Borges' Homosexual Panic: Christensen's Film Version of "La intrusa"

Herbert J. Brant
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

(Presented at the Northeast Modern Language Association Convention,
Montréal, April 18-20, 1996)

Sex is a very problematic component in the fiction of Jorge Luis Borges. Stated simply, it almost never appears. While characters most certainly have a sex, they usually do not have sex.[1] As María Cristina Rivero indicates, for example, "en la obra de Borges, podremos observar que como preocupación personal no aparece el sexo y que el amor y la mujer, como objeto o dadora de ese amor, están casi ausentes" (176). And even the most subtle suggestion of erotic activities is limited to only a very few stories. One may say, however, that in most cases, sex, if it appears at all, is used primarily as a bargaining chip in the relationship between men, and *never* for the traditional purposes of either procreation or pleasure. In short, sex in Borges' fiction, often by means of an objectified female body,[2]

---

[1] The most notable exception are Emma Zunz's encounter with the anonymous sailor in "Emma Zunz" and the scene of Benjamín Otálora in bed with Ulrica in "Ulrica."

[2] Daniel Altamiranda, for example, notes that in the work of Borges, "female characters are despised and denigrated figures, objects or goods that men can use, associated with danger or destruction" (77). Furthermore, Sharon Magnarelli indicates that "unlike much of Latin-American fiction, Borges' prose does not portray the woman in terms of fecundity, nature, nor birth. [...] Instead, rather than a life-giving principle, women are depicted in Borges in relation to death, violence, and often sacrifice" (142).

seems to be nothing more than an activity that gives definition and dynamism to the interaction between men.[3]

In opposition to the traditional critical standpoint that claims that "Borges has concerned himself with heterosexual relations to the exclusion of other types" (Lima 417), it would be more accurate to say that the relationships between characters in Borgesian fiction (almost exclusively male) are always homo*social* and, in many cases, homo*sexual*: a closer inspection of Borges' work frequently reveals the thinly veiled presence of strong homoerotic desire. In the story "La intrusa", written in the 1940s and published only in 1966, the relationship between men in this corner of Borges' fictional word slides across the homosocial-homosexual[4] continuum towards the homosexual side when the two men in the story make use of a communal woman for the clear purpose of connecting physically and emotionally with each other. In "La intrusa," the erotic desire of the two men is plainly not directed towards a female, but rather towards each other, with the female as the intermediary focal point at/in which the two men may coincide. In essence, Borges has substituted an intervening female body between the men as a way to permit them to connect

---

[3] It must be noted that a male character's sexual "object choice" of a female does *not* determine, beyond doubt, that the male character is, by definition, exclusively and permanently heterosexual. The issue of object choice as a determinant of immutable sexual orientation is a concept that has never been applicable to Hispanic culture. On this question, see Manzor-Coats, xxi.

[4] Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, in her landmark study, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*, defines the "homosocial" as a structure that creates social ties between persons of the same sex. For men, these ties serve not only to establish solidarity and loyalty between men, but also to dominate and oppress the feminine (women and other men who are perceived as "feminine"), as a means to maintain patriarchal power (1-5). But according to Sedgwick, the relationships between men can move around anywhere on a continuous scale between the two poles of the homosocial and the homosexual, noting that "[f]or a man to be a man's man is separated only by an invisible, carefully blurred, always-already-crossed line from being 'interested in men'" (89).

physically to each other without transgressing the traditional homophobic hetero-patriarchal prohibitions of Western culture.

