Chapter 2

Redefining Relationships

The universality of human experiences, explicitly expounded in all its magnitude and diversity in the literatures of the world has inspired great men like Goethe, in the west and Tagore, in the east to conceive the notion of “World Literature”. Goethe’s concept of “Weltliteratur” and Tagore’s perception of “Visva-Sahitya” have generated extensive comparative studies both intracultural and intercultural all over the world. The literature of every country is unique in its own way, but one must admit that it also shares some common features with all literatures of the world in the dramatization of human emotions and relationships. This makes literature both ‘individual’ and ‘general’ and Wellek and Warren rightly observe that “Like every human being, each work of literature has its individual characteristics, but it also shares common properties with other works of art, just as every man shares traits of humanity with all the members of his sex, nation, class, profession etc”(42).

The literature of every country is rooted in its culture and therefore culture plays an integral part in defining our relationship to the society. It imparts an individuality and uniqueness to the individual and to society that cannot be ignored. Each culture through its customs and traditions creates, codifies and enforces certain aspects of life in the society and hence its influence on human life is profound. It also accounts for the heterogeneous attitudes to life, among human beings who are believed to be basically the same everywhere. One can therefore agree with Claude Levi-Strauss observation that the “human mind is essentially the same everywhere
and so are its capacities, but the solutions individual cultures find to the problems of human existence are only different” (19).

The aim of comparing two authors of diverse cultures as Ayyappa Panicker observes is “to analyse and identify that which is common to both literatures as well as to understand the uniqueness of each literature, work or author” (57). This analysis helps one to compare and contrast the varied responses to identical problems or situations in different societies and among authors of diverse capabilities. It also enables one to discover deeper affinities between authors and works of different cultures. Affinities in the words of Aldridge Owen, are “resemblance in style, structure, mood or ideas between works of authors who have no other contact or connection” (132).

In this context D. H. Lawrence (1885-1930) and T. Jayakanthan (1934-), artists belonging to diverse periods, countries, cultures and languages seem to have certain close affinities in their attitude to art and life. For both, art is primarily moralistic and they firmly believe that one has to be really religious to become an artist. Art is a medium for them to explore and articulate their perceptions of the difficult and delicate process of living a fully human life. Unlike most of their contemporaries they have distinguished themselves as revolutionary and controversial writers in their respective societies despite lack of social and educational props. In their role as serious novelists they make no compromise in candidly sketching the problems faced by man in society. Their deep consciousness of the issues confronting man in their respective societies, compel them to expose the stark realities of life, despite vehement and bitter criticism. In their attempt to
portray life, both Lawrence and Jayakanthan are chiefly concerned with exploring, in depth the importance and significance of human relationships. They are conscious of the disintegration and degeneration that has affected this relationship in their societies and are chiefly pre-occupied as artists to purge society of its present plight. Both consider man-woman relationship as the most important bond for humanity and are therefore aware of the need for achieving perfect harmony in this union to attain fulfilment in life. They earnestly feel that failure on the part of the individuals to achieve this harmony is bound to end only in disaster.

As novelists who are extremely sensitive to the realities of man-woman relationship in society, they consider it their fundamental duty to present the bond in its varied dimensions. They perceive these relations to be capable of either taking the individual to a gratifying sense of personal fulfilment or destroying one’s own individuality altogether. These writers present an exalted vision of marriage as a sacred bond with an infinite source of happiness and peace in life. Their attempt to view man-woman relationship or marriage from an entirely different perspective has evoked strong resentment and criticism. They consider this union not as merely essential for achieving physical or emotional fulfilment alone, but as a combination of the two from which a greater power is evolved. They transcend the conventional notions associated with sex and see it as a part of a larger concept of purity which is above the physical. Their work project the conflicts and tensions that endanger this bond in the modern, mechanical world, which has miserably failed in realizing the importance of this bond. By way of portraying the stark realities that affect man-woman relationship in their contemporary societies, they intend to warn
humanity of the dangers inherent in perverted and unhappy relationships, as well as convince people of the desirability of reform. Both enunciate the idea that marriage is to be a sacred institution where self-fulfilment can be achieved only if the shadows of inhibitive concepts like dualism, class consciousness, and defamed notions of sex, love etc are pre-empted. According to both Lawrence and Jayakanthan, these shadows are destructive of human happiness and conducive to marital discord and intense sense of failure.

In depicting life, both Lawrence and Jayakanthan have been greatly influenced by the religious philosophies, and the social and psychological theories of the east and the west. Lawrence who has been influenced by the ideas he had acquired from many realms, has been particularly interested and influenced to a considerable extent by Indian philosophy especially Hinduism. Most of the views he advocates especially with reference to man-woman relationship, are based on this influence. Jayakanthan who has been chiefly influenced by Marxism and the psychological and humanistic theories of the west during the early phase of his literary career has also been influenced by Advaitic thought and theology in the later period.

Lawrence and Jayakanthan have also been considerably influenced by Russian novelists particularly Leo Tolstoy. Many critics have drawn striking parallels between the Russian novelist and D.H. Lawrence in their attitude to life and art. Their response to Tolstoy’s presentation of man-woman relationship, especially in Anna Karenina, provoke them to analyze Tolstoy’s views and recreate a relationship which they consider as ideal. Several critics have drawn close parallels between Anna Karenina and some of the novels of Lawrence. While Raymond Williams sees Lady
Chatterley's Lover as a "conscious answer" (145) to Lawrence's response to Anna Karenina, Zytaruk considers The Rainbow as Lawrence's artistic response to Tolstoy.

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. Many parallels can be drawn between the two novelists in their presentation of life. K. Chellapan in his article "Jayakanthanin Puthinaingalil Kilaku-Merku Sangamam", traces close similarities between Tolstoy's Resurrection and Jayakanthan's Cilla Nerangalil Cilla Manithargal. Striking similarities can also be drawn between Anna Karenina and Parisku Pō. There are direct references to Anna Karenina in Parisku Pō, as the Russian novel is not only referred to, but also comes up for discussion in the course of the Tamil novel and the Anna - Vronsky - Karein relationship can be paralleled with the Lalitha - Sarangan - Mahalingham relationship for a comparative analysis.

Traits of Freudian concepts can also be traced in both Lawrence's Sons and Lovers, and Jayakanthan's Rishimōolam. Considered by most critics as the first Freudian novel in English, Sons and Lovers demonstrates very effectively the problems of an Oedipal relationship. Though Jayakanthan confesses that he has never read Freud, one can identify Freudian undertones in Rishimōolam too. The problems of possessive maternal love destroying the lives of children and resulting in their inability to maintain a healthy man-woman relationship is represented vividly by
both the novelists in *Sons and Lovers* and in *Adum Narkaligal Adukindrana*.

Lawrence who has been influenced by Indian thought and Jayakanthan who has been influenced to a considerable extent by western thought firmly contend that man-woman relationship should be viewed from an entirely different perspective, based on a kind of compromise between the western and eastern thoughts. In his letter to the Earl of Brewster, Lawrence remarks “somewhere between the east and the west is really where one wants to be” (Collected Letters 913). Jayakanthan too subscribes to the same opinion when he declares “a new life, a new morality, a new man out of the union between the east and the west is the only solution to purify the defiled family tie in India” (“Killakum Merkum” 278).

David Herbert Lawrence, the most significant and controversial figure of the twentieth century, is a versatile writer of exceptional caliber. He attempts to portray through his works the fundamental problems confronting modern man, and tries to offer plausible solutions for them. He views the world from an entirely different perspective, revolting against established traditional beliefs and ethics. Writing in an age that fails to understand and acknowledge the true meaning and relevance of his vision, Lawrence and his works were being subjected to the most bitter and unjust criticism. Yet due recognition has now been awarded to him, though posthumously, and he has been recognized by F. R. Leavis as “a great novelist, one of the very greatest” (17) of our phase of civilization.

