In order to form an idea of the extension of the Vardhana empire by Harsha, we must be acquainted with the boundaries of the kingdom of Thaneswar at the time of the death of his father. Bana calls Prabhakaravarmana "a lion to the Huna deer, a burning fever to the king of the Indus land, a disturber of the sleep of Gujarat (Gurjaras?) a bilious plague to that scent-elephant the lord of Gandhara, a looter to the lawlessness of the lastas and an axe to the creeper of Balawas glory." C. V. Vaidya says that Prabhakara conquered all these countries and assumed the title of "Maharajadhiraja." R. K. Mookerji also calls Prabhakara the emperor. That the belief of these two scholars is incorrect is obvious from subsequent events. Rajyavarman had to fight with the Huna deer even in the lifetime of Prabhakaravarman and still could only defeat the Hunas but not subdue them. Hiuen Tsang positively states that Sindh was an independent state with three dependencies. Gujarat and Balawas (Western) were also independent states. Gandhara was a dependency of Kapisa and Lata was, probably, a feudatory state of Pulakesin II. Thus we cannot very much rely upon the poetic description of
Bana who perhaps wants to show Prabhakara's excellence and greatness in comparison with other contemporary kings. According to Buhlar Prabhakara's kingdom did not extend beyond the limits of the state of Thaneswar as related by Hiuen Tsang. Cunningham thinks that the kingdom of Thaneswar probably included some portions of Southern Punjab and Eastern Rajputana also.

In conclusion we may say that the kingdom of Thaneswar, inherited by Harsha from his father Prabhakaravardhana, at the most touched the Huna territories of Punjas on north-western side; on the north to the hills; on the west it extended up to Southern Punjab and in the south up to eastern Rajputana and on the eastern side it touched the northern frontiers of the Maukhari kingdom of Kanauj. At the time of its acquisition by Harsha, the Maukhari kingdom extended at least from Kanauj to Kasi (Benaras). Thus when Harsha began his rule, he came to possess most of the portion of Mid-India between Thaneswar and Benaras. Now we can ascertain the extent of territorial gains made by Harsha himself.

Bana was a court poet. Naturally, he
c) Bana's

description: exaggerates:

gives a very exaggerated picture of the exploits of his patron and of the extent of his empire.

So we should not be misled by titles such as "king of kings", "sovereign of all continents", "the lord of the four oceans" used by him for Harsha. It was usual for a court-poet of the age to extol his master. It should not be taken to mean Harsha's paramount position. The testimony of Hsuan Tsang in this respect is on the whole more reliable even though there is some discrepancy here and there. As such his account is very helpful in deciding the boundaries of the dominions directly ruled by Harsha. We are also helped in this task by the contemporary epigraphic (i.e. Madhuban, Bansbera inscriptions etc.), and numismatic material.

Various scholars have interpreted these literary, epigraphic and numismatic sources in a variety of ways. Therefore there is much difference of opinion among scholars about the exact extent of the empire of Harsha at the end of his 40 years' reign. K. M. Panikar believes that Harsha was the master of the whole of Northern India from Kashmir to Kamarupa and from the Himalayan region (including Nepal) to Vindhyas. Ettinghausen accepts this view and holds that the king of Nepal
had acknowledged the suzerainty of Hārṣa. Dr. V.A. Smith states that Hārṣa's dominions included the territories from Himalayas (including Nepal) to the bank of Narmadā along with Saurāśṭra, Gujarāt and Mālawā. The whole of the Gangetic plain was under his direct rule. He excludes the kingdoms of Kāśmir, Punjāb, Sindh, Rājputānā and Kāmarūpa.

