

# UGEC2853 / GDRS2002 SEXUALITY AND CULTURE 性與文化

2022-2023 Summer Session W 4-6; F 4-6 (LSK LT3)

教師：楊德立 博士([cuhk.tlyeung@gmail.com](mailto:cuhk.tlyeung@gmail.com))

## 課程簡介

性不僅是行為，也是文化現象。本課以哲學角度探討性事 (Sexuality) 於不同文化領域中的表現 (representation)，分析其成因 (cause)，反省其理據 (justification)。本課分為三個範圍，藉此訓練同學分析及評價「性事」的能力：(一) 性事的思想；(二) 性事的文化表象；(三) 性事與社會倫理。

## 評核方式

- ✓ 小組報告及個人堂上表現 (閱讀指定文章，堂上報告及討論) 30% + 10% ；
- ✓ 中期測驗 (選擇題) 30% ；
- ✓ 期末考核 (概念分析題，以及運用課堂知識回答自選長題目) 30%

## 講授大綱 (講授內容或會跟據課堂節奏調整)

- 導論：性、性事與文化
  - 從生理學、社會學、哲學等角度看性與性事
  - 何謂「哲學地談性」
  - 性學與性之哲學淺介
- 一、性事的思想
  - 西方傳統性事理論：純潔的「靈」與污穢的「肉」
    - 柏拉圖：靈魂與肉身的對立
    - 基督宗教：性事的神聖與罪惡
  - 東方傳統性事思想：自然的性事觀
    - 中國古代愛欲思想：神話、易經與陰陽
    - 儒家：性事與倫常
    - 道家：養生與房中術
  - 現代性事思想變革
    - 叔本華與佛洛伊德：從性愛形上學到性愛心理學
    - 現代性事革命：嬉皮士文化、金賽性學報告、性反應四階段論
    - 作為社會結構的性事：福柯的《性史》

- 性與愛的演化理論：基因與演化心理學
- 二、性事的文化表象
  - 物化：花花公子哲學、觀看的方式、被展示的身體、AV 文化
  - 虛擬：自慰史、人偶愛好者、VR 虛擬情人
  - 戀態：戀物癖、男色文化、情色文藝、極限體驗
- 三、性事與社會倫理
  - 同性愛與婚姻
  - 身障者的愛慾
  - LGTBQ：性別與身份認同
  - 色情物品與言論自由
  - 婦解、女權、女性主義
  - 賣淫的倫理學與身體自主
- 總結思考：性為何事？性事為何？

### 預習材料（導修文章堂上分發）

1. Soble, Alan & Power, Nicholas. 2008. *The Philosophy of Sex: Contemporary Readings*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

### 參考資料選錄

1. Allyn, David. 2000. *Make Love, Not War. The Sexual Revolution: An Unfettered History*. New York: Routledge.
2. Bauman, Zygmunt. 2003. *Liquid Love: on the Frailty of Human Bonds*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
3. Bergmann, Martin. 1987. *The Anatomy of Loving: The Story of Man's Quest to Know What Love is*. New York: Columbia University Press.
4. Berger, John. 1990. *Ways of Seeing: Based on the BBC Television Series*. London: Penguin Books.
5. Blackburn, Simon. 2004. *Lust*. New York: Oxford University Press.
6. Byrne, Romana. 2014. *Aesthetic Sexuality: A Literary History of Sodomasochism*. New York: Bloomsbury.
7. Fisher, Helen E.. 1992. *Anatomy of Love: The Natural History of Monogamy, Adultery, and Divorce*. New York: Norton.
8. Freud, Sigmund. 1962. *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*. New York: Basic Books.
9. Giddens, Anthony. 1992. *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
10. Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The History of Sexuality – Volume 1: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Book.
11. Goldhill, Simon. 2004. *Love, Sex and Tragedy: How the Ancient World Shapes Our Lives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

