

SIAMESE ATTACKS ON ANGKOR BEFORE 1430

LAWRENCE PALMER BRIGGS*

Washington, D.C.

IT IS A COMMON statement of writers of Cambodian and Siamese history that the Siamese overran Cambodia and captured Angkor Thom on one or more occasions before the final sack of that capital in 1430–31. The dates on which this event is said to have occurred are variously given as 1350–53, 1372–73, 1384–85, 1388, 1393–94, 1408, 1420–21. As authority, these writers can cite almost any of the common versions of the Cambodian chronicle and some versions of the *Annals of Ayuthia* (Siam).

After a careful study and comparison of the available data on the subject, the writer is of the opinion that no such conquest occurred on any of the above mentioned dates, nor on any other date during this period, and that the first sack of Angkor Thom by the Siamese took place in 1430–31.

SUKHOTHAI AND ANGKOR BEFORE 1350

At the end of the thirteenth century, the Tai of Sukhothai, in the upper Menam valley, who for about two centuries had been called *Syam* by their neighbors and were beginning to be called *Sien* (*Hsien*) by the Chinese and to call themselves *Thai*, were in control of most of what is now Siam and parts of some neighboring states. Under their first great kings — Indraditya and Rama Khamheng (from about 1250 to about 1317) — they conquered the Khmers of the upper and central Menam valley and greatly extended their territory; but in his great inscription of 1292, Rama Khamheng does not mention Angkor among his conquests.¹ Chou Ta-kuan, who visited Angkor in 1296–97, says the country suffered from recent ravages of the Siamese;² but in an inscription of 1304, the Khmer King, Indravarman III, hints that the misfortunes of the kingdom were due to his aged

* Mr. Briggs, author of numerous articles in the *Quarterly* relating to the Indochinese Peninsula, served for many years as consul in Indochina and Burma and is author of *The Ancient Khmer Empire*, now in process of publication.

¹ Cornelius Beach Bradley, "The oldest known writing in Siamese," *Journal of the Siam Society*, 6, pt. 1 (1909); George Coedès, *Recueil des inscriptions du Siam: (1) Les inscriptions de Sukhodaya* (Bangkok, 1924), 44–48.

² Paul Pelliot, "Mémoires sur les coutumes du Cambodge par Tcheou Ta-kouan," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient (BEFEO)*, 2 (1902), 123.

predecessor and congratulates the kingdom on having a vigorous young king who was keeping the enemy at a distance.³ The best evidence that Angkor had not been sacked by the Tai, before Chou Ta-kuan's visit, is his description of the wealth of golden towers, statues, images, vessels, jewelry, and other articles which were almost commonplace in the capital and which certainly would not have been spared by a conqueror.

The old partly Khmerized Mon kingdom of Louvo in the lower Menam valley, although overrun by Tai, seems to have retained its identity, probably with some support from the Khmers, who were still holding out in the southeastern part of the Menam delta and the region to the east. A Mon prince, apparently heir of the old kingdom of Dvāravatī,⁴ was still ruling at U Thong, in the Meklong-Menam delta. According to an old Tai legend, a Lu (Tai) prince of the house of Chieng-Sen came down from the north, married a daughter of the *chao* of U Thong, and eventually succeeded him.⁵ Together, they seem to have increased their territory at the expense of Sukhothai and Cambodia.⁶ They had practically absorbed Louvo, when, in 1349, the *chao* of U Thong forced the pious king of Sukhothai to accept his suzerainty. Next year (1350–51), he founded a new capital at Ayuthia, below Lophburi on the Menam, and seems to have made a raid on the Khmer capital (see p. 6). As Ayuthia was better situated to carry on war against the Khmers, Sukhothai began to decline in political importance.

AYUTHIA AND ANGKOR FROM 1350 TO 1430

After 1350, the base of Siamese attacks on Cambodia shifted from Sukhothai to Ayuthia. This was a great danger to Angkor, because of the nearness of the new capital. From 1350 to 1430, wars between the two capitals were almost incessant. It must not be supposed that these campaigns were wholly one-sided and that Angkor was always on the defensive. During all this period and even for a long time after the sack of Angkor in 1430–31, the Khmers held their own along the Chantabun-

³ Inscription of Banteay Srei (A.D. 1304), in *Le temple d'Içvarapura: les inscriptions et l'histoire (Mémoires archéologique, publiés par l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient)* (Paris, 1926), 89.

⁴ Lawrence Palmer Briggs, "Dvāravatī, the most ancient kingdom of Siam," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 65 (April–June 1945), 98–107.

⁵ Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, "Siamese history prior to the founding of Ayuthia," *Journal of the Siam Society*, 13, pt. 2 (1919), 35–36.

⁶ George Coedès, *Histoire ancienne des états hindouisés d'Extrême-Orient* (Hanoi, 1944; Paris, 1947), 286; W. A. R. Wood in *A history of Siam* (Bangkok, 1926 [London, 1926]), 58, 63–64, says they conquered Tenasserim and other territory formerly belonging to Sukhothai and Chantabun region from Cambodia; but, as will be seen, the Chantabun region was still in dispute.

Jolburi-Korat frontier, not too far from the present boundary,⁷ and Khmer armies often penetrated deep into Siamese territory. The documents show that less than 10 years before the sack of Angkor an ambitious Khmer king, while checking Cham inroads in the delta on the one hand, made repeated attempts on the other to reach the new Siamese capital, not only by the Jolburi region in the south, but also via the Se Mun valley in the North.⁸

Perhaps, a greater danger to Angkor lay in the character of the new Siamese capital. Whereas Sukhothai was the center of the Thai — a more vigorous but less advanced people than the Khmers, and their sworn enemies — Ayuthia was in the center of the old Mon kingdom of Louvo which, with Dvāravatī formed part of Ramanyadesa, “the Mon country,” which had been the center of dispersal of Hinayanism in Indochina, from the half-legendary Buddhaghosa to the new Singhalese cult which had recently been introduced into the lower Menam valley.⁹ The Mons were related to the Khmers in race, language, and culture; Khmer settlements had existed in the lower Menam valley for four centuries,¹⁰ and that valley had been an organized part of the Khmer Empire for from two and a half to three and a half centuries. One of the chief causes of the downfall of Angkor as capital was the burden of the maintenance of the many immense monuments. Hinayanism, and especially the new Singhalese cult, was democratic and offered relief from the burden of the monuments. Already in 1350, it had been seeping into Angkor from the Mon and Khmer settlements of Ramanyadesa for a century.¹¹ According to Chou Ta-kuan, it was the leading religion of the masses at Angkor before the end of the thirteenth century. The king himself, it seems, had adopted Hinayanism before 1350. Probably some Cambodians, converted to the new religion during the centuries of Khmer occupation of the lower Menam, had returned to Angkor when the Tai occupied the Menam valley. Perhaps the most disastrous invasion of Cambodia was an advance guard — Mon and probably even Khmer more than Tai — of Hinayanist

⁷ Lawrence Palmer Briggs, “The treaty of March 23, 1907 between France and Siam and the return of Battambang and Angkor to Cambodia,” *Far Eastern quarterly*, 5 (Aug. 1946), 440–41.

⁸ George Coedès, “Etudes cambodgiennes, XVI. Essai de classification des documents historiques cambodgiens conservés à la bibliothèque de l’Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient,” *BEFEO*, 18, no. 9 (1918), 26–27.

⁹ George Coedès, *Histoire ancienne*, 230.

¹⁰ Coedès has recently shown that there were Khmer settlements in the lower Menam valley in the early part of the tenth century in “Une nouvelle inscription d’Ayuthya,” *Journal of the Thai Research Society*, 35, pt. 1 (Feb. 1944).

¹¹ Prince Damrong thinks the new Singhalese cult had reached the Mon settlements in the Menam valley by the middle of the thirteenth century (“Histoire du Bouddhisme au Siam,” *Extrême-Asie*, 4 [1927], 28).

monks.¹² The documents show that the sack of Angkor in 1431 was directly due to the presence there of a "fifth column" in the person of Hinayanist bonzes and ministers (see p. 18).

WHAT THE ANNALS OF AYUTHIA SAY

Our earliest data on the history of these struggles came from Siamese sources. The official *Annals of Ayuthia* were destroyed when the Burmese sacked that capital in 1767. They were rewritten as well as possible by a royal commission at the end of the eighteenth century. Two recensions of these rewritten annals (*Phongsawadan*) have appeared. An English version of part of the first was published by Rev. J. Taylor Jones in the *Chinese Repository*, Canton, in 1836-39.¹³ It is not well known. A second recension was prepared by Prince Paramanujit in 1840, who is said to have used two manuscript editions (one of 1783 and another of 1795) preserved in the National Library, Bangkok.¹⁴ It was used by Bishop Pallegoix (1854),¹⁵ Sir John Bowring (1857),¹⁶ and others¹⁷ in writing their histories and was published in two volumes, with comments, by Dr. Dan Beach Bradley at Bangkok in 1863.

The Taylor Jones recension says Sia Yutiya (Ayuthia) was founded in 712 S.E. (A.D. 1350-51) by "his Lordship Utong." It says that "at that time the king sent his son, Rammesawan, to govern the province of Lopburi." It gives a list of the countries considered as tributary, and Cambodia is not included. The chronicle continues: "This year, the king sent an army of 5,000 men to attack Kamboja. They were defeated; but being reinforced, were victorious and brought back to Siam a great many Kambojan prisoners."¹⁸

Under date of 746 S.E. (1384) this recension says: "Just then, the king of Kamboja marched into Chonburi [Jolburi] and Chantaburi [Chantabun] and carried captive men and women to the number of more than 6,000. His Siamese majesty [Rammesawan], on being informed of it, sent his general to attack the Kambojans, who were defeated in the first

¹² Of the 5 monks — probably mostly Talang (Burmese Mon) — who went from Ceylon to Pagan in 1190 and organized there the first chapters of the new Singhalese sect in Indochina, one was a son of the king of Cambodia (G. E. Harvey, *History of Burma* [London, 1925], 56).