The dawn of the twentieth century bore witness to the havoc caused by the various socio-political events that ushered in radical changes in the social milieu. Revolutionary theories that were enunciated by eminent scholars like Freud, Jung,
Matx and many others, and the drastic effects of the world war accentuated changes in the established concept of life, and deprived man of the complacency he previously enjoyed. The awareness of his insignificance in the world of mighty machines fills him with a sense of horror and frustration. Haunted by anxiety, fear and insecurity resulting in the erosion of faith in traditional beliefs and values, man seemed to lose his hold on life and this, tremendously affected his personality. In an era of perplexities and uncertainties man lost his individuality, and his mind was tormented by pressures both external and internal. The novelists of the twentieth century attempt to portray these struggles, conflicts and disillusion in an effective manner. As an artist of this transitional phase, Lawrence firmly believes that it is his primary responsibility to extricate humanity from the chaotic disintegration into which it has lapsed. He realizes perfectly well that in the present state of uncertainties and doubts, neither religious awakening nor political ideology will help in redeeming society from this catastrophic descent. Regeneration of society and the human being, Lawrence feels, is possible only through the establishment of vital and harmonious relationships between individuals. Fully conscious of this self-imposed responsibility to ameliorate humanity, he embarks on the task of formulating codes of conduct laying great emphasis on the importance of human relationships. Thus relationships between individuals seem to be the main concern of all Lawrence's novels. David Daiches rightly remarks:

Lawrence is concerned always with human relationships, with the relationship of the self to the other self's, with the possibilities of fulfilment of personality and with exposing all the dead formulas about
romantic love, about friendship, about marriage, about the good life which can cause so much of deadness, frustration or distortion in the life of an individual. (141)

Lawrence is primarily concerned with the imperatives of human co-existence and he lays great emphasis on the importance of establishing and maintaining a good and healthy man-woman relationship. His firm faith in this bond which to him is the most important and vital relationship for humanity is “the source of all life, and all living rests in the intermingling, interaction and interchange of a man and a woman and all human relations take birth from and depend upon this basic relationship” (qtd. in Beal, 113). All other relationships to him are only secondary and subsidiary to this great bond which, in spite of its ever changing nature, will for ever be the foundation of human existence. He laments in his writings that the various changes in society have not only altered the whole concept of man-woman relationship, but also challenged the very necessity of this bond.

The complexities of life in a mechanized society have created animosities between individuals resulting in numerous conflicts depriving them of the joy of life. Unhealthy competitions between individuals in modern society have also adversely affected this bond. Men and women compete with each other for supremacy rather than engage in a co-operative attempt to establish a relationship based on mutual respect and understanding. This mad race to dominate the other, has resulted in a race of frustrated and neurotic men and women failing to derive happiness in life. To Lawrence, only a balanced and harmonious relationship between man and woman will save the individual as well as the society from the present predicament.
His obsession with this theme which runs through his literary oeuvre has been criticized vehemently and condemned so intensely that he has been branded by some critics as a “sexologist” and degraded as a “sex soaked genius” (qtd. in Birring ix). But Lawrence never wavers from his aim and remains committed to the task of establishing the importance of this bond and the necessity to evolve a kind of adjustment between man and woman to achieve wholeness.

Lawrence’s strong convictions on man-woman relationship, on the importance of sex and fidelity in marriage, radically opposed to traditional western practice, naturally gave rise to widespread criticism. No other writer in English fiction has so vehemently articulated his views on these issues as Lawrence, and hence he has been grossly misunderstood and misinterpreted. But his views on these crucial issues were deep-rooted and based on strong moral principles. In his attempt to redefine life, he formulates his own ideas hitherto unknown to western society. This is based on his imbibing of innumerable ideas from different parts of the world. His knowledge of the religious philosophies of the east and the west, various psychological and sociological theories enunciated by eminent men, combined with his own personal experiences and intuitions went into the shaping of his ideas. These were unacceptable and even heretical to the western world. The western society miserably failed in understanding and appreciating the deep significance and relevance of his views, as they were largely ignorant of such systems of thought. They were not only alien to them, but were even unimaginable in terms of their traditional Christian ideology. His views on personal consciousness, phallic consciousness, cosmic union etc were beyond their comprehension and hence he
Lawrence has been inspired and influenced by Indian philosophy, particularly by the principles of Hinduism. In a letter to Catherine Carswell he says that he wants to go east before he goes west. His intention is to proceed west from the east. He thus develops an interest in the tenets of Hindu philosophy and his ideas are based on some of the basic principles prescribed in them. Chaman Nahal evaluating Lawrence in his work *D. H. Lawrence: An Eastern View*, rightly feels that Lawrence can be better understood and appreciated if his ideas are evaluated through a parallel body of thought like Hinduism. Nahal discovers three basic affinities between Lawrence’s ideas and Hinduism namely, the reverence for life, veneration of sex, and the importance of the realization of the Self. Aurobindo also feels that Lawrence would have been better understood in a different place, for to him “Lawrence was a Yogi who had missed his way and come into a European body to work out his differences”(246). Anandamurthy too subscribes to Nahal’s view when he states that “Lawrence’s kind of religion which celebrates human relationship and relates it to the circumvent universe, is closer to the Hindu view of life than to the extremely ascetic negation of the joys of ordinary living that Eliot’s kind of Christianity recommends to us”(45).

Lawrence is greatly impressed by Hinduism, particularly Saivism that makes man conscious of creation as embodying the essence of the Divine Spirit. Hence all life, and every act of life assumes a sacred character, and becomes a means of communion with the celestial world.(mentioned in chap-1) Lawrence has been motivated by the wisdom imparted by Saivism, which aims at glorifying life through
a kind of interconnectedness which human beings should establish not only with other individuals, but also with the cosmos itself. In Lawrence, as in Saivism there is the great reverence for life - not only for man, but for all living beings, man being only a part. The Saivite belief that man derives a strength if he lives in harmony with the cosmos has exercised a powerful influence on Lawrence. He remarks "We and the cosmos are one. The cosmos is the vast living body of which we are still the parts" (Apocalypse, 28). On another occasion he laments "We have lost the cosmos. The sun strengthens us no more, neither does the moon" (Apocalypse 29).

Lawrence is also greatly inspired by the principle of 'Arthanarishwara' which symbolizes the union of Shiva and Sakti in Saivite philosophy. This principle signifies "the co-operative independent, separately incomplete, but jointly complete masculine and feminine functions of the Supreme Being" (Bhattacharaya 32). Saivism also aims at making man aware that all aspects of life are the innumerable manifestations of this 'Shiva-Sakti' principle. Therefore all activities of life are interconnected and interdependent and form a whole. Lawrence's declaration "I have always worshipped Shiva" (qtd. in Brewster 112), speaks volumes of the influence Saivism has exercised on his psyche. He also considers the lingam as a great, sacred image representing life. Lawrence thus realizes the profound importance, deep significance, and the great relevance these ethics have on modern man. Imbibing the essence of these philosophies and theories Lawrence attempts to reclaim and rejuvenate mankind and create "a new humanity capable of redeeming itself through and by normal, healthy human relationships, upholding the principles of life" (Inderjit 1).

Lawrence is enamored by the Saivite philosophy that identifies God as a
human being possessing all human qualities. Though an orthodox Christian, he revolts against the narrow mindedness of Pauline interpretation of the Christian faith in upholding the importance of the spirit and condemning the body to achieve salvation. Lawrence who is equally inspired by the emphasis Saivism lays on the harmonious balance between the body and the spirit in order to achieve wholeness, is greatly disappointed to see the dichotomization between the two in Christianity. He considers the whole as greater than the parts and therefore revolts against giving undue importance to any one aspect. A balance between the two - body and spirit, instinct and intellect is necessary for an individual to achieve wholeness. Any kind of division in man between the two, Lawrence maintains is bound to lead to splits and aberrations resulting in drastic consequences.

Lawrence recommends a three fold relationship which is more or less akin to the four-fold division of human life in Indian philosophy. He suggests a man - universe, man-woman, and a man - man relationship to achieve wholeness in life. In *Apropos to LCL* Lawrence states “First there is the relationship to the living universe, then comes the relationship of man to woman. Then comes the relation of man to man. And each is a blood relationship not mere spirit or mind” (qtd. in Inderjit 56). Inderjit is also of the view that Lawrence, in fact proposes a four-fold relationship which is similar to the Indian four-fold division of human life - Brahmacharya, Grahasta, Vanaprastha and Sanyasa. He observes that to Lawrence, the first phase begins with the birth of the child, its relationship in the family and the simple sexless friendship it establishes with other children. This is followed by the powerful passionate sex relationship with woman, which results in marriage. The next phase
implies setting up harmonious relationships with men and entering into collective creative activity for constructive purpose. The last phase stresses the transcendental rapport with the universe. He also observes that the order of the stages is maintained and there is no room for one superseding the other, for each stage fulfills the other. Lawrence’s concept that man-woman relationship is the first step towards man-cosmos relatedness has close resemblances to the Saivaite philosophy which also lays great emphasis on the importance of this union to establish a true relatedness with the universe. Discussing the various relationships an individual has to establish, Lawrence stresses on the importance of the man-woman union, as it is to him, the central clue to human existence. He declares “The great relationship for humanity will always be the relationship between man and woman. The relationship between man and man, woman and woman, parent and child will always be subsidiary. And the relation between man and woman will always change for ever and will for ever be the new central clue to human life” (Phoenix 531). According to him it is the relationship itself which is the quick and central clue to life, not the man nor the woman, nor the children that result from the relationship.

