

Jorge Luis Borges Or The Aesthetics Of Degraded Morals (Aleph 1949)¹

Rafael Ruiloba Caparroso

Accepted 15 March, 2019.

Ana María Barrenechea in *The expression of unreality in the work of Borges*² (1967) with a stylistic approach has stressed that Borges's stories are key stories. Donald Yates (1981)³ in his **Siege of Jorge Luis Borges** postulates that Borges writes based on a narrative formula, which he calls **the appreciation of the essence of the drama**. This key Arturo Echavarría (1983) in *Borges's Language and Literature*⁴ defines it as a *metaphysical ontology*. Mary Luskie Friedman⁵ In **A Morphology of Borges's Stories** (1990) using a psychoanalytic approach concludes that Borges reiterates **the same paradigm**. The important thing about these studies is not their conclusions, but prefigure **the elements that articulate the key to Borges' narrative**. However, in the study of Luskie, to happen that the key is incomplete, she proposes an important thesis, on the most complex part of model of writing borgena. Let's see how this aesthetic works, to postulate this interpretation, if we take as a reference a Borges story to see that key: Emma Zuns from Aleph In the story Borges develops fully what in this essay we call the aesthetics of degraded morals. Emma is an Argentine worker of German Jewish origin who receives a letter from Brazil, where she is told that Mr. Manuel Meyer has ingested, by mistake, a strong dose of poison; who sent the letter does not know that Manuel Meyer was actually Emanuel Zunz, his father. The death of the father is characterized "**as the only thing that had happened in the world and would continue to happen without end**" The letter announcing death is the reason for what will happen later in the story. So she "acted as if somehow knew the subsequent events" The action is actually an action of eternal return, because she sees that it is part of a reality that is repeated. What is the text that is repeated as an archetype? Emma remembers life with her father, the lost happiness of a primordial time. The cause of this is Aaron Loewenthal, his boss, who embezzled the company, for which he blamed his father. Therefore the action of Emma, is the revengeful reaction to the fault committed by his boss against his father, an action that had happened before, at least he feels it in his conscience. Again due to this emphasis of the narrator, we ask ourselves again what is the reality that is repeated?

Borges creates a parallel of actions by contrast in Emma Zuns: in the action of the boss he loves money, it is the golden calf, his sacred fault, for that reason he incriminates Emma's father and is the indirect cause of his death; she destroys the money they pay for prostituting herself. He cries the death of his wife, she cries the death of his father; he lives a degraded life, she

degrades herself to live or recover her life through revenge. The action happens by contrast as it happens in the myth. Emma has a power over her opponent, she knows the truth; he knows that the thief was he; he knows he's scared and that's why he has a dog and a gun in his desk drawer; therefore there is a factor of myth and it is the battle between knowledge and power. In the story all the factors are united by means of a convenient chance, for their purposes. A Norwegian ship departs that night. In the factory there is a strike and she calls her boss. He asks for an appointment to inform you. The second narrative loop Emma travels to the port in search of a Norwegian sailor **to sleep with him** and lose his virginity, this act will work as an alibi for a crime for revenge. On the way to the bars it is reflected in a labyrinth of mirrors, and when it seduces the sailor, it takes her through a labyrinth of doors. This process of degradation is justified by revenge. She considers that with the vengeance, the sacred justice of God is imposed on human justice, which rewarded the indirect murderer of his father, who is now the owner of the company that he embezzled, and in order to do so he blamed his father. Take the bus back. The description of Aaron Loewenthal is timely for the story's climate. Greedy Jew. Very religious that **believed to have a secret covenant with God, which exempts him from doing well in exchange for prayers and devotions**. In other words, man has committed a double fault; one against men and another against God, like the heroes of myth, it is a "hamartia" concept by means of which Aristotle describes the sacred faults in the Greek tragedy, in this case it is a biblical fault, the fault is for worshiping the golden calf, the money. Emma presents herself as a traitor to her companions, evokes loyalty with her boss, says the names of the strikers to gain confidence. This is the subject of the traitor and the hero. Her boss (she makes another mistake) goes out to look for a basin of water and she takes advantage of it to take out the gun that her boss had in the drawer. When he returns he shoots him and informs him of his motives. This is the tragic anagnorisis, she rebels his truth, the motives of the crime, but she does not know if the man listened to her, before dying, she only has a certain reason, her faults before God. Emma calls the police and argues that her boss raped her so she had to defend herself. The paradox closes the text: The miser has committed four faults as Creon in Sophocles' Antigone, but is accused by one who did not perform. **The story was incredible, in fact, but it was imposed on everyone because it was substantially true**. This is the borgeana paradox, in fact the dead one is guilty of his feigned violation. The summary of the story reveals that it is

