

中文大學通識教育課程
中國文化要義 Outline of Chinese Culture

課程資料 Course information
科目編號： UGEA2100 Section Code: E 科目名稱： 中國文化要義 Outline of Chinese Culture 上課日期： May 18, 2021 - June 29, 2021 上課時間： 星期二 15:30 - 17:15 (M 8-9)； 星期四 15:30 - 17:15 (W 8-9) 上課地點： Online class 講師： 關瑞至博士 Dr KWAN Sui Chi Email： suichikwan@cuhk.edu.hk

科目簡介 Course overview
本科從多角度來闡釋中國傳統文化的特色，旨在讓學生對中國傳統文化有一綜合的認識。

學習成果 Learning outcomes
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 能欣賞中國傳統文化的優點。 2. 能解釋中國傳統文化的特色。 3. 能比較中國傳統文化與西方文化之差異。 4. 能陳述中國傳統文化的不足。

評核方法 Assessment scheme		
性質 Task nature	描述 Description	比重 Weight
1. 課堂表現：	課堂與網上討論區均設討論問題或討論材料，學生須積極參與及表達意見。	10%
2. 專題報告：	從專題報告列表中(見後附)，選其中一題，自行擬定一範圍較窄的獨立課題(見下例)，加以探討，製作成powerpoint 一套 (15 到 30 頁)， 不須 於課堂上作口頭報告。 同學可單獨一人完成powerpoint報告，也可不多	40%

	<p>於四人一組合作完成，組中各人得分相同。</p> <p>提交日期：不遲於第13堂 (29/6, Tue) 當天下午11時59分前，以email 遞交。</p> <p>評分準則：(1)有而且只有一個清晰具體的立場(與導師觀點相反額外加分); (2)結構嚴謹; (3) 思路連貫; (4) 文字、圖片、列表，比例恰當，互相關聯</p> <p>例一：專題報告04「道家政治觀」→「論老子小國寡民觀就是一種無政府主義」</p> <p>例二：專題報告05「佛家論苦的解脫」→「從佛家緣起觀論八苦」</p>	
3. 期終考試：	<p>考核範圍包括所有課堂之內容。</p> <p>考核形式：短答二題，長答一題，共三題。</p> <p>提交日期：第13堂 (29/6, Tue) 當天下午11時59分前，以email 遞交。</p>	50%

課程進度：Course schedule (Tentative)			
Class / Week	Date	Topic	Readings
W01/ L01	18/05 Tue	<p>課程概要</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 甚麼是文化？ - 為甚麼 21 世紀還要回看傳統？ - 中國文化的特色 (許倬雲) - 中國古典哲學重人之價值，以生命為中心 - 串聯各分題的線索 	<p>石元康 (1990)，「現代化與中國當前的哲學課題」、「二種道德觀」，《典範轉移》，北京：三聯，pp. 29-47, pp. 103-21。</p>
W01 / L02	20/05 Thu	<p>從演化、地理、氣候、歷史看</p> <p>A. 極簡演化論</p> <p>B. 地理、氣候、歷史</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jared DiaTued 論歐亞人的文明，憑什麼超越美、非、澳各大洲的人類 - 呂思勉與 Kenneth Hsu 論所謂中華民族的來源 - 中華民族是否自古已來已棲於中原 	<p>黃仁宇(1997)，「土壤、風向和雨量」，《中國大歷史》，北京：新華。</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 氣候如何主宰中國歷史 - 黃仁宇論如神如魔的等雨線 - 中國由東北到西南的地理型態如何影響中國歷史及其國際關係的發展 <p>C. 我的「二層實在觀」: 社會層就是價值層</p>	
W02 / L03	25/05 Tue	<p>A. 中國哲學總論</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 春秋時代中國哲學的根本命題: 「周文疲弊」與「禮崩樂壞」 - 對秩序的沉思與沉迷: 禮與儀 <p>B. 從哲學看: 儒家的回應 (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 復禮 - 仁者 - 孟子人性論 - 孟子君子三樂論 	關子尹 (1999), 「從周易看變化」, 見陳天機、許倬雲、關子尹, 《系統視野與宇宙人生》, 香港: 商務, pp. 260-86。
W02 L04	27/05 Thu	<p>A. 從哲學看: 儒家 (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 人性論: 孟荀比較 - 人格論 - 個體與群體 - 天人關係 <p>B. 從社會經濟史看儒家倫理</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Weber 論基督清教(protestant puritanism) 與西方資本主義興起 - Weber 論儒家倫理與儒士精神如何令中國不能產生西方/現代式的資本主義 	<p>金耀基 (1993), 《中國社會與文化》, 香港: 牛津出版社, pp. 128-51。</p> <p>蕭振聲(2016), 「荀子性善說獻疑」, 《東吳哲學學報》第三十四期 (8, 2016), 61-96.</p>
W03 / L05	01/06 Tue	<p>從哲學看: 從分析哲學看儒家對人格的看法 (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 知與行 - Harry Frankfurt 的二層欲望/人格學說 - Frankfurt 學說的應用: 儒家君子與小人動態觀 	<p>關瑞至(2015), 「君子小人動態觀」《東方哲學》第八輯, 上海: 上海書店出版社, pp. 90-108.</p> <p>黃慧英(2020), 「價值與欲望—孟子大體與小體的現代詮釋」, 《解證儒家倫理》, 上海: 東方出版社, pp. 171-185。</p>
W03 / L06	03/06 Thu	<p>從哲學看: 道家</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 道家三個主要概念: 道、德、 	王邦雄、岑溢成等 (2010), 《中國哲學史》, pp.101-48。