Relationships for Lawrence do not mean a mere mingling together of two individuals. He insists on a union that is committed, one to one, intense and in a creative partnership that is akin to marriage. A true moralist Lawrence firmly declares that the union between a man and a woman should be permanent and sacred. This union to him should be based on a dynamic relatedness which is pure, free and spontaneous and not based on promiscuous sex and free love which the modern society unknowingly advocate. All human existence for Lawrence revolves round
this fundamental relationship and no man can exist completely unless he enters into a dynamic and spontaneous relatedness with a woman and vice versa. His strong convictions regarding this union are primarily based on the achievement of a complete balance between love and individuality, and between the sensual and the spiritual. The Platonic or romantic type of love which extols the spiritual condemning the physical is unrealistic for Lawrence, as he believes in the blending of the two for achieving wholeness. His views on love, sex, and marriage are so interconnected that they form one whole and cannot be considered in isolation.

Love, to Lawrence, is not just of one type which can be clearly stated or defined and hence there is no concept as ‘perfect love’ in Lawrence’s philosophy. Love, to him, is of a multiple nature combining both the perfect and the imperfect. To Lawrence “[... ] the perfect love never exists. Love is of a multiple nature, both perfect and imperfect and the whole love between a man and a woman is sacred and profane together”(Phoenix 37). He identifies love as a unifying force that unites two individuals in a creative drive based on the principle of duality that dominates the universe. Identifying this duality and polarity that permeates the universe, Lawrence insists on the need for the exquisite balance between the two opposites as an endless phenomena. Every individual is therefore compounded of this dualism in him and hence conflicts are inevitable in man-woman relationship. But the ultimate goal for mankind is to attain supreme relatedness through love. In his poem ‘Love’ Lawrence considers the love between man and woman as the greatest and the most complete passion the world will ever see because it is dual and because it is of two opposite kind. It is to him like the perfect heartbeat of life - systole and diastole. In
another context he compares the love between a man and a woman to be a kind of perfect breathing, natural and spontaneous. No other writer could have so explicitly presented this concept as Lawrence. According to him the “Love between man and woman is neither worship nor adoration, but some thing much deeper, much less showy and gaudy, part of the very breath, and as ordinary, if we say so as breathing. […] In fact love between man and woman is really just a kind of breathing” (Phoenix 199). Singh rightly observes that for Lawrence “Successive love between man and woman is a kind of breathing together, which would mean a balanced harmony between two perfectly integrated individuals, allowing at the same time maintenance of separateness by both the individuals” (201).

Love to Lawrence is basically the clear and unmuddled current of subtle desire that flows from person to person which is ideally beyond the control of the ego. It is to him dynamic and susceptible to changes, and therefore not to be understood in terms of preconceived notions as it is commonly believed. Of all the emotions, Lawrence feels, love has been made the most counterfeit and deceptive by idealizing it with preconceived ideas. Love, to him, involves a lot of suffering and understanding, but modern men are incapable of realizing its deep significance because they feel with the mind and not with the body. He discovers this inability to establish a true relatedness based on love, devoid of ego, as the main problem confronting modern men. Love, which gives priority to the ego will have a planned objective or goal in mind. Desire of the ego binds one to a rigid routine of expectations, but true love can never exist and can only flourish in freedom. He feels that most people today approach love and even get married with a kind of
readymade concept of love. There are no genuine emotions, but only imitated or imagined emotions and feelings in such cases. This lack of pure and genuine feelings, where people know for sure how they should feel and behave in love, is what makes this wonderful experience counterfeit to Lawrence.

A feeling becomes an emotion to Lawrence only when it is felt in the body and not in the mind. To him “The body feels real hunger, real thirst, real anger, real tenderness, real passion, real hate, and real grief. All the emotions belong to the body and are only recognized by the mind”(Phoenix 493). He therefore held that love can be realized only through the body and not through the mind which attaches great importance to the ego and the will. This “mental consciousness” deprives man of the capacity to experience the true nature of love and sex and hence he emphasizes the great need for humanity to replace it with “blood consciousness”. Blood for him is more important than the forces of reason and therefore he lays deep and unabiding faith in it. He declares “My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds, but what our blood feels and believes is always true”(qtd. in Aldington 129). He emphasizes the importance of intuition, the signal that is given by the unknown as the true guiding factor and therefore advises man to rely on it, rather than on instinct and intellect.

Love to Lawrence is thus not the sole goal in life, but only the means of travelling towards the goal. It is a mutual relationship that he compares to a flame between the wax and the air. This implies that there must be a perfect balance between the wax and the air to keep the fire burning without one yielding to the other. Similarly through love man and woman should remain true to each other without fusing or
They should retain their individuality and strive to achieve fulfilment in their duality. In his poem ‘Love’ he advocates a two in one system which comprises of the sweet love of communion and the fierce, proud love of sexual fulfilment, both together in one love. In this duality he feels, lies fulfilment for though these two movements are opposite, they do not negate each other. Hukum Singh precisely remarks that

Lawrence’s philosophy of love is a direct antithesis of the Platonic Romantic type of love. [. . .] To him, sex and love are interdependent, the two indivisible constitutes that combined together make life pure and perfect. His philosophy of love and his theory of sex are so interfused that it is difficult to separate one from the other. (190)

Sex for Lawrence is a very serious issue having varied connotations. It does not imply carnality alone, but signifies the great quest for the ultimate union between man and woman, which is a result of the recognition of the polarities of existence. He ascribes a religious and ritualistic perspective to sex and considers it an integral part of life. Huxley rightly observes that sex for Lawrence “[. . .] is not a means of recreation or satisfaction of a basic hunger, but a means of realization of the self or more appropriately the realization of the non-mental knowledge of divine otherness”(2). Lawrence has often been misunderstood as an advocate of free or illicit sex. But he never attempts to advocate free or illicit sex for he firmly believes that such sex can never vitalize mankind but will only end in destruction and disintegration. He only insists that an individual should have a cleaner, deeper and passionate understanding of sex in order to achieve fulfilment.
Sex for Lawrence is just another name for the flow of feelings, any genuine feelings between the individuals of opposite sex. Healthy sex to him is never a sin since it is a holy and religious experience worthy of veneration and not something to be suppressed. He condemns dirty or cheap sex, and warns man that such sex will only lead to decay and disintegration of the society. Sex has been so cheapened and commercialized today that Lawrence feels it’s high time we realize its true meaning and significance. The only way to achieve this according to him is to be frank and honest about it, instead of assigning a secrecy to it. He is of the opinion that suppression and inhibition are the root cause of all problems in sex and therefore he wants “Men and women to be able to think sex fully, completely, honestly and clearly” (qtd. in Singh 200). He even advises that a sexual union is not to be indulged in unless that desire comes from one’s inner most soul, since sex to him is ‘delicate and vulnerable and therefore should be true and real. He believes that “there should be a real flow of sympathy, generous and warm and not a tricky thing or a moments excitation or a mere bullying” (qtd. in Macdonald 101).

Lawrence’s concept of sex is akin to the Indian tantric view of sex which identifies the sexual union as a ritual of divine consummation. His theory of the ‘Plexus’ has close resemblance to the Indian yogic concept of Kundalini power. Many critics of Lawrence have drawn close affinities between Lawrence’s views and the Indian yogic concept of ‘The Holy ghost’. Both believe that ‘The Holy Ghost’ – the latent power within man is awakened in a human being through sex, which enables him to achieve wholeness. Like the yogies he too believes in the presence of the ‘God-head’ - the serpent power within the body of every individual. His theory of
the various planes of consciousness - the 'plexus' he identifies have been identified by critics to have close resemblance with the 'Chakra' theory of Indian yoga. Thus Lawrence views sex, as a "door opening to a heightened mystic consciousness, as a means of rejuvenation and rebirth, the portal of oneness with the cosmic power" (qtd. in Ramachandran 247).

Hukum Singh is of the opinion that sex to Lawrence is a means of entering into wholeness and profound fullness of being. Lawrence insists on a complete union of the two into one for achieving a perfect sexual relationship. But he warns that it should only be a union and not a fusion of the two individuals. In a true relationship which is complementary to both, he stresses on the need to transcend the duality of the individuals in order to achieve the perfect consummation. This third element which is greater than the two, Lawrence identifies as 'The Holy Ghost'. Man to Lawrence is both inner and outer, body and spirit, lower and higher, and the existence of these conflicting, but complementary aspects is regarded by him as the basic requisite to attain fullness. Lawrence maintains that sex alone brings a man and a woman into close contact and therefore this union becomes for him, a means through which the male is forced to become pure male and the female, pure female.

