension went down. on the other, I did get some pleasure, I do believe that someday I will follow it, so I do not mark it down based on my ignorance. 'functives and concepts'? 'prospects and concepts'? 'percept, affect, concept'?... well I will get back to you on that...

Alex Lee says

I read this book three times over 10 years, before I really began to appreciate it. In a way, *A Thousand Plateau's* success kind of blinded people to what Deleuze and Guattari were doing. So this next book, feels more like a snap back. It's not the poetry approach, it's not the postmodernism. Here's an analytic account of concepts. What makes a concept? How does it work?

What is Philosophy comes close to approximating the relationship between domains and logic. But there is still a tendency here to wax about relationships rather than to cut to an essential conciseness. Although they hit on many conceptual relationships I agree with their essential categorization of concepts (philosophy, science and art) reads too much like a list. To understand conceptualization as confronting chaos is correct. But the event that undergrids Deleuze's conception of a mark on chaos, a primary cut to determine logic remains mostly hidden from view, instead of more spoken implicitly as an organizing feature. To understand, we need to get at the agential relationships! We must not mistake organization for productive generation.

For an analytic book, this already short book could be made tighter. Instead of hitting us quickly with the range of application, perhaps it's better to speak simply and directly about the relationships involved and then approach the extension. In some ways, Badiou's work on mathematics can actually be of great use here, to help outline the struggle, to give people a different method of approaching an age old question.

So in some ways, their 3 part categorization goes against answering the question "What is Philosophy" since philosophy is included as just another kind of concept. The mode that they are heading towards, but do not reach, I feel, is the deterministic view of logical apparatus, best caricatured by Bertrand Russell and Alfred North Whitehead's *Principia Mathematica* in which we get the pure code of expression. Needless to say this is just another example of conceptualization, but the formalist approach, which is only one way, can help Deleuze and Guattari approach the concise outline of concept's agency better than some of their other angles.

In a sense, the three kinds of concepts is more of a crutch for organizing their own exposition than serving to give us an understanding of the range of how concepts themselves can be extended. To that end, the conclusion feels a little strained to me, a bit too repetitious, where they reach a limit as to how to continue explaining what they have failed to outline.

JJ Weber says

I think I get Deleuze now. Wish I had read this before reading *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*.

Cary Aurand says

this is one of the most profound and passionate works of philosophy i have ever read. D&G's last collaboration, it deals with everything from philosophy to psychology to advertising to 18th century french literature (and a strange fascination with Moby Dick). This book will wreck your world and make your head hurt, but it's irresistibly passionate. It's a revitalizing account of what philosophy (and life) should (and could) be.

Dan says

I enjoyed the two major endeavors of the book: 1) a definition of philosophy as the creation of concepts through the use of conceptual personae and 2) the subsequent comparison of philosophy with art and science when it comes to dealing with chaos. Much of the rest, despite Deleuze's incredible knowledge and insight, felt tangential and even uninteresting. During his (not-so) brief forays into geophilosophy, Godel's theorem, artistic perception, & logical deduction, I often felt the need to skim or even skip full pages. If you want the heart and soul of Deleuze's thesis read the first three chapters (and the introduction) and skim the "functive" and "percept" chapters.

David M says

Obscene graffiti in the margins of Kant.

Joaquin Siabra-Fraile says

El libro se compone de dos partes. En la primera se caracteriza a la filosofía como la disciplina que se dedica a la creación de conceptos. Según esto, un filósofo es aquel que compone unos ciertos ingredientes en una unidad inseparable, y tal composición está firmada con su nombre. P.ej, el cogito de Descartes, la mónada de Leibniz o el sujeto trascendental de Kant serían tres conceptos de subjetividad que comparten ciertos componentes, pero la unidad que consigue cada filósofo es distinta (p.e., en el cogito no se incluye el tiempo, como sí hace Kant), y las relaciones o puentes que se plantean entre los conceptos establecen un plano común de inmanencia (o Razón). En este plano se mueven los personajes conceptuales de cada autor (Dioniso de Nietzsche, el Capitalista o el Proletario de Marx), de modo que cada filosofía (de cada gran autor) habría trazado un plano prefilosófico de inmanencia, habría inventado unos personajes conceptuales (insistencia) y habría creado unos conceptos (consistencia). La filosofía no es entonces, para Deleuze, contemplación, reflexión ni comunicación, sino simplemente aquella manera de pensar que crea conceptos. - En la segunda parte se compara a la filosofía con la ciencia, con el arte y con la lógica, las otras maneras de pensar. Si la filosofía crea conceptos, la ciencia crea funciones, y el arte afectos y perceptos. Por su parte, la lógica pretende reducir el concepto a prospecto, eliminando la consistencia propia de los componentes que hacen del concepto algo íntegro y cerrado.

