

THE DILEMMA OF THE INTERSUBJECTIVITY IN THE FORTY RULES OF LOVE BY ELIF SHAFAK

Muhammad Ilyas Mahmood

Department of English, University of Okara, Punjab, Pakistan
Email: ilyas.edu.tesl@gmail.com

Muhammad Khuram

Education Department, Government of the Punjab, Pakistan

Mubashra Mobeen

Visiting Lecturer
Department of English, University of Okara, Punjab, Pakistan

Abstract

The current study is an effort to disclose the different psychological realities of intersubjective complementarities from the novel. The Forty Rules of Love by Elif Shafak. Using the framework of Benjamin (1990), that explains the different effects of tension as, “domination, submission and recognition, which results from a breakdown of the necessary tension between self-assertion and mutual recognition that allows self and other to meet as sovereign equals”. Benjamin asserts about the psychological development of the subject in intersubjective relations, as “individuality became the inner drama of ego and objects. Research questions of this study are related to two key aspect of intersubjectivity. Concluding the intersubjectivity is composition of diverse and versatile subjects which results in different ways rather it starts with diversity and versatility and ends with the same diversity and versatility. This diversity and versatility in intersubjectivity is a storehouse of subjects where one can find many colors of intersubjectivity.

Keywords: Intersubjectivity, domination, submission, recognition, psychoanalysis

1. Introduction

The key word in the research topic is intersubjectivity. It is composed of two different words inter and subjectivity. Denotatively, Inter- means the between, among while subjectivity belongs to personal views and arguments. Therefore, in literal way, this combination shows intentions of a subject. It seems all about a subject. However, in psychology it is an understanding of two different subjects. There is another important word ‘dilemma’ in the research topic that is used to highlight a particular situation. Again, denotatively the word shows the position, the circumstances in which a choice must be made between two or more alternatives. Along with this, it means a difficult and problematic situation where some decision is essentially needed. Shafak starts her second novel with the spirit of dedication and acknowledgment. This spirit contains a dark and ominous autobiographic account. As a storyteller, she narrates the incidents of her childhood. She recalls that they are living next door to a tailor. He beats his wife like a born stout.

In particular, the term ‘intersubjectivity’ is taken from psycho- analytical study. Psychology deals with internal dealings. It is discussion of two subjects’ internal thoughts (Cerisano 2015). Therefore, the combination of these words explains all the psychological complexities, perplexities and confusions of subjects in taking a decision in problematic and difficult situation. In short, it deals with internal hardships where the subjects have to choose and decide what they want. In addition to

psychological views, sociological values are very important for this subject. Intersubjective relationships are created among different sociological subjects. In simple words, subjects are combined in intersubjective relations through social grounds. Therefore, sociological grounds also incorporate with psychological views to take decisions or choose alternatives. (Friedman 2002).

Intersubjectivity becomes a universal dilemma of humanity (Fabian, 2014). Therefore, the novel is presented in different forms of intersubjective relations among different individuals. These subjects/individuals are trying to sustain or assert their subjectivity, their power in different ways. The novel *The Forty Rules of Love* is exemplifying the value of time and geography in intersubjective relations. One part of the novel is dealing with modern American story where different subjects are performing their roles in intersubjective complementarities. There, a female Ella is trying to assert her subjectivity, her rights. On the other side, her husband is trying to sustain his subjectivity, his power. It becomes quite interesting that both are aware of their rights. There, one tries to be free, the other tries to control. One is violating the other and expects that other remains silent. This conflict helps to bring equality between them. This feeling of equality works for recognition of passive one. This works for social retrieval of subjectivity. At the end, the subjects pave their way of individual development. It brings social change and transformation in this intersubjectivity complementary.

This study focuses on the following questions to explore:

1. How does domination devastate the intersubjective relations despite the apparent equality among individuals in the novel *The Forty Rules of Love* by Elif Shafak?
2. How does the dilemma, which is the result of intersubjective relations, motivates the participants towards their destiny of self-realization in this novel?

2. Literature Review

This section focuses particularly on the emergence of intersubjectivity in different areas of human life. It also deals with the realization of intersubjective relations and its effects on different participants. Hempel (1965) spoke of savages and primitives people without history and studies, with an aim to apprehend the rise of civilization, to endorse the working of natural laws of evolution, or to reveal patterns of the diffusion of culture.

