CHAPTER III

Marriage: Problems and Solutions

Both Hardy and Jayakanthan have discussed not only love but also marriage. Differences are bound to crop up when man and woman join in marriage, which has not much room for romance. Hardy’s heroines are “caught in the trap of archaic and irrelevant legal, social and religious sanctions” (Page 41). Though divorce is not very difficult to obtain in Jayakanthan’s society, he does not resort to it either for creating or for solving the marital problems of his heroines (K.S.Subramanian 215). This chapter discusses the problems the heroines of the selected novels face in marriage and the solutions they seek.

Marriage was “the mainstay of Victorian fiction” (Cunningham 20). The novelists wrote love stories ending on a happy note in marriage in accordance with the taste of the reading public. If they presumed to discuss married life, they never revealed anything other than the happy home. “The covenant gate of marriage,” says Ellis, “was not again opened to the intrusive novel-reader’s eye” (273). Hardy, however, did not agree with the novelists of his time. He held that it was “quite possible to watch the passions at play even after a man and woman had got married” (Ellis 273). He did not believe that man and
woman could ever form a "satisfactory" marital union (Cunningham 51). Norman Page detects a "correlation" between Hardy's "attitude" to marriage expressed in his novels and "the deterioration of his own marriage" (44). Class differences and absence of children alienated Hardy from his wife (Williams 14). Jayakanthan considered the problems arising in marriage to be fit subjects for fiction (Rishimoolam 8-9). As against the novelists before him, Jayakanthan boldly discussed the factors responsible for premarital and extra-marital relationships. He dealt with both love marriage and arranged marriage. While some of his heroines are determined to solve the problems in their married life, some others wilfully ignore opportunities owing to dry idealism. The reason is that, as a "propagandist," he preaches in his later novels the policy that young men and women should stand on their own legs without getting married (Jayakanthan, Sinthayil Ayiram 3,109).

Hardy's heroines suffer because of the cruelty of their husbands. In Jayakanthan's novels, however, men face difficulties caused by their wives. Social factors as well as personal traits cause problems for the heroines of both Hardy and Jayakanthan. This chapter analyses the selected novels to discover marital problems under Part I and suggest solutions under Part II.
Part I
Marriage: Problems

All the selected novels of Hardy treat marriage. But the marriage prospects of the heroines are bleak since marriages "fail to accommodate the existing love relationships" (Page 47). It is easy for people to get married, but it is extremely difficult to disentangle the knots of legal and social obligations of marriage. Cunningham says:

In The Woodlanders a great deal is said in favour of divorce and against the discriminatory laws; Tess of the d’Urbervilles is a powerful indictment of the double moral standard (...). (80)

While woman is punished for sexual transgressions, her partner goes scot-free. So, she challenges the accepted ideals of marriage. Most women cause marital problems because they, and not their parents, are mostly responsible for the choice of their husbands (Cunningham 85). Hardy considered marriage to be a riddle not easily solvable and, as such, the problems in marriage to be endless. Thus the marital problems in Hardy’s novels arise owing to the difficulties caused by society, culture, love, characteristic tendencies of the women and the author’s attitude.
Fancy Day in Under the Greenwood Tree was “superior” to Dick (UG 171). She had secured a certificate as a Government teacher while Dick was a tranter’s son without high formal education. In education and social status, she considered Maybold suited to her (Page 39). She encouraged Farmer Shiner since she was “better in the pocket” than Dick (UG 124). Finally, Dick’s devotion won her heart (UG 148).

Thus Fancy’s education, status and wealth created problems for Dick in his courtship of her. Problems, however, were bound to arise in their married life because of Fancy’s romantic nature. There were two tones that a married woman adopted, one for social gatherings, and the other for the routine married life. Fancy felt frightened when Mrs Dewy discarded “the adorned tones” she had assumed for the social evening and returned to “the natural marriage voice” (UG 68). She “seemed uneasy under the infliction,” which would damage “the airy-fairy nature that Dick, as maiden shrewdness told her, had accredited her with” (UG 109). The difference between the romance of love and the reality of matrimony becomes more pronounced in the later novels.

Fancy’s frivolity caused immense misery for Dick. Until the end of the novel, the hero Dick had nothing better to go by than to believe, “What she loves best in
the world [...] is her hair and complexion. What she loves next best, her gowns and hats; what she loves next best, myself, perhaps!” (UG 156). Her temptation by Maybold and her deceptions until the very end of the novel were due to her superficiality.

Thus the heroine’s romantic nature and frivolity besides her status were the factors to cause marital problems for her.

Elfride in *A Pair of Blue Eyes* was equal in education to all her three lovers. Though bankrupt, Swancourt was a parson, and consequently, his daughter Elfride was a lady (Page 11). Hence the embarrassing proximity of Stephen’s parents [his father was a stone mason] was a factor that caused Elfride’s passion for Stephen to cool (Manford xv). Her chosen lover Knight was her step-mother’s kinsman and her equal in status. Lord Luxellian, who courted and married her after her rejection by Knight, was related to her: Elfride was his runaway great-aunt’s granddaughter. It is doubtful whether he would have married her if she had been of a lower class. Elfride, Stephen and Knight were almost equally poor. Luxellian married Elfride only for his daughters’ sake.

Thus status got in the way of Elfride’s courtship by Stephen.
Elfride had rejected Stephen not only for his low status but also for his immaturity. Her frivolous nature and her deep love for Knight caused her downfall. Her amorous experiences with Stephen, especially her unsuccessful elopement with him, turned Knight against her. He suspected her of having slept with Stephen. His harshness wounded her heart. Even after she had agreed to marry Luxellian, "she had sunk down like a heap of cloths, and fainted away" at the very mention of her lover's name by her maid Unity (PB 369).

Hence Elfride's status, her fickleness and her romantic love were her problems.

Eustacia, Clym and Wildeve in The Return of the Native were educated. Eustacia's father, who was a bandmaster, "took great trouble with his child's education" (RN 65). Clym Yeobright became "a real perusing man" right from his school days (RN 106). Wildeve was an engineer (RN 21). As Captain Drew's granddaughter, Eustacia was Wildeve's social superior. When he had run away with Thomasin, Eustacia felt that she had stooped in loving him. Clym's family "was as good as hers" (RN 107). The three of them were almost at the same economic level. Eustacia's grandfather Captain Drew was not rich. Wildeve did not earn much as innkeeper. Clym had left Paris penniless. It was not for status, however,
that Eustacia married Clym. She hoped that he would give up his foolish idea of educating the children of the heath and go with her to Paris (RN 199). Once she was certain that he had no intention of doing so, her love for him ebbed. Wildeve’s unexpected wealth tempted her (RN 303). When suddenly she doubted whether she was right in leaving for Budmouth in the company of one other than her husband, she committed suicide. Hence her lack of means was responsible for her death.

