CHAPTER III
CAMPAIGNS OF HARSA.

I. OUR SOURCES:

Since different authorities have conflicting opinions about the campaigns and conquests of Harsa, it is not easy to determine the accurate boundaries of his dominions after his exploits. Even though Hiuen Tsang's Life and Travels, Bana's Harsa-carita, the inscriptions and coins of the different rulers of the age etc. throw ample light on this problem, scholars like C. V. Vaidya, R. K. Mookerji, R. S. Tripathi, K. M. Panikar, R. C. Majumdar, Chatterji, Banerji and others have also interpreted sources in a variety of ways and arrived at different conclusions. Therefore it is a difficult task for one to draw a fair line of the exploits and victories of Harsa.

II. MARCH OF HARSA AGAINST SAŚĀNKA.

When Harsa received the tragic news of the assassination of his elder brother Rājya-vardhana and learnt about the misfortune of his sister Rājyaśri through Kuntāla, he became wild with rage and immediately took a vow to clear the earth of the Gauḍas. He, through his supreme minister of war and peace, Avanti, proclaimed that all the kings should either be prepared to give tribute to him or to grasp their swords. Then Harsa ordered Skandagupta, the commandant of his whole elephant troop, to prepare the elephant-corps and be ready for the march. At that time, Skandagupta e him a od
piece of advice which probably hinted at the treachery of the Gaudarāja and he urged upon Harṣa to guard himself against such frauds.3

Harṣa started his march with a big army consisting of elephants, cavalry and infantry corps headed by his faithful generals. Bāṇa describes the whole scene very vividly.

There was a good omen at the very beginning. Harṣa very willingly welcomed the offer of alliance from Kumārarāja of Kāmarūpa,4 who, perhaps being afraid of Saśāṅka, wanted the co-operation of a mighty kingdom of Northern India at the time. Harṣa, after rescuing his unlucky sister and taking her with him, proceeded to Kanauj. As already noted, Saśāṅka had left Kanauj precipitately. Harṣa established himself there and perhaps began to prepare for the war against Saśāṅka.

It is very doubtful whether actual conflict between Harṣa and Saśāṅka ever took place. Bāṇa does not refer to it and H. Tsang is also silent on this issue. There is a vague reference to it in a Buddhist chronicle named Ārya-manjuśrī-mūlakalpa.5 It has the following passage:

"At that time will arise in Madhyadesa the excellent king whose name begins with 'Ra' (perhaps Rājyavardhana) of the Vaiśya caste. He will be as powerful as Soma (Saśāṅka). He also ends at the hand of a king of the Nāga caste."
"His younger brother Ha (probably Harsavarman) will be an unrivalled hero. He decided against the famous Soma. The powerful Vaisy king with a large army marched against the Eastern country, against the excellent capital called Pundra of that characterless man. He defeated Soma, the pursuer of wicked deeds; and Soma was forbidden to move out of his country (being commanded) to remain therein (thenceforth). He returned having (or not having) been respected in that kingdom of the wicked person."

Dr. R. G. Basak accepts the views of Jayaswal on this passage, and says, "the author of M.M.K. means that Harsa, not being welcomed in the Eastern country returned to his own kingdom with the satisfaction that he had won a victory." However, it is not safe to rely upon such a later work which is merely interested in repeating the stories of Sasan's oppression against Buddhism as related by H. Tsang.

Gaudaraja had certainly left Kanauj, when Harsa arrived there with his sister Rajyasri and his minister Bhandi. He might have thought it prudent to reach his capital Karnasuvarna (Pundra) instead of facing a conflict with the mighty army of Harsa. If M.M.K. is to be relied upon, Harsa followed and after defeating him, compelled him to shut himself in his capital. However, Harsa had to return soon to his capital, leaving Sasan subdued. This fact is corroborated by the Ganjam Plate, which refers to Sasan as "Maharajadhira", and H. Tsang, who refers to Sasan as "the recently expired king of
Magadha, when he visited the Eastern parts of the country about 637-38 A.D. It means that Śaśāṇa might have died between 620 and 637 A.D. It is quite likely that after the death of Śaśāṇa, Harṣa might have annexed Magadha and the kingdom of Bengal to his empire or he might have given at least the eastern Bengal to his faithful ally Bhāskaravarman who took possession of the whole of Bengal after the death of Harṣa.9 Hiuen Tsang’s reference to the court held by Harṣa at Kajangala after his return from the conquest of Kongodā in 643 A.D.10 suggests it.

