Chapter 4

Anna Karenina Motif

The influence exercised by Russian novelists, particularly Leo Tolstoy, on the creative development of D. H. Lawrence and T. Jayakanthan is so immense that it cannot be ignored in a comparative analysis of this kind. Their artistic response to Tolstoy’s presentation of man-woman relationship in Anna Karenina, has provoked them to analyze Tolstoy’s view and recreate through their works the kind of relationship they feel ideal. Thus D. H. Lawrence’s The Rainbow and Lady Chatterley’s Lover and T. Jayakanthan’s Parisiku Pō, though primarily concerned with the relationship between man and woman, can also be analyzed as the artistic recreations or “creative extensions and corrections” (Zytaruk 96) of Tolstoy’s observations on this relationship.

The influence exerted by Tolstoy on Lawrence has been pointed out by many critics and striking parallels have also been drawn between the Russian novelist and D. H. Lawrence in their attitude to certain aspects of life and art. Pointing out the many resemblances between Tolstoy and Lawrence, David Garnett observes that “In their vitality, their astonishing understanding of women, their attitude toward science and toward the greatest works of art and towards other artists, […] in their desire to change the world and to withdraw from it, in all these and many other ways there is a curious parallelism between them” (142). Commenting on the influence of Tolstoy on Lawrence, F. R. Leavis remarks that “Lawrence can be seen as a direct descendant of Tolstoy” (qtd. in Zytaruk, 65). Zytaruk is also of the opinion that “it is difficult to find another writer whom Lawrence resembles most” (64). Raymond Williams in
his article “Lawrence and Tolstoy” subscribes to the importance exercised by Tolstoy on Lawrence, and identifies close similarities between their works and declares that “Once we are given the beginning of the thread, we are surprised how far it leads us, especially from Anna Karenina to The Rainbow, St Mawr and Lady Chatterley’s Lover” (qtd. in Zytaruk 69). He even feels that Lawrence’s heroines are all in some measure Anna Kareninas who have the courage to pursue their own fulfilments, but who, unlike Anna choose life instead of death.

Jayakanthan, like Lawrence is a great admirer of Russian novelists and has been immensely inspired and influenced by Tolstoy. He admits in his preface to Immathuku Appāl - a book he has written on Tolstoy, that of all the Russian novelists, he has been particularly attracted and influenced by Tolstoy. In this work he gives expression to Tolstoy’s greatness and his attraction to Indian thought and philosophy, and also points out that this Russian writer has been “very much interested, inspired and influenced by India, Indian literature and Hinduism and definitely there is no other European writer before or after Tolstoy, who has had so much involvement, eagerness and enthusiasm in these matters as Tolstoy” (11). As in Lawrence, many parallels can be seen between Tolstoy and Jayakanthan in their attitude to life. K. Chellapan in his article “Jayakanthanin Punithangalil Kilaku Merku Sangamum”, traces close similarities between Tolstoy’s Resurrection and Jayakanthan’s Cilla Nerangalil Cilla Manithargal.

Lawrence and Jayakanthan have been highly influenced by Anna Karenina, one of the world’s most powerful and popular novels of love, sex and marriage. In the beginning, Lawrence is full of admiration for Tolstoy and he considers War and
Peace and Anna Karenina as among the greatest books that have ever been written. But later this admiration changes and he feels that Tolstoy has miserably failed as a writer to give “strength and encouragement by expressing the vision of life that Russia needed” (Zytaruk 67). Henry Gifford in his article “Anna, Lawrence and “The Law”” is of the opinion that Lawrence’s reading of Anna Karenina has produced in him deep feelings of “attraction and repulsion” (204). He points out that, “this book had engrossed Lawrence in his student days and also bore closely on his own situation when he married Frieda” (204). Gifford observes that Lawrence was “attracted by the creation of Anna - a woman who possesses real feelings” (158). But at the same time he was repelled by Tolstoy, because of his judgement in finally killing her “in the cherished name of the family” (158). Lawrence feels that Tolstoy always sides with the claims of the society or social morality and not with the claims of natural morality or greater morality. Lawrence is convinced that Tolstoy personally recognizes the claims of the higher morality, but as a writer he betrays that vision by taking sides with the society, against those individuals who are trying to live from their deepest instincts. For Lawrence the achievement of individuality is possible only through the “obedience to spontaneous passion and so, to deny this to Anna and Vronsky is to slight the universal law of nature and bolster a society that is dead in its essential roots” (Zytaruk 87).

