

UGED2852 自由與命運 Freedom and Destiny (2023-24 下學期)

Teacher :	Prof. Tao kwok cheung 陶國璋教授
Office Location:	馮景禧樓四樓 417 室 信箱 54 號
Email:	taopaper2022@gmail.com
Teaching Venue:	LSK514 Mon 16:30-18:15p.m.

課程簡介

人生總要面對各種不期而至的遭遇，因此有命運感但人又總是對自由有所希冀。「自由」與「命運」之間，顯然存在著張力。人生是否被命定的？人是否擁有自由意志？面對命運，我們能做和應做甚麼？這些問題與我們如何理解和籌劃人生息息相關。本課即旨在探討「自由」與「命運」的相關課題，讓學員在自我理解和成長上有所深思。

Humans always hope for freedom. But we are finite beings. Most of what happens to us is beyond our control and decision. Is our will free? Is life determined? In what sense can we make a free choice? What can and what should we do in the face of destiny? This course will deal with these significant problems and the tension between freedom and destiny, in order to stimulate students' reflection on their own lives.

學習成果

1. Recognize and describe different views, traditional and contemporary, Chinese and Western, on “freedom” and “destiny” .
2. Analyze and elaborate the rationale behind those different views.
3. Compare and value those different views.
4. Reflect independently and critically on personal life views.

課程內容

1. 導論：本課主題與進路

- 1.1 為何我們有命運感？
- 1.2 自由的層次

2. 從理性的途徑界定自由與命運問題：

- 2.1 決定論 (determinism) 的型態
- 2.2 宿命論 (fatalism) 的型態
- 2.3 自由意志 (free will) 的論證與反駁

3. 人面對命運時所常有的感觸與疑惑：
 - 3.1 命運與各種神祕經驗的關係
 - 3.2 術數的形態與預言的準確性問題
 - 3.3 科學方法與術數批判

4. 西方文化對命運的探索
 - 4.1 希臘的命運悲劇
 - 4.2 莎士比亞的性格悲劇
 - 4.3 基督宗教的絕對服從與救贖

5. 東方文化對命運的探尋：
 - 5.1 王充的命相學與魏晉的才性論
 - 5.2 墨家的非命思想
 - 5.3 佛教的緣起觀與因果思想

6. 西方對自由的承擔：以意志或生命的強度克服命運：
 - 6.1 尼采 (F. Nietzsche) — 超人哲學
 - 6.2 卡謬 (A. Camus) — 對抗荒謬
 - 6.3 沙特 (S. Sartre) — 存在先於本質

7. 東方對自由的承擔：以道德主體為人的自由基礎：
 - 6.1 莊子的安時處順
 - 6.2 儒家的知命與立命

教學活動

1. 每週上課 2 小時

評核方法

1. 中期測驗 (1 小時 40%)：短題目 (五選三)，例如：命定論的理論困難是甚麼？
2. 期終考試 (2 小時 60%)：a. 短題目 (五選三)；b. 長題目 (三選二)，例如：佛教、儒家道家如何超越人生的命限？宗教如何從救贖接受人生的厄運。

各專題之參考文獻

1. Freedom, Determinism (決定論) and Fatalism (命定論)：
 - 1.1 Richard Taylor, *Metaphysics* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1992, 4th ed.), Ch. 5, “Freedom and Determinism”, pp. 35 - 53.
 - 1.2 Richard Taylor, *Metaphysics* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1992, 4th ed.), Ch. 6,

“Fate” , pp. 54 - 67.

