



*Asian Literature and Translation*

ISSN 2051-5863

<https://doi.org/10.18573>

Vol 5, No. 1, 2018, 26-71

**Edwin Arnold's translation  
of the *Hitopadeśa***

**Dermot Killingley**

Date Accepted: 01/03/18

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY).

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>©Dermot Killingley



Cardiff University Press

Gwasg Prifysgol Caerdydd

*The Hitopadeśa*

The *Hitopadeśa* is a version of the *Pañcatantra*, related most closely to the Southern *Pañcatantra*. However, it is not a version of the *Pañcatantra* in the same way as the *Tantrākhyāyikā*, or Pūrṇabhadra's *Pañcākhyānaka*. It cannot claim the title *Pañcatantra*, since it is in four chapters instead of five, and the chapters are not called by the distinctive term *tantra*, but by the more explicit but rather banal designation *kathāsamgraha* 'collection of stories'. The subjects of these four chapters are arranged in two pairs of opposites: *mitralābha*, *suhṛdbheda*, *vigraha*, *sandhiḥ* (gaining of friends, separation of friends, hostility, alliance). This arrangement is both symmetrical and chiasmic: the second pair is in the opposite order to the first, so that the whole begins and ends in harmony (gaining of friends, and alliance) with tension (separation of friends, and hostility) in the middle, like a piece of music. The frame story of Viṣṇuśarman and the princes is resumed at the beginning and end of each chapter, ending with a self-assessment by the princes, in which they assure their teacher that they are now experts in matters of kingship (*rājavyavahāra*). In the *Pañcatantra*, on the other hand, this frame story appears only at the beginning of the whole book (Winternitz 1963: 327 n. 2). The chapters of the *Hitopadeśa* are also less unequal in length, and in number of stories and verses, than those of the *Pañcatantra*. It appears that the author liked symmetry, and found the *Pañcatantra* rather deficient in that respect. The *Hitopadeśa* also has a higher proportion of verses to stories than the *Pañcatantra*.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The numbers are: *kathāmukha*: 1 story, 48 verses; ch. 1: 9, 216; ch. 2: 10, 184; ch. 3: 10, 149; ch. 4: 12, 134. Total: 42, 731; a proportion of 1:17.4. For the *Pañcatantra* the proportion is nearer to 1:13. The greater abundance of verses in the *Hitopadeśa* than in the *Pañcatantra* is most notable in the *kathāmukha*, which has only 4 verses in Edgerton, 5 in Pūrṇabhadra.

The author put as many relevant verses as he could find into each story, evidently aiming to make the book ‘as complete a subhāṣitasamgraha as was possible’ (Sternbach 1960: 20 § 49).

The text is much more stable than that of the *Pañcatantra*: though the printed editions vary here and there in the inclusion or omission of a verse, or in the wording of the verse or prose, they represent a single recension (Sternbach 1960: 1 § 3). It contains some 42 stories,<sup>2</sup> about three quarters of which can also be found in the *Pañcatantra*, including the story of Viṣṇuśarman which is the frame of both collections. But eleven of the stories<sup>3</sup> are not in any version of the *Pañcatantra*: the tiger and the traveller (NSP 1.2); the deer, the crow and the jackal (NSP 1.3);<sup>4</sup> the prince and the merchant’s wife (NSP 1.8); the washerman’s dog and his donkey (NSP 2.3); the lion, the mouse and the cat (NSP 2.4); the vidyādhari in the picture (NSP p. 64, included in 2.3); the cowherd’s wife, the magistrate and his son (NSP 2.7, paralleled in the *Śukasaptati*); the crow, the goose and the traveller (NSP 3.5); the crow, the quail and the cowherd (NSP 3.6; these two parallel stories are introduced and concluded by a single verse); the warrior who sacrifices his son (NSP 3.9, found also in the *Vetālapañcaviṃśati* (ed. Emeneau

<sup>2</sup> Sternbach (1960: 4 § 14) gives the number as 42, but apparently does not count the frame story of Viṣṇuśarman. The exact number depends on how one counts those instances where a single verse introduces more than one story. Thus the stories of the goose and the crow and the quail and the crow (NSP p. 87) are introduced by one verse, as mentioned below. The story of the cowherd’s wife and the barber’s wife (ch. 2 story 6, NSP pp. 64-66) contains the story of the vidyādhari in the picture (NSP p. 64), and that of the jewel-stealing sādhu (NSP p. 66); the parallel story in *Pañcatantra* similarly contains two other stories (Edgerton 1924: 1.48-59).

<sup>3</sup> Sternbach (1960: 4 § 14) counts only ten; but his list (pp. 27-29) does not make it clear which stories are included in this number, and has several unexplained features. It might be asked how many PT stories are omitted from *Hitopadeśa*, but that depends on which version of the *Pañcatantra* it is compared with, as well as on how the recast stories are counted. Counting the five frame stories, and the overall story of Viṣṇuśarman, Edgerton’s reconstruction has 38, Pūrṇabhadra has 93, and M. R. Kale’s study edition has 78; so the *Hitopadeśa* could be said to omit about 5, or 60, or 45 stories.

<sup>4</sup> The NSP edition inadvertently gives the number 2 to two stories: the tiger and the traveller (p. 8) and this story (p. 16). I have therefore added 1 to this and each subsequent number given by NSP in chapter 1.

1958: 41-7)); and the two daityas who kill each other (NSP 4.8). Further, the story of the sage who transforms a mouse (NSP 4.5) is substantially different from the one in the *Pañcatantra*; and the war of the geese and the peacocks, which provides the frame for chapters 3 and 4, is substantially different from the story of the crows and the owls which is the frame of *Pañcatantra* chapter 3, though clearly modelled on it. It is also on a larger scale, geopolitically and ornithologically, since the war is between the water-birds of Karpūra-dvīpa and the land-birds of Jambudvīpa, and birds of several species play leading parts on each side. If we count these two thoroughly recast stories, there are thirteen which are not in the *Pañcatantra*. These thirteen may have been taken from other sources, or invented by the author (Sternbach 1960: 4 § 14).

The origin of the *Hitopadeśa* is obscure.<sup>5</sup> The author, Nārāyaṇa, who is otherwise unknown, ‘probably lived between 800 and 1373 A.D.’ (Edgerton 1924: 2.20; cf. Barnett 1928: xiii). He tells us that his material is taken from the *Pañcatantra* and another book (*pañcatantrāt tathānyasmād granthād ākr̥ṣya*); we do not know what this other book was, and we may suspect that the singular noun refers to several books.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Here I follow Edgerton (1924: 2.20f.); on the origin of the *Hitopadeśa*, he seems to agree largely with Hertel (Sternbach 1960: 2 § 5). The reason for the dates is that the oldest manuscript is dated 1373, while the expression *bhaṭṭāarakavāra* ‘Sunday’ (NSP 20 l. 9) first became common in the 9th century (Winternitz 1963: 326f. n. 4).

<sup>6</sup> Sternbach (1960: 1 n. 1; 11 § 24) actually translates it as a plural, without mentioning the difficulty. Edgerton (1924: 2.20) and Winternitz (1963: 326) translate it as a singular, as we might expect. Johnson (1848:1) translates it ‘the Pancha Tantra, and any other such book’ (the italics indicating words that do not correspond to words in the original); he seems to be trying to reconcile the singular noun with the knowledge that there were several such sources. Barnett (1928: 2) revises this as ‘the Pañcha-tantra and other books.’

*The Hitopadeśa in the nineteenth century*

The currency of the *Hitopadeśa* was enhanced by the British presence in India. Before then it was especially known in Bengal, where ‘it has supplanted all other Pañcatantra versions in popular favor’ (Edgerton 1923: 2.20). When Bengal became the main area of British power in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, the *Hitopadeśa* became the best-known *Pañcatantra* version in the English-speaking world. It was translated into English twice in the eighteenth century, by Sir William Jones and by Charles Wilkins (1787). Wilkins aims to represent the original rather than adapt it to European taste (Wilkins 1787: xiv);<sup>7</sup> he translates the verses as prose but distinguishes them by hanging indentation (Wilkins 1787: xv); those which introduce stories he distinguishes further by italics. An edition by Colebrooke (Sternbach 1960: xi; Johnson 1847: vii) was printed in 1804 in Serampore, where the Baptist missionaries were developing a flourishing printing business, both for their own publications and for government and other contracts (Potts 1967: 110). This edition was doubtless intended for Fort William College, the East India Company’s training college in Calcutta for its British recruits. It was followed in 1810 by a London edition (Johnson 1847: vii; Sternbach 1960: xi), edited by Alexander Hamilton for the Company’s other college in Haileybury, Hertfordshire. While the Haileybury students were cutting their teeth on this edition, August Wilhelm von Schlegel and Christian Lassen published another, with Latin introduction and notes (1831).<sup>8</sup> This was followed by Francis Johnson’s edition of 1847, published by the specialist printer

---

<sup>7</sup> Wilkins often transliterates a Skt word (e.g. “Yōḥvā-rājā” p. 78; “Kōkēḥlā” p. 79) and explains it in an endnote.

<sup>8</sup> The title page mentions a translation by Schlegel; but this was prevented by his death (Johnson 1847: vii).

Stephen Austin of Hertford.<sup>9</sup> Johnson, who taught at Haileybury, dedicated his edition to its students (Johnson 1847: v). He followed it with a translation, again intended for students (Johnson 1848). The translator Edwin Arnold acknowledges ‘Professor Johnson’s excellent version and edition of the *Hitopadesa*’ (1861: xi).

The *Hitopadeśa* thus came to be traditionally accepted as a suitable text for beginners in Sanskrit, rather as Caesar was for Latin; this tradition was continued by Lanman’s *Sanskrit Reader* (1884: 16-43), which puts it second after the *Nalopākhyāna*, another traditional beginners’ text. Johnson had no doubt of its suitability:

The advantages of the *Hitopadeśa* as a class-book at the East-India College have been established by the experience of more than forty years; and it is likely to be used in the same capacity for many years to come.

(Johnson 1848: iv)

The narratives are, in general, written in very simple and unpretending prose; and it may be doubted if any book exist in the *Sanskrit* language that is better adapted to introduce a Student to its acquirement. In no single work is there to be met with a more comprehensive assemblage of serviceable words and phrases.