If Lawrence’s response to Tolstoy is characterized by both attraction and repulsion, Jayakanthan is full of admiration for Tolstoy. K. Chellapan in his article “Jayakanthanin Puthinangalil Kilaku Merku Sangamum”, states very precisely that Jayakanthan who has been considerably influenced on the intellectual level by Marx,
has been immensely influenced on the emotional level by Tolstoy. He also observes that Jayakanthan’s reading of a translation of *Anna Karenina* has tremendously affected him and he considers it as one of the greatest of books. He admires Tolstoy’s effectiveness in presenting the character of Anna, who evokes sympathy from the readers inspite of her act of committing adultery. There are direct references to Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina* in Jayakanthan’s *PP*, and parallels can be seen between *Anna Karenina* and this novel. The Anna-Vronsky-Karein relationship can be paralleled with the Lalitha-Sarangan-Mahalingham relationship for a comparative analysis.

Close resemblances have been drawn by many critics between the works of Tolstoy and Lawrence to highlight Lawrence’s artistic response to Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina*. Zytaruk considers *The Rainbow* as Lawrence’s “most instructive novel in terms of Lawrence’s artistic response to Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina*”(95). He traces many circumstantial evidences and other parallels between Tolstoy’s work and Lawrence’s *The Rainbow*. He points out that Lawrence’s rich evocation of the country side in the early part of his novel, recalls Tolstoy’s account of Levin’s country side. The family of the Brangwan girls is reminiscent of the Shtcherbatskys, and in Anna Brangwan’s absorption in her procreative functions Tolstoy’s Dolly. But inspite of these resemblances, it is on the relationship between Ursula Brangwan and Anton Skrebensky that Zytaruk concentrates and examines these characters as the “creative extensions and corrections of Lawrence’s artistic response to Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina*”(96). He is of the view that Lawrence who finds fault with Tolstoy for having killed Anna, finds in Ursula an extension of Tolstoy’s artistic vision in
order to demonstrate that a woman like Anna need not perish in her search for personal fulfilment and achievement of individuality.

Lawrence is convinced that Tolstoy’s didactic purpose in the novel is out of harmony with his personal opinion, because he is aware that Tolstoy, though he recognizes the importance of the claims of natural morality, is betraying it by taking sides with the claims of social morality. Lawrence who believes that the purpose of life lies in the achievement of individuality, is of the opinion that it is not necessary for men and women to behave in the manner that society expects of them because the laws of any society are temporal whereas the laws of life are eternal. He therefore does not approve of Tolstoy’s conviction that in seeking sexual fulfilment, Anna and Vronsky have sinned. According to him the whole tragedy is a result of Anna’s and Vronsky’s fear of the society and hence they are not able to live in the pride of their sincere passion. Vronsky “lacks the courage to bring forth his own individuality and it is in lack of courage that he really sins and not in committing adultery” (Zytaruk 90). Lawrence as Zytaruk points out cannot accept the fact that a woman like Anna, “who has the courage to seek and to strive for and to realize her own fulfilment” (94) would resort to the cowardly act of committing suicide.

In creating Ursula Brangwan, Lawrence in effect “extends Tolstoy’s artistic vision by showing that a woman such as Anna Karenina, need not perish in her search for personal fulfilment and achievement of individuality” (Zytaruk 96). He observes that it is significant that in her search for fulfilment or in her way towards the achievement of individuality, Ursula finds herself against a man who is almost exactly like Vronsky, who is an officer in the army and whose very name Skrebensky, echoes
that of Anna’s lover. Like Vronsky, Skrebensky is also a man who lacks individuality and he collapses, as Lawrence says, as a man and as a male.