¹³ Correspondent [Rev. J. Taylor Jones], "Siamese history," *Chinese repository*, 5 (1836-37), 55-61, 105-08, 160-64, 537-41; 6 (1837-38), 179-84, 268-71, 321-26, 396-400; 7 (1838-39), 50-54, 543-48. The partial version here given covers the years 1350-51 to 1638-39.

¹⁴ Wood, 23-24.

¹⁵ Mgr. [J. B.] Pallegoix, *Description du royaume thai, ou Siam* (Paris, 1854).

¹⁶ Sir John Bowring, *The kingdom and people of Siam* (London, 1857), 1:35-61.

¹⁷ G. Coedès in *BEFEO*, 14, no. 3 (1914), 1.

¹⁸ T. Jones, *Chinese repository*, 5 (June 1836), 56-57.

rencontre. The Siamese spent three days in building stockades and then renewed the contest and drove the Kambojans into their own quarters; meanwhile, the Kambojan prince saved himself by flight, but his son was taken prisoner, and the Siamese general Chainerong was left with 5,000 men to keep the country in subjection. The king of Siam returned home. After a while the Cochinchinese came to attack Kamboja; while they were few, the Kambojans could resist them, but when they came in large bands, raising great tumults, Chainerong sent letters to Siam, whose king ordered him to sweep up all the inhabitants and bring them to Siam. On their arrival, he made a great festival throughout the country, and rewarded his principal military officers."¹⁹

Further on, this recension says that, after the fight of the two sons of Indraraja for power in 780 S.E. (A.D. 1418), a third brother became king of Siam under the name of Rajatirat. In 783 S.E. (A.D. 1421), "Rajatirat came down from Chainat [where he had been governor] and took possession of the royal city Sia Yutiya, where he appointed his son, Pranakhon Indra king. Rajatirat brought with him images of cows and various other animals and deposited some in the wat Mighty Relic, and some in the wat Sanpet."²⁰ No further mention is made in this recension of trouble between the Siamese and the Cambodians until 892–94 S.E. (1530–32).²¹

It will be noted that this recension speaks of three events prior to 1532: (1) an attack on Cambodia in 1350, (2) fighting in the Chonburi-Chantaburi region in 1384, and (3) later, after 1421, the seating of Pra Nakhon Indra on a throne (see Table 1).

Pallegoix in 1854, following the Paramanujit recension, says, "Phaja-Uthong, after having founded Juthia, took the title of Phra-Rama-Thibodi; he established his son, Rame-Suen, King of Lophburi. Here is the list of states which were under his domination . . . [Cambodia is not mentioned.] He carried war into Cambodia, from where he led a great many captives." The date given is 712 S.E. (A.D. 1350–51). Under date of 747 S.E. (A.D. 1385), *Pallegoix* writes, "He [King Rame-Suen] took the capital of Cambodia and left there only 5,000 souls." His next mention of Cambodia is under the date of 894 S.E. (A.D. 1532), when he says: "He [the king of Siam] took the capital of Cambodia, which was then called Lavek."²²

Bowring, who in 1857 also follows the Paramanujit recension, says:

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 59. By Cochinchinese, Jones here certainly meant Chams, who at that time occupied what is now central and southern Annam.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 60.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 107–08.

²² *Pallegoix*, 2:74–79.

"King Uthong assumes the name Phra Rama-thibodi. . . War was entered into against the Cambodians, and numerous captives were brought away." Bowring gives the same dates and the same list as Pallegoix. Further on he says that in 747 S.E. (1385) "The King of Siam takes possession of the capital of Cambodia, and leaves but 5,000 souls therein." He mentions no further trouble until 1532, when he says, "The King of Siam conquers Cambodia."²³

It will be noted that these two writers who follow the Paramanujit recension, mention only two campaigns prior to 1532: (1) that of 1350-51, in which they say Rama Thibodi invaded Cambodia and carried away many captives, and (2) that of 1385 in which the King of Siam took the capital of Cambodia and left only 5,000 souls. This campaign agrees essentially in date, in the name of the king and the number of persons left, with the second campaign of the Taylor Jones recension, but the scene has been transferred from Chonburi and Chantaburi to Angkor, and the people left behind seem to be Cambodian inhabitants instead of Siamese soldiers.

WHAT THE EARLY CAMBODIAN CHRONICLES AND HISTORIES SAY

The *Royal Cambodian chronicles* were said to have been destroyed during the wars of the eighteenth century. About 1818, King An Chan designated a minister named Nong, who held the title of Oknha Vongsa Sarpeah, to rewrite them. This minister may have had at his disposal a manuscript copy of the *Annals of Ayuthia*,²⁴ although neither of the above-mentioned recensions had then been published.

When Captain Ernest Doudart de Lagrée went to Cambodia as the first French resident-general, he began to look for documents on the history of that country. He found (1865) at the capital, Oudong, a "Chronological list of the kings of Cambodia," which had been preserved by the kings and had probably been used by Nong in writing the *Cambodian chronicles*. This list may now be found in the manuscripts of Doudart de Lagrée published by Villemereuil.²⁵

According to this list, Prea Barom Nipean Bat was reigning at Angkor in 1304 C.E. (A.D. 1382). In 1308 C.E. (1386) Prea Lompong Reachea came to the throne. In 1310 C.E. (1388) Rama Thiphdey (Thibodi), king of

²³ Bowring, 1:43, 44, 45.

²⁴ Coedès thinks Nong had access to the *Annals of Ayuthia*, prepared in 1795 (*BEFEO*, 18, no. 9 [1918], 18).

²⁵ A. de Villemereuil, *Explorations et missions de Doudart de Lagrée . . . extrait de ses manuscrits* (Paris, 1883).

Siam, besieged and took Angkor. His three sons reigned in succession. In 1315 C.E. (1393) Prea Siri Sorijovong reigned. In 1324 C.E. (1402) Prea Barom Reamea reigned at Angkor. In 1328 C.E. (1406) Prea Thom Sokharach reigned at Angkor. In 1330 C.E. (1408) the king of Ayuthia besieged Angkor again and gave it for king his son, Phnhea Prek, who took the name of Entho Reachea. In 1331 C.E. (1409) Prea Reach Angka Prea Barom Reachea Thireach (Ponha-yat), king of Cambodia, put Entho Reachea to death and reigned first at Angkor, then at Phnom Penh.

The *Royal Cambodian chronicles* were first translated into French by Doudart de Lagrée, who died in Yunnan in March 1869. A translation by him, revised by Francis Garnier, was published in 1871; but the translation published from the notes of Doudart de Lagrée by Villemereuil in 1883²⁶ is said to represent more accurately the original work of Doudart de Lagrée.

According to this recension (Doudart de Lagrée's translation in Villemereuil), Nipean Bat mounted the throne at Angkor in 1268 C.E. (A.D. 1346). In 1273 C.E. (1351) the king died. His younger brother, Sithean, reigned three months and died. The elder son of Nipean Bat mounted the throne under the name of Lompong Reachea. In 1274 (1352), the king of Siam, Reamea Thyphdey (Rama Thibodi) besieged Angkor and captured it the following year. In 1353 King Lompong died. Then three sons of the king of Siam ruled in succession over Cambodia. During the six years, 1352–1357, while the Siamese dominated at Angkor, the king of Siam led 90,000 prisoners to Siam.

In 1279 C.E. (1357) Srey Sojovong ruled as king *snang* (*yuvarāja*) at Angkor, succeeding his father (Lompong). In 1288 C.E. (1366) the king died after reigning nine years and was succeeded at Angkor by his son, Borom Reamea. In 1292 C.E. (1370), in the fifth year of the new king's reign, he died and was succeeded by his younger brother, Thom Soc Reach.

In 1294 C.E. (1372), in the third year of this king's reign, the king of Siam, Borom Reachea, besieged Angkor and took it (1373) after seven months. The king of Cambodia died, and the king of Siam raised his son, Phnhea Prek, to the throne as Ento Reachea. The crown prince²⁷ of Cambodia, Phnhea Jeat, sent two mandarins and some men, who put Ento Reachea to death and came to live and reign at Angkor. In 1306 C.E. (1384), the twelfth year of his reign, he was crowned. In 1310 C.E. (1388) he came to live in the country of Basan, then at Phnom Penh.

²⁶ Villemereuil, 21–80.

²⁷ Called "King *snang*" in the *Royal chronicle*.

The Garnier version of the Doudart de Lagrée translation was published in 1871.²⁸ For the period with which we are concerned it differed from the other translation only by adding twelve years to the dates 1357, 1366, 1370, 1372, and 1373.²⁹

By glancing at Table 2, it will be seen that in the "Chronological list" and the Doudart de Lagrée recension of the *Cambodian chronicles*, the length of time between the accession of Nipean-bat and the fall of Angkor is the same, 27 years, and that the length of reigns are the same, 5, 6, 9, 4, and 3 years, with one slight variation. Only the dates differ. Garnier's version agrees except for the addition of the 12 years as noted above, which he apparently repudiates in the account published in his *Voyage* in 1873 (see three paragraphs below).