(Johnson 1847: ix)

It is true that the prose parts of the *Hitopadeśa* are very suitable for beginners, though the same might be said of other *Pañcatantra* versions. The verses, however, which are more abundant in the *Hitopadeśa* than in the other versions, present difficulties which make them unsuitable

---

<sup>9</sup> Johnson (1795/6-1876) was Professor of Sanskrit, Bengali and Telugu at East India College, Haileybury from 1826 to 1855. Unlike Jones, Wilkins, Colebrooke or Arnold, he had never been to India; the furthest east he travelled was Constantinople. His main work was a Persian dictionary. Besides *Hitopadeśa*, he edited *Meghadūta* and parts of *MBh* for Haileybury (ODNB). Sternbach (1960: 1 § 3) considers his *Hitopadeśa* more critical than its predecessors, though less so than Petersen’s Bombay Sanskrit Series edition of 1887. F. Max Müller published an edition in 1865, in two volumes (Chapter I and chapters II-IV); but this is not a scholarly work, being only the text with an interlinear translation of each word.

except for considerably more advanced learners: a much larger vocabulary, the free word-order typical of Sanskrit verse, and a terse gnomic style which requires a knowledge of rhetorical conventions and of the body of knowledge on which they draw. Johnson (1847: viii-ix) remarks that the verses are mostly, if not entirely, quotations, and constitute an anthology—a point which Sternbach established in detail over a century later.

Johnson's translation, though intended for students, was republished in a revised version in 1928, in a series of oriental stories translated by scholars for the general reader (Barnett 1928). The reviser finds Johnson's translation 'a remarkably able piece of work, considering the youthful condition of Sanskrit studies in his time' (Barnett 1928: xiv); his revision corrects passages in which Johnson 'went astray' (ibid.), and makes the style suitable for the general reader rather than the student. However, he follows Johnson in rendering the verses as prose. He may not have been aware of Arnold's version, as he makes no mention of it.

#### *Edwin Arnold*

The next person to translate the *Hitopadeśa* into English was Edwin Arnold (1832-1904), who chose it for his first project in what proved to be a long career as a popular interpreter of Sanskrit literature. He combined this activity with his work as a journalist, writing for the *Daily Telegraph* from 1860, and editing it from 1873 to 1878. He also travelled widely, and wrote travel articles which he afterwards republished in books (Arnold 1886; 1891; 1894; 1896a). His proficiency in verse was shown early, when he won the Newdigate prize for poetry as a student

in Oxford in 1852 (Wright 1957: 15f.). Two books of poems followed,<sup>10</sup> neither attracting much attention. He continued to publish poetry, both original poems and translations from classical Greek (Wright 1957: 64f.). But it is for his poetic translations, paraphrases, and interpretations of Indian literature that he was celebrated, and for which, if at all, he is now remembered. Three stand out: *The Light of Asia* (1879), a poetic life of the Buddha; *The Song Celestial*, a translation of the *Bhagavadgītā* (1885); and *The Indian Song of Songs*, an expurgated and somewhat adapted version of the *Gītagovinda* (1870).

In 1855 he graduated, married, and began to teach English at King Edward VI School, Birmingham (Wright 1957: 23). His connection with India began in 1857, when, through the influence of a relative of his wife (Wright 1957: 27), he was offered the Principalship of Deccan College, the government college in Poona (now Pune), which, with Elphinstone College in Bombay (now Mumbai), constituted the newly founded University of Bombay (Arnold 1896a: 325). Arnold left Deccan College in 1860 and returned to England, apparently for the sake of the health of his wife and family (Wright 1957: 35).

When he travelled to India in 1857 he was well aware of the conflict that was raging there; he refers to it several times in his travel memoirs (e.g. Arnold 1894: 163; 166). However, he also writes of ‘how beautiful, and new, and wonderful India seemed, despite the desperate crisis which was pending’ (p. 164), and the three years he spent in this post left him with a lifelong attachment to India. This attachment is summed up in a couplet from the dedication of his translation of the *Bhagavadgītā*:

---

<sup>10</sup> *Poems Narrative and Lyrical* in 1853; *Griselda and Other Poems* in 1856 (Wright 1957: 19-21; 24).



So I have writ its wisdom here,—its hidden mystery,  
For England; O our India! As dear to me as She!

The last phrase indicates that India is as dear to him as England, and the preceding phrase claims it as ‘ours’: an imperial possession (Robinson 2009: 203), while the first line characterises it as a source of wisdom and mystery. The whole couplet conveys Arnold’s self-imposed task as an interpreter of India’s wisdom to England,<sup>11</sup> the imperial power. This task he undertook first in his translation of the *Hitopadeśa*.

While Arnold’s expressions of love for India are no doubt genuine, they often show an imperialistic and paternalistic attitude which was common at the time, and an acceptance of stereotypes. ‘I liked my dusky students...and wished sincerely to be good friends with them...Hindoos are as susceptible as children to badinage’ (Arnold 1894: 166). ‘Even the peaceful Deccan College, being full of Brahman students, was also full of foolish and windy elements of rebelliousness’ (p. 167). He regarded education as the highest justification of imperial rule (Arnold 1860: 7), but also as a means to securing it against the French and the Russians (Arnold 1860: 6). However, he did not see himself as a tool of imperialism; when he was requested by ‘a high police authority’ to admit two or three police spies in the guise of students, he indignantly refused. He was supported in this affair by Lord Elphinstone, the modernising governor of Bombay Presidency (Arnold 1894: 167), whose ‘strong will and clear intellect’ he admired (Arnold 1860: 18). On his return to England he wrote a letter to his successor as

---

<sup>11</sup> ‘England’ is the name he frequently used in such contexts, but he probably meant to include the rest of the United Kingdom.

Principal, which he soon afterwards published as a pamphlet. There he appears embittered by his experiences, finding his mainly brahmin students only ‘regard learning as an extremely disagreeable means of obtaining a scanty livelihood’ (Arnold 1860:11); but he already revered Sanskrit literature (p. 29). His later memoirs look back on those three years with fondness (Arnold 1896a: 329), and rate the best of the students, and his Indian colleagues, highly; ‘I learnt more than I could teach’ (p. 331).

While at the College, he took the opportunity to learn Sanskrit, applying the facility which he had already developed as a student of Latin and Greek. The pioneer Vedic and Iranian scholar Martin Haug, from Leipzig, joined him on the staff (Wright 1957: 29; Arnold 1896a: 330f.). Arnold is said to have prepared a school edition of the *Hitopadeśa* which was published in Bombay (Wright 1957: 59).<sup>12</sup> He also spent much time shooting wild birds and animals, which in those days, before cameras became more portable than guns, was the usual way to enjoy them. ‘It is certain that nothing makes any one a naturalist so quickly as a sincere love of the spear and the rifle’ (1894: 168). But sometimes he refrained from shooting them, ‘to the disgust of my shikari’ (1894: 170), and later in his life ‘the beauty, wonder and delight in life of the wild creatures grew upon me so much that I can no longer kill any of them’ (p. 168). We may expect,

---

<sup>12</sup> This may be true, but Wright, whose work is very unhelpful in such matters, gives no details, and I have not been able to trace any such publication. In his letter on education (1860: 13), Arnold quotes a verse from the *Hitopadeśa* (*seveva mānam akhilam...*, J I.146 = NSP I.139) with his own translation ‘As Age doth banish beauty...’ (A 29). He adds after the text ‘*Vide* page 50, ARNOLD’s “Hitopadésa”’, which may refer to an edition he had prepared for the college. It is possible that he supervised pandits rather than doing all the work himself.

therefore, that his reading of the animal stories in the *Hitopadeśa* should be informed by first-hand knowledge of Indian wild-life.<sup>13</sup>

In his later years, his interest in Indian culture was coloured by his association with American Unitarians and Transcendentalists; he associates his renunciation of hunting with the same influence. After the death of his first wife in 1864, he married a great-niece of William Ellery Channing in 1868; he named his first son by this marriage William Channing, and the second Emerson (Wright 1957: 54-6). But this was after his translation of the *Hitopadeśa*.

#### *Arnold's Book of Good Counsels*

Arnold's Sanskrit studies and his interest in Indian culture continued, and bore fruit in 1861 in *The Book of Good Counsels*, his translation of the *Hitopadeśa*. The *Hitopadeśa* had been translated into English before: not only Johnson's version for student use, but the earlier versions by Sir William Jones and by Charles Wilkins (Johnson 1847: iii-iv). But in Johnson's view these pioneering works were hampered by their 'time and circumstances' (1847: iii). They do not seem to have been printed in great numbers, so Arnold's can be considered the first truly popular English version.

Arnold acknowledges Johnson's text and translation in his preface (Arnold 1861: xi). His summary of the western travels of the *Pañcatantra* is largely taken from him, almost verbatim in places (p. x; Johnson 1847: viii). However, whereas Johnson makes it clear that it was not the

---

<sup>13</sup> His endnotes on natural history are sometimes well-informed, but not always. He follows the conventional translation of *hamsa* as 'swan', and hardly clarifies it by saying 'The swan (Sanskrit, *hansa*) is a species of flamingo...' (A 159, note 74).

*Hitopadeśa* itself which was translated, but ‘a work which is to be considered as the original form of the *Hitopadeśa*’ (though he fudges the distinction a few lines later), Arnold calls the *Hitopadeśa* itself the origin of the ‘Persic’, Arabic, and other western versions, and thus ‘The Father of all Fables’—including Aesop, whom Johnson does not mention. In doing so, he insists on its ‘high antiquity...doubtless as old as our own era’ (pp. ixf.). Johnson does not venture to date the *Hitopadeśa*. Here, Arnold may be influenced by Wilkins (1787: vii), who in turn follows Jones (quoted *ibid.* ix) in giving *Hitopadeśa* as the original title, and Viṣṇuśarma as the author.

The preface begins by explaining the purpose of the book. Arnold aims to promote understanding of Indian culture, hoping to ‘surprise any vigorous mind into further exploration of [India’s] literature, and deeper sense of our responsibility in her government’ (Arnold 1861: xii).

The hope of Hindostan lies in the intelligent interest of England. Whatever avails to dissipate misconceptions between them, and to enlarge their intimacy, is a gain to both Peoples; and to this end the present volume aspires, in a humble degree, to contribute.  
(Arnold 1861: ix)

As part of this project, he includes endnotes which not only explain words, but expand on aspects of Indian culture and natural history. As the above quotation shows, intercultural interpretation was associated in Arnold’s mind with the ideal of benevolent imperialism. While he speaks respectfully of ‘Scholars’, he differentiates his popular work from theirs—as he does several times in his later works (Robinson 2009: 207f.; Robinson 2014: 220). He introduces the *Hitopadeśa* as a sample of Sanskrit literature, and claims that this literature is ‘the key to the

heart of modern India' (Arnold 1861: ix). Taken together with his emphasis on the book's antiquity, this implies a view that Indian culture is essentially static, and that the Sanskrit tradition is normative for it; such a view was common in his time. He seems to forget the role of the educational system of British India, of which he had been a part, in promoting the currency of the *Hitopadeśa*.