Ursula’s relationship with Skrebensky has also reached the same kind of impasse as Anna’s relationship with Vronsky. Zytaruk remarks that “the worlds of both the women are about to collapse when Anna and Ursula realize the futility of any further involvement with the men whom they had formerly regarded as being capable of bringing about their personal fulfilment” (100). But the solution each finds to their personal problems is different. While Anna sees no alternative to a life without Vronsky, Ursula learns from her experiences with Skrebensky that there is no point in seeking him. The remark that “There would be no child: she was glad. If there had been a child it would have made little difference however. She would have kept the child to herself, she would not have gone to Skrebensky. Anton belongs to the past” (493), shows her determination to proceed forward. She continues to live with the vision of ‘The Rainbow’ which symbolizes to her hope in the future. Thus, while Anna gives in to despair and chooses suicide, Ursula has the courage to stand by her self and realize that she must triumph over society, if she is to achieve her personal fulfilment. In presenting Ursula’s relationship with Skrebensky, Zytaruk observes that Lawrence’s novel provides a parallel to Tolstoy’s treatment of the relationship between Anna and Vronsky as in both these relationships, the action builds up to a climax, and Ursula and Anna arrive at a crisis which contains the possibility of death. The irony of the situation is that it is Ursula who writes to Skrebensky, “Truly the best thing would be for me to die and cover my fantasies for ever” (7R 484), but it is Anna who chooses death and Ursula who chooses life.
It can thus be concluded that Lawrence is in fact “making up in the creation of Ursula Brangwan, that background which Tolstoy’s Anna lacks” (Zytaruk 102). He points out that in *The Rainbow*, Ursula’s life begins at the point at which Anna’s life ends and in *Women in love*, Lawrence is actually extending Tolstoy’s vision of Anna Karenina by presenting Ursula’s life from the time of her rejection of Skrebensky to the time of her marriage to Birkin.

If Zytaruk considers *The Rainbow*, as the most instructive novel in terms of Lawrence’s artistic response to Tolstoy, Raymond Williams sees *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, as Lawrence’s “conscious answer” to his creative response to *Anna Karenina*. Lawrence who is more concerned about individual fulfilment rather than the claims of society, in man-woman relationship, wishes Anna and Vronsky to win over society. Thus Raymond Williams in his article “Tolstoy, Lawrence and Tragedy” observes:

> The terms in which Lawrence describes how Anna and Vronsky ought to have acted, are virtually a description of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, and this novel can be seen as a conscious answer to *Anna Karenina*. A woman leaves her husband, who has gone dead to himself, and finds life inherent in another. Society is defined by this new morality of experience. (636-37)

Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina*, as Ernest Simon observes “is the story of the heroine’s adultery expanded into a consideration of marriage, in which the subplot of love and marriage of Kitty and Levin underscores the tragic moral of the marriage of convenience of Anna and Karein” (95). *LCL* is also from one point of view, a record of the heroine’s adultery with a difference in that Connie “is able to attempt
what Anna Karenina attempted with a better chance of success” (Black 182). In both the novels the husbands are a failure, both as husbands and as men and hence the action springs from the wives deep sense of dissatisfaction and frustration. Anna as a girl has been thrust into a loveless marriage to Karein, who in his devotion to his official duties as Tolstoy ironically remarks, lacks even the human weakness necessary to fall in love. For Anna the relationship with her husband had become a dull, but socially secure relationship which is eventually made tolerable by force of habit as well as her love and affection for her son. Anna who is attracted by Vronsky is passionately in love with him. She is prepared to leave her home, suffer the loss of her son and face cruel condemnation of her social world because she has flouted its conventions. But unfortunately her guilty conscience, separation from her son, the ostracism of the society, combined with the inadequacy of Vronsky to meet the supreme challenge of her love create a mental conflict in her which finally drags her to take the disastrous step of committing suicide. Tolstoy, who attributes great meaning and significance to the sanctity of marriage, seems to suggest through the death of Anna that any extra marital relationship that leads to the destruction of the family, by the husband or the wife is bound to destroy the family as well as the individual. Tolstoy is against the imposition of any rules on morality, but at the same time he insists that morality should come from within each one of us. Anna is thus made to realizes her mistake and punish herself, by giving in to her own judgement by killing herself.

