I. Inherited empire by Harsa.

In order to form an idea of the extension of the Vardhana empire by Harsa, we must be acquainted with the boundaries of the kingdom of Thaneswar at the time of the death of his father. Bana calls Prabhakaravardhana "a lion to the Huna deer, a burning fever to the king of the Indus land, a disturber of the sleep of Gujarat (Curjaras?) a bilious plague to that scent-elephant the lord of Gandhara, a looter to the lawlessness of the lata and an axe to the creeper of Lalana's glory." 

C. V. Vaidya says that Prabhakara conquered all these countries and assumed the title of "MaharajaMahiraja". 

R. K. Nookerji also calls Prabhakara the emperor. That the belief of these two scholars is incorrect is obvious from subsequent events. Bajyavardhana had to fight with the Huna deer even in the life time of Prabhakaravardhana and still could only defeat the Hunas but not subdue them. 

Hsiuen Tsang positively states that Sindh was an independent state with three dependencies, Gujarat and Lalana (Western) were also independent states. Gandhara was a dependency of Kapisa and Lata was, probably, a feudatory state of Sulakehin II. Thus we cannot very much rely upon the poetic description of
Bāṇa who perhaps wants to show Prabhākara's excellence and greatness in comparison with other contemporary kings. According to Buhler, Prabhākara's kingdom did not extend beyond the limits of the state of Thāneśwar as related by Hsuan Tsang. Cunningham thinks that the kingdom of Thāneśwar probably included some portions of Southern Punjab and Eastern Rājputānā also.

In conclusion we may say that the kingdom of Thāneśwar, inherited by Harṣa from his father Prabhākara-śrīvatsana, at the most touched the Bṛṇa territories of Punjāb on north-western side; on the north to the hills; on the west it extended up to Southern Punjāb and in the south up to eastern Rājputānā and on the eastern side it touched the northern frontiers of the Baukñari kingdom of Kauñā. At the time of its acquisition by Harṣa, the Baukñari kingdom extended at least from Kauñā to Kāśi (Benāras). Thus when Harṣa began his rule, he came to possess most of the portion of North-India between Thāneśwar and Benāras. Now we can ascertain the extent of territorial gains made by Harṣa himself.

Bāṇa was a court poet. Naturally, he
Ci 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" all used by him for Nanda. It was usual for a court-poet of the age to extol his master. It should not be taken to mean Nanda's paramount position. The testimony of Hiuen 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 Nanda. We are also helped in this task by the contemporary epigraphic (i.e., Mahabodhi, Baksikhera 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 Nanda at the end of his 40 years' reign. K. S. Manikar believes that Nanda was the master of the whole of Northern India from Kashmip to Kamalip and from the Himalayan region (including Nepal) to Vindhyas. Actinghhausen accepts this view and holds that the king of Nepal
had acknowledged the suzerainty of Harsha. Smith states that Harsha's dominions included the territories from Himalayas (including Nepal) to the bank of Narmada along with Saurashtra, Gujarat and Kālavā. The whole of the Ganges plain was under his direct rule. He excludes the kingdoms of Kashmir, Punjab, Sind, Rājputanā and Kāmarūpa.

According to Dr. R. K. Muokerji,

most of the territories of Northern India were directly ruled by Harsha, while the rulers of some others acknowledged his suzerainty, even though they were actually outside the kingdom of Harsha.

