

不需要直譯，簡潔說明下列之文意。

1. 以下選文摘自 Shelly Kagan (2012) *Death*. Yale University Press.

“So here's the set of common views. First of all, we have a soul, that is to say, we are not just bodies. We're not just lumps of flesh and bone, instead, there's a part of us, perhaps the essential part of us, that is something more than physical—it's the spiritual, immaterial part of us. As I say, in this book we'll call that a soul. Most of us believe in souls. Maybe you do too. Certainly most people in America believe in some sort of immaterial soul. And given the existence of this immaterial soul—the common view continues—It's a possibility, indeed a fair likelihood, that we will survive our deaths. Death will be the destruction of my body, but my soul is immaterial, and so my soul can continue to exist after my death. Of course, there is much that we can't know about death; death is the ultimate mystery. But whether or not you do believe in a soul, you probably at least hope that there is a soul, because then this will be a serious possibility of surviving your death. After all, death is not only bad, it is so horrible that what we would like is to live forever. Immortality would be wonderful. And armed with a soul, as it were, there is at least the possibility of immortality. At any rate, that's certainly what we hope is the case—that we are immortal souls—whether or not we know that it's the case. And if there's no soul, if death is the end, then this is such an overwhelmingly bad thing that the obvious reaction, the appropriate reaction, the universal reaction, is to face the prospect of death and despair. Finally, given how horrible death is, and given how wonderful life is, it could never make sense to throw your life away. Thus, on the one hand, suicide is always irrational; and on the other hand, it is always immoral as well.

“That, as I say, is what I take to be a common set of views about the nature of death. And what I'm going to be doing what I'm going to be arguing in this book, is that the set of views is pretty much mistaken from beginning to end. I am going to try to convince you that there is no soul. I am going to trying to convince you that immortality would not be a good

thing. That fear of death isn't actually an appropriate response to Death. That death isn't especially mysterious. That suicide, under certain circumstances, might be both rationally and morally justified. As I say, I think that the common picture is pretty much mistaken from start to end, and I'm going to try to convince you of that. That, at least, is my goal. That's my aim." (50%)

2. 以下選文摘自 Stephen Darwall (2002) **Welfare and Rational Care**.

"Reasons of care, on the other hand, are welfare-regarding and agent neutral. From the perspective of "one caring", the cared for's values are regulative only insofar as they are represented in his welfare or good. Of course, they very frequently are, but they generate reasons of care only to the extent that they are. Moreover, to one caring, considerations of welfare present themselves as agent-neutral, rather than agent-relative. From the perspective of sympathetic concern, what benefits the cared for seems not only good for him; it seems a good thing absolutely (agent-neutrally) that he benefited in this way."

"Think of a parent's relation to his child at different stages of life. A toddler's desires and will give normative reasons to a parent just insofar as they indicate or represent what is for the child's good. If the child doesn't want to eat his broccoli, then this fact may have no independent weight, except insofar as it indicates that it will be frustrating, painful, and so on, to the child to do so. When, however, the child matures into a competent agent, then his will and desires do acquire independent weight. For a parent to be regulated only by his child's good at this point is paternalism in the pejorative sense." (50%)