

I General Introduction

The present research probes into the anatomy of love especially of the protagonists Florentino Ariza and Fermina Daza in Marquez's *Love in the Time of Cholera*. They suffer throughout their lives because of the tension between illusion and reality especially in the context of their love. Love, for them, is at once a profane desire that gives them physical as well as mental suffering and a sacred mystical power that heals their suffering. Florentino suffers a lot just as he might suffer from any fatal disease and conflates his physical agony with amorous agony when the lady of his heart marries another man.

Florentino becomes mad in her love and suffers from love sickness which no physician can treat. So in the name of healing his suffering, he begins to indulge in illicit relationship with hundreds of loveless love. In spite of such sensual relationship with prostitutes, his heart remains true to Fermina for his unrequited love. After waiting for fifty one years, nine months and four days for her husband's death, he completes his self imposed emotional exile of unfulfilled love. He vows eternal fidelity and everlasting love to Fermina while she is attending her husband's funeral. Outraged by his timing, Fermina forbids him to return to her on the one hand, but while she sleeps mourning, she begins to think more about Florentino than about her recently dead husband. And in her dream also she dreams not her husband but Florentino--the man of her heart. So the main idea in the novel is that love sickness is a literal illness or disease comparable to cholera and a symbol of insanity. Florentino's nostalgia of love is transformed into a reality of love. Ultimately his suffering ends in the union with the lady of his destination. So their love gives them suffering and solace at the same time. Thus, there is contradiction in their love.

Gabriel García Márquez is the most celebrated of the writers who emerged during the great boom in Latin American literature in the 1960s--a group that included

Carlos Fuentes, Julio Cortázar, and Mario Vargas Llosa including Marquez. Garcia Marquez was born in Aracataca, Colombia in 1928. While a law student at the Universidad Nacional in Bogotá, he met thirteen-year-old Mercedes Barcha Pardo. They were married fourteen years later. Garcia Marquez left law school in 1950, devoting himself to writing. He worked for several newspapers, writing both fiction and nonfiction. His journalistic work, political engagement, and restlessness took him to various locales in Europe and North America, as well as Latin America and the Caribbean, over the next fifteen years.

In 1965, Garcia Marquez began writing *One Hundred Years of Solitude*—the novel that not only put him on the literary map but also established him as one of the world's greatest writers. Garcia Marquez's use of the fantastic, or "magical realism," is one of the most readily identifiable features of his fiction. He tells interviewers, "Reality is not restricted to the price of tomatoes "(Columbus 5).

Garcia Marquez's writing also incorporates much Latin American social and political history. Many of his books appear on college reading lists that specifically address these topics. His political writing and activism angered the Colombian government and forced Marquez to spend much of his adult life in Europe, Venezuela, and Mexico. Colombia welcomed him back in the 1980s. He skillfully weaves history and politics with the collective soul and intuition of the Colombian people, endearing him to readers throughout Latin America. He won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1982.

Like many great novels, Gabriel Garcia Marquez's *Love in the Time of Cholera* portrays the tension between illusion and material reality, especially in the context of love. In the novel's final pages, when Florentino Ariza and Fermina Daza are finally together in their old age, we are told that love "was more solid the closer it came to death" (Marquez 345). This statement exemplifies the novel's method

instead of saying what love is, and in this way judging the strength of its characters' grasp of reality, it articulates the relationship between love and something else, giving different perspectives but no definitions. This circling around love gives *Love in the Time of Cholera* the quality of capturing the ineffable.

Different ways of understanding, experiencing, and representing love are embodied by the novel's three central characters—Florentino Ariza, Fermina Daza, and Dr. Juvenal Urbino. For Florentino, love has the properties of a dream; its fullest expression occurs in art (especially in writing), and it stands in opposition to everyday reality, entirely resistant to rational understanding. Like Emma in *Madame Bovary*, Florentino is filled with notions of love derived from popular literature; he also becomes a comic figure when reality unexpectedly intrudes into the world of his imagination. The bird droppings that fall on Fermina's embroidery when they meet as teenagers in the park and the intestinal disruption that betrays him when they meet following Dr. Urbino's death both testify to the unavoidable fact of the material world. But Florentino's fate suggests neither acquiescence to reality nor the continuation of his belief in a wholly illusory kind of love.

As the relationship between Florentino and Fermina unfolds following Dr. Urbino's death, it seems enabled by Florentino's emergence from the imaginary world in which he has lived for so long--his very existence of his imaginary world is made possible by Fermina's absence from it. The letters Florentino writes to her after Dr. Urbino's death possess, in Fermina's words, "a foundation in reality" (330), as opposed to the letters of his youth, inspired by "half-baked endearments taken whole from the Spanish romantics" (75). But other aspects of the novel's conclusion complicate this interpretation. Before making love, Florentino tells Fermina, "I've remained a virgin for you" (339). In light of his many trysts and affairs, in what sense could this be true other than an imaginary one? When asked how long their ship

will sail, keeping up its deception by flying the yellow cholera flag, Florentino answers, "Forever", as if to specifically deny the reality of death (348).

Because of his belief in the power of the rational mind, Dr. Urbino often appears more grounded in reality than Florentino. He considers marriage "an absurd invention", and his marriage to Fermina represents a lifelong effort to defeat the absurd and replace it with something that can withstand logical analysis (209). After his death, Fermina recalls his belief that "the most important thing in a good marriage is not happiness, but stability" (300). On the night they consummate their marriage, Dr. Urbino readily admits to himself that he does not love Fermina, but "he was sure there would be no obstacle to their inventing true love" (159). He thinks of love not as an unruly passion, but as if it can be brought into existence merely by an act of will. But his determination to avoid the chaos of emotion can make Dr. Urbino seem just as divorced from reality as Florentino. In his dissertation, Dr. Urbino asserts that, given the human organisms "many useless or duplicated functions [. . .] it could be more simple and by the same token less vulnerable" (158-59). Is this idea any less illusory than the most extravagant of Florentino's ecstatic proclamations of his love for Fermina?

Between the extremes of Florentino and Dr. Urbino is Fermina. When Dr. Urbino first tells her about the importance of stability, she hears in it a "miserable threat," but when she remembers his words after he dies, she thinks of them as "the lodestone that had given them both so many happy hours" (300). She ends her first affair with Florentino by telling him in a letter that "what is between us is nothing more than an illusion" (102). As coldly precise as this declaration is, Fermina is nevertheless open to the emotional upheavals that attend her marriage to Dr. Urbino. When he confirms her suspicion of his adulterous affair with Barbara Lynch, she wishes he had denied it, preferring the illusion of his fidelity to the feeling that "her

rage would never end" (251). Sharing memories of Dr. Urbino with Florentino, Fermina "could not conceive of a husband better than hers had been, and yet when she recalled their life she found more difficulties than pleasures," admitting to Florentino that she does not "really know if it was love or not" (329).

It is tempting to see Fermina as encompassing both the illusory and the real, but such symmetry would reduce her to a thematic device, as opposed to a fully alive character, capable of expecting nothing more from life after her husband dies and then falling in love with Florentino. The fact that neither she nor the novel ever arrives at a fixed definition of love suggests that its elusiveness is part of its very nature.

The novel begins when Dr. Urbino comes to examine the body of his close friend Jeremiah Saint-Amour. Jeremiah kills himself at the age of 60 in order to avoid growing old. Upon returning to his home, he finds his beloved pet parrot atop a mango tree. While trying to retrieve it, he falls to his death.

Florentino Ariza takes this moment to proclaim his love for Dr. Urbino's aged wife, Fermina Daza but she is repulsed by this outburst and more than a little scared at the feeling she has engendered. When she was young, she and Florentino had written passionate love letters to each other and had even decided to get married. Upon seeing Florentino, however, Fermina is overcome with disgust for him and rejects him.

Florentino maintains an obsession for Fermina and intends to stay virgin until they are together, but soon finds him using sex to mitigate the pain of their separation. Fermina marries Dr. Urbino and becomes a respectable wife to him. Dr. Urbino does likewise except for a brief affair.

Only after Dr. Urbino's death is Florentino able to regain his love for Fermina. He is able to--with the power of his writing-- rekindle their relationship. On a river voyage together, the elderly couple finds themselves in love. Fermina fears the

scandal it may bring think doom to exile but also to be together forever.

Love in the Time of Cholera has received criticism from various critics.

Different critics have analyzed the novel from different perspectives for instance, Claudette Kemper Columbus in his essay, "Faint Echoes and Faded Reflections: Love and Justice in the Time of Cholera," remarks:

Cholera is a metaphor for a disease of the society for social irresponsibility and for relationships that pass as 'love' relationships. It is unsurprising that love continues to be read as being imitation heroism, imitation that felt to make contact with reality or to intervene in the historical elements. The time of Cholera symbolizes styles of avoidance of reality, a disease symbolic of our times, the contagion spread in part by the narcissism of readers soft on critical self-reflection. The text of love splits onto two levels, one representing the lover as lovers and other doubling that these characters can love. (92)

According to Columbus, cholera is a metaphor for a diseased society which suffers from social irresponsibility. It is also about avoidance of reality. The text of love splits into two levels, one representing the lovers as lovers and others doubting that these characters can love. However, he does not talk about the paradox in the novel.

Another Critic, Elissa P. Benedeak, in "Book Forum Literature: *Love in the Time of Cholera*" states that the novel is about love affairs where one or both of the lovers had Cholera, sort of in earlier version of today's love stories about people with AIDS"(1587). Benedeak, is of the opinion that the novel is about lovesickness; here one or both of the lovers have cholera. He confines himself at the literal level of interpretation of the text. He also does not talk about the contradiction of love inherent in the novel. Similarly, Elizabeth A Berverly in her article "The Distance between Bodies" says: "*Love in the Time of Cholera* is about a kind of love which

both defines and redeems time, anger and contagion, but to spend time reading about it. It is the virtue of patient and the suffering of the patients that allows us to recognize and accept love, time and even Cholera. "(410-11). Beverly means that this novel is about the virtue of patient and the suffering of patients that allows us to recognize and accept love even at the time of cholera. So she also does not talk about the profane and sacred love subtly present and discussed in the novel.

Thus, the novel has been observed from several angles by different critics and reviewers in term of love, hate, self-reflection, and disease. However, the main issue in the novel is about contradictory love affair between lovers which proves that love is always love anytime and in anyplace however painful it might prove. All the critics mentioned above have missed this point. The present researcher, therefore, proposes to study this issue in this thesis work.

The present researcher studies the romantic irony on love with respect to the central characters in four chapters. The first chapter is an introduction to the present research, and it presents the hypothesis, a general introduction to the author and the novel against the back drop of different critics' commentaries on the novel. The second chapter elaborates the methodology employed to study the text. The principal theoretical tool employed in this research is romantic irony. The third chapter presents a detail textual analysis with textual citations so as to reveal how the novel documents the instances of paradoxical situation of love among different characters. This chapter presents the analysis for showing much profane and sacred love of characters, especially Florentino and Fermina. The final chapter concludes the research with a brief recounting observation of the work affirming the hypothesis.

II Love and irony

Even though it is difficult to define what irony is, it generally means the differences between the appearance and the reality. In other words, irony is the contrast between what is 'implied by action' and what is the 'actual outcome', what is said and what is meant, or what is thought about a situation and what actually is the case. So, irony is defined as a gap between 'what is said' and 'what is intended'. There are many verbal devices that say one thing and intend another and thus invite the reader to reconstruct unspoken meanings. If we study about the history of its origin and its meaning, the term 'irony' is derived from the Greek term *eiron*, a dissembling character in Greek comedy by Aeschylus, to denote a mode of behavior expression where the *eiron* more plausibly pretends to be saying or doing one thing while really conveying a quite different (often opposite) message.

