The Analysis of Paradoxical Words of Masnavi based on Derrida's Poststructuralist Theory

Ebrahim Rahimi Zangene, PhD[1], Mansour Norouzi Mostaeli[2]

[1]Assistant professor, Razi University, Faculty of Arts, English Department of Persian Literature,
[2]MA student of art and literature – Azad University of Kermanshah.

ABSTRACT

Structuralism and post structuralism school of thought has its root in Binary opposition. Although western thought is based on binary opposition, it is challenged by poststructuralist and the pioneer of this school; Jacques Derrida, a famous French philosopher. In analyzing the paradoxicality of mysticism, the logic which is named deconstruction by Derrida, has the same place as the theory of double location. Therefore, while analyzing the binary oppositions found in Derrida's post structuralism and asserting its similarities with the theory of double location presented by Stace, the study makes an attempt to explain the paradoxical art used by Rumi in mysticism based on these analyses.
KEYWORDS: binary oppositions, structuralism, post structuralism, Derrida, Rumi, Paradox, double location, Stace.

INTRODUCTION

Structuralism

The visible or invisible structure of any work of art is a system in which all the components are unanimously united to build the foundation of the structure of the work of art. This functionality aims to pursue the reflection of meaning that is impossible to convey without the solidarity of a whole system.

The literal structuralism is one of the analytical methods that flourished during 1960s and has its root in structuralistic linguistics. It is clear that using linguistic methods in order to find meaning is common both in literal and all other forms of the social and cultural works. Megdadi asserts:

As one of the outstanding theories of 20th century, in all areas of humanity in general and anthropology and linguistics in particular, Structuralism has proved to be a popular, appealing and efficient method in critical review and analysis. At first the method derived from linguistic theories of Ferdinand de Saussure concerning general rules of language and finding these rules through synchronic studies, hence after spreading among other fields of study" (2000, 313).

The structuralist researchers tried to study binary oppositions in different components of texts. In the early 1960s, the intellectual movement of structuralism emerged with the public awareness. While in one hand, its cultural reputation reminded them of the existentialist movement of the 40s, and on the other hand, with a hostile status against personal and historical issues, it was in complete opposition with existentialism. Existentialism concentrates on an individual subject, hence in structuralism the subject is replaced with unknown structures; existentialism looks for the intentionality of the subject but structuralism focuses on the action and the sample that it has taken as an example. Structuralism emphasizes that meaning is imposed upon the universe by man, no other way round. Human mind is evolutional like language i.e. it enforces the meaning on human beings. Human beings all together make the world based on deep shared structure; however, it brings about so many surface structures as well. Structuralists remind us of linguistic nature of the world. Cognition and truth, which are the integral part of language cannot be disintegrated.

In structural analysis, there seems to be two common methods, which are derived from Saussurian theories of syntagmatic and paradigmatic axis. There have been growing emphases on the distinction between the two axis of language in new literary theories and structural analysis of poetry.

The Russian structuralist and folklorist, Vladimir Prop (1990), has represented the sequential structural analysis (syntagmatic). He has found the basis of the folktales in Russia given their elements and the binary opposition between them. In this type, the structure or formal organization of a folkloristic text is described following the chronological order of the linear sequence of elements in the text.

*Corresponding Author: Ebrahim Rahimi Zangene, PhD, Assistant professor, Razi University, Faculty of Arts, English Department of Persian Literature, Post code: 6714967346 Email: erahimi2009@yahoo.com

Lévi-Strauss – French anthropologist – is the champion of polarimetric analysis of language (paradigmatic). In this method, polar opposition makes the foundation of components' analysis. In fact, Lévi-Strauss's position essentially asserts that linear sequential structure is nothing but apparent or manifest content, whereas the paradigmatic or schematic structure is the more important latent content (ibid).

Binary opposition

Binary oppositions make the groundwork for the schools of structuralism and post structuralism. Not being an accidental phenomenon, they exist in all the natural elements of the universe, for the solidarity of this world is based upon this dual function; i.e. binary oppositions. ''In English binary is indications of duality, likewise two stars next to each other are called binary stars''. (Gaddon, 1999, 82) ''The term was first announced by the linguist, Nikolai Trubetzkoy''. (Ahmadi, 1993, 398), and he considered the principle the main basis for the values that are rooted in cultural history. What is more, the term is counted as one of the key concepts of linguistics, semiotics, and theories of criticism. Generally, identity has always ruled the world, so it is natural to see it gives meaning to the focus and hierarchy. Because life without identity becomes unstable, we cannot imagine living in the absence of identity.