D-G buscan un pensamiento radicado en la inmanencia, y toman partido por la vía espinozista. Ahora bien, existe otra vía de pensamiento inmanente a la que D-G tienen mayor alergia si cabe que a la trascendencia: la dialéctica (cuya crítica más directa se encuentra en "Nietzsche y la filosofía"). Sería interesante comparar la forma como D-G caracterizan el plano de inmanencia, trazado por relaciones sintagmáticas o vecinales de unos conceptos con otros, con las constelaciones de Adorno, establecidas por oposiciones internas entre conceptos. Negatividad o no Negatividad, esa es la cuestión.

Nota: la traducción española de Anagrama no es muy buena, y a veces es incluso delirante. P.ej., en p. 58 se

habla de "los cuatro Racines" de Schopenhauer, cuando claramente se trata de "las cuatro Raices" (del principio de razón suficiente).

Mona Kareem says

Philosophy is not 'to invent concepts' but 'to create' them!

Cybermilitia says

Birbirleriyle celisen topolojik kurmacalar, once metafizige varan belirlenmecilik, ardindan gunah cikarir gibi geri adim atmalar, sanki daha once anlatilmis gibi davrandigi ama her nedense anlatmayi unuttugu ve isin ozune tekabul eden fikirler. Hegel'in yaptigini yapmaya calisip, bu yolda kaybolan kendine guvenli bir kisi daha. Bir filozof degil, donanimli bir entellektuel. Ama o kadar.

Asagidaki ornekler aldigim notlardan buraya yazmak istediklerim. Bu fikrilerin sonuclarinin analizini de icermiyor.

Ickinlik duzlemi, kavrayan kisilik ve kavrami topolojik olarak yerlestiriyor. Ama is sorun/problem kismina gelince topoloji ortadan kalkiveriyor ve klasik felsefi yerlestirmeye birakiyor kendini. Derin bir yontemsel tutarsizlik. Ileride nedeni mantikla iliskisinde cikacak.

Yersiz Yurtsuz/Yurtlastirma kavramlarinin - Gocebenin tarihle ve sosyolojiyle kullanimi var mesela. Saglam bir tarihci bu derece sertlikteki saptamaları çok kolaylıkla parçalar. Ste Croix mesela.

Toplulukların/halkların yaratılamayacağını varsayarkenki yöntemi bile kendini ele veriyor. Haline-gelis'i tarihin disinda ele aldigi icin bu potansiyeli goremiyor. Bu kafayla milletler sistemi bir zorunluluktur.

Bilimi ele alirken kavram kullanmadigi, bilimin kullandigi seyin fonksiyonlar oldugu tam anlamıyla Russelci mantigin anti tezi. Oysa bilim kavram kullanir. Hem de Deleuze'un bahsettiği anlamda. Problem kavrami yaratirken degil, kavramin varligini, niceligini tespit etmek "istemek"e ve o da soruna dayanir. Sorunu icat ettigin topolojiye sokmazsan, olacağı budur. Mantik notuna bakin.

Fonktifler diyerek bilimi nasıl bir basit prosese indirgedigini de gormek gerek. Sonucta Deleuze'cu fonktif sinir ve degiskendir. Gonderimi bir orantidir. Oysa bilim sinirin neden sinir oldugunu da arastirir. Bu mantiga gore mesela string teori bilim olmasa gerektir.

Gizil formlar tamlamalarının tamamında tersten komplo teorisi mantigi gormek mumkun. Ama Deleuze bazı problemleri halinin altına supurmek icin bunu kullanmis. Birazdan bir yontem daha gelecek: Olay

Bu arada, ickinlik duzleminin neden duzlem oldugunu anladik. (Spinoza taraftarligi ve Kant devrimine dusmanlik) Ama bilimin neden gonderimler duzlemi olarak nitelendigini anlamadik. Acaba bilimde de mi askinlik yok? Bu tartisilabilir ama bu kitapta boyle bir tartisma dahi yok.

Kuhn'un bilimsel devrimlerin yapisi fikriyatini Lacatos'suz algilamak. Iste en buyuk problemlerden biri. Bilimin %99u problem cozme'tir. Bilimsel devrim yapmak degil.

Bilimde ozel durum dusuncesi tartismalidir. Bana kalirsa normatif olarak yanlistir. Newton Kuantumun ya da

Relativitenin özel durumu degildir. Basli basina yanlistir! Kutle kutleyi cekmez. Dolayisiyla felsefedeki gelismle bilimdeki gelismim farki Deleuze'un iddia ettigi yerde degildir. Ustuste konmusluk duzeni vardir. Her onune gelen bilim adami bilimsel devrim yapmaz. Acizane bir fikir bu.