The term irony (Greek term *eironeia*) has been first recorded in Plato's *Republic* referring to the irony implied in Socratic dialogue. Likewise, Cicero used the Latin term *ironia* to elaborate the rhetoric of irony. While seeking the origin of irony D. C Muecke remarks as:

Eironeia is first recorded in Plato's *Republic*, applied to Socrates by one of his victims; it seems to have meant something like a smooth, low down way of taking people in. For Demosthenes an *eiron* was one who evaded his responsibilities as a citizen by pretending unfit. For Theophrastus, an *eiron* was evasive and non-committal concealing his enmitie spretending friendship, misrepresenting his acts and never giving a straight answer. (15)

From the above quoted lines it is clear that irony was first published in Plato's *Republic*. For Demosthenes an *eiron* was the person who avoids his/her responsibility

as a citizen pretending unfitness. Similarly, for Theophrastus an eiron was not giving direct or straightforward answer or in another words eiron means to do something to avoid danger and keeping something being seen or known. It is a type of concealing his/her enemies pretending friendship, misrepresenting his/her acts.

Deceptions such as lies, hoxes, hypocrisy, white lies and evocations which purport to convey a truth but may also be seen as contrast of appearance and reality. But since they are not thought of as irony, it is evident that irony has some other elements besides this contrast. In this respect though deception and irony seen to be close neighbour there are differences between irony and deception:

In Theophrastus both the Eiron and Alazon were dissemblers, one concealing himself behind evasive, non-committal,, self-depreciative mask, the other behind a facades of boast. But the modern ironist, whether he plays an ironic or an alazonic part, dissembles or rather pretends, not in order to be believed, but as has been said in order to be understood. In deception, there is an appearance that is preferred and a reality that is withheld, but in irony, the real meaning is meant to be inferred either from what the ironist says or from the context in which he says it, it is withheld only in the weak sense that it is not explicit or not meant to be apprehensible. (35)

This citation shows the distinction between deception, lies and irony. Deception and lies also claim to convey a truth but do not. They may also be seen as contrast between an appearance and reality but they are not thought of as irony because in irony, the real meaning is meant to be understood but in deception, lies, hoax, the real meaning is not meant to be understood, but rather meant to be hidden.

Wyane C Booth, in the preface of his book *A Rhetoric of Irony*, tries to clarify the concept of irony as:

For both its devotees and for those who fear it, irony is usually seen as something that undermines clarities, opens up vistas of chaos and either liberates by destroying all dogmas or destroys by revealing the inescapable canker of negation at the heart of every affirmation. It is thus a subject that quickly arouses passion. (ix)

This view supports that irony has become the mother of confusion and there is no agreement among critics about what irony exactly is. It has never been fully explored. That is why; irony can mean many different things on many different pages and in many periods.

For many reasons the concept of irony is vague, unstable and multiform. The word irony does not now mean exactly what it meant in earlier centuries or it means differently to different writers, critic and scholars. The semantic evolution of irony has been haphazard. However, in the words of Samuel Johnson "a mode of speech of which the meaning is contrary to the words" (qtd. in Enright 5). Similarly, *Concise Oxford Dictionary* defines irony as an:

expression of one's meanings by language of opposite or different tendency, specialty. Simulated adoption of another's point of view or laudatory tone for purpose of ridicule, ill -timed or perverse arrival of event or circumstance in itself desirable, as if in mockery of the fitness of things, use of language that has on inner meanings for a privileged audience and an outer meaning for the person addressed or oncerned(5)

According to the entry in Oxford Dictionary, irony means an expression of something by language of difference as well as opposite tendency. For example, it is a kind of praise in order to ridicule or it is a kind of using of language that has an inner meaning for the audience/spectator and an outer meaning for the person addressed or concerned.

For Northrop Frye's effect to comprehend the whole of literature in one grand vision, irony can mean many different things on many different pages, indeed it must be. He says that irony cannot be reconciled with many works everyone would call ironic. He wrote in *Anatomy of Criticism*:

The ironic fiction writer then deprecates himself and like Socrates, pretends to know nothing even that he is ironic complete objectivity and suppression of all explicit moral judgments is essential to his method. The pity and fear use not raised in ironic art: when we try to isolate the ironic as such, we find that it seems to be simply the attitude of the poet as such, a dispassionate construction of a literary term, with all assertive elements, implied or expressed eliminated. Irony as a mode, is born from the low mimetic, it takes life exactly as it finds it. But the ironist fables without moralizing and has no object but his subject. Irony is naturally a sophisticated mode. (40-41)

This view claims that Socrates was an ironist who pretended to know only one thing that is nothing. So, he is ironic by hiding his intelligence and knowledge.

The scope of irony as a rhetorical enforcement was first available in the irony implied in Socratic dialogue. The irony later on renounced as the Socratic irony that shows Socrates' simulated ignorance to make the argument stronger. It means that the pose of pretended ignorance adopted by the speaker, hides a skeptical, non-committal attitude towards some dogmas, or opinion that lack a basis in reason know only one thing is nothing. So, he is ironic by hiding his intelligence and knowledge. The ironic writer or speaker's awareness of himself as observer makes him free inducing a mood of satisfaction and his awareness leads him to see victim as bond or trapped where s/he feels free. The ironist's own attitude is that of a man whose world appears real and meaningful, and who would see the victim's world as illusory or

absurd. The Socratic irony has also been adopted by many other like Cicero who define irony as a way of treating one's opponent in an argument and as the *verbal strategy of a whole argument* were ignored at first, and for two hundred years and more irony was regarded principally as a figure of speech. The word was defined, as saying the contrary of what one means," as saying one thing but meaning another," as "praising in order to blame and blaming in order to praise, and as mocking and scoffing"(qtd. In Muecke 17)

So in their view irony is regarded as a figure of speech. They emphasize upon the contrariness in irony.

Ever since irony as a word and concept came to the attention of ancient Greek culture, there have been arguments about how irony works and what its scope is or could be. Does irony refer to a word with implied different meaning or is it an entire manner of speaking? The way irony works in uniting (or dividing) authors and readers has been relatively neglected since the latter part of the eighteenth century, and it has never been fully explored. Before the eighteenth century, irony was one relational device among many, the least important of the rhetorical tropes. By the end of the Romantic period, it had become a grand Hegelian concept, with its own essence and necessities, or a synonym for romanticism. Hegel saw the ironist as "unable to act a proper man's part in the world, being formed of negation and nostalgia, contemptuous of the finite (and of the infinite too) indulging herself / himself in bliss of the self enjoyment enhanced by the annihilation of whatever is noble and great"(8).

For Alan Wilder, irony is a typical of the twentieth century, presumably a symptom of some on-going crisis. Wilder, in *Horizons of Assents* (1971) offers how irony works:

Irony, as the typical form, at all levels, of this century's response to the

problematic of an increasingly recessive and dissolving self and an increasingly randomized world, strives, by constantly reconstituting itself, to achieve the simultaneous acceptance and creation of a world that is both indeterminate and, at the same time available to consciousness. . . (4) Irony is more potent vigorous and agile than this report appears to suggest, more closely related to objective realities, more serious. (5)

Hence the Wilder views irony simultaneously as creation and of the world which is both indeterminate and available to consciousness. So irony seems more closely related to reality.

New critics like Cleanth Brooks, perhaps the most original and important critic of the time has made irony in to a kind of synonym for comedy, for the "dramatis tic", and for dialectic: "[A]ll of these refer, in life and literature, to the ways in which, for those who can tell a hawk from a handsaw, the hawk's view modifies or "discounts" the handsaws, and vice-versa" (Booth ix).

William Empson follows with a passage akin to part of T. S. Eliot is definition of wit in the essay on Andrew Marvell: "Irony in this subdued sense, as a generous skepticism which can believe at once that people are and are not guilty - is a very normal and essential method. People, often, cannot have done both of two things, but they must have been in some way prepared to have done either" (6). This is the type of irony that does not reject or turn upside - down, but quietly casts doubts and leaves the question open: not evasiveness or lack of courage or conviction, but an admission that there are times when we can not be sure, not so much because we do not know enough as because uncertainty is intrinsic of the essence. It is generally granted that irony is devious, yet rarely do we give it the sustained attention to its nuances, its multiple workings, its successive and various effects- which we devote to

the most static of poetic images.

Irony is a way of making statement, not unlike that of poetry, which through the unexpectedness and the avoidance of head-on assertion had stronger chance of discomposing, if not winning over, the person addressed. The obvious problem, once the genuine article had been disentangled from the idle phantasms that arise out of habit, senseless tics of the mind, was to gauge how effective--by dint of jolting, intriguing or in its peculiar fashion, amusing--the irony had proved. Amused someone, so it has been claimed in another connection.

Irony is an extraordinarily good road into the whole art of interpretation--no matter of life or literature. Though ironic statements are only a small part of all that men say to each other, they bring to light the hidden complexities that are mastered whenever men succeed to understand each other most flat and literal. Booth remarks about the trouble of irony as:

Irony, an aggressively intellectual exercise that fuses fact and value, requiring us to construct alternative hierarchies and choose among them, demands that we look down on other men's follies or sins, floods us with emotion-charged value judgments which claimed to be backed by the mind accused other men not only of wrong beliefs but of being wrong at their very foundations and blind to what these foundations imply--all of this coupled with a kind of subtlety that cannot be deciphered or "proved" simply by looking closely at the words, no wonder that failure to communicate and resulting quarrels are often found where irony dwells. (44)

Quarrels and dissatisfactions are likely to appear in ironic treatment. So people who love irony are inclined to destroy other man's sacred objects and beliefs. Aristotle had used *eironeia* in the sense of self-depreciative dissimulation rather higher than

alazoneia or boastful dissimulation. In this phase the word eironeia had been developed from a mode of behaviors to a rhetorical figure and used to blame by ironical praise and to praise by ironical blame. If we see Cicero, he has not used 'ironia' as an abusive meaning of the Greek word.

D. C. Muecke deserves citation, on the emergence of the word "irony" in English and into general use:

The word irony does not appear in English until 1502 and did not come into literary use until the early eighteenth century: Dryden, for example used it once. English, however, was rich in colloquial terms for verbal uses which we might regard as embryonic irony: flee, flout, gibe, jeer, mock, scoff, scorn, taunt. Putterham's *Arte of English poesie* (1936) actually translates ironia as "Drie Mock" and this clearly indicates an appreciation of the deadpan quality of a more subtle degree of verbal irony. (16-17)

According to Muecke though irony did not appear in English until fifteen hundred two, there was a kind of embryonic irony prevailing in verbal use before that

Besides that, during the late seventeenth century the words such as derision, droll, rathy, banter and so on were used heavenly which automatically helped to keep the word irony as a literary word later on. As in the rest of Europe, the concept of irony developed very slowly in England. For two hundred years and more irony was considered as a figure of speech, defining the word as saying contrary of what one means, or as saying one thing but meaning as praising in order to blame and blame in order to praise.

Irony perhaps no other form of human communication does so much with such speed and economy; it is mislaid under sudden 'declaration' and 'profusion'. The more sophisticated among us are unused to the devious and when duty obliges us to

take note; we are inclined to labor it as a significant discovery.

Irony since Romantic era--"the mother of confusion"(ix) irony is usually taken as something that undermines clarities, opens up vistas of chaos, and either liberates by destroying all dogma or destroys by revealing the incapable canker of negation at the heart of every affirmation. It is thus a subject that quickly arouses passion.