The western scientific philosophy of thought is based upon the aforementioned polaric principle; the idea that is changed into a real issue, hence after. Lies/truth, good/bad, male/female, life/death, body/soul…are examples of binary oppositions in which there has always been a reference on one side, and not-reference on the other side. In fact, truth is preferred to lies, male to female, life to death, and soul to body; in other words, the presence of one brings about the absence of the other. Though, it may be considered that one of the two poles is incomplete and imperfect without the other. The question is which one has the lead role and which one is marginal. Until 19th century, the taken for granted primary matter gave meaning to the other, and the latter's existence depended on the former; as a consequence the primary matter always had dominance on the secondary one.

According to Strauss:

> Since thought is based on binary propositions, it seems that in order to gain experience, the simplest way is to divide it by two, again each is divided by two. In other words, each question is rearranged such that two possible answer remains: yes or no. (a discussion with Strauss, translated by Shahram Khosravi, 1995, 14).

So as to clarify his viewpoint, Strauss talks about the Cobra and his yes/no response to nature. Because of its body structure, when feeling danger before the enemy, the animal takes two different defensive positions; at first it shows his body surface to attract the enemy and then turns around like a blade toward it to ward off the attack.

Jacobson asserts that: "binary oppositions are inherent in language. In fact the primary act of language learnt by children is to know these oppositions; i.e. the most natural and concise mystery''. (J1998, 47) In this regard, he argues: "we recognize phonemes through unconscious use of distinct phonemes and their similar counterparts" (qtd. in Selden, 1996, 13). As impressed with Jacobson, Strauss comes to this belief that binary opposition is the most prominent application of the collective mind of human. In his opinion, our legendary ancestors because of the limited knowledge try to make an understanding of the outer world through these binary oppositions. Thus, ''the structure of human mind has based upon the opposition'' (Bertens, 2005, 77). As a result, Strauss "impressed structuralist with this general concept to exert on their viewpoint; hence you may find the traces of binary oppositions in the work of lots of structuralists, especially novelists. Barthes believes "binary opposition is the most fundamental concept in structuralism" (1991, 15).

Binary opposition in post structuralism

The term binary opposition plays a significant role in post structuralism, particularly in Derrida's theory of deconstruction though with different outlooks. With the great intellectual revolution in western countries in 1960, binary opposition underwent fundamental changes in its concept. Derrida's starting criticism on the Western metaphysics is that the scientific-philosophic thoughts have always been locked up in the dark dungeon of the elements of binary oppositions. The metaphysical thoughts have never managed to free themselves from the dark dungeon of this imprisonment: bad/good, non-existence/existence, absence/presence, soul/body, death/life and etc…. these two sides have never been able to stand alone "on their own". The main point is that, duality is not only based upon the opposition, but also one of the two sides is considered the deconstructed form of the other, whether covert or overt. To put it in another way, each pole is inserted in hierarchical structure in which the upper one has more value than the lower. Definite structure, proposed by the post structuralists for binary oppositions, has been criticized to some extent.

Jacques Derrida is one of the greatest French post sructuralists, scientist and philosopher, who has proposed new era to take a new view of binary opposition with his encyclopedic knowledge.

There are two distinct theories that arise from Derrida's way of thinking and turns around binary oppositions. First, his criticism about metaphysical opposition has left some people with the idea that he has inverted the opposition so as to bring the lower pole to a higher status. Therefore, he has been considered the advocate of negation , just because in his view, there is no opposition between proof and negation, or absence and presence. What is more, he seems to be skeptic toward unity and originality. He believes the relation between estrangement and generality is in no way contrastive and again he is advocating the indisputable "free game of signs", meanwhile he is questioning the distinction between sign and signifier, as well as immediacy and intermediacy. Lots of philosophers apply the above mentioned oppositions on the both sides, and accordingly, they believe ''Derrida to be a nihilist, anti-politic scientist, or even immature person'' (Nojoumiyan, 2003, 120-121). In the second theory it is claimed that both sides of the oppositions are of the same value to evade the critical analysis of the philosophers. These critics asserted that, ''with making use of contrastive and irrational propositions, Derrida tries to get close to the sophistic language. At last, deconstruction is supposed not to be a philosophical matter, only because it departs from scientific aspects of empirical methodology and positivism'' (ibid).