According to Dr. R. K. Mookerji,
e) **Sphere of Influence:**

most of the territories of Northern India were directly ruled by Hārṣa, while the rulers of some others acknowledged his suzerainty, even though they were actually outside the kingdom of Hārṣa. Valabhu, Kāmarūpa, Kāśmir and Nepal recognized the suzerainty of Hārṣa. According to Dr. Mookerji the mere consideration of the territories directly administered by Hārṣa will fail to give us the correct idea about Hārṣa's empire and his political status. We must also take into account the sphere of his influence. Dr. Mookerji has no doubt that Hārṣa was the supreme ruler of the whole of Northern India. Nihāraranjan Roy almost corroborates this view. He believes that the whole of the country known as middle India was directly ruled by Hārṣa, but the sphere of his influence extended from Jālandhar to Assam and from Valabhu to Ganjam including Kāśmir and Nepal, (i.e. practically the whole of
The arguments of these two great historians that "the sphere of influence (suzerainty) should also be taken into consideration to fix the exact extent of the empire of Harṣa", do not help us in defining precisely the territories of Harṣa, even though it is useful for estimating the position and power of Harṣa.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar challenges the view of Dr. Mookerji. He states that Harṣa's empire was not so extensive and it did not cover up the whole of Northern India. Most of the modern scholars have now adopted the view of Dr. Majumdar, though partially. Recent researches have also proved that the empire of Harṣa was not so limited as stated by Dr. Majumdar. He describes Harṣa as the "king of the state of Kanauj or at the most of mid-India only." This fails to do justice to Harṣa who was the foremost ruler of Northern India during his time, whose supremacy was unchallengable by any state in that region. He received a set back only when he tried to extend his authority to the Deccan; and even then his was the supreme power in Northern India. At the same time Dr. Majumdar's views do contain a substantial amount of truth. He takes into consideration both the positive and negative aspects of the testimony of Hiuen Tsang and believes that
portions of eastern Punjab, the territories of Agra and Ayodhya of U. P. (Uttar Pradesh), Bihar, Bengal and some parts of Orissa at the end of his reign.\textsuperscript{18}

II. EXTENT OF THE EMPIRE:

The Chinese pilgrim mentions several independent kingdoms in Northern India, most of which he visited during his extensive travels from 630 A.D. to 644 A.D. He also gives the names of the kings of most of the states. Some of them perhaps were outside the sphere of Harṣa’s authority (positive evidences). But strangely enough he does not specifically name any of the territories directly ruled by Harṣa except Kanauj. It does not certainly mean that Harṣa was the king only of Kanauj; perhaps Hiuen Tsang thought that they were too evident to be mentioned. Of course he vaguely refers to several campaigns and conquests of Śilāditya Rāja; but it does not give us any accurate idea of the expansion of Harṣa’s empire. He is silent about the political position of most of the states from Thāneswar to Magadha except six, namely Pariyātra (Bairat),\textsuperscript{19} Kanauj, Matipura (Modern Madawar or Mandawar)\textsuperscript{20}, Suvarṇagotra (somewhere near Nepāl), Kapilvastu and Nepāl. Pariyātra and the last three states\textsuperscript{21} might have been outside the empire of Harṣa as Hiuen Tsang mentions the names of their rulers.
The rest of the territories from Thaneswar to Magadha can be considered as being under the direct rule of Harsa (Negative evidences). We may include some parts of Rājputāna also.

Hiuen Tsang also states that Harsa fought the five Indias or brought the five Indias under allegiance. The five Indias may mean Saurāstra or Savarāstra, Kānauj, Gauḍa, Mithilā, and Orissa. If we read Savarāstra instead of Saurāstra it was certainly included in Harsa's empire by the end of his rule. Before fixing the actual boundaries of the empire, it is essential to survey the political position of various states as described by Hiuen Tsang. We may divide these states into two broad categories: (a) States whose kings are mentioned by the pilgrim; and (b) states whose kings are not mentioned by the pilgrim.

A. STATES WHOSE KINGS ARE MENTIONED BY THE PILGRIM:

The king of this state was a Kṣatriya and a Buddhist. We are unable to ascertain who this king was but under him Kapisa was a powerful state. His power extended over more than ten of the adjoining principalities. He had subdued Lampak (Lughman), Nagara and Gandhāra. We can definitely assume that Kapisa
was an independent state.

The next important kingdom mentioned beyond the Indus was Üdyāna or modern Swat.  

2. Üdyāna: 
The name of the king is not stated. It was a stronghold of Buddhism. It probably included the territories of Panjkoa, Bijavara and Bunir. It was possibly an independent state.

Crossing the Indus, Hiuen Tsang visited Kāshmir. It had five dependencies. 

