

ARISTOTLE, BORGES AND KALOKYRIS  
THE UNIVERSE OF THE *POETICS* AND THE POETICS OF THE UNIVERSE



*Eleni Kefala*

---

**I**n the first part of my paper, I study how Borges, a writer who despises realist aesthetics and engages himself with fantastic literature, reads and reinterprets Aristotle's theory on *mimesis* and particularly the notions of the poet as "ποιητής μύθων" ("maker of plots"), and the "εἰκός" ("probable"). I argue that in doing so, Borges launches Aristotle's poet-maker into the centre of his fictional universe since he conceives reality and history as an infinite series of conjectures/narratives which aim at deciphering the inaccessible (to the human mind) universe of God. Thus, Borges' poet, the one who invents and conjectures narratives, becomes the creator of reality/history resolving this way the long-standing debate on *representation* in literature. Subsequently, in the second part of my paper, I focus on how the contemporary Greek writer Dimitris Kalokyris develops the Borgesian concept of the poet as Maker. Specifically, Kalokyris equates *ἱστωρ* (historian) with *ποιητής* (poet), extending this idea of the fictionalisation of reality and history in order to discuss several issues of postmodern culture. In particular, I concentrate on Kalokyris' engagement first, with the increasingly virtual contemporary culture and especially with the notions of "cyberspace"

and “cyberlibrary” and secondly on the idea of “time-space compression” as defined by David Harvey.

Borges’ short story “Tlön, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius” (OC 1) is a luminous speculation on the philosophical problem of knowledge with respect to the external world. That is, how the world we perceive as real is essentially a mental construction of the human mind which tries to provide the world with a meaning while the real world itself is chaotic and lacking of any meaning at all. Borges suggests that what we perceive as reality, like the fantastic structure of Tlön, is “obra de una sociedad secreta de astrónomos, de biólogos, de ingenieros, de metafísicos, de poetas, de químicos, de algebristas, de moralistas, de pintores, de géometras...” (434). The phenomenal world of ours is, like Tlön, a fantastic construction out of chaos: “es un cosmos y las íntimas leyes que lo rigen han sido formuladas, siquiera en modo provisional” (435).

“Cosmos” (κόσμος) means both “order” and “ornament”. On the one hand, for the ancient Greeks, the world was an ornament precisely because it was put into an order by the supernatural. For the Western logocentric philosophy – which begins with Plato and Aristotle – the world is perfectly set into an order and it can be perfectly perceived by the signifying systems of Reason available to the human mind. On the other hand, Borges believes that the phenomenal world, like Tlön, is a “cosmos” (an “ornament”, an “order”) out of chaos, but it is also conventional and arbitrary. That is to say, Borges does not deny Reason or the mental constructions of the human mind. His scepticism is in no way reduced to nihilism. On the contrary, mental constructions are *sine-qua-non* conditions for mankind to survive in the chaotic labyrinth of the real world. What Borges does do, however, is to deny the authenticity of any of these formations. He reminds us that the rules, the norms we attribute to the world are “provisional”. Ultimately, these norms are as fantastic (or real) in relation to the real world of chaos as Tlön.

Borges’ fantastic diminishes the limits between reality and fiction by reminding us that what we consider to be real is actually a temporary convention that the human mind sustains in order to make sense out of the senseless. This way, I would say that Borges is a Realist *par excellence*, one who plunges into the universe of Aristotle’s

*Poetics* in order to speak of the poetics of the universe, that is, the fictional nature of all the narratives which constitute the so called “sources” of knowledge of our world. In his essay, “El ruiseñor de Keats”, Borges, citing Coleridge, distinguishes the Aristotelian from the Platonist:

Observa Coleridge que todos los hombres nacen aristotélicos o platónicos. Los últimos sienten que las clases, los órdenes y los géneros son realidades; los primeros, que son generalizaciones; para éstos, *el lenguaje no es otra cosa que un aproximativo juego de símbolos*; para aquéllos es el mapa del universo. El platónico sabe que el universo es de algún modo un *cosmos*, un orden; ese orden, para el aristotélico, puede ser un error o una ficción de nuestro conocimiento parcial. (OC 2: 96. My emphasis)

Platonism offers Borges a good source for his concept of literature as a *verbal universe*. However, Borges’ universe, in contrast to the Platonic one, does not claim any notion of originality. This is because Borges looks at Platonism through an Aristotelian spectrum – “el lenguaje no es otra cosa que un aproximativo juego de símbolos”. At the same time, though, he comes back enriching the Aristotelian concept of the “real”, which is now contaminated by the symbolic universe of Platonism. For Borges, Aristotelian reality cannot claim any authenticity either. In fact, like the Platonic cosmos, it is itself a simulacrum, a “ficción”.