Valabhī, Kāmarūpa, Kāshmir and Nepal recognized the suzerainty of Harsha. According to Dr. Muokerji the mere consideration of the territories directly administered by Harsha will fail to give us the correct idea about Harsha's empire and his political status. We must also take into account the sphere of his influence. Dr. Muokerji has no doubt that Harsha was the supreme ruler of the whole of Northern India. Nihararanjan Roy almost corroborates this view. He believes that the whole of the country known as middle India was directly ruled by Harsha, but the sphere of his influence extended from Jalandhar to Assam and from Valabhī to Cenjam including Kāshmir and Nepal (i.e. practically the whole of
Northern India. 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 Harsha", do not help us in defining precisely the territories of Harsha, even though it is useful for estimating the position and power of Harsha.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar challenges the view of Dr. Eeekerji, he states that Harsha'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 Harsha was not so limited as stated by Dr. Majumdar. He describes Harsha as the "king of the state of Kansa or at the most of mid-India only." This fails to do justice to Harsha 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 Huen Tsang and believes that
portions of Eastern Punjab, the territories of Agra and Ayodhya of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Bengal and some parts of Ussara at the end of his reign.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 Harsha's authority (positive evidences). But strangely enough he does not specifically name any of the territories directly ruled by Harsha except Kanauj. It does not certainly mean that Harsha was the king only of Kanauj; perhaps Huen Tsang thought that they were too evident to be mentioned. Of course he vaguely refers to several campaigns and conquests of Siladitya Raja; but it does not give us any accurate idea of the expansion of Harsha's empire. He is silent about the political position of most of the states from Thaneswar to Magadha except six, namely Kaliyatra (Bairat),19 Kanauj, Katipura (Modern Kudawar or Kandawar),20 Suvamagotra (somewhere near Nepal), Kapilvastu and Nepal. Kaliyatra and the last three states21 might have been outside the empire of Harsha as Huen Tsang mentions the names of their rulers.
The rest of the territories from Thāneśwar to Nagadha can be considered as being under the direct rule of Harṣa (negative evidences). We may include some parts of Rājputāna also.

Hsiun Tsang also states that Harṣa fought the five Indias or brought the five Indias under allegiance. The five Indias may mean Saurāstra or Savarāstra, Kāñauj, Saūda, Mithilā and Guissā. If we read Savarāstra instead of Saurāstra it was certainly included in Harṣa'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 Hsiun 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 his Karīsa was a powerful state. His power extended over more than ten of the adjoining principalities. He had subjugated Lampak (Lughman), Nāgarā and Gandhā. 27
was an independent state.

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

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

Crossing the Indus, Huien Tsang visited Kāshmir. It had five dependencies: Taxila or Takṣiṣṭhāla, (modern Sahadheri), Sinhacur or Ketus, Urasa or modern Rāsī, Pan-ku-tso (modern Puchen) and Rāja ura (modern rājendri or Īnjor). It was ruled by Durlabhavardhana. Dr. Kookerji, on the supposed testimony of 'The Life', holds that Kāshmir, in a way acknowledged the suzerainty of Harṣa.

The life says, "Silāditya, hearing that Kāshmir possessed a tooth of Bāhna, 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 Harṣa, had the tooth unearthed 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. Kookerji. The expression
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 Kaśmir, as he voluntarily presented the relic to Harsa. A simple threat perhaps helped Harsa to gain the tooth.

Bhaṇa refers to "the inaccessible land of snowy mountains" subdued by Harsa. Dr. Mookerji supposes that it may mean the subjugation of Kaśmir or Nepal. Vaidya thinks it to mean that Harsa compelled the king of Kaśmir to pay tribute and acknowledge his nominal suzerainty. Both these suppositions are far-fetched and lack support. In this connection Ṛṣitarāṅgini 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 Harsa, and other kings." The Harsa referred to should not be confused with the Harsa of Kanauj as has been done by Nihāreranjan Roy. Firstly, such a supposition goes against the chronological order fixed by Stein and secondly Harsa of Kaśmir had a son who succeeded him, while Harsa of Kanauj had no son to succeed him.

On the testimony of Hiuen Tsang and on the evidence of Ṛṣitarāṅgini it can be said that Kaśmir was an independent state with some dependencies. It lay between the Indus and the Seas. It had two dependencies (1) Mon-lo-san-pu or Cheh-ka (TAKA or TAKI) and (2) Ko-fa-to, modern Multān and modern.
the pale of Harṣa's jurisdiction.

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

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

No exact identification of this place has yet been made. It lay to the North of Brahmapura (district between Simhāl and Kumaon) in the great snowy mountains. It was called "the eastern wo-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 Harṣa'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-la-na or Amsuvarman...had composed a treatise on etymology." This has given rise
a great controversy among scholars. Buhl, Bharvânâlîl Indraji, Fleet and Smith assume that Nepal acknowledged the suzerainty of Karsa; while Sylvain Levi, Bühlerhausen, Tripathi, Chatterji and others believe that Nepal was an independent state. The source material has, therefore, to be critically examined before we can reach any conclusions.