Discussing the importance of fidelity in man-woman relationship, Lawrence insists that it should be based on one's own feelings to be true and sincere and not due to any fear of social norm or law. A true moralist, Lawrence does not compromise on morality when he stresses on the importance of sex in this bond. Commenting on fidelity he says "The instinct of fidelity is perhaps the deepest instinct in the
great complex we call sex. Where there is real sex there is the underlying passion for fidelity” (qtd. in Inderjit 52). Chaman Nahal is of the opinion that Lawrence really conceives of “A true relationship between man and woman, the same partners being together throughout life, in a permanent, sincere and committed relationship” (35) Draper too points out that Lawrence “[...] approves sex with reverence and marriage as a stabilizing of the sexual rhythm between a man and a woman, which is altogether different from the superficial relationship of casual promiscuity” (157).

Marriage, for Lawrence is rooted in genuine love and genuine love is rooted in genuine sex, and not based on fear of God, law or social conventions. He laments that there is no genuine love in modern marriages. It is purely based on social security and other considerations rather than on the genuine desire to develop a true relationship. Commenting on this life-long bond and the importance of sex in it, Lawrence observes:

The relationship is a life-long change and a life-long traveling, and that is sex. At periods the sex drive itself departs completely. Yet the great flow of the relationship goes on all the same, undying and this is the flow of living sex, the relationship between man and woman that lasts a life time of which sex drive is only one vivid, most vivid manifestation. (Fantasia 103)

Marriage to Lawrence is the clue to human existence, and therefore should be grounded on a perfect harmony between the principles of love, sex and life. The sanctity of marriage for him does not rest on the sacrament or the ritual, but on the
right type of marriage - the initial desire to marry. Marriage to Lawrence is the coming together of a man and a woman through a kind of intuition, a signal from the unknown and not based on any other considerations. ‘The Star’, ‘The Meeting Ground’ etc. are all different names for this intuitive power. Unfortunately the desire to marry in most cases today is not a result of this intuitive power, but is based on the prompting of the ego, which calculates advantages and disadvantages and arrives at a conclusion. Modern marriages to Lawrence, is counterfeit marriage for:

Modern people are just personalities and modern marriages take place when two people are thrilled by each other’s personality, when they have the same tastes in furniture or books or sports or amusement, when they love talking to one another, when they admire one other’s mind. Now this affinity of mind and personality is an excellent base for friendship between two sexes, but a disastrous base for marriage because marriage inevitably starts the sex activity, and sex activity is always, and always was and always will be in some way hostile to the mental, personal relationship between man and woman. It is almost an axiom that the marriage of two personalities will end in a startling physical hatred (qtd. in Singh 234).

It should not be misunderstood that Lawrence suggests the concept of love at first sight, that is based on physical attraction or intellectual affinity. Lawrence disapproves of such love and declares that such love will dwindle in the long run. He is of the opinion that a real marriage is based on the firm faith that all these are transient and temporary, are subject to change and yet the conjugation should continue.
Modern marriages end in failure as the individuals concerned, enter it with not only preconceived notions of love, but also because they try to assert their egos on the other. It is more of a duel where one tries to dominate the other rather than aim at achieving mutual co-operation. He feels that modern men and women pretend to be in love only to feed their individual ego which goads them to the desire of possession over one another. For Lawrence the relationship between a man and a woman should not be established on any other ground rather than on the desire of the self for the relationship itself. He therefore insists on the voice of the unknown as the chief guiding factor in the establishment of this union as it is not based on ego. This signal of the unknown alone to him is final and will never mislead, while all connections established on measured rules and regulations will crumble and fall apart. Lawrence therefore advises modern men and women to remain awake, to hear this signal from the unknown, before binding themselves to one another. Only in a marriage that is based on this desire from the unknown, the partners will be willing to accept the endless changes that occur in their life.

Lawrence’s insistence on faithfulness, to be true in the relationship forms an important aspect of his philosophy. He observes; “each must be true to himself, herself, his own manhood, and her own womanhood, and let the relationship work out itself” (Phoenix 531). Lawrence identifies such a marriage as a “strange conjugation” in which there is the perfect balance of the two single beings into one entity. It is not for him a mere merging or mingling of each others individuality, for he is against total submission of one partner to the other or against total insistence on individuality. Such an insistence according to him will only result in disaster in
marriage since it would impose a predetermined design to the relationship. He also emphasizes the importance on the part of the partners to accept the principle of change willingly, and acknowledge it as a natural phenomena of life. Accepting the principal of change as natural and maintaining one’s individuality, Lawrence’s great faith is that if a marriage is to be one of bliss the man of the house should be the “Lord and Master”. Commenting on this Chaman Nahal states very clearly that Lawrence when he refers to the man as “Lord and Master” does not have a tyrant or a dictator in mind, but a kind and considerate Lord, to whom one would love to submit. It is not a submission out of fear, but a kind of willing surrender to the greatness in him. Lawrence states “I will be Lord and Master, but ah! such a wonderful Lord and Master that it will be a bliss to belong to me” (Kangaroo 192).

The woman’s willingness to submit to the man is a state of joyful surrender not servitude. But this is possible or dependent on the man’s possessing those high qualities which makes a woman to be proud to belong to him. Lawrence’s women are socially equals of men and hence there is no suggestion of women being inferior to men in this context. Nahal rightly points out that “Lawrence certainly thought of the woman as ‘the other’, but in her ‘otherness’ he saw her great charm. It was this ‘otherness that earned her, her own strength and her beauty apart from men” (123).

To Lawrence, both men and women are independent and unique in their own way and it is only the mutual willingness to accept each others ‘otherness’ that is important. In another context when Lawrence compares the husband to the phoenix and the wife to its nest, he is not reducing the woman to a subordinate position but is only giving her a more important position by recognizing the necessity of the nest for
the bird. In another context he refers to man and woman as two rivers, each flowing in its own way side by side, sometimes mingling sometimes separating and again continuing to travel.

Lawrence thus views marriage as a life-long bond based on true love in which the partners takes into consideration the changing aspects of life and respect the individuality of each other. Nahal rightly sums up Lawrence’s views on marriage as:

A relationship between one man and one woman - the same man and the same woman holding on to the magic for each other all their life. Years will come and go, their needs and their personalities will change, and their love for each other will ebb and alternate, [. . .]. It surely has to be a life-time of togetherness for them to understand each other, to know what it means to be a woman, to know what it means to be a man, to know the ‘otherness of a woman, the ‘otherness’ of a man to have distinction, to have uniqueness of being, alive in the flesh. (94)

Lawrence’s insistence on the importance of sexual consummation should not be misunderstood to be the end of life. He observes in the Fantasia of the Unconsciousness, that though sex holds two people together, it tends to disintegrate society unless it is subordinated to the great dominating male passion of collective purposive activity. Sexual fulfilment alone will not aid in the achievement of wholeness, unless man indulges in “Purposive activity” in the company of other men. But he insists that the “Purposive activity” which man undertakes should be based on the sexual fulfilment achieved in marriage. Lawrence states “[. . .] but
when the sex passion submits to the great purposive passion, then you have fullness. And no great purposive passion can endure unless it is established upon the vast majority of the individuals of the true sex passion" (Fantasia 108).

Lawrence insists on the importance of these two aspects as integral constituents of life. Undue importance attached to any one aspect, at the expense of the other is bound to be disastrous not only to the individual but also to the society. He observes:

[... ] It cuts both ways. Assert sex as the predominant fulfilment and you get collapse of living purpose in man. You get anarchy. Assert purposiveness as the supreme and pure activity of life, you drift into barren sterility, like our business life of today. [...] You have got to base your great purposive activity upon the intense sexual fulfilment of all your individuals. (Fantasia 108)

Lawrence’s views on love, sex and marriage seem to have close resemblance to the ideas enunciated by the Akam poets in Tamil Sangam literature. (referred in chap. 1). Murugan in his thesis, “D.H. Lawrence and Aham Poetry, A Comparative Study of their Themes”, points out striking affinities between Lawrence’s concepts and the views of the Aham poets on these issues. Like the Akam poets, Lawrence too recognizes the importance of man-women relationship as the central fact of human life and acknowledges sexual love as the greatest and complete passion that is necessary for an individual to achieve fulfilment in life. Like the Sangam poets he admits that it is in this physical and emotional union that man attains wholeness. Both emphasize the fact that an individual’s inner harmony and peace rest on this
union. There is a striking parallelism in their conception of the initial coming together of a sexually mature man and women. To the Akam poets this is accomplished by some unknown factor associated to be the result of ‘Pal’ - (Destiny or Providence) and is thus endowed a cosmic perspective. For Lawrence, this is established by “the voice of the unknown”. He observes “We can only know that from the unknown, profound desires enter upon us and the fulfilling of these desires is the fulfilling of creation” (Fantasia 132).