According to Flora Cornish (2009), intersubjectivity is relevant to a wide set of fields. In every field, it has different types of definition. There are six most circulated definitions of intersubjectivity. First, in a simple sense, intersubjectivity is used to refer to agreement in the sense of having a shared definition of an object (Mori & Hayashi, 2006). Then, it is defined in terms of mutual awareness of agreement or disagreement and even the realization of such understanding or misunderstanding (Laing, Phillipson & Lee, 1966). In Cognitive approaches, the term refers to the attribution of intentionality, feelings and beliefs to others (Gardenfors, 2008). However, other approaches emphasize the embodied nature of intersubjectivity, conceptualizing intersubjectivity as implicit and often automatic behavioural orientations towards others (Merleau-Ponty, 1976)

On the other hand, cultural researchers such as Goffman (1959), and Schegloff (1992) emphasize the situated, interactional and performative nature of intersubjectivity. Finally, cultural and dialogical researchers have used the term to study the partially shared and largely taken-for-granted background. Interlocutors assume it. It is against the things that are verbal and practical (Renedo, & Jovchelovitch, 2007). It is a fact that some of these definitions can be incomplete accounts of intersubjectivity (Markova, 2003). However, it is also a fact that each captures a different and important aspect of the phenomenon and in this way relates to the present work. In short, it can be

conceptualized that intersubjectivity involves in a variety of relations between perspectives. These perspectives can be belonged to individuals, groups, or traditions and discourses.

Gillespie and Cornish (2010) states that the concept of intersubjectivity is used widely. It is effective with varying meanings. In fact, intersubjectivity refers to the variety of possible relations among peoples' perspectives. It insinuates that social life is constructed on social interactions. These social interactions become ground for intersubjective relations. So, intersubjectivity becomes a core concept for the social sciences. It is an understanding of social behavior in particular. In a true sense, intersubjectivity forms a multidisciplinary shade of meaning. This becomes a versatile concept in modern sociological studies as well as in other disciplines.

Cognitive psychology, from the ancient Greeks to modern times, has presumed that individuals are self-contained information processing systems (Neisser, 1978). Social exchanges are seen as commerce among individual thinkers. Human beings are sovereign monads. In most of Western philosophy, subjectivity is defined as individual approach. The sources or causes of experience can be objective. The experience itself is accessible only to the unique consciousness of the person having it. That person can talk to others about it, but the actual experience remains subjective and private. There is no basis in philosophy of science to imagine how it could be otherwise. In short, subjectivity is completely an asset of individual.

Husserl and Kem (1973) define intersubjectivity as a phenomenological description of subjectivity of subjects. It is an empathic connection between at least two sentient beings. It is the capacity to apprehend another person's meaning, intentions and emotions. It is not merely an assumption about the other's state of mind, a deduction from behavior and circumstance, nor an epiphenomenal neurological expression. Rather intersubjectivity for Husserl is the human ability to participate in the subjective state of the other.

Benjamin (1990) emphasizes upon "meeting". It recalls Martin Buber's (1937/2004) observation that "All real living is meeting" (p. 11). What Benjamin means is not simply any kind of encounter, but one which is open and alive to the feelings, actions, and intentions of both self and other: "such recognition can only come from another whom individuals, in turn, recognize as a person in his or her own right" (pp. 12). He describes this as an ethical description of intersubjectivity.

In short, dilemma of intersubjectivity is started with the very start of humanity, the dispute of dominance and submissiveness is evident in all historical descriptions and as well it is also a prevailing factor in this very age. In simple words, the subject of intersubjectivity is social, moral, ethical, historical, psychological and modern dilemma which widens the subject of study.

3. Theoretical Framework of Study

Theoretical framework for this study pertains to psychological development of an individual. The individual development is focused in intersubjective relations. Subjectivity of two participants in the social and domestic interactions is the locus of the present study. Benjamin asserts about the psychological development of the subject in intersubjective relations, as "individuality became the inner drama of ego and objects" (*The Bonds of love*, 1990, Chap. 1 para.1). In other words, intersubjectivity in psychoanalysis for Benjamin is "the mental representation of the others". Therefore, intersubjectivity focuses on the subjectivity of two different human beings (two different subjects) at psychological level.

This subjective individual development is a cyclic representation of different stages. In intersubjective relations, origin of domination is a psychological dimension of the subject. Domination in intersubjective relations produces element of tension. The element of tension raises questions about the identity of self and other, about the two different subjects. Therefore, intersubjective

relationship transforms the effect of tension in the form of domination and submission. Benjamin (1990) explains the effects of tension as, "domination and submission results from a breakdown of the necessary tension between self-assertion and mutual recognition that allows self and other to meet as sovereign equals". Realization of both participants as subjects who have equal powers becomes a basic move in individual development. In individual development, realization stands for assertion and recognition.

However, at this stage the elements of assertion and recognition become prominent in intersubjective relations. Benjamin states that, "assertion and recognition constitutes the poles of a delicate balance" (1990, Chap. 1 para.3). This balance produces the effect of "differentiation". Benjamin highlights the aspect of differentiation between different subjects as "the individual's development as a self that is aware of its distinctness from others"(1990, Chap. 1 para.3). Therefore, with equality and difference, it is difficult for the subject to survive. In other words, the need for recognition gives rise to a paradoxical situation. This paradox is a sense of feeling, which is stimulated through others' actions. This allows the self to realize its subjectivity, its equality and agency in different ways. It is worthy to note that all happens due to other's actions, intentions and meaningful feelings. It is also important to note that the inability to recognize the other converts into the form of domination and submission.