1. Borges. Obras Completas EMECE. Buenos Aires Argentina (p 564- 568)
2. Ana María Barrenechea *La expresión de la irrealidad en la obra de Borges*. Editorial Manantial Buenos Aires Argentina, 2009 p 57
3. Donald Yates (1967) y otros *Asedio a Jorge Luis Borges*. Paidós Argentina p 99. 107 1981.
4. Arturo Echavarría (1983) *(Lengua Y literatura de Borges)*. Ariel Barcelona p 47
5. Mary Luskie Friedman En *Una morfología de la cuentos de Borges* (1990) Editorial Fundamentos Madrid España 1990 (p 6)

structured on the basis of several mythical elements of syntactic character manifested in the text. The story is double; the history that is repeated is an archetype: the death of the father is **the only thing that has happened in the world and it will continue happening endlessly**. There are two faults as in the tragic heroes; the one committed against Emma's father and the one committed against God: the greed and the arrogance of believing that she has a covenant with God. Emma fulfills her revenge, considers it a sacred duty she considers herself an instrument of divine justice, because human justice has condemned her father, an innocent man and has freed the guilty. We conclude then that the narrative disposition of the text follows the model of the mythical story, including its theme as motive, revenge as a paradigm of moral authority, complemented by other mythical themes such as the difference between knowledge and power. The story has two faces, one explicit and the other implicit; the first is the myth and the second is the text that masks it, its archetype, the text is the ritual reappearance of another text. Again we ask ourselves, what is that text?

Regarding the text of Emma Zuns Friedman concludes that "*The murder of Emma Zunz to Aaron Loewenthal can be seen as revenge in memory of his father and simultaneously as a murder to a substitute for him*"⁶ The proof of this says Friedman is Emma's memory of her father when they are going to rape her; which would lead Borges to express a particular form of the Oedipus complex, the nuclear complex of culture according to Freud. Our first objection to Friedman's thesis is of a theoretical nature. We believe as Julia Kristeva (1975)⁷ that in the literary text we must not report the picture Psi (hysteria, obsessiveness, perversion, paranoia, but a specific economy completely outside the Psi types "): that is, the intentions of the story. Words Literature can not be understood as a symptom, to be interpreted by a psychological commissary, because this does not explain the literary. D Maldivsky is of the same criterion points out in his **General Theory of literature** that we must differentiate the psychological study of an author and literary study, since the psychological interest insofar as it can explain the semantic, but going beyond is something else.⁸ In the same way, the French psychologist Jacques Leenhardt thinks, because he assures that these studies are only right in the set of meanings of the literary work⁹. From our point of view, this reading implies choosing the text as a psychiatric document and this conceptual framework is beyond the postulates of the semiotic theory. For these reasons we omit the psi reading of Borges' text and we go into his works to discover his literary sense. But let's see then if Borges' compulsion is the result of feelings of revenge against his father, and to confirm this Freudian analysis, we must first see if the text marks this interpretative prominence. First when Emma remembers her mother, Borges writes "*she remembered (tried to remember)*

*her mother*¹⁰ later when she remembers her father during the rape Borges writes. He thought (*he could not help thinking*)¹¹ What Borges marks is a story between father and mother; in it the semantic axis is oblivion and in it, the semantic axis is the memory, but the resentment is not against his father; and here Borges introduces another significant stylistic mark: an enumeration of bad things, which she does not stop remembering: the house they were auctioned, the prison car, the reproach, the anonymous ones; *He remembered (but he never forgot) that his father had sworn last night that the thief was Loewenthal*. All this is a justification for her attitude. The third parenthesis emphasizes the semantic intention of the text; and in none of them is there an emphasis on resentment against his father. So the text does not support the Freudian reading of assassinating a symbolic father. Let us see then our second objection to postulate the key that Friedman lacks in his paradigm on Borgean writing. This objection refers to the code that is hidden in the aesthetic ideology of Borges.