3. Kāśmi-mi-le: (Kāşmir) 
(1) Taxila or Takhišilā, (modern Sahadheri) 
(ii) Sinhapur or Ketus, (iii) Usara or modern Hāzārā, (iv) Pan-nu-tāo (modern Punch) and (v) Rājaurā (modern Rājondi or Rājori). It was ruled by Durlabhavarāhana. Dr. Mookerji, on the supposed testimony of 'The Life', holds that Kāshmir, in a way acknowledged the suzerainty of Harsa. The life says, "Silāditya, hearing that Kāshmir possessed a tooth of Bucja, coming in person to the chief frontier, asked permission to see and worship it. The congregation, being unwilling to grant the request, concealed the tooth, but the king of Kāshmir, being afraid of the exalted character of Harsa, had the tooth unwarthed and presented to him. Then Silāditya seeing it, was overpowered with reverence and using force, carried it off for purposes of worship." This episode related in the Life, hardly supports the assumption of Dr. Mookerji. The expression that Silāditya carried off the tooth by "exercising force...
possibly mean nothing more than that he brought it to Kanauj against the wishes of the congregation. There could not be any possibility of any fight with the king of Kashmir, as he voluntarily presented the relic to Harṣa. A simple threat perhaps helped Harṣa to gain the tooth.

Bāna refers to "the inaccessible land of snowy mountains" subdued by Harṣa. Dr. Mookerji supposes that it may mean the subjugation of Kāshmir or Nepāl. Vaidya thinks it to mean that Harṣa compelled the king of Kāshmir to pay tribute and acknowledge his nominal suzerainty. Both these suppositions are far-fetched and lack support. In this connection Rājatarāṅgiṇī mentions another episode which should be noted. It says, "From this time onwards this country which has suffered from internal disputes, was for some time, subject to Harṣa, and other kings." The Harṣa referred to should not be confused with the Harṣa of Kanauj as has been done by Nihararanjan Roy. Firstly, such a supposition goes against the chronological order fixed by Stein and secondly Harṣa of Kāshmir had a son who succeeded him, while Harṣa of Kanauj had no son to succeed him. On the testimony of Hiuen Tsang and on the evidence of Rājatarāṅgiṇī it can be said that Kāshmir was an independent state with some dependencies.

It lay between the Indus and the Beas. It had two dependencies (i) Mon-lo-san-pu or Multān and (ii) Po-fa-to, modern Farvāla. It was also possibly outside
the pale of Harsa's jurisdiction.

Reinaud identified it with Paryātra or Bairat and Cunningham later on supported him. Hiuen Tsang says, "The king was of the Vaiśya caste and he was a man of courage and military skill. Possibly, it was an independent state.

It is identified by Cunningham with Mandawar or Mandawar, a large city in Western Rohilākhand near Bijnor. The king did not believe in Buddhism and was of the Śuddha stock. It cannot be said with certainty whether he was an independent ruler or had accepted the suzerainty of Harsa.

No exact identification of this place has yet been made. It lay to the North of Brahmapura (district between Gāhwāl and Kumaon) in the great snowy mountains. It was called "the eastern woman country," because it was ruled by a succession of women. The husband of the Queen was king but he did not rule. Possibly it was out of Harsa's sphere of influence.

The Chinese Traveller says only a few words about it, "The kings of Nepal were Kṣatriya Lichhavis, and they were eminent scholars and believers in Buddhism. A recent king whose name is given as Ang-shu-fa-na or Amsuvarman...had composed a treatise on etymology." This has given rise to
a great controversy among scholars. Buhlar, Bhagvänlāl Indraji, Fleet and Smith assume that Nepāl acknowledged the suzerainty of Harṣa; while Sylvain Levi, Ettinghausen, Tripāṭhi, Chatterji and others believe that Nepāl was an independent state. The source material has, therefore, to be critically examined before we can reach any conclusions.

(1) Certain Nepālese inscriptions, dated in years 34, 39 and 45, refer to a king named Aṃśuvarman. He is described as a Sāmant or Mahāsāmant in the inscriptions. Therefore he cannot be an originator of the era in which the inscriptions are dated, for the title 'Mahāsāmant' suggests that he might have accepted the suzerainty of some powerful king whose era he might have borrowed. Huen Tsang calls Aṃśuvarman 'a recent king' and the script of the inscriptions also points to the close of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh c. A.D. as the time of its origin. Thus according to Buhlar and Indraji the years possibly, in these inscriptions, refer to the Harṣa Era, as it was "in widest use" at that time. This implies that Nepāl was subordinate to Kanauj, for no other sovereign ruler would use the era started by another sovereign monarch.