Lawrence a strict moralist like the Akam poets, violently opposed licentious sex. Love and sex to him are not the goals in life but only the means of achieving the goal - the realization of the self. For both, a mate once chosen is permanent and final. To both Lawrence and the Akam poets, sexual faithfulness is not merely applicable after marriage, but should commence the moment the initial desire to marry is born. To both, marriage is only a sacrament, it depends not on the ritual of marriage but on the initial desire to marry that comes from the unknown. This lifelong union for both endures not on the basis of physical attraction or intellectual affinities but is grounded on tenderness and mutual affection between the partners.

In the comparative study of Lawrence and Aham poets, Murugan identifies many affinities between Lawrence and the Aham poets in their attitude to love, sex and marriage. He observes that Lawrence like the Aham poets insists on the balance between the physical and emotional aspects of life to achieve fulfilment in life. Both emphasize the need to engage in “Purposive activity” only after having attained fulfilment in man-woman relationship. A balance between Akam and Puram, love and power, masculine and feminine principles, upper and lower consciousness of
man seem to be an important concern for both. Like the Akam hero, Lawrence's hero also ceases to be a man, if he does not have a living blood relationship with a woman. Similarly he would cease to be a lover, like the Akam lover if he does not have the passionate craving for "purposive activity" burning in his soul.

Lawrence attempts to present through his novels the frustration, discontentment and lack of fulfilment resulting from the lack of proper adjustment between man and woman. The failure of the characters to realize the importance of love and sex in life and their inability to achieve a perfect harmony between the two, result in tragedy in most cases. Most of the themes Lawrence elucidates in his later novels have been expressed in a fragmentary manner in his first novel The White Peacock (1911). The Trespasser (1912) attempts to dramatizes though not very effectively the man-woman conflict and the subsequent tragedy that occurs as a result of misconceived notions of this relationship. Sons and Lovers (1913) the autobiographical novel, captures very explicitly the marital discord between a man and woman belonging to different classes and temperaments affecting the family, particularly the children. The novel also gives a vivid account of how excessive possessive love of the mother strangulates the children and prevents them from maintaining normal man-woman relationship.

The Rainbow (1915) portrays the marital relationship of three successive generations and their attempt to attain fulfilment in their own way. Women in Love (1920) explicitly presents the success and failure of the characters to achieve wholeness in man-woman relationship by exposing the constructive and destructive aspects of love. Aaron's Rod (1922), The Plumed Serpent (1926) and Kangaroo
(1923) unfold the importance of maintaining male friendship after having achieved fulfilment in man woman relationship. In *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928), the most controversial of his works, Lawrence intends to create a new society built upon a new awareness of this bond. To Lawrence, the healthy interaction between the male and the female is the cardinal principle of his philosophy of life and he firmly believes that failure on the part of individuals to acknowledge this is deemed to be disastrous. He also intends to expose through this novel the sexual hypocrisy and the moral stiffness characteristic of his age that has endangered the spontaneity of this relationship.

In the Tamil literary scenario, the novel emerged as a new and popular literary form during the nineteenth century with the publication of *Prathaba Muthaliar Charithram* (1870) by Vethanayagam Pillai. The growth of this new genre in the pre-independent days was rather slow, and an analysis of the novels of the period between 1870-1947 reveals a two fold development. It not only began to provide popular reading material for entertainment, but also established itself as a serious literary form that was capable of depicting and describing the life of the people as individuals and as members of the society. The novels of this period clearly exhibit the influence of novels and novelists of other languages particularly Bengali. translations of the novels of Bakim Chandra Chatterjee, Saranath Chandra Banerjee, Rabindra Nath Tagore etc. exercised a great influence on the Tamil novelists in their selection of themes and portrayal of characters. Translations of classic western fiction into many regional languages, especially novels like *War and Peace*, *Lady Chatterleys Lover*, *Dr Zhivago*, and other famous works exercised a great impact
Post-Independent Tamil-Nadu witnessed rapid and remarkable changes in the social and political milieu which altered and affected the life of individuals to a considerable extent. In the political sphere the most significant feature after 1947 is the disappearance of the political unity that existed during the Pre-Independent era, and the steady emergence of conflicts. The Congress party was no longer the only major political party, and the birth of new regional parties exercised tremendous influence on the society. This period is marked by the emergence of national politics into the main stream of socio-economic movements which is first represented by the Justice party and later by the Dravida Kazhagam party. The birth and growth of the Dravida Munathra Kazhgam (DMK) under the able leadership of Annadurai, inspired and influenced a Tamilian consciousness. "It initiated a renewed interest in the socio-ethical values of the ancient Tamils as outlined in the old didactic works like the *Thirukural*" (Sivathambi 40). In the social sphere, Industrialization gave rise to Capitalism which resulted in the emergence of two distinct and definable classes. The evils of Capitalism had an extremely unprecedented effect on the social consciousness of the people. The gap between the rich and the poor became unbridgeable and led to increased instances of strife and conflicts among individuals.

In the literary field the novel emerged as the most authentic literary form capable of explicitly depicting the multiple problems encountered by the individual. One important feature that loomed large in the fifties and post-fifties era was the widespread serialization of novels in leading magazines as ‘Thodar Kathai’. The credit for popularizing this trend goes to Kalki, who soon became the master story
teller and commentator on social and political issues. P. Krishnamurthy’s novels *Kalvanin Kathali* and *Tyaga Bhumi* were serialized in the magazine *Ananda Vikadan*. The most significant feature of Tamil novel since the fifties is the focus it laid on hitherto unexplored territories. The fifties particularly the post fifties witnessed the emergence of young novelists who attempted to present the lives of the poor, famished and the downtrodden masses. This was an inescapable result of the process of democratization. These writers disturbed the ethical conscience of the Tamil society by bringing into sharp focus, the trials and tribulations of the poor in the independent, secular and democratic country. Such realistic portrayal had far reaching consequences in exposing the sordid living condition of the larger sections of the people. The post-Independent Tamil society heralded the emergence of new political and social ideologies that ushered in profound and radical changes in the social scenario. The tenets of the old systems were challenged by the influence of western ideas that accentuated divergent responses both positive and negative. The writers of this period were propelled to take up these challenges and react in their own way to the various issues confronting man in the modern, capitalist society.

A contemporary of Janaki Raman, Indra Parthasarathy, Rajam Krishna and other prominent writers, T. Jayakanthan (1934-) is a multifaceted genius and a versatile artist of Post-Independent Tamil fiction. He entered the literary scenario as a short story writer, but later emerged as a prominent novelist of exceptional caliber with his controversial and revolutionary ideas. A prolific and significant writer he has claimed for himself a niche in the Tamil literary world with his radical views. Inspite of his humble beginning and lack of formal education he has been
able to establish himself as a great writer through sheer perseverance and commitment to the task he has undertaken.

A true artist of the transitional phase, both political and social he has witnessed the wide spread changes and the resultant problems confronting man. He realizes the need to reform society, to ameliorate Tamil society from the chaos into which it has fallen. He admits that he “creates literature to emancipate the society” (Preface RM 5). A strong social critic and a rebel, Jayakanthan tries to expose the various problems encountered by man, and attempts to explore possible solutions for them. By presenting social evils with stark realism he strives to convince society of the necessity to redefine some of the major issues of life. An artist with a deep insight and an uncanny capacity to capture in print the multiple problems in life he receives varied responses ranging from high admiration on the one hand to bitter criticism on the other. Yet his strong convictions and firm beliefs never waver and he keeps attacking the corrupt and degraded value systems. Diraviam’s remark explicitly sums up Jayakanthan’s artistic capabilities. He observes:

Jayakanthan is a phenomenon in contemporary Tamil writing - an inspiration to some, a challenge to some and an anathema to a few. There are many who consider him a disturbing element, with his obsession with individual perversions and social aberrations. But whether he pleases, provokes, delights or disturbs, soothes or sneers, consoles or challenges, none can deny that he is a writer of rare power and refreshing realism, vigorous in his portrayal, virile in his style, sweeping in his range and subtle in his touches. (JMM 11a)
Winner of the Sahithya Academy award in 1972 and Rajaram award of Tamil Nadu university in 1986, Jayakanthan “struck a terrible blow to the decadent social order that continues to perpetuate atrocities on the common man in the name of religion and morality”(Rangra 143). Almost all his writings are guided by the bare factual materials gathered through his experience in life. He admits that he has been greatly influenced by many writers and philosophers both of the east and the west. A serious writer, Jayakanthan has been chiefly influenced by Marxian theories and thought during his formative period and later by the psychological and humanistic theories of the west. He acknowledges that Advedic thought and theology have also exercised considerable influence on him in his later phase. Some of his novels illustrate the indirect influence of Freudian and Feminist thought on his consciousness. His great indebtedness to the Russian writer Leo Tolstoy who attracted and influenced him cannot be ignored. In his work, *Immathuku Appal*, Jayakanthan expresses his admiration and his great indebtedness to this famous Russian writer. K. Chellapan in one of his articles rightly remarks that in Jayakanthan’s novels we can find “A synthesis of western humanism, Marxist idealism and Indian heritage assuming a new avathar. He not only combines together Marxist ideals, Tolstoian and Gorkian philosophies, but also gives new meanings and significance to old and ancient notions”(54).