Thus Eustacia’s poverty was the cause of her marital problems.

Eustacia was unable to be content with her husband Clym because of her romantic nature. Her promiscuous tendency came to light in her dance with Wildeve on the village lea (RN 264). Nor had she the patience to wait until the advent of better circumstances. Thus Eustacia exemplifies “Hardy’s portrayal of the emotional life at the mercy of economic circumstances” (Page 40).

Eustacia’s romantic nature and Clym’s poverty destroyed their marital harmony.

Grace’s father Melbury in The Woodlanders “had purchased for her the means of intellectual light and culture far beyond those of any other native of the village” including the hapless Giles (TW 48). Fitzpiers was a doctor. So, he was suited to her rather than Giles
was. Being the daughter of a "simple countryman," Grace did not measure up to Fitzpiers, who was a nobleman, though penniless (TW 130). Giles belonged to Grace's class. The "standing" of Fitzpiers's family in the past overawed Grace, and so she willingly married him (TW 120). She was richer than both Giles (TW 48) and Fitzpiers (TW 122). But Fitzpiers thought that he had stooped to mating the daughter of a countryman and sacrificed social ambition for Grace (Duffin 45). Hence he ran away with Mrs Charmond.

Fitzpiers's status and Grace's lack of means created problems in their married life.

The promiscuous propensity of Fitzpiers, who had never really "behaved" towards Grace, Suke and Mrs Charmond "anyhow but selfishly," was a perennial hurdle to Grace's marital happiness (TW 196). He never took pains to earn the love of his wife, and always indulged in adultery irresponsibly. Her flimsy marriage contract was no security against the other two women, who stood in the same relationship with him without its legality.

Grace was under the illusion that under the new law "unmarrying is as easy as marrying" (TW 203). But she soon discovered that her husband Fitzpiers, who had run away with Mrs Charmond, "had not been sufficiently cruel to Grace to enable her to snap the bond. She was
apparently doomed to be his wife till the end of the chapter" (TW 217). Cunningham refers to "the moral inequality in the divorce laws, which make it impossible for her to dissolve her marriage on the grounds of his adultery" (89). The perceptions of the law, that Hardy's characters had, determined their future. Hence within the framework of the novel, the law was not in favour of Grace. When there was no legal solution, she began to vie with her husband in being adulterous. But for Giles's moral hesitation, she would have indulged in adultery herself. Thus Hardy's treatment of the marriage question in The Woodlanders is "explicit" (Page 40).

Hence Fitzpiers's status, his poverty and his immorality caused disharmony in Grace's married life.

Tess in Tess of the d'Urbervilles was educated in the village school (TU 22). Her education made her aware of a world of promise--though of peril--beyond her Marlott home. [...] after her first glimpse of Angel Clare, the young men of the village suffer by comparison with her gentility [...]. (Page 56)

As she was beyond the reach of the men of her station, she fell prey to the rich Alec's temptation. Both Alec and Angel were educated.
Social status plays a vital role in Tess of the d'Urbervilles. The very title refers with irony to the importance of genealogy. Parson Tringham called Tess's father "Sir John" and said that there was hardly another family like his in England (TU 13). This information caused her all the misery. To ask for help, she was sent by her mother to the Stoke-d'Urbervilles, who were not d'Urbervilles of the "true tree" (TU 48). Angel was of high status as he was a parson's son.

Poverty made her mother induce Tess to "claim kin" (TU 35) and seek the Stoke-d'Urbervilles' philanthropy. The old horse had been the family's only sustenance. When Tess had killed it, she felt she ought to do something to get a new one. Hence she agreed to her mother's proposal.

Tess's education served to unsettle the passive acceptance of her worldly lot. Her status as a d'Urberville placed her in Alec's power. Her poverty finally reduced her to be Alec's keep.

Tess's sexuality and her fickleness also caused her downfall. In her letter to her husband, she complained that she was "exposed to temptation" (TU 378). The strain of fickleness that manifested in all the heroines right from Fancy Day was the cause of Tess's rape (Cunningham 81).
Her husband Angel Clare was guilty of "eight and forty hours' dissipation with a stranger" (TU 256). Tess overlooked his lapse while he did not forgive hers. Hardy supports Angel saying:

A sensitive man like Angel Clare could never have been happy with her. After the first few months [if he had run away with her to Brazil] he would inevitably have thrown her failings in her face. (qtd. in Lerner and Holmstrom 92)

But The Daily Chronicle, 28 Dec. 1891, called Angel "unjust" (Lerner and Holmstrom 62). William Watson in The Academy, 6 Feb. 1892, noted "the unequal justice" which society meted out to Tess (Lerner and Holmstrom 80). After all "individual human beings are the victims of social processes they do not control" (Widdowson 75). Hence society's double standard was another cause for Tess's marital disharmony.

Tess's love for her husband Angel was the ultimate cause of her misery. If she had not loved Angel deeply, she would not have killed Alec. After murdering him she said, "Angel, will you forgive me my sin against you, now I have killed him?" (TU 431). It was because of her love for Angel that she was unable to cohabit in contentment with Alec. Hence her love before marriage was the cause of her death.
Thus Tess's family name and poverty created problems for her. Her sexuality and fickleness were responsible for her rape. Finally, the double moral standard in a male-dominated society, and Tess's own love for such a male, damaged her marriage irreparably.

To sum up, Hardy regards education as a cause of unhappiness in marriage (Fancy, Grace and Tess). Status also creates marital problems (Fancy, Grace and Tess). Poverty minimizes woman's chances of marital happiness (Eustacia, Grace and Tess). Woman's fickleness and sexuality cause marital problems (all the heroines). Excessive love before marriage spoils woman's marital harmony (Elfride and Tess). Woman's inability to accept the reality of marriage spoils her marriage (Eustacia). Law permitted no easy escape for her from her cruel and disloyal husband (Grace).

Jayakanthan's heroines face problems in their marriage because of their characteristic vacillation (Krishnasamy 143). They are easily tempted by men's money and glib tongue. Disappointment in early life tells on women's marital harmony. Romantic and physical love before marriage affects their married life. Though divorce laws are in their favour, men's traditional dominant role causes problems for them (Krishnasamy ix).
Loss of chastity mars women's marriage prospects completely.

All the characters in Parisukku Po were educated. Lalitha was a writer, her husband a lawyer, and her lover Sarangan a well-informed violinist. They were equal in status. Education, status and money did not create or solve problems for anyone.

