

persecution of Buddhism; a remarkable statement when measured by the fact that for a long time all his predecessors are said to have shown more or less zeal for the Faith. One may well question whether this may not be the monkish way of stating that the king was not friendly to them. Our European records are full of such solecisms: "Religion" and "the Church" are, among Catholics, systematically connected, and even a Catholic king, engaged in curbing merely the excesses of the "Church," may appear, in clerical records, as an oppressor of religion. However it may be, the objectionable king was soon assassinated, and disorder followed for a weary period covering generations of his successors. Two rival thrones first divided the country east and west; then thrones were multiplied as sons were begot. While the temporal power waned, the spiritual waxed. About the year 1040 A.D. (the preceding two centuries presenting only a confusion of kingdoms, now divided, now reunited) a great Buddhist teacher, Atesha, was invited into the country by one of the Western kings. He attained much esteem throughout the country, reformed the calendar, and by his wisdom undoubtedly increased popular respect for the priesthood.

Another two-century period rolls over the country, which is still broken into fragments; Kublai Khan, one of the greatest of the Mongol emperors, is on China's throne. His forces make their victorious way across the eastern frontier of Tibet, subjecting portions of the national territory. The rest may not have been thought worthy of sacking. Some sort of overlordship seems to have been recognised