Irony has become a pervasive rhetorical strategy in postmodern culture, and its dominance has sparked debates about whether it should be lauded as a vehicle for political commentary, or its political function is essentially conservative. Irony as a political mode of story telling brings with its both promise and problems, in that its message are more subtle resulting both in enhance freedom for the viewer and also difficulties and misunderstandings in interpretation. By using irony as a primary means of communication, the film-makers also assume that the viewer shares his/her values.

Booth, in this reference, refers some other terms that also say something and intend something else as:

There are many verbal devices that 'say' one thing and 'intend' another and thus invite the reader to reconstruct unspoken meanings.

Metaphor, and simile, allegory and apologue -to say nothing metonymy, synecdoche, asteismus, michterismus, charientismus, preterition or of bonter, railiry burlesque and paronomasia. (7)

Despite some similarities between irony and other terms, irony is different from them. It is different in nature, origin and kind. Rather metaphors can be used ironically. Irony as direct and classic devices is not only of oratory and of every kind of communication where it occurs. It is intended but covert. Discovering an ironic intention in a work depends in the ironic reconstruction. Irony has become a part of our life, and reading an irony worth bothering about, we read life in a real sense.

In reading any metaphor or simile, as in reading irony, the reader must reconstruct unspoken meanings through inferences about surface statement that for some reason can not be accepted at a face value. Beardsley defines a literary work as "discourse" in which an important part of the meaning is implicit" such a "semantic definition" of literature as "meaning" of course leads him to classify kinds of literature according to their degrees of "secondary" or implicit meanings: Metaphor and irony tend in this view to become treated in similar term, since both are ways in which discourse becomes "self-controverting" . A metaphor is "a significant attribution that is either indirectly self-contradictory or obviously false in the context" (Booth 22). There is a radical difference between what the two figures require us to do, though both may be said to be in one sense "self-controverting" the powerful shock of negative recognition essential to irony is secondary or muted or perhaps sometimes even non-existent in metaphor (22).

Obviously metaphor can itself be used ironically, when it is , the fourfold process of interpreting irony sets in "police are pigs" or Marilyn is a gazelle" may be straight forward metaphors or ironic ones, to decide that they are ironic we must take the same steps as we would with a non-metaphorical irony (24). He means to say that metaphor should be read ironically.

Shakespeare's metaphor is really ironical in the poem "All the World's a Stage". Here, he metaphorically connects the world with the stage. Metaphorically speaking as the author says and as he clearly believes the world is like a stage. It is also true that even in the most amiable irony one can also always imagine a victim by conjuring up a reader or a listener so naive as not to catch the joke, no doubt in some uses of irony the fun of feeling superior to such imagined victim is highly important . Even irony that does imply victims, as in all ironic satire, is often much more clearly directed to more affirmative matters. And every irony inevitably builds a community

of believers even as it excludes.

In short, irony is used in some satire, not in all, some irony is satiric, and much is not. And the same distinction holds for sacra son. Miss Frust shows the difference between irony and satire as she opines:

The satirist is harsher, employing ridicule, contempt indignation, anger, his attack is 'grounded in ethical standards', and he is a moralist. The ironist, on the other hand, is 'governed by relativities', and does not set himself up 'in the authoritative pre-eminence of the judge'. He is not certain enough, and tends to admit the good and the bad in every alternative. (qtd. In DJ Enright 16)

Hence, she concludes that while satire is ostensibly the harsher of the two, it is also the more buoyant since it implies an underlying faith in the potentiality for betterment.

She further says:

A pessimistic satirist without that faith would not bother to make his attack. 'By contrast, the art of irony, ostensibly less abrasive, may be the more disturbing because it is an enquiring mode that exploits discrepancies, challenges assumptions and reflects equivocations' but does not presume to hold out answers. (17)

The ironist's relativities can be absolutes in the light of disguise. Satire often preaches to the converted, or is buoyed up solely by itself. Both satire and irony may derive from and provide a measure of solace for the pessimist. The satirist is not always hopeful, and may be short on morality. It all depends. By dint of polarizing, Miss Furst has pinned down a form of satire which isn't irony and a form of irony which isn't satire.

Like every other figure except irony itself, pun can be used either ironically or

straight. Puns of all kinds are close to stable irony in intending a reconstruction, they are all more or less covert and most of them yield rigorously limited or local interpretation. But many of them are more like metaphor than irony, lacking the steps of negation. Regarding the issue Wayne C. Booth opines that:

when we were at the circus, the heat was in-tents. The folk pun requires a leap of reconstruction, but it does not require us to repudiate the surface meaning which makes perfectly good sense in itself (when the pun is spoken, not written), when we do recognize the pun we must still keep the original meaning unmodified as part of the reconstruction. (26)

Despite some similarities between irony and other terms, irony is separate from them. It is different in nature, origin and kind. Rather metaphor, pun and satire can be used ironically. Unlike metaphor or allegory, which demand similar supplementing of meaning, irony has an evaluative edge and meaning to provoke emotional responses in those who get it and those who do not. If metaphor reveals "hitherto unsuspected connectives" then irony cannot be "a kind of metaphor"(90). The two tropes may indeed belong to the same general family of semantic deviation, but metaphor's defining relation of similarity is not the same as irony's defining relation of difference. The notion of Irony as metaphor to which it is added the idea of contradiction falls to take in to account both the edge that irony gets from its differential semantic structure and necessarily dynamic, performative and social dimensions of ironic happenings. Metaphor is rooted in the naming function of language while irony is based on the communicative function. Of course, to create a composite, different interdependent one.

There are different types of irony. Among them verbal irony is also called instrumental irony in which language is the instrument. However, it is not always

easy to distinguish verbal irony from observable irony. In verbal irony the ironist says something in order to have it rejected as false. In observable irony, the ironist presents something ironic like a situation, a sequence of events, a character etc. M. H. Abrams defines verbal irony as:

[. . .] Is a statement in which the meaning that a speaker implies differs sharply from the meaning that is ostensibly expressed. The ironic statement usually involves the explicit expression of one attitude or evaluation but with indication in the overall speech situation that the speaker intends a very different and often opposite attitude or evaluation. (135)

Abrams takes irony as a discrepancy between the implied meaning and the surface expression.

It is a figure of speech in which the meaning of a statement is opposite to the meaning intended. A complex instance of verbal irony can be realized in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice* in which she opens the novel with the ironic statement : it is the truth universally acknowledged that a single man in possession of a good fortune must be in want of a woman. Here, Austen does not mean what she has expressed as a single wealthy man is in want of wife but she is satiric here and she means that a single woman is in want a rich husband.

In verbal Irony, sometimes the meaning and evaluation may be subtly qualified than simply reversed and the clues to ironic meaning the author intends may be oblique and unobtrusive.

The next type of irony is dramatic irony. In dramatic irony, the character is ignorant, whereas the author and reader have knowledge of present or future. Here at last, normally the character has a journey from ignorance to knowledge. M. H. Abram remarks:

Dramatic irony involves a situation in a play or a narrative in which the audience or reader shares with the author knowledge of present or future circumstances of which a character is ignorant ;in that situation , the character unknowingly acts in a way we recognize to be grossly inappropriate to the actual circumstances. (136-137)

Thus, in dramatic irony the reader shares the knowledge of the situation with the author about which the character is ignorant. Dramatic irony can, however, become comic irony if the revelation of reality generates humor, thereby leading the characters to the happy resolution.

Cosmic irony is also called 'the irony of fate'. In it, fate deliberately manipulates even so as to lead the protagonist to false hope and frustrates as well as mocks the protagonist. In Thomas Hardy's novel, we can find cosmic irony abundantly.

Another type of irony is a disjunctive irony. Non-resolution of the paradox intensifies the dramatic effect of disjunctive irony. Critic Beerendra Pandey rightly observes that "this non-resolution makes the irony in *The Waste Land* disjunctive with a little astringent verge on the satire"(113). Here opposites go together with reluctance and apathy, so disjunctive irony leads to the final defeatism lacking resolution. It keeps the work poised on a paradox.

Another widely used irony is romantic irony. It is a long jump from the Socratic irony which is distinctly unromantic to the romantic in the nineteenth century. It is also known as the paradoxical irony. Romantic irony has emerged out of the philosophical relationship between nature and human being. Friedrich Schlegel in this regards says:

The artists who can bring off the difficult balancing act, this wonderfully perennial alternation act, this 'wonderfully' perennial

alternation of enthusiasm and irony' produces a work that includes within itself in its own coming into being. He will be like god or Nature immanent in every finite created element, but the reader will also be aware of his transcendent presence as an ironic attitude towards his own creation. This creative surpassing of creativity is Romantic Irony. (Muecke 25)

The artist who creates some work of art and the irony produces a work of art that includes within itself in its own form. S/he is like god or nature. And the reader also must be aware of his/her transcendent presence as an ironic thought or attitude towards his or her own creation. Such type of creativity is romantic irony. Pure or archetypal ironist is god who sits in heaven with knowledge keeping us in illusion what is going to happen. D. C. Muecke comments on God with the similar views:

He is the ironist par excellence because he is omniscient, omnipotent, transcendent, absolute, infinite, and free. The archetypal victim of irony is per contra, man seen as trapped and submerged in time and matter, bound, contingent limited and unfree- and confidently unaware that this is his predicament. (48-49)

Here, God is compared with ironist or puppet master, as playing a game in which men are toys, pawns, where men are taken lightly, whimsically and god smiling down upon his own creation making an object of a play.

In Romantic irony the author is like God or nature immanent in every created element and the reader is also aware of his transcendental presence as an ironic attitude towards his own creation. Muecke observes Romantic irony as:

Creative surpassing of creativity is Romantic ; it raises art to a higher power since it sees for art a mode of production that is in the higher sense artificial because fully conscious and arbitrary and in the highest

sense natural because nature is dynamic process internally creating and eternally going beyond creation. (25)

Regarding the same issue Friedrich Schlegel further says:

Romantic irony views the world as chaotic , unpredictable and inexhaustible fertile ,and the artist ,in the face of it , as obliged to recognize the limitations of his own consciousness; his perception of infinite are inevitably partial and thus in some degree false ,yet he must rightly value them [. . .]And so he preserves balance in his work between rhapsodic affirmation and skeptical reservation (qtd. in D. J. Enright¹²)

Here Schlegel says that for romantic ironist the world is full of chaotic and unpredictable and the artist has to be obliged to recognize the limitation of his own consciousness and should preserve a balance in his/her works.

Schlegel calls Romantic irony as dialectical and paradoxical irony. For him the basic metaphysically ironic situation of man is that he is finite being striving to infinite and incomprehensible reality? We can call this the observable irony of nature Schlegel remarks:

Irony is the form of paradox. Irony is the analysis of thesis and antithesis. Schlegel comments on irony as: irony is the only involuntary and yet completely deliberate dissimulation [. . .] Everything should be playful and serious, guilelessly open and deeply hidden [. . .]. It contains and arouses a feeling of indissoluble antagonism between the impossibility and necessity of complete communication (23-24)

This view of irony has established literature as the site of human consciousness about his/her ironical relation with nature, which is full of dialectical tension.

Schlegel argues that artistic creation has two contrary but complementary phases: expansive phases and contrastive phases. In the expansive phase the artist is naive, enthusiastic, and imaginative but this thoughtless ardor is blind and unfree. In the contractive phase, he is reflective, conscious, critical and ironic but without ardor is dull. He further says, "irony is nothing to joke about. That's true, of course, and of course, it is not true [. . .] Affirm and deny in one sentence, and you too can be a romantic ironist" (25). The originality and strength of Schlegel's thinking lay in his firm grasp of life as a dialectic process and his insistence that human behavior is fully human only when it also awaits an open dynamic dualism. Everywhere in his writing we find him repudiating the law of contradiction and denying the value of anything that is not both itself and itself and its self-generating contrary.