12. Kant, Immanuel. 1930. "Duties Towards the Body in Respect of Sexual Impulse" in *Lectures on Ethics*, trans. by Louis Infield, London: Methuen.
13. Krich, A. M (ed.). 1960. *The Anatomy of Love: A Collection of Essays*. New York: Dell Publishing Company.
14. Plato. 1997. "Symposium" in *Complete Works*. Indianapolis, Ind: Hackett Pub.
15. Santas, Gerasimos. 1988. *Plato and Freud: Two Theories of Love*. Oxford: B. Blackwell.
16. Symons, Donald. 1981. *The Evolution of Human Sexuality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
17. Yalom, Marilyn. 1998. *A History of Breast*. New York. Ballantine Books
18. 艾斯勒 (Riane Eisler) 。2009 。黃覺、黃棣光譯。《神聖的歡愛：性、神話與女性肉體的政治學》北京：社會科學文獻出版社。
19. 喬治巴代伊 (Georges Bataille) ，2012 。賴守正譯：《情色論》。臺北：聯經。
20. 高羅佩 (R.H. Van Gulik) ，1991 。李零等譯：《中國古代房內考》。臺北：桂冠。
21. 榮格 (Carl G. Jung) 、衛禮賢 (Richard Wihelm) ，2016 。張卜天譯：《金花的秘密：中國的生命之書》 (Das Geheimnis der Goldenen Blüte) 。北京：商務。
22. 柯依瑟爾 (Harald Koisser) 、舒拉克 (Eugen-Maria Schulak) 。張存華譯，2007 。《愛、欲望、出軌的哲學》。臺北：商周出版。
23. 黃秀如編，2002 。《做愛情》。臺北：英屬蓋曼群島商網路與書股份有限公司。
24. 張燦輝，2016 。《生死愛欲 — 從希臘神話到基督教》。臺北：漫遊者文化。
25. 劉達臨，1998 《中國歷代房內考》 (上、中、下卷) 。北京：中醫古籍出版社。

## 課程設計

日期	堂數	組別	主題	閱讀 / 導修材料
17.5 (三)	1		如何哲學地談性： 性學與性的哲學導論	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Creta Christin: Are We Having Sex Now or What</li> <li>◆ Raja Halwani: What is Sex?</li> </ul>
19.5 (五)	2		東西方傳統性事思想 1： 古希臘與基督宗教之性事理念	◆ Simon Blackburn, Lust: The Seven Deadly Sins, Ch 3,10,11
24.5 (三)	3		東西方傳統性事思想 2： 易、儒、道等性事思想	◆ Robert Hans van Gulik: Indian and Chinese Sexual Myticism, In: Sexual life in ancient China, p.339-359 印度與中國的房中秘術，頁 455-489
31.5 (三)	4		性事於現代思想中的變革 1： 從性的形上學到性的科學	◆ Donald Symons: Sexual Choice, p.166-205
2.6 (五)	5		性事於現代思想中的變革 2： 性事之社會、政治、科學革命	◆ Michel Foucault: “Scientia Sexualis”, The History of Sexuality, vol. 1, p.53-73
7.6 (三)	6		對象與慾望 1： 性之對象化、物化、商品化	◆ Lina Papadaki: Sexual Objectification, p. 381-399.
9.6 (五)	7		對象與慾望 2： 性交易與虛擬關係	◆ John Portmann: Chatting Is Not Cheating, p.85-101
14.6 (三)	8		所謂不正常 1： 變態的性事 (+ Mid-Term Quiz)	◆ Seririol Morgan: Dark Desires, p.349-370.
16.6 (五)	9		所謂不正常 2： 性悖軌、極限體驗	◆ Shaun Miller: BDSM, p. 421-436.
21.6 (三)	10		性別與性身分 1： 婦解、女權、身體自主	◆ Diane Richardson: Sexuality and Feminism, p. 152-174.
23.6 (五)	11		性別與性身分 2： LGTBQ+與社會認同	◆ Talia Mae Bettcher: Trans 101, p. 119-137.
28.6 (三)	12		性事與社會倫理： 性、關係、婚姻	◆ Elizabeth Brake: Is “Loving More” Better? The Values of Polyamory, p. 201-219
30.6 (五)	13		講座分享—暫定（嘉賓：未定） 期末考核	

Class make-up 3.7.2023. Grade submission deadline 12.7.2023.