Jayakanthan depicts arranged marriages as well as love marriages in this novel. Seshaya's eldest son Narasimhan, though childless, lived with his wife in contentment. His second son's young widow was content with taking care of her child and, later, the entire household. However, Seshaya's daughter Palammal had problems in her arranged marriage. When she saw her husband Narasaya on her nuptial bed with the dancing girl Ganga, she left him for good. Seshaya's last son Sarangan loved and married a French pianist. He was, however, divorced. The middle-aged lawyer Mahalingam married Lalitha for love. But she fell in love with Sarangan and became disloyal to her husband.

When Lalitha's youngest brother pushed her out of her house, she was so forlorn that she sought male company to fill up the sudden vacuum of her life. She was all gratitude when Mahalingam married her. Lalitha had already become a writer. Mahalingam was not much
interested in literature (PP 58). When she met Sarangan, she found him suited to her on various counts. He was intelligent like her. If she was a writer, he was a musician. His ideas on art and life appealed to her. She fell in love with him and began to sleep with him. When Sarangan induced her to ask her husband for a divorce, her conscience pricked her. If she loved Sarangan for his intelligence, she deified Mahalingam for his magnanimity (PP 215). Thus she was guilty of betrayal of the trust he had in her.

Narasaya’s infidelity was the cause of marital disharmony in Palammal’s life. She was so hurt by her husband’s disloyalty that she could not forgive him till the end. In spite of his entreaties, she deserted him, and did not even attend his funeral.

Hence the marital problems in Parisukku Po are the result of infidelity.

Ganga, Prabu and Ganga’s uncle Vengu in Sila Nerangalil Sila Manitharhal were educated. The question of status did not arise in anyone’s life. Ganga was poor when Prabu raped her. She, however, did not lose her chastity owing to poverty. Both Prabu and Vengu were rich. The heroine Ganga’s problems were not caused by status or money.
Ganga's plight was similar to that of Tess. Her fickleness and sexuality made her fall prey to Prabu. She considered herself so weak that she was afraid she would allow any man to seduce her if only she was forced (SN 60). She outwardly hated men. She said:

What would have happened if I had not told my mother [...]. I would have married somebody, borne a few children for him, remained content with him as if he had been everything to me, and continued to live in this manner, pretending to fear him or threatening him--what else could happen to woman here! (SN 118)

But the thought came to her: "The only relationship that [...] remains intact till the end is the one between man and wife" (SN 263-64). On the one hand, she hated men, but, on the other, she longed for male company (S. Subramanian 143). Prabu told her that he had deflowered her only with her consent. Hence Ganga's problems were of her own making.

Ganga's loss of chastity was her chief problem. She blamed her mother for having spoilt her chances of a happy married life by revealing her rape. What she meant was that if her rape had not been made public, she would be considered chaste by the society. Hence she was prepared to put an end to her twelve long years of spinsterhood by
marrying someone. Her old uncle Vengu, however, voiced society’s verdict that she was fit only to be a keep. She understood that he was asking her to be his keep (SN 65). She knew that there were men willing to marry women without chastity. But she committed the mistake of seeking out Prabu and trying to be his keep.

Her second mistake was that she rendered herself unfit for marriage by falling in love with her rapist Prabu, who had a family with a wife and three children. Her love was so deep that she told him she was prepared to go anywhere with him (SN 394). He was unable to befriend her because of her family’s displeasure. Thus in many respects, “Character is fate” in her case.

Above all, social mores got in her way whenever she had an opportunity to get married. When she was educated and employed, her uncle as a religious scholar prevented her from getting married by giving her the verdict that she should rejoin her rapist. When she had fallen in love with him, his mother, brother and neighbours compelled her to marry somebody else.

Therefore the problems that prevented the heroine of Sila Nerangalil Sila Manitharhal from getting married were her fickleness, sexuality and the consequent loss of her chastity, and her love for her rapist.
Kalyani, Ranga and Annasamy in Oru Nadhi Nadaham Parkiral were educated. Though Kalyani was a Devadasi, she did not suffer owing to it. All the three did not face problems caused by poverty.

She had spent her youth on the pleasures of the stage (ON 75). She felt that, by nature, she was unfit to marry (ON 76). Hence she decided to establish a "principled contract" with some man and be his keep (ON 76).

When Ranga came to Kalyani in response to her letter, he began to live with her. Soon, they discovered their deep love for each other. At Annasamy's insistence they got married. And then began their problem.

Ranga thought that his wife Kalyani had some costly habits for vanity. For instance, he did not understand why she was spending a lot of money on cultivating roses. When he expressed his opinion to her, she thought, "Was I vain when I felt excited and overjoyed watching each bud blossom?" (ON 134). Ranga suspected that Kalyani considered him to be no more than either a rose or a drama stage. His suspicion became a certainty when she gave him no credit for his romantic love for her (ON 176). He wanted to find out whether she loved him at all. He asked her whether she would sacrifice the stage and go with him to live in his former room. She refused to do so, and thought: "If I yield to him now, his demands will be
Their nights became miserable, Ranga accusing her of not loving him enough, and Kalyani dodging his questions and giving him a long rope. Finally, he declared that divorce was the only solution since two persons could not live as husband and wife without love (ON 220). All the same, if Ranga was romantically in love with her, she was no less in love with him since, while she was praying, she wrote her husband’s name unawares instead of that of the god (ON 215).

The problem in Kalyani’s life was similar to that of Grace. Fitzpiers married Grace for love. When he met Mrs. Charmand, he was attracted to her person and wealth. He did not try to understand Grace. He was both immoral and disloyal. Though Ranga was a man of integrity, his words and actions hurt Kalyani as much. He did not accept Kalyani’s ‘self’ (ON 251). K.Chellappan says, “The main cause of the conflict in the married life of Kalyani and Ranga is his refusal to accept her individuality […]” (369). Ranga believed that he could change her likes and dislikes according to his whims and fancies (ON 162).

The problems in Kalyani’s married life were caused by Ranga’s romantic love unaccompanied by compassion on the one hand, and his inability to accept Kalyani’s individuality on the other.
Malathi in Ovoru Kooraikum Keele was unable to continue her education beyond the eighth standard because she had to take care of her father when he was laid up with typhoid, her mother having died when Malathi was eight years old. The question of status did not arise in her case since all the families in that locality were poor with just four or five hundred rupees as income each (OK 15). She would have become a teacher if she had not discontinued her education (OK 16). Education as a means of job and independence for women is characteristic of the Tamil society (Krishnaraj 99). This was denied to Malathi.

When she asked herself what security she had after her poor father, "a dark future was the only answer" (OK 36). She could somehow spend the rest of her life running errands for her neighbours and helping the housewives in the kitchen. "But is life no more?" she asked herself (OK 36). Hence poverty was her main problem. Raju was not educated but had his own four-wheeler workshop. Shivagurunathan was educated but unemployed.