I shall now focus on the following question: how does Aristotle define the act of writing and fiction in general and how does Borges read and reinterpret the Aristotelian theory? In the *Poetics*, Aristotle argues:

It is the function of a poet to relate not things that have happened, but things that may happen, i.e. that are in accordance with *probability* or necessity. For the historian and the poet do not differ according to whether they write in verse or without verse. [...] The difference is that the former relates things that have happened, the latter things that may happen. (1451a36-1451b5. My emphasis)<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “Ὅτι τὰ γενόμενα λέγειν, τοῦ ποιητοῦ ἔργον ἔστιν, ἀλλ’ οἷα ἂν γένοιτο καὶ τὰ δυνατὰ κατὰ τὸ εἰκός ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον· ὁ γὰρ ἱστορικὸς καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς οὐ τῷ ἢ ἔμμετρα

The key term here is that of “probable” (“εἰκός”). Aristotle never reduced the art of fiction and representative aesthetics to a poor reproduction of reality, as some scholars inaccurately argue from time to time. For him, *to represent* reality does not mean *to copy* reality but *to create* a reality. On the one hand, the historian copies reality by presenting what “has happened”; on the other hand, the poet creates his own reality by presenting what “may happen”. He is, above all, a *maker of plots*: “it is clear [...] that a poet must be a composer of plots” (1451b27-8).<sup>2</sup> The poet is a maker – a *ποιητής*, from the verb *ποιῶ* which means “to make” – a maker of “probable” plots; that means, of events that may never happen in reality but, nevertheless, could happen – so they are believable. Aristotle goes so far as to say that it is better to present “amazing”, “astonishing” events (“τὸ θαυμαστὸν”) that seem likely to happen than real incidents which seem unbelievable (1452a2-11). Moreover, Aristotle’s concept of the “probable” becomes even broader when he affirms that “it is probable that many things will happen even against probability” (1456a24-5).<sup>3</sup>

What Borges actually does in reading Aristotle is to expand the latter’s concept of the “probable”. If what we perceive as “real”, Borges seems to suggest, is just a fiction then representing the “real” equals to representing fictions (*ficciones*). In fact, the Borgesian equation of the universe with the vast “Biblioteca de Babel” (OC 1) or the infinite “Libro de arena” (OC 3) resolves the long-standing debate on *mimesis*. This is because literature becomes as probable as reality itself since reality is nothing but infinite fictional narratives – a Book. Ultimately, Borges is a “ποιητής μύθων” (an *hacedor* of *ficciones*) who suggests that the most probable (believable) reality in our world of simulacra is that of fantasy. This is because fantasy does not ask from us to believe it; on the contrary, it continuously exposes its fictitious nature.

---

διαφέρουσιν (...)· ἀλλὰ τούτῳ διαφέρει, τῷ τὸν μὲν τὰ γενόμενα λέγειν, τὸν δὲ οἷα ἂν γένοιτο”.

<sup>2</sup> “Δῆλον οὖν (...) τὸν ποιητὴν μάλλον τῶν μύθων εἶναι δεῖ ποιητὴν”.

<sup>3</sup> “Εἰκός γάρ γίνεσθαι πολλά καὶ παρὰ τὸ εἰκός”.

For Borges, even God himself, the maker of the universe, belongs to the same realm like his creations: the realm of the invented. In the short story, “Everything and Nothing” God, like his poet Shakespeare, is simultaneously everybody and nobody. Both, the poet and God are reflections in a series of infinite transformations: “yo tampoco soy; yo soñé el mundo como tú soñaste tu obra, mi Shakespeare, y entre las formas de mi sueño estás tú, que como yo eres muchos y nadie” (OC 2: 182).

Essentially, Borges sustains that poet and God are the two names of the *maker* –the maker of fictions. In Borgesian philosophy, poet is the God, the creator of the universe which is nothing but an immense library –the library of Babel. In Greek, this statement sounds much more natural for *ποιητής* (the maker) is the name of both the poet and God. Specifically, one of the most fundamental principles of the orthodox Christian credo is that God is “ποιητής ούρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων” (“the maker of the sky and earth, of all the visible and invisible”). Ultimately, I assume that one of the infinite transformations of the Borgesian universe is an isosceles triangle in the centre of which lies the *ποιητής*: the poet, the maker, God.

