UGED2852 自由與命運 Freedom and Destiny（2025-26 下學期）

導師：陶國璋教授
Mon 4:30-6:15
LSK 210
taopaper2022@gmail.com
網上輔助教學：哲人絮語 playlist 33-37：
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sExwosqzYOg&list=PL9qAt67yGYw5V3zmmWwIGdmvnPNQ_F-uF&index=29&ab_channel=Gavinchiu%E8%B6%99%E6%B0%8F%E8%AE%80%E6%9B%B8%E7%94%9F%E6%B4%BB

課程簡介

人生難免遭遇各種突如其來的境況，因而產生命運之感，同時人類又始終對自由懷抱期望。「自由」與「命運」之間，顯然存在著深刻的張力。人生是否為命運所決定？人類是否擁有自由意志？面對命運，我們能夠且應當採取何種行動？這些問題與我們如何理解並規劃人生密切相關。

本課程旨在深入探討「自由」與「命運」的相關議題，引導學員在自我認知與個人成長方面進行深刻反思。

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

- To examine the philosophical concepts of free will and determinism through historical and contemporary perspectives.
- To analyze the tension between human aspirations for freedom and the constraints imposed by external circumstances or destiny.
- To encourage students to reflect on their personal agency and ethical responsibilities in navigating life' s unpredictability.
- To explore interdisciplinary approaches, including philosophy, psychology, and religious studies, to understand freedom and destiny.

評核方法

1. **課堂寫作（40%）：**共三次，每次 15 分鐘，即時回應堂上的論題，例如：你為何會相信命運？術數是迷信嗎？

2. **期終考試 2 小時（最後一課、60%　Open book　可帶 5 張 A4 ）**
   a. 短題目（四選二），考核同學的參與程度（30%）；例如 ：自由的層次、命運與命限的區別
   b. 長題目（四選二），考核同學的理解及個人發揮（40%）；例如： 東西方哲學家對命運的看法。科學決定論有什麼漏洞。人生有沒有辦法主宰自己。莊子如何超越人生的限制？
   c. 答題方式：中英文、繁簡體俱（不要使用淺色筆書寫）

課程內容

1. 導論：課程主題與探究進路

1.1 好奇與焦慮的哲學發問

- 探討人類對自由與命運的追問如何源於好奇（對存在本質的探究）與焦慮（對不可控命運的恐懼）。

1.2 **命運的存在性問題**

- 命運是否為客觀實在，或僅為主觀建構？對比柏拉圖的理念世界（命運作為必然性）與佛教的緣起觀（無固定命運）。
- 引入《黑客帝國》的虛擬世界，質疑現實與命運的真實性。

2. 人類面對命運的感觸與困惑

2.1 **命運與神秘經驗的關係**

- 分析神秘經驗（如瀕死體驗、預兆）如何影響對命運的認知，參考佛教五蘊（識蘊）與康德的現象界。
- 探討《黑客帝國》中虛擬經驗是否類比神秘經驗，質疑感官世界的可靠性。

2.2 **術數的形態與預言的準確性**

- 考察術數（如占卜、星相學）的歷史與文化形態，探討其預測命運的哲學基礎。

- 對比斯賓諾莎的決定論（宇宙必然性）與佛教的因果觀，檢視預言是否可信。

2.3 **術數批判的科學性**

- 從科學理性與懷疑論（參考休謨）角度批判術數，探討其與自由意志的衝突。
- 反思《黑客帝國》中先知（Oracle）的預言角色，是否暗示決定論與自由的張力。

3. 理性的進路：界定自由與命運

3.1 決定論的多重型態

- 介紹決定論的類型：硬決定論（Hard Determinism，如斯賓諾莎的因果必然性）、軟決定論（Compatibilism）。

3.2 宿命論的哲學形態

- 分析宿命論（Fatalism）與決定論的區別，宿命論認為命運不可改變（如希臘悲劇的命運觀）。
- 對比佛教無我觀，探討宿命論是否與空性相容。

3.3 自由的三層次分析

- **生活選擇**：日常決策中的自由感，參考存在主義的行動自由。
- **政治領域**：自由作為權利，參考康德的道德自律與政治哲學。
- **人生境界**：超越性的自由，如佛教涅槃或斯賓諾莎的理智之愛。
- 對比《黑客帝國》中尼奧的選擇（紅藥丸）如何體現不同層次的自由。