As no scholar or authority has supported the statement of Dr. D. C. Ganguly that the Gaudarāja referred to by Bāṇa was not Śaśāṇa but some other ruler of Bengal, who was defeated by Harṣa,11 it need not be discussed further. It is clear from the above discussion that Harṣa was not successful in his first campaign on the Eastern side and was not able to make good his boast to clear out of Gauḍās from the earth. There is no sense in saying that he might have pardoned Śaśāṇa because of his Buddhist tendencies when he did wage several battles later on in pursuit of his plan of Bigvijaya.

III. HARSA’S OTHER CAMPAIGNS:

Harṣa acquired the Maukhari empire when he became the guardian at Rājāśri at Kanauj (606 A.D.). This empire extended upto Ahicchatra, the boundary line of the old Thāṇḍāwar kingdom on the west, to Nālandā (Magadha).
on the east; it may have stretched up to the Tarai district on the North and on the South it probably did not extend beyond the Southern limit of modern United Provinces. It is to be fixed on various data how far Harsa expanded his empire beyond these limits. Hiuen Tsang states, "Harsa while proceeding eastward invaded the states which had refused allegiance and continued incessant battles till he, within six years, conquered the five Indias." The five Indias are supposed to include (i) Saurāṣṭra?, (ii) Kanyakubāj, (iii) Magadhā, (iv) Gauda, and (v) Orissā. According to Mookerji the first is not Saurāṣṭra but Svarāṣṭra (Punjāb). Bāna also ascribes to Harsa several victories over distant lands. But there is a great deal of exaggeration in the descriptions of both Bāna and Hiuen Tsang. As already stated Gauda maintained its independence at least up to the death of Saśāṅka. That Punjāb (North) remained an independent kingdom can be inferred from the absence of any evidence to suggest the contrary. It appears probable that Harsa, while returning from the first campaign, might have succeeded in compelling the rulers of mid-India to accept his suzerainty. Thus most of the territories of mid-India, which formed part of either the former Maukhari empire or of the kingdom of Vālava (of Devagupta) might have come under his direct rule. But the same cannot be said for the other kingdoms when Hiuen Tsang reveals the
of their kings at the time of his visit to these states.

A. HIS CAMPAIGN AGAINST SINDH:

Bāna's description of Prabhākaravardhana, as "a burning fever to the king of the Indus land," does not suggest that he had subdued Sindh and annexed it to his kingdom. Bāna further tells us that Hārṣa, after having pounded (Prabhā) the king of Sindh, made his wealth his own, exacted tribute from an inaccessible land of snowy mountains (the districts of Terai of Nepal?) So it be said that Hārṣa might have defeated the king of Sindh but failed in forcing him to acknowledge his suzerainty because Hiuen Tsang clearly mentions Sindh (Sin-Tu) as a separate state which was ruled by a Sudra king, who was a sincere believer in Buddhism. As already discussed, Sahasi ruled in Sindh, when Hiuen Tsang visited it. Hiuen Tsang also informs us that Sindh had at that time three dependencies, viz., (i) Atyan-Pon-Chin-I i.e. Atyanabakala (ii) Pi-to-Shin-lo identified by Cunningham with Haidrābād or Miraṅkot and by Haig with the Thar and Fārkher district, and (iii) A-fan-tu-identical with Brāhmaṇābād or the Khairpur district. From the account of Hiuen Tsang it is obvious that Hārṣa's campaign against Sindh by Hārṣa did not result in its annexation and that it remained outside the limits of Hārṣa's empire.

B. Defeat of Valabhi by Hārṣa:

Hiuen Tsang records, "The ruler of Falapi (Valabhi) was a Kṣatriya by caste. He was a nephew of
Siladitya, the former king of Malawā (Western) and a son-in-law of the Siladitya reigning at Kanyakubja. His name was Tu-lo-po-po-ta (Dhruvabhaṭa). He was, a Buddhist king.19

