

Spheres of Public Governance in Ancient India: Reflections on

*Abhignanshakuntalam* of Kalidasa

Dr. Sanjeev Kumar Sharma

Editor

The Indian Journal of Political Science

C.C.S. University, Meerut (U.P.)

[sanjeevaji@yahoo.co.in](mailto:sanjeevaji@yahoo.co.in)

*{Published in Journal of Political Studies, University of North Bengal,*

*Siliguri, Vol.II, No.1, 2008, pp.6-16}*

## Spheres of Public Governance in Ancient India: Reflections on

### *Abhignanshakuntalam* of Kalidasa

The study of political thought in present day India is fundamentally West-oriented and West-based. We have learnt in our universities and colleges that political science begins with the Greeks. The teaching departments of our country impart this all-accepted belief and knowledge that the study of state as a style of discourse started from the Greeks only. The most celebrated political theorist George H. Sabine emphatically declares that “philosophical-scientific style of thinking of which political theory is a part began among the ancient Greeks.”<sup>1</sup> In the same view Sabine makes a mention of India as “peripheral civilization that produced Buddha”.<sup>2</sup> Incidentally one would not find the mention of the word India in his eight hundred seventy plus pages treatise anywhere else. The other distinguished political theorist Ernest Barker fails to mention India in this regard even once in his off-quoted treatise on political theory.<sup>3</sup> He formidably declares in the very opening sentence of his work that “political thought begins with the Greeks.”<sup>4</sup> He goes further by quoting Plato that philosophy is the child of wonder and concludes that the Greeks dared to wonder about things visible and they attempted to conceive of the universe in the light of reason. He summarily rejects the Indian attempts into the sphere of religion.<sup>5</sup> Ironically our political theorists have very easily accepted these notions without giving any questioning to the edifice of this argument. Bhandari suggests that “we are on safe ground when we say that systematic political thought in the west begins with the ancient Greeks.”<sup>6</sup> He emphasizes that political thought originated with

the Greeks because of the essential secularity of their mind which made them particularly prone to the reason about things.”<sup>7</sup> Our most respected political scientist Ashirvatham has gone too far in this regard. He declares that “the Greeks were the first people to develop political science in its pure and systematic form. They were eminently fitted for this task by the rational and social outlook which characterized all their thinking.”<sup>8</sup> Asirvatham goes on to elaborate this argument by including all oriental thinking and comments that they “had speculated on the state and its problems even before the time of the Greeks. But they did not develop political science in its pure and systematic form. It was mixed up with a great deal of mythology and superstition. Religion and politics were so closely intertwined that no attempt was made to develop an independent science of politics. The social sciences were treated as a branch of theology.”<sup>9</sup> He recognizes that “early Hindu thought has much to say on kingship, village republics, organization of government, and the duties of rulers and subjects. All of this, however, does not produce a comprehensive political theory.”<sup>10</sup> The above description of the inaugural comments of some of the leading political scientists of the Western world and India provide before us a platform creating academic atmosphere of the easy acceptability of the idea of Greek origin of the political thinking. I wish to argue that the unquestioned supremacy of the West essentially emanates from general ignorance of the ideational basis and theoretical premises of ancient Indian philosophical thinking. Incidentally our political scientists, teachers and scholars appear (and attempt hard) to be knowledgeable experts of concepts, theories, models, constructs, and thought of the Western political philosophers. Concomitantly, their references, sources, explanations, analysis and prepositions are based and dependent on books and treatises of Western political scientists only.