Let us now turn to the contemporary Greek writer Dimitris Kalokyris and in particular to his first work of prose *Ποικίλη ιστορία* [*Varia Historia*] (1991). In the Prologue of the book, the writer draws the relation between history and literature, scholarship and parody:

When *literature creates History*, History consumes itself between imperishability and perishability, that is, between scholarship and parody. With the weapons of the former the latter is served. [...] The *plundering of bibliography* belongs to the ways of re-registering human pathology. (10. My emphasis)<sup>4</sup>

At the outset, Kalokyris discloses the cornerstones of his philosophical edifice: history is a creation of literature which, in turn, is a

---

<sup>4</sup> “Όταν η λογοτεχνία δημιουργεί την Ιστορία, η Ιστορία αυτοαναλώνεται μεταξύ αφθαρσίας και φθοράς, δηλαδή μεταξύ επιστημονικότητας και παρωδίας. Με τα όπλα της πρώτης διακονείται η δεύτερη. Μέσω του Ψελλού θεραπεύεται ο Θουκυδίδης. Η λεηλασία της βιβλιογραφίας κατατάσσεται στους τρόπους επανεγγραφής της ανθρώπινης παθολογίας”. All the translations of Kalokyris’ texts are mine.

“plundering of bibliography”. Kalokyris reads Aristotle using the same spectrum as Borges: in a world where everything is fictional, the creator is a writer, a maker of fictions (“ποιητής μύθων”). Like Borges, Kalokyris shares the same triangular universe where poet, maker and God are the names of the one and only figure: that of *ποιητής* who, through his kaleidoscope, organises the chaos of the miscellany by inventing narratives.

The word *ιστορία* like the Spanish “*historia*” means both history and story. Specifically, the etymology of the word comes from the noun *ἴστωρ* which means “wise”, “learned man”. *Ἰστωρ* was the learned man who used to retell and recount stories; thus, “history” originally means “narrative”. Kalokyris, like Borges, goes back to the original meaning of the word and understands history as narrative, that is, as just *another* (and not *the*) narrative, or even as numerous narratives recited endlessly by countless *ἱστωρες*-narrators. Consequently, *ἴστωρ* stands for *ποιητής* which means that the historian is the other name of the poet and the vice versa while *ιστορία* finally stands for *μυθιστορία* (fiction), a tenet that Borges already upheld in 1935 with his first book of fiction, *Historia universal de la infamia*.

The concept of fictionalisation of history and the world in general is directly related to the notions of “dictionary” and “encyclopaedia” which run throughout Kalokyris’ work. This idea of the book as a dictionary of the universe is actually a manifestation of Borges’ fundamental concept of the universe as an infinite book or an infinite library. For Kalokyris, the writer is a lexicographer of the vocabulary of the universe which is seen through a kaleidoscope. The story that probably explores in most detail the *topos* of the universe as a Book is “On the Total Book”<sup>5</sup> published in his recent collection of pseudo-essays, *Prow to Lucifer* (2001).<sup>6</sup> Here, Kalokyris argues that human civilisation is essentially a “written” one and this is due to the fact that writing is the only way to fight against oblivion:

The civilisation that we know always remains, in one way or another, essentially Written. And it remains so because it has invested

---

<sup>5</sup> “Για το απόλυτο βιβλίο”.

<sup>6</sup> Πλήρη στον *Εωσφόρο*.

everything in the fallacy of memory: what is not remembered is not written; what is not written does not exist; what does not exist, we create...and so on. (11)<sup>7</sup>

Since what is not remembered is actually what is not written and since what is not written does not exist, writing, and more specifically the book,

constitutes the geometric and geographic locus of creation. Some people defined the book –in that case the Quoran– as the material form of the creator; others identified the [...] scattered homeland with a Book –the Bible. Finally, some others paralleled the world with a spherical book or they have defined “the universe in alphabetical order” within the pages of the Dictionary. (11)<sup>8</sup>

In brief, the universe, as an image (or multiple images) conceptualised by the human mind, takes the form of an infinite book while writing itself becomes a life-giving act: that is, to name is to fictionalise and to fictionalise is to give life. Subsequently, Kalokyris describes the “total book”, which he calls “βιβββλίο” –bbbook- (13) as the “geometric locus” where the fictional and non-fictional realities meet up, interweave and transform each other. In fact, the narrator goes so far as to suggest that the infinite realities of the book can interfere in external reality and alter it:

It [the bbbook] will consist of thousands of pages where, in fact, a common scene will be described: i.e. somebody is sitting on his sofa reading the Sunday newspapers. The contents of all the pages of all the newspapers follow word for word. [...] However, if we like, there could be digressions from time to time in order to keep the natural time. That is, the “reader” of the book stops, for example, to eat, smoke or to sleep [...]. Hence, the action could be extended ac-

---

<sup>7</sup> “Ο πολιτισμός που γνωρίζουμε, εξακολουθεί να παραμένει, με τη μία ή την άλλη μορφή, κατ’ουσίαν Γραπτός. Και παραμένει έτσι διότι έχει επενδύσει τα πάντα στη φενάκη της μνήμης: ό, τι δεν απομνημονεύεται δεν καταγράφεται ό, τι δεν καταγράφεται δεν υπάρχει· ό, τι δεν υπάρχει το δημιουργούμε· ό, τι δημιουργούμε... κ.ο.κ”.

<sup>8</sup> “αποτελεί τον γεωμετρικό και γεωγραφικό τόπο της δημιουργίας. Ορισμένοι λαοί όρισαν το βιβλίο –εν προκειμένω το Κοράντιο– ως την υλική μορφή του δημιουργού άλλοι ταύτισαν την [...] διεσπαρμένη πατρίδα μ’ένα Βιβλίο –τη Βίβλο. Κάποιοι, τέλος, παραλλήλισαν τον κόσμο με σφαιρικό βιβλίο ή όρισαν ‘το σύμπαν κατ’αλφαβητική σειρά’ μέσα στις σελίδες του Λεξικού”.

ording to one's desire and bifurcate even in the surroundings of the books that he reads. [...] [Action] could also intervene in the evolution of the events that take place, alter the landscapes etc. (12-3)<sup>9</sup>

Ultimately, the "total book" is an infinite kaleidoscopic text within which the universe infinitely changes and transmutes. However, the question that now emerges is whether it is possible to compose such a "total" book:

Today we would say Yes. First, a great part of the classical grammarology has been transcribed into electronic form. Subsequently, there are programmes which scan and digitise every single text and make it workable. With these raw materials and given that *technologically time is continuously compressed, everything is a matter of space –that is, of memory*. And we have seen that what is remembered is what is written; what is written exists ...and so on. (14. My emphasis)<sup>10</sup>

At this point, Kalokyris evidently echoes David Harvey's notion of "time-space compression" as expressed in his book, *The Condition of Postmodernity*:

As space appears to shrink to a "global village" of telecommunications and a "spaceship earth" of economic and ecological interdependencies [...] and as time horizons shorten to the point where present is all there is [...], we have to learn how to cope with an overwhelming sense of *compression* of our spatial and temporal worlds. (240. My emphasis)

---

<sup>9</sup> "[Το βιβλίο] θα αποτελείται από χιλιάδες σελίδες όπου, στην ουσία, θα περιγράφεται μια κοινότατη εικόνα: π.χ. κάποιος που κάθεται στην πολυθρόνα του και διαβάζει τις κυριακάτικες εφημερίδες. Ακολουθούν λέξη προς λέξη τα περιεχόμενα όλων των σελίδων, όλων των εφημερίδων. [...] Αν θέλουμε όμως, δεν αποκλείεται τότε πότε να γίνονται παρεκβάσεις για να διατηρηθεί ο φυσικός χρόνος. 'Ο αναγνώστης' δηλαδή εντός του βιβλίου σταματάει, λ.χ. για φαγητό, για να καπνίσει ή να κοιμηθεί [...]. Η δράση, συνεπώς, μπορεί να επεκταθεί κατά βούληση και να διακλαδίζεται ακόμη και μέσα στο περιβάλλον των βιβλίων που διαβάζει. [...] Δεν αποκλείεται επίσης να παρεμβαίνει στην εξέλιξη των γεγονότων που διαδραματίζονται, να αλλοιώνει τα τοπία κ.λπ".

<sup>10</sup> "Σήμερα θα απαντούσαμε Ναι. Κατ'αρχάς ένα μεγάλο μέρος της κλασικής γραμματείας έχει μεταγραφεί σε ηλεκτρονική μορφή. Εν συνεχεία υπάρχουν προγράμματα που ψηφιοποιούν διά σαρώσεως οποιοδήποτε κείμενο και το καθιστούν επεξεργάσιμο. Με αυτές τις πρώτες ύλες και με δεδομένο ότι ο χρόνος *συμπιέζεται τεχνολογικά διαρκώς, όλα είναι ζητήμα χώρου –δηλαδή μνήμης*. Και είδαμε πως ό, τι απομνημονεύεται καταγράφεται· ό,τι καταγράφεται υπάρχει... κ.ο.κ".



