CHAPTER III

CAMPAIGNS OF HARSA.

I. OUR SOURCES:

Since different authorities have conflicting opinions about the campaigns and conquests of Harsha, it is not easy to determine the accurate boundaries of his dominions after his exploits. Even though Huien Tsang’s Life and Travels, Bana’s Harsha-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. Mukerji, R. S. Tripathi, K. N. 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 Harsha.

II. MARCH OF HARSA AGAINST SAŚANKA.

When Harsha received the tragic news of the assassination of his elder brother Rājyasrīvardhana and learnt about the misfortune of his sister Rājyasrī through Kuntā,1 he became wild with rage and immediately took a vow to clear the earth of the Gaudas. 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.2 Then Harsha ordered Skandagupta, the commandant of his whole elephant troop, to prepare the elephant-corps and be ready for
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 consistin
of elephants, cavalry and infantry corps
headed by his faithful generals. Bana
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 Kamarūpa, ⁴ who, perhaps being afraid of Sasāṅka,
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, Sasāṅka had left Kanauj precipitately.
Harṣa established himself there and perhaps began to
prepare for the war against Sasāṅka.

It is very doubtful whether actual conflict
between Harṣa and Sasāṅka ever took
place. Bana 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 Arya-manjuśrī-mūlakalpa. ⁵ It has the
following passage:

"At that time will arise in Madhyadesa the
excellent king whose name begins with 'Ra'
(perhaps Rājyavarman) of the Vaiṣāya caste.
He will be as powerful as Soma (Sasāṅka). He
also ends at the hand of a king of the Nāga
caste."
"His younger brother Ha (probably Harṣavardhana) will be an unrivalled hero. He decided against the famous Soma. The powerful Vaiśya 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). Ha returned having (or not having) been respected in that kingdom of the wicked person."

Dr. R. C. Basak accepts the views of Jayaswal on this passage, and says, "the author of M.M.K. means that Harṣa, 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 Sasanka's oppression against Buddhism as related by K. Tseng.

Gaudarāja had certainly left Kanauj, when Harṣa arrived there with his sister Rājyaśrī and his minister Bhopāli. He might have thought it prudent to reach his capital Karnasuvarna (Pundra) instead of facing a conflict with the mighty army of Harṣa. If M.M.K. is to be relied upon, followed and after defeating him, compelled him to shut himself in his capital. However, Harṣa had to return soon to his capital, leaving Sasanka unsubdued. This fact is corroborated by the Ganjam Plate, which refers to Sasanka as "Mahārājakṣirāja", and K. Tsang, who refers to Sasanka "as the recently expired king of
Magadha, when he visited the eastern parts of the country about 637-38 A.D. It means that Saśānka might have died between 620 and 637 A.D. It is quite likely that after the death of Saśānka, 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. Hiuen Tsang's reference to the court held by Harṣa at Kajangala after his return from the conquest of Kongōdā in 643 A.D. suggests it.

As no scholar or authority has supported the statement of Dr. J. C. Chaguly that the Gaudarāja referred to by Bāṇa was not Saśānka but some other ruler of Bengal, who was defeated by Harṣa, 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 Gauda from the earth. There is no sense in saying that he might have pardoned Saśānka because of his Buddhist tendencies when he did wage several battles later on in pursuit of his plan of Bigvijaya.

III. HARṢA'S OTHER CAMPAIGNS

Harṣa acquired the Saukhari empire when he became the guardian at Rājasrī at Kanauj (606 A.D.). This empire extended up to Anicchatra, the boundary line of the
on the East; it may have stretched up to the Tarai district in 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 Harsha extended his empire beyond these limits. Huien Tsang states, "Harsha while proceeding eastward invaded the states which had refused allegiance and continued incessant battles till he, within six years, conquered the five Indias.\(^{12}\) The five Indias are supposed to include (i) Saurâśhtra, (ii) Kanyakubaj, (iii) Nagadha, (iv) Gauda, and (v) Orissa.\(^{13}\) According to Hookerji the first is not Saurâśhtra but Svarâśtra (Punjab).\(^{14}\)

Bâna also ascribes to Harsha several victories over distant lands. But there is a great deal of exaggeration in the descriptions of both Bâna and Huien Tsang. As already stated Gauda maintained its independence at least up to the death of Saśâṅka. That Punjab (North) remained an independent kingdom can be inferred from the absence of any evidence to suggest the contrary. It appears probable that Harsha, 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 Bankhar empire or of the kingdom of Sâlawâ (of Devagupta) might have come under his direct rule. But the same cannot be said for the other kingdoms when Huien Tsang reveals the
of their kings at the time of his visit to these states.