There seems to be prevalent a presupposed West-oriented-ness in the community of political science in India in respect of formulation of the text books, research orientation, new fields of study and analysis, etc. Our research journals also reflect this tendency. The natural and obvious corollary of all this has been evident in the language, style, jargon, dogma, presentation, methodology and vocabulary of Indian political scientists being essentially West-based and in continuation of Western thinking of political science. Though it is largely true that even after this obedient following and imitation of the line of thinking of the West at almost all levels of study in Indian political science, unfortunately we have yet to see any enviable recognition or respect earned by our political scientists at global level. The supremacy achieved by a large number of non-Indian writers and commentators of different countries compels us to raise the questions such as – how it is possible that a country of the World's oldest civilization could not produce any writer, thinker, philosopher, theory, concept or idea in its known history of more than five thousand years which could have been assembled in the line of social scientists and political philosophers of the world? What would have been the reasons of continuous neglect of the political and administrative aspect of the nation by a society having paved the way of ethical, transcendental and universal upliftment of the whole world? How it is that the tradition of *rishis* and method of *gurukul* which had manifested amazing intellect and meticulous brilliance in the fields of philosophy, music, arts, literature, medicine, surgery, devotion (*bhakti*) etc. could not endeavour to think upon equally important issues of state, society, administration and leadership? Whether India did not possess any line of thinking, system, organizational structure and administrative institution presentable before the world? And the list of these questions

may go on like anything. Unfortunately, we rarely witness the attempts to find answers to these disturbing questions in the realm of political science in India.

Let me argue that the complete westernization of the study of Indian political thinking has generally given birth to different tendencies. First-our political science scholars have found and recognized the Western political thought as the only reason-based, deep, scientific fundamental, abstract tradition of thinking and therefore not easily understandable for common students and thereby they have accepted the superiority of the Western thinking. Next – so many theoretical constructs emerging out of the inner contradictory and local socio-political requirements of the Western society have been included in the syllabi of political science students in Indian universities and higher education institutions even if those are quite insignificant (and sometimes irrelevant) in Indian contexts. The result is that our students are being made to understand and comprehend various concepts which are different from the conditions prevalent before them and the possibilities of their universal application are immensely bleak. Again, the community of scholars of political science in India have easily accepted that the place of India in the long journey of the evolution of political theory and science is negligible and insignificant. Some of us have by now acceded to the demand of an analytical pursuit of the ancient Indian political thinking to be taught as a part of syllabi in our institutions imparting higher education and that too only to the extent of including the study of Kautilya in the scheme of the study of political thought for the purpose of understanding administrative dimension of the rulers of early India. Ironically in this context also our students are taught that Kautilya was the Machiavelli of India and absurd comparisons are made between the two without giving a serious note or attention to the fact that there

is a gap of more than fifteen hundred years between them and Kautilya is essentially different and distinct in many ways and his work is fundamentally system – based and mechanical. He is a philosopher par excellence having Indian cultural orientations and presenting an assimilation of the ideas of early political philosophers of ancient India. Apart from him no other writer or philosopher is considered worth studying for the students of political science in India. The necessary implication of all this has been very interesting. Our political science teachers and scholars have generally been infected by a deep and latent inferiority complex and the fear of the public manifestation of this complex makes them to attempt for establishing the superiority of the imagined and conceived Western rational intellect. This trend is often reflected in seminars, conferences and research papers published in different journals of our discipline.

It appears that Asirvatham contemplated an assimilation of the political thinking of the West and the tradition of India as he suggests (though casually) that “in India there is an urgent need to graft the valuable political ideas of the entire world to the ancient tree of Indian tradition and culture. In so doing we may revive and revitalize such ancient concepts as *dharma*, *ahimsa*, and *asanga*, and put new meaning into them and provide them with new workable sanctions.” In fact close and deeper understanding of our ancient past coupled with sincere and proper analysis of ancient Indian literature indicates that the *rishis*, writers, poets, dramatists, historians, philosophers, thinkers of ancient India had presented minute and logical analysis of all the factors related to the integrated development and growth of state, society and individual. The argument of not having separate and exclusive works of political thinking seems to be misleading in the light of the fact that ancient Indian thinking had holistic approach towards life of society,