Douglas Atkins, in his article "*Partial* Stories: Hebraic and *Christian Thinking in the Wake of Deconstruction*" has asserted that we always have a great tendency to think of "either this or that", the reasoning which is called "non-contrastive principle". The implication is that "nothing can be both itself and its contrary at the same time" (1983, 17). Deconstruction is grounded in analyzing paradoxes i.e. "either this or that" reasoning. What Derrida proposes here is that, the subject (i.e. paradoxical reasoning) has always been of utmost important is his works (Derrida, 1979). He has always used phrases like "on one hand" or "on the other hand" in a way that the latter negates the former so the paradox remains, while the two sides are active at the same time. Barbara Johnson, the translator of Derrida's "Generative Meaning" speaks of this

> "no less than a revolution in meaning". She also poses that "the complementary logic disarranges the order found in bipolar metaphysical opposition. In that case, we are faced with the proposition "A is both a complement of B and the substitute of B" instead of "A is contrary to B" so "they are not any more the same or opposite sides of each other" (1993, xvii).

In this sense Derrida has employed terms to use binary opposition in a way that pushes upside down what has shaded on western philosophical history for a long time. Terms like P*harmakon* and *Difference* are among such noticeable terms.

Derrida has borrowed the term, P*harmakon*, from Plato which means both poison and medicine. Before starting we may find out how he has set it free from contrastive logic. "Pharmakon is neither poison nor remedy, neither good nor bad, neither in nor out, neither said or written" (Derrida, 1987, 43). The second term is *Difference*. It implies both overcome to "classic opposition between different types and different degrees. *Difference* refers to both kinds of opposition i.e. it is neither this nor that, yet *Difference* is a *distinction* (separation, otherness, inconsistency), as well as the possibility and obligation of other similar existence (restatement, resignation, implication, difference and indifference, with and without (dialectic)) (Derrida, 1987).

Accordingly, Derridian contrastive logic known as "deconstruction" unlike what other critics believe does not seek to replace the opposite side or to put their status upside down. As quoted by Derrida "deconstruction is not to ignore dominant values in this area (values such as reality etc)" (1988, 137). Deconstruction is not replacement yet it is the implication of wandering. Consequently, the purpose behind Derrida's paradoxical reasoning is not to change the sides of opposition but to disseminate the nature of duality.

Derrida's logic of deconstruction is a relation between two opposite sides where each pole depends on and at the same time dissolves within the other. According to what was said we may claim that using paradox in Derrida's writing as a device "is an accepted formula in many religious mysticism, where forms of expression are considered complementary and apparently contradictory" (Ellis, 1989, 7-8).

Binary opposition in mysticism

Historically, either in east or west, paradoxical devices have been an outstanding feature in mysticism because "The entire body of the world's mystical literature warns us that between mysticism and reason, there is some relation which is quite unique in the sense that no other body of thought or experience claims to stand in a like relation to reason. A common statement is that mysticism is above reason" (Stace, 2008). In order to indicate the nature of paradoxicality of mysticism and its relation with logic, Stace has presented some theories among which, the theory of double location is in accordance with Derrida's school of thought, since according to this theory: "To speak of one and the same thing as being simultaneously both square and circular is a contradiction. But the contradiction gets away if we can point out that the predicate 'square' and the predicate 'circular' in reality attach to two different objects or to two different aspects of the same object. For instance, in the vacuum-plenum paradox,

perhaps the two predicates, vacuity and fullness, instead of being simply located in one and the same object, may in reality be double located – one in one object and one in another. If so, the contradiction disappears (ibid). Presumably, most of the mysterious mystical discussions are accepted just in the ground work of mystical paradoxes. The purgatorial existence of human being consists of the integration of this and the other world i.e. spiritual and the mundane world, which is emanated through body and soul and their opposition makes the bases of mystical paradoxes in Rumi's belief. Seven hundreds year ago, he applied the theory of double location in his mystical analysis:

<div dir="rtl">

چون جهت شد مختلف نسبت دو تاست   نفی آن یک چیز و اثباتش رواست

نفی و اثبات است و هردو مثبت است   ما رمیت اذ رمیت از نسبت است

تو نه افکندی که قوت حق نمود   آن تو افکندی چو بر دست تو بود

این دو نسبت نفی و اثباتش رواست   مشت مشت توستت و افکندن زماست

که بدانی و ندانی روح را   هم به نسبت گیر این مفتوح را

</div>

It is possible to deny and affirm the same thing: when the point of view is different, the relation is twofold.