The result of realization can be twofold in the form domination and submission. The realization of self in an interaction moves through different phases. The first step is the bond of relations among different members. The next is mental representation of the other. Then the next move is towards the expressions of domination and submission. There comes the tension due to domination and submission. The breakdown of this tension leads the subject towards the mutual recognition. Mutual recognition motivates the aspect of difference. Through difference, self can distinguish itself as a separate entity. Another subject announces its claim in the share of relations. When the claim is pronounced powerfully, the subject is accepted. If the subject is unable to claim its right then there is a backdrop for his/her in the form of domination and submission. This can be output of realization for subjects.

Benjamin concludes concept of intersubjective relations, "conclusion is both modest and utopian" *The Bonds of love* (1990, Chap.6 para.14). The description of mutual recognition in the wake of its breakdown is not final. It does not redeem anything. It is also not the end of prehistory. Instead of all, Benjamin asserts that it is a necessary part of the continuing process of individual development. It is a form of social change. It unties different ties of social organizational structures. It is a renewal of older form, which is restructured as new one. It shows different inconsistencies among different subjects. Restructuring of intersubjective relations displays different imperfections in subjects, which are innate in all human beings. For Habermas (2003) describes that Benjamin intersubjectivity means to show that, the personal and social are interconnected. If subject tries to understand this, it suffocates its own personal longings for recognition. This suffocates its hopes for social transformation and social change. Benjamin calls it a fact that social transformation is a continuous process. Therefore, it cannot stop anyhow. To sum up, dilemma of intersubjective relations according to Benjamin highlights the 'change, continuity and social transformation'.

4. Analysis and Discussion

The selected novel *Forty Rules of Love* is composed of two different communities. These two different communities are of two different times, of two different geographical regions. Indeed, through these differences, universality of research topic is highlighted. Shafak tries to attach both communities and times imaginatively. Moreover, it becomes an effort to expose universality of the human beings. The novel demonstrates that human beings follow same patterns in their whole history. In short, it is prehistoric truth that human beings try to organize themselves in intersubjective modes, which are exemplified in the novel.

4.1 Versatile Intersubjective Complementarities

The prologue embodies the ending part of the novel. An aspect of modern American community is depicted through the lens of a married couple David Rubinstein and Ella Rubinstein. This very first bond stands on equality, love and share of interpersonal skills. Ella Rubinstein is forty years old married woman who is living a life of still water, a sequence of habits, needs, and preferences. Although it was monotonous and ordinary in many ways, she does not find it tiresome. She forgets about her subjectivity. That is why, in her twenty years of married life 'every wish; every person she befriends and even every decision belongs to her marriage'. This is an element of complementarity in this major bond rather it is an insight of dependency and independency. Here one is bound to this pact of relationship because she is dependent while the other is enjoying his life with all its charms because he is independent.

4.2 Incorporation of Mutuality among Intersubjective Complementarities

This step is showing how the subjects are attached with each other rather it exemplifies attunement of subjects. In intersubjective complementarity of David and Ella both are considered equal, free and central. Their relationship is explained in the text as, "They had life insurance, car insurance, retirement plans, college savings plans, joint bank accounts" (p.2). They decide everything equally as totally harmonized subjects. They are mutual subjects. From the textual analysis, it becomes clear that every relationship is constructed on the grounds of equality

4.3 Sway of Difference among Intersubjective Complementarities

Difference is an automatic force. It sways in its own flow. David and Ella have everything in complementary however, the element of difference is there as when she wants to participate according to her share, everyone rejects her. Often times David comes in the evening and disappeared in the night. They are inwardly living separate lives under the same roof as it is quoted in the text, "No matter how deep the rift between them, she always cooked and he always ate". (p.23) According to this textual cite although Ella is living with her family from twenty years yet the element of difference is prominent in their lives. It is also clear from the interpretations of the text that on the cognitive level both are aware of this rift.

After reading the statement, she considers it like someone's epitaph. She starts differentiating between David and her. She also realizes that she never asserts such type of things to David. Indeed, she is realizing that something is missing. It seems that she is not present in their relationship. In simple words, it becomes obvious that someone snatches her subjectivity, her individuality. In the next line, Ella's thoughts become clearer as she asserts to herself, "This is what they will write about me when I die" (p.3). She finds herself in the whirl of difference and tension, which is shaking her from slumber. It provides a new turn to Ella she does find any place of her own, any room of her own. She is feeling that although she is alike yet different. It becomes a mutual cognitional force for her. It shows her lack of powers and subjectivity. Textual incites explains this

situation as, “the two of them were not only miles apart but also as different as day and night” (p.3). Ella and David are living in the same home yet they are different rather quite opposite of each other. This becomes a turn in their complementary relationship for further decisions. On the dinner table, sitting with her twins and in absence of David, she feels stimulation from the forces of a likeness, spectrum and difference.