It is generally believed that the ruler of Valabhi was a feudatory of Harṣa. Dr. V. A. Smith holds that Dhruvabhaṭa, after his fight with Harṣa, was compelled to sue for peace and accept the hand of the victor's daughter and remain a vassal of Harṣa. Smith believes that this had also resulted into the surrender of Ānandapura, cutch and Soratha, which were the dependencies of western Malawā upto 641 A.D.20 (Western Malawā was a part of the kingdom of Valabhi at the time). Dr. Mookerji supports this view.21 It is suggested that the Navasāri copper plate also refers to the defeat of Dhruvasena II (Dhruvabhaṭa mentioned by Hiuen Tsang) by Harṣa. It states that the illustrious Dadda (Dadda II) gained great glory by giving protection to the lord of Valabhi who had been overpowered by the great lord, the illustrious Harṣadeva.22 Dhruvasena Second was a contemporary king of Dadda Second, the Gurjara king of Broach. Thus the testimony of Hiuen Tsang and the Navasāri grant corroborate each other. Now a question arises as to how a small king of Broach could protect the Valabhi king against a mighty emperor like Harṣa. The answer is
obtained from the Aihole inscription of Pulakesin II Second - which states that the Lāṭas, Mālawas and Gurjaras became, as it were, teachers of how feudatories subdued by force ought to behave. It suggests that the Gurjaras were also the feudatories of Pulakesin II Second. Dadda Second might have relied on Pulakesin's strength while giving protection. This very probably, might have led to the war between Harsa and Pulakesin II.

It should be remembered that the Navasāri plate was not issued by Dadda II but by some later successor who wished to eulogise his predecessor. The inscriptions of Dadda II do not relate the event mentioned above. Even if it were accepted that Dhruvabhaṭ was defeated by Harsa, this does not mean that Valabhi was a feudatory state of Harsa. The following circumstances should be taken into consideration.

According to Bāṇa, Frabhākara was "a trouble of the sleep of Gujārāt (Gurjaras)," "a looter to the lawlessness of the Lāṭas" and "an axe to the creeper of Mālawā's glory." It means that the states of Gurjaras, Lāṭas and of Western Mālawās (it cannot be Eastern Mālawā as Mahāsenagupta - ruler of Eastern Mālawā is supposed to be the maternal uncle of Frabhākara, his mother Mahāsen Gupta Devī being the sister of Mahāsenagupta) were probably independent when Harsa ascended the throne. Like his father,
he might have naturally tried to subdue them after his failure against Śāśānka. In his attempt to subdue Mālawā (or Valabhī), Hārṣa might have come into collision with Dhruvasena II. Dhruvasena, being unable to oppose unaided a mighty king like Hārṣa, might have sought the help from Dadda II, the Gurjara king of Broach. It is very likely that Dhruvasena and Dadda, along with the king of Lāṭa (all the three being the opponents of the kingdom of Thāṇeśwar), formed an alliance to protect themselves against the mighty arms of Hārṣa and as Dr. Kielhorn remarks,25 "they, being impressed by the power of Pulakesin, voluntarily accepted the position of his vassals for the time being to get protection."

As a result, as Dr. R. C. Majumdar points out,26 Hārṣa was defeated by this confederacy headed by Pulakesin. Of course the Aihol inscriptions do not hint at such joint efforts against Hārṣa, but it does not lessen the importance of this view because the inscription would give the whole credit to the ruler of the dynasty and not to the feudatories as Dr. R. S. Trirāṭhi has rightly pointed out.27 Dhruvabhata was able to regain his throne as a result of the treaty between Pulakesin and Hārṣa. Hārṣa might then have married his daughter to Dhruvabhata to win him over to his side.

Valabhī held an important geographical position between the North and South. So the friendship of its ruler was quite necessary for Hārṣa not only to achieve
his further conquests but also check the northern thrust of his rival Pulakesin II.\textsuperscript{28} However, this does not in any way prove that Dhruvasena was a vassal of Harsa. Hiuen Tsang does not hint at the feudatory status of Dhruvabhaṭa who was ruling at Valabhi when he visited it.\textsuperscript{29} The view that Dhruvabhaṭa's presence in the religious gathering at Prayāg, indicates his feudal status, can be refuted by saying that he might have attended the ceremony as the son-in-law of Harsa. Bhāskaravarma, king of Kāmarūpa who had also attended that meeting, was beyond doubt an independent ruler. The same may be true of Dhruvabhaṭa also. Beal informs that Dhruvabhaṭa also held such assemblies in his own kingdom and gave plenty of charity to all types of priests.\textsuperscript{30} All these facts go against general supposition that Valabhi was a feudatory state of Kanauj.

