

“Eudaimonism” in Classical West and East as Philosophy of Education Today

Justin Nnaemeka ONYEUKAZIRI, (PhD)
Fu Jen Catholic University, Taiwan.

Abstract

This paper is a critique of the culture, method and end of education today. It claims that education today does not aim at the integral formation and cultivation of a person. Put differently, it claims that philosophy of education critically speaking ought to be a kind of eudaimonism. Education ought to be fundamentally about the Ultimate good of the human person, and the task of philosophy of education is to critically establish and direct education towards the ultimate good of the human person. Philosophy of Education in a very simple but fundamental sense, is a critical attempt to understand the foundation of education, that is to say, the nature and the end of education. What kind of education ought to be given to children in a city or nation-state, has been an ancient question in different civilizations. This work, is not only a critique of contemporary educational systems, but also a call for a philosophy of education that fundamentally connects education with the Good or Happy life. Hence, this research is an investigation on a philosophical education that is based on the eudaimonistic principle initiated by Plato and Aristotle and sustained by the philosophers of antiquity, such as the Epicureans and the Stoics. It also expounds ancient Chinese philosophy, to sustain the argument that an eudaimonistic philosophy of education has a universal effect and application.

Keywords: Classics, Philosophy, Education, Eudemonism, Confucianism, Happy Life.

Introduction

This research simply put is a critique of the culture, method and end of education today. It claims that education today does not aim at the integral formation and cultivation of a person. Hence, it explores the classical notion of education in the West and the East (focusing on Classical Confucianism) that squarely emphasizes education as the formation and cultivation of the soul, that aims at the ultimate good or happiness of the human person. This classical philosophy of education, in this work is exposed as *eudaimonia*. This eudaimonic end of education is clearly emphasized in the thought of Plato and Aristotle and subsequent Greco-Roman philosophers. It also demonstrates, that the classical Chinese philosophers also maintains this eudaimonic end of education. This work calls for a transformation in education today. It calls for a re-establishment of the superiority of liberal education over servile education. It is therefore, a call for action, that posits the ultimate good of the human person as the ultimate end of education. This will be achieved by investigating a philosophical education based on the eudaimonistic principle initiated by Plato and Aristotle and sustained by the philosophers of antiquity, such as the Cynics, the Cyrenaics, the Epicureans and the Stoics. It also expounds ancient Chinese philosophy, to sustain the argument that an eudaimonistic philosophy of education has a universal effect and application. Hence, the research will be executed thus: 1. Exposition of Eudaimonistic Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity. 2. Eudaimonistic Nature of Confucian Education. 3. A Case for Philosophy of Education as Eudaimonism. This would be followed by a Conclusion.

Exposition of Eudaimonistic Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity

This section is to show that both Plato and Aristotle consider the end of education as a happy life both of the individual and of the city-state at large. This could be seen in the works *Republic* and *Politics* of Plato and Aristotle respectively. The primary problematic in the dialogue, *Republic*, is Justice. The efforts to define justice that is to know the *quiddity* (essence) of Justice, created a whole discussion of what ought to be the ideal City-State and what kind of people should constitute the City-State and their different roles. In the dialogue, Socrates contends that the best way to define Justice, is by the means of knowing the Just person. To know the just person, one need to know first, what a just city is, its nature and end, since the just person is part of a just city (see, *Republic* BK II, 369a). This leads to a long discourse on an ideal political economy of the Platonic city-state. Gathered by individual self-insufficiency, in order to compliment the lack in oneself by the strength of the other, every one, therefore, aims at the common good of the city-state. A special education is needed for the persons whose role is to guard and govern the city-state. This kind of education should be in accordance with the nature of the ideal person. Furthermore, this education is formulated towards the formation and development of the entire human person, body and soul, but most importantly the three parts of the soul—irrational, spirited and rational, with special attention given to the rational part of the soul. Of which, Socrates in the dialogue, posits the love of learning or love of wisdom, which is philosophy, as the special education in accordance to the nature of a good guardian for a proper discharge of his duty. However, this education must begin with music and poetry (though with great censorship) for the cultivation of the soul in the exercise of harmony and moderation and physical training for the strength and health of the body (see, *Republic* BK II, 376b-e; BK III, 404e). The ultimate end of the musical and poetic cultivation of the soul and physical training of the body is the harmony of the spirited and wisdom-loving parts of the soul *per se* (*Republic* Bk III, 411e).