(1) Certain Nepalese inscriptions, dated in years 34, 39 and 45, refer to a king named Amśuvârman. He is described as a Śrânt or Mahâsrânt in the inscriptions. Therefore he cannot be an originator of the era in which the inscriptions are dated, for the title 'Mahâsrânt' suggests that he might have accepted the suzerainty of some powerful king whose era he might have borrowed. Tsyen Tsang calls Amśuvârman 'a recent king' and the script of the inscriptions also points to the close of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century B.C. as the time of its origin. Thus according to Buhl and Indraji the years possibly, in these inscriptions, refer to the Karsa Era, as it was 'in widest use' at that time. This implies that Nepal was subordinate to Kanauj, for no other sovereign ruler would use the era started by another sovereign monarch.

(2) There is another evidence also which suggests that the Karsa era was used in Nepal during the times of Amśuvârman. Jayadeva's inscription dated Śrâvat 1536 states that Jayadeva's mother, Vatsadevi,
was the daughter of a Maurya 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 Shaikpur stone
image inscription of Ādityasena, dated year 66, refers to
the Harsha era, 56 (606 + 66 = 672 A.D.). Thus there is a
difference of 67 years (63-66) 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. 57 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, 58 viz. that of Harṣa.

(iii) The Vamsāvālī informs us that
immediately before the accession of Anuśvarman, Vikramādīt
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 Vikramādītva could
refer only to Harṣa among the Indian rulers.

(iv) The Vamsāvālīs testify to the existence
of the Bais Rajputs 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
Rajputs. 59
(v) Bāha mentions that 'arsa "exacted tribute from an inaccessible country of snowy mountains."\(^{50}\) Buhlar, Bhagvânlāl Indraji and others believe that it refers to Nepal.

b. The other side:

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

(1) The records of Hiuen Tsang suggest by the word 'recent' that Anuvarman's Testimony of Hiuen Tsang: reign had ended shortly before the visit of Hiuen Tsang in about 637 A.D. The last known inscription of Anuvarman refers to the year 45. If it indicates the 'arsa era, then according to its testimony, Anuvarman might have been still ruling upto 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 heresay 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 Hiuen Tsang tally well with the other contemporary literary as well as epigraphic evidences. Thus the years of the inscriptions of Anşuvarman do not refer to the Yarna era, but to some other era.

It is quite probable that Anşuvarman himself might have started an era and used it in his inscriptions. He was the real sovereign of Neptāl, while his master Shivadeva was only a nominal ruler. Inscription No. 6 of Shivadeva refers to Anşuvarman 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 Anşuvarman 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 'Mahaśāman' out of respect to his old master who was alive in Saiwat 39. The cases of Sunga Puṣyanmitra and of Kāhatrpa Rudradēman may be cited as examples. They continued to call themselves 'Senāpati' and 'Mahaśākhatrpa' respectively even after they had assumed the sovereign status. The same fact is illustrated by the Bhashwās also.

Anşuvarman's inscription No. 8 of the year 48 and that of his successor Jisnugupta of the year 48 refer to Anşuvarman as "Bhattaraka Mahārājādhirāja Shri
Amšuvarmapadah."63 Thus if we suppose that Amšuvarman died by about 636 A.D., two years before the visit of Hiuen 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 begins somewhere about the year 590 A.D., which comes very near to the year in which the Nepālese era was, possibly, started. Amšuvarman, 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 Nepāl. Amšuvarman's earliest inscription is dated 592 at 34, and that Samvat very likely suggests an era. Thus there is no basis to suppose that Nepāl adopted the Brahma era.64

(ii) The second argument fails completely if it is accepted that the reckoning of Amšuvarman's inscriptions began approximately about 590 A.D. Adding 163 to 590 A.D., we get 743 A.D., the date of Jayadeva's inscription No. 15. If the Shānpur inscription dated the year 66 of Ādityasena, indicates the Kārṣa 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 roughly comes to 76 years. Thus, according to this
statement also the years would tally remarkably well.\footnote{66}

(iii) Vamśāvalis are not very reliable sources for calculating dates accurately and for deciding the correctness of events. Vamśāvali 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. Hāpa and Huien Tsang give their patron several epithets but not Vikramāditya. Perhaps the authors of the Vamśāvali simply tried to associate the current era of Nepal with the renowned name of Vikramāditya, the founder of the Vikrama era.\footnote{66} A Vamśāvali says that Anśúvardana came to the throne in 3000 of the Kali era-101 B.C., which is quite absurd on the evidence of Huien Tsang and the inscriptions.\footnote{67}

