UGED 2901 Death and Immortality 26-27 1st term

Course Code: UGED 2901
Title in English: Death and Immortality
Title in Chinese: 死亡與不朽

Teaching Lecturer	陶國璋 taopaper2022@gamil.com
Office Location:	馮景禧樓 4 樓 417 室，信箱 55 號
Teaching Venue:	**UCC C3** Monday 4:30—6:15 p.m.
Other information:	Blackboard

Details of course website

哲學五厘米
City of the Silent —Timeline of Death:
http://www.alsirat.com/silence/cemtime/time1.html

Death — the last taboo (Australian Museum):
http://www.deathonline.net/index.cfm

Death in art:
http://www.geocities.com/ppollefeys/main.htm

The International Organization for Near-Death Studies:
http://www.iands.org/

Course overview:

死亡是不可知，而又不可解的事實，人終難免一死，所以我們以虛無恐懼來象徵死亡，視之為忌諱，逃避面對它；甚至想像以種種的長生術、宗教神祕經來逃避它。但，人類能設想未來，表示他能夠想像未來某一天總要離開世界。哲學家對此尚未可能的可能性提出深邃的疑問：死亡迫現人生的陌生感，引動我們思考。究竟生命本身是甚麼？究竟生命何以存在？最後更指向發問：生命既存在又何以有死？其實，最後的問題，才是發問的根源，人感觸其會死這事實，然後求問生命存在的意義。最後更追尋如何安立死亡的恐懼？

課程結合社會學、心理學、哲學，宗教綜合剖示此人生中最大的極限問題。課程加入文學、電影欣賞，讓學員從理性和感性的角度體悟死亡的況味。

Learning outcomes:

1. 認識死亡的不同情境與各種有關死亡的現象
2. 思考死亡與人生的意義
3. 舒緩死亡的恐懼感
4. 了解死亡的苦痛與學習臨終關懷
5. 批判各種有關死亡的迷信

Topic	**Contents/ fundamental concepts**
導論（一）：死亡與生命存在的意義	a. 本課的進路 b. 死亡與存在的意義
導論（二）探討死亡的死亡不同方式	a. 宗教超越死亡的嘗試 b. 科學的死亡中性觀 c. 心理學對死亡的剖析 d. 哲學的進路
分論 I：死亡的剖析	
1. E. Kubler- Ross 的臨終關懷的理論	a. 臨終的五個階段 b. 善別的方法
2. 死亡恐懼感的分析	a. 死亡的害怕（Fear）： i. 醜陋形象 ii. 痛苦 iii. 失去擁有物 iv. 失去親人朋友 v. 失去控制身體的能力 b. 死亡的怖慄感（Dread） i. 獨自上路的孤獨感 ii. 失去自我的統一性 iii. 虛無感
3. 科學以中性及量化的角度描繪對死亡	a. 生命現象與死亡現象 b. 生物演化與求生機制 c. 熱學第二定律與熵
分論 II：不朽的追尋	
1. 死亡的藝術表現	a. 藝術家對死亡情景的刻劃 b. 繪畫、音樂、電影的死亡題材 c. 生命的觀賞態度
2. 神祕經驗的反思	

3. 宗教的安慰 4. 哲學的反思	a. 靈魂存在嗎？ b. 死亡體驗（Near dead experience） c. 超自然的靈界體驗 a. 道教與長生升仙理論 c. 基督宗教的永生觀 a. 生命意義與死亡意義 b. 莊子的物化與齊物 c. 佛教的涅槃理 d. 海德格論死亡的智慧 .

Learning activities

Lecture	Field-trip
24	**non**

Task nature	Description	Weight
1.中期測驗 Open book（可帶 5 張 A4） 2.期終考試 Open book（可帶 5 張 A4）	i. 短題目：電影中的死亡意象（20%） ii. 長題目（四選二）：例如科學的死亡；宗教的死亡觀；分析死亡的恐懼感（30%） a. 短題目：電影中的死亡意象（20%） b. 長題目（四選二），：比較宗教與哲學對死亡的看法；佛教與基督教死亡觀比較；不朽的超越（30%）	50% 50%

AI Tools Usage Approach

Approach 3 – Use only with explicit acknowledgement

Course schedule

週數	課題	指定閱讀材料	
1	導論一：	Kubler-Ross Elisabeth, *" The Dying Patient ",* in Questions and Answer on Death and Dying, New York: Doubleday, c1997, pp. 1-38.	