(ii) There is another evidence also which suggests that the Harṣa era was used in Nepāl during the times of Aṃśuvarman. Jayadeva's inscription dated Śaṁvat 153 states that Jayadeva's mother, Vatsādevī,
was the daughter of a Maukhari prince Bhogavarman and the grand-daughter of the Great Ādityasena, the famous lord of Magadha. Thus Jayadeva was the great-grand-son of Ādityasena. It is generally accepted that the Shānpur stone image inscription of Ādityasena, dated year 66, refers to the Harsha era. Thus there is a difference of 87 years (133-66) between the periods of the great grand-father and of the great-grand-son. It is slightly more than the span of three Indian generations, which comes to about 78 years approximately. Under these circumstances, it is possible that the great-grand-father (672 A.D.) and great-grand-son (759 A.D.) used the same era, viz. that of Harṣa.

(iii) The Vamsāvali informs us that immediately before the accession of Amśuvarman, Vikramāditya came to the country, and established his era there. It is argued that the incident refers to the conquest of Nepāl by Harṣa as at that time the name Vikramāditya could refer only to Harṣa among the Indian rulers.

(iv) The Vamsāvalis testify to the existence of the Bais Rājputs in Nepāl. They might have gone there with Harṣa when the latter went to conquer Nepāl. Harṣa might have granted a portion of land to his clansmen and some of them might have settled in Nepāl. Hiuen Tsang states that Harṣa belonged to the Feishe caste (Bais) which is identified by Cunningham with the Bais Rājputs.
(v) Bana mentions that Harsa "exacted tribute from an inaccessible country of snowy mountains." Buhlar, Bhagvānlāl Indraji and others believe that it refers to Nepal.

b. The other side:

But in spite of all these powerful arguments we face some serious difficulties.

(i) The records of Hiuen Tsang suggest by the word 'recent' that Anśūvarman's reign had ended shortly before the visit of Hiuen Tsang in about 637 A.D. The last known inscription of Anśūvarman refers to the year 45. If it indicates the Harsa era, then according to its testimony, Anśūvarman might have been still ruling up to 651 A.D. (606 + 45 = 651), while the Chinese pilgrim notes that he passed away recently (i.e. before 637 A.D.) Thus there is a discrepancy of about 14 years between the two testimonies. The holders of the first view argue that Hiuen Tsang himself did not visit Nepal; he depended merely on hearsay and as a result he misrepresented the facts and therefore this part of his testimony should not be relied upon. We cannot accept such arguments as we know definitely that most of the
other evidences of Hsiuen Tsang tally well with the other contemporary literary as well as epigraphic evidences. Thus the years of the inscriptions of Anśūvarman do not refer to the Harṣa era, but to some other era.

It is quite probable that Anśūvarman himself might have started an era and used it in his inscriptions. He was the real sovereign of Neptal, while his master Shivadeva was only a nominal ruler. Inscription No. 5 of Shivadeva refers to Anśūvarman as one "who has destroyed the power of all enemies by his heroic majesty.........

.... and whose brilliant fame, obtained by the trouble of properly protecting the people, pervades the universe. Moreover, the inscriptions Nos. 6, 7 and 8 of Anśūvarman do not indicate the name of any of his superior master. As he was the executive head of the state, he became powerful and independent even during his master's life time. He may have called himself as 'Mahāsāṃsā' out of respect to his old master who was alive in Samvat 39. The cases of Śūṅga Pusyamitra and of Kākāratra Rudradāman may be cited as examples. They continued to call themselves 'Senāpati' and "Mahākākāratra" respectively even after they had assumed the sovereign status. The same fact is illustrated by the Vīshvās also.

Anśūvarman's inscription No. 8 of the year 48 and that of his successor Jīṣṇugupta of the year 48 refer to Anśūvarman as "Bhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Shri
Amsuvarrapadah. Thus if we suppose that Amsuvarman died by about 635 A.D., two years before the visit of Hsuen Tsang in 637 A.D., and that the year 45 denotes the last year of his rule, we come to the conclusion that the reckoning in the inscriptions began somewhere about the year 590 A.D., which comes very near to the year in which the Nepalese era was, possibly, started. Amsuvarman, probably did not start it immediately after his accession. At first he dated the inscriptions in the years of his reign. But during the last years of his reign, when he became the absolute ruler of the land, he changed it into an era calculating back from the beginning of his rule and the same tradition might have been continued by his successors in Nepal. Amsuvarman's earliest inscription is dated Sāmvat 34, and that Sāmvat very likely suggests an era. Thus there is no basis to suppose that Nepal adopted the Harsa era.