In **A Vindication of the Kabbalah** (1932)¹² Borges postulates the thesis of the Kabbalists of the existence of an absolute book, impenetrable to the contingency of history, without the collaboration of chance; the work is an archetypal repetition of Platonic character "*individuals and things exist insofar as they participate in the species that includes them*"¹³ History of Eternity (1936) If we use an equestrian metaphor to explain Platonism, we will say that the existence of the horse alludes to a comprehensive (or: thorough) preexistence. We see this Platonic distinction in Phaedrus, whose basic idea is myth; the original and the lineage, (the versions of the myth) is the copy.¹⁴ He says that in this way Plato tries to ensure the latent distinction between the two kinds of images (individuals and species as Borges says) *It is about ensuring the triumph of the copies over the simulacra, the versions of the myth and the bad versions*. But what is the version that parodies Borges or repeats Borges or ... Let's see.

Remember that all the texts of the Universal History of Infamy are versions of other texts. Because the essential has already been given and the creation is no more than a copy or a simulacrum of that essentiality. Let's see an example. Borges has a famous story **The Two Kings and the Two Labyrinths** (Aleph 1949). According to Borges himself, in a chronicle published on June 16, 1939 in the magazine El Hogar¹⁵ The text is by Sir Richard Burton and is called History of **the Two Kings and The Two Labyrinths**. Borges's text and Burton's text are identical, but they have a significant difference: Burton's is called History of the two ... instead, Borges's is called, The Two Kings and the two labyrinths.

Burton writes "His lips made no complaint, but he told the king of Babylon that he in Arabia **had a better labyrinth** and that if God was served, he would make it known someday"¹⁶ Instead Borges writes "His lips did not complain none, but he