It may be noted that all these accounts — the "Chronological list" and the Doudart de Lagrée and Garnier versions of the *Chronicles* — relate two events: (1) the capture of Angkor by Rama Thibodi of Ayuthia, in 1388 according to the "List," in 1352–53 according to the *Chronicles*, and (2) a second siege and capture of that capital, in 1408–09 according to the "List," in 1372–73 according to Doudart de Lagrée, in 1384–85 according to Garnier. Nothing has yet been said by the *Cambodian chronicles* of any campaigns in Chantabun or Jolburi.

But before Garnier published in 1873 the account of his voyages,³⁰ he read the Taylor Jones recension of the *Annals of Ayuthia*, Abel-Rémusat's account of Chinese relations with Cambodia (see footnote 36), and, apparently, the Ang Eng recension of the *Cambodian chronicles* (see footnotes 49–52). By the first, he was led to record the campaign of Chonburi (Jolburi) and Chantabory (Chantabun), but he placed it before the final capture of Angkor; by the second, he was induced to bring the Annamites into the affairs of Cambodia, a few centuries too early; by the third, he seems, like Doudart de Lagrée and Moura, to have got the story that the Siamese carried away 90,000 Cambodians.

Garnier writes in his *Voyage*:

Phra Rama Thibodi, after seizing Angkor, established there successively three of his sons as sovereigns. Their domination appears to have lasted from 1352 to 1358 and, during this period, the Siamese led more than 90,000 Cambodians captive. On the death of Phra Rama Thibodi, which occurred in 1369, Cam-

²⁸ Francis Garnier, "Chronique royale due Cambodge," *Journal asiatique*, ser. 6, 18 (Oct.–Dec. 1871), 336–85, especially 341–44.

²⁹ Garnier follows the Doudart de Lagrée recension, except for his (Garnier's) errors of chronology.

³⁰ F. Garnier, *Voyage d'exploration en Indochine* (Paris, 1873).

bodia recovered its independence. Some years later, the Siamese King, Phra Barommaraxa, came to besiege Angkor again. At the end of a siege of seven months, the city was taken, the King of Cambodia was killed and his son fled to the Annamites (1373). Barommaraxa established his son as king at Angkor, under the name of Phra Chao Ento Reachea; but the latter was assassinated the same year of his coming by emissaries of the Cambodian royal prince who, with the aid of the Annamites,³¹ whom we see intervene for the first time in the affairs of Cambodia, came back to reign at Angkor. In 1384, profiting by Phra Rame Souen's war against Chiengmai, the King of Cambodia made war in his turn against the Siamese, pillaged the cities of Chonburi and Chantabury and took 6,000 captives. But Phra Rame Souen exercised terrible reprisals; he seized Angkor next year and left only 5,000 inhabitants. The King of Cambodia fled and his son was made prisoner. A Siamese general named Xainerong was left with 5,000 men to guard the country. The King of Cambodia appears to have invoked again the aid of the Annamites to remount the throne. In 1388, the King of Cambodia abandoned his capital, too exposed to Siamese excursions, and fixed his residence at Basan, or Boribun, near Phnom Penh.³²

In 1883, Jean Moura, who had been French resident-general in Cambodia for several years,³³ published his two-volume work on the history of that country. The *Cambodian chronicles* seem to have been revised in the meantime and are called the *Annales du Cambodge* by Moura. In revising the *Chronicles* all the works mentioned above, several local annals, and written and oral traditions were used. Moura claims that his work was based largely on a Pali document, translated under his supervision;³⁴ but he evidently used all the other material at hand as well. The chief innovations of his work were that it shifted the beginning of Nipeanbat's reign back to 1340 and that of Ponha-yat ahead to 1421, added two new kings and lengthened the reigns of others.

In 1340, according to Moura, Nipeanbat was reigning at Moha Nacor Vat (Angkor). In 1346, he died and was succeeded by his brother, Sithean, who died after a reign of three months when Lompong-reachea, son of Nipeanbat, came to the throne. Lompong died in 1350 and was succeeded in 1351 by his brother, Srey-sorijotey; but, before the king could take the throne, Chao Utong Reamea-thupphdey (Rama Thibodi), king of Siam, "seized Nacor Vat" (Angkor). The Cambodian king fled to Laos and his two nephews to the south. The Siamese king put his three sons on the

³¹ Garnier here apparently means Annamites and not Chams (see footnote 19), but he places their interference more than two centuries too early.

³² Garnier, *Voyage*, 1:139-40.

³³ Moura, after a couple of unimportant interims, succeeded Doudart de Lagrèe as resident superior of Cambodia in 1868.

³⁴ J. Moura, *La royauté du Cambodge* (Paris, 1883), 2:3-4.

throne in succession. Together they reigned a little more than three years. The first two died, the third was driven out by the two Cambodian princes. Chao Utong (Rama Thibodi) came to their aid but retired to Korat with 90,000 prisoners. He was driven out by King Srey-sorijotey, who resumed the throne in 1355. Sorijotey died in 1363 and was succeeded by Barom-reamea, son of Lompong, who reigned ten years, when he was succeeded by his brother, Thommo-soccarach. In 1384, King Thommo-soccarach seized Chantabun and Choloborey and carried off 8,000 prisoners. In 1393, the king of Siam attacked Chantabun and Choloborey but was driven out, carrying away many inhabitants. In 1401, Srey-sorijovong, son of Sorijotey, came to the throne and reigned until 1417, when he died. Srey-sorijovong was succeeded by his nephew, Barommo-soccoroch, son of Barom-reamea. In 1420, the king of Siam besieged Angkor. King Barommo-soccoroch died, and the capital surrendered after a siege of seven months. Phnhea-jat, son of Sorijovong, submitted, but the king of Siam crowned his son as Entho-reachea. The Siamese withdrew, carrying off the idol of "Prea-cu [Preah Ko = Nandin, the sacred bull], a bronze lion and other idols." Phnhea-jat had Entho-reachea assassinated (1421). After an interim, the mandarins chose Phnhea-jat king (1432). In 1435, he built a palace at Bassan, in the province of Srei Santhor. In 1446, he moved his capital to Chidor-muc (Phnom-Penh).³⁵

WHAT THE CHINESE DYNASTIC HISTORIES SAY

Cambodia, like some other countries of Southeast Asia, had not been anxious to enter into relations with the Mongol dynasty of China. The embassy with which Chou Ta-kuan was connected does not seem to have had any sequence. But when the Ming dynasty came to power (1368), Cambodia hastened to renew tribute. Rémusat has translated the portion of the Ming dynastic history concerning the relations between the two countries during this period.³⁶ In 1370, according to Rémusat, an embassy from Cambodia arrived at the imperial court of China. A king of Chenla (an earlier name for Cambodia) called Hou-eul-na sent an embassy in 1371 with a letter and rich presents, which was repeated in 1373.

After a pause of six years, tribute was sent again in 1379. This time it was sent by a king called *Ts'an-tha kan-wou-che the-tha-chi*, whom Aymonier called Samtac-Kambuja-dhipati (which, of course, is a title). Trib-

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 2:36-39.

³⁶ J. P. Abel-Rémusat, "Description du royaume de Cambodge," *Nouveaux mélanges asiatiques* (Paris, 1829), 1:89-97.

ute arrived again in 1380. In 1383, the emperor sent inspectors of patents to Cambodia, with authority to grant titles to the king and to examine the credentials of Chinese travelers found there. This was probably a precaution against the machinations of the enemies of the Ming dynasty. The emperor sent to the king 36 pieces of gold-embroidered cloth and 19,000 porcelain vases. The king sent tribute.

After another pause of three years, officers were sent, in 1386, to carry the king some more porcelain vases. This king was called *Ts'an-lieh phao pi-sie kan-pou-che* (Samtac Chao Siri Kamboja). When the messengers returned (1387), the king sent with them an embassy with 59 elephants and 60,000 pounds of perfumes. The emperor sent him a gilded silver seal. The tribute for 1388 consisted of 28 elephants, 34 valets to serve them, and 45 other foreign slaves. Tribute was sent in 1389 and 1390.

In 1403, the first year of the reign of the Emperor Ching Sung (Ch'eng-tsu [Yung-lo]), officers were sent to Cambodia "to publish the patent of investiture, accorded to the Prince of this country." In 1404 tribute was received from a king named *Ts'an-lieh phao pi-ya* (Samtac Prah Phaya). In 1405, officials were sent to the funeral of this king and to establish on the throne his eldest son, *Ts'an-lieh chao ping-ya* (Samtac Chao Phaya).

Tribute was sent again in 1408. In 1414 the Cambodian envoys complained of invasions by the Cochinchinese (Chams) who had several times prevented their arrival in China. The emperor sent an escort with them and an order to the king of Cochinchina (Champa) to live on good terms with his neighbors. Tribute arrived in 1417 and 1419. The king at this time was called *Ts'an-lieh chao ping-ya*.³⁷ After the period 1426-35, tribute ceased to come regularly.

The Chinese give here some data about Cambodia and its people, which would apply only to the period when the capital was at Angkor.

WHAT LATER HISTORIES OF CAMBODIA SAY

It is interesting to see how historians of Cambodia who wrote after all this material had been made available to them reacted to it.

Two histories of Cambodia appeared in 1904. Both were written by officials of the French administrative service in Indochina, who had made a special study of Cambodia and its people. As they were contemporaries, or nearly so, of Moura and Garnier and knew some of the persons concerned in preparing the recensions of the chronicles and annals, and the

³⁷ This does not mean that he was the same king as the one who came to the throne in 1405. The names given by the Chinese are purely titles.

conditions under which they were prepared, their opinions of these sources have a special value. Both place little dependence on these documents and not much more on similar Siamese documents.