Karl Solger's concept of irony rises to even more rarified metaphysical heights than Friedrich Schlegel's and even those who without to clarify Solger are not easy to follow. More explicitly than Schlegel; he locates irony at the centre of life. He says:

While the universal, the definite and absolute can be manifested in particular, finite or relative forms, that is by a self-negation or annihilation, these in turn must self-destructive in the process of fulfilling their function which is to reveal the universal, the infinite and the absolute. The irony resides in the two-fold opposed movement in which each sacrifices itself to other. (qtd. in Muecke²⁵)

From the above quoted lines, we know that he focuses how expressed and intended meanings opposed each other and sacrifice one to other meaning.

The term Romantic irony in its technical sense is more familiar to German than to English scholars. As M. H. Abrams says:

Romantic irony is a term introduced by Friedrich Schlegel and other German writers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to

designate a mode of dramatic or narrative writing in which the author builds up the illusion of representing reality only to shatter it by revealing that the author as artist is the creator and arbitrary manipulator of the characters and their action. (137)

Hence Abrams sees the ironist as the creator and arbitrary manipulator of the characters in action.

In romantic irony the character builds up an imaginative and romantic world but at last imaginative world is destroyed by the realization of ugly reality. One can find it a constant dialectic interplay of subjective and objectivity. In the words of Muecke "[w]e are very close to romantic irony when the work is accompanied by a critical commentary on events and characters and closer still when the commentary directs its ironic attention to literary composition in general or even to the composition of the work in hand" (qtd in Padmanabhn 40)

Byron's great narrative poem *Don Juan* (1819-24) persistently uses this device for ironic and comic, revealing the narrator to be fabricator. Schlegel sometimes confusingly identifies Romantic irony and distinguishes as infinitely superior to rhetorical irony. He tries to characterize the self-consciousness of the modern writer and his awareness of the complexity and the gelatinizing of things. Romantic ironist adopts attitudes at once of romantic enthusiasm and ironic detachment towards his creation. The ironist has an attitude in which everything must be jest and yet serious, artless, openness and yet deep dissolution. Schlegel deserves citation on the nature of Romantic irony: "It includes a sense of poignancy and pathos of man's existential plight benefit of absolute sanction- of what we might perhaps term cosmic irony(qtd. in Leod 35)

Romantic irony as an artistic tool envisages a double aim: by incorporating the artistic self awareness to imbue the created work with the dynamic of the creative

process, and simultaneously but in reverse, to invent a form for expressing this artistic illusion of self creativity. Successful romantic ironic mode seems to be art raised to a higher power, a work whose raw material is already art. Romantic irony, even embraces verbal and structural irony, too.

In *English Romantic Irony (1980)* Ann K. Mellor does her best to explain the phenomenon, which she considers radically new around eighteenth century related to the various revolutions of the late eighteenth century, political and industrial and decline of belief in a newly God-oriented universe, and then to demonstrate its presence in English writing. She defines the romantic ironist as one:

[W]ho perceives the universe as an infinitely abundant chaos; who sees his own consciousness as simultaneously limited and involved in a process of growing or becoming; who therefore enthusiastically engages in the difficult but exhilarating balancing between self-creation and self-destruction; and who then articulates this experience in a form that simultaneously creates and decreases [. . .] (13)

Here, according to the above quoted lines, romantic ironist's situation is the mixture of self-creation and self-destruction, s/he involves in a process of growing or becoming whose world is unpredictable and chaos.

The trouble is that so few sizable defining examples of it are forthcoming. What can it be of which Lord Byronism the 'most masterful' exponent and which are 'quintessential' in John Keats? which is manifest in *Sartor Resartus* 'masterfully embodying 'an attack` on the limits of language (ironically, a favorite pursuit of professional users of language today) and present, if guilty denied, in S. T. Coleridge, and also, though he went in fear of flux and disorder, in Lewis Carroll? Byron, Miss Mellor says, exhibits 'a heroic balancing between enthusiastic commitment and Sophisticated skepticism' Agreed, he is romantic and unromantic,

solemn and flippant, high-flown and down-to-earth, by turn (13)

Romantic irony is the mixture of both the qualities of opposite meanings.

With this view Enright analyzes Romantic Irony as:

'Romantic Irony' is simply having it both ways -infinite/finiteness, angel/ape, passion/reason, power/importance, praise/lament, [and so on] all those ancient dichotomies [. . .]. In which case it is a question of degree, not of kind, and hence in no need of special treatment [. . .]. Goethe may have summed up the topic in this lucid verse epigram: 'if you wish to advance in to the infinity, just follow the finite in all direction. (14)

Here, the romantic irony means having both qualities for examples infinity and finiteness, angel and ape, passion and reason, and so on Keats mixes ardor with reasoned skepticism; he found life both beautiful and painful. (love in a hut ,with water and a crust , is - love , forgive as !- cinders,ashes,dust'was as near as he came to the Byron , and he soon sheered away)(14). There is nothing extraordinary there, nothing unprecedented, apart from the intensity of Keats's sensation more justly in his ability to persuade us that what happens is happening for the first time ever.

Lilian R. Frust has made of sterner stuff albeit the physical weight of her book, *Fiction of Romantic Irony in European Narrative 1760-1857*(1984), is at odds with the ethereal abstractions within it. She opens by declaring that "we must come to grip with irony, and with romantic irony too, if we too understand modern literature" (15). Miss Frust's description of the 'commanding position 'thus awarded it smacked of a N. A. S. A. handout:"The dialectic of its tension is to permeate every facet of the aesthetic artifact, shaping its outer and inner configuration, and this dynamic is to act as the propellant for the advance towards transcendence. The destructive step for the subsequent re-creation on a higher plane"(15). Miss Frust further says:

In the transition from traditional irony to romantic irony, irony within framework of the fiction is transmuted into a fiction which may then be potentate in to an irony of fictional irony -aired of the functionality of existence. It is a process that starts with ambiguity, edges from ambivalence to paradox and ends in an alienating derangement of the text and of the text send of the world. (17)

Hence, she attempts to assert that instead of ascending in ecstatic self- liberation, irony may provoke a descent in to an agonizing awareness of uncertainty. It is a process that begins from ambiguity edges from ambivalence to the paradox and that ends in alienation.

Paradox as a figure is just the opposite. Here the name refers to a statement which on the surface seems false, contradictory, or nonsensical, but which turns out to further examination, to reveal a hither to unconsidered truth. In this respect there is the affinity between paradox and irony. In both cases, it seems that there is an explicit surface meaning and than a secondary cancelled meaning which is the real point of the utterance and constitutes its truth value.

In contemporary literary theory there is a widespread belief that ironies and paradoxes are closely akin. This is due to the importance that is given to the use of language in contemporary estimation of literature. Ironies and paradoxes seem to embody the shorts of a linguistic rebellion, innovation, deviation, and play that have throughout this century become the dominant criteria of literary value. The association of irony with paradox, and of both with literature, is often ascribed to the new criticism and more especially to Cleanth Brooks. Brooks however, uses the two terms in a manner that is *Unconventional*, even eccentric, and that differs significantly from their use in figurative theory. The present researcher will, therefore, examine irony and paradox as verbal figures, nothing their characteristic features and criteria,

and in particular, how they differ from one another. Regarding the irony and paradox *Brooks* opines:

Have important affirmatives with irony and paradox as figures but they must be regarded as quite distinct, both in figurative theory. This is due in part to the huge importance that is given to the use of language in contemporary descriptions and estimations of literature. Ironies and paradoxes seem too related and embody the sort of linguistic rebellion, innovation. Deviation and play that have throughout this century become the dominant criteria of literary value. (25)

The explicit association of irony with paradox with literature is often ascribed to the new criticism, and more especially to new critic Cleanth Brooks. Brooks, however, uses the two terms in a manner that is unconventional, even eccentric. He thinks of irony as a principle of order and unity: not so much a feature of language or meaning as a sort of coherence joining disparate elements together, rather like Aristotle's conception of wholeness and integrity in poetics (Brooks 1951). As for paradox, Brooks regards it as a quality in language very like Viktor Shklovsky's defamiliarisation i. e. a deviation from conventional language designed to wrench our perception and our thoughts into unaccustomed, and therefore enlightening, pathways paradox, in this view, is a device which compensates for the limitations of conventional language, and is this the only way in which poets can express the unconventional in sights that are their stock in trade. Paradox, for Brooks, is not just useful and entertaining, but necessary. He takes paradox as the language appropriate and inevitable to poetry as he says, "Language of poetry is the language of paradox" (Brooks 3).

Brooks was not, of course, the first to say this kind of thing, nor was the new criticism the first to draw attention to irony and paradox as source of literary value. The history of Romanticism is filled with similar sentiments, and they are among the

factors that define what Romanticism is, or was. It was the first of the rebellions against the Enlightenment, and not least against the ideal of a Cartesian clarity of language.

Unlike the Romanticists, for New Critics, a paradoxical irony is not the outcome of paradoxical relationship of human beings with nature rather the multiple impulses and experiences that are likely to be subverted by another. So for New Critics too, literature is the representative of this fact of paradox which shows how human beings maintain poised balance even such contradictions. Irony, for them, has become a general criterion of literary value--an internal equilibrium of opposite experiences, attitude and evaluations, which, as Muecke starts, brings "in to a "balance poised"(Enright 26). So from the above discussions, it is clear that all literary works more or less are ironic. And irony is a form of paradox. In this regard ironies and paradoxes are closely interred- related. They are inseparable or in other words one cannot exist without other or one is the integral part of the other.

There are many paradoxical situations in the matter of love of different characters along with the main character in Marquez *Love in the Time of Cholera*. So the researcher feels that the theoretical tool of research must be applied to study the paradoxical love situation in the novel, *Love in the Time of Cholera* by Marquez. Romantic irony is also known as the paradoxical irony. Here, in the text, there are many paradoxes of love between Florentino Ariza and Fermina Daza. Florentino indulges with hundreds of prostitutes in the name of healing the suffering but in vain and tells with Fermina that he is virgin for his unrequited love for her. And similarly, Fermina also when Florentino appears to vow his everlasting love for her becomes angry and scolds him not to show his face again to her but when she sleeps she sees Florentino not her dead husband in the dream of the first night of her husband's funeral. So, both the protagonists--Florentino and Fermina's--activities are different

or contradictory in the appearance and the reality. So, it is justifiable to use romantic irony for textual analysis of this dissertation.

III Love as Profane and Sacred in Marquez's

Love in the Time of Cholera

The fascination of passionate love lies in its promise to resolve the paradoxes of compelling and opposing erotic quest which is the longing for oneness with the beloved. Love lies in the intermediary space between body and mind bounded by biological instinct on one side and imaginative impulse on the other. The love of Florentino for Fermina begins when he happens to see her for the first time when he reaches to Fermina's house to deliver a letter:

As he passed the sewing room, he saw through the window an old woman and a young girl sitting very close together on two chairs and following the reading in the book that the woman held open on her lap. It seemed a strange sight: the daughter teaches the mother to read. His interpretation was incorrect only in part, because the woman was the aunt, not the mother of the child, although she had raised her as if she were her own. The lesson was not interrupted, but the girl raised her eyes to see who was passing by the window, and the casual glance was the beginning of a cataclysm of love that still had not ended half a century (55)

The woman, whom the girl is teaching, seems to be her mother but in reality, she is not the real mother of the girl but her aunt. In fact, Florentino thinks that they are mother and daughter. This is an example of ironic gap between what Florentino thinks and what actually the reality is. Florentino, in order to win the heart of his destination, Fermina, starts sitting in a park under an almond tree in front of her house, from early in the morning pretending to be reading books. He begins his secret life as a solitary hunter:

It was in this innocent way that Florentino Ariza began his secret life as a solitary hunter. From seven o'clock in this morning, he sat on the most hidden bench in the little park, pretending to read book of verse in the shade of almond trees, until he saw the impossible maiden walk by in her blue-striped uniform stockings that reached to her knees.

