Book—V: Aparīksitakāraka

The title of book-V, Aparīksitakāraka suggests that it is all about the consequences of hasty or ill-considered action. The opening verse (V.i), where a man is warned against inconsiderate action also supports this view. When do we need to consider? In fact, it is a differentiation of good-bad, right-wrong and so on. Naturally, all these are respective terms and vary from one person to another. And the conflict rises here. Rational argument is the only way to resolve it. Hatch (1999) comments --- “Without effective arguing, a community has difficulty making decisions, coming to consensus, living with negotiating difference and simply getting things done.”¹ Again, Hatch proves that “arguing is rational persuasion.”² "And when arguing breaks down, people must usually resort to some sort of force to accomplish their goals...”³

Let’s see how Visnuśarmā argues against the hasty action in this book. It is to be noted, that the teachings of other four books will bear no fruit if those are carried out in haste. In the power-game, which is taught here from different perspectives, patience and persuasion are required. This is the core-concept of the book and the text culminates with it. Therefore this book deserves our special attention.

Kale⁴ has edited fourteen sub-stories into the framework of book-V. But there are only five (V.i, V.v, V.vi, V.viii, V.xiii) stories, where we can identify the elements of emotion as an output of intra-actions or inter-actions of certain beast characters.
The first story (V.i) is about the mongoose, who saves his master’s child from the snake, but loses his life in the hands of his mistress.

The mongoose kills the snake. This die-hard enmity exists in other cases of cats and dogs, dogs and foxes, and so on. No personal reason is required to spark these explosive bonds. As a matter of fact, in the frame-story of book-III, Kākolūkīya, Visnuśarmā himself has shown such a bitter tie between the crows and the owls.

If the story closes then and there, in that case, we can consider it as a mere animal-story, where the loyalty of a pet mongoose is narrated. But, Visnuśarmā intends something more. In this story the blood-stained mongoose greets his mistress, his foster-mother as she returns. The story-teller plainly insists us to praise him for his bravado. This sort of desire to be recognized is as natural for human-kind as the snake-killing of the mongoose.

Plutchik named it “Pride”. He states the definition of pride in the following equation--- “Pride = Anger + Joy”\textsuperscript{5}.

The equation explains the story brilliantly. First, the mongoose is angry with the snake. Then he expresses sheer joy as he wins over the snake.

This story (V.v) is about Sahasrabuddhi, Śatabuddhi and Ekabuddhi. Sahasrabuddhi and Śatabuddhi are fishes and Ekabuddhi is a frog. They are friends. Notably, species-wise they are different, but they accept each other as friend. Plutchik shows Acceptance as one of the eight fundamental emotions.\textsuperscript{6}
As per the story line, all of a sudden Sahasrabuddhi, Śatabuddhi and Ekabuddhi come to know that the fishermen will invade their pond the next morning. Ekabuddhi the frog seeks suggestions from his fish-friends, in this eleventh hour, to escape from inevitable death. Both of the fishes deny running away. Sahasrabuddhi has confidence in his swimming skill and hopes that the fishermen might not turn up too. Śatabuddhi deeply relies on his intellect and refuses to leave his ancestral home. But, the fishes assure the frog strongly that in any case they will save their friend. Ekabuddhi driven by his own practical sense migrates to another pond, with his family on that very night, though. Thus they respond differently to the same stimulus, in this case, the threat of death. Even then we should study that the bond of Acceptance, the fundamental emotion-base of their friendship, strongly binds them together.

Now, we shift our focus to the part of argumentation. We have mentioned earlier that in the question of leaving the pond, the fishes and the frog are poles apart. Moreover, the fishes are not in unison. Sahasrabuddhi refuses to go away because he hopes that nothing would happen ultimately. He veils his fear behind the claim of confidence. But his passivity is actually a form of submission. Plutchik defines Submission as a sum total of Acceptance and Fear. 7

If Sahasrabuddhi personifies confidence then Śatabuddhi enacts just its counterpart. Only a weak personality needs the shield of legacy to sustain his existence. So did Śatabuddhi. Apparently, he boasts of his intelligence,
but it seems that he is also a prey of cynicism. Plutchik explains, “cynicism = disgust + anticipation”. ⁸

It looks like that Ekabuddhi; the frog loses the battle to his fish-friends. But, in reality he can save himself and his family from utter death and destruction. What else one can expect even from the King? Perhaps, here Visnuśarmā wants to teach the ultimate goal of power-game, i.e. outwitting opponent at any cost and wins over.

Generally, the donkey brays. But, in the story (V.vi), Uddhata, the donkey not only sings but also delineates on the classical music. He gives this lecture to the fox. Though, Uddhata takes pride of his knowledge, the fox thinks otherwise. He tries to calm down the enthusiastic Uddhata, for the sake of the unsafe surroundings of some field. The argument sparks off. Here the immense courage of the donkey is depicted. He anticipates the danger of being caught and beaten by the owner of the field. Still he enjoys the music. Plutchik tells us this “optimism/courage = anticipation + joy”. ⁹

Then there is a story of a wise monkey and his troop. In this story (V.viii), the conflicts between the old and the youth are pen-sketched. The wise monkey is the leader of the pack. He warns his fellow-men against stealing in the royal kitchen, as he can foresee the consequences of the greed. Naturally less-insightful inexperienced youth band cannot agree with him. As a result he leaves them and takes shelter into the dense forest. He experiences the “despair”. As Plutchik shows “despair = fear + sadness”. ¹⁰

Then someday, his anticipation turns into hard reality. The group of the monkeys is killed by the king’s order. The wise, old leader, who is left by luck, decides to take
revenge. And he lures the king with his men to the forest. Then, he kills them in a planned way. This action may be interpreted as his expression of outrage. Plutchik defines “outrage = surprise + anger”. 11

Among all these interesting stories we take the last story (V.xiii) as the most striking one, which stands for the core-theme of Book-V. Here we find the sketch of the conflict in its ultimate form. When one fights with another on some cause, then it is a mere issue of disagreement, which can be settled down in due course. But, when one engages in argument with oneself, then that inner-conflict may lead to the alienation, where he isolates from his own inner self as Karen Horney 12 posits in her proposition on neurotic needs.

This is a story of two-mouthed Bhāranda bird. [ In reality one might not find such a bird, but often one can meet such a man in the literal sense of the term “double-mouthed”). In this story, the second mouth commits suicide by taking a poisonous fruit as it feels humiliated by the indifferent attitude of the first one. It happens in real life too. At the spur of a moment, one becomes detached with his surroundings, even he becomes “alienated” from his own self; then takes the final decision to kill himself. Often it is an outcome of temporary insanity. But, that is also an extreme example. As a matter of fact, not only the classical Prince of Denmark, but also Tom-Dick-Harry are vacillating between the proverbial “to be or not to be”, and often they take up the losing side. And that declares the end by them. This story narrates their tale in fable-form.

Thus book-V is closed.
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