

111 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：111/05/06 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 (20%) and write your comments and thoughts in Chinese on this passage (30%).

Critical distance from the object of intellectual analysis is necessary. Buddhists, by virtue of their religious commitment, lack such critical distance from Buddhism. Hence, Buddhists are *never* good buddhologists. Or, alternatively, those who take any aspect of Buddhist doctrine seriously (whether pro or con) are scientifically suspect by virtue of allowing their individual beliefs to affect their scholarship. Good scholarship is neutral as regards questions of truth. Hence, evaluative/ normative scholarship falls outside of the purview of Buddhist Studies.

From “Buddhist Studies as a Discipline and the Role of Theory”

2 Please write in Chinese the summary of the following two passages. (50%)

(1) 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. (25%)

Form “Perspective in the Study of Chinese Buddhism”

(2) There is today a call for the increased investigation of alternative semiotic forms—oral and vernacular traditions, epigraphy, ritual, patterns of social and institutional evolution, gender, lay and folk traditions, art, archaeology and architecture. Moreover, many of the critics who push for greater scholarly emphasis on the nondoctrinal are asking for more than merely a voice, since part of the critique is that the study of alternative semiotic forms directly impinges on, and challenges, the validity of the strictly chirographic-doctrinal paradigm. The claim is not simply that the investigation of other semiotic forms should exist alongside the study of doctrine as it is found in written texts, but that doctrine itself cannot be fully understood independently of culture in the broad sense of the term. (25%)

From “Buddhist Studies as a Discipline and the Role of Theory”