Jayakanthan thus attempts to expound his own philosophy of life by embracing the varied ideas he has acquainted himself with, yet he tries to retain the essential individuality of his own culture. Swaminathan aptly remarks that “Jayakanthan is a unique product of Tamil culture, steeped in the vibrancy of the Tamil tradition and
yet amazingly progressive in his outlook” (137). He further states that in all his writings Jayakanthan transmits a new force by “[...] his daring exploration of the untapped realms of the human mind and has thus emerged as a fearless critic of moth eaten social taboos and meaningless rituals” (137). Jayakanthan’s novels like his short stories venture to capture with deep insight and exquisite style, the changing panorama of human life. All his novels right from Valkai Azhaikirathu to Sundarakandam, analyze the divergent aspects of human existence. No aspect of human life seems to have been untouched by this versatile genius. Though his early novels are not quite popular, his later novels some of which have been filmed deal with pertinent problems related to the individual and the society in great depth.

Human relationships form the central theme of almost all his works, yet he is primarily pre-occupied with the theme of man-woman relationship in the modern, conflict ridden society. He firmly believes that of all the relationships, man-woman relationship is the most important and therefore stresses the great need to establish a good and healthy union. To him “Man-Woman relationship is the one of the most essential and important relationship. [...] It is a very important, basic and indeed the foundation of all other relationships” (CNCM 263). Emphasizing the importance of this bond he declares that it is not only necessary for the welfare of the individual but is also required for the well-being of the society. Most of his works are an analysis of the different aspects of this significant bond which forms the foundation of humanity. His revolutionary and controversial views on these issues were radically opposed to the conventionally orthodox Tamil society and hence he has been vehemently criticized. Yet he advocates his views boldly without any reservations.
Identifying the problems that confront this bond Jayakanthan tries to make man aware of the intricacies involved in the establishment of this union in the modern society. By exposing these issues he intends to warn humanity of the impending dangers, if this relationship is not understood in the proper sense.

Many factors seem to operate in creating marital discord in the present society. In the mad race for material prosperity, human emotions and moral values are relegated to a secondary position. No longer is this conjugal bond based on mutual love, understanding and co-operation. It is more like a battle where each partner’s ego wants to dominate, bully and rule the other. Jayakanthan attributes the inability of modern man to respond freely and spontaneously in this relationship to the various conflicts confronting him. The influence of western ideologies, education, feminism etc have all greatly altered the traditional concepts of man-woman relationship. Man seems to be according to Jayakanthan, oscillating between the demands of individual desires and the demands of the society. In his Prefaces which are self-explanatory as well as critical, he states that “in this conflict between man and society, man either submits or sacrifices his individuality to the society. He allows the social norms or society, to win or discards the basic norms and concerns of the society and upholds his individuality” (KEC 3). He observes that unless this problem is resolved in an effective manner, man-woman relationship is bound to end in disaster. He insists on a kind of balance between man and woman based on mutual love, affection and understanding, acknowledging the individuality of the other to achieve wholeness in this relationship.

Love, to Jayakanthan is one of the most important aspects of life as it enables
a human being to attain wholeness in life. Insignificant reasons may be instrumental to its birth as well as to its destruction in the present situation. Love to him is not mere physical attraction or intellectual affinity as is commonly believed, but is a very honorable aspect of life which involves a variety of basic factors. He explicitly states “Love is not merely physical or emotional alone, but is definitely the union of the two; both physical and emotional. Therefore the relationship between man and woman should be based on love and understanding giving due respect and recognition to each other involving a kind of mutual adjustment” (Karunaiyinal Alla 46) He reiterates in many contexts that the type of love he implies is not the type of romantic love that the modern people advocate as a primary requisite for this union. Jayakanthan has no faith in the concept of romantic love, as it is not ideal for the establishment of this bond. He insists on a kind of mature, intense and sincere love that takes into consideration the changes that may take place in each other in due course of their development.

Imperfect understanding of the real meaning and significance of love and sex is one of the primary factor affecting man-woman relationship in the present context. He laments that in the modern world which is characterized by the raving rush for power and material gains, love has lost its true meaning and relevance in life, and has become spurious in nature. There is no room for deep and sincere love and it has become a kind of illusion, but the partners imagine that they love each other. This mutual illusion easily creates antagonisms between partners and leads to marital conflicts and disharmony. This to Jayakanthan is the root cause of many problems arising in this union. He rightly sums up his views and
apprehensions as follows:

Love today does not possess its true meaning. [. . .] In this world there is no scope for real happiness, joy and affection; in this dry, cruel, heartless graceless world filled with cunningness, where everything is measured in terms of money. In this dirty world, it is just an illusion to imagine that deep love exists between man and woman. The so-called ‘love’ between man and woman, which modern people believe to emanate in their hearts, is only an illusion. It is a kind of self-deception. In due course it becomes a kind of mutual deception. This leads to a kind of forced attachment in which both try to suck the sap from the other. (*Sundarakandam* 176-77)

Modern men's inability to respond freely and spontaneously in man-woman relationship is largely due to this lack of realizing the real meaning of love. The misconceptions regarding love, Jayakanthan points out, have also drastically affected marital relationship. He remarks that the “concept of love has been drastically misunderstood and bullying is understood to be love, and hence the urge to punish and divorce rather than to pardon dominates the partners at the first opportunity” (*PP* 266). The prime motive of such a false or counterfeit love is the desire to dominate and subdue the other rather than aim at establishing a harmonious bond based on mutual affection and sincerity. This type of love according to Jayakanthan will only result in frustrated and neurotic men and women who fail to achieve wholeness in this bond.

Sex to Jayakanthan does not denote carnality, but has many serious
connotations. It is a very serious individual, as well as social issue affecting the lives of human beings, if it is not realized in the right sense. One of the major criticisms that has been triggered against Jayakanthan is that he is greatly preoccupied with the theme of sex in some of his works. He admits that he is concerned with sex, not to arouse passion, but because he wants man to have a more clear and healthy attitude to sex, which is one of the important aspects of life. In his Preface to Rishimoolam he observes that he does not write stories to arouse the prurient instincts of sex, but only to portray the problems related to sex. His remark “I have not written stories to instigate sex, I have only written stories which consider the problems of sex” (RM 13) illustrates his serious concern regarding the problems related to sex. To Jayakanthan “sex is a social problem like hunger, [. . .] and even more important than hunger. It is a fundamental problem” (Preface RM 9).

Sex to Jayakanthan is a natural phenomena of human existence and plays a vital role in man-woman relationship. He is of the opinion that wrong notions of sex, associating it with sin has crept into the Indian psyche which has culminated in conflicts and tensions in this bond. His frank discussion of some of the issues of sex in some of his novels highlights his views on this significant issue. Commenting on the various books and studies that have appeared in the west, he wonders whether such healthy discussions are possible in our own country where such frank discussions are considered a sin. He observes “[. . .] Is it possible for our Indian women to think about their personal issues in this manner? How much have we developed to think about the problem of sex in the modern world. Here even a husband cannot really understand his wife’s mind” (SENP 128). According to
Jayakanthan, the average Indian does not have a healthy attitude to sex as he still clings to the petrified notion of sex. He explicitly sums up our attitude to sex in the novel by stating that it is still considered a sin and a taboo, and this perspective itself, is detrimental to our understanding of sex. He states “Sex, here is considered an inevitable sin. It is safeguarded secretly and stealthily. They consider it shameful to discus and argue on this matter and thus we are prematurely imprisoned in ignorance” (SENPI 129).