Malathi's poverty caused another problem for her. She thought that her father was unable to find a groom for her (OK 36). Hence she became the rich young workshop-owner Raju's keep. He was already a married man though she knew that "her life would not be honourable" as
Raju's keep (OK 38), she had to consent as it was her last resort (OK 38). She had not over-much sexual desire in being his keep. Raju was aware that their relationship had no legal sanction. Hence without the right to call her to his bed as often as he liked, he had to wait for days before she visited him at night in total secrecy. She had met him thus "four or five times" (OK 40).

When her father announced Shivagurunathan as her groom, her problem began. Though Shivagurunathan was poor, her life with him would be acceptable to society. However, that she was not a virgin was her problem. She was unable to make up her mind at once. She consulted Raju himself. He told her to agree to the proposal in spite of his deep love for her (OK 48).

Unlike Tess and Ganga, for whom society created problems, Malathi's troubled conscience was her problem since society did not know the loss of her chastity. She decided to ask her former teacher Packiam whether she was right to marry one man after sleeping with another.

Packiam had remarried a widower after her first husband's death. Her daughter considered her disloyal to her first husband's memory and rejected her. Packiam told Malathi that she had lived with her first husband as sincerely as she did with her second one (OK 68-69). She said, "Is it not my right to decide whether I need a man's
company? Or, is it that of others?” (OK 65). Malathi thought:

Packiam is a widow. She is arguing in favour of remarriage [...]. What have I done? Having lived secretly with one man like his wife, how can I marry another? [...] Won’t my conscience prick me all my life? (OK 69)

This shows that loss of chastity makes both society and the unchaste woman’s conscience undermine her marriage prospects. Malathi’s poverty and her guilty conscience were her problems.

Sita, Suhumaran and Giridharan in Sundara Gandam were educated, and had equal status. Sita’s father Sundara Sharma had three daughters. His first two daughters had got married when he was poor. He wanted to earn money by hook or by crook. So he started the journal 'Sundari' [Beauteous Girl] and serialized erotic stories, which increased its sale. He acquired aristocratic tastes. He drank foreign liquor and slept with costly prostitutes. The result was that he had incurred large debts.

Suhumaran was a rich, young widower, who was Sharma’s companion in debauchery. Sharma and his wife decided to give their daughter in marriage to Suhumaran without asking her consent.
Sita thought, "Father must have had this plan for quite a long time" (SG 48-49). She became sad. She said to her father, "I do not know why you are compelling me to marry a man who does not suit me and whom I do not love" (SG 87). He replied that he would commit suicide if she did not marry Suhumaran. Sita realized that she had already been sold and that she had no recourse whatever but to agree. She decided that, at least to show that her parents and she were no longer related except by the accident of her being their daughter, she should marry someone and leave their house (SG 92). "Here a modern slave is sold to a modern master with traditional rites. On her the seal of wife is stamped," she thought (SG 125).

Thus poverty was Sita's problem while both the men in her life were not poor.

Sita reacted after her marriage. She did not yield to her husband Suhumaran. She was determined to commit suicide if he tried to molest her (SG 153). When he had waited long enough, he asked himself, "Why not rape her?" (SG 205). He was unable to do so only because of his cowardice (SG 205).

Sita decided to seek economic independence. She asked Suhumaran for a job in one of his business establishments (SG 213). When her father resigned as editor of 'Sundari', Suhumaran appointed her to that
position. One night, she happened to see Suhumaran and Meena rolling lasciviously in each other's arms in the moonlight (SG 326). She wanted to make Suhumaran and Meena get married. He said: "I don't like a child being born to Meena by me. On the other hand, I shall proclaim as my own a child born to you by any man [...]" (SG 351). Sita was shocked by the words of such an amoral person. She said, "Yours is not a sacred home" (SG 352), and walked out.

Sita's problem was her being treated as chattel. She created problems for herself not only by marrying without love but also by loving someone other than her husband.

Thus Jayakanthan's heroines do not remain content in marriage. When they meet men suited to their nature and ideas of life, they transgress marriage morality and cause marital problems (Lalitha and Sita). The husband who is unable to accept the individuality of his wife creates problems (Kalyani). The husband who is disloyal to his wife also creates problems (Sita). As in Hardy, excessive love spoils marriage prospects for Jayakanthan's women (Ganga and Kalyani). Of the social factors, lack of resources creates marital problems (Malathi and Sita). Loss of chastity either known (Ganga) or unknown (Malathi) affects marriage prospects because of either society or woman's conscience.
Hardy and Jayakanthan bring out the marital problems of woman both in the West and the East. Poverty affects marriage prospects (Tess, Ganga and Malathi). Male chauvinism is another cause of woman's problems (Elfride, Tess, Kalyani and Sita). Woman's fickleness causes problems for her (Fancy, Elfride, Eustacia, Grace, Lalitha and Ganga). Romantic love either before or after marriage causes problems for her (Elfride, Eustacia, Tess, Lalitha, Ganga, Kalyani and Sita). Loss of chastity as a cultural aspect of woman's life creates marital problems (Tess, Ganga, and Malathi). Problems are created when man does not accept the individuality of his wife (Eustacia and Kalyani).

Education affects woman's marriage in Hardy (Fancy, Grace and Tess) while a lack of it prevents her in Jayakanthan from acquiring a job to help her stand on her own legs and have better marriage prospects.

Part II

Marriage: Solutions

Both Hardy and Jayakanthan thought that it was difficult to solve marital problems. Hardy said that he did not see any "possible scheme for the union of the two sexes that would be satisfactory" (qtd. in Cunningham 51). Jayakanthan, too, did not openly recommend solutions to marital problems Nanum Enathu Nanbarhalum 111). However,
Ellis finds solutions "sufficiently implicit in the structure" of Hardy's novels (Lerner and Holmstrom 144). Similarly, the Tamil scholar Valampuri John says that novelists should not shirk their responsibility to suggest solutions to problems they discuss in their fiction and that Jayakanthan too hints at solutions (Jayakanthan, Nanum Enathu Nanbarhalum 111).

Life's problems depicted in literature are not without solutions. The persons involved in the drama of life may or may not accept solutions. Those who read their lives in literature have the right to visualize them. The spectators know that Lear is in dotage and that Macbeth is ambitious. Thus writers depict problems and point out solutions on the one hand, and, on the other, spectators and readers analyse the problems in literature with a view to discovering solutions.

This part of Chapter III discovers solutions to the problems discussed under Part I.

Hardy gave importance to the sorrows in woman's life. He concentrated on the factors contributing to problems rather than to solutions. However, the following is an attempt by the researcher to trace solutions.