		<p>自然</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 道家人生哲學倫理觀 - 老莊觀快樂：道家生死相通的獨特哲學 - 個體如何獲致快樂？ - 群體如何獲致快樂？ 	
W04 / L07	08/06 Tue	<p>從哲學看：佛家</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 對萬物存在狀態的診斷：眾生皆苦 - 救贖觀：苦與緣起性空 - 印、中佛教小史 - 佛家與斯多葛主義(Stoicism) - Case study: 壓力 (壓力感 vs 壓力源; stress vs pressure) 	邵頌雄(2019.6.25)，佛家的「無我」，香港：立場新聞。 (link)
W04 / L08	10/06 Thu	<p>從文學看</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 中國文學簡史 - 莊子與中國文學藝術傳統 - 古典詩詞的平仄格律 - 小讀李清照《如夢令》 - 中國文學批評的傳統 - 王國維的三種境界說 - 文學藝術的理解問題：「詩無達詁」/ Gadamer 的「前見」/ Barthes 的「作者已死」(或從略) 	沈清松(2002)，「中西美學的比較與會通」，魏明德、沈清松編《天心與人心》，北京：商務，pp.91-112。
W05 / L09	15/06 Tue	<p>從中西教育哲學與政治哲學看</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 儒道的政治觀 - John Rawls 的正義論 - 儒道的教育觀 - Ivan Illich 的廢校論 	石元康(1995)，「自發的秩序與無為而治」，《當代西方自由主義理論》，台北：聯經出版社。
W05 / L10	17/06 Thu	<p>從中醫看</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 陰陽五行學說 - 臟象學說 - 診斷學 - 方劑學 - 中西醫能否兼容？ 	<p>馬有度(1998)，「醫理與哲理」，《中醫精華淺說》，北京：新華，pp. 3-19。</p> <p>廖少明(2020)，《為何到最後，還是需要中醫》，香港：青森文化。</p>
W06 / L11	22/06 Tue	<p>生死問題：</p> <p>從中西哲學看人生意義與安樂死</p>	關瑞至(2017)，「西緒弗斯導讀」

		/內在自我圓滿感的追尋 - 卡繆的西緒弗斯 - 佛道看生死與安樂死 - 斯多葛主義看苦難 - 個案研究：弘一大師臨終之嘆	
W06 / L12	24/06 Thu	總結 / 測考提要	
W07 / L13	29/06 Tue	提交期終測考 (23:59 前)	