Etienne Aymonier had succeeded Moura about 1880, as resident-general in Cambodia, and had studied Cambodian language, architecture and epigraphy for many years. Up to the present he has probably done more than any other person to give the world something like an accurate knowledge of Cambodia. In his work he disparages the *Royal Cambodian chronicles* "on the one hand by the manner in which the chronicle was compiled, with the aid of various manuscripts, incomplete or of doubtful origin, and on the other hand by the absolute default of critical sense, the complete lack of scruples for historical truth found among Cambodians in particular and Indo-Chinese in general."³⁸

Aymonier transcribed Nipean-bat as Nirvanapada, which was the posthumous name of Suryavarman I (1002-49), the first Buddhist King of Cambodia. He thinks that, when the ministers were ordered to begin the chronicle with 1346 or 1340, lacking a legitimate list they began with this celebrated king and that the names of his immediate successors were equally fictitious. On the Chinese accounts, as given by Rémusat and on "data deduced from Siamese history," he bases his idea that Angkor was not sacked and abandoned until 1461-62.³⁹

George Maspero, in his history of the Khmer Empire,⁴⁰ gives a list of names and dates of the kings of Cambodia according to the *Annals*, from 1340 to 1420, and the Pali equivalents of those names; but, like Aymonier, he thinks the names are fictitious. He does not believe Angkor was taken by the Siamese before 1420. He identifies Ponha-yat with Chieu-Binh-Nha,⁴¹ who, he says, sent an embassy to China in 1415, and he thinks that was the posthumous name of Barommo-soccoroch (Paramasoka) and places the beginning of his reign in 1415. Later, he says, this king went to reside at Chado-Mukh (Phnom Penh). Maspero does not think the decline of Cambodia began until the capture of Lovek by the Siamese at the end of the sixteenth century.⁴²

In 1914, *Adhemard Leclère*, who had a long service in the French administration of Cambodia, wrote his history of that protectorate.⁴³ Leclère had already established himself as a leading authority on the religion, manners, and customs and laws of modern Cambodia, and the

³⁸ Etienne Aymonier, *Le Cambodge* (Paris, 1900, 1901, 1904), 3:735.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 3:738-44.

⁴⁰ Georges Maspero, *L'empire Khmèr* (Phnom Penh, 1904), 54-55. ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 55. ⁴² *Ibid.*, 54-60.

⁴³ A. Leclère, *Histoire du Cambodge* (Paris, 1914).

modern pages of his history rate among the leading works on the subject. But his interpretation of the early chronicles does not enhance his reputation as a historian. He says his history is based on "the lapidary inscriptions, Chinese and Annamite annals and European documents of the last six centuries," but it does not show much evidence in its early pages of such a basis. His authorities are not generally designated and, whatever they are, are poorly digested and presented. In the main, he follows the same sources as Moura with some variations. He makes a futile attempt to relate the first king of the *Annals* (Nipean-bat), who he says was reigning in 1340, with the kings mentioned in the inscriptions and early legends.⁴⁴ He gives, in great detail, the older chronicles' account of the founding of Ayuthia, the capture of Angkor by the Siamese king and the reign there of his three sons, in 1353-57; but he has practically the same event happen again in 1384 or 1394⁴⁵ and again in 1420-21. He identifies Sauryopéar with Ponghéa Yéat (Ponha-yat), who he says reigned from 1384 to 1431. He says Ponghéa Yéat moved the capital from Angkor to Basan, in Srey Santhor, in 1388, and, in less than a year moved it again to Chadomoukh, and that in 1431, he abdicated in favor of his son, Noréay-réachéa.⁴⁶ In the latter part of this period, he is clearly confused by having too many kings and too many years at his disposal, and his efforts sometimes approach the ridiculous.⁴⁷

ANOTHER REVISION OF THE CAMBODIAN CHRONICLE

In 1918, George Coedès⁴⁸ translated into French and published a fragment of an older revision of the *Cambodian chronicles* which he found, in Siamese, at the National Library, Bangkok. This fragment was given by Ang Eng of Cambodia to the king of Siam in 1796 and is thus the oldest revision of the *Cambodian chronicles* known to have been published in any European language. It purports to cover about a century, beginning with 1346.⁴⁹ It does not give many dates but gives the length of the reigns

⁴⁴ He says Nipean-bat was the son of the king of the cucumber-garden legend common to all Southeast Asia, which in Indochina has been ascribed to Indravarman III, 1297-1307 (*ibid.*, 195).

⁴⁵ The capture of Angkor, which on all three occasions he says took place after a siege of several months, he extends here over a period of ten years (*ibid.*, 199-207, 211-15).

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 216-22.

⁴⁷ The comparison of his dates with Moura's are shown in Table 3. This matter will be taken up later (see p. 31).

⁴⁸ Coedès was secretary of the Royal Institute of Siam and director of the National Library, Bangkok, from 1918 to 1930.

⁴⁹ Coedès, "Etudes Cambodgiennes, XVI," *BEFEO*, 18, no. 9 (1918), 15-28. It was published in Siamese in 1915 under the title *Phōngsāvādan Lavèk* in vol. 4 of *Pra: xūm phōngsāvādan* (Bangkok: Porānagati, 1915).

of most of the kings it mentions⁵⁰ and gives a wealth of genealogical detail. It may have been known to some of the later historians of Cambodia — Moura and Leclère, for instance.⁵¹

According to this fragment — which, for want of a more accurate designation, we will call the Ang Eng recension — Samtec Brah Mahānibbāna (Nipean-bat) was reigning in 1346. Rāmādhipati (Rama Thibodi) of Ayuthia sent two brahmans to propose an alliance, and Nibbāna put them to death. Nibbāna died five years later and three kings ruled a total of 19 years — one of whom was called Paramathākhemārājā — when Lāmbān Paramarājādhirāja came to the throne (1370). He reigned six years, and his brother ruled three months. Then a second Lāmbān came to the throne and ruled a short time. During the reigns of these two kings, Cambodia was invaded by Rama Thibodi of Ayuthia and his three sons, who captured Angkor and carried off 90,000 inhabitants.⁵² The sons of Rama Thibodi reigned at Angkor for about six years; then they were driven out, and Kalamegha, nephew or grandson of Paramathākhemārājā,⁵³ came to the throne. He seems to have reigned about three years, when he abdicated in favor of his nephew, Gāmkhāt Rāmādhipati. Gāmkhāt was a strong king and waged war against Ayuthia and against the Chams and Indians,⁵⁴ who had captured Muang Caturmukha (Phnom Penh), which he recaptured. He was engaged in an expedition against Ayuthia via the Se Mun valley, when he was poisoned. The length of his reign is not given.

Dharmāçakarājādhirāja Rāmādhipati (Dharmasoka), younger brother of Gāmkhāt, succeeded him. In the third year of his reign, King Paramarājādhirāja of Ayuthia laid siege to Angkor. After a siege of seven months, two nobles and two bonzes⁵⁵ went over to the Siamese, Dharmasoka died, and the capital surrendered. The Siamese king left his son, Brèt, to govern Angkor, under the name of Indarājā, while he returned

⁵⁰ The dates given in parentheses in the account to follow have been supplied by the author, based on the length of reigns.

⁵¹ This question will arise later, see p. 19.

⁵² This is possibly the source of the statements of Garnier (in his *Voyage*), Moura, and Leclère.

⁵³ Coedès, "Etude cambodgiennes, XVI," 25, note 4.

⁵⁴ Probably Malays, who from early times were associated with the Chams. At this time, both were Mohammedan.

⁵⁵ It is probably significant that the new Tai capital, Ayuthia, was in the old Mon kingdom of Louvo. The defection of the ministers and bonzes of Angkor may be more readily understood when it is recalled that their conquerors were not the Thai of Sukhothai, but partly their kinsmen — Mons and probably even Khmers — of Ayuthia, who brought with them the consolation of the mild Singhalese sect of Hinayanist Buddhism to replace their old Brahmanism and Mahayanist Buddhism with their monuments which had become a burden to them.

to Ayuthia with the spoils and about 40,000 captives. He founded pagodas near Ayuthia in honor of the two renegade bonzes. Gām Yāt, son of Gāmkhāt, who was in hiding, had Indarājā assassinated, seized Angkor, and reigned under the name of Dharmikarāja. Later, he established his capital at Muang Caturmukha (Phnom Penh).

Although the date, chronology, and genealogical data do not always agree in detail, it is not difficult to find a sufficient correspondence between the rulers of this recension and those of Moura and Leclère to attribute their origin to this fragment or a similar document (see Table 3).