In the dialogue, Socrates argues that the end of this kind of education is not just for an individual happiness but it is in order to establish a happy city-state, to ensure that the city-state as a whole has the greatest happiness (*Republic* BK IV, 420b-421c). This education, is ordered in such a way that there would be the cultivation of the four cardinal virtues of wisdom, courage, moderation (temperance) and justice, which are necessary for a happy city-state (*Republic* Bk IV 427e-435b). This shows a fundamental connection between education, virtue and happiness. The ultimate end of education is happiness and there cannot be happiness without the cultivation of virtue, most importantly the cardinal virtues of wisdom, courage, moderation (temperance) and justice. In sum, in book VII of *Republic*, the famous allegory of the cave was employed by Socrates to elucidate the effect of education, which is to disperse ignorance, mere perceptions and opinions, to lead one to the truth—the knowledge of things *per se*, the essence of things. At this juncture, Socrates contends that education is not “putting knowledge into souls that lack it, like putting sight into blind eyes” but rather that “the power to learn is present in everyone's soul and that the instrument with which each learns is like an eye that cannot be turned around from darkness to light without turning the whole body. This instrument cannot be turned around from that which is coming into being without turning the whole soul until it is able to study that which is and the brightest thing that is, namely, the one we call the good” (*Republic* Bk VII, 518b-c). Thus, education is an activity of the soul, the redirection of the soul to the light of knowledge, which is Truth. The contemplation of the Truth, therefore, is the happiness of the soul. The happy person, therefore, is one who is rich in a good and rational life (*Republic* Bk VII, 521a). Simply put, the

end of education should be in order to be rich in good and rational life, that is to say, the excellence in virtue and intellection. This sought of education, must be absolutely free, without coercion, “because no free person should learn anything like a slave. Forced bodily labor does no harm to the body, but nothing taught by force stays in the soul” (Republic Bk VII, 536e).

Aristotle begins his work, *Politics*, with a teleological motif, by contending that every political community or the state “is established with a view to some good”, not just for a certain good but for the highest good (Bk I, 1252a1-10). He posits “justice” by which in this context he means “the common interest” as the good of political science, of which proper subject as a science, is the political community or the state (Politics Bk III, 1282b15-20). However, in respect to the good of the state *per se*, he maintains that the highest good is the good life, of which education and excellence (virtue) are of superior importance (Politics Bk III, 1283a23-25). Making reference to his eudaimonic position in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, he sustains “the happy life”, as what characterizes the best constitution of government. Of which he describes the happy life as “the life according to excellence lived without impediment, and that excellence is a mean, then the life which is a mean, and in a mean attainable by everyone, must be the best” (Politics Bk IV, 1295a35-1295b1). The life of the mean, which for him is life in accordance to the rational principle of the soul, in other words, the intellectual life (1295b5-10). In Book VII, Aristotle plunged into the question of the best life, eligible for all the member of a state. He maintains that the happy man ought to have the threefold goods of life: “external goods, goods of the body and goods of the soul” (1323a25-30). He elevates the goods of the soul, which is intellectual activities and moral excellence (*arête*), over and above the other two goods. Hence, he submits that “happiness, whether consisting in pleasure or excellence, or both, is more often found with those who are most highly cultivated in their mind and in their character, and have only a moderate share of external goods, than among those who possess external goods to a useless extent but are deficient in higher qualities” (1323b1-10). This follows that for him, the cultivation of the soul is indispensable for the happy life of an individual person and for the state at large. Whereas, the usefulness or utility of external goods decreases inversely proportional to increment of the external goods, while, the utility of the goods of the soul increases directly proportional to the increment of the goods of the soul. Thus, he sustains that “each one has just so much of happiness as he has of excellence and wisdom, and of excellent and wise action” (1323b20). This, he claims also applies to the state. He maintains that “the happy state may be shown to be that which is best and which acts rightly; and it cannot act rightly without doing right actions, and neither individual nor state can do right actions without excellence and wisdom” (1323b25-30). Therefore, he submits that “the best life, both for individuals and states, is the life of excellence, when excellence has external good enough for the performance of good actions” (1323b35-1324a1). He thus, with several examples of states in antique (1324b1-40), sustains that the educational formation given by a state is determined by what the state considers to be the best life. Hence, positing an eudaimonic relationship between education and the good life or happy life (life of excellence or virtue) of individuals and the state.