6. "Friedman op cit p 232

7. Julia Kristeva (1975). *Semiótica I* Ediciones Aurora Buenos Aires 1985 p 269

8. D. Maldivsky (1974) *Teoría Literaria General*. Paidós Buenos Aires Argentina 1974 p 89.

9. Jacques Leenhardt. *Lectura Política de la novela*. Siglo XXI Editores, México 1975 p169 1978

10. Borges Oc p564.

11. Ibid. p. 566

12. Ibid p. 210

13. Ibid P. 356

14. Guilles Deleuze 1969 *La Lógica del sentido*. Barral Editores Barcelona España 1974 p325

15. Jorge Luis Borges *Textos Cautivos*. Ensayos y Reseñas en El Hogar 1936/1939) Tusquets Editores p 329

16. Ibid p 329

told the king of Babylon that he had **another maze** in Arabia and that if God was served, he would let him know someday¹⁷ But there is something interesting in this duality, first they are not equal texts. In Burton's text the labyrinth is of the king of Arabia; On the other hand, Borges's, even if it is the same labyrinth, is God's, it is a paradoxical labyrinth without walls, corridors, corridors and stairs. The emphasis of Burton is on the kings, on de Borges is in the labyrinth. Subtle differences have introduced an essential change. So technically it is another text. An example of this Platonic logic is the copy of Don Quixote by Pierre Menard. According to the story they are the same words, but it is not the same Text. In Aleph there is another story that exemplifies this Platonic intertextual dialectic about Burton's text and it is **Abenjacan El Bajorí, dead in his labyrinth**, which is another version of Burton's story, but more elaborate, now it is an infinite labyrinth, to make the difference between the essence of the myth and its simulacrum, in the story of Abenjacan the Rector Allaby alludes to the story of Burton, which Borges reiterates in the following story, so that in the Aleph the Platonic difference between Burton's story as a simulacrum and those of Borges as a reiteration of an essential archetype is palpable. This is the same Platonic ideal that structures the story **The Scripture of God, which is also another version of Burton's text** and is part of the Aleph. In 1952 in the postscript added to the Aleph, Borges writes that "**the text Abenjacan el Bajorí, dead in his labyrinth, is nothing more than a version of Burton's text.**"¹⁸ In the case of the Tale El Muerto, in the epilogue of the Aleph, Borges refers us to its source: Chapter XXIX of the book Decline and Fall of Edward Gibbon's Roman Empire. We have that the text has been repeated as an archetype in the work of Borges. The chapter on Caligula in the history of Rome was recreated for the first time in the chronicles of José Tuntar, on November 18, 1933, in the Critical Journal of Buenos Aires. Tuntar is a pseudonym of Borges and a gaucho version of this story reappears in the Aleph, called **The dead**, which is nothing more than an archetypal repetition of the famous Caligula trappings described by Gibbon. This is the text that reappears in the stories of Borges del Aleph.

Then we have that Borges develops the exercise of literature as an infinite version of the same essential elements of the Platonic archetype. It happens as Gilles Deleuze says about Platonism. "We must not understand the similarity of one thing to another but of a thing to an idea, since it is the idea that understands the relations and constitutive proportions of the internal essence"¹⁹. This is what Borges does. This leads us again to answer the question about Maria Barrenechea's thesis that Borges's texts are written in code, we will say in a Platonic key, to specify why Borges understands literature as the reiteration of an archetype, which varies from the exact copy, the text of Bustor, even the baroque versions of the other Aleph texts and these versions are nothing more than nominations of the same reality.

Another aspect of Borges' aesthetics is that **literature has three ways of postulating reality. The Postulation of**

reality²⁰ **The first** says "we see and hear through the memories of fears, of forecasts" **In the superstitious ethics of the reader** (1932)²¹ Borges says that readers subordinate emotion to ethics. In the text that concerns us Emma Zuns acts for revenge, (emotion), but subordinates her action to ethics by imagining that her revenge for the death of her father is part of the justice of God. That is why when she is raped, she remembers the goodness of the life she lost in order to have an ethical justification, because in her theory the literary text must be contextualized **in significant moments of life**. Borges chose, **revenge**, and **murder**, as part of these significant moments.

Let's apply this code to the Aleph texts, to confirm it. We observe in Emma Zuns that revenge is the result of a degradation that leads to personality change, a symbolic death, we also see that it is not a simple murder, but that it happens after the revelation of the motives of the murderer, reasons unavoidable by sacred, it is the anagnorisis, of the myth, the revelation of the tragic truth. Emma a naive virgin, who degrades herself to prostitute to have a moral alibi for a murder. Another example we have in the story The dead, Benjamín Otolora, a 19-year-old bandit, equal to Emma's age, professes a spiteful envy at the leader of the bandits, who foreseeing a betrayal, condemns him to death, but as the trial has been secret, the condemned grant his last wish, so the leader of the bandits undergoes a process of degradation, gives the other his attributes: the leadership of the band, his wife and his horse until the former head he remains poor and miserable as he was before; one becomes the other to justify his revenge, the ruse results and when the wishes are fulfilled, they shoot him, in this way The boss has a motive to take revenge. This is the supreme act of borgeana revenge syndrome, the leader of the bandits is degraded as part of his scheme, since killing the other for envy, would have no psychological sense for him, so he must degrade to find a reason for the revenge as it happens in the text of Tuntar on Caligula; that's why envying him did not have enough motive, on the other hand if he had it as an act of revenge, that is why he hands over, the command, to his wife and his horse to take pleasure in revenge. This is not a fact that does not lead us to the Oedipus complex, but to the "Schadenfreude Syndrome", or pleasure for revenge. According to psychologist Brian Knutson, from Stanford University, California (USA). Scientists tend to take revenge as an irrational act, which offers no benefits to those who punish. But now I feel there is a balance between potential costs and benefits, and the gain is the pleasant feeling of satisfaction. Therefore the syndrome of Schadenfreude Syndrome ", is the pleasure for revenge, that we find in all the stories of Borges, only one no, he has it. "The experiments support our hypothesis that people get the satisfaction of revenge and are rewarded for their actions," said neuroscientist Dominique de Quervain of the University of Zurich and author of another study on the subject published in the journal "Science" (www.sciencemag.org). Men are more vindictive Another research carried out by psychologists at University College London and published in the journal Nature, used tests with brain scans to measure the satisfaction