4.4 Retrieval of Domination in Intersubjective Complementarities

In the bond of David and Ella, the lack of powers and subjectivity compels Ella to submit. It is also a truth that submission brings recognition to individual. The submissive position is quite clear as text narrates Ella’s position in this intersubjective complementarity, “Not that she complained. Being the mother, the wife, the dog walker, and the housekeeper kept her busy enough” (p.6). She is performing all her duties without any demand of rewards. Her submission is evident in her views, as she does not complain what is going on. She becomes a silent, passive and serving to all. This suppression of submission follows the power of spectrum. Now, she is able to divide between herself and others.

Indeed, it is an indicator to awake her subjective powers. Cognitive forces are still effective in her life. In fact, she wants to reject all dominative powers. In other words, Ella’s condition answers the first research question how domination spoils the intersubjective complementarities.

4.5 Final Version of Intersubjectivity

The final version of intersubjectivity becomes evident in the bond of David and Ella. Ella is dreaming about someone who is romantic fellow, who looks like her expectations and turns to be according to hers taste. This effect becomes more sounding as she is reading Rumi. She is feeling that she is living in the thirteenth century and living and conversing with Shams and Rumi. It clarifies that intersubjective complementarities are beyond the time, age and gender.

Reading Rumi brings clarity in her mind and soul as well as it brings confusion in David’s mind. Reciting repeatedly Rumi’s poetry causes self-awareness and a renewal in her attitude. She contacts Aziz, a modern mystic, follower of Rumi because she is working on Aziz’s novel, “*Sweet Blasphemy*”. Now, she can differentiate between herself and David. The fact is very strange that she is forced by David to work on the novel of Aziz. In simple words, David himself is throwing her in new state of mind, to think about someone other. She is astonished on noticing this yet it is vibrant power for her individuality. This starts a new twist in their lives which is full of difference, spectrum and above all of tension. These are fundamental forces, which work for one’s subjectivity and individuality.

This recognition of equality supports a new subjective approach in Ella’s mind. It empowers her with new wisdom of individuality and subjective consciousness. Although, David uses the tool of children to sustain his domination, to sustain her submission yet Ella bluntly asserts what she wants. She boldly says, “I love them very much, but I also love Aziz...” (p.250). This statement shows that they are converted into equal subjects. David admits all his misdeeds. Here, David tries to shift his position and asserts, “Oh, my God! What’s come over you? This isn’t you! Stop being so romantic, will you? Come back to your old self” (p.250). He becomes meek and tries his level down although inwardly he does not want to do so. Her subjectivity changes her completely. She shuns submissiveness and expresses her wishes and whims. She starts loving herself. She tries to memories the first rule of Shams’ forty rules of love, “How we see God is a direct reflection of how we see ourselves.” (p.30) Shams further explains the situation to her imaginatively, “If we see God as full of love and compassion, so are we”(p.30). It turns all her attentions towards herself. She

thinks about her individuality and subjectivity. She recalls her past yet move on. Therefore, for the first time, they sleep in separate beds as two different poles of same value.

At this stage, Ella questions herself what type of life she is living. Unconsciously she raises objection in front of herself that this is only way for her to live. In an email she differentiates between her past and new life, "I kept wondering, is the way I've lived my life the way I want to continue from now on?" (p.114). Now, the result of domination is at hand. This is the stage, which answers the second research question. She recalls one of the rules of Shams,

In the result of the later bond, appears a new bond that is between Ella and Aziz. This bond is started in the form of a distant intersubjective complementarity, between a reader and an author, between a preacher and a listener, between two different communities. Here, one is Muslim and other is Jewish, one is mystic and other is wanderer, yet both are beloved. Instead of all this, this bond is composed of keenest desire of individuality and subjectivity. It becomes the result of other subjects' oppressive and dominative actions.

The reaction is quite unexpected for Ella. She suddenly tries to remit. She leans towards her timid self. Yet Jeannette goes many furlongs ahead and comments in these words, "You know what I'm thinking, Mom? Jeannette said in a voice so flat as to be unrecognizable. I'm thinking you're projecting your own fears onto me" (p.8). Here remission is not the demand rather a subject is snatching other subject's subjectivity. Jeannette denies her mother's subjectivity. In this dilemma of intersubjectivity, she moves back towards herself. She herself questions her unconsciously, Was she an unhappy housewife? A washed-up mom trapped in a failing marriage? Was this how her children saw her? And her husband too? What about friends and neighbors? Suddenly she had the feeling that everyone around her secretly pitied her, and suspicion was so painful that she gasped. (p.10)

The next bond is between two historic, Islamic and learned figures of thirteenth century Muslim Turkish lands. They are Rumi and Shams. It is a fact that spirits of both are still alive in east and west. They both are from contradictory worlds. One is from Sufi and mystic world while other is from rigid and scholarly sphere of religion. In fact, both are opposite. They are also opposite as Baybars' uncle comments, "Rumi preaches submission" (p.188) instead of Rumi, Shams preaches individuality. In the coming pages Shams is described as a transforming force. As the text is evident for this purpose, "Shams is the person who is responsible for the transformation of Rumi" (p.190). Shams does not belong to one person.

