

## UGED 2891 Philosophy of Love 2023-2024 (下學期)

Course Code: UGED 2891 Title in English : Philosophy of Love Title in Chinese : 愛情哲學
--

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

<p><b>Course overview:</b> 為何人類會投向偶像崇拜、軍事征服擴張國土、奢侈放縱好名好權、或為他人犧牲，或為禁慾捨棄，或為強迫性地工作，或為藝術創造，或為對神的奉獻，或為對人的關懷。種種人性的現象其實顯示了人類對自我的存在感到疏離，因著疏離而產生內心的焦慮，而不斷有所追求，希望實現一種統合感，以對抗隔離的不安，這就是愛。 所謂追尋統合感，其實是在生存歷程中找到愛與被愛，愛是存在的動力，亦是最困擾人性的情感；而各種感情現象中，又以愛情最為微妙。愛情多以春天借喻，喻其蘊藉興發欣欣滋長之機。春情就是自然生機之煥發，盎然滿溢，卻又無所著落的一種錯失感，千頭萬緒困蓋一起，蜷伏回去，內中洄漩流蕩，便是春情之傷。 本課以哲學分析為入路，並透過文學、電影幫助理解愛情現象從不同的角度描繪人類特有的情感世界。</p>
---

<p><b>Learning outcomes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. 認識不同的愛情理論與愛情的價值</li><li>2. 反思不同的愛情現象及愛情的苦樂相生的結構</li><li>3. 認識戀愛的主客互感之關係，並學習愛者超越被愛者</li><li>4. 建立與他人的親密關係</li><li>5. 反思現代人對愛情的迷惘根源</li></ol>
---

### List of topics

Topic	Contents/ fundamental concepts
導論	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. 本課的進路</li><li>b. 為何人需要愛？</li><li>c. 輕不著地的年代</li></ol>
1. 愛情與神話	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. 中國神話的愛情傳說</li><li>b. 西方愛情神話的典範： (Narcissus、Eros &amp; Psyche、Venus etc;)</li><li>c. 柏拉圖式的愛 (Platonic Love)</li></ol>

2. 浪漫愛情 (Romantic love) 的渴求與幻象	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 騎士之愛與浪漫愛情的源流</li> <li>b. 浪漫愛情的主題：死亡 (Liebstod)</li> <li>c. 浪漫愛情的現代版本</li> </ul>
3. 生物學的愛情理論	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 愛情的生物學基礎</li> <li>b. 男女大不同的科學理據</li> <li>c. Helen Fisher 的愛情三段論</li> <li>d. 生物愛情觀的理論困難</li> </ul>
4. 心理學的愛情理論	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 愛與潛意識</li> <li>b. 弗洛伊德 (S. Freud) 論力比多理論 (Libido) 與愛欲的驅使力 (Drives)</li> <li>c. 弗洛姆 (Erich Fromm) 的 Symbiotic Union 理論</li> <li>d. 愛的心理扭曲 (自戀、癡戀、溺愛、戀物、施虐與被虐等)</li> </ul>
5. 社會學對的現代愛情的反思	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Alain de Botton 論愛情的命運感與霸權</li> <li>b. Anthony Giddens 論現代浪漫愛情觀的延續與危機</li> <li>c. 現代人的愛情困思</li> </ul>
6. 愛情現象	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 愛者與被愛者</li> <li>b. 青澀之愛</li> <li>c. 妒忌、怨恨</li> <li>d. 操控與施虐</li> <li>e. 犧牲</li> <li>f. 生死與共</li> <li>g. 愛別離苦</li> <li>h. 愛情輪迴</li> <li>i. 愛情公式</li> <li>j. 唐璜現象</li> <li>k. 完美的破裂</li> </ul>

Task nature	Description	Weight
1. 課堂短測 (1 小時)	a. 短題目 (五選三)，例如：人為何需要愛？愛的不同類別，解構電影中的愛情情節與意象。	40%
2. 期終考試 (2 小時)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 短題目 (五選三)，主要評考同學上課之參與程度</li> <li>b. 長題目 (三選二)，考核課堂的理論內容及閱讀資料，例如：批判生物學的愛情觀、心理學對愛情的剖析，柏拉圖式愛，浪漫愛情的幻象等，現代人的愛情觀。</li> </ul>	60%

## Learning activities

講課：26 小時

電影欣賞與互動討論：13 小時

## Course schedule

週數	課題	指定閱讀材料	
1	導論：愛是甚麼？ 愛情的憧憬與賦值	I. Singer, The Nature of Love 選段	
2	導論：愛與情	陶國璋《愛的盲點》上篇：第三章《不同層域的 愛》	
3	古典愛情理論之一：愛情 神話與傳說	張燦輝：《比較羅蜜歐與朱麗葉與梁祝的愛情觀》 馮夢龍：《情史》選段	
4	古典愛情理論之二：柏拉 圖式的愛	柏拉圖《饗宴篇》選段 陶國璋《愛的盲點》下篇：第四章：完美主義的 幻象	
5	浪漫愛情之源流與愛至於 死	Alain de Botton：Essays in love 選段	
6	愛情的生物學解構	Richard Dawin：The Selfish Gene 選段 Helen Fisher：Anatomy of Love 選段	
7	愛情心理學與愛性潛意識	The Psychoanalytic Contribution：What Freud discovered about love	
8	現代的愛情觀之一：身份 焦慮的出現	Alain de Botton：Status Anexity 選段	
9	現代的愛情觀之二：輕不 著地的年代	陶國璋《愛的盲點》下篇：第二章《過度的自我 專注》	
10	現代的愛情觀之三：愛情 關係的發展	Anthony Giddens：Love, Commitments, and Pure Relationship	
11	愛的維修：	陶國璋《愛的盲點》下篇：第五章《愛的維修》	
12	愛情與學習：認識戀人的 心境	羅蘭·巴特《戀人絮語》選段 Roland Barthes, 'A Lover' Discourse Fragments 選段	
13	總結	佛洛姆：《愛的藝術》選段	