(56)

Florentino's activity is ironical because people think that he is reading books but actually, his intention is not reading a book but to hunt a lady. Here is also difference between the appearance and the reality of situation. Florentino's activities are concerned with the longing for Fermina or longing for oneness with her not physically but spiritually.

Florentino Ariza sees Fermina and her aunt pass back and forth four times a day and once on Sundays when they come out of high mass, and just seeing the girl is enough for him. Gradually, he begins to idealize her with improbable virtues and imaginary, and after two weeks he thinks of nothing else but her. Because of his longing for her he begins to write the love letter. Florentino decides to send Fermina a simple note written on both sides of the paper in his exquisite notary's hand. But he keeps it in his pocket for several days, thinking about how to hand it to her, and while he thinks and he writes several more pages before going to bed, and the original letter was turning into a dictionary of compliments, inspired by books he has learned by heart because he reads them so often during his vigils in the park (57). It is a great satire to Florentino who has been so mad that his love letter turns into the size of a dictionary. He is mentally so suffered that he does not realize the size of the love letter. Therefore, here is irony as well as intense longing to get her in his life. Time passes, Florentino goes on writing pages after pages. Till that time, the letter becomes

of sixty pages. He is not able to resist the burden of his love so he shares his burden with his mother

There is no such thing as love without fear, pertaining no heights and are therefore, inevitably also tales of torment. Seeing the pitiable situation of her only one son, Florentino, Transito Ariza begins to help her son empathetically. She begins by convincing him not to deliver a lyrical sheaf of papers, since it will only frighten the girl of his dreams, who she supposes is as green as he in matters of the heart. The first step, she says, is to make her aware of his interest so that his deceleration will not take her so much by surprise and she will have time to think. She says: "But above all, "the first person you have to win over is not the girl but her aunt" (57).

Similarly, the flame of love begins to give heat to Fermina Daza too. At first glance she idealizes him and she recognizes Florentino Ariza the first time she sees him reading under the tree in the little park, although it in no way disquiet her until her aunt tells her he has been there for several weeks. The fear is the wish especially in matters of love.

Then, when they (Fermina and her aunt) see him on Sundays as they come out of mass, her aunt is convinced that not all these meetings can be casual. She says, "He is not going to all this trouble for me" (58). Aunt Escolastica has an instinct for life and a vocation for complicity, which are her greatest virtues and the more idea that a man is interested in her niece awaken an irresistible emotion in her. Ferminé Dara however, is still safe from even simple curiosity about love, and the only feeling that Florentino Ariza inspires in her is a certain pity, because it seems to her that he is sick but her aunt well understand that the man is sick but sick of love.

Fermina Daza, however, was still safe from even simple curiosity about love, and the only feeling that Florentino Ariza inspired in her was a certain pity, because it seemed to her that he was sick. But her

Aunt told her that one had to live along time to know a man's true nature, and he was convinced that the one who sat in the park to watch them walk by could only be sick with love. (58)

Aunt Escolastica is refused of understanding the affection for the only child of a loveless marriage. She has raised her since the death of her mother, and in her relations with Lorenzo Dara she behaves more like an accomplice than an aunt. So that the appearance of Florentino Ariza is for them another of the many intimate diversions they invent to pass the time. Four times a day, when they walk through the little park of the Evangels, both hurry to look with a rapid glance at the thin, timid unimpressive sentinel who almost always dresses in black and despite the heat who pretends to read under the tree. "There he is" (58) said she, one who sees him first, suppressing her laughter, before he raises his eyes and sees the two girls, aloof woman of his life as they cross the park without looking at him. Then, aunt Escolastica says her that Florentino is not able to come with them because she is with her: poor thing, her aunt has said: "He doesn't dare approach you because I am with you, but one day he will if his intensions are serious, and then he will give you a letter" (58). Fermina, with the burning flam of love begins to awake in the middle of the nights with terror and prays god to give him courage to disclose the inner feeling of love with a delicate love letter.

God is the ironist par excellence because he is omniscient, omnipotent, transcendent, absolute, infinite, and free. In Romantic irony the author's like God or nature immanent in every created element. The god is also ironist with whom Fermina prays to give him the courage

The unexpected, almost childish antics caused an unfamiliar curiosity in Fermins Dara, but for several months, it did not occur to her that it could go any further. She never knew when the diversion became a

preoccupation and her blood frothed with the need to see him , and one night she awake in terror because she saw him looking at her from the darkness at the foot of her bed. Then she longed with all her soul for her aunt's predictions come true, and in her prayers she begged God to give him the courage to hand her the letter just so she could know what is said. (58 - 59)

Here also we can see the difference between Fermina's reality and appearance. In reality, she is longing to be united with Florentino but in appearance, with fear, she pretends not to be so.

However, her prayer is not answered. Her preoccupation turns into despair as the December vacation approaches, and she asks herself repeatedly how she will see him and let him see her during the three months when she will not be walking to school. Her doubts are still unresolved on Christmas Eve, when she is shaken by the uneasiness that is in the crowd at midnight mass, looking at her, and this uneasiness floods her heart. She does not dare to turn her head, because she is sitting between her father and her aunts, and she has to control herself so that they will not notice her feelings of troubles and anxieties.

Without fear there is no pleasure. So, tales of love are also tales of terrors and torments. On Christmas Eve, when she is shaken by the presentment that he is in the crowd at the midnight mass, looking at her, and this uneasiness floods her heart. She does not dare to turn her head, because she is sitting between her father and her aunt and she has to control herself so that they will notice her agitation. However, when the crowd is leaving the church, she feels him so close, so clear that an irresistible power forces her to look over her shoulder as she walks along the central nave and then, a hand's breadth from her eyes, she sees those icy-eyes that lived face, those lips petrify by the terror of love. With the feeling of shock and of being discouraged by

her own willingness to take any risk, Fermina seizes the Aunt Escolastica's arm with the tears in her eyes and on the other hand, Florentino, moves here and there like a sleeper walker until dawn, with tears in his eyes too. Shocked by the illusion that it is he and not God who has been born on that night:

Dismayed by her own audacity, she seized Aunt Escolastica's arm so she would not fall and her aunt felt the icy- perspiration on her hand through the lace mitt, and she comforted her with an imperceptible sign of unconditional complicity. In the din of fireworks and native drums of colored lights in the doorway and the clamor of the crowd yearning for peace, Florentino Ariza wondered like a sleepwalker until dawn, watching the fiesta through his tears dazed by the hallucination that it was he not God who had been born that night. (59)

It shows the contradiction in the outer situation and inner feelings of Florentino and Fermina. Outside, all the people of the fiestas are happy whereas the two lovers are not happy; rather with tears daze by the hallucination and illusion confuse what is happening there.

At first Florentino thinks that the lesson under the almond trees are a casual innovation due to the interminable repairs on the house, but in the days that follows he comes to understand that Fermina Daza will be there within view, every afternoon at the same time during the three months of vacation, and that certainty fills him with new hope. He does not have the impression that he is seen, he can not detect any sign of interest or rejection, but in her indifference, there is a distinct radiance that encourages him to persevere. Then, one afternoon toward the end of January, the aunt put her work on the chair and left her niece alone in the doorway under the shower of yellow leaves falling from the almond trees. Encouraged by the impactions she thinks that this is an arranged opportunity, Florentino Ariza crosses the street and stops

infront of Fermina Daza, so close to her that he detects the catches in her breathing and the floral scent that he identifies with her for the rest of his life. He speaks with his head high and with a determination that will be his again only half century later, and for the same reason: "All I ask is that you accept a letter from me', he said" (60). It is not the voice that Fermina Daza has expected from him. It is sharp and clear, with a control that has nothing to do with his languid manner. Without lifting her eyes from her embroidery, she replies:

I cannot accept it without my fathers permission . . . Florentino Ariza shuddered at the warmth of that voice, whose hushed tones he was not to forget for the rest of his life. But he held himself steady and replied without hesitation: Get it. Then he sweetened the command with a plea. . . . It is a matter of life and death. Fermina Daza did not look at him, she did not interrupt her embroidering but her decision opened the door a crack, wide enough for the entire world to pass through. Come back every afternoon, she said to him, and wait until I change my seat. (60)

The above quoted lines are also contradictory to each other. Fermina in the beginning when Florentino asks about to give her a letter she gives very funny answer that she can not accept the letter without her father's permission and at the back every afternoon. So, in Fermina's words are contradictory. The words 'life' and 'death' are used in the same paragraph, these words are opposes to each other.

Florentino Ariza does not understand what she means until the following Monday when, from the bench in the little park, he sees the same scene with on variation: when aunt Escolastica goes into the house, Fermina Daza stands up and then sits in the other chair. Florentino Ariza, with a white camellia in his lapel, crosses the street and stands in front of her. "He said "This is the greatest moment of

my life” (61). Fermina Daza does not raise her eyes to him, but she looks all around her and sees the deserted streets in the heart of the dry season and a swirl of dead leaves pull along by the wind. “Give it to me she said” (61). Florentino Ariza has intended to give her the seventy sheets he can recite from memory after reading them so often, but then he decides on a sober and explicit half page in which he promises only what is essential: his perfect fidelity and his everlasting love. He takes the letter out of his eyes of the troubled embroiderer, who has still not dared to look at him. She sees the blue envelop trembling in a hand petrify with terror, and she raises the embroidery frame so he can put the letter on it, for she can not admit that she has noticed the trembling of his fingers. Then it happens: a bird shakes himself among the leaves of the almond trees, and his dropping fell right on the embroidery. Fermina Daza moves the frame out of the way, hide it behind the chair so that he will not notice what has happened, and looks at him for the first time, her face aflame. Florentino Ariza is impassive as he holds the letter in her hand and says:

“Its good luck”. She thanked him with her first smile and almost snatched the letter away from him, folded it, and hid it in her bodice. Then he offered her the camellia he wore in his lapel. She refused: “It is a flower of promise”. Then conscious that their time was almost over, she again took refuge in her composure. “Now go” she said, “and don’t come back until I tell you to”. (61)

The two lovers – Florentino and Fermina secretly exchange love letters, their conversation and so on and the other people are uninformed about the reality. It is also the dramatic irony.

Florentino can not resist his heart so he decides to break the promises given by her a month before and goes to the park but he has been very careful not to be seen . Nothing has changed the reading lesson under the trees ends about two o’ clock when

the city is waking from its siesta, and Fermina Daza embroiders with her aunt until the day begins to cool. Florentino Ariza does not wait for the aunt to go into the house, and he crosses the street with a martial stride that allows him to overcome the weakness in his knees, but he speaks to her aunt, not to Fermina Daza : "Please be so kind as to leave me alone for a moment with a young lady,' he said. 'I have something important to tell her'. 'What impertinence!'"(62)

The scene is also ironical because his inner intension is, in fact, to talk with Fermina but he does not talk with her but her aunt thinking that it will be easy for him to close with Fermina through her to them. So here is also the difference between what is done and what is the target of Florentino.

True love is mortal that never dies. True love does not concern with body rather with soul and the soul never dies. So Florentino does not fear death. Florentino becomes ready to die for the sake of his love to Fermina : “ 'Shoot me,'” he said, with his hand on his chest. 'There is no greater glory than to die for love'. ”(83). Fear is the wish especially in the matters of love:

Fermina Daza could not sleep through a single night as she sweated in fear and listened in the darkness to the coming and going of silent travelers who tied animals to the poles and hung their hammocks where they could. . . Spying on the students over their shoulder, she discovered that Fermina Daza was pretending to take notes in her notebook when in reading she was writing love letters. According to the rules of the academy, that error was reason for expulsion. (83)

What Fermina seems to be doing and what she actually is doing contrary to each other creating a (dramatic) irony.

