

史特勞斯論洛克

周家瑜

國立臺北大學公共行政暨政策學系助理教授

以批判現代自然權利危機著名的列奧史特勞斯（Leo Strauss）在其經典著作《自然權利與歷史》中論證：洛克並不像一般以為的是一個傳統的自然法思想家，相反的，洛克的政治思想所呈現的只是一個「表面上的傳統基督教自然法」，另一方面，以唐恩（John Dunn）為首的洛克研究者則將洛克視為傳統的自然法思想家，並主張洛克的政治思想建立在明確的神學基礎上。在這篇文章裡所要指出的是：兩種詮釋似乎有共同的缺失，也就是他們共同假定「霍布斯主義就等同於霍布斯」，因此儘管在結論上相互對立，但實際上共享同一個比較基準。

關鍵字：洛克、霍布斯、史特勞斯、自然法、自然權利

Leo Strauss on John Locke

Chia-yu Chou

Assistant Professor

Department of Public Administration and Policy, National Taipei University

ABSTRACT

In his *Natural Right and History*, Leo Strauss argued that rather than being a traditional natural law theorist as usually thought, John Locke “deviated considerably from the traditional natural law teaching and followed the lead given by Hobbes”. In contrast, John Dunn argued that the Hobbesian question is irrelevant to the political problem that Locke intended to tackle. In this essay, I intend to first examine the seeming opposition between the two camps. I argued that while the two sides seem to hold diametrically opposite conclusions about Locke’s political philosophy in general, Locke’s theoretical relationship with Hobbes in particular, they share the common basis of Hobbism in the sense that they both take for granted the main assumptions of Hobbism as they proceed with the comparison.

Key Words: John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Leo Strauss, laws of nature, natural right