Aristotle posits three principles that make the human person good and excellent, and they are, nature, habit and reason. Among the three, only reason is exclusively a principle in the human person, since, nature (instinct) and habit are common in humans and other animals. For the human person to lead the happy life, the three principles of nature, habit and reason, must be in harmony with one another. The strive that constantly exist between these three principles, besides the use of legislation, must be regulated and harmonized by education (1332b1-10). Therefore, education

should be planned and executed with the best end of the human person in mind; with the view that leisure and peace are more superior than business and war; what is honourable in life is superior to what is necessary to survive and what is useful in life (1333b1-5). What is honourable in life actually deals with the formation of the rational part of the soul, the intellectual and moral activities of the soul. While what is necessary and useful in life deal with the irrational part of the soul and the corporal part of the human person. He emphasizes the place of excellence in leisure to the formation of both a happy person and a happy state, saying, “Since the end of individuals and of states is the same, the end of the best man and of the best constitution must also be the same; it is therefore evident that there ought to exist in both of them, the excellence of leisure” (1334a10-15). Leisure is very necessary for the cultivation of the rational part of the soul, and this explains the relationship between philosophy and leisure. Hence, Aristotle contends, “Courage and endurance are required for business and philosophy for leisure, temperance and justice for both, and more especially in times of peace and leisure” (1334a20-25). He concludes the work, *Politics*, with these words on education: “Thus it is clear that education should be based upon three principles—the mean, the possible, the becoming, these three” (Bk VIII, 1342b30ff). These three principles are intrinsically connected to the intellectual and moral excellence of the human person and the state.

Eudaimonism is the principle that guides, especially, the practical philosophies of Aristotle. He systematically constructed this principle and expounded on it in his work entitled, *Nicomachean Ethics* (NE). He begins this work thus: “Every art and every inquiry, and similarly every action and choice, is thought to aim at some good; and for this reason the good has rightly been declared to be that at which all things aim” (Bk I, 1094a1-5). Every action and choice we make, in the final analysis, is in order to live, in other words, their good is life or for the good life. What then is the purpose of living or the good or end of life? What is the ultimate good of the human person? What is the good life? These are the questions, at the heart of eudaimonism through the Greco-Roman period. Socratic-Plato, entertained this questions in their philosophical discourse, but it was Aristotle that initiated these questions into the central enterprise of philosophy, by sustaining a systematic discourse in response to these questions. The ultimate good is that for which sake everything is done, that for which sake every action or choice is made. Hence the ultimate or chief good is complete *per se* and lacks nothing, for it is self-sufficient. it is “that which is in itself worthy of pursuit more complete than that which is worthy of pursuit for the sake of something else, and that which is never desirable for the sake of something else more complete than the things that are desirable both in themselves and for the sake of that other thing” (NE Bk I, 1097a25-30). He calls this ultimate good *eudaimonia* (roughly translated as happiness or wellbeing). However, what exactly is this happiness which is the ultimate good of every human person, as Aristotle admits, this is a big problematic among both the wise and the common people. Aristotle attempts to describe it as the “activity of soul in conformity with excellence, and if there are more than one excellence, in conformity with the best and most complete” (NE Bk I, 1098a15). A thorough reading of *Nicomachean Ethics*, shows that Aristotle himself is not clear and precise on what exactly is happiness. Thus, it became the very task of subsequent philosophical traditions to clearly define what the ultimate good, happiness, is. Hence, diverse philosophical schools after Aristotle were developed for the education and training of people to lead life in accordance to their notion of the ultimate good. This sort of education, therefore, is what has been known as eudaimonism. Below, the eudaimonistic view of the following schools is

briefly exposed: Cyrenaic, Cynicism, Epicureanism and Stoicism.