For Fermina Daza, separation is a perpetual agony. The stench of the loads of salted catfish adds to the loss of appetite caused by her grief and eventually destroys

her habit of eating and if she does not go mad with despair it is because she always finds relief in the memory of Florentino Ariza. She does not doubt that this is the land of forgetting.

Fermina with the great sorrow of tragedy loses her appetite also and she nearly goes mad but the sweet memory of Florentino gives solace to her from being mad. It means to say that pure love is spiritual that one can feel or realize from memory. Spiritual love can be used as the healing. "The only disease my son even had was cholera" (218). Florentino's mother has confused cholera with love of course long before her memory failed. Here, love is metaphorically compared with cholera.

Tales of love are the tales of terrors, torments and suffering. In sacred love, lovers vow in search of oneness. So, loving someone means offering oneself as a sacrificially victim in the hope of a moments pleasure. In the novel, Florentino vows with Fermina of his ever-lasting love. He even waits for her more than half a century. So they prove that love is love at any time and any place or at any age.

Florentino Ariza has imagined that moments down to the last since the days of his youth when he has devoted himself completely to their cause of his reckless love. For her sake, he has won fame and fortune without too much concern for his methods, for her sake he has cared for his health and personal appearance with her rigor that does not vary manly to other men of his time and he has waited for this day as no one else could have waited for anything or anyone in this world: without an instant of discouragement. The proof that death has at last interceded on his behalf fills him with the courage he needs to repeat his vow of eternal fidelity and everlasting love to Fermina Daza on her first night of widowhood.

“Fermina, he said, “I have waited for this opportunity for more than half a century to repeat to you once again my vow of eternal fidelity and everlasting love (50) “Get out of here”, she said. ” and don’t show

your face again for the years of life that are left to you” (50) . . .

While she slept, sobbing, she had thought more about Florentino Ariza than about her dead husband. (51)

The quoted lines show paradox because Fermina’s inner heart or soul and her outer appearance seem contradictory to each other. When Florentino comes in front of her and vows his everlasting love for her she becomes angry and tells him to get out and not to show his face and when she sleeps she thinks not about her dead husband but Florentino so from these lines we can strongly say that Florentino is in her heart not her husband. So here her saying and her thought seem quite different. Therefore, here is also the difference between her thinking and doing so it is ironical.

Florentino Ariza’s long passionate, and tortured love for the haughty, oppressed Fermina Daza is the stuff of masochists. When the woman of his heart goes and marries another man, Florentino spends his life pining over her. Despite his finding solace in hundreds of sexual encounters, his heart remains true to her. Everything he does, he does with the hope of one day regaining her love even after fifty-one years. Two days later, she receives different types of letter from him: hand written on linen paper and his complete name inscribed with great clarity on the back of the envelope. It is the same ornate handwriting as in his earlier letters, the same will to lyricism but, applied to a simple paragraph of gratitude for the courtesy of her greeting in the cathedral. For several days, after she reads the letter Fermina Daza continues to think about it with troubled memories.

On one of his early visits, when he is talking about his ships, Florentino Ariza has given Fermina Daza a formal invitation to take a pleasure cruise along the river, with one more day of traveling by train she can visit the national capital, which they like most. Caribbean’s of their generation, still call by the name it bears until the last century.

Irony is the difference between what is said and meant or what is thought about a situation and what actually the case is. So irony is the gap between what is said and what is intended. Here in the text: “you do not have to cajole me as if I were a baby’, she told him. ‘If I go, it will be because I have decided to and not because the landscape is interesting’”(325). Fermina says to her son she is not a baby and she can decide what is good and what is bad but she is doing bad activities i. e. a mother of many children and a widow of someone, often, goes to meet her former lover so these sayings are ironical.

When her son suggests that his wife accompany her, she interrupts him off abruptly: “I am too big to have anyone take care of me” (325). She herself arranged the details of the trip. She feels immense relief at the thought of spending eight days traveling up river and five on the returns with no more than the bare necessities: half a dozen cotton dresses, her toiletries, a pair of shoes for embarking and disembarking, her house slippers for the journey and nothing else: her life time dream. Here also lies irony, she is not big enough to care herself because if she is big enough or mature enough, she does not need another boyfriend in her old age. Therefore, her sayings are contradictorily what she is saying and what she actually is doing.

There can be no love without sex, that is without its real, imagined, or sometimes unconscious enactment in the sexual embrace of two persons. Sensual intimacy can evoke terror at one's helplessness. Love's insatiability with its wave of violent, consuming hunger threatens the loss of there that hold dear. Ferminé and Florentino stay at the rolling surrounded by noisy passengers who make bets on how well they can identify the lights in the city, until the boat soiled out of the bay, moved along invisible channels and through swamps spatter with the undulating lights of the fishermen and at last take a deep breath in the open air.

Florentino Ariza pressed her hand, bent towards her, and tried to kiss her on the cheek. But she refused, in her hoarse, soft voice, "Not now," she said to him. 'I smell like an old woman'. Irony: she actually is old. However, they are old lovers; they are treating each other as if they are young and newly married couple. (338)

Love means the longing for oneness not physically but spiritually. While walking on the road, she thinks about him. Fermina Daza has spent the entire afternoon wondering what stratagems Florentino Ariza will use to see her without knocking other cabin door, and by eight o'clock, she can no longer bear the longing to be with him. She goes out into the passageway, hoping to meet him.

For them love is love at anytime, at any place. For true lovers there is no age/time boundary. They are virgin for each other. Florentino's penchant for the high drama as a poet and lover is portrayed as both ridiculous and serious.

Florentino Ariza had foreseen how things would be that night, and he withdraws. At the door of her cabin, he tried to kiss her good night, but she offered him her left cheek. He insisted, with labored breath, and she offered him her other cheek, with a coquettishness that he had not known when she was a pupil. Then he insisted again, and she offered him lips with a profound trembling that she had tried to suppress with the laugh she had forgotten after her wedding night. (337)

Then he looks at her and sees her naked to her waist, just as he has imagined her. Her shoulders are wrinkled, her breasts sagged, and her ribs are covered by a flabby skin as pale and cold as frogs. She covers her chest with the blouse. She has just taken off, and she turns out the light. Then he sits up and begins to undress in the

darkness, throwing everything at her that he take off while she tosses it back, dying of laughter.

They lay on their backs for a long time, he more and more perturbed as his intoxication left him, and she peaceful, almost without will, but praying to God that she will not laugh like a fool as she always does when she over indulges in anisette. They talk to pass time. They speak for themselves of their divergent lives of the incredible coincidence of their divergent lives of their lying naked in the dark cabin on a stranded boat when reason tells them they have time only for death. She has never heard of his having a woman, not even one, in that city where everything is known even before it happens. She speaks in a casual manner, and he replies without hesitation in a steady voice. "I have remained a virgin for you" (339). This is ironical because both of them are not virgin. Fermina has married Dr. Juvenal Orbino and Florentino indulge with many erotic affairs with many girls. However, he is saying she is virgin. Here is irony because he is saying something just the opposite of the reality.

It is the first she has made love in over twenty years and she has been held back by her curiosity concerning how it will feel at her age after so long a respite. However, he has not given her time to find out if her body loved him too. It has been hurried and sad and she thinks:

Now we've screwed up everything. Nevertheless, she was wrong: despite the disappointment, that each of them felt, despite his regret for his clumsiness and her remorse for the madness of the anisette, they were not apart for a moment in the days that followed. They were satisfied with the simple joy of being together. The dream of other voyages with Florentino Ariza appeared on the horizon: mad, voyages, free of trunks, free of social commitments; voyage of love. (341-42)

From the above quoted lines, we can say that they are satisfied with the simple joy of being together. The aim or ultimate goal of every true lover is also to be one or to unite with each other at last.

The night before their arrival, they have a grand party with paper garlands and colored light, the weather cleared at nightfall. Holding each other very close, the captain and zeraida dance the first boleros that are just beginning to break hearts in those days. Florentino Ariza dares to suggest to Fermina Daza that they dance their private waltz, but she refuses. Nevertheless, she keeps time with her head and her heels all night, and there is even a moment when she dances sitting down without realizing it:

Like belated lovers, they were together in silence. Like an old married, couple wary of life, beyond the pitfalls of passion beyond the brutal mockery of hope and the phantom of disillusion: beyond love. For they had lived together long enough to know that love was always love anytime, any place, but it was more solid the closer it came to death[. . .]. Fermina Daza and Florentino Ariza had heard everything from their table, but that did not seem to matter to the captain. He continued to eat in silence, and his bad humor was evident in the manner in which he breathed the rules of etiquette that sustained the legendary reputation of the riverboat captains. (347)

Here, they prove that the lovers are not blind; they see everything but do not mind. Similarly, they see/ hear everything but do not seem to matter. When there is nothing left to eat on the plates, the captain wipes his lips with a corner of the tablecloth and breaks into indecent slang that ends finally the reputation for fine speech enjoys by the riverboat captains. For he is not speaking to them or to anyone else. But is trying instead to come to terms with his own rage. His conclusion, after a string of barbaric

courses, is that he can find no way out of the mass he has gotten into with the cholera flag. "The captain looked at Fermina Daza and saw an hr eyelashes the first glimmer of wintry frost. Then he looked at Florentino Ariza, his invisible power, his intrepid love, and h was overwhelmed by the belated suspicion that it is life, more than death, that has no limits"(348).

For lovers there is no limitation of time and space. They are not concerned even if they reach to the mouth of death, "how long do you think we can keep up this goddamn coming and going?(350). He asks. For true lovers, love will last to the eternity.

In passionate love, there is then another stream in which the adoration and cherishing of the person for whom one lusts out over ride the forces of ambivalence, selfishness and destruction which desire for sensual excitement, sexual possession and orgasmic release.

Lotario thugut the emperor of Florentino, and Florentino have a very good friendship in spite of their age. They have a friendship difficult to understand because of the difference in their ages, for they may seem to be grandfather and grandson, but they get along at work as well as they do in the taverns around the port, which are frequently by everyone out for the evenings regardless of social class, from drunken beggars to young gentleman in tuxedos who fled the gala parties at the social clubs to eat fried mullet and coconut rice. Lotario Thugut is in the habit of going there after the last shift at the telegraph office, and down often found him drinking Jamaican punch and playing the accordion with the crews of madman from the Antillean Schooners. He is corpulent and bull necked, with a golden beard and a liberty cap that he wore when he goes out at night, and all the needed is a string of bells to look like St Nicholas. At least once a week he needs the evening with a little night bird, as he calls them, one of the many who sells emergency love in a transient hotel. For

sailors when he meets Florentino Ariza, the first thing he does with a certain magisterial delight, is to initiate him in to the secret of his paradise. He chooses for him the little birds he thinks best, he discusses their services:

Florentino Ariza met a man who lived like a king by exploiting three women at the same time. The three of them rendered their accounts at dawn, prostrate at his feet to beg forgiveness for their meager profit, and the only gratification they sought was that he go to bed with the one who brought him the most money. Florentino Ariza thought that terror alone could induce such indignities, but one of the three girls surprised him with the contradictory truth. (351)

In any event, his youthful adventures in the transient hotel are not limited to reading and composing feverish letters but also includes his initiation in to the secrets of loveless love. Life in the house begins noon, when his friends the birds get up as bare as the day they were born, so that when Florentino Ariza arrives after work he finds a palace populated by naked nymphs who shout their nudity traces of their past: scars of knife thrusts in the belly, starbursts of gunshot wounds ridges of the razor cuts of love, Caesarean sections sewn up by butchers. Some of them have their young children with them during the day, these unfortunate fruits of youthful defiance or carelessness, and they take off their children's clothes as soon as they are brought in so they will not feel different in that paradise of nudity. Each one cooks her own food, and no one eats better than Florentino Ariza. When they invite him for a meal, because he chooses the best from each. It is a daily fiesta that lasted until dusk, when the naked women march singing, towards the bathroom, ask to borrow soap, toothbrushes, scissors, cut each other's hair, dress in borrowed clothes, paint themselves like lugubrious clowns, and go out to hunt the first prey of the night .