請注意大學有關學術著作誠信的政策和規則，及適用於犯規事例的紀律指引和程序。詳情可瀏覽網址：<http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academichonesty/>。

學生遞交作業時，必須連同已簽署的聲明一併提交，表示他們知道有關政策、規則、指引及程序。如屬小組作業，則組內各學生均須簽署聲明；如作業有任何抄襲內容，所有組員，不論已否簽署聲明，均須負上集體責任。未有夾附簽署妥當的聲明的作業，老師將不予批閱。學生只須提交作業的最終版本。

專題報告題目：

專題報告 01：中國歷史問題
專題報告 02：孔子論仁與禮
專題報告 03：孟荀人性論比較
專題報告 04：道家政治觀
專題報告 05：佛家論苦的解脫
專題報告 06：中國文學的特色
專題報告 07：中國傳統藝術與道家關係
專題報告 08：傳統教育是否只為政權服務？
專題報告 09：中醫能否與現代醫學接軌？
專題報告 10：中國傳統文化在現代世界的出路

參考書目：

中文

1. 陳華(1995),《中醫的科學原理》第三版,香港:商務。
2. 陳天機、許倬雲、關子尹(1999),《系統視野與宇宙人生》,香港:商務。
3. 方穎嫻(1979),〈論語之「仁」義〉《東方文化》,香港:香港大學,1979年。卷17第1、2期。收入1986《先秦之仁義禮說》,臺北:文津出版社。
4. 葛兆光(2003),《中國古代社會與文化十講》,香港:商務印書館。
5. 河森堡(2019),《進擊的智人》,北京:中信出版社。
6. 徐復觀(2014),《中國人性論史——先秦篇》,武漢:湖北人民出版社。
7. 徐復觀(1966),《中國藝術精神》,台北:學生書局。
8. 許靖華(Kenneth J. Hsü) (2012),《氣候創造歷史》,台北:聯經。
9. 黃仁宇(1997),《中國大歷史》,北京:新華。
10. 金耀基,1993,《中國社會與文化》pp. 128-53,香港:牛津出版社。
11. 馬有度(1998),「醫理與哲理」,《中醫精華淺說》,北京:新華
12. 賈晉華 (2020),《從禮樂文明到古典儒學》,第一章及第二章,上海:東方出版社。
13. 關瑞至(2015),「君子小人動態觀」《東方哲學》第八輯,上海:上海書店出版社,pp. 90-108.
14. 關瑞至(2017),「西緒弗斯導讀」,《西緒弗斯神話》,香港:商務。
15. 李敬恆(2019),「迴轉的愁思:讀李清照的《聲聲慢》」、「簡白的濃烈:讀李清照的《一翦梅》」,香港:火苗文學工作室 ([link 1](#), [link 2](#))
16. 牟宗三(1983),《中國哲學十九講》,臺北市:臺灣學生書局。
17. 勞思光(2005),《新編中國哲學史》,桂林:廣西師範大學出版社。
18. 邵頌雄(2019.6.25),佛家的「無我」,香港:立場新聞。([link](#))
19. 沈清松(2002),「中西美學的比較與會通」,魏明德、沈清松編《天心與人心》,北京:商務
20. 石元康 (1990),「現代化與中國當前的哲學課題」、「二種道德觀」,《典範轉移》,北京:三聯。
21. 唐君毅(1973),〈孔子之仁道(上)〉《中國哲學原論·原道篇》,香港:新亞書院研究所。
22. 王邦雄、岑溢成等(2010),《中國哲學史》修訂版,台北,里仁書局。
23. 王力(2002),《詩詞格律概要》,北京:北京出版社。
24. 韋政通(2003),《中國文化概論》,台北:水牛圖書出版。
25. 黃慧英(2020),《解證儒家倫理》,上海:東方出版社
26. 葉嘉瑩(1975),「人間詞話中批評之理論與實踐」,《文學評論》第一集,台北:書評書目社。
27. 葉維廉(1980),「無言獨化——道家美學論要」,《飲之太和》,台北:時報出版公司。

英文

1. Aurelius, M, *Meditations*. (open source [link](#))
2. Frankfurt, H. (1971). Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person. *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 68, No. 1 (Jan. 14, 1971), pp. 5-20.