Education, which is universally considered to promote man's well-being, was, to Hardy, "a thin glossy coating upon a multitude of shabby minds and paltry souls" (Ward
The long line of educated men in Hardy right from Knight in *A Pair of Blue Eyes* to Angel Clare in *Tess of the d’Urbervilles* caused problems which either destroyed women completely (Elifride and Tess) or gave them no peace whatever (Grace and Eustacia). His women have “a good formal education and a quick native intelligence” (Cunningham 81). Still they “have a built-in predilection” for loving the wrong men (Cunningham 87).

Education helped neither Fancy Day select Vicar Maybold nor Elfride avoid attempting to run away first with Stephen and next with Knight. Eustacia was not cured of her impossible desire for being madly in love by her education. Nor was she helped by it to get used to her husband’s indigence. Education harmed Grace and Tess. Grace’s education rendered the humble Giles unfit for her and sowed the seed of discontent in her mind. Education made Tess look beyond the village youth. It misled her to the Stoke-d’Urbervilles. Hence education can be considered in no way to have helped Hardy’s heroines solve their problems.

Status based on genealogy played a major role in the lives of the people of Victorian England. Hardy himself suffered owing to “the extremes of a society in which he occupied a place somewhere near the middle” (Page 5). His unpublished novel *The Poor Man and the Lady* was a sardonic
treatment of noble birth (Page 8). In Hardy's novels, however, its role is minor. It remains to be seen how far status solved problems for Hardy's heroines.

Fancy's mother in *Under the Greenwood Tree* was a teacher in a landed family's nursery, and was foolish enough to marry the keeper (UG, 170). Fancy, with a little play-acting at loss of appetite, made her father give her in marriage to a tranter's son without further difficulty. Thus class distinction rather created problems than solved them for the heroine.

Class plays almost a negligible role in *A Pair of Blue Eyes*. The low class that Stephen belonged to made Elfride's love for him ebb a little. But she chose Knight to be her ultimate lover on the basis of his maturity (PB 289). She was related to Lord Luxellian. Her class helped her get married though it did not win her lover Knight for her and prevent her untimely death. Hence Elfride's social status did not solve her problems arising from her love.

Eustacia in *The Return of the Native* married Clym not because his family was as good as hers (RN 107) but only because she considered him to be the means of a glittering life in Paris. When that life was denied to her, she rejected him (RN 285). Hence class distinction did not solve Eustacia's problems.
Melbury in *The Woodlanders* had a high opinion of Fitzpiers's noble family, and encouraged his daughter Grace's interest in him (TW 120). Her visit to his ruined ancestral property made her feel romantic (TW 122). However, she finally married him as a learned doctor commensurate with her educated self since she had already started disliking the uncouth nature of Giles in comparison with her elite tastes. Later, her jolly trip with her husband on the continent and stay in royal hotels testified to her wise decision. When Fitzpiers fell for Lady Charmond and deserted Grace, she was in a "peculiar situation, as it were in mid air between two storeys of society" (TW 164). Felice Charmond, however, "was always a little despised by the other girls at school" for her low station (TW 168). She "was a play-actress" before Mr. Charmond married her (TW 172). Had Grace had more money, her class would have been greater than that of Mr. Charmond himself. Hence class could not have solved problems in Grace's life.

The heroine of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, after being raped by Alec d'Urberville, hated her ancestors "for the dance they had led her" (TU 122). She was not right. S. Rogers says, "While Jack seeks cash, Joan seeks an advantageous marriage for Tess" (2). She went to the Stoke-d'Urbervilles only because she was too poor to
support her family. Angel did not know her class when he fell in love with her. Nor did he leave her because of it. Neither Tess’s second fall nor her murder of her rapist could in any way have been prevented by it. Hence Tess’ class did not solve her problems.

The analysis so far proves that though class was very attractive in the eyes of Hardy’s characters, both male and female, it did not solve the problems faced by the heroines.

Money can solve problems like poverty and disease. It can buy education and class. Hardy’s men and women were no exception. All his heroines except Tess were fairly well off. It cannot be said, however, that they did not suffer for want of money since desire is boundless.

Fancy Day’s money in Under the Greenwood Tree was the reason why Dick Dewy was kept long on tenterhooks by Fancy. Once they were married, money had lost its role, the groom being as steady a breadwinner as any in his station as tranter, besides his plans for the extension of his business. Money, thus, was not required to solve problems for Fancy.

Elfride in A Pair of Blue Eyes had no difficulty either with her lovers or with her husband owing to money. Neither Stephen nor Knight expected money from her. Lord
Luxellian married her for her attachment to his daughters. Thus money did not solve problems for Elfride.

Eustacia Vye in _The Return of the Native_ was the first of Hardy's heroines who really suffered for want of money, the others being Grace and Tess. Being a captain's granddaughter, she was not poor. But she was not rich enough to translate into action her dreams of a life of poetry and dance (RN 285). She thought that her husband had failed her though he had never once promised before their marriage to take her to Paris. When she had lost hope that her husband would ever come back to her after their separation, she decided to reach Budmouth with Wildeve's help. But at the last moment in that fateful night, she thought it beneath her dignity to request help from a stranger (RN 358). It was not enough for her to reach Budmouth. She had to go to the continent. "Money: she had never felt its value before. Even to efface herself from the country, means were required," ran her thought (RN 358). If her romantic nature prevented her from accepting the life which fate had designed for her, it was money, and money alone, which could have saved her from suicide.

Grace Melbury in _The Woodlanders_ was a woman of means. But Mrs. Charmond eclipsed her. Melbury's money was a strong temptation for Fitzpiers in marrying Grace
Melbury (Duffin 45). But Mrs. Charmond's money was a stronger temptation. Therefore he deserted his wife. If Grace had had more money, she would not have had as many problems as she had.

Tess suffered throughout her life and finally died because of her poverty. She was driven by her lack of means to the Stoke-d'Urbervilles', where she lost her chastity. If she had had money, she would not have fallen victim to Alec a second time (TU 393), and murdered him eventually. Hence money would have solved Tess's problems.

In short, money bought education for Fancy (UG 170) and raised Stephen's status in the eyes of "the worthy Mayor of St. Launce's" (PB 354). In Tess of the d'Urbervilles,

Hardy's implicit point is that had Tess the money to stand out from the crowd she could have better utilized her ancestry, even with the socialist Angel Clare. (S. Rogers 2)

Hence among the social factors, money alone can be deemed to have had power enough to solve many of the problems that Hardy's heroines faced in their married life.

There are, however, more serious problems in marriage than money can solve. An analysis of the thoughts and
actions of the characters can reveal the solutions suggested by Hardy.

There were two problems facing Dick besides money in Under the Greenwood Tree. One was that the lovers, once married, are expected by the society to be "blind to romance" (UG 69). It would be difficult for his wife Fancy to adhere to society's expectation. The second was her secretive and deceitful nature. Even after Dick had proposed to her, her reply to him for his question whether she encouraged his rival Shiner was: "0,—I don't know,--yes--no" (UG 145).