17. *ibid.* p. 329

18. Borges O.C. 629

19. Deleuze *Op.cit.* p 325.

20. Borges OC p 218.

21. Borges OC p 202

of men and women in situations of revenge. According to experts, men have developed more than women the so-called "**Schadenfreude syndrome**", or pleasure for revenge, as a way to maintain punishments within society and make social groups more cohesive. That is why Emma Zuns' story is significant because it is an exception to the theory of Vengeance. Dr. Tania Singer, who led the research, stated that the results of the study suggest that throughout history man played a predominant role in maintaining justice in society and passing punishment, while that of women was to forgive. **This does not happen in the story of Borges.**

In the **Biography of Tadeo Isidoro Cruz**, he belongs to a sect, the gauchos, he is surrounded by the police, ready to fight until he dies, he fights, but they reduce him, recruit him and send him to jail; the police recruit prisoners and go out to chase the gauchos; he becomes a sergeant, which means that he is a persecutor; now he directs a party that goes in search of a deserter gaucho, during the battle he understands his true nature and decides to betray the police to be the same; in such a way that he decides to die fighting with the defector gaucho named Martin Fierro, to take revenge on his enemies, who had degraded him by turning him into a policeman, in this way he takes revenge on the others, even if it means his annihilation; we see then that the action of all the Borges stories refer us to a transformation of the conscience due to the degrading action, to feel in this way, the taste for revenge. This is the aspect that is missing from the thesis of Mary Luskie Friedman.

The **second** way to postulate reality is to imagine a reality more complex than the one declared to the reader and to refer its derivations.²² We see in the text of Emma Zuns when after each narrative loop the narrator makes an emotional derivation of the facts. In the first notation Emma receives the letter announcing the death of her father. This is the reason for the action. The description of his reaction: first what happens in his body, then in his conscience, which leads him in two directions the unreality and the mythological feeling that his father's death was the only thing that had happened in the world. In this way reality is more complex, because it degrades to the unreal. When Ema travels to the port to establish her alibi she crosses through a labyrinth of mirrors and a labyrinth of doors. Therefore the flat and frugal reality of the trip to the port where it is deflowered borders the limits of unreality; a labyrinth of mirrors where the same image is reflected or a labyrinth of doors that flow into the monstrous room where it is deflowered. In this derivation to the unreal, it takes us to the myth, a labyrinth of mirrors and doors; when returning is another person like the myth of the Alcestes. Emma is veiled, she can not see her face, like Alcestes when she returns from hell, because she is another person, at the beginning of the trip she is an 18-year-old girl full of illusions, but when she returns she is a cold and calculating murderer, who suffered a degradation that transforms it and enables it for revenge.

In an interview with George Charbonier²³ Borges says that his characters are innocent beings, who do not realize what they

do and in their actions innocence and infamy rub shoulders because one drifts into the other. It is what we see in this story.

The third way to postulate reality is through laconic details.