## Grade Descriptors for Essays

	Argument	Theory Analysis	Writing Style
[Excellent] A (85–92) or [Very Good] A- (80–84)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You provide a <b>detailed and specific thesis statement</b> 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.</li> <li>You <b>defend your claims</b> in a well-developed way by giving and explaining your reasons for your position.</li> <li>You identify likely <b>objections</b>, present them charitably and respond to them effectively.</li> <li>You carefully explain the theoretical and/or practical <b>implications</b> of your argument.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You provide an <b>accurate account</b> of the relevant parts of the theory.</li> <li>You illuminate the relationship between the theory’s <b>conclusion(s) and its arguments</b>.</li> <li>You quote relevant <b>key passages</b> with proper citations.</li> <li>You define <b>key terms</b>, and explain their role and how they relate to each other.</li> <li>You discuss what the thinker would probably have said about an issue by drawing on what he/she did say about other related matters.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You choose your words carefully. The language is <b>precise</b> rather than vague, <b>natural</b> rather than awkward, <b>straightforward</b> rather than ostentatious.</li> <li>Each piece of the essay is presented in a way that makes it clear to the reader how it is <b>relevant to your thesis</b>.</li> <li>Where appropriate, you use real or hypothetical <b>examples to help illustrate</b> abstract points.</li> </ul>
[Good] B+ (76–79), B (72–75) or B- (68–71)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis statement is clear, but general and unambitious.</li> <li>The reasons given to support claims are occasionally weak or too brief. Some claims in need of defence are merely asserted.</li> <li>Some key objections are not considered, or the response is weak or too brief.</li> <li>Theoretical and/or practical implications are not explained, or the explanation is vague and imprecise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are minor inaccuracies in the account of the theory. Some small points are overlooked.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Use of quotations is sometimes missing or erratic or without proper citations.</li> <li>Some key concepts are not defined, or are defined carelessly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The language is generally clear, but occasionally lacks precision or naturalness or desirable simplicity.</li> <li>The relevance of small parts of the essay is not made clear.</li> <li>Illustrative examples are used rarely or not at all.</li> </ul>
[Fair] C+ (64–67), C (60–63) or C- (56–59)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thesis statement is absent or insignificant or confused.</li> <li>The reasons given to support claims are usually weak or too brief. Many claims in need of defence are merely asserted.</li> <li>Objections are not considered, or they are</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are significant inaccuracies in the account of the theory. Some major points are overlooked.</li> <li>The theory’s conclusion(s) are described without reference to its arguments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The language is often unclear, due to being vague or awkward or ostentatious.</li> <li>The relevance of significant parts of the essay is not made clear.</li> <li>Illustrative examples are used incorrectly or not at all.</li> </ul>

	<p>only a straw-man version, or the response is ineffective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implications are not identified, or they are asserted without explanation.</li> <li>• The argument is likely to contain contradictions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of quotations is missing or erratic or without proper citations.</li> <li>• Key concepts are not defined, or are defined incorrectly.</li> </ul>	
<p>[Pass]</p> <p>D+ (53–55) or</p> <p>D (50–52)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You demonstrate an awareness of what an argument is, and try to make one.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You grasp at least the main features of some of the theory’s most important points.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The language is intelligible more often than not.</li> </ul>
<p>[Fail]</p> <p>F (0-49)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• You show little awareness of what an argument is, fails to make an argument, and shows almost no effort to make one.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 almost no effort in representing the theory accurately.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The language is more unintelligible than not and the meaning of the language is very hard to discern. The essay is thoroughly unorganized.</li> </ul>

### ***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"> <li>You faithfully reconstruct the author’s positions, and prove this knowledge by knowing the argument(s) supporting the theses in the text.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You exhibit thorough understanding of the relations of the themes presented in the various texts.</li> <li>You demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the relations between the various subjects and authors discussed in the course.</li> <li>You demonstrate an above-average facility in judgment by applying the various theories to cases and situations presented in the course of the exam.</li> </ul>
<p>[Good] B+ (76–79), B (72–75), or B- (68–71)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You can faithfully reconstruct the author’s positions, and demonstrate a basic comprehension of the arguments supporting those positions.</li> <li>You show some independence in thinking, but have difficulty developing your own criticisms and rebuttals to criticism.</li> </ul> <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You exhibit relatively complete understanding of the relations between the authors and the themes presented in the various texts.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<p>[Fair] C+ (64–67), C (60–63), or C- (56–59)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<p>[Pass] D+ (53–55), or D (50–52)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul> <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>You fail to demonstrate facility in the application of various theories to cases and situations presented in the course of the exam.</li> </ul>

<p>[Fail] F (0-49)</p>	<p>Argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• You demonstrate no understanding of the course content. You relay inaccurate information about the positions and arguments for those positions in the text.</li></ul> <p>Theory Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li></ul>
----------------------------	--



### ***Grade Descriptors for Tutorial Performance***

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

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