2	導論二：	*"Euthanasia",* in Applying Ethics: A Text with Readings, 4th ed. Jeffrey Olen and Vincent Barry, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1992. pp. 207-252.	
3	為何人會發問死亡的意義？	托爾斯泰：《伊凡·伊里奇之死》（Death of Ivan Ilych）（選段）	
4	生命存在的意義	V. Frankl：*Man's search for Meaning*，Boston, Beacon Press，2017（選段）	
5	如何舒緩死亡的痛苦	鮑比以(邱瑞鑾譯）：《潛水鐘與蝴蝶》選段，台北，時報，1998 年。	
6	死亡的藝術表現	趙遠凡：《死亡的藝術表現》，第一章《上古時代—恐懼與神祕》p.1-11 北京，群言出版	
7	中期測驗		
8	科學的死亡觀	Mitch Albom ：*Tuesday with Morrie* 選段 ，Doubleday 1997	
9	宗教的安慰（一）	傅偉勳：《死亡的尊嚴與生命的尊嚴》選段，台北，正中，1993 年。	
10	宗教的安慰（一）	《西藏生死書》選讀第三篇第十八章，索甲仁波切著，鄭振煌譯，台北市： 文化事業股份有限公司，1996 年。	
11	哲學的反思（二）	陶國璋《哲學的陌生感》：第四章《死亡的況味》，香港，匯智出版社，2003 年	
12	哲學的反思（三）	生命的解決是否可能？ 陶國璋《寂寞空虛與絕望的哲學抒緩配方》第四章（人生的意義），台灣，2046 出版社，2024	
13	最後一課	考試	

I 主要參考書：

1. Kubler-Ross Elisabeth, On Death and Dying, London: Taristock Publications, 1970
2. 陶國璋：《哲學的陌生感》，香港，匯智，2003 年。

II 中文參考書：

3. 陶國璋：《無聊、空虛、絕望的哲學抒緩配方》， 台北， 2046 出版社，2024 年。
4. 傅偉勳：《死亡的尊嚴與生命的尊嚴》，台北，正中，1993 年。

5. 段德智《死亡哲學》台北，洪葉文化 1994 年。
6. 郭子華：《死的困撓與生的執著》，北京，人民大學，1992 年。
7. 蘇恩佩：《死亡別狂傲》，香港，突破，81 年初版。
8. 鄭曉江：《中國死亡智慧》，台北，東大圖書，1991 年。
9. 曹聚仁：《浮過了生命海》，香港，三育圖書，1974 年。
10. 威克科克斯、蘇頓（嚴平譯）：《死亡與垂死》，北京，光明日報，1990 年。
11. 米奇·阿爾博姆(吳洪譯)：《相約星期二》或《最後十四堂星期二的課》，上海，上海譯文，1998 年。
12. 鮑比以(邱瑞鑾譯）：《潛水鐘與蝴蝶》，台北，時報，1998 年。
13. 賢：《杏林隨筆》，香港，突破，1991 年。
14. 西西：《哀悼乳房》，台灣，洪範，1996 年
15. 楚冬年：《計劃死亡》，香港，商務，1990 年。
16. 邱仁宗：《生死之間》，香港，中華，1988 年。
17. 巴納德、穆契南（黃塵譯）：《死亡的奧祕》，台北，國家，1977 年。
18. 雷蒙穆迪（孫慶餘譯）：《揭開死亡之迷》，台北，求精，1977 年。
19. E.雲格爾（林克譯）：《死論》，香港，三聯，1996 年。
20. 鶴見濟：《完全自殺手冊》，台北，茉莉，1994 年。
21. 趙遠帆：《死亡的藝術表現》，北京，群言，1993 年。
22. 菲力浦·維岡，史蒂芬妮·維岡,《我還活著，潛水鐘之愛》， 水晶，1998 年。
23. 井村和清：《愛的手札 給我的女兒們》，台北:東販, 2006 年。
24. 唐・派普 賽思・墨菲，《去過天堂 90 分鐘》， 台北，究竟，2007 年。
25. 依品凡：《重新活過來》，台北，遠流, 2003 年。
26. 米奇・艾爾邦: 《再給我一天》，台北，大塊文化, 2007 年。
27. 艾力克·埃馬紐埃爾·史密特，《最後 12 天的生命之旅》，台北，方智叢書，2004 年。
28. 克理希那穆提：《生與死》，台北，方智叢書，1995 年。
29. 一行禪師：《你可以不生氣》，台北，橡樹林，2003 年。
30. 一行禪師：《你可以不怕死》， 台北，橡樹林， 2003 年。
31. 弗蘭克：《活出意義來》， 台北， 光啟文化， 2008 年。
32. 盧雲, 《浪子回頭--一個歸家的故事》，台北，校園書房，1997 年。
33. 盧雲：《受傷的治療者香港》，基道出版社，1998 年。
34. 盧雲：《鏡外：生死之間省思》， 香港，基道出版社，1992 年。
35. 盧雲：《始於寧謐處──默想基督徒生命》， 香港，基道出版社，1991 年。
36. 戴邁樂：《弦外之音》，台北， 光啟文化，2000 年。
37. 戴蘊樂：《慧眼禪心》， 台北， 光啟文化， 2003 年。
38. 戴蘊樂：《聽蛙》， 台北，光啟文化，, 1998 年。
39. 戴蘊樂：《觀蛙：心靈默想極短篇》， 台北，光啟文化， 2002 年。
40. 尤金歐凱利：《追逐日光》，台北，商周出版，2006 年。
41. 蘇絢慧：《死亡如此靠近》， 台北， 大塊文化，2001 年。
42. 陸幼青：《生命的留言（死亡日記）》， 台北，香海文化，2001 年。
43. 山崎章郎：《一起面對生死》， 台北， 圓神，1994 年。
44. 龔立人：《眼淚並未抹乾》， 香港，基道出版社，2000 年。
45. 何紫：《何紫情懷》， 香港，山邊， 1996 年。
46. 索甲仁波切:《西藏生死書》， 台北， 張老師文化， 1998 年。
47. Bernies Siegel：《愛、醫藥、奇蹟》， 台北，遠流， 2001 年。
48. 聖嚴法師：《歡喜看生死》， 台北， 法鼓， 2009 年。
49. 永元輔：《大往來》
50. 楊牧谷：《再生情緣》，卓越出版社，1993 年。
51. 杜拉斯（Marguerite Duras），《廣島之戀》，瀋陽：春風文藝，2000 年。