(ii) The second argument fails completely if it is accepted that the reckoning of Amsuvarman's inscriptions began approximately about 590 A.D. Adding 153 to 590 A.D., we get 743 A.D. as the date of Jayadeva's inscription No. 15. If the Shāhpur inscription dated the year 66 of Ādityasena, indicates the Harsa era, it would then belong to the year 672 A.D. Then the difference between Ādityasena and his great-grandson will be only 71 years (743-672 A.D.). It is slightly less than the duration of three Indian generations, which as stated above roughly comes to 78 years. Thus, according to this
statement also the years would tally remarkably well.65

(iii) Vamsāvalis are not very reliable sources for calculating dates accurately and for deciding the correctness of events. Vamsāvali states that Vikramāditya, after coming to Nepal, introduced his era there, but no authority says that Vikramāditya ever went there and that Harsa was ever known by the epithet of Vikramāditya. Bāna and Hiuen Tsang give their patron several epithets but not Vikramāditya. Perhaps the authors of the Vamsāvali simply tried to associate the current era of Nepal with the renowned name of Vikramāditya, the founder of the Vikrama era.66 A Vamsāvali says that Amśuvarman came to the throne in 3000 of the Kali era-101 B.C. which is quite absurd on the evidence of Hiuen Tsang and the inscriptions.67

(iv) And again, the people of Fei-she caste (mentioned by Hiuen Tsang) are not identical with the Bais caste or Bais Rājputs. Hiuen Tsang was familiar with the castes of the rulers and of the people of India because of his wide travels throughout the country. He definitely calls Harsa - a Vaisya king. Cunningham's casual suggestion that the Bais caste should be identified with the Bais Rājputs, cannot be accepted as correct. The family suffix 'Vardhana' indicates that Harsa belonged to the Vaisya Varna. Therefore the fourth argument also loses its force.
Lastly, the Harṣa-carita's reference to "the inaccessible land of snowy mountains" does not necessarily mean Nepal only. Sttingausen believes that it refers to some Tukhāra country. And again, the passage is open to several interpretations. Dr. R. S. Tripāṭhi assumes that the words like "Durgāvā Gṛhitah Karah" may mean that Harṣa obtained the hand of Durgā born in the snowy mountains. It may refer to the marriage of Harṣa with some hill princess. But as Gaurishankara Chatterji rightly points out it is a mere pun. It does not refer at all to the marriage of Harṣa. Suvarṇa-gotra was also situated in the snowy mountains. Harṣa-carita might be referring to Harṣa's victory over that country. Hence, it is safe to exclude Nepal from the sphere of Harṣa's sovereignty.

9. Ka-mo-Lu-po or Kāmarūpa:

As already pointed out the friendship of Harṣa was sought at the very beginning by Bhāskaravarman who desired to protect himself against the imperial designs of Saśāṅka. The offer was also welcome to Harṣa because he wanted a good ally to help him in punishing Saśāṅka. Dr. Mookerji's holds, "that by the above mentioned treaty Bhāskaravarman offered allegiance to Harṣa of his own accord and he was anointed king by his lord (Harṣa)." It rests on a passage from Harṣa-carita, viz. "Atra Devena
Abhisiktah Kumāraḥ"\(^{74}\) which is not corroborated by any other evidence. Secondly, the word Kumāra, "probably, refers to Mādhavagupta and not to 'Kumāra Bhāskaravarman' whom Bāna usually calls "Prāgjyoṭisvarā" - or king of Assām. The Achsa inscription of Ādityasena indicates the same fact.\(^{75}\)

The event of the compulsory visit of Hiuen Tsang hardly leads us to any conclusion. The episode merely shows that Bhāskaravarman yielded to the pressure of an ally whose friendship he valued the most. The fact that Bhāskaravarman attended both the assemblies at Kanauj and Prayāga, does not in any way suggest his political status. He was present as a great friend of Hārṣa and was honoured by Hārṣa as such. Thus we can safely conclude that Kāmarūpa was an independent state.

10. Wy-she-ven-na or Ujjain:

The king of Ujjain was a Brāhmin by caste. He was well versed in the Hindu Darshan shastra and was not a Buddhist.\(^{76}\) He might have been a feudatory king to Hārṣa.

