

109 學年度佛教學系博士班入學試題

科目：佛學研究暨佛學英文 日期：2020.5.8 10:20-12:00

本試題共 3 面，本頁為第 1 面。

試題需收回
 試題不需收回

1. Please translate the following passage into Chinese. Try to translate it as literally as possible. (40%)

In this paper I address the issue of the formation and role of the Pali Canon in Theravāda history and culture. My perspective is strictly that of an external observer wishing to make an academic discussion of the issue: I mean to imply no evaluation whatsoever of any way in which the Canon has been or is seen by Theravāda Buddhists. From this perspective and for these purposes, I want to suggest that the role of the Canonical texts in Theravāda tradition has been misunderstood, and that the usual scholarly focus on the early period of Theravāda is misplaced. We must, I will suggest, reject the equation ‘the Pali Canon = Early Buddhism’, and move away from an outmoded and quixotic concern with origins to what I would see as a properly focused and realistic historical perspective. Rather than pre-existing the Theravāda school, as the textual basis from which it arose and which it sought to preserve, the Pali Canon --- by which I mean the closed list of the scriptures with a special and specific authority as the avowed historical record of the Buddha’s teaching --- should be seen as a *product* of that school, as part of a strategy of legitimation by the monks of the Mahāvihāra lineage in Ceylon in the early centuries of the first millennium A.D.

----- from “On the Very Idea of the Pali Canon”

2. Please read the following passage and answer the questions below in Chinese or in English. (30%)

If divergent methodological approaches to the study of Buddhism are emerging, then the time has come for us to seriously consider these alternative methodologies and to ask what role methodological reflection should play in the field today. For the past

several years, different approaches to the study of Buddhism have emerged that challenge what they take to be the **classical paradigm**, which has constituted "**classical Buddhology**", and which is portrayed as overly concerned with a specific geographical area (usually India). This methodological approach is said to have two problematics: (1) by equating the study of Buddhism with its study in specific geographically hegemonic area, classical Buddhology has been charged with impairing the development of areas of research --- Chinese, Tibetan and South Asian Buddhist Studies, and (2) it makes of the study of the languages and civilization of these other areas mere tools to the study of the dominant cultural region, i.e., India. Moreover, there are those who claim that the field focuses almost exclusively on written, doctrinal texts to the exclusion of other semiotic (that is, meaning-producing) forms (e.g., oral texts, epigraphical and archaeological data, rituals, institutions, art and social practices). In other instances, traditional Buddhology is seen as overly narrow in its scope --- in its hyperspecialization, unconcerned with broader, comparative questions and unable to enter into dialogue with the wider intellectual community.

---- from "Buddhist Studies as a Discipline and the Role of Theory"

問題: 請指出上文中作者指出所謂的“classical paradigm” 或者所謂的“classical Buddhology”的研究方法為何？作者指出這樣的研究方法或進路對佛教研究 (Buddhist Studies) 來說有哪些缺陷或局限？(30%) 可用中文或英文作答

3. Please read the following passage and answer the questions below in Chinese or in English. (30%)

Let me present the gist of what I have to say in the form of three **paradoxes**. **First**, that our view of Chinese Buddhism as a historical phenomenon is greatly obscured by the abundance of our source materials. **Second**, that if we want to define what was the normal state of medieval Chinese Buddhism, we should concentrate on what seems to be abnormal. **Third**, if we want to complete our picture of what this Buddhism really was, we have to look outside Chinese Buddhism itself.

I realize that the perspective which I have presented leaves many questions unanswered, and that it only represents one kind of approach. **Firstly**, it is an attempt to get away from the view that early Chinese Buddhism is a more or less homogeneous whole, presented to us by the thousands of texts that we have at our

disposal, and to replace that view by a more critical approach stressing the stratified nature of Chinese Buddhism, and the fact that we know too much about too little.

Secondly, it attempts to get away from the tendency to overstress the identity of Chinese Buddhism as a clear-cut, independent tradition different from other types of Chinese religion. Here again, I believe that we are led astray by the fact that our materials are focused upon the very top, the products of the clerical elite, the level at which Buddhism was most articulate, and its unique identity as a system of religion and philosophy was most clearly expressed. It can be demonstrated that, as soon as we go below that top level, quite another picture emerges, in which Buddhism loses much of its sharp contour, as it is absorbed into the surrounding mass of Chinese indigenous religion. **Thirdly**, it is an attempt to redress the balance, not by underestimating the value of the study of the Great Tradition (for it evidently contains the most admirable products of Chinese Buddhism), but by developing, in addition, ways and means to penetrate further down — to sink shafts into the hidden body of the iceberg.

---- from “Perspectives in the Study of Chinese Buddhism”

問題：請根據上文 1. 解說作者認為漢傳佛教研究有哪三種吊詭（paradox），2. 作者對漢傳佛教研究方向上或方法上提出哪些觀點或建議？(30%)可用中文或英文作答