What are these laconic details? At this point the thesis of Mary Luskie Friedman²⁴ is correct, amazingly correct and we will try to add two new elements to understand the laconic details of Borges; according to her the parameters are the following: **First the subject of the action belongs to a sect, second** which opens a **process of loyalty and betrayal; third** his characters **live locked up**; the confinement, is characterized by a diversity of places that are repeated: stairs, red walls; rust and bricks. Indeed all this series of data appear in the tales of the Aleph that we have commented. Emma Zuns and her boss are Jews. (Loewenthal, her boss has betrayed her father, she who is part of a women's union betrays them to meet with her boss. Benjamín Otorola belongs to a gang of gauchos, but he betrays his boss because he wants to be like him. His boss simulates a process of degradation, gives the command, his horse and his wife as the last will of the dead, the ritual finished, they capture him locked up with the woman in a room and kill him. The same thing happens in a chronicle about Caligula written by Borges with the Pseudonym of José Tuntar²⁵ The tyrant comforts the victim with all kinds of gifts and presents and then murders him. Emma lives locked up in her room, pretends to betray her friends, and during the whole story she travels from one confinement to another, from her room, to the hotel room, from the hotel room to the place where her boss is locked up. In a way, the story of Emma Zuns is nothing more than an archetypal version of a historical act by Caligula. **Fourth**, the action begins with a motivating disgrace. This or we see not only Emma Zuns who receives a letter announcing the death of his father, Zur Linde, receives the news that he will be shot. Tzinacan the magician locked in the pyramid, receives the news that Pedro Alvarado burned the pyramid, etc. **Fifth** This opens a degradation process that transforms the character; we already saw that Emma Sunz, innocent virgin of 19 years becomes its opposite, a calculating killer. In Deutsches Requien, Christoph Zur Linde, a Nazi murderer becomes his opposite: a kind of Christ, who dies to vindicate Germany. **Sixth** *On the trip there are drinks, deserving states such as drunkenness, dreams, dizziness, intercourse, hallucinations*; this happens in the trip of Emma to the port, where the des-realization takes place by means of hallucinations, reflection in mirrors and labyrinths of doors, and has intercourse in a pension to establish its alibi; **seventh** at the end of the degradation there are primitive beings, in EMMA the sailor who owns it, the boss whom he kills; in Zur Linde, it is the same, he is being primitive, they are going to shoot, so that Germany is reborn; **In the Scripture of God** the magician locked in the pyramid, undergoes a process of degradation, travels to memory; to the labyrinth of metaphysical speculations and dreams to discover the secret writing of God, that the god was he, a primitive being who had no desire to restart another cycle of time in revenge against the priest locked in the pyramid, who was the same. **Eighth** the subject

22. Borges OC. p. 219

23. Entrevista con George Charbonier op cit p 67

24. Friedman (op cit p 59- 62

25. Borges Obras, reseñas y traducciones inéditas. Editorial Atlántida Buenos Aires Argentina 1995 p 172.

performs a revenge, (we have already seen in all his stories including Emma Zuns that we analyzed) or an annihilation of personality, (Emma stops being what she was) In the story The Episode of the enemy the killer tells him to the victim that it is not a matter of revenge, but of an act of justice²⁶, the problem is that the victim was the same Borges so to save himself he chose to wake up. This is the only story where revenge is not the reason. The contrast is that in Borges' work no one is saved, except him. All the other condemned are marginal beings, impoverished guachos, compadritos who live by jumping, members of sects, poor innocent devils for their tragic youth, etc. These are the characters object of the revenge in the work of Borges; not only are beings defeated by history, but they are beings subjected to a process of degradation. We can conclude that this is undoubtedly an indication of the author's political ideology. An indication of Borges 'rejoicing at moral degradation as an aesthetic foundation, is this the essence of Borges' work? It is possible but in this case we only say that it is the intention expressed in their texts.

Ende Friedman's thesis is correct on the laconic details, but the work of Borges is not reduced to them, there are missing the elements of the Platonic archetype, which we have described and lack the *Schadenfreude Syndrome*". We have then that the same Friedman theory leads us to confirm the thesis of the Borgean platonic archetype. In the subjects related to annihilation are the revelation, the mirrors, scars, masks, blindness, faces, photos, texts, drinking drinks, precious objects. Emma reveals her boss because she murders him, she sees his real face, bad and cursed. Otorola is told that everything that had the command, the horses and the wife of his boss was the concession by the last will of the condemned, she sees his true face, that of the dead and kisses him in the face; the priest locked in the pyramid discovers that he is the true god and to take revenge on the priest, that is to say of himself does not pronounce the words that reinitiate the mythical time again; etc. This indicates that Borges's stories refer us to a unique narrative structure modeled by a Platonic archetype, where the same themes are reiterated with the same combination of elements, on the narrative structure of the myth, thus forging a repeating archetype different ways in different stories, that is why we can not say, in the case of Emma Zunz that the oedipal conflict of murdering the father is reflected, but that it is a repeated mythologization of the revenge syndrome as moral degradation.