IV. THE WAR AGAINST PULAKESIN II

Most of the scholars, on the authority of Navasāri Plate and Aihole inscription, believe that Harsa had to fight with the Cālukya king Pulakesin II because of Dhruvasena II, the Valabhi king. The Aihole inscription of Pulakesin of A.D. 634 refers to the defeat of Harsa by Pulakesin. It also mentions Lātas, Tālawas and Gurjaras as his
feudatories. Dhruvasena, after his defeat by the hands of Harsa might have taken refuge with the Gurjara king Dadda II of Broach and joined the union of the Lātās and of the Gurjaras and accepted Pulakesin as his overlord for the time being. Dadda II possibly ruled between 629 and 640 A.D. Dhruvasena ascended the throne probably about 628 A.D. Therefore, it is quite likely that the battle between Harsa and Pulakesin took place sometime between 628 and 634 A.D.

Scholars assign various reasons for the break out of hostilities between these two. It is said that Harsa could not tolerate such a union which was a direct challenge to his imperial ambitions. Perhaps he came into clash with Pulakesin while pursuing Dhruvasena or he might have attacked Pulakesin to remove the chief obstacle in the way of extending his dominions. The fact may be that Harsa intended to extend his empire southwards after or before the treaty with Dhruvabhaṭa of Valabhi.

Hiuen Tsang remarks, "The great king Śilāditya at this time was invading east and west and countries far and near were giving allegiance to him, but Mo-ha-la-cha (Mahārāṣṭra) refused to become subject to him." 'Life' throws additional light on the question
by remarking that "Siladitya, boasting of his skill and the invariable success of his generals, filled with confidence, himself marched at the head of his troops to fight with the Prince, but he was unable to subjugate him." The Pilgrim's account of this great conflict is also confirmed by the evidence of Calukya inscriptions. In the Aihole inscription of 634 A.D., the poet Ravikirti describes the exploits of his patron Pulakesin2 in these words, "Harsha, whose lotus-feet were covered with the rays of the jewels of the feudatories,... was caused by him (Pulakesin) to have his joy melted away by fear, having become loathsome with his rows of mighty elephants fallen in battle." Other inscriptions such as Nirpan, Kamul and Togarcedu grants also refer to the event, and state that the Calukya monarch (Pulakesin II) acquired the title of "Paramesvara" or supreme lord by defeating glorious Haršavardhana - "the lord of the whole northern country."  

The victory of Pulakesin might have been due not only to the proud spirit and war-like character of his people but also to his superior military force of cavalry and elephants as described by Hiuen Tsang. The above discussion indicates that Harṣa attacked Pulakesin but failed to conquer him. Pulakesin might not have achieved
his successors' inscriptions. Whatever it be, if we accept the general belief that the battle was fought somewhere on the bank of the Narmadā, it fixed the southern limits of the empire of Harsa. This defeat not only ended his schemes, if any, of advancing into the Deccan, but also checked the expansion of his dominion in Western India. He lost the fruit of his victory over Dhruvasena and had to acknowledge him as an independent ruler. He also could not subdue the Lātās, the Kālawas and the Gurjaras, as Hiuen Tsang mentions Kālawā (Western) and Gurjara as separate states. It is believed that after the defeat, Harsa ruled in peace at least upto 640 A.D., and during that time he increased his military power considerably to meet any challenge to his power.

V. PENETRATION INTO THE SOUTH A MERELY MYTH:

Some scholars hold that Harsa penetrated far into the Deccan and defeated the Pallava king Mahendravarm I. This belief is based on two sources (i) a verse of Mayūra, a court-poet of Harsa, supposed to refer to the victories of his patron Harsa over Anga, Kuntāla (Karnātak), Cola, Madhyadesa and Kānci; and (ii) the Gaddemana inscription (Shimoga district of Māsore) supposed to refer to the victory of Silāditya (Harsa ?) over Mahendra (Mahendravarm I ?). They believe that the inscription corroborates the testimony of Mayūra.
First of all Sri Srikantha Sastri, on the evidence of the verse of Mayura, tried to prove in 1926 that Harṣa defeated Mahendra I - his contemporary Pallava king. He also took support of the Gaddemane inscription which was first published in 1923 by Dr. Shām Shāstri. This theory is based on the misinterpretation of the evidence. Mayūra in the verse conceives the earth as the wife of his patron and he uses the words Anga, Kuntāla, Cola, Madhyadesa and Kānchi respectively in the sense of her body, hair, cloth, chest and griddle. As Dr. R. C. Majumdar rightly observes, it is merely poetic imagination. Gaurishanker Chatterji has made another supposition. He imagines that Mayura perhaps being displeased with Harṣa or Bāna, might have gone to Pulakesin II who readily gave him refuge. He composed that verse probably in praise of Pulakesin who had actually conquered most of the countries mentioned in the verse, or as he says, if Mayura continued as the court poet of Harṣa, the verse should be discarded as an above mentioned evidence by considering it merely as a piece of poetry.