Like Anna, Connie in Lady Chatterley’s Lover, is a married woman whose life has become barren and meaningless as a result of her husband being a cripple
and a handicapped person. Her relationship with her husband Clifford offers only mental intimacy and she realizes that her life is a void. She is completely deprived of warm hearted intimacy and she does not enjoy the intellectual company of her husband’s circle. She feels that there is no meaning in her life and is aware that her whole life is disintegrating as a result of the lack of real intimacy in her relationship with her husband. In the first part of the novel she is depicted as a woman who “devotes herself loyally to looking after her husband, but nevertheless becomes gradually oppressed by the aridity and emptiness of her own life” (151). She feels that the whole fabric of her life is disintegrating.

Clifford realizes that Connie is having a disintegrated life and so generously suggests that she can have a child through someone and also that he is prepared to accept the child as the heir to Wrangby. Thus Clifford will not object to his wife’s adultery if only if he can be assured of her love and companionship. He will not mind her “occasional connections, the occasional sexual connection” (42) provided she continues to remain his wife and look after him. As far as he is concerned the casual sex affair is nothing compared to the life long togetherness. She has a secret affair with Michaelis, a dramatist and a friend of Clifford, but she is dissatisfied and realizes that it will not help her in anyway to get over the emptiness and loneliness in her life. In her relationship with Mellors, the gamekeeper, she finds a new fulfilment as well as qualities which she feels will integrate her life for the better. Though she is conscious of her position as Clifford’s wife, she continues her affair with Mellors. In her pursuit towards achieving wholeness and individuality, she boldly rejects her husband and accepts Mellors. Connie thus rejects the claims of society
or social morality and accepts the claims of natural or higher morality.

It can thus be concluded that Tolstoy had exercised considerable influence on Lawrence in the creation of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. H. T. Moore rightly points out that *Lady Chatterley's Lover* can be considered as "the descendant of *Madame Bovary*" and *Anna Karenina* and states that "instead of leading the heroine to her doom, Lawrence shows her the way towards renewed and enriched life" (263).

Jayakanthan in *Parisku Pô* (1966) makes use of the *Anna Karenina* motif in the main plot as well as in the sub plot. The main plot which depicts the relationships of a number of characters, primarily concerns itself in presenting the adulterous relationship of Sarangan and Lalitha and how they finally find a solution to their situation. The sub plot which though not very conspicuous when the novel is taken as a whole, definitely gives, an extensive account of man-woman relationship in general through the words of Narasiah, a man who has accidentally committed adultery. A direct reference is made to Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* in the main plot and is also indirectly referred to in the sub plot. By referring to this novel, Jayakanthan not only attempts to work out his views on the novel in general, but also expresses his views on man-woman relationship in particular. Thus the Karein-Anna-Vronsky relationship can be paralleled with the Mahalingham-Lalitha-Sarangan situation. The novel attempts to present the plight of a married woman (Lalitha) caught between her obligation towards her husband and her love for her lover. But unlike Anna who walks out of marriage, Lalitha sacrifices her love and remains committed to the sanctity of marriage.