individual and the state. The rationalists of ancient India found statecraft to be the essential element of the universal *dharma* which systematically regulates all spheres of the functioning of individual, state and society. Therefore, the main theme of all the treatises is essentially the study of the various paths leading to the accomplishment of *dharma*. This is why the other dimensions of human life are considered to be the part of the pursuit of *dharma* though they are not at all immaterial or negligible. This is in this backdrop that the ancient Indian thinkers who had been making perennial efforts in the direction of the understanding the metaphysical aspect of human life have provided excellent composite expressions of different aspects of human life in Vedic, Upanishadic and epic periods. The myth of not having specific works on state, politics and administration was exploded by the invention of Kautilya's Arthashastra in early years of twentieth century. The famous Indologist Basham comments that "until the last half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century Europeans made no real attempt to study India's ancient past, and her early history was known only from brief passages in the works of Greek and Latin authors."<sup>12</sup> He further elaborates that "though India had no formal political philosophy, the science of statecraft was much cultivated, and a number of important text books on this topic have survived. *Dandaniti*, the administration of force, or *rajniti*, the conduct of the Kings, was a severely practical science, and the texts cursorily dismiss the more philosophical aspect of politics, but give comparatively detailed advice on the organization of the state and conduct of governmental affairs."<sup>13</sup>

In this very context this may be interesting to note that even the works of literature which are full of romantic ideas and themes and dwell mainly upon love stories also contain such explicit and specific elements and components of political functioning

and thinking that they appear to be inseparable part of and lightened testimony to the enriched thinking tradition of ancient India. It is a well known fact that Sanskrit literature is the most ancient as well as the richest in the world. Large number of treatises has been produced in Sanskrit from times immemorial, covering diverse fields of knowledge. Kalidasa is the greatest of the poets and dramatists of Sanskrit literature who reached the highest level of excellence incomparable to literature of the whole world. It has been observed that “on the whole classical Sanskrit literature has not been well received in the West. Though the works of Kalidasa delighted Goethe, the literature taken as a whole has been called artificial, over-ornate, lacking in true feeling, or even an example of wasted and perverted ingenuity. Indians themselves are not always satisfied with it.”<sup>14</sup> Except *Raghuvansham* any other work of Kalidasa does not predominantly contain description of Kings or the rulers. Kalidasa is mainly a poet of love. *Raghuvansham* is incidentally a poetic re-presentation of *Ramayana* of *Valmiki*. But the most respected work of Kalidasa is *Abhignanshakuntalam* (Shakuntala Recognized). This is actually a drama based on *Shakuntalopakhyan* of *Mahabharatam* written by *Ved Vyas*. Kalidasa has been saluted by so many reputed laureates of the world for depicting his wonderful and extraordinary brilliance and flourishing beauty of his charming poetry. The place of Kalidasa in world literature has been immensely established by his superb treatment of the story of Paurava King Dushyanta and hermit girl Shakuntala which was earlier narrated at epic length in the *Adiparva* of *Mahabharatam*. The drama has been divided into seven parts.

The brief sketch of the story is produced here for the purpose of providing an insight into the actual situation and the resultant political comments. Once the Paurava King Dushyanta went with a big army for hunting and reached the peaceful precincts of a



hermitage on the banks of Malini River. He comes into contact of Shakuntala, the adopted daughter of sage Kanva in the ashram. Both of them fell in love. The king left the ashram promising Shakuntala to invite her to his kingdom in a few days. He presents her a ring bearing the name Dushyanta. Because of the curse of *rishi* Durwasa, Dushyanta forgets his love for Shakuntala while sage Kanva after his return from Somatirtham sends Shakuntala to the King's place with his disciples. Shakuntala loses the ring during the journey. The king does not recognize Shakuntala and shows her the way out. Menaka, the actual mother of Shakuntala comes down from the sky as a spread of light in female shape, picks up her daughter and vanishes. The signet ring lost by Shakuntala in the river while coming to the King's palace is found in the hands of fisherman and produced before the king by the police whereupon his lost memory revives and he becomes painfully aware of the enormity of his action. For him the sight of the signet ring marks the beginning of a long period of agonizing remorse to which there seems to be no end. He does not know where the celestial being has taken Shakuntala or whether she will even come back to him. Meanwhile Dhushyanta has been invited by Indra to render help to fight a horde of demons descended from Kalanemi and the king shakes off his dejection and proceeds to the heavenly regions in Indra's chariot. Returning victorious from this battle, the king happens to halt in hermitage of Marichi and Aditi, the divine progenitors of gods and men. There he meets his son Sarvadamana and wife Shakuntala. The reunion of the two is depicted by the poet with a tenderness, pathos, and emotion which is perhaps unequalled elsewhere in Sanskrit drama.