The philosophical school Cyrenaicism, most probably was founded in Athens, by Aristippos/Aristippus of Cyrene (c.435-c.360BC). He went to Athens from Cyrene, attracted to the teachings of Socrates and become one of the companions of Socrates. By his own life and teachings, Aristippos maintains that the ultimate good is in the enjoyment of pleasure, no wonder “he was the first of the followers of Socrates to charge fees and to send money to his master” (Diogenes Laertius, n.65). Hence, for the Cyrenaics, living pleasurably each day is the ultimate good, for only the present day is within the control of a person. From the Church Father, Athenaeus, we are informed that “All the philosophical schools have contended about the choice of enjoyment; and that which is known as the Cyrenaic school took its origin from Aristippos the Socratic, who taught that the enjoyment of pleasure is the end of life, and that happiness resides in that” (cited in Robin Hard, 2012, n.538). One may disagree (as many of their contemporaries did) with the Cyrenaics philosophy of life, but the point is that they were committed to the education of Aristippos in leading a life that is consistent to their belief that present enjoyment of pleasure without worrying of the past or the future, as the ultimate good. Happiness is in present sensual satisfaction (bodily pleasure) and not in being mastered by pleasure but in mastering pleasure. According to Diogenes Laertius, “They also hold that there is a difference between “end” and “happiness.” Our end is particular pleasure, whereas happiness is the sum total of all particular pleasures, in which are included both past and future pleasures” (Lives of Eminent Philosophers, n.87). This eudaimonistic attitude which was later called hedonism, had a strong influence on the Epicureans.

The school Cynicism, was founded by Diogenes the Cynic (c.404-c.323BC), also known as the Dog. He is from Sinope but lived and practiced his philosophy in Athens. Having being influenced by the teaching of Antisthenes who emphasizes the ascetic way of life, he chose a radical way of life that maintains the critical attitude of Socrates to conventions, but to the extreme. He chose to live a frugal life of a beggar on the street or in a jar during the cold. He considers himself as “a liberator of humanity, a healer of human ills... a prophet of truth and plain speaking” (in Robin Hard, n.1). His view on the noblest of men is “Those who despise riches, reputation, pleasure and concern for life, and are thus able to overmaster their opposites, poverty, ill-repute, suffering, and death” (Stobaeus in Robin Hard, n.78). Following their master, the Cynics maintained the choice of life, which is to fight against pleasure and to clean up human life. They took upon themselves poverty and self-sufficiency as way of life. Thus, positing poverty as the natural aid to philosophy, since the end of all philosophizing is to be self-sufficient, a free choice of poverty is thus, its quickest route. According to Diogenes Laertius, “they maintain, that the end is to live in accordance with virtue.... that we should live a simple life, feeding only to sustain ourselves, wearing only a single cloak, and scorning wealth, repute, and high births.... It is the privilege of the gods to need nothing, and of those who are like the gods to need little” (in Robin Hard, n. 27). For them the ultimate end is virtue and the ultimate good is happiness and happiness is the mind and soul being in a state of calm and serenity. This eudaimonistic attitude to life, explains why they have strong influence on Stoicism.

As mentioned above the school Epicureanism was influenced by Cyrenaicism, especially in respect to their ethics and way of life. However, their philosophy of nature and general metaphysics was influenced by the atomistic philosophy of Democritus. Thus, their metaphysical orientation is materialistic. Epicurus (341-271 BC) who hailed from Athens was the founder of

