

At that time, Huan-kung 桓公 of the Zheng 鄭 state conquered the area about Lu-yang, and proved himself independent of P'ing-wang and Hsieh-wang 携王. But Wu-kung 武公 who succeeded Huan-kung submitted to P'ing-wang, and then, Wen-hou 文侯 of the Chin 晋 state supported P'ing-wang, and ruined Hsieh-wang. The second stage of the eastward-transfer era was the time of the loyalty of the Chin and Zheng states to the Chou dynasty. After the death of Wen-hou, civil war broken out in the Chin state. The Zheng state overwhelmed the states, namely, Shen, Lu and others, that installed P'ing-wang during the first stage, and transferred the control of the area about Lu-yang to P'ing-wang, and had him make Lu-yang the capital of the Chou dynasty. The third stage of the eastward-transfer era was the time of Zheng's monopoly of the influences to the Chou dynasty because of the civil war of the Chin state.

From the eastward-transfer era to the early Spring and Autumn period, the major states expanded their territories. They attempted to bring the surrounding areas under their domination, and to subdue the minor states about them. The expansion of the major states made their conflict with each other constant, and made their control of the Kuo-jen 國人 unstable. This situation prompted drafting various treaties, that ultimately aimed to settle these contentions. The "minor hegemony" of the Ch'i state was the expression of the integration of such treaties.

A Study of *Kê-i* 格義 Buddhism :
The Formation of Early Chinese Buddhism

by Takatoshi ITO

Until now *Kê-i* (hermeneutical) Buddhism has been defined as the interpretation of Buddhism through the medium of indigenous Chinese thought. Our conventional understanding has been that this was a phenomenon characteristic of the period from the beginning of the transmission of Buddhism to China until the Wei-Chin dynasties. At that time, this Practice was rectified by Shih Tao-an and Kumārajīva and Buddhism since has been correctly apprehended, transmitted and

imported to Japan. Does this way of thinking, however, not result from the fact that because Japanese Buddhists, with Japanese scholars following suit, consider the Buddhism that has been transmitted to and expounded in Japan to be correct, they have been reluctant to gainsay that which is its origin, i. e., Buddhism as it was understood in China?

In this article, first We consider true Buddhism to be the Indian Buddhism of Shakyamuni which, from a logical perspective in opposition to the orthodox Brahmanic teaching that set up brahman and atman, etc. as the monistic absolute, presented the theory of *pratityasamutpāda*, and precisely advocated the doctrines of "*anitya*" and "*anātman*", thus providing for the refutation of the absolutist theories native to India.

Next, an investigation of the manner in which *Kê-i* has been grasped by Chinese and Japanese scholars, reveals that Japanese scholars, even more than the Chinese, have been ambiguous their definition of *Kê-i*. With that in mind, as a new definition, we take indigenous thought, i. e., the absolutist theories based upon the *Lao-tzu Chuang-tzu* and *I-ching* to be "*Tao-Li* 道·理 Philosophy", *Kê-i* is that which interprets Indian Buddhism through the basis of *Tao-Li* thought and any Buddhism of this type is called "*Kê-i* Buddhism".

Finally, from this perspective we investigate the Buddhism of Tao-an as well as the *Êrh-ju-ssü-hsing-lun* 二入四行論, a work of pivotal importance for the Zen school, demonstrating that throughout both works "*Tao-Li* Philosophy" is the interpretive medium and that these are not texts expounding impermanence and egolessness, doctrines based on the foundation of Buddhism, the theory of dependent origination.

The Social Status of the Military Households
of the Ming Dynasty : From Points of Civil Service Examination
and Official Appointments

by Chih-chia YUE

The social status of the military households (*chün-hu* 軍戶) of the Ming dynasty has been underestimated in the past. Using examination