TWO MORE RECENSIONS OF THE ANNALS OF AYUTHIA

Two versions of the *Annals of Ayuthia* older than the versions of the *Phongsawadans* already discussed have recently been discovered, and their dates, as far as they concern this study, seem to be accurate or nearly so. In 1907 an official named Luang Prasoet discovered in a private house and presented to the National Library, Bangkok, a fragment of the *Annals*, which seems to have been prepared in 1680. It was published by Prince Damrong in 1907, translated into English by O. Frankfurter and published in the *Journal of the Siam Society* in 1909.⁵⁶ It covers the period 686–966 S.E. (A.D. 1324–1604). According to this recension, Ayuthia was founded in 712 S.E. (A.D. 1350). There are many entries regarding wars and conquests, but nothing about a conquest of Angkor at this time. The first mention of Angkor or Cambodia is the statement: "In 793 [1431], year of the pig, the Somdet Paramaraja conquered (Nakhon Luang) [Angkor] and he then appointed his son Phra Nakhon Indr to hold sway over it. At that time, the King ordered Phaya Keo and Phraya Thai to bring all the images to Ayuddha."⁵⁷

In 1914 George Coedès translated into French and published a Pali recension of the *Annals of Ayuthia* covering the period from 1350 to 1767. It is a religious document and, except for naming the kings and giving a list of their reigns, it does not concern itself much with political affairs. It says that in 1892 B.E. (1350) Rāmādhīpati Suvannadola (Rama Thibodi) was ruling in Ayuthia, which city he founded. It does not mention Angkor nor Cambodia until 1591, when it speaks of the beginning of campaigns against Cambodia in which the capital was taken.⁵⁸ It gives few dates but

⁵⁶ O. Frankfurter, "Events in Ayuddhya, from Chulacakaraj 686 to 966 (a translation)," *Journal of the Siam Society*, 6 pt. 3 (1909).

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 3–5.

⁵⁸ George Coedès, "Un recension pâlie des annales d'Ayuthya," *BEFEO*, 14, no. 3 (1914), 1–31, especially 1–2, 18, 21–22. It is contained in Part 7 of a religious work called the *Sangitivamsa* written in 1789.

Table 3. Comparison of Chronologies of Ang Eng, Moura, and Leclère

Probable Dates	Ang Eng	Moura	Leclère
1404	<p>1. (1346) <u>Mibānā</u></p> <p>2. (1351) Tulai, brother-in-law of 1</p> <p>3. (1362) Garu, brother of 2</p> <p>4. (1367) Paramthekamrāja, grandson of 3</p> <p>5. (1370) <u>Lāmbhā</u> Paramarājādhirāja, brother of 4 (1373) R.T. of Ayuthia invaded Cambodia. (1376) <u>Lāmbhā</u> died</p> <p>6. (1374) Brother of 5 Died after 5 months rule</p> <p>7. (1376) <u>Baḥ Lāmbhā</u> R.T. seized Angkor; his 3 sons ruled at Angkor for 6 years; Angkor prisoners taken to Ayuthia</p> <p>8. (1382-83) Kalamagha, nephew of 4</p> <p>9. (1386) <u>Gāmhāt</u> Rāghāshipati, nephew of 4; grandson of 6; fought against Chams and Ayuthia</p>	<p>1. 1340 <u>Mibean-bat</u></p> <p>1346 Sithean</p> <p>2. 1347 <u>Lompong</u>, son of 1 In 1350 Lompong died</p> <p>3. 1351 Sorijotey, brother of 2 1351 R.T. seized Angkor; Sorijotey fled to Laos. Sons of 2 ruled 3 years; 90,000 Angkor prisoners taken to Ayuthia. Siamese driven out</p> <p>3. 1351 Sorijotey, brother of 2 1351 R.T. seized Cambodia; S. killed; Angkor taken. Sons of 2 ruled with 10,000 soldiers; Angkor prisoners taken to Ayuthia. Siamese driven out at Angkor. Siamese fled from Laos; retook Angkor in 1357.</p> <p>4. 1356 <u>Barom-reaema</u>, son of 2</p> <p>5. 1373 <u>Thommo-saccarach</u>, brother of 4 1384 Cambodians invaded Chantabun and Choloborey; took C. prisoners; Siamese driven out; retired with many prisoners</p> <p>3. 1401 Sorijovong, son of Sorijotey</p> <p>5. 1417 <u>Barom-soccoroch</u>, son of Thommo Sorijotey; Angkor; deflection of 2 mandarins; Siamese of Barom; Angkor fell; Siamese Prince ruled 1451; Paricea-jat had Siamese Prince assassinated</p>	<p>1. 1340 <u>Mibean-bat</u></p> <p>1346 Sithean</p> <p>2. 1347 <u>Lompongs</u>, son of 1 reinforced. Siamese (son of 3) fled to Laos; Lompongs died in 1355</p> <p>3. 1353 <u>Saurtoyey</u>, brother of 2 R.T. again invaded Cambodia; S. killed; Angkor taken. Sons of 2 ruled with 10,000 soldiers; Angkor prisoners taken to Ayuthia. Siamese driven out at Angkor. Siamese fled from Laos; retook Angkor in 1357.</p> <p>4. 1366 <u>Barom Rang</u>, son of 2</p> <p>5. 1373 <u>Thommasoka</u>, brother of 4 sieged Angkor; defection of 2 mandarins; Siamese driven out; Angkor killed; fall of Siam (1384), after 7 months. Son of B.R., ruled--stanes, traitor bonzes and spoils taken to Ayuthia</p> <p>3. 1401 Saurtoyey, son of Saurtoyey</p> <p>5. 1417 <u>Barommasoka</u>, nephew of Saurtoyey 1420 Angkor again attacked and taken; S. died after reign of 3 years</p> <p>6. 1421 <u>Ponhea Yeat</u>, son of Saurtoyey</p>
1428	<p>10. <u>Dhammascha</u> Rāghāshipati, brother of 9</p> <p>1431 <u>Paricea-jat</u> ruled; Siamese deflection of 2 mandarins and 2 bonzes; death of D.R. Indrarājā ruled; Siamese took 40,000 captives</p>	<p>3. 1401 Sorijovong, son of Sorijotey</p> <p>5. 1417 <u>Barom-soccoroch</u>, son of Thommo Sorijotey; Angkor; deflection of 2 mandarins; Siamese of Barom; Angkor fell; Siamese Prince ruled 1451; Paricea-jat had Siamese Prince assassinated</p>	<p>3. 1401 Saurtoyey, son of Saurtoyey</p> <p>5. 1417 <u>Barommasoka</u>, nephew of Saurtoyey 1420 Angkor again attacked and taken; S. died after reign of 3 years</p>
1432	<p>11. <u>Gān Yāt</u>, son of 9</p>	<p>6. <u>Pinhea-jat</u>, son of 3</p>	<p>6. 1421 <u>Ponhea Yeat</u>, son of Saurtoyey</p>

Notes: (1) The Barommo-soccoroch of Moura is evidently a repetition of Thommo-soccorach, whom Moura says is his father. (2) The statements about Chantabun and Choloborey are evidently brought in from a Siamese source and would better have been attributed to Barom-reaema, who may correspond to Ang Eng's Gāmhāt. (3) Leclère shows more clearly the identity of these two kings and that Barommo-soccoroch, whom he calls Barommasoka, is a repetition of Thommo-soccorach, because the events given under Thommasoka more properly belong under the person he calls Barommasoka. (4) Even more clearly, Sorijotey and Sorijovong of Moura are identical. (5) The dates of Ang Eng, Moura, and Leclère are all wrong. The dates on the left are offered as correct dates, corresponding to Table 2.

gives the length of the reigns of kings. It is of value to this work chiefly in checking the chronology of the Frankfurter recension, with which it is in general agreement.

Even after the appearance of these two recensions, whose chronology, while brief, is approximately correct, histories continue to appear which complete and sometimes exaggerate and scramble the mistakes of the earlier recensions. In 1926, W.A.R. Wood, British consul-general at Chieng-mai, published the first edition of *A history of Siam*, which has since appeared in several editions. He purports to follow the Luang Prasoet recension, translated by Frankfurter, and a history of Siam by Prince Damrong, in Siamese; but in his account of the relations between Cambodia and Ayuthia during this period, he leaves Luang Prasoet long enough to commit many of the errors of the older period and add a few of his own. He says the Prince of Ut'ong (Rama Thibodi) founded Ayuthia in 1350; that Siam conquered Cambodia in 1352, after a siege of nearly a year (during which the king of Cambodia died), and put the crown prince of Siam on the throne; that, in 1393, as a consequence of the invasion of the Jonburi and Chantabun districts by "Kodom Bong" of Cambodia, Ramesuen, king of Siam, captured Angkor, carried away 90,000 Cambodians as prisoners, set up a vassal king, and left a Siamese garrison of 5,000 men under General Jai Narong, and that, in 1431, Boromoraja II invaded Cambodia, took the capital after a siege of seven months (during which another Cambodian king — Thammasok — died), and set up his own son, the Prince of Inthaburi, as king. "King Boromoraja II brought back from Cambodia, after the invasion, a quantity of bronze images of animals, including one of a sacred cow. . . . He also captured a vast number of prisoners." The Prince of Inthaburi died — or was murdered — and a Cambodian prince was appointed king with the title of Boromoraja Thirat Rama Thibodi; he moved the capital to Phnom Penh.⁵⁹ The exact source of some of Wood's statements is not revealed.

WHAT THE INSCRIPTIONS AND OTHER HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS SAY

Before beginning the appraisal of the Siamese and Cambodian chronicles, which are largely speculative, it is well to determine just where historical certainty ends and speculation begins.