Epicureanism. Epicureanism holds that the ultimate good is pleasure. Influenced by their master, the Epicureans believe that “the totality is [made up of] <bodies and void>; for in all cases sense-perception itself testifies that bodies exist, and it is by sense-perception that we must infer by reasoning what is non-evident” (Diogenes Laertius in Brad Inwood, n.37). This implies, only bodies and void (which are unlimited and eternal) exist, nothing spiritual including the gods exist. In *Letter to Menoecus*, Epicurus writes to one of his students enjoining him, thus: “Do and practice what I constantly told you to do, believing these to be the elements of living well. First, believe that god is an indestructible and blessed animal.... Get used to believing that death is nothing to us. For all good and bad consists in sense-experience, and death is the privation of sense-experience” (Diogenes Laertius in Brad Inwood, n.123). Simply put, since everything is matter and atoms, one should not fear death because there is nothing after death. For it is the fear of death and the longing for immortality, that cause disturbance and restlessness in the human person. As Epicurus contends, “So death, the most frightening of bad things, is nothing to us; since when we exist, death is not yet present, and when death is present, then we do not exist” (n.125). Therefore, one ought to be contented with the present life and maximize its enjoyments, seek pleasure and avoid pain, for the ultimate goal is freedom of the soul from disturbance. Thus, while the Cyrenaics directly seek bodily pleasure as a positive end, the Epicureans seek pleasure in the soul by the avoidance of pains, in other words as a negative end. Epicurus himself, clarifies their position on pleasure thus: “So when we say that pleasure is the goal we do not mean the pleasures of the profligate or the pleasures of consumption, as some believe, either from ignorance and disagreement or from deliberate misinterpretation, but rather the lack of pain in the body and disturbance in the soul” (n.131). Hence, they maintain, “pleasure is the starting-point and goal of living blessedly” (n.128), as the sum of their eudaimonistic attitude.

Just as Epicureanism was influenced by Cyrenaicism, Stoicism was influenced by Cynicism. Stoicism was founded by Zeno (c.334-262 BC) around 300BC in Athens. According to Seneca, who himself is a prominent Roman Stoic, Stoics follows the guidance of Nature (Reason), “a doctrine upon which all Stoics are agreed. Not to stray from Nature and to mould ourselves according to her law and pattern—this is true wisdom” (On the Happy Life, III,3). Sustaining this line of thought, Epictetus (AD 50-135), another stoic, contends, “The subject-matter with which the good and excellent man has to deal is his own governing principle, that of a physician and the masseur is the body, of a farmer is his farm; but the function of the good and excellent man is to deal with his impressions in accordance with nature” (Bk III, ch.3). This “governing principle” which is the subject-matter of the good and excellent man is Reason. On the enquiry on what is the Happy Life, Seneca maintains that “The happy life, therefore, is a life that is in harmony with its own nature, and it can be attained in only one way. First of all, we must have a sound mind and one that is in constant possession of its sanity; second, it must be courageous and energetic, and, too, capable of the noblest fortitude, ready for every emergency, careful of the body and of all that concerns it, but without anxiety; lastly, it must be attentive to all the advantages that adorn life, but with over-much love for none—the user, but not the slave, of the gifts of Fortune” (On the Happy Life, III, 4). The end of these attitude, is the tranquility, peace and harmony of the soul, “boundless joy that is firm and unalterable” (On the Happy Life, III,4). From another perspective, Seneca maintains that for the Stoics, the ultimate or highest good “is a mind that scorns the happenings of chance, and rejoices only in virtue.... or say it is the power of the mind to be unconquerable, wise from experience, calm in action, showing the while much courtesy and consideration in

intercourse with others” (On the Happy Life, IV,2). For the Stoics, therefore virtuous life in accordance to Reason is the only good, the only treasure worth living and dying for.

Eudaimonistic Nature of Confucian Education

The Confucian Analects (), begins with the question of 「 W 」 (studying and learning/practice). It is maintained that, it is pleasurable to put study or learning into practice ([「 爾 之 , 不亦 乎 」 (. 爾篇第一)] Analects Bk I). Which shows that Confucius and his disciples consider educational formation as central to human development. Education should be aimed at the moral cultivation and social integration of the human person. The ultimate end of Confucian education is the cultivation of the ontological *cum* moral principle 「仁」 (Ren), that constitutes the *quiddity* of the Confucian human person. The four books that constitute the Confucian classes, all defines the human person thus: [「仁者人也」], that is to say, what makes the human being a person is Ren(「仁」).