Hardy seems to be against romantic love since it is in total contrast to the reality of married life. Both man and wife can learn to accept the commonness of married life as against the romance of premarital love. But the characteristic frivolity of a woman like Fancy will cause suspicion and mar the pleasures of married life.

Elfride in A Pair of Blue Eyes rejected suitor after suitor in an effort to discover her true self, and finally settled on Knight as the man who answered her definition of the ultimate lover. But she was guilty of inconstancy to Stephen and dishonesty to Knight. When she decided to give up Stephen, her conscience accused her of the "vows" she was forsaking (PB 249). She moved heaven and earth to prevent Knight from knowing her relationship with Stephen.
There is no reason to suppose that she ever revealed her love affairs to her wedded husband Lord Luxellian. Though most of her faults are exaggerated, her tendency to hide facts is not praiseworthy.

Hardy seems to aver two inferences in this novel. One is that the basic inconstancy and dishonesty of woman are not conducive to the peace and happiness of married life. The other is that there is no guarantee that romantic love will succeed and that, in case it fails, the misery that it causes will be proportionate to the depth of one's love. Elfride never recovered from her unrequited passion for Knight.

Hence giving up dishonesty and romantic love is the ultimate solution to marital problems. According to Hardy, if it is human nature to fall in love, then it is human nature to suffer. "No matter how fiery love may be, it is cooled by marriage," is a Russian proverb (Marriage, Quotable Quotes 2). The marital problems in The Return of the Native were Eustacia's inconstancy and her romantic ideas on love and life. Hardy has devoted more space to the description of her nature and person than he has done to any other of his heroines. "Tall and straight" with "two matchless lips" (RN 50) and "pagan eyes full of nocturnal mysteries" (RN 63), she was a "voluptuous" woman (RN 204). She wanted to enjoy pleasures without earning them. The woman who has the romantic desire to live life to the full (RN 285)
should be prepared to work for it. Furthermore, the characteristically "disturbing" sexual desires of Eustacia in no way help her abide by the code of conduct that marriage entails (Wright 171). Eustacia was unlikely ever to solve her problems since her very nature was problematic. A change of her approach to life alone would be her solution.

The society's double standard was the marital problem in *The Woodlanders*. Fitzpiers made love to Suke Damson before his marriage and to Lady Charmond after. He expected his wife to accept him when he returned to her after Lady Charmond's death. But when she lied to him that she had shared Giles's bed, he backed away. Cunningham sums up Fitzpiers's tendency:

> For Fitzpiers, Grace is either an adulterous, fascinating but no longer suitable as a wife, or a wronged innocent, easily lured back to the matrimonial fold, who can be betrayed without fear of sexual reprisal in the future. The poor girl cannot win. (97)

Grace made advances to Giles only in retaliation. When she had rejoined her husband, her father Melbury said:

> let her bear in mind that the woman walks and laughs somewhere at this very moment whose neck he'll be colling next year as he does hers to-
night; and as he did Felice Charmond's last year; and Suke Damson's the year afore [...].

It's a forlorn hope for her [...]. (TW 274)

Hardy himself wrote on The Woodlanders to J.T. Grein, "you have probably observed that the ending of the story--hinted rather than stated--is that the heroine is doomed to an unhappy life with an inconstant husband" (qtd. in Cunningham 87).

Hence the only solution to Grace's marital problems would be her husband's fidelity.

There were two solutions possible for the heroine of Tess of the d'Urbervilles. Her rapist could have given her "social salvation" (TU 100) if he had married her. When she and Angel were married, she asked herself whether she was not "more truly Mrs Alexander d'Urberville?" (TU 244-45). Angel said to her, "How can we live together while that man [Alec] lives?--he being your husband in nature, and not I" (TU 275). When her husband had deserted her, Alec approached her and proposed to her. She "did for one moment picture what might have been the result" if she had become "the monied Alec's wife" (TU 359). "It would have lifted her completely out of subjection [...]," she thought (TU 359). When her family was in total misery after her father's death, "a consciousness that in a physical sense this man [Alec] was
alone her husband seemed to weigh on her more and more” (TU 402). To Ranga’s question whether love was not required in marriage, the lawyer in Jayakanthan’s *Oru Nadihai Nadaham Parkiral* gave the answer: a married couple cannot be compelled to love each other (236). Tess’s very thought that Alec was her husband would be enough foundation on which to construct the tenement of their marriage. If Tess had not fallen in love with Angel and married him, she would have become Alec’s wife.

Since her solution did not come from Alec, she expected it from her husband Angel. He, however, did not go to her rescue. If he had forgiven her lapse and accepted her as his wife, her problem would have been solved. But he was unable to do so. When he had returned from Brazil, he considered hers to be “an actual modern situation,” and asked himself why he had not been able to “assimilate” it “into his weakly held modern principles” (S.Rogers 2), and to judge her “by the will rather than by the deed” (TU 414).

Since she did not love Alec, she might have fled England in Angel’s company. Or, Angel might have been a little more tolerant and forgiven her. Thus Tess was not without solutions to her problems. Hardy did not want her to reach them since Tess’s tragedy was Hardy’s premeditated conclusion (Lerner and Holmstrom 92).
The solutions to the marital problems in the selected novels of Hardy are money and fidelity. Money could have solved the problems of Eustacia, Grace and Tess. If Elfride had remained loyal to Stephen, she could have avoided all her problems. Had Eustacia been loyal to Clym and given up her impossible dreams, she would not have been forced to commit suicide. If Angel had been satisfied with Tess’s fidelity, he would not have lost the unrivalled love that she bore him.

There are solutions to the problems faced by the heroines of Jayakanthan from the way in which he describes the "superstitions, cruelties and treasons in vogue all along the ages" (Oru Ilakiavathiyan Kalai Ulaha Anubavangal 228). The renowned critic Sivathambi considers Jayakanthan to have written with the aim of pointing out solutions to problems in his society (Krishnasamy 27). S.Subramanian says that Jayakanthan’s female characters have the confidence to overcome problems and that they do not allow themselves to be overwhelmed by them (138). The discussion below is an attempt to discover solutions to the problems faced by the heroines of Jayakanthan in their marriage.

All the main characters in the selected novels were educated. In Parisukku Po Lalitha’s education did not overcome her immoral love for Sarangan. In Sila
Nerangalil Sila Manitharhal, Ganga’s education did not help her marry Prabu or any other man. In Oru Nadihai Nadaham Parkiral, it did not make Ranga accept Kalyani’s individuality. In Ovoru Kooraikum Keele, Malalthi was educated in a school. Her education, however, did not clear her doubt whether she was right in deciding to marry one man after sleeping with another. In Sundara Gandam, Sita was a Ph.D. scholar. Her education did not solve her marital problems.