This unhealthy attitude to sex is one of the root causes of many of the sex-related problems in society. Ghani in his article “Jayakanthanin Novelkalil Marapum Marxisamum” is of the opinion that, sex to Jayakanthan is “neither fire nor passion, it is a natural phenomena of all living organisms” (66). Jayakanthan firmly upholds that an individual should have a clear and healthy attitude to sex, in order to understand its significance in the man-woman relationship. He declares that an individual who does not have a healthy approach to sex cannot grow and develop into a good individual and so is a society that does not entertain a positive attitude to sex. He observes that the more secretive sex is considered the more aggressive it becomes and destroys the human being. Jayakanthan’s frank and bold opinions on sex have been misunderstood by many to mean that he advocates free or licentious sex relationships. A staunch moralist, Jayakanthan views sex, only as a means of achieving the goal and not for a moment, does he consider it the sole aim of life. He stresses on the importance of love and sex in man woman relationship and insists on the balance between the two to achieve wholeness.

Jayakanthan recognizes the importance of marriage as an inseparable bond
in life that is based on real love. A marriage that is not rooted in real love, equality and affection and in which the ego's of the individuals concerned want to dominate each other, this bond becomes a kind of rigorous imprisonment. He feels that this sacred bond has lost its significance in the present mechanical world and is treated like a business contract in which the parties are more concerned about their personal gains and are ready to revoke the bond the moment there is a problem. He states:

Marriage is an inseparable bond that is based on love, sympathy, sacrifice, tolerance and forgiving nature. It is the combination of all these aspects that enables two people to live together life long. It should not be considered a prison to dominate and rule or punish the other. Today the husband or wife is able to do so because the sacred bond of marriage has lost its power and strength and it has been cheapened like a business contract. [ ... ] It is like a business partnership which is withdrawn once there is something wrong between the partners. (PP 269-70)

The real meaning of marriage to him is to realize that it is “founded on sincere love and the willingness to change and adapt for the sake of the other and not something for one's own personal satisfactions” (Unmai Chudum 35). The main reason attributed by him for the weakening of this bond is the lack of sincere love between husband and wife. Like all aspects of life, love has also become adulterated and greatly misconceived and bullying is understood as love, and hence the urge to penalize rather than to forgive dominates the partners at the first opportunity.

The desire to marry, to establish the union is more important to Jayakanthan
than the ritual or the sacramental part of marriage. The willingness of the partners
to involve themselves wholeheartedly in this union should be the primary concern
than any other considerations. He remarks in one of his novels, “The mind is more
important, not customs, rituals and laws, for they cannot bind two people for
long”(ONNP 214). Criticizing the conventional manner of arranging marriages where
priority is given to the horoscope and other advantages than the willingness of the
individuals concerned, the heroine in one of his novels asks “Is it enough if two
horoscopes match, don’t you think there should be match between two minds?”
(SK 79).

Jayakanthan argues that marriage should not be considered a yoke to enslave
the partner. One of his heroines declares that marriage in India is a yoke meant to
degrade and enslave women. This is due to the dualistic nature of Indian men which
is another major factor that creates conflicts in this relationship. He argues that
duality of personality is neither ideal for unity in life nor in society as it creates
splits and leads to dangerous consequences. In his preface to Kokila Enna
Cheithuvitāl & Samukam Enpathu Nāluper, Jayakanthan observes very clearly
that Indian men are full of enthusiasm in upholding equality, freedom, women’s
rights and other civilized codes of conduct as imperative in the social framework,
but when these principles enter the family, they seem to destroy the sacred purity
of the family. This leads to conflicts and narrow mindedness which to him is one of
the main reasons for the instability of most marital bonds. Jayakanthan states that
there is a conflict in the individual perception of these ideas in relation to the society
and the family. He observes that “man is able to exercise his views on equality,
freedom and emancipation only to the society in which he does not hold much responsibility, but in his personal relationships he is unable to digest the individuality of women and so denies these principles" (KEC 5).

The conflicts and tensions arising in man - woman relationship as a result of this duality is explicitly exemplified in the novel Kokila Enna Seithuvitāl (1967). The main character Anandamurthy, a journalist, is a distinguished and respectable man, vibrant with revolutionary ideas but in his personal life, in his relationship with his wife, he is a degraded, prejudiced man full of suspicion. Men like Anandamurthy may preach new and sophisticated theories to others but in their personal relationships they cling to the age-old traditional customs and are content with a sense of satisfaction that all the preaching is for others and not for them. The irony of the situation Jayakanthan observes, is that such dualistic nature is entertained by the modern, educated and enlightened men like Anandaraman. He is a modern man who preaches socialism, opposes orthodox concepts and ardently aspires to build a society based on equality. But in his personal life he cannot digest the fact that, a wife is also an equal with independent thinking and individuality. Unless the duality is resolved and the partners recognize and respect each other’s individuality one cannot find happiness and fulfilment in marriage.

Rishimōolam (1969) is a novel with Freudian overtones and can be analyzed as a novel dealing with an Oedipal relationship. Jayakanthan, though he claims that he has not read Freud, has been consciously or unconsciously affected by his theories on repression, Oedipus complex and interpretation of dreams as he makes use of all these three concepts in this novel. The various masks that Rajaraman dons right
from his childhood to hide the guilt of having accidentally seen his mother’s naked body through the mirror, and the subsequent dreams which haunt him from that day onwards in which he sees his mother caressing him in a nude manner, have all Freudian undertones. Though his conscious mind torments him, his unconscious mind seems to enjoy it; but he is filled with a great sense of guilt for the situation over which he has no control. From the moment he reaches the house of his father’s friend the childless Sambu Iyer, the mother-figure is substituted by the figure of Saradamami, Sambu Iyer’s wife. Rajaraman becomes a dual personality oscillating between his conscious and unconscious selves. Inspite of his conscious efforts to restrain himself he succumbs and the dream is materialized. The sense of guilt drives him to leave his house and become a rishi ridiculing and passing sarcastic statements on life.

If *Rishimūlōlam*, presents the unconscious effect of the mother-figure affecting the life of one of her children, *Ādum Narkaligal Ātukindrana* (1969) portrays effectively the conscious, omnipotent, possessive love of the mother wrecking the lives of her children and preventing them from establishing healthy man-woman relationship. Alankariammal’s over possessive love combined with her unhealthy attitude to sex make her view the world with suspicion, contempt and hatred. Her own disillusionment in marriage alienates her from society and she in turn alienates the children from the society and imprisons them. The dominating, possessive nature of the mother, prevents them from responding freely to others, and deprives them of the ability to maintain normal man-woman relationships. Jayakanthan condemns the unhealthy attitude to sex and life entertained by the mother which damages the lives of the children.
There are many striking similarities between Lawrence’s *Sons and Lovers* and Jayakanthan’s novelettes *Rishimoolam* and *Attum Narkaligal Attukindrana*. The mother-figure consciously and unconsciously influencing and affecting the lives of the children seems to be the main feature of these works. An Oedipal relationship affecting the lives of the hero and depriving them of their natural self can be discerned in both *Sons and Lovers* and *Rishimoolam*. The theme of the overpowering mother, who failing to achieve happiness in her own marriage, turning to her children for love and strangulating them and preventing them from having a life of their own can be identified in both *Sons and Lovers* and *Attum Narkaligal Attukindrana*.

An intricate novel discussing and debating various issues related to art, music, painting etc, *Parisuku Pō* (1966) explores in depth man-woman relationship as perceived by the different characters in the novel. Jayakanthan, who has been greatly influenced by Tolstoy uses one of his famous novel *Anna Karenina* as a frame of reference to express his views on man-woman relationship. The plight of a married woman caught between her obligation towards her husband and her love for her lover is graphically depicted by Jayakanthen in the novel. It exposes the agony and distress of an intelligent and independent woman’s (Lalitha) relationship with her husband (Mahalingam) whom she admires and adores for his godly qualities and her lover (Sarangan) whom she believes as the only man she loves. One of the character’s (Narasiah) long sermon on his death-bed on man-woman relationship is important for understanding Jayakanthan’s views on this bond. Narasiah strongly expresses the view that the uniqueness of Indian marriages is its intimate, inseparable aspect of this bond and therefore changes should be brought about for the betterment
of this union and not for the disillusion of this important bond.