However, Kalokyris seems to argue that it is not just the world as a “global village” that is compressed due to the advancement of science and technology but the *world as a library*. He sustains that in contemporary culture, time itself technologically is continuously compressed up to the point that it becomes *memory*. What does this mean? The writer is playing with the word “memory” and its use in computer science: time becomes the minute space which the computer memory occupies. That means, if our spatial and temporal worlds are what is “written”, according to Kalokyris’ previous assumption, then these worlds today are compressed in the infinitesimal space of the computer memory in which they are registered. Consequently, everything becomes not just a matter of memory but of virtual memory. In the story, “The Beginning of the Self-Destruction of Books” published in *The Discovery of Homeric* (1995),<sup>11</sup> he speaks of literature as a “diachronic cyberspace”, an “Intertextual Internet”: “however, we could speak, in a way, of a kind of a DNA of the written language which could form its own ‘cyberspace’ -a space famous since ancient times in literature- an ‘Intertextual Internet’” (68).<sup>12</sup> Later in the story, Kalokyris speaks of the Borgesian concept of the universe as a library seen through a postmodern spectrum:

Today, the ecumenical net [...] has been expanded in the indirectly perceptible cyberspace of ideas, in the *locus* of parallel worlds, in the crepuscular electronic sparkles which permeate in the depths of mind. Hence, the Argentine was right with respect to his concept of the library as a form of the universe. (75)<sup>13</sup>

The Argentine’s idealism and his reinterpretation of Aristotle’s *Poetics* give Kalokyris the means to construct a postmodern spec-

<sup>11</sup> “Η αρχή της αυτοκαταστροφής των βιβλίων” in *Η ανακάλυψη της Ομηρικής*.

<sup>12</sup> “Θα μπορούσαμε όμως να μιλήσουμε, τρόπον τινά, για ένα είδος DNA του γραπτού λόγου που δυνητικά σχηματίζει έναν δικό του ‘κυβερνοχώρο’ -τόπο πασιγνωστό από αρχαιοτάτων χρόνων στη λογοτεχνία- ένα ‘Διακειμενικό Internet’”.

<sup>13</sup> “Το οικουμενικό δίκτυο [...] έχει σήμερα εξαπλωθεί στον έμμεσα αισθητό κυβερνοχώρο των ιδεών, στον τόπο των παράλληλων κόσμων, στους αμυδρούς ηλεκτρικούς σπινθηρισμούς που διαχέονται στα έγκατα του νου. Άρα δικαιώνεται ο αργεντινός για τα περί βιβλιοθήκης ως μορφής σύμπαντος”.

trum through which the universe and the library are transformed into cyberspace and cyberlibrary respectively. This is the space of parallel and simultaneous worlds where the writer-cartographer simulates his textual maps.

Furthermore, virtual memory is actually an “emptying out” of real memory and history which Fredric Jameson and subsequently Beatriz Sarlo identify as a fundamental feature of postmodern culture. Specifically, in an article on contemporary video culture, Jameson argues that “memory seems to play no role in television, commercial or otherwise (or, I am tempted to say, in postmodernism generally): nothing here haunts the mind or leaves its afterimages” (70-1). Likewise, in her book *Escenas de la vida posmoderna*, Sarlo argues that “ese vaciamiento de historia” (55) is symptomatic of the postmodern condition. In fact, Kalokyris’ texts are highly engaged with this notion of “emptying out” of memory and history in postmodern culture. For example, in “Argumentum Sub Rosa id est Photography as a Literary Genre” published in *Photoromance* (1993),<sup>14</sup> he argues that the world (as memory) becomes virtual memory which, in turn, has no real substance. Specifically, in this story he relates the art of photography to literature mainly suggesting that they both aim at reconstructing memory:

Immaterial photographs [...] have already taken over. Projected transparencies are in competition with compact disks [...] and the digital images of computers. [...] *The memories of the future will be rationalistic, but of a dreaming texture. Without material substance but of high fidelity.* Fleeting and radiant. They can be selected and (remote) controlled. (107. My emphasis)<sup>15</sup>

The key term here is that of “remote control”, the act of *teleoperation*: that is, an operation which is acted from a certain distance (*tele-*). I would argue that memory and its fields of action such as

---

<sup>14</sup> “Argumentum sub rosa ήγουν η φωτογραφία ως λογοτεχνικό είδος” in *Φωτορομάντο*.

