

The Critique of Modern Beauty in Balochi Poetry

In the Study of Gul Khan's Poetry:

By

¹Muhammad Amin, ²Yousaf Rodini, ³Shazia Jaffar

Abstract:

If a poet, specifically speaking follows the direction of romanticism and his creation becomes an artistic piece. In this paper "artistic" means to suppose novelty, contingency, spontaneity, self-creation, contradictory and probably consistency in art. This cerebation involves his art into the modern art. I suppose Gul Khan Nasir's social mode as a romantic task which makes empathy possible. When man empathizes anything on intellect plan, then his expressions come from his self.' Thus self always supposes novelty, contingency, spontaneity, self-creation, contradictory and probably consistent. (Tahir and Amin)This cerebation makes Gul a modern poet. In this paper I focus on the sources of modernity of Gul's poetry, because modern philosophy is based on epistemological inquiry. In which the source of knowledge is primary than other things. In this paper further I entertain the discourse of "source" through Gadamer's philosophy which argues language is not something that could be conducted by man. In first portion I discuss analytically Gul Khan's artistic mode with Gadamer's philosophy, and count the importance of debate. In second position I make a debate on Gadamer's philosophy, finally in third portion I try to analyze entire cerebation or debate to conclude it with the debate of "conducted beauty".

Keywords:Gul Khan, Balochi, Poetry, Beauty etc.

¹Lecturer, B.U.I.T.M.S, Quetta, Pakistan.He teaches philosophy in private institutes. He wrote four books in Balochi and edits a research book series in Balochi known as Rajmaan. As an author he is known as Amin Zaamin Baloch.

²Assistant Professor, Department of Pakistan Studies, University of Balochistan, Quetta Pakistan

³Assistant Professor, Department of Pakistan Studies, University of Balochistan, Quetta Pakistan

Introduction:

This research paper carries the following importance about the modern beauty of Balochi poetry of Gul Khan Nasir:

1- Whatever sources Baloch poetry gets from others to build up a modern beauty. This beauty basically has been conducted; but when researcher gauges it in Gadamer's philosophy, in which conduction of anything does not remain natural.

2- Romanticism is not a worthwhile position in art, because it produces language to conduction.

3- Balochi poetry of Gul Khan's is modern in its romantic paradigm; thus it does not make it modern beauty natural.

Generally, Gul Khan had been conceived as a poet who had been influenced by surrounding on bases of intellectual empathy with concerning thing which influenced him. The empathy of intellect leads man towards oneness. Oneness makes feeling to a man whatever another lay man, in uncertain condition, feels; on the bases of empathy other man goes to feel same un-certainty in intellect plan as well as and vice-versa. (Tahir and Amin)

There was a probability to Gul Khan that he made him one with the situational circumstances and feels the anxiousness of a lay man. When he got oneness then whatever he created, they all came from his self. If the self is the source of creation then creation has been assuming into art. Thus we can make his poetic version artistic and his peculiarity of emotional attachment romantic. (Ibid)

In this paper I try to produce some question to understand the language as the medium of hermeneutical experience, language as the determination of hermeneutic object and language as the determination of hermeneutic act.

1- Language as the Medium of Hermeneutical Experience:

Primarily first we have to know the language as the medium of hermeneutic experience, because this makes paths to understand hermeneutic object and act. First question I raise is that Why Gadamer talks about the conversation in the portion of Language as the medium of hermeneutic experience?

When I go to deal with language as the medium of hermeneutic experience, I try to make an account to understand we do not conduct conversation rather according to Gadamer we fall into Conversation.

But how do we know that we do not conduct conversation? I presume each word follows other word. We seek the flow of word when we experience the conclusion. Because the phenomenon of conclusion is always there, and without experience we do not know what conclusion comes out. We do not get sure on conclusion, because we use language as a medium to make an involvement in conversation.

Thus, we get that conversation leads us. And language becomes a medium that push to fall us into conversation. Conclusively, we know we do not conduct conversation but we fall into Conversation.

Now it is time to answer the question that Why Gadamer talks about the conversation in the portion of Language as the medium of hermeneutic experience?

This question carries two answers:

Answer 1: because we use language as a medium for falling into conversation, but this position does not show to us that it constructs conversation or paths to lead it, rather the almost availability of conversation makes it possible we use language.

Answer 2: the proper understanding of subject matter is task of hermeneutics.(Gadamer.1989., pp. 385). Conversation makes understanding possible because meanings are intact in conversation, and intact meaning always obtains a subject matter which gets possible to demonstrate only through language; that is why' considering language as a medium and this medium is not presupposed.