But the homosexual relationship between the Nilsen brothers, while only subtly insinuated in Borges' story, becomes dramatically explicit in Carlos Hugo Christensen's film version of the work. The film, made in Brazil in 1979, takes as a point of departure an unspoken element that runs throughout the written text: the homoerotic desire of the Nilsen brothers. The homosexual relationship between the brothers, suggested by a series of codified and subtle hints through a narrator who cannot speak out loud the words to describe their passion, remains a deafening silence that, by its very unspokenness, clearly announces the situation which Christensen put down on film. The film, with its blatant sexual content, caused an intense and horrified reaction in Borges. Given Borges' outraged response to the film, I believe that Christensen's adaptation indeed hits the target when it visually portrays a homoerotic subtext that appears to have simultaneously attracted and repulsed Borges himself.[5] The result is a classic case of "homosexual panic." In this presentation, I examine the delicate clues that suggest the presence of a strong homoerotic undercurrent that is obscured in the written text and which have been brought out explicitly and powerfully in Christensen's film version of the story.

Borges' original story of "La intrusa," the source for the film adaptation, is the story told of two brothers, Cristián and Eduardo Nilsen, who are infamous for both their rough

---

[5] Borges' views on homosexuality, as Canto, Balderston, and Altamiranda show, were conflicted and intense. Canto, for example, notes that "Borges, que veía con diversión y hasta simpatía la homosexualidad feminina, nunca hacía alusión a la masculina, ni siquiera para denigrarla. La ignoraba en sus amigos o la ponía a un lado cuando tropezaba con ella en la literatura. (En Melville, por ejemplo, negándose a ver el siniestro fondo homosexual de *Billy Budd*)." Canto goes on to explain, however, that Borges' attitudes about male homosexual intercourse are clearly indicated by his use of the word "sodomía" because the "designación bíblica—sodomía—...implicaba la desaprobación divina, con su relente medieval de azufre y hogueras" (170-171).

and brutal ways as well as their unusual closeness. According to the "legend," the incidents of the story occur in the 1890s on the Argentine pampas when the elder brother, Cristián, brings home a woman to live with them: Juliana Burgos. When the younger brother, Eduardo, becomes aroused by her presence, rather than starting a fight, Cristián tells him: "si la querés, usala" (*Brodie* 20).[6] But soon their joint use of Juliana gives rise to a strong emotional tension between the two brothers. In order to resolve the conflict, Cristián decides to sell Juliana to a brothel outside of town and divide up the money equally with his brother. Their need to share her, however, continues as they both make secretive trips to "use" her at the bordello. Cristián decides that in order to save money and "no cansar a los pingos," it would be best that he buy Juliana back and take her home again. but once this occurs, the jealousy between the brothers becomes even more powerful. Finally, on a Sunday morning, Cristián tells Eduardo that they must take a trip to sell some "hides." When they arrive at a deserted field, Cristián confesses that he has already killed Juliana, thereby putting an end to their fraternal disharmony. The brothers embrace, "casi llorando", linked even more closely by "otro vínculo: la mujer tristemente sacrificada y la obligación de olvidarla" (*Brodie* 23).

Borges, naturally, is very clever about how he insinuates the growing mutual love between the brothers. Unlike Christensen, Borges never portrays any sexual situation involving the brothers or Juliana and he certainly never directly indicates what the relationship between the brothers might suggest. But on the other hand, Borges does insinuate that the love between the Nilsens is the kind of love between men that surpasses the love between a man and a woman. A Biblical citation, indicated only the chapter and verse designation "2 Reyes, I, 26"is the curious epigraph to the story. As Balderston

---

[6] All references to the story will appear in the text between parentheses with the abbreviation *Brodie* and the page number.

correctly asserts, the use of this epigraph is one of Borges' clever ruses that functions to express and, at the same time, suppress a homosexual context for the story (35). The Biblical reference that Borges gives is, as Woscoboinik calls it, a "picardía" that "esconde pudorosamente" the content (129). Balderston explains: "[t]he first chapter of the second book of *Kings* does not have a twenty-sixth verse, but the second book of *Samuel*, sometimes also known as the second book of *Kings*, contains the most famous of all declarations of homosexual love: 'I am distressed for thee, my brother, Jonathan: very pleasant hast thou been unto me; thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women'" (35). Once deciphered by the reader, the epigraph sets up the story as one that will convey the power of a man's passion for another man, a love that will surpass the love of a woman. Christensen, taking Borges' modest concealment of the Biblical passage and expressing it in the most direct manner possible, displays it in superscript over a still shot of the family Bible, making the relationship between the brothers unmistakably explicit for the viewer. Although the director loses some of the subtlety of Borges' version of the story when he reveals the solution to the mystery of the epigraph, Christensen succeeds in preparing the audience for the visual depiction of the homosexual relationship between the brothers that will appear later on in the film.

