

112 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：112/05/05 10:20-12:00

本試題共 2 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 (60 %)

Passage 1

The word “canon”, in relation to textual materials, can usefully be taken in two ways: first, in general sense, as an equivalent to “scripture” (oral or written). Used in this way, the term does not specify that the collection of texts so designated constitutes a closed list; it merely assigns a certain authority to them, without excluding the possibility that others could be, or may come to be included in the collection. In the second sense, however, the idea of a “canon” contains precisely such an exclusivist specification that it is this closed list of texts, and no others, which are the “foundational documents”. (20%)

From “On the Very Idea of the Pāli Canon”

Passage 2

I believe that the Buddhist Canon has left us mere clue that it is modelled on Vedic literature than has been generally recognized. In my view, early Buddhist poems were called *sūkta*, which in Pali (and other forms of Middle Indo-Aryan) becomes *sutta*, as in *Sutta Nipāta*. Literally a *sūkta* is synonymous with a *subhāṣita*, something “well spoken”. In this case by the Buddha or one of his immediate disciples; but the word also alludes to the Veda. I am of course aware that many centuries later *sutta* was re-Sanskritized as *sūtra*. A *sūtra* is however a recognized genre of Sanskrit literature, a prose text composed with the greatest possible brevity, so that it can normally not be understood without a lengthy commentary. (20%)

From “How Mahāyāna Began”

Passage 3

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. (20%)

From “Perspective in the Study of Chinese Buddhism”

2. Please summarize the central points of the following passage, and write your comments to it in Chinese (40%).

The critique of the classical paradigm in Buddhist Studies can take other forms as well. There are those who claim, for example, 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 some instances, the critique goes further, not only bemoaning the narrowness of the data traditionally considered (a critique of content) but also attacking the traditional means of studying the data that *is* considered (a critique of method). The latter often takes the form of a repudiation of classical Buddhist philology, seen by its detractors as a naive and scientific approach to the study of written texts. 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”