The question of status did not arise in the Tamil society that Jayakanthan has depicted in the selected novels. Kalyani in Oru Nadihai Nadaham Parkiral suffered owing to her being an actress. She considered herself unfit for marriage (ON 76). Ranga was afraid of society’s unfavourable criticism as an actress’s husband (ON 62). But once they were married, the problems created by the fact that she was an actress no longer existed. In no other of the selected novels was it a problem at all.

Money plays an important role in Jayakanthan’s novels as in Hardy’s. According to him, money is one of the solutions to human problems (Vedasahayakumar 10). Sarangan’s father in Parisukku Po found fault with him for being penniless (PP 151), and, later, created difficulties for him by shutting off electricity to his rooms (PP 223). But Sarangan’s poverty never interfered either with his
excellence as a musician or with his love for Lalitha. The problems in Lalitha’s married life had nothing to do with money.

Ganga’s problem in *Sila Nerangalil Sila Manitharhal* was her loss of chastity, and not her poverty. She attributed her fall to the improper way in which her mother had brought her up (SN 292). She admired Prabu’s wife as a wise mother for having made her daughter aware of the pitfalls in teenage (SN 292).

Neither Kalyani nor Ranga was poor in *Oru Nadihai Nadaham Parkiral*. That Ranga did not possess a house of his own while Kalyani lived in a bungalow did in no way affect their married life. She moved in the house rented by him. Money had nothing to do with their marital problems.

Poverty was, however, the sole problem for Malathi in *Ovoru Kooraikum Keele*. If she had not been very poor, she would not have discontinued her education, and would have become a teacher (OK 6-7). She became Raju’s keep not because she was in love with him but only because she thought that her father was unable to give dowry, which plays a pivotal role in arranged marriages in the Tamil society (SG 104-05). She knew that even to remain unmarried, money was required (OK 36). Hence if she had
been rich, she would not have become Raju's keep, and her doubt would not have arisen.

Poverty was the main problem for Sita in Sundara Gandam, too. If her father had not been in debt, she would not have married Suhumaran, and would have been free to choose Giridharan as her husband.

Thus, of the five selected novels of Jayakanthan, two treat money as the sole cure for marital problems. Jayakanthan seems to think that money is a crucial factor not only in backward societies, in which poverty causes problems as in Malathi's case, but also in advanced societies since Sita's father was not a poor man when he incurred large debts. Therefore the problems caused by the want of money are inherent in any society. Money bought education for Ganga and promoted the Devadasi Kalyani's status. It would have made Malathi a teacher and helped Sita avoid an unhappy marriage, had it befriended them.

Hence Jayakanthan considers money to be an important solution to marital problems.

Jayakanthan's heroines face problems created by extramarital affairs and rape apart from poverty. Hardy's heroines except Tess in the selected novels did not indulge in extramarital affairs because he was primarily writing for the conservative Victorian society. The fact
that Jayakanthan was writing for a modern public gave him enough freedom to experiment with both premarital and extra-marital relationships.

Lalitha in Parisukku Po fell in love with a man other than her husband. If her husband Mahalingam had been problematic, she would have unhesitatingly asked him for a divorce. But he was not so (PP 208). When she was in a tight corner, she consulted her lover himself. Sarangan gave her three options: to seek a divorce from her husband, "who, in course of time, would realize the futility of his meaningless emotional attachment to his wife and mature from his bitter experiences"; to remain married to Mahalingam, "cherish her romantic love, and dedicate her life to creative writing"; or "to continue her illicit relationship" (PP 339-40). Sarangan condemned the last option as indecent and immoral. She chose the second one, since, "being a writer, she will not mope and pine, but be artistically kindled by the recollection of her days in his company" (PP 340). Jayakanthan seems to condemn divorce sought for no better reason than the extravagant immorality of the spouses in the name of romance.

Jayakanthan considers marriage and divorce from the points of view of Sarangan, Lakshmi, Palammal, and Narasaya. Sarangan, who had married the French girl Jean,
was divorced owing to his drunkenness (PP 111). He said: "Marriage is just an agreement, and not an irrevocable imprisonment" (PP 222). He was pained at the single life led by his brother's young widow Lakshmi, and said to Lalitha:

It is a cruel practice [...]. We are talking about modernity in literature, art and life! But how backward we are! That too in the case of woman, how backward our life is! (PP 206)

But Rangaya's widow Lakshmi was content to lead a single life looking after her son, her father-in-law and the household. Palammal considered her husband to have died the moment he had shared another woman's bed (PP 245). She was not ready to forgive her husband at all. She was "proud that she had rejected her husband for his mistake" (PP 157). Her husband Narasaya, on the other hand, said:

Marriage is not an agreement to be revoked [...]. A wife is not merely one who gives sexual pleasure; above it, she is her husband's mother too—she is greater than his mother; for the mother is a mere mother; the wife is a wife too! If a woman, who has got this splendid relationship, snaps it envying another woman who has just satisfied her husband's lust, there
cannot be much difference between the two.

(PP 267)

Narasaya's argument sounds logical.

Jayakanthan has depicted a wide variety of life in this novel and given each character their due. There are men and women like Narasaya, Lakshmi and Palammal in life who are tradition-bound. The question of divorce arises only for men like Sarangan. Divorce being legal, nobody has the right to question it. On the whole, Mahalingam held the right opinion when he said, "Forget the past [...]. Being true to each other is morality [...]" (PP 135). Whoever transgresses this moral will have problems. This is Jayakanthan's solution to most of the marital problems.

Ganga's problem in Sila Nerangalil Sila Manitharhal was her loss of chastity. Though she did not think well of men since her rape, she began to long for a man's company after twelve years of spinsterhood, especially that of a husband (SN 264). But her relatives got in her way. The only solution in cases like hers is to keep society ignorant of the lapses. Once such lapses come to light, it is impossible to deny society its cruel joy.

Jayakanthan offers a solution to this problem through Prabu's daughter Manju. As the subtitle Kalangal Marum [Times Will Change] suggests, Manju was the representative
of a time when education and worldly knowledge had totally changed womanhood. She not only kept men at arm’s length but made them cringe before her too (SN 390-91). Tagore, the Tamil critic who has discussed *Silathoratal* in an article (1974) says, "Manju’s character shows that when times change, the disadvantages that woman has will disappear" (Krishnasamy 48).