Beyond the epigraph, the characterization of the Nilsens in Borges' story is also suggestive and only hints at their true passions. In the story, the narrator reveals that the Nilsen brothers are not at all like the other men of the region. First, their peculiar nature makes them unusually removed and even antisocial. In public, the Nilsens inspire fear and admiration among the people of the area. Their private lives are kept completely secret. No one dares intrude on their privacy and they never let anyone into their "caserón": "pocos, por lo demás, entraron ahí; los Nilsen defendían su soledad" (*Brodie* 18).

Christensen exploits the dramatic quality of the distinction between public image and private secrecy by creating scenes that emphasize this glaring antithesis. In the world

outside their very private and well-protected ranch, the brothers are considered to be powerful, frightening, and macho men, while at home, they display a gentler side to their character. To demonstrate their reputation for being terrifying and intimidating, for example, Christensen includes a scene in which local men, sitting in line for the next available prostitute at the bordello, immediately move back to let the Nilsen brothers go ahead of them in line. This fear of the Nilsens is explained partly through scenes of knife duels with their enemies which show the brothers to be extremely violent and aggressive in defense of their individual and family honor. As stated both in the story and the film, "malquistarse con uno era contar con dos enemigos" (*Brodie* 19). Furthermore, Christensen films scenes of gaucho horsemanship to highlight the brothers' graceful, but masculine, power, control and domination. Christensen's use of cockfight scenes also reinforce the notion that the brothers are both highly competitive and protective of each other.

In stark contrast, however, are the scenes in which Christensen has depicted the private physical and emotional relationship between the two brothers. In opposition to the fearful image projected in public, the two men display humor, tenderness and sincere affection for each other in the private world of their ranch. A scene of particularly boyish (and homoerotic) playfulness immediately follows the opening scene of the film. Eduardo's cock wins an important fight agains the one owned by the local boss, Juan Iberra. Delighted by the win, the two men return home, they undress and conduct a mock knife fight *in the nude* before putting on their union suits and sleeping together in the same bed. Another scene of affectionate intimacy is one in which Eduardo returns home drunk one night and Cristián cradles his brother in his arms and tends to him until he fall asleep.

Borges' text underscores the oddness, the "queerness" of the brothers by noting further that they are of an uncertain ethnic lineage which makes them appear *physically* different. The narrator concludes that it is this physical difference, as well as "*lo que ignoramos*, ayuda a comprender lo unidos que fueron" (*Brodie* 19; my emphasis). What

makes them distant, what makes them so odd, but above all, what makes them so close, in other words, is due to something physical[7] and also to something that remains hidden from us. In the film, Christensen takes these two things, the brothers' unidentified northern ethnicity and that elusive unknown element, and combines them when he casts the roles of the Nilsens with, as Balderston calls them, “pretty blonds who look as though they work as models in their spare time” (36). The unusual casting of “pretty blonds” as two fearsome frontier gauchos, serves the purpose of making the men look distinct from the other men around them, but in more than just ethnic terms. It is a commonplace belief, especially in

---

[7] Since the late Nineteenth Century, there has existed a well-documented Western tradition in science of attempting to find a visible, physical difference in homosexuals so that their particularly frightening menace would become obvious to all and could then, as a result, be neutralized. In Argentina, for example, as Salessi has persuasively shown, the desire to be able to identify any homosexual quickly and easily originates in the reactionary movement to preserve social and national “health” of the Argentine nation following the dramatic immigration and urbanization into Buenos Aires at the end of the Nineteenth Century. As a consequence of the need to locate and label homosexuals, scientists and criminologists came to theorize that homosexuals were indeed physically different in appearance—their bodies bore a mark, a sign, a stigma that could be recognized instantly. Indeed, Michel Foucault asserts that it is this marking that, in effect, provides homosexuals with a distinct identity and selfhood:

> [t]he nineteenth-century homosexual became a personage, a past, a case history, and a childhood, in addition to being a type of life, a life form, and a morphology, with an *indiscreet anatomy* and possibly a *mysterious physiology*. Nothing that went into his total composition was unaffected by his sexuality. It was everywhere present in him: at the root of all his actions because it was their insidious and indefinitely active principle; *written immodestly on his face and body*... (43; emphasis added)

Edelman further stresses the “textuality” and “readability” of the queer body insofar as “homosexuals themselves have been seen as producing—and, by some medical 'experts,' as being produced by—bodies that bore a distinct, and therefore legible, anatomical code. [...] Homosexuals, in other words, were not only conceptualized in terms of a radically potent, if negatively charged, relation to signifying practices, but also subjected to a cultural imperative that viewed them as inherently textual—as bodies that might well bear a 'hallmark' that could, and must, be read” (5-6).

strongly *machista* contests, that prettiness and blondness in men diminishes their masculinity and makes them appear more feminine. And furthermore, femininity in men is almost always a visual and public mark of the homosexual in Western culture. While Borges' narrator prudishly pleads ignorance on what makes the brothers so close,[8] the director of the film uses the visual medium to make it clear to the audience..

In an interesting move, immediately following the acknowledgment that Borges' narrator is unaware of what causes the two men to be so attached to each other, he mentions their *sexual* behavior: it is know that their "episodios amorosos" have only ever been encounters with prostitutes, "de zaguán o de casa mala" (*Brodie* 19). This information is significant because it emphasizes the difference between public reputation and private reality. The Nilsens can be seen publicly at the brothel, and their image as presumably heterosexual men is preserved, despite the rumors that the brothers are much closer than "normal." But when Cristián brings the prostitute Juliana Burgos[9] home to live with them, his intention is not to form the hetero-patriarchal bond of marriage, but rather to acquire a

---

[8] Given the context of the rest of the story, however, the narrator's feigned ignorance seems to be an indisputable case of not being able to name the "peccatum illud horribile, inter christianos non nominandum," in other words, homosexuality, the love (or sin) that dare not speak its name.

[9] It is quite surprising that critics have not commented on the name of the woman in the story, especially considering Borges' well known obsessive use of symbolic names. "Juliana," repeats the initial consonants of "Jorge Luis" and is coupled with "Burgos," the Castilian version of the Portuguese "Borges." It appears, then, that the author is using his own name, in a slightly altered form, for the communal woman in the story. But why would Borges make such a fairly obvious link between himself and the woman who is the sexual intermediary between two men? Perhaps Borges is suggesting that, like Juliana Burgos, he himself was once the powerless object of male sexual aggression and violence and, for that reason, the relationship between men in his fiction is almost always a violent one. Based on his interpretation of information revealed by Estela Canto, Balderston sustains that "as a boy Borges must have suffered some sort of rape" (43). This hypothesis, although horrifying, is fascinating for its power to explain the almost ubiquitous mix of violence and adoration in the relationships between men in Borges' fiction.

live-in maid ("[e]s verdad que ganaba así una sirvienta"), and even more importantly, to be able to show her off as his companion when he goes out in public ("la lucía en las fiestas") (*Brodie* 19). This last use of Juliana as a displayable heterosexual partner—known in slang terms as a "beard"—is quite necessary to deflect the already circulating accusations of homoerotic desire between the brothers, as suggested by the narrator's modest coded phrase, "la *rivalidad latente* de los hermanos" (*Brodie* 20; emphasis added).