It is interesting to turn from the assessment in Arnold's preface of the importance of the *Hitopadeśa* for understanding Indian culture to a much later article on 'Oriental Story-tellers' (Arnold 1894: 325-44). This article proposes, not entirely seriously, that Europe should introduce 'from the East the good old profession of story-teller'. The proposal, he admits, has little prospect of success, both because literacy has made it redundant and because

the reciters of the East permit themselves a range of subjects and a freedom of language which, while immensely enhancing the piquancy and amusing nature of their entertainments, would be swiftly suppressed by our Lord Chamberlain,<sup>14</sup> and indeed, forbidden by public propriety.

(Arnold 1894: 326)

The freedom and piquancy to which Arnold refers were a problem to him as a popular translator, notably in the *Gītagovinda*, but also in the *Hitopadeśa*, as we shall see. We may also note the way in which this sentence dwells on the erotic while veiling it in circumlocutions: a kind of literary strip-tease.

The 'East', at this late stage in Arnold's career, included countries as far apart as Egypt and Japan, in both of which he had travelled; indeed, he married his third wife in Japan in 1892

---

<sup>14</sup> The official responsible for censorship of the theatre until such censorship was abolished in 1968.

(Wright 1957: 148). He gives examples of stories from both countries. But when it comes to India, he makes no mention of the *Hitopadeśa*, or of anything like it. Instead, he tells his readers that

In India it is principally the wandering mendicants and *joshi* [*jyotiṣīs*, astrologers] who follow this ancient profession [p. 327 mentions ‘the wandering *Byrajis* [*vairāgīs*] of India’ as storytellers]; and the tales which they find most popular are antique passages of war and miracle, or wild religious legend and Aryan chivalry, drawn from such inexhaustible sources as the *Ramâyana* [sic] and the *Mahâbhârata*. It is characteristic of the serious genius and philosophic tastes natural even to the peasantry of India that all the people of a village—women and men, girls and boys alike—will sit in hushed and attentive circles round the half-naked Brahman, hearing him interpret to them from the old-world Sanskrit text of those immense and extraordinary poems the majestic, if often grotesque, fictions of Hindoo fancy.

(Arnold 1894: 343f.)

Of the stories in the *Hitopadeśa*, only that of the warrior’s sacrifice (*Hitopadeśa* III story 9) falls into this category; it is indeed miraculous, chivalrous, and grotesque. But it is quite untypical of the book. Arnold’s later works of intercultural interpretation were concerned with the ‘serious’ and the ‘philosophic’;<sup>15</sup> the *Book of Good Counsels* continued to sell, but he may have ceased to consider it an important contribution to the British public’s understanding of India.

### *Domestication*

---

<sup>15</sup> A curious exception is his translation of a love-poem, *Caurapañcāśikā* (Arnold 1896b). This was written on holiday in the Canary Islands, as the preface explains; it is printed in colour from his own notebook, corrections and all, on unnumbered pages, with the original in his own Devanāgarī, and with his own colour illustrations, ‘to amuse scholars, lovers and ladies’ (ibid.).

Arnold's later work in interpreting Indian texts shows a concern to domesticate them, to make them more accessible to his readers by adapting them to norms to which they are accustomed (Robinson 2014: 220-222)—in Schleiermacher's terms, to bring the author to the reader. The popularity of a translated work often depends on the liberties by which the translator adapts it to the cultural expectations of readers (Sutton 1996: 308). In his later work, Arnold sometimes used drastic though covert methods to achieve this: for instance, turning the Rādhā of the *Gītagovinda* into a Victorian heroine whose sweet influence turns her lover from dissipation to propriety (cf. Robinson 2014: 226). At other times he uses the overt device of introducing a British enquirer in conversation with an Indian expositor, as in his poem *The Secret of Death*, expounding the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*. He also looks to literary analogues in the Western canon, as a way of showing that his Indian texts are not of a totally alien kind. Sometimes he does this in his titles: his selections from the epics are called *Indian Idylls*, suggesting an analogy with Tennyson's Arthurian collection *Idylls of the King*,<sup>16</sup> and his *Gītagovinda* is called *The Indian Song of Songs*, indicating an analogy with the biblical Song of Songs.

He seems to consider the *Hitopadeśa* sufficiently approachable without such devices, and claims that his version is 'a condensed but faithful transcript of sense and manner' (Arnold 1861: xi). However, his translation shows some concern to accommodate his readers. As we shall see, *The Book of Good Counsels* is condensed mainly by the omission of over two thirds of

---

<sup>16</sup> The word *idyll* previously meant a pastoral poem; it was Tennyson who gave it the meaning of a heroic poem, and Arnold uses it in this sense.

the verses, and also of six stories. In other respects it is expanded, by the insertion of words or phrases; and occasionally the sense is altered, and verse rendered as prose.

Though he opens his preface by remarking that ‘A story-book from the Sanskrit at least possesses the minor merit of novelty’ (Arnold 1861: ix), he hardly remarks on those formal features of the *Hitopadeśa* which might be considered novel, or at least distinctive: the talking animals, the inclusion of verses, and the device of stories within stories. He commends ‘the wit, the morality, and the philosophy of these “beasts of India”’, and the rendering of them by his illustrator (Arnold 1861: xii), but says no more about the use of beasts as characters. (Nor does he note that nine of his thirty-six stories are about human characters.) He does not remark on the place of the verses in the composition; but he says they ‘compose a selection from the writings of an age extremely remote’ (1861: x). The sources, he claims, include not only the *Mahābhārata*, which is confirmed by Sternbach’s survey of the sources of these verses (1960: 67-86), but ‘the textual *Veds*’, though Sternbach finds no Vedic quotations. He says nothing about the device of stories within stories, letting it speak for itself.

His public would have been aware of some precedents for these features. Distant derivatives of the *Panchatantra* stories had been available as *The Morall Philosophie of Doni* from 1570, and as *The Fables of Pilpay* from 1699; and the use of stories, particularly animal stories, to convey practical wisdom was commonly associated with India or ‘the East’ (Ballaster 2005: 343-7). It is common for animals to converse in Aesop’s fables, which had been current in English for centuries, in many versions. They also converse in some of the stories collected by the



brothers Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, which first appeared in English in 1823, translated anonymously by Edgar Taylor and David Jardine. Indeed, even inanimate objects converse in Aesop and in Grimm, though not in the *Hitopadeśa*. The conversation of the animals in the *Pañcatantra* and *Hitopadeśa*, however, has an urbane, *saṃskṛta* quality which is not found in Aesop or Grimm; one of the strengths of Arnold's translation is the way it renders this urbanity in English. Verses occur in some of the Grimms' stories, though not nearly as frequently as in the *Pañcatantra* and *Hitopadeśa*, and not as contributions to debates. Often they work magic, or are spoken by magical beings or by animals. This feature was reproduced, though not consistently, by Taylor and Jardine, and by later translators. Stories within stories are essential to collections such as the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Decameron*, and also to the *Thousand and One Nights*, which had been popular in English versions since the early eighteenth century.

#### *Addition of detail*

Arnold evidently found the prose style of the *Hitopadeśa* too plain for English literary taste. He thought the reader needed more detail than the text provides, in order to envisage the scene, or to understand the manners and motivations of the characters. The narrative of the *Hitopadeśa* is often very brief; Arnold sometimes expands it, to give atmosphere and colour, or to make a narrative point clearer. He frequently replaces neutral verbs of speaking with more specific verbs, often appropriate to the species of the speaker: *hastī brūte* 'the elephant said'<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> My translations are intended merely as aids in understanding the Sanskrit; they are not meant to be contributions to literature, nor a yardstick against which Arnold's translations are to be measured.

(J 33.855, NSP 39.24) becomes ‘grunted the Elephant’ (A 40); *pakṣibhir uktam. bho bho vānarāḥ* ‘the birds said: “O, O monkeys”’ becomes ““Twit! twit! you Monkeys,” they began to chirrup’ (A 84 ≈ J 64.1688. To make the introduction of a new character less abrupt, *dūradarśī nāma grdhro mantrī brūte* ‘a vulture minister named “Far-sight” said’ (J 75.1977, NSP 96.8) is expanded to ‘interposed the Vulture-Minister, whose title was “Far-sight.”’ Other expressions are similarly elaborated. In the story of the jackal and the elephant, *nimagnaḥ* ‘sank’ (J2 30.864 ≈ NSP 40.15) is expanded to ‘plunged heavily before he could stop himself’; *mahāpaṅke patito* ‘ham ‘I have fallen in a great marsh’ (J 33.871 ≈ NSP 40.16) is expanded to ‘I am up to my belly in this quagmire’ (A 40); and *śrgālena vihasyoktam: deva mama picchāgre hastaṃ dattvottiṣṭha* ‘The jackal laughed and said: “Your Majesty, hold the end of my tail with your trunk and get up”’ is expanded to ‘**Perhaps** your Majesty,’ said the Jackal, with an **impudent** laugh, ‘**will condescend to** take hold of the tip of my brush with your trunk, and so get out.’ When the warrior Vīravara, in the story that appears also in the *Vetālapañcaviṃśati*, tells the king that his equipment consists of his two arms and his sword (*dvau bāhū tṛtīyaś ca khaḍgaḥ* J 78.2072f., NSP 100.9f.), Arnold adds ‘rolling up his sleeve’ (p.101).

Some of Arnold’s insertions clarify points of Hindu practice or Sanskrit literary tropes which would not be familiar to his readers. The description of the hypocritical tiger in *Hitopadeśa* I story 2 as *snātaḥ kuśahastaḥ* ‘bathed and holding kuśa-grass’ (J 6.141) is expanded to ‘**newly** bathed... **like a Brahman**, and with **holy** kuskus-grass in his paws’ (A 9); he also adds an endnote ‘*Kusa grass*.—Used in many religious observances by the Hindoos. (*Poa cynosuroides*.)’

(A 149 note 14). When the mouse hears the friendly words of the pigeon, 'his fur bristled up **for pure pleasure**' (A 15); the text only says *pulakitaḥ* 'bristled', though Johnson (1848: 12) adds 'with joy'.