When all is said and done, the direct solution to Ganga’s problem according to Jayakanthan seems to be that she should ignore society’s accusation of her loss of chastity as outdated in the modern age and that, as Mahalingam in *Parisukku Po* said, she would do well to forget her past, marry some man, and be true to him (PP 267). Attempting to retrieve one’s lost chastity through a vain hunt for the rapist is impractical as Ganga’s life illustrated.

Ranga in *Oru Nadihai Nadaham Parkiral* was unable to accept his wife Kalyani’s self. He believed that true love consisted in sacrificing the self. When Kalyani was not prepared for it, he asked her for a divorce. But when he was separated from her as a precondition for divorce, he realized Kalyani’s selflessness in her services to him when they had been together. Hence he rejoined her. He learned that love does not consist in editing the personality of the loved one.
Jayakanthan wrote this novel to prove that romantic love is against those who are its slaves and that there are other qualities that hold husband and wife together. According to him, the kind of love that married people require is a combination of sincerity, honesty and compassion (ON 166-67). Grace and Fitzpiers in The Woodlanders failed to foster these virtues. Thus the novel Oru Nadihai Nadaham Parkiral is Jayakanthan's answer to those who find love lacking in their married life.

Premarital sex was Malathi's problem in Ovoru Koorai Kum Keele. She met her former teacher Packiam to ask whether she was right to marry Shivagurunathan after the loss of her chastity. Packiam said, "You have committed neither a crime that ought not to be committed nor a sin that cannot be expiated" (OK 72), and added, "It is a day-to-day happening in modern life--forget it" (OK 75). Malathi's problem seemed to Packiam "so simple that it made her even laugh" (OK 75).

Packiam, who had been remarried after her first husband's death, asked Malathi whether a good husband would expect his wife to "wither away" after his death (OK 68). Her daughter rejected her for having married a second time. She sadly observed that the young men and women of her day did not know how to live a modern life (OK 72). Packiam asked Malathi if it was not her right to
decide whether she needed a husband or not (OK 65). She said that the man who wanted his wife to live in despair after his death could not be modern (OK 68). She held that premarital aberrations are common in modern life (OK 75). According to her, one can be modern if one forgets one's past and remains sincere to one's spouse (OK 74).

Jayakanthan seems to believe that the solution to premarital sex is simply to forget it.

Sita in Sundara Gandam had two solutions before her. She should either divorce Suhumaran and marry her lover Giridharan or, in the event of a divorce being beyond her, cohabit with her lover. She opted for neither. When her father gave her all the modern ideas in favour of divorce (SG 255), she said: "In the present social milieu moral men and women should seek economic independence and keep waiting until a better social order is ushered in" (SG 359). About Jayakanthan's women like Sita figuring in novels like Antha Ackavai Thedi [In search of That Elder Sister] and Ooruku Nooruper [A Hundred Persons in Each Village], Vedasahayakumar says:

Even though these women have the opportunity to shatter the shackles of social compulsions, they refuse to do so, and try to seek happiness in an insincere life between the needs of nature and the social mores. (17)
Jayakanthan's idealism alone prevented Sita from reaching her solution (*Sinthayil Ayiram* 109).

Jayakanthan gives more importance to marital problems and their solutions than Hardy does. Money can buy education (Ganga) and raise status (Kalyani). It can solve the problems of most of his heroines (Ganga, Malathi and Sita). The spouses accepting each other's individuality and not trying to efface it can solve marital problems (Kalyani). Fidelity rescues women from extra-marital love (Lalitha and Malathi). The universal solution to marital problems according to Jayakanthan is to forget the past and be true to each other.

Hardy and Jayakanthan suggest solutions to marital problems arising from social factors, cultural observances and individual traits. Of the social factors of education, status and money, the last is considered by both to be capable of solution since it can buy education and raise status (Fancy, Grace, Ganga and Kalyani). Loss of chastity should be overlooked (Tess, Ganga and Malathi). Characteristic fickleness (Elfride, Eustacia, Lalitha and Ganga) should be overcome. Premarital (Tess, Ganga and Malathi) and extramarital (Elfride and Lalitha) affairs should be forgotten. Marital morality is redefined as being true to each other. Jayakanthan wrote fiction almost a century after Hardy. The vast time gap
and the resultant change in men's minds helped Jayakanthan discuss premarital and extramarital affairs freely. He has treated problems on a large scale and suggested concrete solutions.

This chapter has analysed the marital problems in the selected novels of Hardy and Jayakanthan and discovered the solutions suggested by them. Both the writers stress the need for a change in social outlook as a precondition for solutions. The findings are presented below in terms of similarities and dissimilarities.

Both Hardy and Jayakanthan pried into marriage to lay bare the problems in it. Poverty causes problems for women in marriage (Eustacia, Grace, Tess, Ganga, Malathi and Sita). Women straying from the strict observance of chastity as a cultural aspect cause marital problems (Elfride, Tess, Ganga and Malathi). Male chauvinism creates problems in married life (Elfride, Grace, Tess and Kalyani). Characteristic fickleness makes women transgress marriage morality and create problems in marriage (Elfride, Eustacia, Grace, Tess, Lalitha, Ganga and Malathi). Premarital love causes women misery in marriage (Elfride and Malathi). Extra-marital love, physical or ideal, creates problems (Eustacia, Grace, Lalitha and Sita).
Money in both Hardy and Jayakanthan would have solved most of the problems for women (Eustacia, Grace, Tess, Ganga, Malathi and Sita). If men had considered women to be equal to them in sexual vacillation, they would not have been guilty of cruelty to them for premarital lapses (Tess and Ganga). The solution suggested by both novelists is to forget the past, be true to each other, and not be swayed by temptation after getting married (Elfride, Tess, Lalitha and Malathi).

Dissimilarities arise owing to differences in the individual characteristics of the writers, social customs and cultural practices. Hardy considers formal education to be a cause of marital trouble (Fancy, Grace, Fitzpiers, Tess and Angel) while a lack of it alone causes problems in Jayakanthan (Malathi). Hardy's men and women suffer owing to class distinction (Dick, Stephen, Grace and Tess) whereas Jayakanthan sees even a Devadasi (Kalyani) claiming equality with anybody else in society by dint of her education and money. Men in Jayakanthan (Ranga and Shivagurunathan) accept the individuality of their women, but those in Hardy do not, because of the gap of a century between the two writers.

Problems arise in marriage because of sexual transgressions both by men and women. It is impossible either to eradicate human temptation or to ignore social
prohibition. To forget the past and remain steadfast in marriage is a halfway house. Women (Grace, Tess, Ganga and Sita) have long learned to coexist with men's sexual vagaries. Men in Hardy's time were still either unwilling (Fitzpiers) or hesitant (Angel) to accept those of women. However, in Jayakanthan's modern age, men (Suhumaran and Shivagurunathan) have learned this lesson. The next chapter discusses this question further under chastity.