The most valuable use of Juliana, however, is her position as a sexual intermediary between the brothers. As Magnarelli demonstrates, Juliana is the third point of the love triangle and as such, "[s]he... has no intrinsic value, her value is the result of the mediator's, the other's prestige. Cristián desires her because Eduardo does and viceversa" (144). So although the brothers share her separately, they connect man-to-man through her body. As a result, Juliana, whose existence is purely functional, ceases to have even a nominal identity as a human being, becoming a mere sexual apparatus that permits the two men to have intimate physical contact with each other without actually engaging in male-male sexual intercourse. The understanding of the true nature of their relationship emerges when, as Keller and Van Hooft affirm, "Juliana comes to serve as a catalyst and a foil for a more profound intrusion—the emergence of a conscious awareness of fraternal love, an awareness which is intolerable to the brothers" (305).

Their mutual desire, "aquel monstruoso amor," as the narrator puts it in the story (*Brodie* 22), however, becomes so overwhelming that the brothers must find a release from the tension it causes. After a long discussion, the two men decide to "sell" Juliana to a brothel and, in that way, they may succeed in eliminating the instrument that makes their physical love possible and in calming their own homophobic feelings of guilt. The need to connect through the female's body, however, intensifies and manages to negate the fear of recognizing their mutual sexual passion. As a consequence, the brothers are forced to buy her back after they visit her repeatedly individually at the brothel in an attempt to recreate

the erotic structure that once united them. In the scene that caused Borges to condemn the film publicly, Christensen finally makes explicit the true nature of the relationship between the brothers. Rather than sharing her separately as they had always done before, this time they come to her bed together and the two men make love to each other while she is positioned physically between them.

This scene is highly significant for several reasons. Whereas every sex scene up to this point between Juliana and one of the brothers has depicted sexuality as brutal, animalistic, and with a strong undercurrent of violence and rage, the sex between the two brothers with Juliana lying in the middle, while intense, is also more gentle and passionate. This, of course, mirrors the fact that the brothers, in both story and film, always treat "intruders" with aggression and dominance but show tenderness and affection with each other only in private. Also very important is the fact that the two men reach orgasm simultaneously without ever having penetrated Juliana. The sexual climax here is the result of the two men touching and kissing each other while Juliana's body merely serves to provide a locale for sex.

Although this scene in the film seems to be a perfectly natural extension of what is suggested in the text of the story, Borges was thoroughly scandalized by its inclusion in the film. In order to understand more clearly Borges' response, one must consider several remarks that Borges and others have made about the story and the film. Unlike the majority of Borgesian fiction, "La intrusa" has occasioned an enormous diversity of critical opinion with regard to its content and artistic quality. Some critics, for example, consider the content annoying and even alarming and contend that the narration indicates a clear break with the earlier Borgesian style, a more ornate and complicated style of prose. Others see a continuity between Borges' earlier and later production and that this story incorporates some important innovations in the narrative technique of the author. But the biggest problem in the analysis of this story is the meaning of the relationship between the Nilsen

brothers and Juliana Burgos. For the majority of critics, writing at an earlier moment in our understanding of gender and sexuality, the life and especially the death of the woman becomes a necessary distraction for purely homophobic interpretations. Robert Lima, for example, maintains that Cristián "confronted the erotic 'demon' in himself and executed it. He has opted for the fraternal rather than for the sexual bond. [...] Erotic love gave way to fraternal love through violence" (415). For Lima, an automatic heterosexist presumption negates the possibility of a fraternal *and erotic* love and that brothers can also be lovers. George McMurray sees the death of Juliana at the hands of the Nilsen brothers as a purifying sacrifice "to atone for their 'sin' of love" (144), while Sharon Magnarelli considers the death of the woman as a sacrifice made for a detested homosexuality and the destruction of the inner femininity of the brothers (148). These points of view presuppose that homosexual love is, after all, a sin and a source of shame that requires a psychological expiation.