_Samūkam Enpathu Nālu Per_ (1970) is a novel that presents the frustration and discontent of the hero (Muthuvender) in marriage as a result of lack of proper perceptions regarding sex in our society. He condemns our attitude to sex which considers it as an inevitable sin secretly and cunningly protected. For Jayakanthan, sex becomes a mere physical act without any emotional attachment if there is lack of proper understanding and true love between the partners in marriage. The hero’s unsuccessful relationship with both his wives, and his attempt to achieve fulfilment in life by establishing a relationship with Suguna, a liberated and emancipated woman is disrupted as a result of social claims and it drives him to commit suicide. There is a reference to D.H. Lawrence in the novel, when Jayakanthan makes his hero present a collection of Lawrence’s essays and say that for people who think independently and are individualistic these essays are of great significance.

Lawrence’s _The Trespasser_ and Jayakanthan’s _SENP_ seem to have some close resemblance. Both the novels portray the theme of a frustrated and discontented husband leaving the wife or wives (Tamil novel) and getting involved with a young woman to achieve fulfilment. Both Sigmund and Muthuvelar were married quiet young in their lives and they feel alienated from their wives in their later years. The irony of the situation in both the novels is that the husbands are not able to achieve what they desired due to different reasons but both commit suicide in the end.

_Cilla Nērangalil Cilla Manithargal_ (1970) initially conceived as _Time Changes_ won for Jayakanthan the prestigious Sahithya academy award in 1972. It is a remake of Jayakanthan’s short story _Agni Pravesam_ (1966) which evoked
vehement criticism and bitter resentment among the members of the orthodox Tamil society. They felt that Jayakanthan, through this story has not only distorted, but even scandalized the age-old concept of chastity and the importance ascribed to it. The resentment compelled Jayakanthan to change the course of the story and it resulted in the birth of this novel. Though new in its form and technique it has succeeded in exploring and exposing the theme of man-woman relationship from a different perspective. Jayakanthan admits in his preface to the novel that he has handled with bold imagination new characters and new themes.

The novel attempts to dramatize the changing phase of the heroine (Ganga) from a traditional simpleton, enticed by a stranger to a strong, self assertive woman who tries to reason, argue and assert her individuality in the family and in the society. Her uncle’s typical Indian conviction that a girl who has lost her chastity cannot hope for a marital status and his casual remark that if she aspires for it she should have the guts to trace him, inspires ideas for her. As suggested by her uncle she traces the man (Prabhu) who had seduced her twelve years back and projects him as her ‘man’ ignoring the comments and criticism of the society. In course of time Ganga realizes that though their relationship began initially as a mutual friendship, she has started falling in love with him. Prabhu who now has only sympathy for her for having spoilt her life realizes that his presence will only strengthen her love for him, therefore quits without notice. The novel ends with the dejected disappointed and frustrated Ganga resorting to drinks to calm her wounded spirit.

_Oru Nadikai Nādakam Parkirāṭ_ (1971), is a novel analyzing in depth the man-woman relationship in the modern society. The novel analyses the trials and
tribulations that threaten to hamper man-woman relationship in the present society. Misconceptions about love and lack of clear perceptions regarding its importance in man-woman relationship create conflicts in the lives of the characters. The hero’s (Ranga) duality coupled with his inferiority complex also contribute to create conflicts and tensions which result in marital discord. Class differences between the partners and misconceptions regarding love and marriage bring about problems in their marital relationship. Ranga, though he belongs to the slums, is an educated man with liberal and revolutionary ideas. A journalist by profession, he airs his radical views strongly without any reservations. But in his relationship with his wife (Kalyani) he is not the emancipated man with revolutionary ideas but the conventional Indian husband who cannot accept the individuality and independence of his wife. Inspite of his liberal ideas, Ranga falls a prey to the temptation of bullying his wife and trying to assert his will in making her accept his views. Kalyani’s calm, unimposing nature and her strong convictions on love and marriage are misunderstood by Ranga for lack of love and it creates rifts in their bond. She does not believe in the concept of romantic love or in the ritual of marriage and she gives more importance to the act of living and therefore insists on living together to prove the strength of love. The novel ends with Ranga realizing his mistake and accepting his wife with a clear conscience. Lawrence’s *Women in Love* and Jayakanthan’s *ONNP*, seem to explore the success and failure of the characters to achieve wholeness in man-woman relationship. The institution of marriage is seriously questioned in both the novels and the novelists offer solutions that they feel would set right this bond in the modern conflict ridden society.
Ganga Enge Pokiräl (1978) is a direct sequel to CNCM, in which Prabhu and Ganga meet again though on a different footing. Prabhu who has left his home, is spending his time in a distant village as a workshop mechanic, in the company of a small boy whom he has adopted. Unnoticed, far away from the maddening crowd, Prabhu is seeking joy in the simple pleasures of life and this had relieved him of much of the tensions of his earlier life. As planned earlier, Ganga comes to join Prabhu after retirement to spend the rest of her life with him. But the novel ends with the accidental death of Ganga the next morning, while she is taking her bath thus becoming one with the river Ganga, the symbol of holiness and purity. Ganga’s niece Vasantha is an important character in the novel. A doctor by profession and one who has been greatly influenced by modernist and feminist ideas, she articulates her views on man-woman relationship firmly and boldly.

Sundarakandam (1982) the novel that won for Jayakanthan the Rajaraman award of Tamil Nadu University in 1986, analyses in great depth the theme of man-woman relationship in the modern scenario. Though Jayakanthan has been preoccupied with this theme in most of his works in one way or the other, this novel proceeds to give a wider and universal perspective in relation to the Sita archetype. The novel attempts to examine the concept of marriage, its meaning, significance and relevance in the modern context using The Ramayana myth. Sita, the symbol of Indian womanhood, is the image that every woman wants to emulate and Jayakanthan warns women against such self-deception. He boldly proclaims that all men are Ravanas, and declares that if a woman is imprisoned by one such Ravana, she should free herself from it and not get entangled in it. To Jayakanthan a marriage
that is not based on true love, equality and mutual respect is imprisonment.

The novel dramatizes the plight of the heroine, an educated girl with liberal views (Sita), who is forced to marry an industrialist (Sukumaran) against her wishes, and her strong resolution to free herself from the bond. Though legally married, she could not accept him as her husband, as she sees him as the man who has imprisoned her. To her, he is Ravana, the one who has enslaved her without her consent and not Rama, the husband she loves and respects to whom it would be a bliss to belong. The hero soon realizes that physical intimacy between them is impossible, but still he wants the bond to continue, since he is concerned about his image in the society. He gives her freedom to accept someone as her lover and even to have a child from that relationship, but the only condition is that the lover should be a reputed and respectable person. There is a direct reference to Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, when the hero refers to his secret lover of this novel and how he is also prepared to accept the solution offered by Clifford to Connie, in his wife's case. As in Connie's case, the heroine also frees herself from the bond, and decides to engage in social activities till she finds her real Rama. Jayakanthan attempts to discuss through this novel, many issues related to man-woman relationship and passes his final verdict that a marriage that is not based on real love, affection, mutual regard and respect for the other and the willingness to accept and acknowledge each other's individuality is bound to be imprisonment for the partners.

A comparative study of these two writers reveals many correspondence, though some of the differences are more striking than the similarities. D. H. Lawrence and T. Jayakanthan, authors belonging to diverse milieus, ages, and having
led disparate lives seem to have some close affinities in their attitude to art and life. Controversial artists in their respective societies, they were deeply conscious of the problems faced by man in the modern society. They reveal a heightened sense of awareness of the disintegration that has gripped the society and the problems confronting this sacred bond in the modern conflict ridden society. They attempt to redefine some of the aspects of this relationship in order to realize its importance and significance in attaining fulfilment in life. They view sex not merely as a physical act but as something from which a greater power is evolved. They transcend the common connotations associated with sex and see it as a part of a larger concept, a purity which is above the physical. Both try to evolve a solution to their problem by a synthesis of the philosophies of the east and the west. Lawrence's views on man-woman relationship have been influenced by the Indian tradition, particularly by the principles of Saivism. There are also close affinities between Lawrence's concepts and the views enunciated by the Aham poets on this relationship. Jayakanthan who has been greatly influenced by Marxism and the psychological and the humanistic theories of the west seems to have been influenced by Lawrence too. An analysis of the novels of Jayakanthan reveals that he has been consciously or unconsciously influenced by some of the views of Lawrence. He has referred to Lawrence as a writer of exceptional caliber in his novelette *SEN*, where the hero presents his fiancee with the collection of Lawrence's essays. In his novel *Sundarakandam*, Jayakanthan refers to Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. In some of the other novels that have been taken for analysis there are instances of affinities between these two writers, which will be discussed in succeeding chapters.
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