Ren(仁) as a Chinese character pre-dates Confucius, but it could be said that it was Confucius that employed the character 「仁」 as a philosophical category and concept. In the thought process of the Chinese people, the notion of 「仁」 has evolved in its signification. From, the loving experience among family members and kin, 「塾」, as it could be found in the text 《 》 and 《左 》, to 「人」 (“love humanity or human love”). With Confucius, henceforth, it becomes a more philosophical concept, possessing meaning extending beyond family or kinship love, to becoming the ground for moral value in the society [(「道德 值」)。] In the major Confucian classical text, the term 「仁」 is a key term but used with slightly different significations. For instance, in the Analects 《 里仁》, it is maintained 「不仁者不可以久 , 不可以 。仁者安仁 , 知者利仁。」¹ Here, 「仁」 signifies moral virtue, whereby a contrast is made between the moral person 「仁者」 who has cultivated the moral essence 「仁」 and 「不仁者」, who lacks happiness due to lack of the cultivation of 「仁」. Thus, 「仁」 is posited as the source not only morality but the source for a tranquil and serene happy living(「仁者安仁」). The privation of 「仁」 leads to the inability to persevere in adversity and the inability to be self-controlled and modest in bountifulness (「不仁者不可以久 , 不可以 貳.

The end of Chinese philosophy in a sense is, the self-cultivation and the serenity of the human person(「修己安人」). The *quiddity* of the human person in the Confucian anthropology is 「仁」(《中庸》:「仁者人也」;《孟子公孫丑章句上第七章》:「 之心, 仁之端也; 〇 之心, 非人也」;「仁也者, 人也。合而言之, 道也」²). These assertions simply maintains that to be a person is to possess 「仁」, that is to say to be a moral being(「道德物」). It is thus, morality that distinguishes the human person from other living beings. The ultimate purpose of education therefore is, self-cultivation 「修己」, aimed at the development and enhancement of the principle of 「仁」 in the human nature. On the socio-political level, this self-cultivation produces the ideal person in the Confucian socio-political

1. 【宋】朱熹,《四書章句集注》,台北市:長安出版社,民國80年。For English reading see: D.C. Lau (trans.) (1992). Confucius: The Analects (Bilingual Edition). Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

2. 【宋】朱熹,《四書章句集注》,台北市:長安出版社,民國80年。

thought, 「君子」(junzi). However, the ultimate end is to become the Sacred Sage (人), the transcendental *persona* (personhood), that everyone ought to aspire to. Education, therefore, ought to be organized and executed towards this socio-political and transcendental end. As a result, these concepts "Li" 「禮」 and "Yue" 「樂」 are both emphasized in Confucian philosophy, as the educational means for the self-cultivation of the human person. While Confucius (孔子) and Mencius (孟子), emphasize 「禮」, Xunzi (荀子) emphasizes 「樂」 in the self-cultivation of the human person. While 「禮」 is the philosophical concept for socio-political order and harmony, 「樂」 is the philosophical concept for the interior order and harmony of an individual person. With both 「禮」 and 「樂」, the external cultivation of the social-ethical person, 「仁德」, and the internal cultivation of the moral law, 「仁道」, respectively could be developed.

In 《孟子·公孫丑章句上第七章》, it is maintained: 「天之尊爵也, 人之安宅也。莫之而不仁, 是不智也。不仁、不智、○、○, 人役也」,³ where, 「仁」 as a theoretical substance, is posited as the foundational principle for the three practical principles that intrinsically define the human person, namely, 「智」, 「禮」 and 「樂」. Thus, the concept 「仁」, is not just a moral virtue but the principle of all virtues. It has the concept of 「道」 as its First Principle; 「德」 as its Manifestation and 「孝悌」 as its Ground. 「道」 is 「天道」 and 「德」 is 「仁/人道」. 「仁道」 as the moral reduction of 「天道」 in the human person, is that which makes the transcendental union of the human person with the Nature/Heavens possible (「天人合一」/「天人合德」), which is the ultimate end of the human person. Therefore, for the Confucians, education must be aimed at the transcendental union of the human person with Nature as its ultimate end.