(The text) thou didst not throw when thou threwest is relative: it is negation and affirmation: both are authorized.

Thou threwest that (gravel), since it was on thy hand; thou didst not throw, for God manifested (His) power.

"(O Mohammed), the handful is thy handful, and the throwing is from Me": on account of these two relations (both) the denial and the affirmation of it (the throwing) are right.

Regard also as (explicable) by means of relation this (subject) which was opened (above), (namely) that you know and do not know Noah.

(Molavi, 1998, 3658-68/3-henceforth Masnavi)

Now to explain the point in mystical paradoxes, through classification its types as the following, you will see examples extracted from Masnavi.

Pantheistic paradox

Actually, pantheistic paradox explains the uniformity and differentiation of existence to God; God is identical to existence, and it is believed that the whole existence is the reflection of God, at the same time, it is believed that He is different from this tangible existence in a way that His true nature is hidden from all beings and nobody knows anything of His real essence.

<div dir="rtl">

تو وجود مطلقی فانی‌نما   ما عدمهاییم و هستیهای ما

حمله‌شان از باد باشد دمبدم   ما همه شیران ولی شیر علم

آنک ناپیداست هرگز گم مباد   حمله شان پیداست و ناپیداست باد

هستی ما جمله از ایجاد تست   باد ما و بود ما از داد تست

عاشق خود کرده بودی نیست را   لذت هستی نمودی نیست را

</div>

We and our existences are really non-existences: thou art the absolute Being which manifests the perishable (causes phenomena to appear).

We all are lions, but lions on a banner: because of the wind they are rushing onward from moment to moment.

Their onward rush is visible, and the wind is unseen: may that which is unseen not fail from us!

Our wind and our being are of thy gift; our whole existence is from thy bringing (us) into being.

Thou didst show the delightfulness of Being unto not-being, (after) thou hadst caused not-being to fall in love with thee. (602-606/1, Masnavi)

As regards with Rumi's viewpoint, determined nature of human beings counter to divine and plane essence of God is glaringly described with terms like non-existence, existence, lions on banner, and wind as to indicate the material and spiritual world in his view. Seeing that, what is visible is unable to bring anything into Being while what is unseen may bring things into Being. Rumi has beautifully indicated the point by allegorical use of the word "light" in his poetry. Seemingly, each of the ten lamps has the light of their own yet they are all the same in essence and you cannot distinguish each from the other. Hence, in his opinion, unity is like a treasure that is hidden under the visible world of Being:

<div dir="rtl">

هر یکی باشد بصورت غیر آن   ده چراغ ار حاضر آید در مکان

چون به نورش روی آری بی‌شکی   فرق نتوان کرد نور هر یکی

صد نماند یک شود چون بفشری   گر تو صد سیب و صد آبی بشمری

تا ببینی زیر او وحدت چو گنج   صورت سرکش گذاران کن برنج

</div>

If ten lamps are present in one place, each differs in form from another
To distinguish without any doubt the light of each, when you turn your face towards their light, is impossible
If you count hundred apples or a hundred quinces, they do not remain a hundred (but) become one, when you crush them together
Make headstrong from waste away with tribulation, that beneath it you may descry unity, like a buried treasure
(678-81/1, Masnavi)
Or:

<div dir="rtl">

پنهان ز دیده ها و همه دیده ها ز اوست   آن آشکار صنعت پنهانم آرزوست

</div>

Hidden from every eye, and all things seen are from Him, that hidden One manifest in works is my desire.
(441, Divan-e Shams)

In another situation, by making use of numbers, he has vividly described the mysterious aspect of pantheism:

<div dir="rtl">

ما همه چون یکیم بی من و تو   پس خمش باش این سخن با کیست

</div>

(498, Divan-e Shams)

<div dir="rtl">

مستان خدا گرچه هزارند یکی اند   مستان هوا جمله دوگانه ست و سه گانه

</div>

Though God's drunkards are thousands, yet they are one; the drunkards of lust are all double and treble.
(332, Divan-e Shams)

> According to Stace:
> when I think of the Supreme Being as [inactive]- neither creating nor preserving, nor destroying- I call him Brahman…the Impersonal God. When I think of Him as active – creating, preserving, destroying – I call Him Sakti, or Maya, or Prakriti, the Personal God. But the distinction between them does not mean a difference. The personal and impersonal are the same thing. It is impossible to conceive one without the other. (2005, 167)

Death/survival paradox

The implication behind death and survival paradox refers to perishing person's identity, at the time of his survival. The wise man, Allama Rumi, believed in order to achieve the real self, eternal living and "survival", the human being, i.e. human soul, should be naught.