The discovery and publication or the re-examination of a couple of inscriptions have brought to light data which were not available to most

⁵⁹ Wood, 62, 65, 76, 81.

of the writers mentioned above, if they had cared to use them. (1) A Khmer inscription, found in a gallery of the Bayon in 1913, was noted in that year.⁶⁰ It was reproduced and given a number (no. 470) in 1915⁶¹ but was not translated into a European language. Coedès reviewed it in 1928 and published some of its contents.⁶² According to Coedès, the inscription says that the reign of Indrajayavarman ended and that of Jayavarma paramesvara began in 1327. (2) A Sanskrit stele inscription — the last Sanskrit inscription of ancient Cambodia which has come to light — was discovered at Angkor Wat and was translated into French and published by Abel Bergaigne in 1885,⁶³ but it has never been given much attention by historians. This inscription records the foundation by King Jayavarma paramesvara of a hermitage to Siva. No date is given, but from the context it seems that this king had then been ruling a few years. So, it may be said with certainty that this king was on the throne until after 1327, perhaps as late as 1330. This foundation and his name, however, seem to indicate that he was Sivaite.⁶⁴

According to the Laotian chronicles, some time shortly after 1316, Phi Fa, son of the king of Muong Swa, or Muong Java (afterward called Luang Prabang), fleeing from the Laotian court with his infant son, Fa Ngom, for an offense against his father, took refuge at the Khmer court with the king (whom Le Boulanger calls Paramathakemaraja,⁶⁵ but who could be none other than the Jayavarma paramesvara of the inscriptions). They remained a long time at the Khmer court where Fa Ngom was brought up by a Hinayanist monk. When he was 16 years old [1332], he married a daughter of the Khmer king. Coedès gives additional reasons for thinking Jayavarma paramesvara reigned even after 1330.⁶⁶ He thinks that in that year he sent the embassy to the imperial court, mentioned in Chinese dynastic history,⁶⁷ and that it was he who, in 1335, sent a delegation to

⁶⁰ *BEFEO*, 13, no. 7 (1913), 105–06.

⁶¹ George Coedès, "Supplement à l'inventaire des inscriptions," *BEFEO*, 15, no. 2 (1915), 179.

⁶² G. Coedès, "Etudes cambodgiennes, XXII. La date d'avènement de Jayavarma paramesvara," *BEFEO*, 28 (1928), 145–46. See also Coedès, *Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie* (Paris: Boccard, 1948), 379.

⁶³ A. Bergaigne, "Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge, no. 65: Angkor Vat," *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres: notices et extraits des manuscrits* (Paris, 1885), 560–88.

⁶⁴ This is not decisive, however, as all through Cambodian history, Mahayanist kings made foundations to Brahmanic gods and Buddhist and Vishnuite kings maintained the state-cult of the Sivaic *devaraja*.

⁶⁵ P. Le Boulanger, *Histoire du Laos français* (Paris, 1931), 41–51.

⁶⁶ G. Coedès, *Histoire ancienne*, 294, and Coedès, *Etats hindouisés*, 372–73, 380.

⁶⁷ Paul Pelliot, "Deux itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du VIII^e siècle," *BEFEO*, 4 (1904), 240, note 5.

Cua Rao, to pay his respects to the emperor of Annam on the occasion of his successful expedition against the Tai kingdom of Ai-Lao.⁶⁸

Some time about 1350, the Khmer king decided to help Phi Fa and Fa Ngom to gain the throne of Muang Swa and to make that kingdom independent of Sukhothai.⁶⁹ So he provided them with an army of 10,000 men, which conquered Muang Swa. Phi Fa died during the siege, but Fa Ngom deposed his grandfather, ascended the throne, and secured the recognition of his suzerainty by all the Tai states from the Se Mun valley to Yunnan and from the Annamite chain to the Salween basin, including Lan-na (Chieng Mai). He even invaded the territory of Ayuthia, where Rama Thibodi is said to have recognized his suzerainty and promised him a daughter in marriage.⁷⁰ The founding of the independent Laotian kingdom of Lan Chang, with its capital at Muang Swa took place in 1353. This date is well established.⁷¹ It is the natal day of Laotian independence, the 802, 1066, or 1776 of Laotian history.

The Khmer king, through his daughter, seems to have maintained his influence over Fa Ngom for many years. Shortly after that monarch's accession, his subjects complained of his tyranny. The Khmer king remonstrated with him and exhorted him to follow the precepts of the Buddha. Fa Ngom accepted and asked for monks, sacred books, and artisans. A commission was sent, headed by Fa Ngom's old teacher. This is said to have been the occasion of the conversion of Laos to Hinayanism. The mission is said to have taken with it a famous statue of the Buddha, known as the Great Prabang, or "Luang Prabang." This became the palladium of the Laotian kingdom, and its name was afterward given to its capital. The installation of this statue is said to have taken place in 1358. Fa Ngom's queen died in 1368, and he was deposed by his subjects in 1373.⁷²

Thus, it is known on unimpeachable historical grounds that Jayavarma paramesvara⁷³ was reigning in Angkor up to about 1330, at least; and if Jayavarma paramesvara and Paramathakemaraja are identical — and there seems no doubt of it — it is almost historically certain that he was reigning

⁶⁸ Henri Maspero, "Etudes d'histoire d'Annam, VI: La frontière d'Annam et du Cambodge du 8 au 14 siècle," *BEFEO*, 18, no. 3 (1918), 35.

⁶⁹ Muang Swa had been tributary to Sukhothai since before 1292 but Sukhothai seems to have been made tributary to the king of Ayuthia in 1349 (see p. 4).

⁷⁰ Le Boulanger, 49–50; Coedès, *Histoire ancienne*, 289; Coedès, *États hindouisés*, 373.

⁷¹ Coedès, *Histoire ancienne*, 288; Coedès, *États hindouisés*, 374.

⁷² Le Boulanger, 50–51; Coedès, *ibid.*, 290, and *ibid.*, 375.

⁷³ Coedès sometimes calls him Jayavarmadiparemeçvara, but Bergaigne says that the infix *adi* is superfluous (Bergaigne, 585, note 3).

until about 1358, perhaps even to 1371, which is the year the Chinese say Hou-eul-na was on the throne of Chenla and sent tribute to the imperial court (see p. 14). After the last certain date of Jayavarma, say about 1358, the next certain date of Cambodian history is 1430–31, the siege and capture of Angkor. The problem, then, is to fill in the space between 1358 and 1430 and to make the kings conform to the statements about them in the Chinese account given by Rémusat (see pp. 14–15).

CONCLUSIONS

Some dates may be considered as fixed:

(1) The *chao* of U Thong founded Ayuthia in 1350 and took the name of Rama Thibodi (Rāmā dhipati). This date is established by the two oldest but most recently discovered recensions of the *Annals of Ayuthia*, and it is discussed in some detail by Prince Damrong and by Coedès.⁷⁴ It is generally accepted.

(2) Boromoraja II (Paramarājādhirāja) of Ayuthia besieged Angkor Thom in 1430 and took it after 7 months, in 1431. This date is established by the most ancient and reliable of all the chronicles — Luang Prasoet's recension of the *Annals of Ayuthia*, as translated by Frankfurter (see Table 1) — and by other data given herein. Coedès has established, by means of a recension of a Cambodian chronicle found at Phnom Penh,⁷⁵ that the capital was founded there by Ponha-yat in 1434, after he had spent a year at Basan. The Chinese say that embassies from Chenla to the imperial court ceased to come regularly during the period 1426–35.

(3) The date of the accession of Boromoraja II of Siam may be fixed at 1424. This is the date given by Frankfurter. Other recensions, which we know are wrong in other particulars (see Table 1), place it in 1418 and 1419. Frankfurter's date of the reigns of Siamese kings, given in Table 1, may be accepted as correct for this period.

(4) The accession of Barommo-soccoroch or Thommo-soccarach (Dharmasok) of Cambodia is dated in 1428 by the simple fact that practically all versions of the Cambodian chronicles or annals agree that the siege of Angkor began in the third year of his reign. If 1430 is accepted as the date of the siege of Angkor, 1428 must be accepted as the date of the accession of that king. The "Chronological list," which places the siege of Ang-

⁷⁴ Prince Damrong, "The foundation of Ayuthia," *Journal of the Siam Society*, 11 (1914), 7–10; Coedès, *Histoire ancienne*, 285–87; Coedès, *États hindouisés*, 364–70.

⁷⁵ G. Coedès, "Le fondation de Phom Pén au xve siècle d'après la chronique Cambodgienne," *BEFEO*, 13 no. 6 (1913), 6–11.

kor in 1408–09, dates the accession in 1406. Doudart de Lagrée gave 1372–73 for the siege of Angkor and 1370 for the accession. Moura gives 1420 and 1417 respectively but says the siege began in the third year of the reign, giving the king's name as Barommo-soccoroch. The Ang Eng recension gives no dates for this event, but says it happened in the third year of the reign of the king, whom it calls Dharmasoka (see Tables 2 and 3).

From the data above and other data, several additional conclusions may now be drawn: (1) the Siamese did not conquer Angkor in 1350–53; (2) a campaign seems to have taken place in Chantabun and Jolburi, beginning probably as early as 1390 and extending into the fifteenth century; (3) the Chams invaded the delta early in the fifteenth century and probably advanced as far as Chantabun; (4) each of these three Siamese campaigns – 1350–51, Chantabun-Jolburi, and 1430–31 – had certain identifying characteristics; and (5) the dates of these events were set back, or their character was changed, and the reigns of kings were placed much earlier than they really occurred, by those who prepared or revised the chronicles of Cambodia, and kings and events were sometimes added – chiefly by repetition – to fill the gap between 1432, when fairly reliable records begin, and 1346 or 1340 – the date arbitrarily set for the beginning of the chronicle. Each of these points will be taken up in order.

(1) The belief that Rama Thibodi I of Ayuthia did not capture Angkor in 1350–53 or at any other time is based on the following facts: (a) Siamese annals do not mention such a conquest – they only mention a raid into Cambodia; (b) the Chinese, who had intimate relations with Cambodia after 1370 (see Table 2) give no hint of a Siamese conquest prior to 1430–31; (c) nothing is said of the loot of the temples of Angkor, which would have been great; (d) the Laotian chronicles indicate that the king who was on the throne before 1330 was there after 1353, and (e) according to the “Chronological list,” Nipean-bat did not begin to reign until 1382, which, as will be seen, in our corrected chronology, is equivalent to 1404.