Apparently the drama does not contain an iota of direct political element, yet the closer understanding of this world-fame drama provides good idea of the political

structures and institutions present in his age. Despite his being critical of the values of politics, Kalidasa has unintentionally included the administrative models in his description of the palace of king Dushyanta. In this regard his depiction is literary and because of that the analysis of his political component in this drama might have substantial limitations for students of political science but we must take into account the considerable amount of light these depictions throw on the comprehensive understanding of the political norms and culture prevalent in those days. Primarily Kalidasa follows Manu with regard to dharma, society, state and king. Therefore, the king of Kalidasa not only prescribes rules, laws and punishment for those who have violated the established system and diverted from the path of their own *dharma*, but also fixes punishment for his own sins, besides striving hard for regular conflict resolution and providing vigilant security to his people.<sup>15</sup> He performs the duty of the family members of his *praja* in the days of scarcity thereby becoming close relative of each and every person of the populace. The king committed for providing good governance through peoples welfare cannot be autocratic, tyrant and despotic. He must be able to win over the hearts of the people and competent to govern the people with empathy. Therefore, he must be profuse in observing the duties of strong administration. This is why his working is decided according to the division of time into different sections. For Kalidasa, “he looks upon his subjects as his own children and supports them with fond care. Now, tired in mind, he seeks seclusion like the prince of elephants who, having led his herds from place to place in the torrid sun, seeks the cooling shade.”<sup>16</sup> His worries follow fast his ascending the throne. The sacred duty of people’s welfare cannot be deferred by the king because no rest or leisure for those who rule the world. The king, for the tribute of a sixth that he

takes, toils hard and long.<sup>17</sup> The king is deeply and continuously engaged in the welfare of the people and he considers democratic system to be the essential aspect of his administration. The expression by a small duty officer of the king that this right to democracy is absolutely without break or discrimination is essentially the most wonderful statement in whole of the ancient Indian Sanskrit literature. For a student of political science and public administration this statement contains three very significant components: democracy, right, and absence of discrimination. These are the major contours of our modern political thinking. One may argue that the present form and nature of democracy, rights and equality are totally different from what Kalidasa could have conceived in his comment on the monarchical system of governance yet the admission of this argument cannot lower the ultimate significance of the presence of these three terms in society at that time and the acquaintance of Kalidasa with these terms. It incidentally means that he had a definitive idea of these concepts having a manifest content of the sense of responsibility towards the people because of collecting six percent of their income as tax. This revenue collection is for twin purposes – one, to provide basic amenities to the people, and two – to ensure their security through consolidating the army. This tax receipt inculcates a sense of responsibility in the king who has to show his faith in public good through equality based rules and the people have the right to approach the king for anything in pursuance of the common good. This form of democracy consisting of equality and rights may sound technically different from the present day models of democracy i.e. sensitivity of the rulers towards the people. The one sixth of the income of the people collected by the king has also to be spent in way which

largely establishes explicit predominance of knowledge, philosophy, craft and *tapas* through the maintenance of *gurukulas*.<sup>18</sup>