3.4 自由意志的論證與反駁

- 介紹自由意志的經典論證（如笛卡爾的二元論）與反駁（斯賓諾莎的決定論、佛教的無我）。

4. 西方哲學對命運的探索

4.1 希臘悲劇與莎士比亞的性格悲劇

- 分析希臘悲劇（如《俄狄浦斯王》）中的命運必然性，與莎士比亞（如《哈姆雷特》）中性格驅動的命運。
- 對比柏拉圖的靈魂觀（理性超越命運）

4.2 存在主義的命運與人性

- 探討存在主義（如沙特、卡繆）如何看待命運：人類在荒誕世界中創造意義，自由是責任而非逃避。

4.3 **《約伯記》的絕對服從與救贖**

- 分析《約伯記》中命運（神意）與人類服從的關係，探討救贖是否意味自由。
- 對比康德的道德哲學（絕對命令）與佛教的放下執著。

5. 東方哲學對命運的探尋

5.1 **道家的安時處順與消融命運**

- 探討道家（如老子、莊子）的“順應自然”，如何通過無為化解命運的限制。
- 對比斯賓諾莎的理智接受必然性。

5.2 **儒家的知天命與立命說**

- 分析孔子“五十知天命”與孟子的“立命”思想，強調通過道德修養超越命運。
- 對比康德的道德自由與佛教的因果觀，探討主動立命的意義。

5.3 **佛教的緣起觀與因果思想**

- 探討佛教的緣起（五蘊和合）與業力如何解釋命運，無我觀如何破除命定觀念。
- 結合般若學的空性（你提到的議題），分析《黑客帝國》中虛擬世界的空性與超越命運的可能性。

<u>各專題之參考文獻</u>

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。

學術誠信

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。

- 如屬小組習作，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（不論有否簽署聲明及不論有否直接或間接抄襲）均須負上集體責任及受到懲處。
- 如作業以電腦製作、內容以文字為主，並經由大學「維誠」系統 (VeriGuide) 提交者，學生將作業的電子檔案上載到系統後，便會獲得收據，收據上已列明有關聲明。

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。

學生將作業或作業的一部份用於超過一個用途（例如：同時符合兩科的要求）而沒有作出聲明會被視為未有聲明重覆使用作業。學生重覆使用其著作的措辭或某一、二句句子很常見，並可以接受，惟重覆使用全部內容則構成問題。在任何情況下，須先獲得相關老師同意方可提交作業。

評分準則

Grade Descriptors for Test and Final Examination

A Outstanding performance on all learning outcomes. You provide an accurate account of the relevant parts of the theory or course content.

A- Generally outstanding performance on all (or almost all) learning outcomes. You illuminate the relationship between the theory' s conclusion(s) and its arguments.

B+ Substantial performance on all learning outcomes, OR high performance on some learning.

B Some small points are overlooked. Outcomes which compensate for less satisfactory performance on others, resulting in overall substantial performance.

B- Some key concepts are not well defined , or are defined incorrectly. There are inaccuracies in the account of the course content.

C+ There are significant inaccuracies in the account of the theory. Some major points are overlooked.

C The content are described without valid inference to its descriptions.

C- Illustrative examples are used incorrectly or not at all.

D Unsatisfactory performance on a number of learning outcomes, OR failure to meet specified assessment requirements.

F Unsatisfactory performance。

Grade Descriptors for Essays

Argument Theory Analysis Writing Style

[Excellent] A (85 – 92) or

[Very Good] A- (80 – 84)

- 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.
- 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.
• 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.

[Good]

B+ (76 – 79), B (72 – 75) or B- (68 – 71)

• 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 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.
• 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.
• The language is generally clear, but occasionally lacks precision or naturalness or desirable simplicity.
• The relevance of small parts of the essay is not made clear.
• Illustrative examples are used rarely or not at all.

[Fair]

C+ (64 – 67), C (60 – 63) or C- (56 – 59)

• 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
• 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.
• 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.
•
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.
• Use of quotations is missing or erratic or without proper citations.
• Key concepts are not defined, or are defined incorrectly.
[Pass]
D+ (53 – 55) or
D (50 – 52)
• You demonstrate an awareness of what an argument is, and try to make one.
• You grasp at least the main features of some of the theory’ s most important points.
• The language is intelligible more often than not.
[Fail]
F (0-49)
• You show little awareness of what an argument is, fails to make an argument, and shows almost no effort to make one.
• You fail to grasp any 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.
• The language is more unintelligible than not and the meaning of the language is very hard to discern. The essay is thoroughly unorganized.