Then life in the house becomes impersonal and dehumanized, and it is impossible to share in it without paying.

Florentino Ariza lives with the girls and share their pleasure and measures, but it does not occur to him or them to any further:

One afternoon at six o'clock, when the girls were dressing to receive the evening's client, s the woman who cleaned the evenings clients, the woman who cleaned the room on his floor in the hotel came in to his cubicle. She was young, but haggard and old before her time, like a fully dressed penitent surrounded by glorious nakedness. He saw her every feeling himself observed: she walked through the rooms with her brooms, a bucket for the trash, and a special rag for picking up used condoms from the floor. She came in to the room where Florentino Ariza laid reading, and as always she cleaned with great care so as not to disturb him. Then she passed close to the bed, and he felt a warm and tender hand low on his belly. He felt it unbuttoning his trousers while her breathing filled the room. He pretended to read until he could not bear it any longer and had to move his body out of the way.

(74)

Here is also Florentino(indirectly)pretends to read books . It means he is not actually reading. It means here is also difference between the appearance and the reality of the behavior of Florentino. Not only that the situation itself is contradictory, in the same hotel in other rooms people are indulging in sexual intercourse where as Florentino is reading books. It looks like dissimilar so it is dramatic irony.

She is dismayed, for the first thing they warn her about when they give her the cleaning job is that she shall not try to sleep with the clients. They do not have to tell her that, because she is one of those women who think that prostitute does not mean

going to bed for money but going to bed with the stranger. She has two children, each by a different father, not because they are casual adventures but because she can never love any man who comes back after the third visit. She comes to work at six o'clock in the afternoon, and she spends the whole night going through the rooms, sweeping them out, picking up condoms, changing the sheets. It is difficult to imagine the number of things that men leave after love. They leave vomits and tears, which seems understandable to her, but they also leave many enigmas of intimacy :puddles of blood ; patches of excrement, glass ,eyes, gold watches, false teeth , locket with golden curls love letters, business letters, condolence letters-all kinds of letters. Some come back for the items they have lost, but most are unclaimed, and Lotario Thugut keeps them under lock and key and thinks that sooner or later the palace that have seen better days with its thousands of forgotten belongings will become a museum of love. Florentino with the suffering of love becomes mad and began to involve in profanity – sensuality:

One night when he stopped his reading earlier than usual and was walking distracted toward the toilets, and door operates he passed through the dining room, and a hand like a hawk seized him by the shirt sleeve and pulled him into a cabin. In the darkness he could barely see the naked woman, her age less body soaked in hot perspiration, her breathing heavy who pushed him on to the bunk face up, unbuckled his belt, unbuttoned his trousers, and impaled herself on him, without going of his virginity. . . "Now go and forget all about it. , "she said, "this never happened. "(142)

That love, which only concerns on sex, is transient. Therefore, such love is loveless love. Such types of activities are transient as well as delightful so people for the sake of such types of illicit relations can forget everything. Florentino, for this

sake, even forgets his lover, Fermina, and thinks more about her than Fermina, his destination.

That supposition was so seductive that he began to think about her with more intensity than he thought about Fermina Daza, ignoring everything else." She was no more than twenty five she was slender and golden, she had Portuguese eyelids that made her seem even more aloof, and any man would have been satisfied with only the crumbs of the tenderness that she lavished on her son. "From breakfast until bedtime she was busy with him in the salon, while the other two played Chinese checkers, and when at last she managed to put him to sleep she would hang the wicker cage from the ceiling on the cooler slid of the railing. (113)

The above lines are ironical in the meaning of love. Florentino on the other hand, thinks about Fermina Daza, as his ultimate goal and at the same time does not leave the girl (prostitute) to have sexual relationship. So, here it is ironical in his appearance and inner thought.

The great-unexpected event is that, a mother sent a widow to her son's bed in order to cure his son from suffering. It is the great irony. It is unimaginable and beyond the reality of the society so it is ironical. Without marriage, a mother sent a girl, a widow to her son. It is against the social convention of the traditional marriage for the widow also It is Transto Ariza who takes control of the situation and sends the widow her son's bedroom on the pretext that there is no space in hers but actually in the hope that another love would cure him of the one that does not allow him to live. Florentino Ariza has not made love since he loses virginity to Rosalba in the cabin in the boat, and in this emergency it seems natural to him that the widow will sleep in

the bed and he in the hammock. But she comes there sit nearby him and loses his virginity after her widowhood:

She sat on the edge of the bed where Florentino Ariza was lying, not knowing what to do, and she began to speak to him of her in consolable grief for the husband who had died three years earlier and in the meantime she removed her widow's weeds and tossed them in the air until she was not even wearing her wedding ring even wearing her wedding ring. She took off the taffeta blouse with the beaded embroidery and threw it across the room on the easy chair in the corner, she tossed her bodice over her shoulder to the other side of the bed, without pull she removed her long ruffled skirt, her satin garter belt and funeral stockings and she threw evenings on the floor until the room was carpeted with the last remnant of her mourning. She did it with so much joy and with well measured pauses that each of her gestures seemed to be saluted by the cannon of the attacking troops, which shook that city down to its foundation. Then she removed her lace panties sliding them down her legs with the rapid movements of a swimmer, and at last she was naked: her naked body preserved in fact the giddy excitement of an unmarried girl. She undressed him too whereas she had never been able to undress her husband. She had never even been in the same bed with any man other than her dead husband. (149-50)

Another irony is also that a widow who has not undressed her own husband when he was alive, is now undressing a stranger. It is a great surprised, unacceptable, and unimaginable. The girl further says, " I adore you because you made me whore"(151).

The line itself is ironical as well as paradoxical because the girl becomes happy of becoming a whore by him.

Florentino, in order to cure the pain of separated soul, he strips the virginity of a conventional marriage of a widow and finds solace and at last with no sorrow they forget each other. It is a great satirical or ironical to say that for true lovers, to heal the suffering of pure love, he has to indulge with illicit /sensual relation with somebody else. It can not do treatment of secret love rather it gives birth immorality, inhumanity to the society.

During this period, Florentino Ariza has to attend to so many responsibilities at the same time, but his spirit never flagged as he seeks to expand his works as a furtive hunter. After his erratic experience with the widow Nazareth, which opens the door to street love, he continues to hunt the abandoned little birds of the night for several years, still hoping to find a cure of the pain of Florentino:

. . . And it was just as well. No sooner did he leave his office at five in the afternoon than he began to hunt like a chicken hawk. At first he was content with what the night provided. He picked up serving girls in the parks, black woman in the market, sophisticated young ladies from the interior on the beaches, gringos on the boat from New Orleans. (174)

Here, Florentino ironically compares himself with the hawk that hunts chicken. As hawk can not survive without its prey that is chicken, Florentino also cannot remain without prostitutes.

It is in those days that he advises his rather simplistic theories concerning the relationship between a woman's appearance and her aptitudes for love. He distrusts the sensual type, the ones who look as if they can eat on alligator raw and tend to be the most passive in bed. The type he prefers is just the opposite, those skinny little

tadpoles that no one bothered to turn around and look at in the street, who seem to disappear when they take off their clothes. The Difference between a woman's appearance and her aptitude for love (is different). Here is also the gap in her appearance and the reality.

Profane love is sensual, it concerns only in pleasure. It is not concerned with spiritual but with physical. The ultimate goal of such sensual love is sexual pleasure:

Florentino Ariza was very taken with the charms of nudity, and she removed his clothes with sure delight as soon as she closed the door, not even giving him time to greet her, or to take off his hat or glasses, kissing him and letting him kiss her with sharp-toothed kisses unfastening his clothes from bottom to top, first the bottoms of his fly, one by one after each kiss, then his belt buckle, and at last his vest and shirt, until he was like a live fish that had been slit open from head to tail. (177)

Here is irony because Florentino on the other hand puts Fermina in his sacred soul as his ultimate goal and on the other, indulges sensually with others his love also seems paradoxical.

Then she sits him in the living room and take off his boots, pulls on his trouser cuff so that she can take off his pants while she removes his long underwear. Then Florentino Ariza stops kissing her and letting her kiss him so that he can do the only thing he is responsible for in that precise ceremony. It is a kind of profane loves that Florentino Ariza involves and when he becomes naked he is compared with a live fish.

Florehtino is not satisfied indulging sexually with few girls rather he desires more and more girls and more and more pleasure of loveless love:

Florentino Ariza met Leona cassiani, who was the true woman in his life although neither of them ever knew it and they never made love. He had sensed her before he saw her as he was going home on the trolley at five o'clock. It was tangible took that touched him as if it were a finger. He raised his eyes and saw her, at the far end of the trolley, but standing out with great clarity from the other passengers. She did not look away . On the contrary: She continued to look at him with such boldness that he could not help thinking what he thought: black, young, pretty, but a whore beyond the shadow of a doubt. He did all love that was paid for. (182)

Florentino begins to involvewith many types of prostitutes' girls. Involving sensually with such types of girl is an example of profane love or profane desire.

Love of Florentino Ariza to such girls are not diminish because such love is transient and does not concern with heart rather sensual organs of males and females and the sensual organs do not have sensation:

Florentino and America vicuna had made love after lunch and they were lying together at the end of their siesta, both of them naked under the ceiling fan, whose humming could not hide the sound like falling hail that the buzzards made as they walked across the hot tin roof.

Florentino Ariza loved her as he had loved so many other casual women in his long life. (183)

Likewise, Florentino involved such types of six hundred twenty-two sensual relationships but he does not get solace. Rather his immortality increases, interest also increases, so his suffering can not heal rather increase. His suffering heals only when he knows about the death of Dr. Juvenal Urbino and again goes to Fermana.

Love is a form of insanity. Love and Madness seem corollary. All lovers must be fools, crazed in some transcendent even mystical sense.

Florentino Ariza wrote every night. Later by letter, he had no mercy as he poisoned himself with the smoke from the palm oil lamps in the back room of the notion shop, and his letters became more discursive and more lunatic the more he tried to imitate his favorite poets from the popular library, which even at that time was approaching eighty volumes. His mother, who had urged him with so much fervor to enjoy his torments, became concerned for his health "you are going to wear out your brain" She shouted at him from the bed room when she heard the first rooster's crow. "No woman is worth all that. "She could not remember ever having known anyone in such a state of unbridled passion. But he paid no attention to her. Sometimes he went to office without having slept, his hair in an uproar of love after leaving the letter in the prepared hiding place so that Fermina Daza would find it on her way to school. (69)

Fermina Daza, on the other hand, under the watchful eye of her father and the vicious spying of the nuns, can barely manage to fill half a large from her notebook when she locks herself in the bathroom and pretends to take notes in class. In reality they are distracted letters, intends to keep the coals alive without putting her hand in the fire, while Florentino Ariza burns himself alive in every line. Desperate to infect her with his own madness he sends her miniaturist's verse inscribes with the point of a pin on camellia petals. It is he not she who has the audacity to enclose a lock of his hair in one letter but he never receives the response he longs for, which is an entire strand for Fermina Daza's braid. Fermina on the other side (is also) becomes mad in love:

One night, without any warning, Fermina Daza awake with a start: a solo violin was serenading her, playing the same waltz over and over again. She shuddered when she realized that each note was an act of thank giving for the petals from her herbarium for the moments stolen from arithmetic to write her letters, for her fear examination when she was thinking more about him than about natural science.