His incomes are not the purpose of his entertainment. Unmindful of comfort he labours day by day for his people's welfare and so it has to be. Does not the spreading tree let the sun's fierce heat beat upon its head in order to refresh all who seek its shade.<sup>19</sup> His ascending the throne ends his longing to become the king, while the task of guarding what he has obtained wears him out. It's truly like the parasol that's troublesome to hold in one's own hand but serves to protect one from the heat.<sup>20</sup> He accomplishes his normal duties as king alongwith providing security to the people from fears and calamities. He declares with pride that even the lowliest of his subject does not take the vicious path.<sup>21</sup> When the hermits enter his place he enquires about austerities of the sages being undisturbed; he thinks about some person doing wicked harm to the beasts roaming around the woods; he apprehends of his misdeeds restraining the creepers to bloom; and such varied doubts arise and fill his mind with deep distress.<sup>22</sup> And when the hermits ensure that "how could they be hindered when you, the protector of the good, are here? When the sun is shining, no darkness there can be"<sup>23</sup> he feels relieved and says that his title then is not in vain and he truly deserves to be a king. This reveals the sense of deep belongingness and concern for the people of his kingdom. Kalidasa indicates about the education and training of the king, though in a casual and sarcastic way. He comments that the kings are taught deceit as a science.<sup>24</sup> This makes an indication of the teaching of diplomacy to the future kings. The usual *Bharata-vakyam* or benedictory verse is an indication of the feelings of the poet through the prayer of the king. "May monarchs of

world strive for the common weal! May the heavenly muse inspire the learned and the wise! May the self-created, omnipotent, blue-red god release me from rebirths?"<sup>25</sup>

Kalidasa includes political elements in *Abhignanshakuntalam* in indirect ways. Most of the characteristics of so-called Hindu polity have found place in the works of Kalidasa. The authority of the state and official legitimacy are reflected by so many examples in his works. *Abhignanshakuntalam* also contains state authority manifested in orders released for officers through messengers,<sup>26</sup> inspection by the officers before royal visits,<sup>27</sup> the accessibility of the king,<sup>28</sup> the pronouncements on behalf of the king,<sup>29</sup> the ruler – people interface,<sup>30</sup> etc. The declarations of the king are as a matter of fact indicators of the authority of king prevalent in the territory of state. The declaration by the king on being informed that the minister could not look into one case of a citizen because of being busy with heavy revenue collections, and the minister has sent his report on it for king's perusal,<sup>31</sup> that let him see the report and make a decision, reveals that the ministers were assigned different tasks and duties and the reports were immediately submitted to the king for perusal. This part of the drama makes curiously interesting reading. It speaks about laws of property, inheritance, laws of wealth, the intensity of the feeling of compassion for the people and so on. The king is informed that the sea-faring merchant Dhanamitra has perished in a ship-wreck, and as the unfortunate man has no issue, all his wealth escheats to the king. The king inquires that being wealthy this gentleman must have had many wives. It should be ascertained if any among them is expecting a child. He is informed by the office staff that one of them, a Saketa merchant's daughter, recently celebrated the *pumsavana* rites. Listening to this, the king immediately pronounces that "surely then the child in the womb is entitled to the father's wealth. Go

and tell the minister.”<sup>32</sup> After a minute he gets a second thought he summons his courtman and says “it matters not whether he has any off-spring or not.”<sup>33</sup> He then directs that “let it be proclaimed, should any subject be bereaved of a dear relation, provided he be innocent of any crime, his place will be taken by Dushyanta himself.”<sup>34</sup> This pronouncement is a glaring indication of the intensity of affection and sense of belongingness for public welfare in the mind of the king and this is a certificate of his integrity in people’s common good. The king who is the highest executive officer of the welfare state is declaring that anyone who is deprived of any of his family member, close relatives, affectionate ones need not to feel bereaved and full of sorrow because except for the sins and crimes committed by a citizens, the king is ready to fulfill the duties of a father, a brother, a sister, a mother and so on. The deep sense of love for the populace is the testimony to social sensitivity present in the mindset of the king. That is the quest of most of the citizenry even today and we do not find iota of this feeling in our rulers who claim to be the policy-makers and decision-makers of the modern democratic system of governance. This example prudently presents the ancient Indian monarchical system in a better light than the modern democracy. This pronouncement, it must be noted, is being made by the order of the king, on behalf of the king for the people of the kingdom. This shows the immense sensitivity of the king and the sense of responsibility in the king for the people. The classical form of governance may appear to be monarchy but the intense quest for people’s welfare makes it evident that the democratic values and norms of ultimate common good were very much present in the kingship of ancient India.