We can conclude then that Borges uses the mythical model of Platonic ideology to reiterate his own personal mythology based on the belief that literature can be reduced to its essential values, which are repeated over time as a form of eternal return, until the infinite, but this infinite has a limit: the work of Borges, who is at the end of the labyrinth. Borges the author, who takes his characters to the journey of death, the motive is revenge, but the scheme is the journey. Gastón Bachelard (1942) in his epistemology of myths called **The Water of Dreams**, writes that "*if it is true that a dead person*

for the unconscious is absent, only the navigator of death is a dead person with whom one can dream indefinitely"²⁷.

That is what Borges does with the reiteration of his archetype, he is the navigator of death, where one story is the version of another where the same scheme of the journey to psychic degradation is repeated as a symbolic death or as a real death. "**This is the myth of death conceived as a game in the water**, says Bachelard.²⁸ In Emma Zunz her father dies to take Zunz poison; the boss goes to get him a glass of water and she takes the opportunity to take the gun out of the drawer and kill him. A glass of water was the carelessness that led to his death. The house of Asterión is full of gutters and cisterns, cisterns etc, the drinking troughs are infinite, says the Minotaur, whose reflection forms a labyrinth of mirrors where you can see his face Abenjacar, the bajori, drink beer before he dies, Otorola "a quarrelsome spirit" ", etc; Bachelard says that "*deep imagination requires water to participate in death.*"²⁹ And that is what Borges does for the water of death is one of his laconic details of his postulation of reality, but also includes the symbols of water, because the reflection says Bachelard is one of the fundamental themes of the poetry of the waters.³⁰

We have then that Borges has proclaimed to be a species of Proteus³¹ since he wrote works with the name of Alex Ender, Benjamín Beltrán, Andres Curthis; Pacual Guida; Bernardo Aedo and José Tuntar. These works were rewritten works, versions or plagiarism of Universal Literature, as it is the case of the text taken from the history and decay of Rome of Edward Gibbon. Which took their first borgeana version in Universal History of the infamy, where all the personages realize a trip to the death. However, the image of the Proteus that is transfigured is like the image of Charon. Borges is the symbolic boatman who takes all his characters (and his readers to experience the pacer of revenge. In the stories of Borges the narrator is the boatman who leads his characters through the degradation of death, this is the mythical adventure of his stories, which are then repeated transfigured in variations and masks in his other stories. For Borges, literature is the reiteration of a single message that is repeated. Human degradation His mythical version of the writer is more likely to be seen as a late version of the transcendental philosophy promulgated by the German philosopher Fietche, who considered the writer a prophet of culture who could reveal the transcendent reality residing in the background of all appearance.

³²*The man of letters emerges to keep that divine idea externalizing itself in each new generation.* In the case of Borges his work is a new version of the mythical archetype of Apollonian revenge; his Charon complex tastes the journey of degradation, which leads to death to complete the revenge syndrome; Revenge is not to promote the idea of God, or a reactionary ideology, in which it passes to a set of symbols characters of the popular classes by the purified sieve of degraded morals. It is significant that the only character that is saved from this dynamic is Borges himself, and as the saying

26. Borges **Oc 1132**

27. Bachelard, Gaston. El agua de los sueños. Mexico Efe 2005 p 116 - 117 -

28. Bachelard op cit p 119.

29. Bachelard p 20

30. ibid p 73

31. Borges El oro de los tigres. Obras Completas p 1108 - 1109

32. Tomás Carlyle, Los héroes. Espasa Calpe Argentina 1951 p 147 .