<sup>15</sup> “Ήδη κυριαρχούν [...] φωτογραφίες άυλες. Τις προβαλλόμενες διαφάνειες συναγωνίζονται οι συμπαιγείς βιντεοδίσκοι [...] και οι ψηφιακές εικόνες των υπολογιστών. [...] *Οι αναμνήσεις του μέλλοντος θα είναι ορθολογιστικές, αλλά ονειρικής υφής. Χωρίς υλική υπόσταση αλλά με υψηλή πιστότητα.* Φευγαλέες και λαμπρές. Κατ’ επιλογήν και (τηλε)χειριζόμενες”.

photography and literature are acts of *teleoperation* in the sense that they deal with issues which, in terms of time, are distant from the present time of the operation. Photography and literature reconstruct a time other than the present –past and/or future. However, in contemporary culture, technology creates a distance of a totally different kind: a *virtual distance*. That is, not only time but also space becomes *virtual*. I explain: the act of processing a photograph or a text in the computer is a teleoperation due to the distance between the keyboard and the screen. But this distance is a false one, it is a non-distant distance since both the photograph and the text actually have no real substance: they are virtual images. In addition, since, as I have argued above, literature and photography are acts of teleoperation, processing a photograph or a text or even looking at a photograph or reading and writing a text on the screen of the computer is actually a teleoperation of teleoperation –a second degree of teleoperation. In short, it is a teleoperation in the sphere of the virtual. Furthermore, Kalokyris argues that memories of the future, the virtual photographs, will be of a dreaming texture yet “rationalistic” due to the high “fidelity” offered by technology. And herein lies one of the greatest contradictions of our culture which produces untrue (virtual) documents of high fidelity.

Let us now return to the end of the story, “On the Total Book”:

I must warn you that this bbbook has already started being written day by day, it’s been some centuries now [...] and that it is being filled out everyday with linguistic signs in all sorts of tangible, digital or imaginary pages of the universe. I do not want to dissappoint you but, apparently, we are still in the Prologue. (14-5)<sup>16</sup>

The total book (the bbbook) is nothing but human civilisation in its entirety; it is the condensation of the countless books of the library of Babel; it is the summation of every document of civilisation, material or virtual, which has ever been or will be registered. In

---

<sup>16</sup> “Θα πρέπει να σας προειδοποιήσω ότι το βιβββλίο αυτό έχει αρχίσει ήδη να γράφεται μέρα με τη μέρα, εδώ και αρκετές εκατοντάδες χρόνια [...] και ότι συμπληρώνεται καθημερινά με σημεία του λόγου πάνω σε κάθε είδους αιπές, ψηφιακές ή ονειρικές σελίδες του σύμπαντος. Δεν θέλω να σας απογοητεύσω αλλά, κατά τα φαινόμενα, βρισκόμαστε ακόμα στον Πρόλογο”.

the light of the twenty-first century, the book bifurcates with great velocity fictionalising everything, from time and space to the universe itself. But the following question arises now: is this book a monstrous labyrinth or a promising project of our highly virtual culture? Probably both. But whatever it is, Kalokyris seems to suggest, it always moves within the territory of the infinite games of language, the land of Borgesian fictions, where the poet-maker-God composes the poetics of the Universe interminably.

*Eleni Kefala*  
*University of Cambridge*

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aristotelis De Arte Poetica Liber*, ed. Rudolfus Kassel. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Aristotle. *Poetics*, trans. Richard Janko. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1987.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. *Obras Completas*. 4 vols. Buenos Aires: Emecé, 1996.
- Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. London and New York: Verso, 1991.
- Kalokyris, Dimitris. *Ποικίλη ιστορία [Varia Historia]*. Athens: Ypsilon, 1991.
- Kalokyris, Dimitris. *Φωτορομάντσο [Photoromance]*. Athens: Ypsilon, 1993.
- Kalokyris, Dimitris. *Η ανακάλυψη της Ομηρικής και άλλες φαντασμαγορίες [The Discovery of Homerica and Other Phantasmagories]*. Athens: Ypsilon, 1995.
- Kalokyris, Dimitris. *Πλώρη στον Εωσφόρο [Prow Toward Lucifer]*. Athens: Nefeli, 2001.
- Sarlo, Beatriz. *Escenas de la vida posmoderna: Intelectuales, arte y videocultura en la Argentina*. Buenos Aires: Ariel, 1994.