## 參考書目：

### Recommended learning resources:

### 主要參考書目：

1. 佛洛姆：《愛的藝術》，臺北志文新潮文庫，85年
2. Erich Fromm, *The Art of loving*, London : Unwin, 1975.
3. 羅蘭·巴特：《戀人絮語》，臺北桂冠，94
4. Roland Barthes : *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments* , New York : Hill and Wang, 1978.
5. 陶國璋：《愛的盲點》上、下篇，香港中華書局，2011、2020年

## I 中文

1. 唐君毅：《人生的體驗》，臺北，學生，1979年
2. 唐君毅：《人生的體驗續篇》，臺北，學生，1979年
3. 唐君毅：《愛情之福音》，臺北正中書局，95年五版
4. 唐君毅：《致廷光書》，臺北，學生書局，1984
5. 傅統先：《哲學與人生》，台灣 水牛出版社，1987年
6. 陸傑榮：《從痛苦到超越》，瀋陽，遼寧教育，1991年
7. 羅秉祥：《生死男女》，香港，突破，1997年
8. 羅秉祥：《繁星與道德》，香港，三聯書店，1993
9. 劉小楓：《沉重的肉身》，香港，牛津大學，1998年
10. 羅素：《幸福之路》，北京，文化藝術，1998年
11. 羅蘭·巴特：《戀人絮語》，臺北桂冠，94年
12. 瓦西列夫著，趙永穆、范国恩、陳行慧譯：《情愛論》，北京：三聯書店，1992年
13. 佛洛姆：《愛的藝術》，臺北志文新潮文庫，85年
14. 海倫·費雪：《愛慾》，臺北時報文化，98年
15. 約翰·基爾：《男女大不同》，臺北桂冠，97年
16. 柏拉圖：《會飲》，北京華夏出版社，2003年
17. 米蘭·昆德拉：《生命中不能承受之輕》，臺北時報文化，96年
18. 曹雪芹：《紅樓夢》，北京中華書局，66年

## II 英文：

1. Irving Singer, *The Nature of love* 3 Vols; Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1984.
2. Irving Singer , *The Pursuit of love* , Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994 .
3. Erich Fromm, *The Art of loving* , London : Unwin, 1975.
4. Alan Soble , *The Structure of love* , New Haven ; London : Yale University Press, 1990.
5. Alan Soble edited, *Eros, agape, and philia : readings in the philosophy of love* , New York : Paragon House, 1989.
6. Mark Gibbard, *Dynamic of love : an exploration into believing praying and being humand* , London : Mowbray, 1974.
7. Sue Miller, *For Lover* , New York : HarperCollins, 1993.
8. Chris John-Terry, *For the love of wisdom : an explanation of the meaning and purpose of philosophy* , New York : Alba House, 1994
9. Robert C. Solomon, *Love : emotion, myth, & metaphor / Robert C Solomon* , Buffalo, N.Y. : Prometheus Books, 1990
10. Jack D. Douglas, with the assistance of John Hillebrand *Love, intimacy, and sex* , Newbury Park, Calif. : Sage Publicatin, 1988.

11. *Encyclopedia of love & sex : a comprehensive guide to the physiology of sex, the art of loving, and the psychology of love* , New York : Crescent Books, 1984.
12. Denis de Rougemont, *Love in the Western world / Denis de Rougemont translated by Montgomery Belgion*, Princeton, [N.J.] : Princeton University Press, 1983.
13. Constance Rover, *Love, morals and the feminists*, Routledge & K. Paul : London, 1970.
14. Jeffrey E. Ford, *Love, marriage, and sex in the Christian tradition from antiquity to today*, San Francisco : International Scholars Publications, 1999
15. William Reiser edited *Love of learning : desire for justice : undergraduate education and the option for the poor* , Scranton, PA : University of Scranton Press, c1995
16. Douglas N. (Douglas Neil) Morgan, *Love : Plato, the Bible and Freud*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice Hall, 1964
17. Odile M. Liebard compiled , *Love & sexuality* Wilmington, N.C. : Consortium Books, 1978

### Grade distribution

<p>[Excellent] A (85–92) or</p> <p>[Very Good] A- (80–84)</p>	<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>
<p>[Good] B+ (76–79), B (72–75) or B- (68–71)</p>	<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>
<p>[Fair] C+ (64–67), C (60–63) or C- (56–59)</p>	<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</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>

	<p>asserted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections are not considered, or they are</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] D+ (53–55) or 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>
<p>[Fail] 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>

### 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/academichonesty/>.

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.