He belongs to everyone and everywhere. He stands for subjectivity of all. This ability of Shams makes unimaginable effects in the life of Rumi. He becomes a mirror for Rumi. The word 'mirror' in fact exemplifies individuality and subjective consciousness of a person. It is need of everyone. As Rumi confesses, "Find the one who will be your mirror! For me that mirror is Shams of Tabriz" (p.197). Subjectivity can be named as a personal dictionary. In this dictionary, definitions are belonged to personal deeds, desires and demands. At every major turn, human beings have to follow this personal dictionary where one can imagine one's self.

Rumi realizes what his destiny is. He himself thinks that he is a scholar. In fact, his real subjectivity is still hidden from him. Shams predicts that one-day people of east and west know your name equally. Rumi questions Shams, "How is that going to happen?" (p.208). This becomes a time for Shams to introduce Rumi that is why he says these textual words, "Through your words, Shams answered" (p.208). In simple words, Rumi's words are his subjectivity. His poetry with whom he never confronts now about to approach. This becomes the crucial stage in their intersubjective relationship.

It is a phase in Rumi's life that everything seems going to be perfect as Rumi asserts this change in these words, "Life is about perfection" (p.288). Rumi is thinking about his past how conservative way of life he enjoys in his past years. However, at this stage another subjective sense

is appeared in his circle of life. He knows the real meaning of equality as a rigid Islamic scholar and a prostitute are living, eating and enjoying life in the same house. Shams encourages Rumi to visit a tavern where he talks to drunken as it is not considered good in early days of life.

These changes are not outwardly adopted rather it changes his inner self. It becomes strange as a scholar is walking in the shoes of a beggar. An Islamic '*faqih*' is changed into a '*faqir*'. In simple words, Shams is turns an elite into a lay person. Rumi explains him in these words, "Shams cut lose all the moorings that tied me to life as I knew it. Wherever he saw any kind of mental boundary, a prejudice or a taboo, he took the bull by the horns and confronted it" (p.290). In fact, Shams reforms whole life of Rumi and introduces to him reality. In this reality, all dominative forces are vanished. One thing remains there and this is his subjectivity and individuality. Indeed, Rumi knows what is, "taste of loneliness, helplessness, slander, seclusion, and finally, heartbreak" (p.290) Rumi is ready to leave everything which is belonged to him, "My books, sermons, family, wealth, or name—I am ready to give up anything and everything" (p.290). He wants just only his own individual self. This is the result of all his oppressed past who makes a new.

The next bond is among Hasan a bagger, Rumi and Shams. In this intersubjective relationship, three individuals are intertwined in an indirect relationship. This is a strange combination of a bagger, a scholar and of a mystic. Three different human beings are combined in place, at the one platform of intersubjectivity. Hasan being a bagger suffers extremely. On the other hand, Rumi is being an Islamic scholar and preacher of first rank enjoys all luxuries of life. Shams as mystic tries to understand the hidden spirits in all the others and tries to alight them through different reformations. The conflict starts when Rumi preaches the importance of sufferings of humanity.

Indeed, at the psychological level suffering becomes spectrum through which division among the subjects can be made in this erotic life. As Hasan criticizes Rumi's statement about sufferings, "I continued to be angry at Rumi for his flamboyant speech on suffering—a subject he clearly knew little about" (p.123). It is the dilemma of intersubjectivity, that powerful subjects are imposing their powers without any right. Unquestionably, Hasan admits Rumi's subjectivity. On the other hand, Rumi declines to accept Hasan. Tension hovers in the mind of Hasan. As mentioned above Rumi praises suffering while he is not sufferer.

At this stage, Shams comes forward and Hasan the bagger realizes his true self what he is. For first time someone presents him greetings. It is the time when no regards are considered for his downtrodden individuality. It develops a bridge of mutuality between them. Hasan feels that he is. It is a fact that all love their identities. Shams also resolves the complications of Rumi's individuality. This is the result of clarification of domination that a bagger is paying respect to a scholar and a scholar is loving a mystic.

There is another bond between Desert Rose and her patron, sociologically empowered. This bond is somewhat different from all the other bonds. In this bond, Desert Rose stands for individuality and her master nominates all those forces, which are keeping her in objectivity rather the other side is in possession of all dominative powers. Desert Rose is an embodiment of marginalized and submissive individual whose only recluse is brothel. She has to sell herself either she wants or not. In fact, she becomes a substance on whom different parasites are living. In this bond, her name is also used in an ironic way. In other words, she is rose who is living in desert, which is full of human being that is why she is named as Desert Rose.