The situation of Lalitha is quite different from that of Anna in that, unlike
Anna who had been forced into a loveless marriage at an early age, Lalitha marries Mahalingham at a mature age, after having lived a miserable and stray life in the company of many men. Mahalingham is in fact, as far as she is concerned a saviour, a God, who had saved her from a wanton life and stabilized her life by marrying her. Her relationship with her husband is therefore filled with respect and regard for this God like man, who has accepted her as his wife and who continues to love her sincerely even after knowing her dark past. She acknowledges his magnanimous nature and appreciates his strong will in marrying her against the opposition of his family members. Their relationship is characterized by affection, sympathy and mutual respect for each other. Lalitha is also equally aware that it is mainly because of his sincere affection and encouragement that she has bloomed into a well known writer. Inspite of all these obligations, she finds herself in a precarious predicament when she realizes that she is in love with Sarangan, the France returned artist whose revolutionary views and modern thinking inspire her to a great extent. Their strong mutual attraction and companionship develops into deep, intense love. She wonders whether it is really possible for a woman to fall in love at this stage in her life. She confides to Sarangan that though she has been acquainted with a number of men in the past, she has never really loved anybody, including her husband. Lalitha confesses that from the nameless boy at the typing institute who tried to entice her at the age of sixteen, to this God like man, her husband, she has never really loved anybody. She only considers all these affairs as different types of innocence. She says "I have had relationships with many people, my body had been exploited by many people, but I have never given a place to anyone in my heart. I have never loved
anybody so far” (PP 210).

In all her affairs with men, Lalitha had never felt that she was cheating the men who were after her. But now for the first time, she wonders whether it is right on her part to cheat her husband and have an adulterous affair with her lover. At one moment she feels guilty of her adulterous affair and even feels sorry for cheating a true and good life partner, yet at another instant she is ashamed of thinking of her cowardice and the false life she is living. Though she agrees to Sarangan’s proposal to request for a divorce from her husband so that they could get married and go to France, she is not quite sure whether it is right on her part. She is in fact troubled with doubts and uncertainties about her future, yet she does not refrain from meeting Sarangan.

Sarangan’s attitude to marriage is quite different as a result of his upbringing in an alien culture and so he thinks he does not attribute great significance to the inseparable and abiding nature of this bond. He advises Lalitha to get a divorce from her husband and accompany him to France. He asks:

What is wrong in making life easy?. Marriage is only a life contract, not an imprisonment in which you and another person get yourself locked; sometimes it may be amicable for the people who have locked themselves. But there should be room for even those who have locked themselves willingly, to open the door and free themselves, otherwise in the name of heritage, each one will be torturing the other. Where the laws are stringent there should be loopholes too, otherwise there will be too much discipline alone” (PP 222).
Lalitha, on the other hand knows the significance of marital relationships in our society and knows for sure that it is not as easy as he says, but consoles him by assuring that she would discuss the matter with her husband at the earliest and try to find a solution to their situation. Stating her delicate position to Sarangan she remarks:

Everyday I am also thinking of how to discuss the matter with my husband, but I am really getting confused as to how to begin the topic. Even now the very thought of separating from such a good man will, I think, blemish all my happiness, even if I were to be in heaven it will only create a gloom in my life. Any way, I will discus the matter with him and take a decision. (PP 323)

It is at this juncture that all the three characters happen to watch the film *Anna Karenina* on the same day and the discussion that ensues presents the views of the various characters on the extramarital relationship of Anna. Mahalingham considers the film “a wonderful film” (328), that creates a great emotional impact on individuals and confesses that he himself had literally broken down seeing some of the scenes. Surprised to hear such a statement from her husband, Lalitha playfully asks Mahalingam “Don’t you feel that it is really strange, how Tolstoy has made us cry over the fate of Anna? It is really strange how he is able to make people like us, who always cry over the fate of chaste women like Sita, Nalayini and Kannaki, has made us cry for an unfaithful, disloyal and adulterous wife?” (PP 328). She disagrees with her husband who is of the opinion that we cannot hate the character of Anna just because she is unfaithful and firmly states that “[...] instead of sympathizing
with Anna, my deep sympathies are with Anna’s husband Karein”(329). Lalitha intentionally makes this statement in order to read her husband’s mind. Mahalingham who disagrees with Lalitha, immediately retorts that he differs from what she feels and asks Sarangan’s view on this film.