11. Mo-La-po (Western Mālawā):

It was a part of the Maitraka kingdom of Valabhi. It had three dependencies (i) Kīta identified with Cutchh of Khedā, (ii) Ānandaśura, and (iii) Su-la-cha-Saurāṣṭra of Suraṭa? As already stated Dhruvabhāṭa (Dhruvasena II) was possibly in possession
of Mālawā (Western) with all its three dependencies at the time of Hiu'en Tsang's visit. Two copper plates have, discovered of the period of Dhruvasena II from Ratlam. One of them bears the Gupta year 324 (320+324 = 644 A.D.)\(^7\) It describes the charity of the king who gave land to some Brāhmīṇa. Dhruvasena is said to have ruled from 629 to 644 A.D. This fact also proves that Mo-la-po was a part of the Valabhi kingdom and not of Kanauj.

12. Falapi (Valabhi):

As said before the Dhruvabhaṭa mentioned by Hiu'en Tsang has been identified with Dhruvasena, II, a nephew of Śīlāditya Dharmaditya first and a son-in-law of Hārsha. Sanjusri-Mūlakalpa calls some Dhruva a servant, covetous and foolish.\(^7\) From this Gaurishanker Chatterji assumes that Dhruvabhaṭa was a feudatory king of Hārsha.\(^7\) It is already proved by various evidences such as the Navasāri Plate, Aihole Inscription and Maitraka inscriptions that Valabhi was an independent kingdom. So we have no ground to hold that 'Dhruva' mentioned by M. M. K. is Dhruvabhaṭa of Valabhi. Hence, we cannot infer that Valabhi acknowledged the authority of Hārsha. It was an independent state.

13. Po-Lu-Ka-cha-po (Brāhigukaccha or Broach):

As stated already its ruler Dadda II gave protection to Dhruvasena II of Valabhi against Hārsha.
Broach was, possibly, a feudatory state of Pulakesin II at that time.

14. Mo-ha-la-cha (Mahārāṣṭra):

According to Huen Tsang Tu-Lo-ki-she (Pulakesin) was the ruling king of this region. His authority extended far and wide and served faithfully by his vassals. Harṣa could not extend his empire in Mahārāṣṭra because he failed against Pulakesin. Owing to this failure Harṣa had to accept river Narmadā as the boundary line between the two states.

15. Ku-che-lo (Gurjara kingdom):

Its king was a young man, Kṣatriya by birth. He was a devout Buddhist and was celebrated for his wisdom. There is no evidence to believe that he was a vassal of Harṣa.

16. Chin-chi-to:

It is identified with the state of Jajhoti or Jejakabhukti. Its capital was Kajuraho. Its territory corresponded with modern Bundelkhand. The pilgrim says that the king was a Brāhmaṇ and a firm believer in Buddhism. He patronised men of merit and learning. He also seems to have been an independent king.

17. Mo-hi-ssu-fa-La-pu-Lo (Mahēśvarapura):

The region round Gwalior between the Chambal and the Sindhu rivers, was probably known as Mahēśvarapura. Its ruler was a Brāhmaṇ and not a
believer in Buddhism. This state was also outside the empire of Harsa.

18. Sîn-tu (Sindh):

It was ruled by a king of the Südra caste, who was a Buddhist. It had three dependencies (i) Atien-po-chin-lo or Atyanabakela (ii) Pi-to-shih-lo, Hyderabad or Thar Parker districts, and (iii) A-fan-tu identical with Brāhmaṇābād or Khairpura. As already stated we cannot believe in the statement of Bāṇa that Harsa pounded a king of Sindh. At best it might have been a short-lived victory or just a cessation of hostilities. On the authority of Hiuen Tsang, we can say that Sindh was an independent state with three dependencies.

Conclusion: The above survey shows that the following states of Northern India were independent states and lay beyond the authority of Harsa.


Hiuen Tsang informs that the king of Mid-India, appreciating the sincere faith of the king of Jālandhara, gave him the sole control of matters relating to Buddhism in India. The king of Mid-India cannot be any one else than Harsa. "Life" further informs that Silāditya charged the king of Jālandhara
(named Wy-Ti-Wuddhi or Buddhi ?) to escort the pilgrim in safety to the frontiers. These two instances suggest that the ruler, Jalandhara was a vassal of Harṣa.

Māvura being situated very near to Kanauj, might not have been in a position to maintain its independence. Moreover, Hiuen Tsang does not mention the name of the king. He simply says, that the king and his statesmen devoted themselves to good works. He was perhaps a vassal of Harṣa.