#### *Avoidance of formulae*

Arnold seems to have felt that the formulae which highlight the structure of the *Hitopadeśa* would not be suitable for his English readers. Again and again he replaces them with phrases of his own which provide variety instead of uniformity, and sometimes also enhance the meaning. In the *Hitopadeśa*, as in the *Pañcatantra*, nearly every story is introduced by a verse, consisting typically of a general statement followed by an allusion to the story which exemplifies it. This verse provokes the question *katham etat?* 'How was that?' The story then begins, and its conclusion is marked by the formula *ato 'haṃ bravīmi* 'That is why I say', followed by the opening words of the same verse. Johnson, whose translation is for the guidance of students reading the text, follows his prose translation of the verse with words such as "How was<sup>18</sup> that?" said the Crow. HIRANYAKA related' (Johnson 1848: 13). But Arnold avoids this formula by using various devices of his own.

---

<sup>18</sup> Johnson uses italics not for emphasis but to indicate that an English word does not correspond to any word in the Sanskrit original. This device is used in the KJV, and was therefore so familiar that he did not need to explain it.

He usually keeps the introductory verse to a story, but he often omits the concluding reference to it, or disguises it with a paraphrase. Thus the story of the heron,<sup>19</sup> the crow and the traveller (*Hitopadeśa* III story 5), which in Arnold's translation begins with the verse

“With evil people neither stay nor go;<sup>20</sup>  
The Heron died for being with the Crow” (A 89.15f. ≈ J III.13, NSP III.22),

ends: ‘No!’ concluded the Parrot, ‘I like the society of honest folk’ (A 90.12f. ≈ J 8.1791), where the original is *ato 'haṃ bravīmi: na sthātavyaṃ na gantavyam ityādi* ‘That is why I say: “Neither stay nor go” and so on.’ Similarly, the story of the jackal who killed the elephant by luring him into a marsh (*Hitopadeśa* I.6) is concluded: ‘Hence,’ continued the attendant, ‘is why I suggested stratagem to your highness’ (A 41.3-4), recalling the lesson inculcated by the verse, but not quoting it as the original does (J 33.875f. = NSP 40.22f.: *ato 'haṃ bravīmi upāyena hi yac chakyam ityādi* ‘That is why I say: “What can be done by a stratagem” and so on’). At the end of the story of the prince and the merchant's wife, which frames this story, Arnold does not allude to the introductory verse at all; and this is his common practice. He evidently feels that a strict representation of the formulaic structure of the original would be unsuitable in an English context.

---

<sup>19</sup> The word is *haṃsa*, which usually means ‘goose’, though it is often translated ‘swan’ because of the literary and proverbial associations of these two words. Johnson translates it ‘goose’, but Arnold, though he elsewhere translates it ‘swan’, here translates it ‘Heron’; he may be right, since the story requires the bird to perch in a tree, which a heron could do but a goose or a swan could not.

<sup>20</sup> In the original, this verse introduces two similar stories: the crow, the goose and the traveller, and the crow, the quail and the cowherd (above, p. 2). The words *na sthātavyaṃ na gantavyam* refer to these two stories in turn: the goose suffers by staying near the crow, and the quail by travelling with him, as the last quarter of the verse makes clear. In translating these as ‘neither stay nor go’, Arnold is faithful to the original and gets a good rhyme, but his omission of the second story makes ‘nor go’ redundant.

Arnold was following a literary convention which favoured elaboration over simplicity, and preferred a circumlocution to the repetition of a phrase. Taylor and Jardine’s translation of Grimm, first published in 1823, shows a similar reluctance to be as formulaic as the original. Sometimes it fails to repeat a verse—for instance, when the stepmother addresses the mirror in the story now known as ‘Snow White’ (Sutton 1996: 26)—and it replaces the formulaic openings of the stories with more varied openings.<sup>21</sup>

In the story of the self-sacrificing camel (*Hitopadeśa* IV story 10, J 97.2572-98.2609, NSP 123.12-125.4), one of those that do not appear in the *Pañcatantra*, Arnold not only avoids a formulaic introduction, but departs in other ways from the structure of the original opening. The text gives the usual introductory verse: *matir dolāyate nūnaṃ satām api khaloktibhiḥ | tābhir viśvāsito yo ’sau mriyate citrakarṇavat ||* (J IV.58 ≈ NSP IV.54). ‘Surely the minds even of the good are swayed by the words of scoundrels. Whoever is conned by such words dies, like Citrakarṇa.’ This is followed, according to the usual pattern, by *rājā pṛcchati katham etat | sa kathayati*. ‘The king [of the peacocks] asked ‘How was that?’ He [the crow] narrated.’ The story then begins by introducing the most prestigious character, the lion: *asti kasmimś cid vanoddeśe madotkaṭo nāma simhaḥ* ‘In a certain part of a forest there was a lion called Furious’ (J 97.272f.). The lion’s followers are then introduced: a crow, a tiger and a jackal (*tasyānucarās trayah | kāko vyāghrah*

---

<sup>21</sup> The Taylor and Jardine version uses the formula ‘There was once’ in only fourteen stories, and ‘Once upon a time’ in only four, while ‘Es war einmal’ is more frequent in Grimm. ‘“Once upon a time” does not become a stock phrase in an [English] edition of the Grimms’ stories until ... *Household Stories* published in 1853.’ (Sutton 1996: 20). Perrault, on the other hand, regularly uses the stock opening ‘il était une fois’.

*śṛgālaś ca*). (This is enough to tell us that it will be tale of nobility manipulated by malice, treachery and subtlety.) Only then does *atha*, the usual signal of a new topic, introduce a camel who has strayed from a caravan. This way of introducing the characters may seem odd when the verse names only Citrakarṇa, the camel; but the lion, as king, has precedence, and it is not unusual in these stories to have to wait for the central character.<sup>22</sup>

Arnold translates the verse:

‘The good think evil slowly, and they pay  
A price for faith—as witness “Crop-ear” may.’

(Arnold 1861: 131)

But he follows it with a more specific question than the formulaic *katham etat*:

‘Who was Crop-ear?’ asked the King of the Peacocks.

The question is answered not with the formulaic opening, with its initial *asti* followed by a locative and a nominative, as the original does, but in an expanded version:

‘A Camel, may it please you,’ replied Night-cloud, ‘who strayed away from a kafila, and wandered into the forest. A Lion, named “Fierce-fangs,” lived in that forest; and his

---

<sup>22</sup> A particularly complicated example is the set of three stories (*Hitopadeśa* II story 6) introduced in a single verse (J II.109 = NSP II.110). This verse mentions three people who suffered for their own faults. After the usual question *katham etat* ‘How was that?’, the narrator begins by introducing and naming a king, who plays no part in the story (except insofar as he is responsible for the administration of dharma in his realm), and is not mentioned again. It then introduces a barber, who is being led to execution, a wanderer (*parivrājaka*), who repeats the same verse as part of an appeal for the barber’s reprieve, and a sadhu, who has no role except as the protagonist of the third story (which Arnold omits though Johnson includes it). When asked by the guards to explain the verse, again using the usual *katham etat*, the wanderer tells three stories; he is the protagonist of the first, and a witness to the other two. It is only the second story that is relevant to the appeal; this story, much longer than the other two, is the story of the severed nose, which also appears as the main story of a set of three in PT I story 3 (Edgerton) or story 4 (Pūrṇabhadra).

three courtiers, a Tiger, a Jackal, and a Crow, met the Camel, and conducted him to their King.’

The characters are thus introduced in a different order, with the camel first instead of last. The ensuing narrative takes other liberties in translation, rendering direct speech by indirect. Arnold wishes to smooth over what seems to him an awkward way of telling the story.

#### *Introductions to verses*

Among his devices to make the style less terse, less formulaic and more colourful, Arnold often expands the formulae which introduce the verses. The frequently used formula *yataḥ*, which he sometimes renders simply ‘for’ (A 4.11, introducing J 0.43 = NSP 0.44) or ‘for indeed’ (A 13.2, introducing J I.35 = NSP I.35), and sometimes omits altogether (A 9.11, before J I.5 = NSP I.6), he also sometimes expands to expressions such as ‘How saith the sage?’ (A 12.17f. ≈ J 9.225, NSP 12.18). Sometimes a reference to its context is added: ‘Ah! Sir Tortoise’ (A 31.23, adding a vocative which is not in the original, introducing J I.161, NSP I.158), or ‘Ah! woman-kind!’ (A 117.2, introducing a verse on the fickleness of women, J IV.7<sup>23</sup>). Another common formula *anyac ca* can become ‘for we know that’ (A 11.18f. ≈ J 9.209, introducing J I.26 = NSP I.27); *tathā cōktam* can be ‘It is the old tale!’ (A 12.2f. ≈ J 9.215, introducing J I.28 = NSP I.29). In the introduction to the story of the blue jackal (*Hitopadeśa* III story 8), *tathā cōktam* is expanded to ‘Your royal memory doubtless retains the story of’ (A 96.2f. ≈ J 73.137, introducing J III.60 = NSP III.57), giving the phrase a ceremonial tone suitable to the context.

---

<sup>23</sup> NSP places this verse as I.117.

Arnold's introductions to the verses often evoke a written store of wisdom instead of an oral one: 'Is it not written,—' (A 15.18 ≈ J 12.293, introducing J I.51 = NSP I.50); 'have you never read,—' (A 16.12f. ≈ J 12.310, introducing J I.55 = NSP I.54<sup>24</sup>). Both of these translate *yataḥ* 'because'. Similarly, *āḥ kim evam ucyate* 'Ah! Isn't it said' (J 8.199, introducing J I.22 = NSP I 23) is rendered 'but you've read the verse—' (A 11.13), and *uktam ca* 'and it is said' is rendered 'The holy Books counsel it' (A 31.11f. ≈ J 26.672, introducing J I.156 = NSP I.149<sup>25</sup>). The formula 'it is written', referring to an ancient textual authority, is frequent in the Bible, especially the New Testament, and Arnold saw an analogy between the Bible and the Indian tradition. One of his endnotes says:

the intelligent reader will remark a curious similarity between these ancient Hindoo proverbs and those of Solomon.

(A 150 n. 17, referring to J I.18 = NSP I.19)<sup>26</sup>

Besides making the phrases which introduce the verses less formulaic, and more specific, he sometimes expands them to clarify an argument which might not be clear to readers unfamiliar with the tradition. For instance, he introduces a verse on the opposition between

---

<sup>24</sup> Arnold omits verse 55 which immediately follows *yataḥ* and is followed by *aparam ca*.

<sup>25</sup> NSP omits the introductory formula to this verse.