Sarangan gives an entirely different view to the whole situation by saying that his sympathies are not with any of the characters, but with Tolstoy himself. He says “Yes I really mean it. As an artist Tolstoy has unconsciously crossed the limits of a writer in his portrayal. That is why the confusion he suffers is unconsciously reflected in all his characters. Finally he kills those characters. That is why I feel that Tolstoy himself would not have been happy with this novel”(329). But Mahalingam is not willing to accept this viewpoint and so he continues the discussion by saying “Mr Sarangan you are mixing two things together and confusing yourself. Whether Tolstoy felt happy with this novel is altogether a different question concerning the novel. But I cannot agree with your view that the confusions Tolstoy has are reflected in his characters and that is why he has killed Anna”(329). Refuting Mahalingam’s statement Sarangan clarifies his stand in the following manner. He says “No, I will explain. Does not Anna ask Karein for a divorce? The reasons he gives for denying it are quite strange. Suppose Karein had given his consent for a divorce to Anna, then don’t you think that the whole story of Anna would have changed?”(330). Lalitha also could not accept Sarangan’s views as she realizes that he is arguing very subjectively.

Mahalingam who is rather perturbed continues the discussion on Anna Karenina, during dinner and asks his wife of her opinion about the film, and whether
she also subscribes to Sarangan’s view. Lalitha very calmly replies that she too was surprised to hear Sarangan’s comments and tells her husband that she herself did not respond to his comments thinking that Sarangan’s disturbed mood was perhaps the reason for such a response from him. Thinking of the situation she adds that though initially she did not quite agree with Sarangan’s proposition, on further contemplation, she also thinks that there is nothing wrong in Karein giving a divorce to Anna. On hearing such a remark from Lalitha, the agitated Mahalingam asks her:

Lalitha, how can you ever think in such a manner?. Can’t you, a writer, who is exposing the minute intricacies of human emotions not understand this?. Can you think that since Anna and Karein are Russians, their emotions will be different from the rest of the world?. Divorce may be a legally accepted aspect everywhere in the world, but when it is made use of by individuals, and that too individuals who have enjoyed living together and shared their life for sometime, that too if either the husband or the wife is still continuing to shower selfless love on the other, it is not right to hack the bond like tearing the flesh and dripping the blood and detach the relationship and go away. Do you think that it is usually possible. (PP 331)

These words of Mahalingam remind us of Lawrence’s comments on divorce in one of his essays. He says “If a man has ever cared for a woman enough to marry her, he will always care for her. And divorce is all bump”(qtd. in Aldington 500)

Mahalingam further explains this point by citing their own situation as an example. He points out that earlier they were just two different individuals, but for
the past five years they have been married and are leading a meaningful life. He asks her whether it is possible for either him or for her to break this relationship. To this statement Lalitha in a very calm and composed mood tells her husband "You should not think wrongly. Since you have begun this as a debate, I am asking you, I am just asking you as an example. As an example if I were asking you for a divorce--"(PP 333). But before she could complete her sentence Mahalingam embraces her and stops her talk by pressing his lips on hers and pleads to her like a child, not to ever think of leaving him even for the sake of citing as an example. He says:

No Lalitha, even as an example don't cite our case [. . .] Lalitha, I don't know, when I was seeing that film, whenever I saw Anna, I was reminded of you. May be one reason is because your physic resembles hers. Lalitha you will not do such a thing. You cannot get separated from me. May be death may separate us. Even then I will die first.(PP 333)