(iv) And again, the people of Fei-sha caste (mentioned by Huien Tsang) are not identical with the Bais caste or Bais Rājpats. Huien 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 Vaiśya king. Cunningham’s casual suggestion that the Bais caste should be identified with the Bais Rājpats, cannot be accepted as correct. The family suffix ‘Vardhana’ indicates that Harsa belonged to the Vaiśya Varna. Therefore the fourth argument also loses its force.
(v) Lastly, the Harsa-carita's reference to "the inaccessible land of snowy mountains" does not necessarily mean Nepal only. Settinausen believes that it refers to some Yukhara country. And again, the passage is open to several interpretations. Dr. R. S. Tripathi assumes that the words like "Durgāvaratā Garitāh Karah" may mean that Harsa obtained the hand of Durgā born in the snowy mountains. It may refer to the marriage of Harsa with some hill princess. But as Gaurishankar Chatterji rightly points out it is a mere nun. It does not refer at all to the marriage of Harsa. Svarna-gotra was also situated in the snowy mountains. Harsa-carita might be referring to Harsa's victory over that country. Hence, it is safe to exclude Nepal from the sphere of Harsa's sovereignty.

9. Ka-mo-lu-po or Kāmarūpa:

As already pointed out the friendship of Harsa 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 Harsa because he wanted a good ally to help him in punishing Saśāṅka. Dr. Nookerji's holds, "that by the above mentioned treaty Bhāskaravarman offered allegiance to Harsa of his own accord and he was anointed king by his lord (Harsa)." It rests on a passage from Harsa-carita, viz. "Atra Devara
Abhisiktsh Kumāraḥ 74 which is not corroborated by any other evidence. Secondly, the word Kumāra, "probably, refers to Bādhavagupta and not to 'Kumāra Bhāskaravarman' whom Bāṇa usually calls "Prājyotisvara" - or king of Assām. The Amsad inscription of Ādityasena indicates the same fact."75

The event of the compulsory visit of 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 Harṣa and was honoured by Harṣa as such. Thus we can safely conclude that Kāmarūpa was an independent state.

10. Yi-she-ye-na or Ujjain:

The king of Ujjain was a Brāhmin by caste. He was well versed in the Hindu Varaha shastra and was not a Buddhist.76 He might have been a feudatory king to Harṣa.

11. Mo-La-fo (western Malava):-

It was a part of the Vaitraka kingdom of Valabhi. It had three dependencies (i) Kita identified with Cutchh of Shēdā, (ii) Ananda ura, and (iii) Su-la-cha-Surāṣṭra of Suraṭa? As already stated Bhruvabhaṭa (Ādityasena II) was possibly in possession
of Mālawā (western) with all its three dependencies at the time of Hiuen 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.). It describes the charity of the king who gave land to some Brāhmīnas. 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. Falci (Valabhi):

As said before the Dhruvabhata mentioned by Hiuen Tsang has been identified with Dhruvasen-II, a nephew of Siladitya Dharmanitya first and a son-in-law of Harṣa. Manjusri-Sulakalpa calls some Dhruva a servant, covetous and foolish. From this Gaurishanker Chatterji assumes that Dhruvabhata was a feudatory king of Harṣa. It is already proved by various evidences such as the Navasāri Plate, Aihole Inscription and Saitraka inscriptions that Valabhi was an independent kingdom. So we have no ground to hold that 'Dhruva' mentioned by W. W. K. is Dhruvabhata of Valabhi. Hence, we cannot infer that Valabhi acknowledged the authority of Harṣa. It was an independent state.

13. Po-Lu-Za-che-po (Bhilagaccha or Broach):

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

14. Ko-ka-la-chha (Maharashtra):

According to Hiuen Tsang Fu-lo-ki-she (Pulakesin) was the ruling king of this region.\(^8^0\) His authority extended far and wide and served faithfully by his vassals. Harsa could not extend his empire in Maharashtra because he failed against Pulakesin.\(^8^1\) -wing to this failure Harsa had to accept river Narmada as the boundary line between the two states.