(70)

Fermina Daza became so mad in her love for Florentino that she even begins to awake in the middle of the night and thinks more about him than her subject of examination. So it is a suffering of love.

Every love story includes it's lover's paradoxical association of fear and wishes. So there is confusion what to do and what not to do:

Fermina Daza, however, was so confused that she asked for sometime to think it over. First she asked for a month, then two, then three and when the fourth month had ended she had still not replied, she received a white camellia again, not alone in the envelope as on other occasions but with the peremptory notification that this was the last one: it was now or never. Then the same afternoon it was Florentino Ariza who saw the face of death when he received an envelope containing a strip of paper, torn from the margin of a school notebook, on which a one-line answer was written in pencil: very well, I will marry you if you promise not to make me eat eggplant. (71)

From these lines, we can see the evasiveness of Fermina in the beginning but later on she promises to get married with her lover, Florentino. It is also ironical because, when she meets Dr Juvenal Urbino, she does not tell about Florentino, rather she simply accepts his marriage proposal of his. Therefore, it is ironical in her saying and

her doing. Femina's sleep is restless: she sees Dr Juvenal Urbino everywhere. She sees him laughing, singing,

Love is also terror and torment more dangerous than any epidemic diseases: Love sickness is a literal illness, a disease comparable to cholera. After Florentino Ariza sees her for the first time, his mother knew before he tells her because he loses his voice and his appetite and spends the entire night tossing and running in his bed. But when he begins to wait for the answer to his first letter, his anguish is complicated by diarrhea and green vomit, he becomes disoriented and suffers from sudden fainting spells, and his mother is terrified because his condition does not resemble the turmoil of love so much as the devastation of cholera. Florentino Ariza's godfather, an old homeopathic practitioner who has been Transito's Ariza's confidant ever since her days as a secret mistress, is also alarmed at first by the patient's condition because he has weak pulse, the hoarse breathing, and the pale perspiration of a dying man. But his examination reveals that he has no fever, no pain anywhere, and that his only concrete feeling was an urgent desire to die. All that is needed is shrewd questioning first of the patient and then of his mother, to conclude once again that the symptoms of love were the same as those of Cholera. Here love is metaphorically compared with the symptoms of cholera. He is so suffered that he had no any symptoms but he is abnormal Florentino Ariza is ready to face any suffering or even ready to die for the sake of love. The word is used paradoxically:

He prescribed infusions of linden blossoms to calm the nerves and suggested a change of air so he could find consolation in distance, but Florentino Ariza longed for just the opposite: to enjoy his martyrdom "Enjoy the death". No one can enjoy the death rather the true lovers, for them love is immortal, never dies concern not with physical world.

(376)

Transito Ariza, whose instinct for happiness has been frustrated by poverty, and she took pleasure in her son's suffering as if it is her own. She made him drink the infusions when he becomes delirious, and she smotheres him in wool blankets to keep away the chills, but at the same time she encourages him to enjoy his prostration. "Take advantage of it now, while you are young, and suffer all you can," She said to him, "because these things don't last your whole life. (380) Here in the given lines the mother thinks that her son's suffering do not last any longer so she says take advantage of such suffering but on the country, after her death also Florentino suffers a lot so her thought and the happening become different to each other so it is also irony. The two words pleasure and suffering are the opposite words. When somebody suffers he/she never become happy rather becomes sad/ laments. The mother taking pleasure in the son's suffering is paradoxical. Paradoxical in the sense that she feels the pain of her own too.

Florentino Ariza is so much in deep with the love of Fermina Daza that when he hears the news of the marriage of Fermina, it becomes unbearable to him and he suffers a lot and loses his appetite, speech and begins to cry for the sake of his true love. When Florentino Ariza learns that Fermina Daza is going to marry a physician with family and fortune, educated in Europe and with an extraordinary reputation for a man of his years, there is no power on earth that can raise him from his prostration. Transito Ariza does all she can and more, using all the stratagems of a sweetheart to console him when she realizes that "he has lost his speech and his appetite and is spending nights on the end in constant weeping"(105)

Florentino Ariza, hardened by so much suffering, attends to the preparations for his own funeral. At midnight, he puts on his Sunday suit and goes to stand alone under Fermina's Daza's balcony to play the love waltz he has composed for her, which is known only to the two of them and which for three years have been the emblem of

their frustrated complicity. He plays murmuring the words, his violin bathes in tears with an inspiration so intense that with the first measures the dogs on the street and then the dogs all over the city begins to howl, but then, little by little they are quieted by the spell of the music and the waltz ends in supernatural silence.

Florentino Ariza awakes most of the night thinking that he hears the voice of Fermina Daza in the fresh river breeze ministering to his solitude with her memory, hearing her sing in the respiration of the boat as it moves like a great animal through a darkness. "Fermina Daza's happy marriage lasted as long as the honeymoon" (250). Here is also paradox as the happy marriage life lasts as long as the honeymoon. Marriage life must be happy forever. But here it is only up to the honeymoon. So, it is like a sensual or physical relation not spiritual. So, it is ironical.

Dr Urbino justifies his own weakness with arguments, not even asking himself if they were in conflict with the church. He can not admit that the difficulties with his wife has their origin in the rarify air of the house, but blames them on the every nature of matrimony: an absurd invention that can exist only by the infinite grace of god. It is against all scientific reason for two people who hardly knew each other with no ties at all between them, with different characters, different upbrings and even different genders to suddenly find themselves committed to live together, to sleeping in the same bed to share two destinies that perhaps are fated to go in opposite directions. He will say "The problem with marriage is that it ends every night after making love and it must be rebuilt every morning before breakfast"(209) the marriage relation of Fermina and Florentino is just the opposite what actually was. The two term science and god are used in the above lines but they are quite different or contrary to each other science does not believe in God. So it is also paradox Irony is a praise in order to blame, blame in order to praise. Similarly, Fermina also in the book tells her husband lies in order to learn the truth.

In the three weeks that followed Fermina Daza does not find the odor in his clothing for a few days, she finds it again when she least expected it. Urged by her imagination, she begins to discover changes in his husband. She finds him evasive, without appetite at the table or in bed, prone to exasperation and ironic answers and when he is at home he is no longer the tranquil man he has once been but a caged lion. For the first time since their marriage, she begins to monitor the times he is late, to keep track of them to the minute to tell him lies in order to learn the truth but then she feels wounded to the quick by the contradiction. One night she awakes with a startles, terrified by a vision of her husband staring at her in the darkness with eyes that seems full of hatred. She has suffered a similar fright in her youth, when she has seen Florentino Ariza at the foot of her bed, but that apparition has been full of love not hate.

In their marital love - hatred begins to develop. The relationship becomes like that of strangers though they are husband and wife. It means that though they unite physically they can not unite spiritually. It becomes profane relation: “Dr Urbino. . . ashamed his weakness longing for death, cursing himself for the lack of courage that kept him from asking Fermina Daza to pull down his trousers and burn his ass on the brazier” (230). She wishes him dead with all her heart. Their life can not be happy because although they love each other physically they do not have any emotional or spiritual attachment. For Fermina Florentino is in her heart. She even sees him in the dream and can not forget the childish memories of Florentino with her and she can not love her husband in the true sense. So her inner feelings and outer appearance are just the opposite and became contradictory and ultimately, when their marriage life can not become as she has thought she wishes him dead with all her heart.

Their love is concerned only with materialism so they suffer a lot in their life and ultimately after the husband's death she goes and marries with her former lover.

It is because for Fermina, Florentino is always in her heart. She used to see him even in the dream, can not forget him as her childish memories, and can not love her husband in the true sense. As a result, they have to suffer. Whereas, on the other hand, the love of Fermina and Florentino was true and united even after half a century only because their love is sacred and all their sufferings also end with the union of the two sacred souls. Therefore, profane love is the cause of suffering. It is like a dangerous disease. It is as dangerous as the plague or cholera. To cure from such disease, no medicine works, rather it needs love in its sacred form.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

Love in the Time of Cholera deals with the anatomy of love. In an anatomical and visionary sense, it is about the growth and development of love. This research has used romantic irony as well as theory of love to depict the paradoxical situation in three entangled stories of Florentino and Fermina, Fermina and Dr. Juvenal Urbino and Florentino with other prostitutes in the name of healing his suffering but in vain. The love of Florentino and Fermina is considered as marital love and the love of Florentino with other hundreds of women is called illicit or profane love.

The main notion is that love sickness is a literal illness, a disease comparable to cholera. Florentino Ariza suffers from these just as he might suffer from any malady. At one point, Florentino combines his physical agony with his amorous agony. Florentino's penchant for the high drama as a poet and lover is portrayed as both ridiculous and serious. He may go to outlandish length for love but at the end, the absurdity is ennobling and his suffering is a kind of dignity.

Florentino Ariza's long passionate, and tortured love for the haughty oppressed Fermina Daza is the stuff of masochistic when the lady of his heart goes and marries another man. Florentino spends his life all the time missing her very much. Despite his finding solace in hundreds of sexual encounters, his heart remains true to her. So it is an amalgam of two starkly contrasting elements: the sacredness of love and love's embodiment of everyday experience. Ultimately, the transcendental power of love emerges as the beautifully rendered theme of Florentino's evocative and paradoxical masterwork. Every thing he does, he does with the hope of one day regaining her love.

Florentino, ridiculously observed with Fermina Daza, is a poet much in demand on the Arcade of Scribe for his love letters. He falls in love with and waits more than fifty years for her husband to die. Therefore, he can declare his everlasting love. During these periods he spends most of his time traveling from one to the other of six hundred twenty two erotic assignations, through it all he still considers himself a virgin, untouched by anything other than his unrequited love for Fermina. Therefore here is contradiction in his saying and doing in the sense of love. So it is a romantic irony.

After waiting more than half a century for Urbino to die, Florentino ends his self-imposed emotional exile (of fifty-one years, nine months and four days) of unrequited love. He declares his “vow of eternal fidelity and everlasting love” to Fermina while she is attending to her husband’s funeral. Outraged by his poor timing, Fermina forbids him to return on the one hand, but while she slept sobbing, she thought more about Florentino than about her dead husband and in her dream of the first night of her husband’s funeral she did not see her husband but Florentino. So here is also found contradiction in her outer appearance and in her feelings. Therefore, here is also romantic irony.

Tales of love are also the tales of terrors and torments more dangerous than any epidemic disease. Love sickness is a literal illness, a disease comparable to cholera. Florentino’s rise age precedent of local shipping company, his redecorating his childhood home, his devotion to arts- it is all for her. So strong is his love for her that his tortured passion resembles the symptoms of the dreaded cholera, the disease that reputedly ravaged this Caribbean town. Love for Florentino becomes a mix blessing giving more trouble than joy to begin with. Florentino’s nostalgia of love is transformed into a reality of love. And of course there is Fermina's husband, the illustrious Dr. Urbino. As the most respected, most innovative doctor in the region,

he is beloved by all except his own wife who married him more out of convenience.

So here in this situation, also it is humorous and ironical.

Thus the aforementioned love stories in Marquez, can be studied with the scientific study of love as it prevails in the society i. e. the contrasting element of love: profane and sacred. The love for Fermina and Florentino is at once a profane desire that brings emotional and physical illness and a sacred transcendental power that heals the suffering. Therefore, their love gives them both suffering and solace at the same time.