Scholars like Shām Shāstri and Nihāraranjan Roy have laid more stress on the evidence of the Gaddemane inscription which is assignable to the 7th c. A.D. It mentions...
the death of a Pettani Satyanya in a fight against the Beda chief when Sil-a-ditya ascended the throne - or invaded the south and put Mahendra to flight. According to the scholars like Shastri, it suggests that (i) Pettani Satyanya was a commander of Harsha, (ii) Harsha defeated Mahendravarman, and (iii) the latter, being afraid, resorted to flight. After this Pettani Satyanya was killed perhaps in battle by the chiefs of Mahendravarman. The study of the inscriptions reveals that it does not mention Harsha by name anywhere. It simply refers to Siladitya in a vague way, and that also as Sil-a-ditya. There were several Siladityas in ancient India. So 'Siladitya' cannot be identified with Harsha. Secondly, the inscription also does not state that Pettani Satyanya was the commander of Siladitya. Nor does it mention that Mahendra was Mahendravarman Pallava. It simply refers to same Mahendra. If he is the famous Mahendravarman Pallava, the name should have been given with some titles. In fact the said inscription does not refer to the battle of Harsha with Mahendravarman, but to a fight between two petty chiefs, one being Satyanya and the other Mahendra. Siladitya and Mahendra of this inscription can be identified respectively with Yuvaraja Sryasraya Siladitya (a son of Pulakesin II) and Pallava Mahendravarman II, respectively both of whom flourished during the latter half of the 7th c. A.D. This view also lacks corroborative evidence since the inscription does not state anything clearly.
B. A. Salatore believes that Siladitya mentioned in the Gaddaroane inscription, may be Siladitya - a king of Valabhi. He is described in an inscription as the lord of the Earth between Vindhya and Western ghats. As he did not belong to the Royal dynasty, no title like Maharajadhiraja etc., was applied to him. This supposition is also a baseless one. It fails to answer two questions. (i) how Siladitya want to Kannad, and (ii) how did the Southern Câlukya ruler allow him to conquer Kannad and gain a victory over Pallava Mahendravarman. Under the circumstances it is wrong to assume that Harsa ever invaded the South either before or after his failure against Pulakeshin II.

VI. CONQUEST OF KONGÂDA (GANJAM) AND POSSESSION OF KACÂDA:

Hiuen Tsang informs that when he had gone to Kamarûpa at the invitation of its king Bhâskaravarman in about A.D. 643, Harsa had conquered Kôngâda and was halting at Kajangala near Râjamahâl (identified by Cunningham) on the bank of the Ganges. The fact of Harsa having resided and held his court there proves that Kajangala was included in his empire. Life further informs that, after the subjugation of Kôngâda, Siladitya camped in Orissa for a time and made a splendid gift of the 'revenue of eighty large villages in Orissa.
to Jayasena, the most learned Buddhist scholar, who, in the spirit of other worldliness, declined the king's repeated requests. This suggests that Orissa was a part of the empire of Harsha.

That Magadha must have been a part of his dominions by this time, is proved by the Chinese records and the seals at Nalanda. The Chinese encyclopaedist Ma-Twan-Lin states that Silâditya assumed the title of the king of Magadha in 641 A.D. Huien Tsang confirms it.

While travelling through Magadha in A.D. 637-38, the pilgrim marked that Sasanka had lately cut down the Bodhi tree at Gaya and died shortly after. Then the king of Magadha named Pûrṇavarman, the last descendent of Asokarâja, revived the tree. After Pûrṇavarman's death, (i.e. after 638 A.D.) Harṣa probably annexed Magadha to his empire either while going to conquer Kongoda or while returning from it, at the Chinese recorder Ma-Twan-Lin states. The Nalanda seals of Harṣa record, the construction of a temple with a bronze cover at Nalanda by Silâditya. Huien Tsang corroborates it.