<sup>26</sup> Arnold's version of the verse referred to is 'Trust not water, trust not weapons; trust not clawed nor horned things; | Neither give thy soul to women, nor thy life to Sons of Kings.' He may be thinking of Proverbs 31.3 (KJV): 'Give not thy strength unto women, nor thy ways to that which destroyeth kings,' where the next verse shows that what destroys kings is wine. But if this is the verse he expects his 'intelligent reader' to think of, the resemblance is only superficial.



human effort (*pauruṣa*) and fate (*daiva*), an opposition much discussed in the *Mahābhārata*, by expanding the formula *api ca* into a brief reflection:

‘Nevertheless,’ mused the King, ‘I know it is urged that human efforts are useless: as, for instance,—

‘That which will not be, will not be—and what is to be, will be:  
Why not drink this easy physic, antidote of misery?’

(A 2f. ≈ J 0.29, NSP 0.30<sup>27</sup>)

Later, to introduce a verse on the same topic, spoken by the lame bull in the frame story of the second chapter, he expands *yataḥ* to ‘Well, well,’ he thought, ‘it is all destiny whether I live or die’ (A 47 ≈ J II.15, NSP II.17). Similarly, he adds ‘Enough is never what we have’ to introduce a verse (JII.2 = NII.2) which elaborates this point; the original is again *yataḥ*. He omits the next verse, but introduces the next verse he translates (J II.4, NSP II.4) with an inserted reflection: ‘And is not wealth won by courage and enterprise?’ In the original, these verses are introduced merely by *yataḥ* and *anyac ca*.

#### *Arnold’s treatment of verses*

Arnold usually translates the Sanskrit verses into rhymed verse; in his day, a short piece in English would hardly be recognised as verse if it did not rhyme, since blank verse belonged to long works. He does not keep to one metre for the common śloka, as he did later in his translation of the *Bhagavadgītā*, where he renders it in blank verse (Arnold 1885; Robinson 2014:

---

<sup>27</sup> *api ca—yad abhāvi na tad bhāvi bhāvi cen na tad anyathā | iti cintāviṣaghno’yam agadaḥ kiṃ na pīyate ||* ‘And again: What is not to be will not be; if it is to be, it will not be otherwise. Why not drink this medicine which destroys the poison of anxiety?’

225), though he has some preference for a couplet of iambic pentameters, or else of trochaic lines of fifteen syllables. Nor does he attempt to match his metre to the longer Sanskrit metres. This freedom allows him to expand or abridge his verses at will. A śloka can be reduced to a couplet of tetrameters, totalling 14 or 15 syllables:

Sickness, anguish, bonds, and woe  
Spring from the wrongs wrought long ago.

(A 14 ≈ J I.42, NSP I.41)

This verse gives an opportunity for an endnote on karma and rebirth (A 151 n. 22). But the shortness of Arnold's verse entails reducing a list of five items to four, and the more important loss of the metaphor of a tree and its fruit: 'Sickness, woe, anguish, bondage and calamities: these are the fruits of the tree which is the wrongdoings of embodied beings' (*rogaśokaparītāpabandhanavyasanāni ca | ātmāparādhavṛkṣasya phalāny etāni dehinām ||*).<sup>28</sup> The same metre is used to translate a verse counselling caution before migrating:

One foot goes, and one foot stands,  
When the wise man leaves his lands.

(A 26 ≈ J I.106, NSP I.102)

The original shows the usual juxtaposition of example and precept: *calaty ekena pādena tiṣṭhaty ekena buddhimān | nāsamiṅṣya paraṃ sthānaṃ pūrvam āyatanaṃ tyajet ||* 'The wise person moves with one foot and stands with the other. He should not leave his old home without examining the other place.' Arnold has conflated the precept with the example.

<sup>28</sup> NSP I.41 reads *vṛkṣānām*, giving *vṛkṣasya* as a variant.

By contrast with such compression, Arnold can expand a śloka to two couplets, in a metre of fifteen syllables to a line, totalling 60 syllables to the original's 32, and giving scope for his poetic imagination:

Floating on his fearless pinions, lost amid the noonday skies,  
 Even thence the Eagle's vision kens the carcass where it lies;  
 But the hour that comes to all things comes unto the Lord of Air,  
 And he rushes, madly blinded, to his ruin in the snare.

(A 15.19-23 ≈ J I.51, NSP I.50)

The original says merely 'The same bird that sees carrion from over a hundred leagues, does not see the snare when his time has come' (*yo'dhikād yojanaśatāt paśyatihāmiṣaṃ khagaḥ | sa eva prāptakālas tu pāśabandhaṃ na paśyati ||*). To identify the bird as an eagle is Arnold's idea, giving him an opportunity for a soaring description which is all his own.

Elsewhere, Arnold uses two couplets of this metre to translate a verse of 33 syllables in āryā metre, freely adding the sentiments of a Victorian liberal Christian familiar with Greco-Roman stoicism:

True Religion!—'tis not blindly prating what the priest may prate,  
 But to love, as God hath loved them, all things, be they small or great;  
 And true bliss is when a sane mind doth a healthy body fill;  
 And true knowledge is the knowing what is good and what is ill.

(A 31.13-19 ≈ J I.156, NSP I.147<sup>29</sup>)

---

<sup>29</sup> *ko dharmo bhūṭadayā kiṃ saukhyam arogiṭā jagati jantoḥ | kaḥ snehaḥ sadbhāvaḥ kiṃ pāṇḍityaṃ paricchedaḥ ||* 'What is dharma? Compassion for beings. What is happiness? Health, for a creature in the world. What is love? Kindness. What is wisdom? Discernment.' Arnold must be thinking of *mens sana in corpore sano* (Juvenal Satire 10, line 356).

Using a single couplet of the same metre, Arnold expands a śloka by adding more examples to the four of the original, and a half-line of moral comment at the end:

Wealth is friends, home, father, brother—title to respect and fame;  
Yea, and wealth is held for wisdom—that it should be so is shame.

(A 29 ≈ J I.133, NSP I.126<sup>30</sup>)

While Arnold was a prolific versifier, with a tendency to absorb the styles of his contemporaries (Wright 1957: 19f.; 77f.), his judgment is sometimes questionable. One of his least successful translations is:

Friend! gracious word!—the heart to tell is ill able  
Whence came to men this jewel of a syllable.

(A 42 ≈ J I 223, NSP I 213)<sup>31</sup>

He omits the first half of the verse, but that is a small matter compared to the forced rhyme, gained at the cost of awkward word order.

#### *Omission of verses*

Arnold omits far more verses than he translates. While the *Hitopadeśa* contains 745 verses, *The Book of Good Counsels* has only 236: less than a third of the original.<sup>32</sup> In reducing the number of verses, he cites as a precedent the Persian translation made for Akbar by his vizir Abdul Fazl:<sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> *yasyārthās tasya mitrāṇi yasyārthās tasya bāndhavāḥ | yasyārthāḥ sa pumāṃl loke yasyārthāḥ sa tu paṇḍitaḥ ||*  
'Whoever has wealth has friends, whoever has wealth has relations, whoever has wealth is a man in this world, whoever has wealth is wise.' (NSP reads *hi* for *tu*.)

<sup>31</sup> *śokārātibhayatrāṇaṃ prītivīśrambhabhājanam | kena ratnam idaṃ sṛṣṭaṃ 'mitram' ity akṣaradvayam ||* 'Who created this disyllable *mitra* ("friend"), a jewel which protects from sorrow, enmity and fear, which represents love and trust?'

The Emperor had also suggested the abridgement of the long series of shlokes which here and there interrupt the narrative, and the Vizier found this advice sound, and followed it, like the present Translator.

(A x-xi)

While Arnold in his preface celebrated the verses of the *Hitopadeśa* as even more ancient than the narrative, in his translation he subordinated them to it. As the above quotation suggests, most of his omissions are from the long sequences, in which each verse is introduced by a phrase such as *api ca*, *aparam ca*, *tathā ca*, *kiṃ ca*. The most drastic reduction is in the *kathāmukha*. Here, he lets the second of the series of nine introductory verses stand alone, in italics, as his opening:

*This book of Counsel read, and you shall see,  
Fair speech and Sanskrit lore, and Policy.*

(A 1.4-5 ≈ J 0.2<sup>34</sup>)

The next two verses in the *Hitopadeśa* are those that prompt the king in the frame story to seek a teacher for his sons. Arnold omits the second of these, but inserts before it two verses from the introductory series:

*Wise men, holding wisdom highest, scorn delights, as false as fair,  
Daily live they as Death's fingers twined already in their hair.*

<sup>32</sup> The numbers for each chapter in A, with those in J in brackets, are: *Kathāmukha*: 17 (48); ch. 1: 76 (226); ch. 2: 53 (183); ch. 3: 45 (152); ch. 4: 45 (136).

<sup>33</sup> This version was called 'iyār e-dānesh 'touchstone of knowledge', or as Arnold renders it *Criterion of Wisdom* (A x). Akbar commissioned it because he found the earlier Persian version, the *Anwār e-suḥailī*, too elaborate and unsuitable for Indian readers of Persian. I am grateful to Dr Christine van Ruymbeke for information on it.

<sup>34</sup> *śruto hitopadeśo'yaṃ pāṭavaṃ saṃskṛtoktiṣu | vācāṃ sarvatra vaicitryaṃ nītividyāṃ dadāti ca*. 'When this Useful Instruction is heard, it gives skill in Sanskrit utterance, variety in speech, and knowledge of conduct, everywhere.'

Truly, richer than all riches, better than the best of gain,  
Wisdom is, unbought, secure—once won, none loseth her again.

(A 1.11-2.2. ≈ J 0.3f.<sup>35</sup>)

The king's reflections which follow these verses are reduced from thirty verses (J 0.12-0.41) to ten; this is nevertheless Arnold's longest sequence, in which, for once, he imitates the original's *api ca* and so on by interspersing the verses with 'And again this', 'For indeed', 'And', 'So verily' (A 2f.).

In one passage, Arnold makes his omission of the verses part of the story. The king of the haṃsas (swans in Arnold's translation) asks his minister the cakravāka (brahmīny goose in Arnold), how many (*kati*) kinds of party are unsuitable for alliances (*asaṃdheya*, J 94.2496 = NSP 119.25). The minister replies with four śloka listing twenty such parties (J IV 34-7 = NSP IV.30-33), and fifteen more śloka expanding on the topic (J IV.38-52 = NSP IV.34-48). Arnold translates none of these nineteen śloka. Instead, he has the king ask: 'as to this peace, who [not 'how many'] are they with whom it should not be concluded?' The minister answers, 'They be twenty, namely—', but the king interrupts him: 'Tarry not to name them' (A 128). Arnold adds an endnote: 'I suppress in this place nineteen shlokes, or stanzas, of the original, which enumerate rather tediously the vices or failings to be avoided in an ally' (A 166 note 106). He has used the king as a mouthpiece for his own impatience.