15. Ku-chi-lo (Curtana kingdom):

Its king was a young man, Ksatriya by birth. He was a devout Buddhist and was celebrated for his wisdom.\(^8^2\) There is no evidence to believe that he was a vassal of Harsa.

16. Chin-chi-lo:

It is identified with the state of Dajhoti or Jejakabhukti. Its capital was Kajuraho.\(^8^3\) Its territory corresponded with modern Bundelkhand. The pilgrim says that the king was a Brahmin and a firm believer in Buddhism. He patronised men of merit and learning.\(^8^4\) He also seems to have been an independent king.

17. Ko-hi-su-la-la-pu-lo (Kahesovarapura):

The region round Gwalior between the Chambal and the Sindhu rivers, was probably known as Mahesvarapura.\(^8^5\) Its ruler was a Brahmin and not a
believer in Buddhism. This state was also outside the empire of Harsa.

18. Sin-tu (Sindhi):

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

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


Huen Tsang informs that the king of Ṣid-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 Ṣid-India cannot be anyone else than Harsa. “Life” further informs that Śilāditya charged the king of Jālandhara
(named Wy-Ti-Suddhi or Suddhi? to escort the pilgrim in safety to the frontiers. These two instances suggest that the ruler of Jalandhara was a vassal of Harsa. Mathura being situated very near to Kausuj, might not have been in a position to maintain its independence. Moreover, Hsiian 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 Harsa.

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

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

1) Ku-lo-to or Kullu.
2) She-to-tu-lo or Satadru country (Modern Simind).
3) Sa-ta-ni-sau-sud-lo or Śārvīśvaro Thāneswar.
4) Su-lo-kin-na = Brughna (Sugh).
5) Po-lo-hin-mo-pu-lo = Brahmāpara.
6) Ku-pi-sang-na = Govisena, (districts of Kāshipur, Ramour and Silībha.
7) Ngo-hi-chi-to-lo = Ahichhatra (Eastern part of Rohilākhand).
8) Pi-lo-shan-na = Atranjikhera.
There are other evidences to prove that some of the territories were actually administered by Harsa. He inherited the kingdom of Thaneswar including
the valley of Saraswati river and parts of eastern Rajputanā. The finds-sets of the Sanskhorā and Madhuban Plates, mentioning grants of land, indicate that Ahicchatra and Śrīswetī respectively formed bhūtīs or divisions of his empire. If the Śīlāditya coins discovered in the Bhitaurā hoard (Fyzābād district) are to be ascribed to Harsa, as has been done by Burn, it is a direct proof that Ayodhyā was ruled by Harsa. (Dr. Hoernle’s objections to this attribution of these coins to Harsa, do not seem to be sound.) We may not put much trust in the evidence of the Rājatarangini on this matter. Hāyānā was certainly included in Harsa’s empire as it was the place where he distributed his wealth in charity. The “Life” calls Harsa a king of Magadhā. Therefore Magadhā also formed a part of his empire. Harsa had also constructed a temple with bronze cover at Nālandā. Moreover the fact that Śīlāditya 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 Harsa’s empire included Orissa also where he had offered 80 big villages in charity to the learned Buddhist named Jayasena. And lastly, as Hsüan Tsang informs us, Harsa returned victorious from Kongā (modern Ganjam) in 643 A.D. Thus it was also included in the empire of Harsa.

Authoritative sources:

While concluding, we can say on the authority of
Bitten Tseng and of the other literary, epigraphic and numismatic sources that Harsa's empire consisted of some parts of eastern Punjab, almost the whole of the present Uttar Pradesh (perhaps excluding Matipura), Bengal, Bihār and Orissa, including Kāngoda or the Ganjam district. This assumption is supported by the fact that all the places mentioned by Bitten Tseng in connection with Harsa's tours of inspection lie on the eastern side. He also calls Harsa "lord of the five Indias which is explained as consisting of Svarāstra or the Punjab (eastern portion of Punjab in this case), Kānyakubja, Mitilī or Bihār, Gauda or Bengal and Utkala or Orissa.\(^1\) Thus, the view that Harsa's empire extended over the whole of Northern India from the Himalayas to the Vindhyas and from Sindh to Kāmerūpa, 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.