VII. THE CHRONOLOGY OF HARSA'S CAMPAIGNS:

The statement of Huien Tsang, "that Harṣa waged incessant warfare until in six years he had brou
the five Indias under allegiance?\(^5^3\) (or fought the five Indias?) and then he reigned in peace for thirty years without raising a weapon\(^5^4\), has been responsible for a great deal of controversy among scholars. Relying on this statement R. K. Mookerji assumes that Harsa's campaigns and conquests were over by 612 A.D. as he had ascended the throne about 606 A.D.\(^5^5\) But the Chinese traveller himself states at another place that Harsa returned from his campaign against Kongoda about 643 A.D. Dr. R. S. Tripathi has pointed out the discrepancy between these two statements of Hiuen Tsang, one which says that Harsa fought only for six years continuously and then reigned in peace for 30 years and the other which states that Harsa fought his last battle about 643 A.D.\(^5^6\) R. C. Majumdar opposes Dr. Tripathi's opinion and declares that there is no such contradiction in the statements of Hiuen Tsang as understood by Dr. Tripathi. According to him, Harsa fought all his wars between A.D. 606 and 612, after ruling in peace for 50 years between A.D. 612 and 642, proceeded against Kongoda in 643 A.D.

This assumption creates another serious difficulty. If we accept this, we shall have also to believe, along with Dr. Fleet and Dr. Mookerji, that Harsa would have fought with
Pulakesin in or somewhere before 612 A.D. The Haiderabad grant of Pulakesin II dated 612 A.D. states that Pulakesin II assumed the title of Paramesvara by defeating hostile kings. Dr. Fleet holds that, after defeating Harsa in 612 A.D., Pulakesin assumed the title of Paramesvara. Dr. Fleet also believes that the later Calukya inscriptions and the Aihole inscription of 634 A.D. corroborate this supposition. The said grant does not mention the name of Harsa at all. If we accept the view that Harsa fought with Pulakesin after compelling Dhruvasena II of Valabhi to take refuge with Dadda II of Broach, we shall have to place the time of this battle somewhere between 628 and 634 A.D. i.e. about 630 A.D. as Dhruvasena II and Dadda II seem to have begun their rule after 628 A.D. In the same way we cannot accept the conjectures of Dr. V. A. Smith and C. V. Vaidya that the battle took place about 620 A.D. we also cannot support the supposition of Prof. Jouveau Dubreuil that the battle was fought about 637-38 A.D. because he holds that while the Aihole inscription (634 A.D.) does not mention the name of Harsa clearly and the later Calukya inscriptions do so. Even though Aihole inscription does not refer to Harsa, it does refer to Siladitya. As such it refers to no other battle than the one fought between Harsa and Pulakesin II.

Beal's interpretation of the text, informs
that Harsa carried on warfare for 30 years, after which his authority was established and he reigned in peace after 636 A.D.

for about 11 years. This also cannot be correct as Harsa's last campaign came about in 642-43 A.D. The fact is that we should interpret the statements of Hiuen Tsang in spirit and not in letter. He perhaps simply meant that though continuous wars were fought by Harsa, he could reign in peace and give comfort and happiness to his subjects. At the very beginning of his reign, he had to save the empire at a critical moment. He extended it far and wide over Northern India and gave his subjects the blessing of security and good administration for thirty long years. It is very likely that he had no exact idea of the early career of Harsa whom he met only by 643 A.D. It is possible that he has confused the years and committed the mistake.

Bana refers to several campaigns and conquests of Harsa, but their exact nature cannot be ascertained. There is some poetical exaggeration also in his work to praise his patron. The date of his campaign with Sindh (if any) is yet to be decided by the scholars. In conclusion it may be said that Harsa, possibly, came in collision with Sasanaka immediately after his accession at Kanauj.
(A.D.606). Next he conquered Mid-India (Uttara Pradesh) including Eastern Mālawā (606-612 A.D.). Afterwards he was engaged for some time in consolidating his power over the newly acquired territories. While trying to subdue Western Mālawā, Hārṣa might have clashed with the Valabhi king Dhruvasena-II who fled to Dadda II, a feudal of Pulakesin II. As a result Hārṣa had to fight with Pulakesin against whom he failed (between 628 and 634 A.D.). On account of this set back he had to spend some time in consolidating his position and except his campaign against Kingoda about 642-643 A.D., he spent rest of his life in peace.

----
Campaigns of Harsha
606 AD to 649 AD

1. Sthanesvara
2. Kanauja
3. E. Malawa
4. Magadha
5. Karnasuvarna
6. Sinda
7. W. Malwa
8. Valabhi
9. Bharukachha
10. Maharastra
11. Konyodā
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