---

<sup>35</sup> *ajarāmaravat prājño vidyām arthaṃ ca cintayet | grhīta iva keśeṣu mṛtyunā dharmam ācaret ||* 'The wise man should think of knowledge and policy as unageing and immortal; he should follow dharma as if Death held him by the hair.' *sarvadavyeṣu vidyaiva dravyam āhur anuttamam | ahāryatvād anarghyatvād akṣayatvāc ca sarvadā ||* 'Of all assets, wisdom, they say, is the very highest, because it cannot be taken away, is invaluable, and never perishes.'

## Verse rendered as prose

Besides omission, Arnold has another device for reducing the number of verses: he renders some of them wholly or partly as prose. He does this once in the *kathāmukha*, where Viṣṇuśarma offers to teach the princes:

‘But in this royal family the offspring are royal-minded, and in six moons I will make your Majesty’s sons comprehend Policy.’

(A 4 ≈ J 0.44ab, NSP 0.45ab with following prose<sup>36</sup>)

He omits the simile of quartz in a ruby mine which forms the second half of the verse.

For a sequence of six verses in the mouse’s story of his experience in the hermit’s cell, Arnold uses several devices. He translates the first verse as prose, omitting much of it:

‘Just so, I said to myself, ‘the soul and organs of the discontented want keeping in subjection. I must be done with discontent:—

(A 30 ≈ J I.150, NSP I.143<sup>37</sup>)

He translates the next verse as verse, then omits one, then versifies another:

‘Golden gift, serene Contentment! have thou that, and all is had;  
Thrust thy slipper on, and think thee that the earth is leather-clad.’  
‘All is known, digested, tested; nothing new is left to learn

<sup>36</sup> *asmim̐s tu nirguṇaṃ gotre nāpatyam upajāyate | ākare padmarāgāṇāṃ janma kācamaṇeḥ kutah? || ato ’haṃ ṣaṇmāsābhyantara eva tava putrān nītiśāstrābhijñān karisyāmi.* ‘But in this family no worthless offspring are born; how could quartz be produced in a ruby mine? Therefore I will make your sons know political science in just six months.’

<sup>37</sup> *dhanalubdho hy asaṃtuṣṭo ’niyatātmā ’jitendriyaḥ | sarvā evāpadas tasya yasya tuṣṭaṃ na mānasam ||* ‘Every disaster happens to someone whose mind is not content—avaricious, dissatisfied, uncontrolled.’

When the soul, serene, reliant, Hope's delusive dreams can spurn.'

(A 30 ≈ J I.151, I.153, NSP I.144, I.146<sup>38</sup>)

He then expands the *api ca* which introduces the next verse into an explanatory introduction, and follows it with an inserted expression of resolve:

'And the sorry task of seeking favour is numbered in the miseries of life—

'Hast thou never watched, a-waiting till the great man's door unbarred?  
Didst thou never linger parting, saying many a sad last word?  
Spak'st thou never word of folly, one light thing thou would'st recall?  
Rare and noble hath thy life been! fair thy fortune did befall!'

'No!' exclaimed I, 'I will do none of these...'

(A 31 ≈ J I.144, NSP I.147<sup>39</sup>)

With his facility as a versifier, it is unlikely that Arnold thought himself unequal to the task of rendering more than a third of the verses in the *Hitopadeśa* as rhymed verse. Rather, he thought that the verses tended to interrupt the flow of the narration and dialogue, and therefore omitted some, turned others into prose, and preceded yet others with introductory matter to make the transition from narrative or speech to gnomic verse less abrupt.

---

<sup>38</sup> *tathā ca—sarvāḥ sampattayas tasya samtuṣṭam yasya mānasam | upānadvāḍhapādasya nanu carmāvṛteva bhūḥ || ... kiṃ ca—tenādhītam śrutaṃ tena tena sarvam anuṣṭhitam | yeṇāśāḥ pṛṣṭhataḥ kṛtvā nairāśyam avalambitam ||* 'Also: Every advantage comes to someone whose mind is content; for someone whose foot is covered by a shoe, the earth itself is leather-covered... But then: Someone who has put hopes behind, and holds to freedom from hope, has studied, heard and accomplished everything.'

<sup>39</sup> *api ca—aseviteśvaradvāram adṛṣṭavirahavyatham | anuktaklibavacanam dhanyam kasyāpi jīvanam ||* 'If anyone has not waited at a lord's door, not seen the pangs of separation, not spoken a cowardly word, then his life has been fortunate.'



*Omission of stories*

Arnold completely omits six of the 42 stories in the *Hitopadeśa*. These are: *Hitopadeśa* I story 6, an old man whose young wife shows affection for him so suddenly that she must have a secret reason (J 21.553-23.598, NSP 26.3-27.25);<sup>40</sup> *Hitopadeśa* II story 6c, in which a wooden vetāla traps a man who tries to steal a jewel from its head (J 52.1369-74, NSP 66.8-66.15); *Hitopadeśa* II story 7, a cowherd's wife whose two lovers are the village magistrate and his son (J 52.1382-53.1405, NSP 66.24-68.5); *Hitopadeśa* III story 3, the donkey in the tiger's skin (J 64.1702-65.1711, NSP 83.9-21); *Hitopadeśa* III story 6, a quail who is punished for the misdeeds of a crow (J 68.1794-1800, NSP 87.17-23); *Hitopadeśa* IV story 12, the brahmin who kills a mongoose instead of a snake (J 102.2711-103.2727, NSP 130.12-101.8).

The motive for the omission does not seem to be the same in each case. The story of the quail and the crow is a mere variant of the story of the goose and the crow which precedes it, and Arnold could have justifiably considered it too feeble to include. But the brahmin, the mongoose and the snake, another story of mistaken punishment, is justly famous as one of the most widely travelled of the stories, and there seems to be no reason for omitting it. The story of the wooden vetāla is so grotesque, and so briefly told, that Arnold may have given up trying to make sense of it. He also may have been put off by the fact that it takes place at the door of a brothel. We might similarly suppose that the old man and the young wife, and the cowherd's

---

<sup>40</sup> This is only an abridgment of *Hitopadeśa* III story 7, which may be partly why Arnold omitted it. If, as the following discussion shows, he was not averse to bawdy stories, he may well have preferred good ones to feeble ones.

wife and her two lovers, were omitted because they are erotic. The story of the donkey in the tiger's skin also has a sexual element: the donkey brays when he sees a man in a grey coat and thinks he is a she-donkey.<sup>41</sup>

Yet this is not a sufficient explanation, since Arnold does not totally exclude erotic stories. While he omits two of them, he retains five: the prince and the merchant's wife (*Hitopadeśa* I story 8, A 37-42); the prince who married a submarine vidyādhari (*Hitopadeśa* II story 6a, A 65-7); the cowherd's wife, the barber's wife and the severed nose (*Hitopadeśa* II story 6b, A 67-68); the cuckold carpenter who hides under the bed (*Hitopadeśa* III story 7, A 91f.); and the wife who exonerates herself by accusing a servant of eating camphor (*Hitopadeśa* IV story 3, A 116f.).

#### *Treatment of stories*

More often than omitting a whole erotic story, Arnold deals with the erotic by suppressing or modifying some of the detail. The story of the prince and the merchant's wife (*Hitopadeśa* I story 8, J 31.820-34.887, NSP 38-41) is introduced by the verse: *svayaṃ viṅṣya yathā vadhvāḥ pīḍitaṃ stanakuḍmalam | vaṅīkputro 'bhavad duḥkhī tvaṃ tathaiva bhaviṣyasi ||* 'As the merchant suffered grief when he saw his wife's nipple squeezed, so will you also' (J I.206 = NSP I.197).

Arnold's version is:

The merchant's son laid plans for gains,  
And saw his wife kissed for his pains.

(A 37)

---

<sup>41</sup> NSP 83.18 omits the sexual element, reading *gardabho 'yam* where J reads *gardabhīyam*.

Kissing is the most intimate contact Arnold ever mentions; though this may be a code which his adult readers would understand. In explaining the lady's name *Lāvanyavatī* as 'Lāvanyavati—i.e., the Beautiful',<sup>42</sup> he overlooks the saltiness of the word. Nor does 'very lovely' convey the erotic potential implied by *atīva prauḍhayauvanām*.<sup>43</sup> The *dūtī* (later (J 22.846, 22.847) referred to as *kuṭṭinī* 'bawd', which Johnson (1848.36) translates 'the female pander') is called 'a female attendant' (A 38.5f.), and later 'the Slave' (A39.10). Whereas, in the original, the prince sends only a verbal message to the merchant's wife, Arnold adds a letter (A 38.5); accordingly, the wife 'refused with dignity to receive his letter' (A 38.15). Here, he is not only adapting his narrative to a literate culture, as we have noted elsewhere, but domesticating it to conform to English fiction and public discourse, where the receiving of letters is a recognised and mentionable form of wifely misconduct. While he translates *pativratā* very reasonably as 'I am my husband's', he does not attempt *parapuruṣasparśamātraṃ na karomi* 'I don't so much as touch another man.' When the *dūtī* conveys this message to the prince, Arnold inserts 'he was in despair'. But in his version of the prince's speech, the phrase 'only her presence will cure my wound', recalling English literary representations of a lover's despair, is not as strong as *tāṃ vinā katham ahaṃ jīviṣāmi* 'how shall I live without her?' (J 32.846). Mention of contact between the sexes is avoided again when, the first time the merchant brings a lady to the prince, he worships her *tāṃ yuvatīm asprśann eva* 'without touching the girl'; Arnold renders this as 'without even **approaching** his fair visitor'. He also avoids the verb *samarpayati* which occurs

<sup>42</sup> Wilkins (1787: 306 note 106) gives the same rendering.