Next question is that why do we follow this process? Because we make it our intellect need to reach at truth meaning. If we follow our intellect need there should be the horizon of proper understanding available because it makes destine of truth meaning possible probably.

Now we should follow that do we recognize the meaning when falling into conversation? For understanding this position first we have to answer some questions

1- What possibilities of understanding are available?

2- How to move towards proper understanding?

3- How do the conversation and language recognize meaning?

Answer 1: the possibilities of understanding consist on conversation but when individual discloses himself to other. (Ibid., pp. 385). Individuals reach at the point of understanding, this destination is known as genuine application of hermeneutics.

Answer 2: understanding becomes probably proper when partners are aware about the alien, because this alienation is supposed to be here. According to Gadamer “partners recognize the full value of what is alien to them”. (Ibid .pp. 387). The common dictum and diction become sources to get proper understanding, because the text does not necessarily deal with the comparison to fixed point of view of meaning, because the text does not carry a single question or meaning.

Answer 3: conversation and language recognize meaning when individual does not intend to “understand the text itself”. (Ibid. pp. 388). When interpreter intend to understand text in itself thus he reawakes text with his own meaning. And his constructed meanings become decisive for him ultimately this single decisive position gets built in force. This is a risk of text. Of course there is a conversation with text he makes. But this conversation is free from alien because of decisive mode.

2- Language as the Determination of the Hermeneutic Object:

Tradition develops beyond the written form but in the sphere of meaning.(Ibid. pp. 390). Whatever forms the tradition gets from experiences.

Thus, tradition is not a fragment piece of past.(Ibid, pp. 390). Although the tradition is involved the unique co-existence of past and present.(Ibid., pp. 390). And it is a medium of transformation of meaning between past and present. Therefore, it does not depend on retelling of anything. This makes genuine opportunities to tradition that it opens more its horizon.

We can reach to proper understanding through the hermeneutic object.

Writing is an objective quality, moreover it produces objectivity’. That is why language gets its identity from writing.(Ibid, pp. 392). In this process the tradition is only thing which is here. Therefore, no inscription is free from literature. Literature gets existence on the basis of those things

which are remaining residuary in tradition. In this sense conclusion is prevailed. But the unique form of conclusion has been created by writing. Basically as I am aware literature is the name of that creation. Because literature is an involvement and it gets its contemptuous in every period. This position intrinsically shows the fall of conversation.

If we focus, thus we get that writing is secondary in relations of language, (Ibid, pp. 392) because language is primarily not presupposed in hermeneutics. But writing has foundational reality.

We count the sharing of language itself in the pure identity of meaning is the reality of writing. But the expressions go downfall in writing thus it is the second position of writing that makes it secondary. For making experience objective we consider writing is a real phenomenon, as Gadamer says “writing is the abstract ideality of language”.(Ibid, pp. 392). Basically writing meanings are identifiable and repeatable too. In here repeatable does not mean to return in original source. Rather understanding of writing is not a repetition, meanwhile the meanings of present come out form writing and it shares them. We can conclude our position that we talk to text and we make conversation to text and these all situate in present. Thus we do direct experience and it leads us to proper understanding.

As I concern after reading Gadamer that the position of proper understanding supposes the acceptance of the alien of speech. In this situation we destine to reach meaning and speech because “meaning with a self-alienation”. (Ibid, pp, 393) To destine to the meaning and speech is called transformation back of Hermeneutics. Basically this is Hermeneutic Object that determines Language.

3- Language as the Determination of the Hermeneutic Act:

I think the producing a connection between language and understanding is a hermeneutic act. If we take understanding as a verbal or traditional phenomenon thus we find generalization form’. This generalization supposes understanding has fundamental connections with language.(Ibid, pp. 395-6). And as we know understanding is an interpretation in-itself, (Ibid, pp. 396)., because it creates a hermeneutical horizon with the meaning of text. If a man wants to develop a relation with text so he has to make a relation to text through translation. But translation supposes proper understanding should be available, because’ horizon of interpretation is required for establishing horizon of fusion.(Ibid, pp. 397). But this position gets more possible through verbal interpretation, because

interpretation is only source to involve text into conversation. Thus right language is necessary for interpretation. This does not do culmination of one single interpretation rather' interpretation concerns with text, (Ibid, pp. 397)., and what kind of interpretation, it culminates. Interpretation makes understanding explicit but it does carry the meaning of that the interpretation is a source of achieving it, rather it provides place to words.