A. HIS CAMPAIGN AGAINST SINDH:

Bṛṣaṇa's description of Prabhākaravarmanasa, as "a burning fever to the king of the Indus land," does not suggest that he had subdued Sindha and annexed it to his kingdom. Bṛṣaṇa further tells us that Harsa, after having subdued (pravargya) the king of Sindha, 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 Harsa might have defeated the king of Sindha but failed in subduing him to acknowledge his suzerainty because Hiuına Hsang clearly mentions Sindha (Sin-Tu) as a separate state which was ruled by a Śūdra king, who was a sincere believer in Buddhism. As already discussed, Senāsi ruled in Sindha, when Hiuına Hsang visited it. Hiuına Hsang also informs us that Sindha had at that time three dependencies, viz., (1) Atien-Fon-Chin, i.e., Atyanabakala (ii) Ni-to-Shin-lo identified by Cunningham with Sairābād or Sirankot and by Baig with the Thar and Garh district, and (iii) A-sai-ta-identic with Bārjmanābād or the Shairpur district. From the account of Hiuına Hsang it is obvious that Harsa's campaign against Sindha by Harsa did not result in its annexation and that it remained outside the limits of Harsa's empire.

B. DEFEAT OF VALAHI BY HARSÁ:

Hiuına Hsang records, "The ruler of Falapi
Sīlāditya, the former king of "śalawā" (western) and a son-in-law of the Sīlāditya reigning at Sānyakubja. His name was Tu-lo-po-po-ta (Uhrvabhata). He was, a Buddhist king.¹⁹

It is generally believed that the ruler of Valabhi was a feudatory of Narsa. Dr. V. A. Smith holds that Uhrvabhata, after his fight with Narsa, was compelled to sue for peace and accept the hand of the victor's daughter and remain a vassal of Narsa. Smith believes that this had also resulted into the surrender of Anandapura, cutch and Suratha, which were the dependencies of western śalawā upto 641 A.D.²⁰ (Western śalawā was a part of the kingdom of Valabhi at the time). Dr. Hookerji supports this view.²¹ It is suggested that the Savasāri copper plate also refers to the defeat of Uhrvasena II (Uhrvabhata mentioned by Hsien Tsang) by Narsa. 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 Kṣaṇḍada.²² Uhrvasena Second was a contemporary king of Dadda Second, the Gurjara king of Broach. Thus the testimony of Hsien Tsang and the Savasāri grant corroborate each other. Now a question arises as to how a small king of Broach could protect the Valabhi king against a might emperor like Narsa. The answer is
obtained from the Aiholo inscription of Pulakesin II. Second - which states that the Lātas, Śālawas 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 Māraṇa and Pulakesin II.

It should be remembered that the Navasārī 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 Dhruvabha was defeated by Māraṇa, this does not mean that Valabhi was a feudatory state of Māraṇa. The following circumstances should be taken into consideration. According to Bāna, Trabhākara was "a trouble of the sleep of Gujarāt (Gurjaras)," "a looter to the lawlessness of the Lātas" and "an axe to the crescer of Śālawā's glory." It means that the states of Gurjaras, Lātas and of western Śālawā (it cannot be eastern Śālawā as Bahaśeṇagupta - ruler of eastern Śālawā is supposed to be the maternal uncle of Trabhākara, his mother Bahaśeṇaguptādevī being the sister of Bahaśeṇagupta) were probably independent when Māraṇa ascended the throne. Like his father,
he might have naturally tried to subdue them after his failure against Vasaṅka. In his attempt to subdue Malawa (or Valabhi), Harsa might have come into collision with Dhruvasena II. Dhruvasena, being unable to oppose unaided a mighty king like Harsa, might have sought the help from Jadda II, the Gurjara king of Broach. It is very likely that Dhruvasena and Jadda, along with the king of Lata (all the three being the opponents of the kingdom of Ṭhāṇeswar), formed an alliance to protect themselves against the mighty arms of Harsa and as Sr. 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 Sr. K. C. Kajumdar points out,2 Harsa was defeated by this confederacy headed by Pulakesin. Of course the Ahobh inscriptions do not hint at such joint efforts against Harsa, 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 Sr. K. S. Trināthi has rightly pointed out.2 Dhruvabhāṭa was able to regain his throne as a result of the treaty between Pulakesin and Harsa. Harsa might then have married his daughter to Dhruvabhāṭa to win him over to his side.

Valabhi held an important geographical position between the North and South. So the friendship of its ruler was quite necessary for Harsa not only to achieve
his further conquests but also check the northern thrust of his rival Pulakesin II.28 However, this does not in anyway prove that shrivasana was a vassal of marṣa. Huen Tsang does not hint at the feudatory status of shriva bhaṭa who was ruling at valabhi when he visited it.29 The view that shriva bhaṭa’s presence in the religious gathering at rayāg, indicates his feudal status, can be refuted by saying that he might have attended the ceremony as the son-in-law of marṣa. Bhāskararavaman, king of kamarūpa who had also attended that meeting, was beyond doubt an independent ruler. The same may be true of shriva bhaṭa also. Beal informs that shriva bhaṭa also held such assemblies in his own kingdom and gave plenty of charity to all types of priests.30 All these facts go against general supposition that valabhi was a feudary state of kanauj.