3. Viktor, F. (1959) *The Meaning of Life*. Boston: Beacon Press.
4. Harari, Y. (2014). *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*. Harper.
5. Lai, K. (2006). Learning from Chinese philosophies : ethics of interdependent and contextualised self. Routledge.
6. Leakey, R. (1994, 2008). *The Origin of Humankind*. Basic Books.
7. Illich, I. (1971, 2000) *Deschooling Society*. London: Open Forum.

網站：華文哲學百科 http://mephilosophy.ccu.edu.tw/explor_now.php

Grade Descriptors for Essays

Argument	Theory Analysis		Writing Style
<p>[Excellent] A (85–92) or [Very Good] A- (80–84)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You provide a detailed and specific thesis statement that clearly describes the main claim(s) you will be arguing for and indicates how what you plan to say adds something to the discussion, rather than mostly repeating the material we have read. • You defend your claims in a well-developed way by giving and explaining your reasons for your position. • You identify likely objections, present them charitably and respond to them effectively. • You carefully explain the theoretical and/or practical implications of your argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You provide an accurate account of the relevant parts of the theory. • You illuminate the relationship between the theory’s conclusion(s) and its arguments. • You quote relevant key passages with proper citations. • You define key terms, and explain their role and how they relate to each other. • You discuss what the thinker would probably have said about an issue by drawing on what he/she did say about other related matters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You choose your words carefully. The language is precise rather than vague, natural rather than awkward, straightforward rather than ostentatious. • Each piece of the essay is presented in a way that makes it clear to the reader how it is relevant to your thesis. • Where appropriate, you use real or hypothetical examples to help illustrate abstract points.
<p>[Good] B+ (76–79), B (72–75) or B- (68–71)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thesis statement is clear, but general and unambitious. • The reasons given to support claims are occasionally weak or too brief. Some claims in need of defence are merely asserted. • Some key objections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are minor inaccuracies in the account of the theory. Some small points are overlooked. • The theory’s arguments for its conclusion(s) are described, but the relationship between them is not explained, or the explanation is vague and imprecise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language is generally clear, but occasionally lacks precision or naturalness or desirable simplicity. • The relevance of small parts of the essay is not

	<p>are not considered, or the response is weak or too brief.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theoretical and/or practical implications are not explained, or the explanation is vague and imprecise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of quotations is sometimes missing or erratic or without proper citations. • Some key concepts are not defined, or are defined carelessly. 	<p>made clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illustrative examples are used rarely or not at all.
<p>[Fair] C+ (64–67), C (60–63) or C- (56–59)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thesis statement is absent or insignificant or confused. • The reasons given to support claims are usually weak or too brief. Many claims in need of defence are merely asserted. • Objections are not considered, or they are only a straw-man version, or the response is ineffective. • Implications are not identified, or they are asserted without explanation. • The argument is likely to contain contradictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are significant inaccuracies in the account of the theory. Some major points are overlooked. • The theory's conclusion(s) are described without reference to its arguments. • Use of quotations is missing or erratic or without proper citations. • Key concepts are not defined, or are defined incorrectly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language is often unclear, due to being vague or awkward or ostentatious. • The relevance of significant parts of the essay is not made clear. • Illustrative examples are used incorrectly or not at all. •
<p>[Pass] D+ (53–55) or D (50–52)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You demonstrate an awareness of what an argument is, and try to make one. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You grasp at least the main features of some of the theory's most important points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language is intelligible more often than not.
<p>[Fail] F (0-49)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You show little awareness of what an argument is, fails to make an argument, and shows almost no effort to make one. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You fail to grasp <i>any</i> of the major features of the theory. You have a fundamentally flawed and distorted understanding of the major points of the theory. On the whole, you demonstrate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The language is more unintelligible than not and the meaning of the language is very hard to discern.