(a) Of the two recensions of the *Annals of Ayuthia*, which are earlier than those prepared in the late eighteenth or nineteenth centuries, neither mentions any sack of Angkor before 1431. To be sure, the Pali recension translated by Coedès does not mention any at that time either; but the Luang Prasoet (Frankfurter) recension mentions the capture of 1431 and no other. Of the rewritten annals, the Taylor Jones recension, which is the oldest, says the Siamese made a successful campaign into Cambodia in 1350–51 but it does not say they captured the capital. Neither Pallegoix nor Bowring, who followed the Paramanujit recension, says the Siamese

captured Angkor at that time. It is not until we come to the later and less reliable *Cambodian chronicles* that we find the statement that the Siamese captured Angkor in 1351–53. It is hardly conceivable that the *Annals of Ayuthia*, which boast that Rama Thibodi I was in possession of several places whose possession by him at that time is doubtful, would have omitted such an important place as Angkor if he had taken it.

(b) The Chinese enumerate fifteen or sixteen embassies from Chenla (Cambodia) to the imperial court between 1370 and the period 1426–35. They mention invasions by the Cochinchinese [Chams] but not by the Siamese. All through the period, the kings of Chenla sent rich gifts to the Ming emperors. The Chinese speak of the magnificence of the court of Chenla and say there is a proverb “rich as Chenla.” This does not sound like a capital which had recently been captured and looted.

(c) Angkor, as described by Chou Ta-kuan in 1296–97, must have been one of the wealthiest cities of the world, and no city would have provided a richer booty to its captors. The Chinese mention gold and silver images sacked by the Chams during the period, but none by the Siamese. It is hardly conceivable that this city should have fallen into the hands of the enemy without some remark as to the disposition made of its treasures. To be sure, not much is said on this subject on the occasion of its capture in 1431; but brief as the records are, the Frankfurter account says the king of Siam ordered all the images brought to Ayuthia; the Taylor-Jones recension says that “Rajatirat brought with him images of cows and various other animals and deposited some in the wat Mighty Relic, and some in the wat Sanpet;” the Moura version of the *Cambodian chronicles* says that the Siamese carried off “The idol of Prea-cu,⁷⁶ a bronze lion and other idols;” Leclère says the king of Siam “carried off the Preah Ko and all the statues of the Buddha, which were of gold and of silver;”⁷⁷ the Ang Eng recension says the Siamese built two pagodas from the spoils; and Wood gained from Siamese sources that the king of Siam brought back “a quantity of bronze images of animals, including one of a sacred cow.”

(d) According to the *Annals of Laos*, as previously stated, the king who was reigning at Angkor in 1330 was there after 1353 and, precisely in 1351–53, instead of being conquered and driven to the court of Laos to get the support of that country to regain his own throne, he was at that moment giving refuge to two members of the royal family of Muang Swa and preparing to aid them to drive from the throne that king whom the

⁷⁶ Preah Ko = Nandin, the sacred bull.

⁷⁷ Leclère, 214.

Royal Cambodian chronicles and some historians say was giving him refuge in 1351.

(e) Finally, according to the "Chronological list"—the original list of kings, according to the records preserved at Oudong, before the revisers began writing the chronicles back to 1346 or 1340—Nipean-bat did not begin to reign until 1382, 27 years before the fall of Angkor, which, properly corrected, means A.D. 1404 (see Table 2).

On the evidence, then, there seems to be little reason to think that Rama Thibodi I of Ayuthia captured Angkor in 1351 or at any other time. He probably invaded Cambodia at that time.

(2) There seems to have been fighting in the frontier provinces of Chantabun and Jolburi, beginning apparently about 1390. The reason for thinking this fighting began before 1404 (see previous paragraph) is that the information comes from Siamese sources which ascribe it to the reign of king Ramesuen of Siam, whose reign according to Frankfurter extended from 1388 to 1395. This account first appears in the Taylor Jones recension, which says the Cambodians invaded this region and carried off 6,000 captives. It indicates that this occurred in the third year of the second reign of Ramesuen and gives it the date of 1384, but the two most trustworthy recensions of those annals—those translated by Frankfurter and Coedès—say the second year of that king's reign was 1390 or 1392. Taylor Jones says that, later, the Siamese drove the Cambodians out of this region and left 5,000 men under Chainerong to hold it in subjection and that, still later, due to the invasions of the Cochinchinese [Chams], Chainerong gathered up all the inhabitants and took them to Siam. Pallegoix substitutes Cambodia for Chantabun and says that in 1385, Siam took the capital and left only 5,000 inhabitants.⁷⁸ Neither the "Chronological list" nor Doudart de Lagrée mention a campaign in Chantabun, but Garnier, in his historical sketch (see p. 13), combines the statements of both Taylor Jones and Pallegoix and, while dating the campaign of Ramesuen (1388–95) in 1385, places it *after the siege and capture of Angkor by Boromoraja II* (Paramaraja) (1424–48) which event he places in 1373. Aymonier and Maspero carefully avoided all reference to this campaign, but Moura and Leclère tried to fit it into the reign of a Cambodian king with, as will be seen (Table 3), disastrous results. Wood says that, in 1393 (a date he says he got from Prince Damrong, and which is probably the correct date),⁷⁹ King "Kodom Bong" of Cambodia (whoever he was) in-

⁷⁸ This seems to be the origin of the error that Siam captured Angkor on this date.

⁷⁹ Wood says that, according to "Cambodian history" (whatever that means), this invasion

vaded Jolburi and Chantabun; whereupon Ramesuen (he died in 1394) captured Angkor (still another date for this event), left Chainerong with 5,000 men (at Angkor now, instead of Chantabun), took 90,000 prisoners to Ayuthia (generally attributed to the campaign of 1350-51), and set up a Cambodian vassal king (this is something new; I wonder where he got that) to rule at Angkor.⁸⁰ The Ang Eng recension does not mention Chantabun nor Jolburi but relates in some detail the attempts of a king it calls Gamkhat (whose successors' reign is said to have begun three years before the final fall of Angkor) to invade Ayuthia by the southern route.⁸¹

(3) The Chams invaded the delta region, perhaps as far as Chantabun, early in the fifteenth century, perhaps earlier. The first definite date on this point seems to have been 1414, when the Chinese say that the Cambodian embassy of that year complained that invasions of the Cochinchinese had several times prevented the arrival of their embassies.⁸² The Chinese emperor sent an escort with the envoys and ordered the king of Cochinchina (Champa) to withdraw his troops from Cambodian territory and to leave his neighbor in peace. This does not seem to have checked their predatory instincts however; for although embassies arrived in 1417 and in 1419, an inscription dated 1421, in the Cham language, carved on the pedestal of an image of Vishnu, found at Bienhoa near Saigon, says that the Cham king took possession of a kingdom called Brah Kanda and, after numerous victories, returned to Champa that year and made several foundations with the booty he had taken from the Kvir (Khmer).⁸³ That the Nagara Brah Kanda of the inscription included the entire delta there can be little doubt; for the Ang Eng recension says the Chams and Indians seized many gold and silver Buddhas and attacked Catur Mukha (see p. 18); whereupon, King Gamkhat (presumably Barom-reamea; see Table 3) defeated them, recovered the loot, and drove them out. This seems to have occurred just before Gamkhat made his last attack this time via Korat on Ayuthia. About this time, Gamkhat met his death by poison. It was in reprisal for this attack that the Siamese king made the final attack on Angkor, in the third year of the reign of Gamkhat's successor, Dharmasoka (Barommo-soccoroch or Thommo-soccarach).⁸⁴

took place in 1357, but that he placed it in 1393 on the authority of Prince Damrong (Wood, 76, note 3). This was a good idea so far as the date of the invasion is concerned, but he should have left the 90,000 at the earlier date to agree with other authorities.

⁸⁰ Wood, 76.

⁸¹ See p. 18.

⁸² Rémusat, 97.

⁸³ R. C. Majumdar, *Ancient Indian colonies in the Far East*, vol. 1, *Champa* (Lahore, 1927), pt. 3, 224.

⁸⁴ This Gamkhat seems to have died in 1427-28 and his defeat of the Chams probably

(4) Each of the Siamese campaigns — 1350–51, Jolburi-Chantabun, and 1430–31 — had certain identifying characteristics. As seen in previous pages, various versions of the *Annals of Ayuthia* — Taylor Jones, Pallegoix, Bowring — simply say that Rama Thibodi made an expedition into Cambodia and brought back many prisoners. But the *Cambodian chronicles* — Doudart de Lagrée, Garnier, Moura, Leclère, Ang Eng — say (1) that Rama Thibodi took Angkor, (2) that his three sons reigned there, and (3) that 90,000 captives were taken to Ayuthia. These chronicles do not agree on the date of the alleged sack of Angkor. Most of them give the date as 1351–53, but the “Chronological list” gives 1388 (but see Table 1) and, according to the chronology of the Ang Eng recension, the date was 1376 or later. There is quite general agreement that this disaster happened under the reign of Lompong or the first year of the reign of his successor (whom the Ang Eng recension calls also Lamban, but who seems to correspond to the Sorijotey of Moura and Sauryotey of Leclère — see Tables 2, 3). The length of time between the accession of Nipean-bat and the restoration after the alleged Siamese rule is 11 years according to the “Chronological list” and Doudart de Lagrée, 15 years according to Moura, 17 years according to Leclère (who has practically the same thing happen again either in 1384 or 1394), and 36 or more years according to the Ang Eng recension (showing the difficulty of the later writers to fill in the space). As has been seen, there are weighty reasons for believing that the Siamese did not capture Angkor during this period, but that they merely made a raid into Cambodia and carried off many prisoners, as the *Annals of Ayuthia* say they did. If the Siamese intervention — which is the only recorded event of the Cambodian chronicle during the period — did not occur, there is no reason for thinking these kings reigned at that time, but another strong reason for believing — what has already been advanced (see p. 27) — that these kings reigned, if at all, between 1404 and 1431.