The king through the state is considered to be the protector of the citizenry. He has to ensure the establishment and accomplishment of social and cultural norms

prescribed by the early philosophers. He has to make sure that all the functions of the state are performed as per the *rajadharmā*. The rituals, the duties, the functions, the sustenance and the performance of any member of the populace cannot be disturbed and hampered because the king is perfectly involved in his *dharma* which indirectly means that the king has to provide not only for the overall development of his people but also to make possible the hassle free observance of their own specific *dharma* by the people. And this would necessarily pave the way of better governance. The discourse between state and people is described to be absent in ancient Indian tradition but this seems to be emphatically untruthful statement in the light of so many interactions of the general public persons with the king and the other officials of his kingdom in this drama. The construction of the story is inclusive of the depiction of the day to day functioning of the king through his immaculate power, potential, administrative acumen and sense of love and empathy for the people. The king is duty bound to provide security to those who have any kind of fear. He has to protect the people and he has got sufficient expertise in this duty. The idea of his getting expertise and competence in the performance of his duties has – emerged several times in *Abhignanshakuntalam*. Most of the description of the functions of the king are eventually related either to his deep involvement in public good or to his role as protector of the people. This protection is closely corresponding to his duty as a provider, as a facilitator and as an arbitrator. These responsibilities of state are considered most important even today in the discourses on public policy and governance.

Kalidasa makes indirect symbolic indications in the *Abhignanshakuntalam* about political system, king, criminal justice administration, law, and other aspects of ancient Indian polity. The treatise is basically a love story and therefore, the poet appears to be

avoiding any direct comment of the political and administrative affairs of the state. Yet the king being the main character of this drama, the political system gets immensely and visibly reflected through description of the functioning and depiction of different acts of the officers and institutions of the state by way of indications about the *kanchuki*, *pratihari*, *dauwarik*, *mantri*, *sarathi*, *shyala*, *rakshaka*, *purohita*, *amatya*, *senapati*, etc. The section of the fisherman and the warder having discussion and the treatment of the police and security officers given to the fisherman is indicative of the civil administration. The conversation reveals that the corruption is also prevalent at the lower level of bureaucracy. The *amatya* completes day to day functions vehemently even in the absence of the king from the headquarters and his sending the official papers to the king for perusal and consent shows the system of office of the king and his other officials.

The communication system and the presence of effective means of transmission of information to and fro the king and the other officials and administrative personnel also get presented and depicted in this drama. The movement of the king from the seat of judicial administration to a place earmarked for meeting the people from hermitage shows that there were different sub-offices of the king for different roles and performances. The comment by Bhambhari appears to be true when he says that “ancient literature on polity reveals that the king was, in reality, the servant of the people.”<sup>35</sup> This whole description is basically an argument for projecting the formidable presence of political ideas and concepts about political system, institutions and public governance in this world fame drama of love.

It has been rightly argued that the “state in India was considered a means to the realization of decent, good and meaningful life. Political thought and speculation about



the functions and the proper conduct of rulers and governments were conceived within the framework of the *chaturvarga* philosophy. Political thought, therefore, was called *rajadharmā* or *arthashastra*.<sup>36</sup> The king is, therefore, the guardian of the community and the protector of the people. And this becomes a testimony to the ancient Indian concern for just government and efficient administration. The above description is strongly indicative of the presence of systematic thinking about political institutions and public governance in ancient India which has evident elements of democratic value system.

It has been properly argued that in ancient India, the different branches of knowledge were grouped under four heads, namely, Philosophy, the Vedas, Economics, and Politics. Of these, Politics was regarded as a very important if not the most important subject of study.<sup>37</sup> Shri Aurobindo was very clear in this direction when he said that “there was a strong democratic element, if we must use the western terms, in Indian polity and even institutions that present a certain analogy to the parliamentary form.”<sup>38</sup> Thus, I have tried to summarize the points having emphatic indications about public governance in this famous drama of Kalidasa. This reveals some interesting dimensions of ancient Indian polity. This also emphasizes the urgent and pertinent need for a closer, systematic, theoretical and scientific study and analysis of more and more literary works not only of Kalidasa but also of other poets and dramatists of ancient India with a view to understand and explore the political system and institutions in that period that would necessarily improve our comprehension of the working and nature of the present day political institutions in this largest and oldest democracy of the world. We have to further study of present day relevance and utility of these aspects of ancient Indian public

administration in the context of traditional socio-cultural values and politico-institutional norms.