<sup>43</sup> Wilkins's (1787: 78) 'in the very prime of youth' is closer.

repeatedly in the story, in reference to how the merchant will ‘hand over’ his wife to the prince. The erotic climax of the story is toned down and abbreviated: *nirdayam āliṅgyānandon-mīlitalocanaḥ prahr̥ṣṭamanā bahuvīdhām anaṅgagrīḍām vidhāya paryāṅke tayā saha suṣvāpa* (J 34.885f.)<sup>44</sup> ‘He embraced her mercilessly, and with eyes wide open with joy and his mind excited, after indulging in many sorts of love play, he slept with her on the bed’ is reduced to ‘kissed and caressed her without the least restraint’ (A 41).<sup>45</sup>

In the story of the carpenter, who is convinced of his wife’s chastity by the speech on the subject which she makes to her lover (*Hitopadeśa* III story 7, J 68.1807-70.1841, NSP 88.5-89.21),<sup>46</sup> Arnold (A 91-2) follows the text fairly closely, though he makes the carpenter hide ‘in his wife’s chamber’ (A 91) rather than under the bed (*khaṭvātale* J 69.1812).<sup>47</sup> As a consequence of this change, instead of discovering her husband’s presence by happening to touch him under the bed, we are only told that ‘by chance she detected the presence of her husband.’ Similarly, Arnold’s statement that she ‘invited the gallant to pass the evening with her, and began to spend it with him in unrestrained freedom’ (A 91) is less specific than *tena samaṅ tasmin paryāṅke krīḍantī* ‘while playing with him on that bed.’ It is also longer, exemplifying what we have called literary strip-tease. The lover’s question *kim iti mayā sahādyā nirbharaṅ na ramase?* ‘why aren’t you making unrestrained love with me today?’ (J 69.1817 ≈ NSP 88.16)

---

<sup>44</sup> NSP 41 line 10 has *vilālāsa* for *suṣvāpa*.

<sup>45</sup> Wilkins (1787: 84) also plays down the erotic description, though he goes further than Arnold: ‘quite forgetful who was present, began to embrace her; and at length, with his eyes half closed with extreme happiness, he led her to a sofa richly ornamented with strings of precious gems.’

<sup>46</sup> This is less striking than the *Pañcatantra* version, in which she invents a miracle story—a motif which appears in Chaucer’s Merchant’s tale.

<sup>47</sup> *paryāṅkātale* NSP 88.12.

becomes “Life of my soul! what ails you?” said her lover; “you are quite dull to-night” (A 91). The climax of the story is again played down. In the original, the carpenter puts the bed with the couple in it on his head and dances (*tām khaṭvām śrīpuruṣasahitām mūrdhni dhṛtvā sa mandamatir nartitavān* J 70.1841f. ≈ NSP p. 89.19-20),<sup>48</sup> but Arnold’s version is ‘rushing from his place of concealment, he exclaimed in ecstasy to his wife’s gallant, “Sir! saw you ever truer wife than mine?”’ Once more, he avoids mentioning a bed in an erotic context.

Even where the story itself is not erotic, Arnold shows similar avoidance. In the story of the bell-demon (ch. 2 story 5), he makes the heroine not a bawd (*kuṭṭanī* NSP p. 60 line 22) but a ‘peasant woman’ (A 62);<sup>49</sup> her occupation is not material to the story, except that it suggests she is independent-minded. His rule that sexual contact must go no further than kissing, which we have already noticed, governs his rendering of a verse justifying violent self-defence: *anyadā bhūṣaṇaṃ puṃsām kṣamā lajjeva yoṣitām | parākramaḥ paribhave vaiyātyaṃ surateṣv iva ||* ‘At other times the ornament of a man is patience, as modesty is of a woman; when [a man is] insulted, valour [is his ornament]—as, when [a woman is] making love, unrestraint [is hers]’ (J III.7).<sup>50</sup> Arnold’s version is:

A modest manner fits a maid,  
And Patience is a man’s adorning;  
But brides may kiss, nor do amiss,  
And men may draw, at scathe and scorning.

(A 85)

<sup>48</sup> NSP reads *sānandaṃ* for *sa mandamatir*.

<sup>49</sup> Wilkins (1787: 122) calls her ‘a certain poor woman’.

<sup>50</sup> Wilkins (1787: 172) fails to understand this verse.

Similarly, in a verse listing nine things one should diligently conceal, he translates *maithuna* ‘copulation’ as ‘domestic joys’.<sup>51</sup> In another verse, he translates it as ‘pleasure’ (J I.140, A 30).<sup>52</sup>

In at least one case, Arnold fails to understand the point of a story. A mouse who lives in the house of a mendicant has the apparently inexplicable power of leaping up to a store of food (*Hitopadeśa* I story 5). A visiting mendicant deduces that the mouse’s power comes from a hoard of money which is under his burrow: the story is a piece of magical realism, satirising the power of wealth to raise a person’s status, and also the acquisitiveness of mendicants. This is clearer in the *Pañcatantra* versions, but it is evident also in the *Hitopadeśa*, and in Johnson’s and Wilkins’ translations. The inference that the mouse is sitting on a hoard of money is backed by two verses which Arnold omits:

Whoever has money is powerful in the world, everywhere and always. For even the sovereignty of kings grows from the root of money...

Anyone is strong by wealth, becomes learned by wealth. Look at this wretched mouse, reduced to the level of his own species.<sup>53</sup>

Instead, Arnold makes the mouse’s power arise from a ‘hoard of provisions’; he inserts the remark ‘the fellow is well off and fat’ (A 28). Incidentally, Arnold does not seem to recognise

---

<sup>51</sup> *āyur vittam gr̥ha-cchidraṃ mantra-maithuna-bheṣajam | tapo-dānāpamānaṃ ca nava gopyāni yatnataḥ ||* (J I.138 = NSP I.131). Arnold’s version contains some other odd translations: ‘Say the sages, nine things name not: Age, domestic joys (*maithuna*) and woes (*gr̥ha-cchidra*), / Counsel (*mantra*), sickness (*bheṣaja*), shame, alms, penance; neither Poverty (*vitta*) disclose’ (A 29). Wilkins omits this verse, without indicating the omission with asterisks.

<sup>52</sup> In this verse, Arnold fails to convey the sense, perhaps deliberately: for *krayakrītaṃ ca maithunam* ‘sex bought for a price’, he has ‘present pleasure purchased with a future woe’. Wilkins (1787: 60) mistranslates the whole verse.

<sup>53</sup> *dhanavān balavān loka sarvaḥ sarvatra sarvadā | prabhutvaṃ dhanamūlaṃ hi rājñām apy upajāyate ||* (J I.130 = NSP I.123)... *arthena balavān sarvaḥ arthād bhavati paṇḍitaḥ | paśyemaṃ mūṣikaṃ pāpaṃ svajātisamatāṃ gataḥ ||* (J I.131 ≈ NSP I.124; NSP reads *dhanena* and *dhanād* for *arthena* and *arthād*).

the Indian practice of keeping food from vermin by hanging it from a hook (*nāgadantaka* J 21.541, 551). He calls it a shelf (A 28), perhaps misled by Johnson (1848: 22), who first calls it a bracket, but later (following Wilkins 1787: 51) a forked stick (1848: 23).<sup>54</sup>

### Vocabulary

Sometimes Arnold translates a Sanskrit word with an English version of the same word; for instance, ‘Raja’ (A 3.21) or ‘Pundit’ (A 3.24). In both these cases the context indicates the meaning, since the same people have already been referred to as ‘the King’ and ‘learned men’; in the second case, however, he explains it as ‘learned men’ in an endnote. In the story of the brahmin and the goat, between the first and second encounters, he writes ‘With that he went on a coss, and came to the second knave’ (A 131).<sup>55</sup> The word *coss* translates *krośa*; it is glossed in a brief endnote as ‘Two miles.’ Arnold can also use an endnote to introduce a Sanskrit-related word which he has not used in his translation: he translates *tīla* as ‘sesamum’ (A 3.6), but explains it as ‘The “tilla” seed; which, together with the cocoa-nut, supplies Hindostan with oil’ (A 148 note 5). In these ways, Arnold gently introduces the reader to some of the vocabulary of the original, sometimes with additional information. At other times, he uses words that seem chosen to give the book a generic Oriental flavour, rather than a specifically Indian one. Thus, instead of *raja*, he sometimes uses the Perso-Arabic word *sultan*; similarly, he

<sup>54</sup> Barnet (1928: 36) calls it a bracket both times.

<sup>55</sup> *anantaram punar dviṭīyena krośamātrasthitena tad evoktam* ‘Immediately the second rogue, who was waiting at a *krośa*’s distance, said the same’ (J 97.2567). NSP lacks the detail of the *krośa*: *athānantarasthitenānyena dhūrtena tathāivoktam* (NSP 123.5f.).

translates *mantrī* as *vizier*, and *praṇāma* as *salaam*. Here, he is perhaps relying on the currency given to these words by the *Thousand and One Nights*. But this does not explain his translation of *sārtha* (NSP p. 123 l. 13) with the Arabic word *kafila* (A 131), which is rare in English, rather than with the thoroughly anglicised word *caravan* (from Persian *kārwān*), with which he glosses it in an endnote (A 166 note 10). At such times, Arnold seems merely to display his knowledge.

#### *Arnold's introduction and endnotes*

Arnold's endnotes often give information which is not needed to follow the story, or is even totally irrelevant to it. Such superfluous material includes the marks which distinguish gods from mortals (A 148 note 7), and some samples of verse translation from the *Mahābhārata* (A 164 notes 94 and 97). The endnotes serve the didactic purpose of Arnold's book, and thus help us to understand what that purpose was. Thus, in the frame story, the *śāstras* which the princes fail to study (*anadhigataśāstrāṇām* NSP 2 line 8) are translated as 'the Sacred Writings' (A 2), and this leads to an endnote introducing the four Vedas, and saying that 'Hymns and metrical addresses to the elemental gods occupy them mainly' (A 147, note 3).<sup>56</sup> Some endnotes give information on natural history (A 149 note 13, on tigers; A 151 note 23, on champak; A 155 note 50, on anthills), or on material culture (A 149 note 12, on bangles; A 153 note 35, on a blacksmith's bellows). But the commonest topic is mythology.

---

<sup>56</sup> Johnson's vocabulary entry *śāstram* (1847: 180) is much more relevant; it gives as examples 'Vedānta Śāstras...Dherma Śāstras...Kāvya Śāstras...Śilpi Śāstras...Kāma Śāstras'.



Sometimes Arnold deliberately includes words or phrases in his translation that the reader is unlikely to understand, and adds endnotes on them; the example of *coss* has been mentioned. This seems to have the didactic purpose of introducing the reader to aspects of Hindu culture. E.g. ‘the Koil’ (38), ‘The God of the five shafts’ (39), ‘the reverential prostration of the eight members’ (39); the endnote on this gives additional information on verbal and gestural greetings, and says ‘The salutations of India are Spanish in their variety and exactness’. Where the text (J 33.868, NSP 40.13) merely mentions a favourable opportunity (*lagnavelā*), he adds an endnote (A 154f., note 45) on the importance of astrology, with information from Manu on favourable days of the month and week. Sometimes he uses an Indian word without a note, since it can be understood from the context: ‘In a nullah that leads down to the Nerbudda river there stood a large silk-cotton tree’ (A 83.24) translates *asti narmadātīre parvatopatyakāyāṃ viśālah śālmalītaruḥ*.