Matematikte bile tartismali hale gelen normatif rabitalari butun bilime yedirmek gercekten olaganustu yanlis. Bundan kacabilmek icin "olay" adini verdigi bir kavram daha ortaya cikariyor. Ama Deleuze'un olayi -en azindan bu kitapta- bir cuval. Her problem o cuvalin icinde belirsizlesiyor.

Kavramsal kisiliklerin bilimdeki iz dusumu olarak ortaya koydugu tamamen belirsiz. Schrodinger'in kedisi mi yoksa kutuyu acan mi ozne/kisilik? George Gamow'un Mr. Tompkins'in seruyenlerini ele alsak mesela? Yeterince Zerdustvari degil mi?

"Kisacasi, onermesal hale gelmekle, kavram felsefeci kavram olarak edinmis oldugu tum vasiflarini, kendiliginden gonderimini, ic-tutarlilikini ve dis tutarlilikini, yitirir" Bu daha onceki ve sonraki aciklamalardan da anlasilacagi uzere Godel'den kacis icin yapilmis bir manevradir. Kavram'i onermeden siyirip, onu degerlendirmeden kacirip, Godel Eksikliginden azade tutma gayretidir. Oysa kacamazsin. Cunku Eksiklik teoremi onermelerle sinirli degildir. Kaldi ki yukarida kavramin Deleuzecu maceralarini gorduk.

Mantik'i Russel'in anti tezi olarak kabullenme durumu cok rahatlikla goruluyor. Ama burada da bir kacis var. Bir degerlendirme olcutu olarak -illa felsefenin bir kavraminin degeri degil- mantigin reddedilisi. Metafizige yeniden teslim olmak disinda baska bir yol var mi bunu yapinca? Asil problem belki de su: Kavramlar yalnızca betimlenebilir. Ve betimlemelerin birbiriyle uyumunu, aralarındaki iliskiyi gostermenin bir gerekliligi yoktur. Yani mantik deger olarak da adimler arasi uzaklik olarak da kullanilamaz.

Burada Kavrami "ozgurlestirmek" ve boylece hic bir olcut olmadan sacmalayabilmek icin en son adim sorun/problemler kavramin arasini kesmek. Bu adimi da atiyor Deleuze. "Yasanmis oldugu kadar seylerin durumuna da gonderimi yoktur, ama ic birlestiricileri tarafından tanimlanmis bir tutarliliğe vardir: ne seylerin durumunun tasiyicisi ne de yasanmis anlamliligi olan kavram, birlestiricileri aninda kateden saf anlam olarak olaydir" Tabi burada ic tutarliliği neyin sagladigina ait (Mantik? Gorsel estetik? Muzik?) hic bir sey yok. Aslında kitabın tamamında buna iliskin tek bir betimleme yok.

Goethe ile Newton arasındaki renkler tartismasında kendi sozlerini inkar ediyor mesela. Degil-felsefeci dedigi bir alani dogrudan felsefe olarak ortaya koyuyor.

Psikolojiyi reddin ilk nuvelerini bile gorebiliyoruz: Yaratici uydurunun, guclendirilmis olsa da bir ani, ya da bir fantazmayla hic bir iliskisi yoktur.

Kaos'u, duzlemi, elegi ve bir moment olarak olayi anlatısında onlarca kucuk celiski ortaya cikiyor. Sanati bilimi ve felsefeyi her anlatıda hafifce degisen bir sekilde yerlestiriyor. Adeta hic birisi o konumda mi degil mi anlasilamiyor.

Sanatin neden duzlem oldugu yine belirsiz. Tabi bu iyice sacma. Sanatci askinlik mantigini digerlerinden cok daha fazla kullanir. Yani ortada bir duzlem yoktur. Deleuze'un bu topolojik yerlestirmeleri inanilmaz tutarsiz.

Son bolum her bir paragrafin bir oncekindeki tutarsizligi kapatmaya calismasiyla geciyor.

Sonucta Kant devrimine karsi, imalar disinda (Hristiyanligin askinligini ozne/fenomen olayiyla tekrar felsefenin icine sokmak gibi ucuz saldirilar) tek bir cevap yok. Hegel'in Kant'in fenomen yasagini nasil asil bilgi dogurucu oldugunu gosteren mantigina karsi cevap da yok. Ama buna karsilik Deleuzevari felsefenin neden tarihle hasir nesir olmak istemedigini, mantigi neden ele alinmasi gereken bir problem olarak gormedigini bu kitaptan yola cikarak anlamak mumkun. Kavram betimlemesine indirgenmis bir felsefe

