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提 要

佛學研究在歐美和日本的大學中已有百年以上的歷史，成績斐然。反觀國內，從事佛學研究的工作仍只是佛學院與少數宗教所與哲研所的學者參與佛教思想與經典的研究，至於佛教文學，在各大學文學系、所幾乎乏人問津，最大的原因是缺乏一部《中國佛教文學史》來提供相關視野。

然而作佛教文學研究可以針對局部性的問題一部分、一部分，慢慢梳理，作《中國佛教文學史》建構，卻必須面對全部範疇的釐清與全面性方法論的檢討等問題，這是本文難以完整掌握的地方。二十一世界的今天，中國大陸已經有許多團隊開始著手建構，台灣卻仍然沉寂無聲。

基於佛教文學教育的普及所需，建構《中國文學史》是必需且必要之策略。筆者已曾寫過一篇〈《中國佛教文學史》建構方法論芻議〉，擬藉此機會「再譯」，一方面參酌一般《中國文學史》的建構方法，一方面對照思考文學材料取材範疇的相關問題；其次，本文以中國佛教文學「範疇論」與「建構方法論舉隅」為討論內容，範疇論方面，本文主張「一、文人創作；二、佛經文學；三、僧人創作」三大範疇，範疇釐定後，《中國佛教文學史》的主體內涵便能呈現。

總之，文學史乃是一個複雜的巨系統運動的結果，它是多種合力的產物。建構佛教文學史應該在「範疇論」和「方法論」中考慮橫向擴展的種種因素和縱向發展的史觀運用，使作品篇什的擴增與輯佚更能呈現文化發展之開闔動蕩、遷躍斷裂的過程中，在無序之流中成長出有序的意識構築。

**Re-discussing the Construction of the History of Chinese Buddhist Literature**
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Abstract

Buddhist studies, which have been researched for over one hundred years in European and Japanese universities, have obtained an outstanding outcome. Back to Taiwan, Buddhist studies are researched merely by the scholars of Buddhist colleges, several graduate institutes of religious studies and philosophy. The crucial reason that Buddhist Literature is extremely neglected in all the literature departments of universities is lacking a “History of Chinese Buddhist Literature” to provide the relative vision.

One could deal with specific topics for researching on Buddhist Literature while one has to clarify the categories and analyze the problems of methodology to construct “History of Chinese Buddhist Literature.” However, the latter is definitely the most difficult part for this paper to master. Nowadays, many groups in China have started to construct it, but there is still no action in Taiwan.

Based on the necessity of popularizing education on Buddhist Literature, constructing a “History of Chinese Literature” is a essential and indispensable [strategy](http://www.nciku.cn/search/en/strategy). The researcher have written an article about ‘a Discussion on Methodology of Construction of “History of Chinese Buddhist Literature” ‘. On this foundation, the researcher want to ‘’retranslate’’ it, on the one hand, by consulting the general methods of constructing “History of Chinese Literature”, on the other hand, by comparison of the issues of how to draw the materials from different literature categories.

Second, this paper discusses Chinese Buddhist literature through ‘theory of categories’ and ‘methodology of construction.’ There are three categories disserted here, including literati’s composition, Buddhist literature, and monks’ composition. The content of “History of Chinese Buddhist Literature” would be presented only if the categories are determined. Finally, as to methodology, due to the complication of constructing the literary history, only “compiling, editing and discriminating scattered documents and manuscripts, application of philology and bibliography” and “consideration of historical views” are two aspects currently discussed in this paper.

However, literary history, the result of a complicated macro-system dynamics, is the production of multi-power combination. Synchronic reasons and diachronic historical views should be considered within ‘theory of categories’ and ‘methodology’ to construct Buddhist literary history. Therefore, the amplification, compilation and editing of literary works could represent more the turbulent and interrupted process of culture development and form a meaningful well-ordered construction out of disordered chaos.