B. STATES WHOSE KINGS ARE NOT MENTIONED BY THE PILGRIM:

Hiuen Tsang is silent about the governments of some of the states of Northern India. Probably he assumed that territories which constituted the empire of Harṣa did not need any explicit mention. On this presumption it may be held that the following territories were included in the empire of Harṣa at the end of his reign:

1) Ku.Lu-to or Kullu.
2) She-to-tu-Lu or Satadru country (Modern Sirhind).
3) Sa-ta-ni-ssu-fa-lo or Śrīnīsvara Thāñeswar.
4) Su-lu-kin-na - Srughna (Sugh).
5) Fo-lo-hin-mo-pu-lo - Brahmāpurā.
6) Ku-pi-sang-na - Gavisena, (districts of Kāshipur, Rāmpur and Pilibhi
7) Ngo-hi-chi-ta-lo - Ahichhatra (Eastern part of Rohilākhand)
8) Pi-Lo-shan-na - Atranjikhera.
9) Kah-pi-ta (Kacitha) Sankasya, modern Sankissa.

10) A-yu-te Ayodhyā.

11) A.ye-mu-ka (Hayamukha) i.e. Daundiakhera.

12) Kiao-Sheng-mi Kosāmēbi.

13) Po-lo-ya-ka Prayāga.

14) Pi-sho-ka Visoka?

15) Shi-lo-fa-si-tu Šravasti.

16) Lan-mo (Rama) Rāmagrāma


18) Po-lo-na-se Vārāṇaṣi

19) Chan-chu country Čhāzipur district?

20) Fei-she-Li Vaiśālī

21) Fu-Li-chin the Vṛṣa country.

22) Mo-kie-to Magadhā.


24) Chan-po (Champa) i.e. Bhāgalpur.

25) Ku-chu-wen (Kajangala) i.e. Rājmaḥāḷ.

26) Pun-na-fa-tan-na - undravardhana.

27) San-mo-ta-char -Samataṭa.

28) Tan-mo-Lih-Ti - Tamrāliptī


30) Wu-Tu (Udra) Orissa.

31) Kung-yu-to (Kongodha) i.e. modern Ganjam.94

There are other evidences to prove that some of the territories were actually administered by Hārśa. He inherited the kingdom of Thāṇēswar including
the valley of Saraswati river and parts of eastern Rajputanā. The finds of the Banskherā and Madhuban Plates, mentioning grants of land, indicate that Ahicchatra and Sravasti respectively formed bhuktis or divisions of his empire. If the Silāditya coins discovered in the Bhitaurā hoard (Fyzābād district) are to be ascribed to Harṣa, as has been done by Burn, it is a direct proof that Ayodhyā was ruled by Harṣa. (Dr. Hoernle's objections to this attribution of these coins to Harṣa, do not seem to be sound.) We may not put much trust in the evidence of the Rajatarangini on this matter. Prayāga was certainly included in Harṣa's empire as it was the place where he distributed his wealth in charity. The "Life" calls Harṣa a king of Magadha. Therefore Magadha also formed a part of his empire. Harṣa had also constructed a temple with bronze cover at Nālandā. Moreover the fact that Silāditya held his court at Kajangala in his progress to East India, proves that his dominion extended so far in the east. From the evidence of the "Life" we can say that Harṣa's empire included Orissā also where he had offered 80 big villages in charity to the learned Buddhist named Jayasena. And lastly, as Hiuen Tsang informs us, Harṣa returned victorious from Kongoda (modern Ganjam) in 643 A.D. Thus it was also included in the empire of Harṣa.

Authoritative sources:

While concluding, we can say on the authority of
Hiuen Tsang and of the other literary, epigraphic and numismatic sources that Harṣa’s empire consisted of some parts of eastern Punjabi, almost the whole of the present Uttar Pradesh (perhaps excluding Matipura), Bengal, Bihār and Orissa, including Kāngodā or the Ganjam district. This assumption is supported by the fact that all the places mentioned by Hiuen Tsang in connection with Harṣa’s tours of inspection lie on the eastern side. He also calls Harṣa “lord of the five Indias which is explained as consisting of Svarāśtra or the Punjabi (eastern portion of Punjab in this case), Kānyakubja, Mithilā or Bihār, Gauḍa or Bengal and Utkala or Orissa. Thus, the view that Harṣa’s empire extended over the whole of Northern India from the Himalayas to the Vindhyas and from Sindh to Kāmarūpa, should be given up.

At the same time there is no doubt that he was the most powerful ruler of Northern India, and his influence extended far and wide.