2. 存在主義 (Existentialism) (上) : 沙特 (Jean-Paul Sartre) :
 - 2.1 Jean-Paul Sartre, *Nausea* (translated from the French by Lloyd Alexander, New York: New Directions, 2007), pp. 126 - 135.
 - 2.2 陶國璋:《哲學的陌生感》(香港:匯智出版,2003),〈何為陌生〉及〈存在的荒謬感〉,頁3 - 6、7 - 13。
3. 希臘悲劇 (Greek Tragedy) :
 - 3.1 索福克里斯 (Sophocles) 著,呂健忠譯:《索福克里斯全集 I:伊底帕斯三部曲》(台北:書林出版有限公司,2009),〈伊底帕斯王〉,頁31-169。
4. 存在主義 (Existentialism) (下) : 卡繆 (Albert Camus) :
 - 4.1 加繆著,杜小真譯:《西西弗的神話》(北京:三聯,1998 第二版),〈荒謬的自由〉及〈西西弗的神話〉,頁58 - 74、140 - 145。
另有英文版提供 (Justin O' Brien 譯)
5. 尼采 (Nietzsche) :
 - 5.1 尼采著,黃明嘉譯:《快樂的科學》(上海:華東師範大學出版社,2007),第108、109、125、143、276、343、344條,約15頁。英文版:Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, translated by Josefine Nauckhoff, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
 - 5.2 周國平:《尼采與形而上學》(北京:新世界出版社,2008),頁4 - 14、57 - 61。
6. 基督宗教 :
 - 6.1 《聖經——中英對照(和合本·新國際版)》(香港:漢語聖經協會,2009 八版),〈舊約全書·約伯記〉,頁828 - 880。
7. 莊子 :
 - 7.1 王博:《莊子哲學》(北京:北京大學出版社,2004),第四章:〈德充符〉,頁60 - 73。
 - 7.2 陳鼓應:《莊子今註今譯》(香港:中華書局,2012 修訂重校本),〈德充符〉,頁165 - 189。
8. 孔子與孟子 :
 - 8.1 唐君毅:《中國哲學原論:導論篇》,第十六章:〈原命上:先秦天命思想之發展〉,第一至六節。

<p>[Excellent] A (85 – 92) or</p> <p>[V ery 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.
<p>[Good] B+ (76 – 79), B (72 – 75) or B- (68 – 71)</p>	<p>Thesis statement is clear, but general and unambitious.</p> <p>The reasons given to support claims are occasionally weak or too brief. Some claims in need of defence are merely asserted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some key objections are not considered, or the response is weak or too brief. Theoretical and/or practical implications are not explained, or the explanation is vague and imprecise. 	<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. Use of quotations is sometimes missing or erratic or without proper citations. Some key concepts are not defined, or are defined carelessly.
<p>[Fair] C+ (64 – 67), C (60 – 63) or C- (56 – 59)</p>	<p>Thesis statement is absent or insignificant or confused.</p> <p>The reasons given to support claims are usually weak or too brief. Many claims in need of defence are merely asserted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objections are not considered, or they are 	<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.
	<p>only a straw-man version, or the response is ineffective.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implications are not identified, or they are asserted without explanation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 argument is likely to contain contradictions. 	
[Pass] D+ (53 – 55) or D (50 – 52)	<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.
[Fail] F (0-49)	<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 almost no effort in representing the theory accurately.

Academic honesty and plagiarism

Attention is drawn to University policy and regulations on honesty in academic work, and to the disciplinary guidelines and procedures applicable to breaches of such policy and regulations. Details may be found at <http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academic honesty/>.

With each assignment, students will be required to submit a signed [declaration](#) that they are aware of these policies, regulations, guidelines and procedures. For group projects, all students of the same group should be asked to sign the declaration.

For assignments in the form of a computer-generated document that is principally text-based and submitted via VeriGuide, the statement, in the form of a receipt, will be issued by the system upon students' uploading of the soft copy of the assignment. Assignments without the receipt will not be graded by teachers. Only the final version of the assignment should be submitted via VeriGuide.

Feedback for evaluation:

1. Students are welcome to give feedback on the course at any time. They can do so by communication to teacher or tutor in class, by email, posting comments and questions to the eLearning platform, or during tutorials.
2. As with all courses in General education, students evaluate the course through a survey and written comments at the end of the term.

