# 20
# RUMI LESSONS
## FOR THE MODERN SOUL

*Love, Ego, and the Search for Meaning*

**Dr. Sam Irani**

ELSEWHERE
publishing house
There is a world elsewhere

**Published by Elsewhere Publishing House**
First Edition: 2026
Author: Dr. Sam Irani

ELSEWHERE
publishing house
There is a world elsewhere

*To my dad,*
*who filled my world with books,*
*and his quiet library in the heart of our old home.*

# Table of Contents

# Before We Begin

## Introduction

There are some books we read, and some voices we end up living with.

For as long as I can remember, the voice of Mowlana Jalaluddin Mohammad Balkhi — known to many readers in the West as Rumi — has been one of those voices for me. Not as a distant literary figure, but as something present in everyday life. His words appeared in family conversations, in old books passed between hands, in moments when ordinary language was not enough to hold what people were feeling.

I grew up in Iran, where his poetry is not something you "discover" later in life. It is already there, quietly woven into the background of how people speak about love, loss, longing, and meaning. Long before I understood what he was saying, I recognised the tone of it.

Later, I returned to him as a reader rather than an inheritor. And what surprised me was not his beauty — that I already knew — but his precision. The way he describes inner states that still feel immediately recognisable today: attachment, fear, longing, ego, and the quiet instability of being human.

The world he lived in was entirely different from ours. Yet beneath that difference, the same patterns remain. The need to be seen. The fear of loss. The confusion between love and

possession. The search for something stable inside an unstable self.

This is not a book about Rumi as a historical figure, and it is not an academic study of Persian literature. It is an attempt to listen to his work as something alive — and to place it in conversation with the emotional reality of modern life.

Each chapter begins with a pattern I recognise from today's world — often in relationships, identity, or the mind's constant attempt to secure certainty — and then turns toward what Mowlana's poetry might offer in response. Not as instruction, and not as self-help, but as a different way of seeing.

A brief note is also necessary about the name he is known by.

Mowlana was born in Balkh, in a region that is part of present-day Afghanistan. He later lived much of his life in Konya, in present-day Turkey. His poetry, however, was written in Persian, and belongs to the long and continuous tradition of Persian literature.

Different cultures have found a connection to him across time, and perhaps that is part of why his voice has endured. His work does not belong to one geography alone, even though it has a clear linguistic and literary home.

I write from my own place within this tradition — as an Iranian reader who grew up with these poems as part of everyday language, and who later returned to them with new questions shaped by modern life.

The intention of this book is simple.

Not to explain him away. Not to modernise him. But to sit with his words long enough for something to become clearer — about love, about ego, about meaning, and about the parts of ourselves that do not change as quickly as the world around us.

What follows are twenty lessons.

Each one is an attempt to listen more closely.

***Sam Irani***

**A note on reading:** each lesson is self-contained. You can read sequentially for momentum, or open to any chapter that calls to you. The book is not a program. It is a conversation you can enter at any point.

# Part I:
## Love

# Lesson One:
# Love Is Not Possession

## Why We Try to Own What We Love

Most people think love begins with finding someone. Rumi's great discovery was that love often begins when you realise you cannot keep them.

There is a particular kind of love that exhausts itself trying to hold on.

I have felt it. Most of us have. The version of love that watches, checks, calculates. That needs to know where the beloved is at eleven on a Tuesday. That feels a quiet panic when the other person laughs too warmly at someone else's joke. That disguises control as care, and calls jealousy by the prettier name of devotion.

This love is not false. It is real in its longing, real in its fear. But it is love that has been infected by something older and more frightened than love itself. It has confused possession with closeness.

Rumi knew this confusion intimately. He had loved Shams of Tabriz with an intensity that shook the foundations of his life — his teaching, his writing, his sense of who he was. And then Shams disappeared. Twice. The second time, perhaps permanently.

What Rumi discovered in the wreckage of that loss was not bitterness. It was something more radical: that the love had

never belonged to him in the first place. That he had never, in any meaningful sense, had Shams. And that this was not a failure of the relationship. It was its deepest truth.

> *"I have lived on the lip of insanity, wanting to know reasons, knocking on a door. It opens. I have been knocking from the inside."*

The door he had been knocking on — desperately, obsessively — was already open. The wanting to possess understanding, to possess the beloved, to possess love itself was the very thing creating the sensation of being locked out.

Modern love has a possession problem. We speak of relationships using the language of ownership almost without noticing. My partner. My person. The grammar is innocent enough. But beneath it runs a deeper current — the belief that loving someone means securing them. Containing them. Making them yours in a way that forecloses the possibility of loss.

This is not entirely our fault. We live in a culture that treats almost everything — including people — as something to be acquired and maintained. We optimize, invest, protect. And love, despite being one of the last things in modern life that resists optimization, gets pulled into the same framework.