The dilemma of intersubjectivity arises through the spectrum. On the one side, there are men of all professions like robbers, soldiers, drivers, performers and even gypsies and on the other side standing alone the Desert Rose. She was in situation where she can easily differentiate herself although apparently looking like them. Desert Rose, a harlot wants to love God as all other her fellow human beings want. Therefore, she visits a nearby mosque where Rumi is delivering his sermon to

the lovers of God. However, her fellow human members reject her. She runs to save her life and considers it as a rejection from the God. In fact, her all fellow members of community snatch her subjectivity although she is a subject like them. Here, Shams comes forward and works like the cognitional force for her. Shams explains her true individuality to her that how she is like the other but different. He explains that subjectivity is the name of her personal skills as Shams explores the dilemma, "All you need to do is keep in mind how everything and everyone in this universe is interconnected. We are not hundreds and thousands of different beings. We are all One" (p.135). Shams describes her as alike the other human beings.

The next move in this bond is Desert Rose's seclusion in Rumi's house. Here, she finds what she loves from early days of her life. She says goodbye to brothel and her life becomes anew. It does not belong to anyone else rather to herself alone. She can also realize that it all happens due to excessive domination of all social norms as well as polite and delicate guidance of Shams. When Kimya tries to ask her new about the new state of life, she plainly asserts that, "But I have not started life anew. The only thing I did was to die before death"(p.313) In fact, this is final stage in intersubjective complementarity. It is a stage where things are seemed beyond the domination and submission. Everything seems plain, soft, and delicate in a subjective way. It becomes destiny of subjects.

The next bond in this process of intersubjective complementarity is between Rumi and his Wife Kerra. Kerra has a keen interest for knowledge as Rumi has. The marriage between Rumi and Kerra is not simply marriage but it is a way of enhancement of understanding between two individuals. Kerra can still recall the time, the time of her past. When Rumi marries Kerra, Christianity seems to her a tale tell by heart. However, she submits herself and accepts Islam for the sake of Rumi. At the time of their wedding, the relationship is based on equality and mutuality. Both are from opposite religions yet they are living in complete harmony. People are thinking that their religious beliefs are hurdle for their coming life however; they prove their judgment wrong by their love and understanding. After their eight years' marriage, at this stage comes a twist in their relationship.

As the character of Rumi is discussed in different other relationships, he is a learned and seasoned person on the other hand, Kerra has also keen desire to learn. This quest of learning and the oppression of learned becomes a move for differentiation. The element of differentiation starts from the aspect of domination, which is heightened through the involvement of Shams who becomes an intruder in their relationship. In fact, before Shams' arrival they are living a life of mutual harmony although there are some hidden marks of domination are present. In other words, Shams brings a recognition for Kerra's individuality rather Shams brings Kerra's real individuality to the surface. The other side of the coin is that she loses her subjectivity and individuality yet it is Shams who brings back her towards her individuality.

In this process of intersubjectivity, now she is feeling her individuality, her subjectivity as she is questioning herself about her identity. In fact, she tries to rediscover what she misses. All her past becomes present. She is recalling, what she is. As she asserts, "sometimes I yearn to see Mary's kind brown eyes. Her gaze always had a soothing effect on me"(p.179) This is not simply a revival of past with a battalion of tension. It becomes a realization of truth that she is something. Realization of individual and subjective truth is coming to appear. She feels her individual identity and confronts the dominating forces. These dominating forces are helping her to differentiate between her submissive self.

Kerra tries to resist her new acknowledgment yet it is very forceful. The effect of domination sounds powerful when Shams throws Rumi's books into water fountain. Kerra recalls her early days of marriage. At that time, she is not allowed to touch them. Rumi prohibits her that she cannot touch them for cleaning. However, Shams is throwing those precious books into water and Rumi is

standing next to Shams silently. Instead of Rumi when Kerra questions Shams, "What are you doing? I asked Shams. These books have no other copies. They are very valuable. Why are you throwing them into the water? Have you lost your mind?"(p.205). This action is not one sided. Rumi is involved in this. He does not stop Shams rather trying to sooth Kerra with his unsuitable answer to the situation. Rumi asserts, "Calm down, Kerra, please"(p.205) This answer brings an inward storm of tension in her mind and heart. She runs back to kitchen, which is only place for her internal recluse. Later on Kerra narrates, there I "sat down and cried my heart out"(p.205). She unconsciously thinks about herself without mentioning it to anyone. In fact, dilemma of intersubjectivity is reached to its height with devastating effects of domination. All these are projecting the evidences for my first research question.

There is another bond, which is between a father, Rumi and a son, Aladdin. In this bond, domination also performs its role. As the intersubjectivity is the game of personal shares, rights and desires. Every subject yearns for its proper rights. This bond is also a result of Rumi and Shams' subjective bond. In this bond domination converts its ways towards the son of Rumi. Mutuality of Rumi and Shams effects Aladdin. Suddenly element of difference is hovering over their lives. When Rumi spends forty days in isolation with Shams, there starts the conflict. Aladdin who is living with his father and as a heir of all his legacy, he cannot bear anyone else. Rumi ignores him rather rejects him for the sake of Shams. In the meeting of Shams and Rumi, Aladdin tries to speak with Shams but there he realizes his true place in the eyes of his own father. His fathers' words sound in an unforgettable way for him. They become a hunting hammer for him. His father utters with a frozen tongue that, "Just get out!" my father repeated, turning away from me" (p.164).