But the interpretation proposed by Gary D. Keller and Karen S. Van Hooft, whose study at first contains some very accurate insights into the story, provides, in the end, an unfortunate heterosexist and condescending interpretation. The authors conclude that Juliana exists solely as a "test" of the psychological development of the brothers—a test that they fail miserably. According to Keller and Van Hooft, the Nilsens live in a childish state of psychological indifferentiation which must be overcome "in order to attain heterosexual maturity" (314). The death of Juliana, therefore, demonstrates the the brothers have failed in their "correct" maturation and have remained in a state of unconscious unity: "[i]n a sense it is the fate of these brothers to be 'yoked' to each other like oxen—they are melded. And just as oxen are altered studs, the brothers are not permitted entry into the mature heterosexuality of the adult world" (315). This conclusion, with its unfortunate tone of heterosexist superiority, repeats the baseless chauvinistic assumption in psychoanalysis that the ultimate goal of psychological development is heterosexuality and that homosexuals, by

definition, must be stuck in a state of infantile immaturity. These interpretations fail to take into account the strength of the passion between the brothers that surpasses the love between a man and a woman. Cristián kills Juliana, not out of hatred for this woman or women in general, but out of the necessity to eliminate the obstacle that prevents the complete realization of his homoerotic love. The brothers must advance beyond a relationship with a communal woman as substitute towards a relationship with their true object of desire.

But the homophobic reaction of the critics with respect to this story cannot compare to the outraged reaction to the film that Borges had. As Alifano reports, Borges insisted that the idea that the brothers could be homosexual never entered his mind: "'[e]n ningún momento ni remotamente pasó por mi cabeza la idea de la relación homosexual entre esos dos hombres'" (162). But in contrast to this statement, Alifano quotes Borges as also having stated that

> [l]a pista para ["La intrusa"] surgió de una conversación casual con mi amigo, el guapo, Nicolás Paredes, a fines de los años veinte. [...] Paredes señaló con sequedad: Cualquier hombre que piense cinco minutos seguidos en una mujer no es un hombre, es un marica. El amor entre esa gente [los compadritos] estaba reglamentado; yo sabía que su verdadera pasión era la amistad. Más tarde, a partir de este conjunto bastante abstracto de ideas desarrollé mi cuento. (161-162)

From the quote above, it would seem that the idea that the two men are motivated only by "friendship" and that real men only think about other real men, never women, is in its essence homoerotic. Perhaps Borges was naive enough not to realize what his "culto de la

amistad" might suggest; perhaps not. But as a footnote in Emir Rodríguez Monegal and Alastair Reid's anthology of Borgesian writing indicates, Borges based "La intrusa" on a real incident that he found necessary to modify precisely *because* the possibility of the two men being homosexual did indeed cross his mind. They note that the "the chief alteration [to the story] was to make the protagonists brothers instead of close friends, to avoid any homosexual connotations. (Perhaps unwillingly, he added incest)" (361). Estela Canto, too, affirms that when she discussed the story with Borges, "[l]e dije que el cuento me parecía básicamente homosexual. Creí que esto—él se alarmaba bastante de cualquier alusión en este sentido—iba a impresionarle. [...] Para él no había ninguna situación homosexual en el cuento. Continuó hablándome de la relación entre los dos hermanos, de la bravura de este tipo de hombres, etc." (230).

Despite Borges' public objections to any implication of homosexuality in the story and his attempts to disguise the nature of the relationship between the men by making them stereotypically *macho* gauchos on the pampas, I believe that there is a clear homosexual content in the story and that Christensen's representation of the characters and their situation is a perfectly valid interpretation supported by the text. It does seem, however, that Christensen's film touched a very delicate and sensitive spot on Borges' psyche, setting off a panic so intense that Borges actually stooped to advocating censorship in the case of this particular film. Alifano relates that Borges "[c]asi inmediatamente me dictó un artículo que tituló *La censura* donde a pesar de pronunciarse en contra de esa arbitrariedad tan usual de los gobiernos totalitarios, la aprobaba en el caso específico de la película basada en su cuento" (162).