A Case for Philosophy of Education as Eudaimonism

This work posits the question central to Eudaimonism, which is: "What is the good life or happy life?" as the end of philosophy of Education. Put differently, this work claims that philosophy of education critically speaking ought to be a kind of eudaimonism. Education ought to be fundamentally about the Ultimate good of the human person, and the task of philosophy of education is to critically establish and direct education towards the ultimate good of the human person. Philosophy of Education in a very simple but fundamental sense, is a critical attempt to understand the foundation of education, that is to say, the nature and the end of education. What kind of education ought to be given to children in a city or nation-state, has been an ancient question in different civilizations. In ancient Greek, as exposed above, we find it in Plato's *Republic* and in Aristotle's *Politics*, both raised and discussed the question within a general discourse on politics or political economy. However, their aim is to construct an ideal nation-state of an ideal people who enjoys or ought to have a good or happy life. In investigating the Ultimate good of the human person, Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, contends that the Ultimate good of the human person is *Eudaimonia*, commonly translated in English as Happiness, Blessedness

3【宋】朱熹,《四書章句集注》,台北市:長安出版社,民國80年。

or Wellbeing. This question on what is the Ultimate good of the human person, as exemplified in the lives of sages or wise men, became the nucleus of the Hellenistic philosophical traditions, becoming what is, henceforth, known as Eudaimonism. Hence, every philosophical tradition during the Hellenistic period, was a kind of eudaimonistic tradition. People seek to be educated by a philosopher/sage, mainly because they seek to lead a good or happy life. Thus, making the end of education the strive for a good and happy life, through intellectual discourse and the pursuit of moral and virtuous living. This philosophy of education thus is eudaimonism. Similar experience is found in ancient Chinese civilization. The ultimate end of education in the thought of ancient Chinese philosophers is the moral and virtuous cultivation of the human person with the view to becoming the ideal human person. This especially is not only the central end of the philosophy of education of the Confucian philosophy, originated by Confucius (孔子) and sustained by Mencius (孟子) and Xunzi (荀子), it is indeed, the nucleus of their entire philosophical, ethical and political thoughts. The Ultimate good of the ideal person (人), which is the moral person (德者), in Confucianism is (「天人合一」), that is to say the transcendental union of a person with Nature or the Absolute One.

During the middle ages, both in the West and in Chinese history, unfortunately, education began to have less and less the eudaimonistic nature and end, and began to have a more servile and utilitarian end. In the West, during the middle ages, education became mainly the privilege of those within the ecclesiastical and religious hierarchies and those around the royal courts; philosophy becomes the handmaid of theology, serving a functional end; the eudaimonistic end of philosophical education became substituted, mainly, by Christian spirituality and religious rites. In the Chinese world, during the middle ages, education became a tool to break out of poverty and the class of the common people into the elite class. The passion for education, for many, became to pass the imperial examination and become a staff in the Imperial Court. Simply put, education became a necessity for socio-economic survival and for elevation in social status. Since, the breakthrough and continuous advancement of science and technology in the modern era, with its consequent industrial, economic and commercial revolutions, education, more or less, has become a State's tool in producing citizens that can sustain the doing of servile works for the wealth of a nation. Today, schools have become more or less a capitalist factory, where labour forces are produced to fill in the spaces in the capitalist labour markets. Education today, is becoming a means by which young people obtain the tools and the certificate to secure a job and make a living. Hence, it is uncontested that the need for philosophy of education not only for professional philosophers or professional teachers but also for students, is pertinent. This work, therefore, is not only a critique of contemporary educational system, but a call for a philosophy of education that fundamentally connects education with the Good or Happy life. And as Aristotle contends, that, which was sustained by the philosophers of antiquity, the Good or Happy life deals mainly with the interior cultivation of the human person, that is, the intellectual and moral activities of the soul. Since, what distinguishes the human person from other animals, is the possession of rationality, the happiness and the good of the human person must necessarily be about the rational activities of the soul.

Conclusion

This work is a critique on education today. Education, as contended by this work has been hijacked by capitalistic economical ends. These ends make education basically pragmatic and functional. In the sense that students mainly take courses in the university to have grades and spent four or more years in the university to obtain a certificate, which has at its end finding a job and make a living. Hence, students go to school in order to secure a job, after which, they live in order to work. Teachers and schools today, therefore, have become instruments and factories that produces work forces or labour for the small, medium and big companies—private and state-run, all over the world.