#### *Arnold’s purpose*

The *Hitopadeśa*, like the *Pañcatantra* itself, is intended as a textbook on personal and political conduct (*nītiśāstra*). Nevertheless, the frame story of Viṣṇuśarman indicates that it was also intended to be amusing, and specifically amusing for young boys. Many of the Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Pañcatantra* indicate that they are intended for children (Winternitz 1963: 309 n. 1), and not only for those of kings. The frame story need not be taken as indicating a royal readership: it is itself a story, as much as is any story in the *Pañcatantra* or *Hitopadeśa*, and

does not prove that the book is intended for princes, any more than it is intended for lions or birds. However, the didactic purpose of the *Pañcatantra* and *Hitopadeśa* is indicated by the gnomic verses, and particularly by the way each story is introduced by a verse giving a maxim and alluding to the way the story illustrates it. Arnold, too, aims to instruct and to amuse; but his instructive purpose could not be the same as that of the original, since it was addressed to a different readership.

A magazine article of 1894 recommending books as Christmas presents says that *The Book of Good Counsels* would make a good present for a boy or girl.<sup>57</sup> The reviewer may have been influenced by a common assumption that stories about animals must be for children. The Grimms' stories were similarly presented as a book for children, as well as a product of scholarly research, until the realisation that not all the stories were suitable for children led to the publication in 1825 of a smaller collection distinct from the complete one (Dollerup 1999: 57f.). Arnold's inclusion of erotic stories—which the 1894 reviewer seems to have overlooked—suggests that he intended the book for adults. The preface and endnotes are clearly intended for adults, though studious children might also be interested in them, as they would in any adult literature. The main purpose declared in Arnold's preface is to promote understanding of India among the English-reading public; there is no indication that the book is intended for children. The inclusion of illustrations, which Arnold mentions with approval (p. xii), might suggest that it is; but we must remember that in Arnold's time many books for adults, such as

---

<sup>57</sup> *Hearth and Home*, 29th Nov. 1894, p. 130. I am grateful to Catherine Robinson for a copy of this article, and for other material.

Dickens' novels, were published with illustrations, and the notion of children's literature, as now understood, hardly existed.

Arnold intended *The Book of Good Counsels* to provide transcultural instruction, by introducing British readers to traditional India. Though he dates the *Hitopadeśa* to the beginning of the common era (Arnold 1861: ix-x), he includes vocabulary from Islamic India: *sultan*, *vizier*, *salaam*. The endnotes even mention features of British India: the note on greetings (A 154 note 44) says that 'the native' receives the greeting 'ram-ram' 'with gratification from the Sahib'. But such contemporary touches do not occur in the main text. The India Arnold presents is timeless; it is constructed from elements which include the *Hitopadeśa*, but also include the Veda, dharmaśāstra, and even aspects of Mughal India.<sup>58</sup>

His inclusion of unfamiliar words which require explanation in endnotes indicates a further purpose: to teach the 'intelligent reader' some of the vocabulary which was familiar to British people with connections to India, but not to those without such connections. Those with such connections formed a distinct sub-culture in British society, with its own food, language and other habits. The barrier between this culture and the main culture is explored in Thackeray's *Vanity Fair*, for example, where Becky Sharp, whose precarious status depends on her knowledge of the world, finds herself baffled by the food and language of those who

---

<sup>58</sup> The endnotes on what Arnold conventionally refers to as 'caste' indicate standard textbook knowledge constructed from dharmaśāstric sources, not observation of Indian society. Thus he explains a verse on the virtues of the four varṇas (ch. 4 verse 21, NSP 118.25-6) as 'a mention of the four castes, with their distinctive occupations' (p. 166 note 105). Mention of a kāyastha in ch. 2 story 2 (NSP 48.16-17) prompts an endnote '*Kāyeth caste*.—A writer; a man sprung from a Kshatriya father and a Sudra mother' (p. 156 note 53), which follows the brahmanical theory, but ignores the fact that most (if not all) Kāyasthas have Kāyastha fathers and Kāyastha mothers.

have spent years in India. It is also satirised in a nonsense poem by Edward Lear, in which he deliberately uses Indian words in contexts which imply totally different meanings from their real ones.<sup>59</sup> Arnold's book, like those of Kipling later in the century, serves not only to bridge the cultural divide between India and what he refers to as 'England', but also to bridge the divide within British society between those who knew India and those who did not.

*The Book of Good Counsels*, Arnold's first project in the interpretation of 'India' to 'England', is marked out from the rest by its lack of theological or spiritual content, as well as by being mainly in prose. The book itself is worldly in outlook, and although many of Arnold's endnotes provide information on mythology, and even some on the Veda, they do not encourage the reader to find spiritual nourishment in this material. It was only later that he showed such an interest, perhaps under the influence of his American associates.

---

<sup>59</sup> 'She sat upon her *dhobi* / To watch the evening star / And all the *punkahs* as they passed / Cried 'My! how fair you are...' and so on till the unfortunate heroine is swallowed by a *cummerbund*.

## Abbreviations

- ≈ ‘equals approximately’, linking a passage in Arnold to the passage in *Hitopadeśa* which he is translating.
- A Arnold’s translation of the *Hitopadeśa* (Arnold 1861). Verse and prose are referred to in the form A 11.2, where the first number indicates the page and the second indicates the line.
- J Johnson’s edition of the *Hitopadeśa*. When quoting the text, I follow this edition, since it was the one used by Arnold. Verses are referred to in the form J 0.20, J I.11, where 0 indicates the *kathāmukha*, I-IV indicate the chapters, and the second number indicates the verse. Prose is referred to in the form J 6.123, where the first number indicates the page and second number indicates the line as given in Johnson’s edition, which numbers the lines in a single sequence, 1-2839. (Johnson’s second edition, 1864, has different pagination, and the lines are numbered 1-2815.)
- H *Hitopadeśa*.
- KJV King James version of the Bible.
- NSP Nirṇaya Sāgara Press edition of the *Hitopadeśa*, ed. Kāśīnāth Pāndurang Parab, 16th edn. Mumbai 1958. I have used this edition whenever Johnson was not available to me, and I follow its numbering of the stories, but I follow Johnson in quotations where the text differs. Verses are referred to in the form NSP 0.20, NSP I.11, where 0 indicates the *kathāmukha*, I-IV indicate the chapters, and the second number indicates the verse. Prose is referred to in the form NSP 6.10, where the first number indicates the page and second number indicates the line as given in this edition, which numbers the lines separately on each page.
- ODNB *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

## Bibliography

- Arnold, Edwin. 1861. *The Book of Good Counsels: From the Sanskrit of the “Hitopadesa.”* London: Smith, Elder and Co.
- 1860. *Education in India: A Letter from the ex-Principal of an Indian Government College to his Appointed Successor.* London: Bell and Daldy. 1860.
- 1886. *India Revisited.*
- 1891. *Seas and Lands.*

- 1894. *Wandering Words: reprinted, by permission from papers published in the “Daily Telegraph” and foreign journals and magazines.* London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- 1896a. *East and West.*
- 1896b. *The Chaurapanchâsika, An Indian Love Lament. Translated and Illustrated by Sir Edwin Arnold.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.
- Ballaster, Ros. 2005. *Fabulous Orient: Fictions of the East in England, 1662-1785.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barnett, Lionel D. 1928. *Hitopadeśa: The Book of Wholesome Counsel: A Translation from the Original Sanskrit by Francis Johnson revised and in part re-written.* London: Chapman and Hall.
- Dollerup, Cay. 1999. *Tales and Translation: The Grimm Tales from Pan-Germanic Narratives to Shared International Fairytales.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1924. *The Panchatantra Reconstructed.* 2 vols. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Emeneau, Murray B. 1958. *Jambhaladatta’s Version of the Vetālapañcaviṃśati.* New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.
- Johnson, Francis. 1847. *Hitopadeśa. The Sanskrit Text with a grammatical analysis, alphabetically arranged. By Francis Johnson, Professor.* London: Wm. H. Allen and Co., Booksellers to the Honourable East-India Company, Leadenhall Street. Hertford: Stephen Austin, Bookseller, Printer and Stationer, to the East-India College. (2nd edn., differently paginated, same places and publishers, 1864).
- Johnson, Francis. 1848. *Hitopadeśa, or Salutory Counsels of Vishnu Śarman, in a series of connected fables, interspersed with moral, prudential and political maxims, translated literally from the original into English, for the use of the Sanskrit student.* London: Wm. H. Allen, and Hertford: Stephen Austin.
- Jones, William. 1807. *Works,* ed. Lord Teignmouth. 13 vols., London: John Stockdale and John Walker.
- Lanman, Charles Rockwell. 1884. *A Sanskrit Reader: Text and Vocabulary and Notes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Potts, E. Daniel. 1967. *British Baptist Missionaries in India, 1793-1837.* London: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, Catherine A. 2009. ‘“O Our India!” Towards a Reassessment of Sir Edwin Arnold.’ *Religions of South Asia* 3(2): 202-19.
- . 2014. ‘Interpreter of Hinduism to the West? Sir Edwin Arnold’s (Re)Presentation of Hindu Texts and their Reception.’ *Religions of South Asia* 8.2: 217-236.

Schlegel, August Wilhelm von, and Christian Lassen. 1831. *Hitopadesas, id est Institutio Salutaris*. Bonn: Edward Weber.

Sternbach, Ludwik. 1960. *The Hitopadeśa and its Sources*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.  
As this exact but not very readable book is divided into sections which are much shorter than the pages, I give section numbers (§) as well as page numbers.

Sutton, Martin. 1996. *The Sin-complex: A Critical Study of English Versions of the Grimms' Kinder- und Hausmärchen in the Nineteenth Century*. Kassel: Brüder Grimm-Gesellschaft.

Wilkins, Charles. 1787. *The Hēētōpadēs of Vēēshnōḍ-Sārmā, in a series of connected fables interspersed with moral, prudential, and political maxims, translated from an ancient manuscript in the Sanskreet language*. Bath: J. Marshall.

Winternitz, M. 1963. *History of Indian Literature*, vol. 3 Part 1, tr. Subhadra Jha. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Wright, Brooks. 1957. *Interpreter of Buddhism to the West: Sir Edwin Arnold*. New York: Bookman Associates.