<div dir="rtl">

هیچ کس را تا نگردد او فنا   نیست ره در بارگاه کبریا

</div>

There is no way (admittance) for any one, till he become naughted, into the audience-chamber of (Divine) Majesty.
(232/6, Masnavi)

<div dir="rtl">

در باغ فنا درآ و بنگر   در جان بقای خویش جنات

</div>

(378, Divan-e Shams)

By virtue of the theory of double location, Rumi has destructed the opposition between death and survival for he argued that man should get rid of his personal attributes to attain real eternity. Actually, the logic implies reaching survival after death just through the theory of double location which is in line with Derrida's logic concerning paradoxicality.

<div dir="rtl">

گفت قایل در جهان درویش نیست   ور بود درویش آن درویش نیست
هست از روی بقای ذات او   نیست گشته وصف او و در وصف هو
چون زبانه‌ی شمع پیش آفتاب   نیست باشد هست باشد در حساب
هست باشد ذات او تا تو اگر   بر نهی پنبه بسوزد ز آن شرر
نیست باشد روشنی ندهد ترا   کرده باشد آفتاب او را فنا

</div>

The speaker said "There is no dervish in the world; and if there be a dervish, that dervish is (really) non-existent."
He exists in respect of the survival of his essence, (but) his attributes have become non-existent in the attributes of Him (God).
Like the flame of a candle in the presence of the sun, he is (really) non-existent, (though he is) existent in (formal) calculation.
Its (the flame's) essence is existent, so that, if you put cotton upon it, it (the cotton) will be consumed by the sparks;
(But) it is (really) non-existent: it gives you no light: the sun will have naughted it. (3669-74/3, Masnavi)

Established upon binary opposition proposed by Derrida in post structuralism, we can analyze death and survival opposition in the above verses.

The emphasis in these paradoxes has been dissolving within God's attribute in order to attain divine nature. Therefore, the so called vanishing individuality paradox may refer to "perishing" individual's identity while preserving it.

<div dir="rtl">

آب کوزه چون در آب جو شود   محو گردد در وی جو او شود

وصف او فانی شد و ذاتش بقا   زین سپس نه کم شود نه بدلقا

</div>

When the water in the jug goes into the river-water, it disappears in it, and it becomes the river.

His (the lover's) attributes have passed away, and his essence remains: after this, he does not dwindle or become ill-favored.

(3913-14/3, Masnavi)

In the above analogy, while comparing human existence to water in the jug and the nature of being to river-water, Rumi has beautifully described perishing human traits in God's essence, owing to the fact that a mystic would reach the status that brings him spirituality by progressing in the annihilation and revocation of surplus Being and there remains no sensual aspects to separate him from truth (Haeri and Rahimi, 2009).

<div dir="rtl">

کانَ لله دادنِ آن حــــــبه است   تا که کان الله لَه آیــــــد به دست

زآنک این هوی ضعیف بی‌قرار   هست شد زان هوی رب پایدار

همچو قطرهٔ خایف از باد و ز خاک   که فنا گردد بدین هر دو هلاک

چون به اصل خود که دریا بود جست   از تف خورشید و باد و خاک رست

ظاهرش گم گشت در دریا و لیک   ذات او معصوم و پا بر جا و نیک

</div>

Kána lilláh is the giving of that groat, in order that *kána 'lláh lahú* may come into (thy) hand;

For this weak unstable *hú* (personality) was brought into being by the steadfast (permanent) *hú* of the Lord.

('Tis) like a drop of water (which is) afraid of wind (air) and earth; for by means of these twain it is made to pass away (and perish).

When it has leaped (thrown itself) into the sea, which was its source, it is delivered from the heat of the sun and from wind and earth.

Its outward form has disappeared in the sea, but its essence is inviolate and permanent and goodly.