III 英文參考書目：

52. Kubler-Ross Elisabeth, *Questions and Answers on Death and Dying*, NY: Macmillan 1976.
53. Kubler-Ross Elisabeth, *Death: The Final Stage of Growth*, New Jessey: Prentice Hall, 1975.
54. Schneidman Edwin ed., *Death: Current Perspectives,* Palo Alto, Calf: Mayfield, 1980.
55. Wilcox Sandra and Sutton Mainlyin, *Understanding Death and Dying: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, Calf.,: Alfred, 1985.
56. Charon Jacques, *Death and Western Thought*, NY: Macmillan, 1963.
57. Maquire Daniel, *Death by Choice*, NY: Image Book, 1984.
58. Grof Stanislew, *Books of the Dead: Manuals for Living and Dying*, London： Thames and Hudson, 1994.
59. Wein Robert F, *Ethical issues in Death and Dying*, NY: Columbia U.Press, 1986.
60. Davidson Glen; *Living With Dying: A Guide For Relatives and Friends*, Angsburg: Fortess, 1990.
61. Peachy Mark, *Facing Terminal Illiness*, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1981.
62. Bluebond-Lagner Myra, *The Private Worlds of Dying Children*, Princeton: Princeton Un. Press, 1978.
63. Ariès, Philippe, *Western Attitudes Towards Death*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1974
64. Badham, Paul and Linda Badham (eds), *Death and Immortality in the Religions of the World*, New York : Paragon House, 1987
65. Bowker, John, *The Meanings of Death*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993
66. Malpas, Jeff and Robert C. Solomon (eds), *Death and Philosophy*, London: Routledge, 1998*
67. Mother Teresa, *In My Own Words*, New York : Gramercy Books, 1997
68. Peck, Scott, *Denial of the Soul: spiritual and medical perspectives on euthanasia and mortality,* New York : Harmony Books, 1997.
69. Kushner, Harold, *When bad things happen to good people*, New York : Schocken Books, 1981.
70. Thich Nhat Hanh, *Living Buddha, Living Christ*, New York : Riverhead Books, 1995.
71. Thich Nhat Hanh ,*Peace is every step : the path of mindfulness in everyday life*, edited by Arnold Kotler, New York, N.Y. : Bantam Books, 1991
72. Thich Nhat Hanh, *Creating true peace : ending violence in yourself, your family, your community, and the world*, New York : Free Press, 2004,
73. de Mello, Anthony, *Taking flight : a book of story meditations,* New York : Doubleday, 1990
74. Nouwen, Henri, *The wounded healer : ministry in contemporary society*, Garden City,N.Y. : Image Books, 1979
75. Nouwen, Henri, *The return of the prodigal son : a story of homecoming*, London : Darton, Longman and Todd, 1994
76. Frankl, Viktor, *Man's search for meaning*, Boston : Beacon Press, 2006
77. Pausch, Randy, *The last lecture*, New York : Hyperion, 2008.
78. Kubler-Ross, Elisabeth, *On death and dying*, London: Tavistock, 1970
79. Albom, Mitch, *Tuesdays with Morrie*, New York : Anchor Books, 1997
80. Albom, Mitch, *For one more day*, London: Sphere, 2007
81. Walsch, Neale Donald, *Conversations with God*, New York : G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1996
82. Eugene O'Kelly, *Chasing Daylight: how my forthcoming death transformed my life : a final account*, New

Feedback for evaluation

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 eLearing 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.

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.

Grade Descriptors for Essays
Argument Theory Analysis Writing Style
[Excellent] A (85–92) or
[V ery 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.

Grade Descriptors for Essay Examinations
[Excellent]
A (85–92) or
[V ery Good]
A- (80–84)
Argument
• 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.
Theory Analysis
• 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.
[Good]
B+ (76– 79),
B (72–75), or
B- (68–71)
Argument
• 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.
Theory Analysis
• 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.
[Fair]
C+ (64– 67),
C (60–63), or
C- (56–59)
Argument
• 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.
Theory Analysis
• 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.
[Pass]
D+ (53– 55), or
D (50–52)
Argument
• 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.
Theory Analysis
• 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.

[Fail]
F (0-49)
Argument
• You demonstrate no understanding of the course content. You relay inaccurate information about the positions and arguments for those positions in the text.
Theory Analysis
• 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.