The characteristics of the Chantabun-Jolburi campaign, according to Taylor Jones were: (1) that region was invaded by Cambodians, (2) Ramesuen, king of Ayuthia, expelled the Khmers, (3) the Siamese left there a general, Chainerong, with (4) 5,000 men. Pallegoix apparently gave the date as 1385, instead of 1384, because according to his account Ramesuen's

occurred not very long before that date. The Chams probably did not hold the delta for a very long time, for that would have halted the embassies to the Chinese court. No embassy is specifically mentioned after 1419, although they seem to have come with some regularity until 1426, when they became very irregular. It was probably about this date (1426) that the Chams made their last invasion of the delta, which led to their defeat at Catur Mukha.

reign began in 1385. He transfers the event from the provinces to the capital and, instead of leaving 5,000 soldiers to hold the place, leaves a remnant of population of only 5,000, which would be ridiculous for a city the size of Angkor. Garnier, in his *Voyage*, repeats Taylor Jones's statement that the king of Cambodia invaded Chantabun and Jolburi in 1384, but follows Pallegoix's error that Ramesuen captured Angkor in 1385 and left only 5,000 inhabitants, and then, on his own, transfers Chainerong and his 5,000 soldiers to Angkor! Moura agrees with the Taylor Jones recension in having the Cambodians invade Chantabun-Jolburi in 1384, but he has Siam attack that region in 1393 and carry off many inhabitants (see p. 14). Wood (temporarily abandoning or rather supplementing the Frankfurter recension, which he claims to follow) says the Cambodians invaded Chantabun-Jolburi, and that, as a consequence, Ramesuen took Angkor in 1393 and left Jai Narong (Chainerong) there with 5,000 soldiers. And then he adds that Ramesuen carried away on this expedition 90,000 prisoners, an event which the Cambodian chronicles attribute to the campaign of Rama Thibodi I in 1351-53. (Pallegoix had left only 5,000 inhabitants there eight years before.)

The account of the siege and capture of Angkor, which has been fixed at 1430-31, has also certain identifying characteristics: (1) Paramaradjhira (Boromoraja II) was king of Siam; (2) Thommo-soccarach (Dharmasoka) was king of Cambodia; (3) the siege lasted seven months; (4) two Cambodian mandarins — Keo, Kieu, or Kielo, and Thai, Tay, or Thy and two monks, according to the Ang Eng recension, went over to the Siamese; (5) the Khmer king was killed or died during the siege; (6) the Siamese king put his own son — Inthaburi, Indr, Indra, Ento, or Entho-reachea — on the throne; (7) the Siamese carried off the idols to Ayuthia; (8) the Cambodian heir apparent — Ponha-yat (Gam Yat) — had the Siamese puppet killed and assumed power, and (9) Ponha-yat moved the capital to Basan, then to Phnom Penh. These characteristics, though variously dated, may be identified as relating to the siege and capture of Angkor in 1430-31.

(5) The dates given in the various Cambodian accounts were evidently set back by the minister or commission which prepared and revised the *Royal chronicles* in the early part of the nineteenth century and by those who prepared the new recension for Moura during the reign of Norodom.

When Nong and his assistants met, in the reign of Ang Chan, to write the *Royal Cambodian chronicles*, they decided to begin with 1346. That was the date chosen for the Ang Eng recension, probably in the preceding reign. Why this date was chosen does not appear, unless it be that the

Annals of Ayuthia, prepared a short time before in the same way, began in 1350, and one recension of it spoke of an attack on Angkor in 1350–51. Cambodian records before 1431 had probably been destroyed when the Siamese sacked Angkor on that date. The records remaining dated from the abandonment of that city in 1432 and probably what the writers could remember of events before that date. What they could remember previous to Ponha-yat's accession was probably represented by the "Chronological list" of five kings covering a period of 27 years from the accession of Nipean-bat to the fall of Angkor. According to this "List," the reigns of these five kings covered a period from 1382 to 1409, but it has been established that Angkor fell in 1431. This places the beginning of Nipean-bat's reign in 1404, which corresponds well with the date the Chinese give for the accession of a new king of Cambodia (see p. 15).

The problem, then, which confronted Nong and his associates was to bridge the gap of 86 years between 1432, when the records began again, and 1346, the date desired for the beginning of the *Royal chronicles*, with only 27 years of records. The compilers of the "Chronological list" had already taken up 22 of these 86 years by moving the period covered by the "List" back from 1404–31 to 1382–1409. From Doudart de Lagrèe's account, it may be gained that Nong and his associates solved their problem by transferring these five kings back to 1346–73, by the interjection of a Siamese interregnum where none existed, and by lengthening the reigns of some kings. Garnier created a temporary diversion by adding 12 years to some of these dates, but later he returned to Doudart de Lagrèe's chronology. A glance at Table 2 will show the essential agreement of these recensions and the probable true chronology. After this commission had moved Lompong's accession back to 1351, apparently to meet the exigencies of the *Annals of Ayuthia*, they went the *Annals'* account of the Siamese attack on Angkor one better by having the Siamese actually capture the capital. But to put that event under Lompong's reign in the "List," they had to date it 1388 (in the revised chronology, 1410).

Moura says he wrote his account of this period from Pali documents furnished him by King Norodom, which were translated for him by a local scholar of some renown. As nothing else is known about these Pali documents, this account is here called the Moura recension,⁸⁵ as he evidently tried to reconcile the Pali documents with others. These documents, according to Moura, show Nipean-bat on the throne in 1340. This imposed the necessity of making the intervening reigns cover 91 years between

⁸⁵ See p. 13.

that date and 1431, the now established date of the fall of Angkor. The result gives a hint of the method employed. The compilers of the Moura recension moved the date of Ponha-yat's accession back to 1421 — probably partly because Taylor Jones's recension of the *Annals of Ayuthia* says that was the year the Siamese king set up his son Indra (Entho) as king and brought some images to Ayuthia, and more probably because the Chinese say a king named Chieu-bing-Nha, whom Moura wrongly identified as Ponha-yat,⁸⁶ sent an embassy to the imperial court in that year. That took up 10 of the 91 years. The first five kings on Moura's list (if we disregard Sithean who reigned only a few months prior to and in the same year as Lompong's accession) are the same as the first five on the "Chronological list"—Nipean-bat, Lompong (Lamban), Sorijotey or Sorijovong (Suryavamsa), Barom-reamea (Paramarama), and Thommo-soccarach or Barommo-soccoroch (Dharmasoka). But Moura has Thommo-soccarach come to the throne in 1373, and it is now established that he came to the throne in 1428. In between these dates the Moura recension interjects two new kings — Sorijovong and Barommo-soccoroch — who are quite obviously only repetitions of Sorijotey and Thommo-soccarach. According to Moura's account, his first three kings actually reigned six, three, and twelve years respectively (omitting one year each for the transition preceding the accession of the second and third). The Moura recension adds six years to the reign of Barom-reamea, giving him a reign of ten years (instead of four, given him by other accounts), gives his two interjected kings reigns of twenty-eight and sixteen years and adds a year to the reign of Barommo-soccoroch (whom we identify as Thommo-soccarach, and will call Dharmasoka, as the Ang Eng recension does) by having his reign begin a year before the established date of 1428. Thus the Moura recension fills in the 91 years as follows:

Setting the date back from 1431 to 1421	10 years
Reigns of 5 kings (according to revised Moura).	28 years
Interjected years:	
Transition periods 2 and 3	2 years
Barom-reamea's reign extended	6 years
Thommo-soccarach	28 years
Sorijovong	16 years
Extra year of Dharmasoka	1 year
	53 years
	91 years

⁸⁶ Moura, 2:39, note 1.

The accompanying Table 1 compares the chronology of the other recensions of the *Annals of Ayuthia* — Coedès, Jones and Pallegoix (Paramanujit) — with Frankfurter (Luang Prasoet), which is considered correct. Wood's chronology is given for comparison, because his is the most widely read and up-to-date history of Siam in English. In general, Wood follows Frankfurter; but, as shown, in his few incursions into this period of Cambodian history, he wandered from his safe guide long enough to let the chronicles and histories of Cambodia persuade him that Rama Thibodi I took Angkor in 1351–52 and to let Pallegoix lead him into errors about the event he dates 1393.

Table 2 shows the essential agreement of various versions of the Nong recension of the Cambodian chronicles with the "Chronological list." It shows also how Moura's account, properly revised, will fit into this chronology.

Table 3 compares and tries to parallel the accounts of Moura and Leclère (who seems to follow Moura, in part at least, or to have used the same source) and the Ang Eng recension, from which both Moura and Leclère may have derived. All the dates of the table are incorrect. If we accept the revision of Moura and throw out of the record the reigns of Sorijovong and Barommo-soccoroch, the five remaining kings will agree essentially with those of Table 2. A comparison of Moura and Leclère shows that Leclère's repetitions correspond with those of Moura but are not so well worked out.