IV. THE WAR AGAINST PULAKESIN II

Most of the scholars, on the authority of navasāri plate and aihole inscription, believe that marṣa had to fight with the calukya king pulakesin II because of shrivasana II, the valabhi king. The aihole inscription of pulakesin of a.d. 634 refers to the defeat of marṣa by pulakesin. It also mentions lātas, čalavas and Gurjaras as his
feudatories. Dhruvasena, after his defeat of the hands of Harsa might have taken refuge with the Gurjara king Dadda II of Broach and joined the union of the Latas 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 Dhruvabhata of Valabhi.

Hiuen Tsang remarks, "The great king Siladitya at this time was invading east and west and countries far and near were giving allegiance to him, but Mo-ha-la-cha (Maharashtra) 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 whole inscription of 634 A.D., the poet Revikirti describes the exploits of his patron Pulakesin 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 the rows of mighty elephants fallen in battle." Other inscriptions such as Hirpa, Kamul, and Togarcedu grants also refer to the event, and state that the Calukya monarch (Pulakesin II) acquired the title of "Parasvēvara" or supreme lord by defeating glorious Harravarhana - "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 Karsa 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 Karmadā, it fixed the southern limits of the empire of Haraśa. 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 Shruvasena and had to acknowledge him as an independent ruler. He also could not subdue the Lātas, the Pālawas and the Surjaras, as Hiuen Tsang mentions Pālawā (Western) and Surjara as separate states. It is believed that after the defeat, Haraśa ruled in peace at least up to 640 A.D. and during that time he increased his military power considerably to meet any challenge to his power.

5. Penetration into the Sūtra: A mere myth:

Some scholars hold that Haraśa penetrated far into the Deccan and defeated the Pālava king Mahendravarman I. This belief is based on two sources (1) a verse of Śayūra, a court-poet of Haraśa, supposed to refer to the victories of his patron Haraśa over Anga, Kuntāla (Karnatak), Cola, Kadnyadasa and Sānci; and (2) the Gaddemana inscription (Shimoga district of Mysore) supposed to refer to the victory of Śilāditya (Haraśa ?) over Mahendra (Mahendravarman I ?). They believe that the inscription corroborates the testimony of Śayūra.
First of all Sri Srikanta Sastri, on the evidence of the verse of Kayura, tried to prove in 1926 that Sarsa defeated Manendra I - his contemporary Pallava king. He also took support of the Gaddemane inscription which was first published in 1923 by Dr. Shem Shastri. This theory is based on the misinterpretation of the evidence. Kayura in the verse conceives the earth as the wife of his patron and he uses the words Anga, Kuntala, Cola, Madhyadesa and Kachi respectively in the sense of her body, hair, cloth, chest and griddle. As Dr. R. C. Majumdar rightly observes, it is merely poetic imagination. Dr. Gaurishanker Chatterji has made another supposition. He imagines that Kayura perhaps being displeased with Sarsa or Bana, might have gone to Pulakeshin II who readily gave him refuge. He composed that verse probably in praise of Pulakeshin who had actually conquered most of the countries mentioned in the verse, or as he says, if Kayura continued as the court poet of Sarsa, the verse should be discarded as an above mentioned evidence by considering it merely as a piece of poetry.

Scholars like Shem Shastri and Nihararanjan 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 rettani Satyānka in a fight against the Bedā chief when Śilā-ditya ascended the throne - or invaded the south and put Mahendra to flight. According to the scholars like Shastri, it suggests that (i) rettani Satyānka was a commander of Kṛṣṇa, (ii) Kṛṣṇa defeated Mahendravarma, and (iii) the latter, being afraid, resorted to flight. After this rettani Satyānka was killed perhaps in battle by the chiefs of Mahendravarma. The study of the inscriptions reveals that it does not mention Kṛṣṇa by name anywhere. It simply refers to Śilā-ditya in a vague way, and that also as Śilā-ditya. There were several Śilā-dityas in ancient India. So Śilāditya cannot be identified with Kṛṣṇa. Secondly, the inscription also does not state that rettani Satyānka was the commander of Śilāditya. Now does it mention that Mahendra was Mahendravarma Pallava. It simply refers to some Mahendra. If he is the famous Mahendravarma Pallava, the name should have been given with some titles. In fact the said inscription does not refer to the battle of Kṛṣṇa with Mahendravarma but to a fight between two petty chiefs, one being Satyānka and the other Mahendra.42 Śilāditya and Mahendra of this inscription can be identified respectively with Kuvarāja Śryāraya Śilāditya (a son of Pulakesin II) and Pallava Mahendravarma 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 Śilāditya mentioned in the Sāndeme inscription, may be Śilāditya - a king of Valabhī. He is described in an inscription as the lord of the earth between Vindhyā and the Western ghats. As he did not belong to the royal dynasty, no title like Mahārājādhirāja etc., was applied to him. This supposition is also a baseless one. It fails to answer two questions. (1) how Śilāditya want to Kannad, and (2) how did the Southern Calukya ruler allow him to conquer Kannad and gain a victory over Pallava Mahendravarman? Under the circumstances it is wrong to assume that Hārṣa ever invaded the South either before or after his failure against Pulakesin II.