**Reference:**

1. George H. Sabine – A History of Political Theory, Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1973, p.7.
2. Ibid, p.12
3. Ernest Barker – Greek Political Theory: Plato and his Predecessors, Methuen and Co. Ltd., London, 1918 (reprint 1967)
4. Ibid, p.1
5. Ibid, p.1
6. D.R. Bhandari – History of European Political Philosophy, The Bangalore Printing and Publishing Company Ltd., Bangalore, 1975, p.1
7. Ibid, p.1
8. Eddy Asirvathan – Political Theory, The Upper India Publishing House Limited, Lucknow, 1968, p.1
9. Ibid, p.1
10. Ibid, p.1
11. Ibid, p.7
12. A.L. Basham – The Wonder That was India, Rupa Co, New Delhi, 1967 (reprint 1995), p.4
13. Ibid, p.80
14. Ibid, p.417

15. “You raise the rod of justice and deviants from the righteous path are restrained at once, disputes get resolved, the weak feel protected, where wealth abounds kinsmen are not scarce but you are the perfect kinsmen to rich and poor alike.” *Abhignanshakuntalam*, (Shakuntala Recognized) 5 (8) in *Plays of Kalidasa*, KVK Sundaram, Patriot Publishers, New Delhi, 1988, p. 237
16. *Ibid*, 5 (5), pp. 235-236
17. *Ibid*, 5 (4), pp. 235
18. *Ibid*, p. 235
19. *Ibid*, 5 (7), p. 236
20. *Ibid*, 5 (6), p. 236
21. *Ibid*, 5 (10), p. 237
22. *Ibid*, 5 (9), p. 237
23. *Ibid*, 5 (13), p. 239
24. *Ibid*, 5 (24), p. 243
25. *Ibid*, 7 (33), p. 278
26. *Ibid*, 5, p. 236
27. *Ibid*, 6, p. 252
28. *Ibid*, 6, p. 248
29. *Ibid*, 6, (23) p. 261
30. *Ibid*, 6, p. 261
31. *Ibid*, 6, p. 260
32. *Ibid*, 6, p. 260

33. Ibid, 6, p. 261
34. Ibid, 6, (23), p. 261
35. C.P. Bhambhari – A Primer of Hindu Polity, p.31
36. Sibesh Bhattacharya – Secular and Pluralistic Elements in the Idea of State in Early India, Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Shimla, 2002, pp. 21-22
37. Pramathanath Banerjea – Public Administration in Ancient India, Uppal Publishing House, New Delhi, 1985, p.1
38. Sri Aurobindo – The Spirit and the Form of Indian Polity, Calcutta, 1947, p.5

Traditionally, in classical Indian texts, the four branches of knowledge are considered to be: 1) Philosophy, 2) The Three Vedas, 3) Economics, and 4) The Science of Government. With this legacy, it is no wonder that the much less ambitious Indian Constitution is still the longest in the world, the most detailed and most concerned with trying to micro manage the nuts and bolts of administration. We have also seen how the problems that Kautilya tried to tackle are more or less the same as what modern states fail spectacularly at, even when aided by more gee-whiz technology. With a PhD in History of Indian Religions from the University of Pennsylvania, Olivelle started his career teaching in the Department of Religious Studies at Indiana University from 1974 to 1991. Later, he moved to Texas where he served as Chair of the Department of Asian Studies and Professor of Sanskrit and Indian Religions at the prestigious University of Austin from 1994 to 2007. Ancient Indian Art Ancient Indian Geography Ancient Government Ancient India Religion Ancient India Facts Ashoka Chandragupta Maurya Harshavardhan Indus Valley Civilisation Vedic Age. Modern Indian History. Freedom Fighters India Indian Independence Mahatma Gandhi. Leaders. Reformers. Indian Clothing. Indian Food. Indian Architecture.