		almost no effort in representing the theory accurately.	The essay is thoroughly unorganized.
--	--	---	--------------------------------------

Grade Descriptors for Essay Examinations

<p>[Excellent] A (85–92) or [Very Good] A- (80–84)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You faithfully reconstruct the author’s positions, and prove this knowledge by knowing the argument(s) supporting the theses in the text. • You evidence independent and self-initiated thinking and understanding of the arguments and philosophical problems through your ability to present your own counter-arguments and possible replies to counter-arguments. <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You exhibit thorough understanding of the relations of the themes presented in the various texts. • You demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the relations between the various subjects and authors discussed in the course. • You demonstrate an above-average facility in judgment by applying the various theories to cases and situations presented in the course of the exam.
<p>[Good] B+ (76–79), B (72–75), or B- (68–71)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You can faithfully reconstruct the author’s positions, and demonstrate a basic comprehension of the arguments supporting those positions. • You show some independence in thinking, but have difficulty developing your own criticisms and rebuttals to criticism. <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You exhibit relatively complete understanding of the relations between the authors and the themes presented in the various texts. • You show some basic, though average, facility in judgment by applying the various theories to cases and situations presented in the course of the exam.
<p>[Fair] C+ (64–67), C (60–63), or C- (56–59)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You demonstrate an ability to properly relay information about the various texts and the positions contained therein, but have difficulty re-constructing the arguments, presenting counter-arguments, and criticism. • You can faithfully relay information, but you show no independence in philosophical thinking, fail to show basic competence in philosophical argumentation and have a difficulty understanding arguments.

	<p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You show an incomplete understanding of the relations between the authors discussed in the course as well as the themes presented in the various texts. • You demonstrate competence to memorize information, but you have some difficulty applying various theories to cases and situations presented in the course of the exam.
<p>[Pass] D+ (53–55), or D (50–52)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You demonstrate some understanding of the course content, but have difficulty relaying accurate information about the positions and the arguments for such positions in the text. <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the answers are readable, you exhibit seriously incomplete understanding of the content as well as the relationships between authors and themes covered in the readings and discussed in class. • You fail to demonstrate facility in the application of various theories to cases and situations presented in the course of the exam.
<p>[Fail] F (0-49)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You demonstrate no understanding of the course content. You relay inaccurate information about the positions and arguments for those positions in the text. <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The answers are unreadable, and your answers exhibit a complete lack of understanding of the relationships between authors and themes covered in the readings and discussed in class.

Grade Descriptors for Tutorial Performance

<p>A (85–92) or [Very Good] A- (80–84)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You concisely explain the relevant material in a way that clarifies how the various pieces are meant to fit together. • You raise and clearly explain your own insightful questions of interpretation about the material. • You raise and clearly explain your own challenging yet fair objections to the material. • You construct charitable replies on the author’s behalf to your points, and provide your own rejoinders. • You carefully discuss the significance of your points and their theoretical or practical implications. • In discussion, you demonstrate a willingness to share newly formed ideas, and you effectively begin to develop ideas on the spot through constructive yet critical interaction with others.
<p>[Good] B+ (76–79), B (72–75) or B- (68–71)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of material contains minor errors, or is correct but adds little or nothing. • Questions/objections are relevant, but obvious. • Author’s reply is absent or oversimplified. • Implications are not discussed or are only briefly explained. • Good effort at discussion, but hesitant to take risks and has difficulty developing ideas on the spot.
<p>[Fair] C+ (64–67), C (60–63) or C- (56–59)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of material contains significant errors or oversights. • Questions/objections are often confused or unclear. • Author’s reply is absent or mistaken. • Implications are not discussed or are confused or unclear. • Little or no effort at discussion.
<p>[Pass] D+ (53–55) or D (50–52)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You attend and show a reasonable interest in the discussion and a willingness to participate minimally if called upon.
<p>[Fail] F (0-49)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You rarely attend or do not attend at all. You show little or no interest in the discussion and a general lack of willingness to participate if called upon.

Note: Marks cannot be given for mere “attendance”, but may be deducted for “absences”.