This domination crushes everything in his life. Aladdin asserts to his brother Sultan Walad that Shams is not only dominant person in their lives. It seems that he is killing them. Aladdin considers him a murder as the text explains, "They say Shams put a spell on our father," Aladdin said. "They say he was sent by the Assassins."(p.202). It does not mean that Shams is killing them apparently rather he snatches their subjectivity by violating different personal wants. The use of word 'Assassins' is not simply used for a murderer; it shows intensity of situation. In fact, assassins are famous to murder with diverse techniques. It is noteworthy Aladdin feels that Shams is one of those assassins who is killing him and his relative with a new and different technique. It seems that difference and domination infuriated all cognitional forces, which are instinctual part of Aladdin's individuality. He is clearly following his power of spectrum and creating a division between his belongings rather between himself and other subjects. Through this aspect of spectrum, Aladdin tries to find new ways for his individuality.

This recognition is further highlighted by the Shams. Shams marries the same girl Kimya to whom Aladdin wants to marry. Earlier he leaves his family yet on hearing Shams and Kimya's marriage he leaves his house and stays with friends. In short, domination devastates all he has. He becomes an awful individual. This becomes the destiny of her character as it explains the validity of my second research question.

There is another interesting bond between Shams and Kimya a girl of sixteen years old. Their complementarity is not simply a way of their union however; different types of similarities are present in the course of their lives. One major similarity is both are envisioned human beings. They can observe different types of metaphysical realities, which are named as 'visions'. In simple words, strangeness is the hallmark of their personalities. Before their physical union, they are united through their qualities. This becomes a fact for their likeness.

Their complementarity starts with a question. It looks like a relationship between a student and teacher. After missing many lessons from Rumi, Kimya thinks to restart. She plans to study without her teacher. However, at the very first step she is entrapped by a question. Therefore, she

goes towards Rumi for the answer of her question. Instead of Rumi, Shams is present there and he answers her question. There, she finds a new difference between her new mentor and the previous one. In fact, this complementarity is clearly a psychological as well as sociological bond.

The next phase in the bond of Shams and Kimya is also started with another question. Here, the question is bit different from all other questions. For the first time, Shams offers answer to her question. However, this time she wants to be answered. This question is about the different meanings of same statement. She desires to know things more deeply rather her concern becomes the knowledge of reality. This reality can empower her to understand meaning of her own self. She wants to differentiate among different levels of individuality. Apparently, she is asking about the meaning of Quranic verses of *Al-Nisa*. She considers it as a womanly issue. However, Shams explains it in the form of four different levels. The second last level captures her interest most. Here, Shams stresses on the blurred boundaries of genders. According to him, "each and every one of us, including you and me, has both femininity and masculinity in us, in varying degrees and shades"(p.198) In fact, Shams tries to diminish limits between males and females. He asserts that this is only the matter of 'manhood' and 'womanhood'. In simple words, according to Shams, a man can act like woman and woman can act like man, as both are two equal subjects, beyond the aspects of gender. This is the matter of individual understanding of participants. This arises a sense of mutuality in Kimya rather she moves forward a step in her quest of subjectivity.

One night in her proper womanhood, she confronts Shams in his room. However, Shams' reacts in an extremely destructive way. His one sentence becomes destiny for Kimya. As he utters, "I am disappointed in you, Kimya," Shams said. "Now, could you please get out of my room?"(p.319). The results are very devastating for her.

She loses her heart and stops to resist. She feels that everything moves away from its orders. She submits completely as she describes about herself, "I never saw Shams again. After that day I never left my room" (p.320). Everything is vanished away and she watching all this with open eyes. In fact, she imagines her death as she experiences, "All strength was drained from my body, ebbing away bit by bit." (p.320) In short, she dies before death because she loses power to oppose others.

5. Conclusion

I discover different intersubjective complementarities, which are present in the novel. In these complementarities, mostly there are two subjects. In these intersubjective complementarities, one subject leads and behaves, as powerful while other remains passive and submissive. Through this agenda of power game and struggle for survival, I try to disclose different aspects of intersubjectivity, which are similar in many complementarities yet different and novel in many cases. The subjectivity of subject's result in different ways as the subjects are different.

The findings of my study are versatile as the intersubjectivity is combination of versatile subjects. The very first bond of my study, which is between a husband and a wife, it shows that domination devastates their lives and both realize a new sense of subjectivity. This new subjectivity, which is evoked by domination, results in the form of breakup. This breakup is not of a young couple rather they spend their youth with each other. They live together for twenty years and they understand each other yet feelings of domination ruin their complementarity. Therefore, both are separated after twenty years of marriage. The results are shocking yet both accept their subjectivity and start living separately according to their own ways.