(2614-18/4, Masnavi)

In the above verses, the weak unstable *hú,* , actually refers to sensual aspect of one's self that has passed through annihilation stages so as to reach his spiritual self with a divine emanation in the presence of eternal Being like a drop that joins sea in order to get dissolved within it. When it is alone, the existence of a drop may be in danger encountering soil, wind, and sun but at the moment it joins sea, disappears in it yet its essence still remains. It is exactly the same in the individuality of the individual ,which exists in its annihilation.

<div dir="rtl">

برگ بی برگی تو را چون برگ شد   جان باقی یافتی و مرگ شد

</div>

When the provision of unprovidedness has become your provision, you have gained life everlasting and death is gone

(1378/2, Masnavi)

Here the poet has beautifully used the term "provision of unprovidedness" in referring to provisions and preparations that bestows eternal Being to mystic and get him free of death. As discussed in the following, negation of individual's "I" is along with unveiling the everlasting Being:

<div dir="rtl">

چون انای بند لا شد از وجود   پس چه ماند؟ تو بیندیش ای جحود

گر تو را چشمی است بگشا در نگر   بعد لا آخر چه ماند دگر

</div>

When a man's 'I' is negated (and eliminated) from existence, then what remains? Consider, O denier.

If you have an eye, open it and look! After '*not*,' why, what else remains?

(2096-97/6, Masnavi)

Again in other verses, he has added that the best of beings are the non-existent. In fact, it is a beautiful interpretation of true survival i.e. death and survival paradox:

گفت مغلوب تو بودم مست تو   دست من بر بسته بود از دست تو

این چنین معدوم کو از خویش رفت   بهترین هستها افتاد و زفت

او به نسبت با صفات حق فناست   در حقیقت در فنا او را بقاست

He (David) said, "I was overpowered by Thee, drunken with Thee: my hand (power) was tied up by Thy hand.
Such a non-existent one who hath gone from himself (become selfless) is the best of beings, and the great (one among them).
He hath passed away (*faná*) in relation to (the passing away of his attributes in) the Divine attributes, (but) in passing away (from selfhood) he really hath the life everlasting (*baqá*). (395-98/4, Masnavi)

Amongst other subjects related to paradox in Rumi's poetry are the provision of leaflessness, the death of deathlessness, or being as you see in the following:

برگ بی برگی نشان عارفی است زردی زر، سرخ رویی صارفی است

The provision of leaflessness (spiritual poverty) is the sign of being a Gnostic; they yellowness of gold is the (cause of the) money-changer's ruddiness of face (cheerful countenance). (2055/4)

مرگ بی مرگی بود ما را حلال   برگ بی برگی بود ما را نوال

The death of deathlessness is lawful to us, the provision of unprovidedness is a bounty to us. (3927/1)

پیش هست او بباید نیست بود   چیست هستی پیش او کور و کبود

It behoves (us) to be not-being in the presence of His Being, in His presence what is (our) being? Blind and blue (518/1)

لذت هستی نمودی نیست را   عاشق خود کرده بودی نیست را

Thou didst show the delightfulness of Being unto not-being (after) thou hadst caused not-being to fall in love with thee. (606/1, Masnavi)

According to this verse, Rumi believed Being comes through not-being which reflects clearly the paradoxical aspect of his thought regarding existence. There you may still read:

نک جهان نیست شکل هست ذات و آن جهان شکل هست بی ثبات

Lo, (it is) a world apparently non-existent (but) essentially existent, while that other world is apparently existent (but) has no permanence. (795/1, Masnavi)
Or:

نیست را بنودی هست و محتشم   هست را بنمودی بر شکل عدم

He (God) hath caused the non-existent to appear existent and magnificent; He hath caused the existent to appear in the form of non-existence. (1026/5, Masnavi)

In Book III, Rumi has expressed in a paradoxical way that his death is integrated in his life:

آزمودم مرگ من در زندگی است   چون رهم زین زندگی پایندگی است

اقتلونی اقتلونی یا ثقات   ان فی قتلی حیاتاً فی حیات

I have tried it: my death is (consists) in life: when I escape from this life, 'tis to endure forever.
"Kill me; kill me, O trusty friends! Lo, in my being killed is life on life." (3838-39/3, Masnavi)

In his belief, death is a way to salvation and true Being. Of course, in his view, sensual death and getting rid of darkness of soul is an integral part of humanity.