VI. CONQUEST OF KONGODĀ (GANJAM) AND POSSESSION OF MACAJA:

Hiuen Tsang informs that when he had gone to Kāmarūna at the invitation of its king Bhāskaravarman in about A.D. 643, Hārṣa had conquered Kongodā and was halting at Kajangala near Rājamahāl (identified by Cunningham, on the bank of the Ganges). The fact of Hārṣa having resided and held his court there proves that Kajangala was included in his empire. Life further informs that, after the subjugation of Kongodā, Śilāditya 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 Ka-Twan-Lin states that Śilāditya assumed the title of the king of Magadha in 641 A.D. Hiuen Tsang confirms it.

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

VII. THE CHRONOLOGY OF HARSA'S CAMPAIGNS:

The statement of Hiuen Tsang, "that Harṣa waged incessant warfare until in six years he had bro
the five Indias under allegiance?\textsuperscript{53} (or fought the five Indias?) and then he reigned in peace for thirty years without raising a weapon\textsuperscript{54}, has been responsible for a great deal of controversy among scholars. Relying on this statement P. K. Nockerji assumes that Harsha's campaigns and conquests were over by 612 A.D., as he had ascended the throne about 606 A.D.\textsuperscript{55} But the Chinese traveller himself states at another place that Harsha returned from his campaign against Kongoda about 643 A.D. Dr. R. S. Trinath\textsuperscript{\textregistered} has pointed out the discrepancy between these two statements of Huien Tsang, one which says that Harsha fought only for six years continuously and then reigned in peace for 30 years and the other which states that Harsha fought his last battle about 643 A.D.\textsuperscript{56} R. C. Majumdar opposes Dr. Trinath\textsuperscript{\textregistered}'s opinion and declares that there is no such contradiction in the statements of Huien Tsang as understood by Dr. Trinath\textsuperscript{\textregistered}. According to him, Harsha fought all his wars between A.D. 606 and 612\textsuperscript{57} and then ruling in peace for 30 years between A.D. 612 and 642, proceeded against Kongoda in 643 A.D.\textsuperscript{57}

This assumption creates another serious difficulty. If we

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Various assumptions:}
  \begin{itemize}
    \item accept this, we shall have also
    \item to believe, along with Dr. Fleet
    \item and Dr. Nockerji, that Harsha would have fought with
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
ulakesin II assumed the title of Parameswara by defeating hostile kings. Dr. Fleet holds that, after defeating Harsha in 612 A.D., ulakesin assumed the title of Parameswara. 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 Harsha at all. If we accept the view that Harsha fought with ulakesin after compelling Uhravasena 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 Uhravasena 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 Jubreuil 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 Harsha clearly and the later Calukya inscriptions do so, even though Aihole inscription does not refer to Harsha, it does refer to Siladitya. As such it refers to no other battle than the one fought between Harsha and ulakesin II.

Beal's interpretation of the text, informs
b. Beal's Interpretation:

That Arasa carried on warfare for 30 years, after which his authority was established and he reigned in peace after A.D. 636.

For about 11 years. This also cannot be correct as Arasa'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 Arasa, 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 Arasa whom he met only by 643 A.D. It is possible that he has confused the years and committed the mistake.

Hansa refers to several campaigns and conquests of Arasa, 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 Arasa, possibly, come in collision with
(A.D. 606). Next he conquered Mid-India (Uttara Pradesh) including eastern Vālawā (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 Vālawā, Harsa might have clashed with the Valabhi king Shrīvasen-ll who fled to Sadda II, a feudatory of Pulakesin-II. As a result Harsa had to fight with Pulakesin against whom he failed (between 628 and 634 A.D.). On account of this setback he had to spend some time in consolidating his position and except his campaign against Kongodā about 642-643 A.D., he spent rest of his life in peace.
Campaigns of Harsha
606 AD to 647 AD.