The question to ask therefore is: What is the ultimate purpose of the university or college education? Why should a young boy or girl spent four years or more in the university or college? If one is guaranteed a job, whether or not one has a university or college certificate, does one still need a university education? Put simply, other than job security, is there a need to obtain a university education? If there is, then, what is it? The purpose of this work is to answer this question(s). This work by asserting the eudaimonic end of education, contends that there is fundamental need for education, especially for higher education—university or college education. The purpose of higher education is the training and cultivation of the soul; education is the activities of the soul. The activities of the soul are mainly the intellectual and moral formation of the human person. The intellectual and moral formation of the human person, is possible because the human person possesses *intellectus*, the rational part of the soul. The possession of the rational part of the soul, is what distinguishes the human person from all other animals. Therefore, education, especially the university education, ought to be focused on making or helping the young ones become or realize their personhood, by the cultivation of the distinguishing nature of the human person. Hence, the university education should aim at self-realization and self-actualization of students. During, the university education, the young should be challenged and inspired to ask serious, critical and fundamental questions about themselves, their society, the world and reality *in toto*. By completing a university education, a student, should be able to have a better self-awareness, should be able to *know thyself*. For no one could be truly happy or fulfilled who does not know his or herself.

These processes of the formation and cultivation of the soul, aimed at the ultimate good or happiness of the human person, is what has been exposed as *eudaimonia* in this work. This eudaimonic end of education is clearly emphasized in the thought of Plato and Aristotle and subsequent Greco-Roman philosophers, notwithstanding, some bioethical (such as euthanasia) or socio-political (such as exclusion of women and slaves in education) implications in the formation of their ideal person and state. It is also demonstrated, that the classical Chinese philosophers also maintains this eudaimonic end of education. Simply put, for the classical people, education is for the interior formation and integral discipline of the human person; it is a way of becoming a person; a way of life. Hence, education is philosophy and philosophy is education. People do not go to the philosopher or sage to be educated in order *to make a living*, but in order *to live*; they do not go, in order *to obtain a certificate*, but in order *to obtain wisdom*; they do not go to school because *they have to*, but because they *need to*; they do not go to school because they *feel compelled by parents or society*, but because they are *freely moved by the love of wisdom and Truth*; they were not interested in *riches and wealth*, but they were interested in *virtue*

and honour.

In conclusion therefore, to save education today, is to re-establish the superiority of liberal education over servile education. That is to say, to re-establish the place of leisure for learning and learning for leisure, over and above, learning for utility and for work. This work, therefore is a call for action that posit the ultimate good of the human person as the ultimate end of education. This was achieved by investigating a philosophical education based on the eudaimonistic principle initiated by Aristotle and sustained by the philosophers of antiquity, such as the Cynics, the Cyrenaics, the Epicureans and the Stoics. And of which the ancient Chinese philosophy was also exposed, to sustain the argument that an eudaimonistic philosophy of education has a universal effect and application.

References

- Aristotle (1984). "Politics" (tr. by B. Jowett). *The Complete Works of Aristotle* (Vol. II), Jonathan Barnes (ed.), New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Aristotle (1984). "Nicomachean Ethics" (tr. by W.D. Ross/ revised by J.O. Urmson), *The Complete Works of Aristotle* (Vol. II), Jonathan Barnes (ed.), New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Brad Inwood (ed) (2003). *The Cambridge Companion to The Stoics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brad Inwood and L. P. Gerson (trans. & eds.) (1994). *The Epicurus Reader: Selected Writings and Testimonia*, Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- D.C. Lau (trans.) (1992). *Confucius: The Analects* (Bilingual Edition), Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Diogenes Laertius (1972). *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Bk 1-5), R.D. Hicks (trans.), Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Robin Hard (trans.) (2012). *Diogenes the Cynic Sayings and Anecdotes: With Other Popular Moralists*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Epictetus (1985). *The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual, and Fragments* (Vol. II), W.A. Oldfather, (trans.), (Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Plato (1997). *Complete Works*, John M. Cooper & D.S. Hutchinson (eds.), Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Seneca (1932). *Moral Essays* (Vol. II), John W. Basore (trans.), (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932).
- 【宋】朱熹 (1991) 《四 黻澆 貳 L 笔 : 安出版社。