مرده است از خود، شد زنده به رب   زان بود اسرار حقش در دو لب

مردن تن زین ریاضت زندگی است   رنج این تن روح را پایندگی است

He has died to self and become living through the Lord: hence the mysteries of God are on his lips.
The death of the body in self-discipline is life: the sufferings of this body are (the cause of) everlastingness to the spirit. (3364-65/3, Masnavi)

Rumi, in the following verse, has argued that at the time I come to this understanding that my Being is in not-being, I will know that I really am; at this level I am actually non-existent so it is the time that I will prove my Being. This paradoxical logic actually consist Derrida'a accepted theory that allows neither/nor as well as both/and.

چه دانم نیستم هستم؟ ولیکن این مایه می دانم: چه هستم نیستم ای جان، ولی چو نیستم هستم

I don't know if I am non-existence while I exist but I know for sure, when I am, I am not but when I am not then I am (1419, Divan-e Shams)

Conclusion

One of the most important concepts in structuralism and even post-structuralism is the term binary opposition. The consistency of the world seems to be based upon this phenomenon that has left traces in all the natural components. This polaric principle that made the basis of the western scientific-philosophical thought was a dominant school until 19th century, which showed that one side always plays the role of reference and the other is not-reference as well, in other words each negates the existence of the other. However, a French philosopher, Jacques Derrida, fore-frontier of post-structuralism, has left progressive changes in the western post structuralism. The great philosopher posed a new idea known as "deconstruction" in order to link both sides of opposition in a way that each pole complements the other.

Derrida's new idea reminds us of the mystical paradoxes i.e. Derridian paradoxical logic known as deconstruction is in line with the theory of double location, proposed by Stace. This study tried to show that 700 years earlier, Rumi beautifully described in Masnavi what was introduced later on through the Stace's theory of double location.

REFERENCES

Atkins, Douglas G, (1983) "Partial stovaic and Christian thinking in the wake of deconstruction" Religion and Literature 19(3): 7-21

Barthes, Roland. (1991). Semiotic elements, (Trans. Majid Mohammadi). Tehran: Almahdi Publications.

Derrida, Jacques. (1979) Living on Border Lines in Deconstruction and Criticism, (Edition; Harold Bloom). London: Routledge.

_____ (1988) limited INC, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Derrida Jacques .(1987)"Some Questions and Responses" in the Linguistic of Writing : Arguments between Language and Literature, (Edition; Nigel Fobb, Derek Alan Durant and Colin Maccabe). Manchester: Manchester University Press

_____, (1997), Politics of Friendship. (Trans. George Calins). London and New: Verso

Guddon, J.A (1999) A Dictionary of Literary Terms. 4th edition. New York. New York University Press.

Haeri, Mohammad Hassan, & Rahimi Zangene, Ebrahim. (2009). Theoretical basis of mystical paradoxes in Rumi viewpoint. Tehran: Allame University.

Johnson, Barbara (1993) Translators' Introduction. London: Athlone Press.

Meghdadi, Bahram.(2000). An Encyclopedia of Literary Theory: From Plato to the Present.1st edition.Tehran: Fekr-e Rooz Publication.

Molavi, Jalal al-din Mohamad Balkhi. (1998). Masnavi Ma'navi,(Edition, Abdol-karim Soroush), 5th edition. Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Press.

_____,(1991). Koliyat-e Shams, (Edition; Jalal al-din Homaii), 9th edition. Tehran: Safi Ali Shah Publications.

Nojoumian, Amir Ali. (2003). Paradoxical Logic of Jaques Derrida. Tehran: Shahid Beheshti University Press.

Okhovat, Ahmad. (1992), Ancient Grammar, Isfehan: Farda.

Prop, Vladimir. (1989). Morphology of the folktale, (Trans. Fereidoun Badreii). 1st edition. Tehran:Tous publications.

Pour Namdarian, Taghi. (2001). In the Shadow of the Sun, 1st eidition. Tehran: Sokhan Publications.

Selden, Raman, & Widdowson, Peter. (1997). Contemporary literary theory. A Discussion with Lévi-Strauss, (Trans. Shahram Khosravi). Tehran: Markaz Publications.

Stace.W.T, (2005). Mysticism and philosophy, Translation of Khoramshahi. 6th edition. Tehran: Soroush Publications.