There is something unique and unprecedented in Borges' reaction to this film. As Silvestri notes, Borges "siempre ha acogido las interpretaciones de su obra con irónica distanciación" (57). Never before had any interpretation of his stories ever caused him to violate his own set of personal beliefs, declaring himself suddenly in favor of the silencing

of creative artists. To say that Borges overreacted, would be an understatement. I agree completely with Balderston when he indicates that Borges' exaggerated response can be classified as a clear case of "homosexual panic." This phenomenon, as Sedgwick has explored, can be conceived of as that shocking moment of sudden realization that a person might possibly be considered homosexual by others and that that perception must, therefore, reveal a publicly perceptible latent homosexual desire. It may have been that despite all of Borges' carefully crafted attempts to diminish the homosexual undertones in the narrative, the author was suddenly shocked to discover how he himself had created a situation of unmistakable homosexual eroticism. The film, as a result, may have sparked a moment of terror in Borges when he wondered whether his male-centered and male-dominated fictional world might now be viewed under a new light and that his own sexual orientation might be exposed to speculation and innuendo.

Whether or not Borges' strenuous protestations against the film indicate anything about the author's own sexuality, we cannot say for sure. What is clear, in the end, is that no interpretation of his work could be more loathsome of devastating to Borges than one that fleshes out the images of sex between men that originated within his own creative imagination.

WORKS CITED

Alifano, Roberto. *Borges: Biografía verbal*. Barcelona: Plaza y Janes, 1988.

Altamiranda, Daniel. "Borges, Jorge Luis (Argentina; 1899-1986)." *Latin American Writers on Gay and Lesbian Themes: A Bio-Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. David William Foster. Westport: Greenwood P, 1994. 72-83.

Balderston, Daniel. "The Fecal Dialectic: Homosexual Panic and the Origin of Writing in Borges." *¿Entiendes? Queer Readings, Hispanic Writings*. Eds. Emilie L. Bergmann y Paul Julian Smith. Durham: Duke UP, 1995. 29-45.

Borges, Jorge Luis. *El informe de Brodie*. Madrid: Alianza, 1970.

Canto, Estela. *Borges a contraluz*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1989.

Edelman, Lee. *Homographesis: Essays in Gay Literary and Cultural Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*. Trad. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1980.

Keller, Gary D. y Karen S. Van Hooft. "Jorge Luis Borges' 'La intrusa': The Awakening of Love and Consciousness/The Sacrifice of Love and Consciousness." *The Analysis of Hispanic Texts: Current Trends in Methodology*. Eds. Lisa E. Davis y Isabel C. Tarán. New York: Bilingual P, 1976. 300-319.

Lima, Robert. "Coitus Interruptus: Sexual Transubstantiation in the Works of Jorge Luis Borges." *Modern Fiction Studies* 19 (1973): 407-417.

Magnarelli, Sharon. "Literature and Desire: Women in the Fiction of Jorge Luis Borges." *Revista/Review Interamericana* 13.1-4 (1983): 138-149.

Manzor-Coats, Lillian. "Introduction." *Latin American Writers on Gay and Lesbian Themes: A Bio-Critical Sourcebook.* Ed. David William Foster. Westport: Greenwood P, 1994. xv-xxxvi.

Rodríguez Monegal, Emir. *Jorge Luis Borges: A Literary Biography*. New York: Paragon House, 1988.

--- and Alastair Reid, eds. *Borges: A Reader. A Selection from the Writings of Jorge Luis Borges*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1981.

Salessi, Jorge. *Médicos, maleantes y maricas: Higiene, criminología y homosexualidad en la construcción de la nación Argentina (Buenos Aires: 1871-1914).* Buenos Aires: Beatriz Viterbo Editora, 1995.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985.

Silvestri, Laura. "Borges y la pragmática de lo fantástico." *Jorge Luis Borges: Variaciones interpretativas sobre sus procedimientos literarios y bases epistemológicas*. Eds. Karl Alfred Blüher y Alfonso de Toro. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert Verlag, 1992. 49-66.

Woscoboinik, Julio. *El secreto de Borges. Indagación psicoanalítica de su obra*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Trieb, 1988.