Lalitha who is deeply moved by her husband's confessions, realizes his sincere love and immediately declares "I need you only, I need only you . . . Oh ! what a lucky person I am!. Is it possible for me to get separated from you ?. Is it possible for me to forget you, aren't you not my God ! believe me"(334). She is finally convinced that even though she loves Sarangan very much she can never lead a happy life with him by hurting the feelings of this God like man. The concluding lines of the chapter "Is it possible for one to live with somebody, somewhere by killing the heart?" (PP 335) illustrates Lalitha's mind. She realizes that she cannot lead a happy life with Sarangan by hurting the feelings of her husband who loves her
so sincerely. She tells Sarangan “I feel that I cannot show brightness in your life by
darkening the life of the man who gave a meaning to my meaningless life” (339).
Thus unlike Anna who chooses to leave her husband and go with her lover, Lalitha
chooses one option from the three offered by Sarangan and decides to sacrifice her
love and remain with her husband. Accepting the fact that Sarangan will be the last
man in her life, she decides to remain with her husband and continue her literary
activities. Lalitha says “[. . .] I am worried about your going back to Paris, not as a
lover but as a lover of art, when the artist is lost. We are not separating to forget
each other, but we are separating so that both of us will remember each other. Please
forgive me” (PP 340).

In the subplot again there is a reference made to Anna Karenina by
Jayakanthan in the long speech that Narasiah makes on his death-bed on the
importance of man-woman relationship. Marriage according to Narasiah is an inseparable
bond that has to possess emotions like love, sympathy, sacrifice, endurance, and forgiving
nature in the right proportion to make life better. But he laments that marriage today has
lost its meaning and significance and hence it is possible for partners to punish each
other and get separated from each other as is the case in a business contract. The
basic reason for this situation according to him, is that husbands and wives today
“do not love each other fully in a wholesome manner” (PP 265), and hence they are
ready to separate at the slightest provocation. He feels that if the husband and the
wife sincerely love each other, they will definitely have the mind to forgive and
forget the mistakes committed by the other. Stressing on this point Narasiah refers
to an incident in a Russian novel. Though he does not refer to the name of the novel,
it refers to the first part of *Anna Karenina* which presents the adulterous affair of Oblonsky and the governess of his children. Narasiah does not refer to any names but he only draws our attention to the discussion held between the wife of the man who has had a secret affair with his governess and another woman who comes to console her. The woman advises the other lady in the following manner:

If you have decided to leave your husband for the adultery he has committed, it is wholly your personal affair, but what is the meaning of Oh!, how much I had loved him. Do you love your husband to such an extent that you can forgive him for the fault that he has committed. When Tolstoy is asking this, what a great truth is he trying to explain"(PP 265).

Jayakanthan is in fact referring to the discussion between Anna (Oblonsky’s sister) and Dolly (Oblonsky’s wife) in which Anna tries to bring about a reconciliation between her brother and her sister-in-law. Anna tells Dolly that when she spoke to her brother she did not realize the dreadfulness of her situation because she only thought of her brother and the family, but now that she has spoken with Dolly she is able to see it in a different way, from the woman’s side. She tells Dolly:

I see your sufferings and I cannot tell you how sorry I am for you! But Dolly darling even though I fully understand your suffering, there is one thing I don’t know: I do not know... I do not know how much love for him is left in your heart. Only you know that—whether there is enough for you to forgive him. If there is, do forgive him! (AK 108)

Narasiah feels that it is lack of genuine love that makes partners to punish the other
and discontinue the relationship once some problem arises as, in a business contract. In his view only the problems have to be discarded, not the great bond, for he feels that whatever may be the mistakes committed it should not lead to separation.

A comparative analysis of these novels reveals the fact that D. H. Lawrence and T. Jayakanthan have been greatly influenced by Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina* and these novels can be considered as their artistic response to Tolstoy’s presentation of man-woman relationship in his novel. Both Lawrence and Jayakanthan are against Tolstoy’s final judgement in killing Anna and they try to approach the problem from a different angle and give their own solutions. Lawrence who upholds the importance of “natural morality” against “social morality” (Zytaruk 87) finds fault with Tolstoy for killing Anna and therefore presents his heroines Ursula and Connie as having the strength to fight against society in order to achieve individual fulfilment. Jayakanthan too is not able to accept Anna’s suicide and therefore does not kill his heroine, but makes her sacrifice her love and remain committed to her husband.
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