The result is love that is exhausting for both people. The one who controls lives in permanent low-level anxiety — always monitoring, always managing the edges to prevent the loss they cannot bear imagining. The one who is controlled slowly disappears, not from the relationship but within it, as the space

for their own inner life contracts. And the strangest part: the tighter the grip, the faster the connection drains away. Because genuine intimacy cannot be forced. It can only be invited.

Rumi had a word for the frightened self that grasps: the nafs. The ego-layer that confuses what it needs with what it loves. The part of us that says I love you and means, at least partly, I need you to stay exactly as you are so I don't have to feel the fear underneath.

But he also showed what love looks like when it has been freed from the ego's agenda. And what it looks like is startlingly different.

> *"Lovers don't finally meet somewhere. They're in each other all along."*

This is not a romantic sentiment. It is a philosophical claim. Two people who truly meet do not do so by possessing each other. They do so by recognising, in the other, something that was already present in themselves. The beloved is a mirror. And what the mirror shows is not the other person's face — it is the face of your own deepest nature, reflected back.

You cannot own a mirror. You can only look into it.

I spent years trying to understand the difference between love and attachment. They feel identical from the inside — same heat, same pull, same sense that this person must not be allowed to change or leave. What I eventually found — slowly, through loss more than through insight — was that attachment has fear underneath it. Love, when it is genuine, does not have

that quality. Love wants the beloved to flourish. Attachment wants the beloved to stay. These are not always the same thing.

The person who loves you fully is glad when you grow, even if that growth takes you somewhere they cannot follow. The person who is attached experiences your growth as a threat, even when they would never say so, even when they don't know it themselves.

When we stop trying to possess the people we love — when we hold them more lightly, with more genuine curiosity about who they actually are — something changes. There is space to breathe. The other person, feeling less contained, often moves closer. Because the one thing that drives people toward real intimacy is the sense that they are safe to be themselves. Control produces the very distance it is designed to prevent.

This is what Rumi understood: that love's highest form is not about securing the beloved but about offering them freedom. Not the freedom of indifference — not I don't care what you do. But the freedom of genuine regard: I see who you are, and I want you to become more fully that, even if it costs me something.

This kind of love requires a self that is not entirely dependent on the other for its sense of wholeness. A self that can be alone without feeling erased. A self that trusts its own inner life enough not to need the beloved to provide it. In other words: the path to free love runs through the interior. Not through the other person. Through yourself.

The reed cries, but it does not try to return to the reed bed by force. It does not attach itself to another reed and demand that it substitute for what was lost. It sings. It lets the longing be what it is, and in that letting, it becomes the instrument it was always meant to be. That is the whole teaching, in one image. Everything that follows is commentary.

## A Small Practice

Think of a relationship where you notice the quality of holding on. Not as judgment — as observation.

*Ask yourself: What am I afraid would happen if I held this person more lightly?*

Sit with what comes up. You are not trying to detach. You are trying to understand what the attachment is protecting you from feeling. That feeling is the real starting point.

# Lesson Two:
# Stop Looking for Someone to Complete You

## The Loneliness Beneath Romantic Fantasy

We have built an entire culture around the idea that somewhere out there is a person who will make us whole.

The soulmate. The one. The person who gets you in a way no one else does, who fills the particular shape of emptiness you carry, who will finally make the loneliness stop. Romantic comedies are structured around this premise. Dating apps are designed for it. The self-help industry has repackaged it in slightly more sophisticated language — your person, conscious partnership, aligned energy — but the underlying belief is the same: you are incomplete, and the right relationship will complete you.

Rumi would have found this both understandable and wrong.

Understandable, because the longing it describes is real. There is a genuine ache in the human experience — a sense of something missing, something that the world as encountered never quite satisfies. Rumi felt it acutely. His entire body of work is, in some sense, a sustained meditation on longing.

Wrong, because he traced that longing to a different source entirely — and identified a different destination.

> *"Out beyond ideas of wrongdoing and rightdoing, there is a field. I'll meet you there. When the soul lies down in that grass, the world is too full to talk about."*

The field is not another person. It is not a relationship. It is a state of being — a quality of presence and openness — that no partner can provide and no partner can take away. The meeting Rumi describes happens when two people who have each already arrived somewhere real encounter each other in that reality. It is not completion. It is recognition.

The distinction matters enormously in practice. When you enter a relationship seeking completion, you are placing on another person a burden they were never designed to carry. They must be your mirror, your therapist, your best friend, your adventure partner, your emotional home. When they inevitably fail at one of these — because they are a person, not a project designed to your specifications — you experience it as betrayal, incompatibility, proof that this is not the right one. And the search continues.

I have watched this pattern play out in people I know well, including myself. The person who has not done the work of building an inner life will always feel incomplete, regardless of who they are with. They will choose partners based on how well those partners fill the gap. And when the filling stops — when the partner goes through their own difficult season and can no longer perform the function of completion — the relationship feels like it has failed.

It hasn't failed. It has simply revealed what it was built on.

Rumi's image for genuine love is instructive: two lamps, each burning from its own source, placed near each other so that the light mingles. Not one lamp trying to borrow fire from another.