The diversity and versatility of intersubjectivity is highlighted through the result of another bond, which is between Ella and Aziz. This bond explores many mysteries of intersubjectivity rather it

explains how the sociological powers dominate different subjects. This domination spoils everything in subjects' lives. They find themselves into new intersubjective complementarities. Ella and Aziz express their subjective approaches. They devise their old ways into new one as they find themselves free, liberal from all dominating powers.

Moreover, the innovation of intersubjectivity comes to the surface through the intersubjective complementarity of a beggar, Hassan and Rumi, a scholar. This unfolds a different type of subjective approach. It explains the unpredictable situation where one is imposing its ideas on the other. The scholar shows his powers of knowledge while it is rejected by experience of powerless beggar. This shows a different view of subjectivity. In short, theory and practice are standing face to face. In simple words, scholar and beggar are harmonized through the discovery of new personal attitudes. A strange intersubjective complementarity occurs, as a scholar understands the beggar and beggar respects the scholar. This is all about the intersubjective consciousness.

The intersubjective results are further highlighted through the complementarity of a husband, Rumi and his wife Kimya. Their complementarity shows different dimension of intersubjectivity. They are opposite as they are from diverse religions. This time, one subject, while having all powers, remains silent. Therefore, its subjectivity is snatched by the powerful. It has not any share in the intersubjective complementarity. Powerless is merged into powerful property. It presents dilemma of intersubjectivity in another way.

Intersubjectivity is hidden under different shades (Berger 1988). One color of this shaded intersubjectivity becomes vivid through the intersubjective complementarity of Askander and his mother, Pembe. It is quite interesting that one serves and other rules. This is quite strange that submission brings death of subjectivity. Subject itself believes in disentitle state. Therefore, powerful subject ruins the other. Pembe loses all her colors and becomes a colorless. Having voice, she assumes the state of voiceless. This shows a different shade of dilemma of intersubjectivity.

To sum up, intersubjectivity is composition of diverse and versatile subjects. Therefore, it results in different ways rather it starts with diversity and versatility and ends with the same diversity and versatility. This diversity and versatility shows the different subjects in different guises. In other words, intersubjectivity is a storehouse of subjects where one can find many colors of intersubjectivity. In this research work, I try to collect results of these different subjects from different intersubjective complementarities. This serves the purpose of my study to discover the dilemma of intersubjectivity through the observation of different subjects.

References

- Benjamin, J. (1990). *An outline of intersubjectivity: The development of recognition*. *Psychoanalytic psychology*, 7(S), 33.
- Berger, L. S. *The Bonds of Love: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and the Problem of Domination* by Jessica Benjamin New York: Pantheon, 1988,
- Cerisano, D. (2015). *Husserl and intersubjectivity: the bridge between the Cartesian and Ontological Way* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Cornish, F., & Gillespie, A. (2009). A pragmatist approach to the problem of knowledge in psychology. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 14(6), 800-809. doi:10.1177/1359105309338974
- Fabian, J. (2014). Ethnography and intersubjectivity: Loose ends. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 4(1), 199-209.
- Friedman, M. S. (2002). *Martin Buber: The life of dialogue*. Psychology Press.
- Gillespie, A., & Cornish, F. (2010). Intersubjectivity: Towards a dialogical analysis. *Journal for the theory of social behaviour*, 40(1), 19-46.
- Goffman, E. (1959). The moral career of the mental patient. *Psychiatry*, 22(2), 123-142.
- Habermas, J. (n.d.). (2003). Habermas on Benjamin. *Modern Critical Thought*, 232-259. doi:10.1002/9780470756195.ch13
- Hempel, C. G. (1965). *Aspects of scientific explanation* (Vol. 3). New York: Free Press.
- Husserl, E., & Kern, I. (1973). *Zur Phänomenologie der Intersubjektivität. Texte aus dem Nachlass Dritter Teil: 1929–1935*.
- Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A. R. (1966). *Interpersonal perception: a theory and a method of research*.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1976). *Phénoménologie de la perception* (1945). *Librairie Gallimard, Paris (trad. it. Bonomi A., La Fenomenologia della Percezione, 1965, il Saggiatore, Milano)*.
- Markova, I. (2003). Constitution of the self: Intersubjectivity and dialogicality. *Culture & Psychology*, 9(3), 249-259.
- Mori, J., & Hayashi, M. (2006). *The achievement of intersubjectivity through embodied completions: A study of interactions between first and second language speakers*. *Applied linguistics*, 27(2), 195-219.
- Neisser, U. (1978). *Perceiving, anticipating, and imagining*.
- Renedo, A., & Jovchelovitch, S. (2007). Expert knowledge, cognitive polyphasia and health: a study on social representations of homelessness among professionals working in the voluntary sector in London. *Journal of health psychology*, 12(5), 779-790.
- Shafak, E. (2010). *The forty rules of love: A novel of Rumi*. Penguin.
- Shafak, E. (2011). *The forty rules of love*. Penguin UK.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1992). Repair after next turn: The last structurally provided defense of intersubjectivity in conversation. *American journal of sociology*, 97(5), 1295-1345.