4- The Relation of Experience and Object:

Man can know things better in his present rather past, because he makes direct experience. When man reads text he gets a present relation with text because of his conversation which he has built to text. In here present is experience, conversation is object and knowing the process of experience and conversation is act.

For Balochi Poetry Baloch has adopted a new literal beauty. But still Baloch is narrating world-view in its own perspective. In short Baloch remain stay in its own world-view. When Baloch faces and entertains itself with modernity that means it conceives its entertainment is its own world-view and it feels that it is facing its own world-view. And concerning relation which is made between its world-view to another, that makes its beauty order per se. when as a nation Baloch conceived other beauty to its own then Baloch does not keep recurrence of past because this beauty not only becomes a reality for other which got actualization others paradigm but this beauty also remains real for Baloch as a notion of new world-view.

The paradigm of differences is available between human languages and language gets unfolding in concerning limitations or paradigm. Because every language biologically an organ. Likewise mind utilizes its abilities through language. If we consider language in above mentioned cerebation thus we find vast varieties of language to make a comparative study.

When we adopt others' concept of beauty, ultimately we make it fixed with us; nonetheless we do not want to abandon the adopted beauty because it gets fixation in our paradigm. The clicked question is that do we fall into the others' beauty or have we conducted it?

In a first and ultimate case, we wriggle that we made a romance with foreign beauty and made it fix with us. So, next position is that to trace the conditions of romance what we followed, or conducted. If we do follow the conditions of romance so, in first step we are countable in the

“conduct”; in short, we conducted other’s beauty. Because there is no any plan to gauge feelings, sensibilities. Feeling and sensibilities are in a flow, which are free from any conducted background.

If we count our adopted beauty as a flow, and presume that we have fallen into the beauty of other’s, which became an intrinsically real for us as such as it is for other. But why did we fix it with the privileged thought process? Why we did not have any less privileged cerebration? May be answer is very simple to say “because we love privileged cerebration” if we find any lofty sensibility to less privileged, it could be quite possible to fall into that beauty. I think this presumed answer might become ad hoc modification of adopted conception of beauty. When we have fallen into other’s (privileged) beauty, then of the romance of it we wished to be perceived in other’s paradigm. Now the paradigm of other is not for other, but it became as such familiar and real for us. This wish effected upon us; thus, this affection makes us adjust into other’s beauty or conception of beauty.

If our presumed argument is available in above mentioned argument, then it makes romance conditional because it follows cause and effect, likewise it makes romance a cause. Philosophy of hermeneutics of Gadamer does not conceive conditional position as a “flow”, rather conduct.

In a second and ultimate case, we conceive foreign mind as more authentic and strengthen regard us. And we follow this pattern to build us strengthen. When we determine the destination to build us strengthen before made it clear that public support our efforts for making a novel beauty in literature. Notwithstanding, public presume foreign beauty aesthetically valuable and choose it for making our-self aesthetically valuable. Thus we could not abandon adopted beauty.

Basically, above mentioned beauty is clearly a conducted piece of art. First, its foundations show the de-legitimization of collectiveness, which is alive and essential foundation of our literature, which does not let individual to fold him with external world. This stand of collectiveness challenges the objectivity that individual orderly minimizes his individuality when he moves to know object.

Foreign beauty cynically an oriented thing which always needs a less privileged competitor for making its own position privileged. For making to remain its position privileged, thus concerning beauty wants to

approach natural state where individual to be able to do what he wants to do. In this stage sexuality becomes core discussion of time.

When we adopt foreign beauty thus at first stage we de-legitimize our collectiveness. We want to fold ourselves to know the external world. On the basis of objectivity we find ourselves in romanticism which is not ironically valid. Thus we conduct romance with foreign mind.

Nonetheless, we compete the western art on the basis of romanticism, thus we intend to make our novel beauty strengthen. Thus, we need to make a less privileged position; ultimately we count our own beauty traditional. We conceive ourselves natural, instinctual, sensitive and etc. to count sexual discourse as a debate of progress and development.

Conclusion:

Above mentioned discussion made it clear that we conduct beauty and language. Rather, language always falls into a tradition not in the paradigm of conduct. Because conducted position shows alienation, contrary, “to fall into” shows its own consciousness.

References:

Gadamer, Hans-Georg.(1989). Truth and Method.Second revised edition,
translated and revised by Joel Weinsheimer and Donlad G.

Marshall. London: Sheed and Ward.

Tahir, Muhammad. & Amin, Muhammad.Gul Khan Nasir as an Artistic
Poet A Discussion of Idealistic Version of Art through
Romanticism.*Unpublished*