UCLA
Mester

Title

Waiting for Father and Putting up with Mother: An Iconoclastic View of Carlos Fuentes' El tuerto es rey [The One-eyed Man is King]

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8h8830k2

Journal

Mester, 13(1)

Author

Durán, Gloria

Publication Date

1984

DOI

10.5070/M3131013695

Copyright Information

Copyright 1984 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at https://escholarship.org/terms

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Waiting for Father and Putting up with Mother: An Iconoclastic View of Carlos Fuentes' *El tuerto es rey* [*The One-eyed Man is King*]

Now that Fuentes' third play, *Orquídeas a la luz de la luna* [*Orchids in the Moonlight*] has established him as a dramatist who can withstand the test of production, it is important to re-examine the predecessor of this play, *El tuerto es rey* [*The One-eyed Man is King*], which is the one work of Fuentes most ignored by critics.[1] Although *El tuerto* was published by Barral in 1971 in the same volume as *Todos los gatos son pardos* [*All Cats Are Grey*], I consider that it is the former, and *virtually ignored*, play that is *Orquídeas'* true predecessor.[2] The similarities between *Orquídeas* and *El tuerto* are striking. Both are two act plays, essentially limited to two characters who are locked into a love-hate relationship within the confines of a private world and who are dominated by a third character who never appears.

In Fuentes' most recent play the third archetypal character is the quintessence of femininity, the movie star "Mommy."[3] In *El tuerto* the missing third character is *el Señor* [the Lord], who is believed by critics to dominate the play and to be identified with God. He is a God, the Father, who has abandoned his children. In the following pages I propose to re-examine this interpretation and to seek other, and perhaps more deeply buried, meanings in this highly metaphysical work. In this endeavor I shall be obliged to dissent not only with other critics (including Octavio Paz) but with the author himself.

In his introduction to the play, Fuentes, acting as his own critic, explains to the reader that this is a new version of Genesis, one in which God is finally shot in retaliation for his abandonment of his children, Duque and Donata. As if to give the author's voice even greater authority, Fuentes quotes from his friend and mentor, Octavio Paz, who sees *El tuerto* "como una nueva versión de la Caída" ["like a new version of the Fall"].[4] After such "official" interpretations, there is little wonder that few critics have found anything more to add to our understanding of the work. Even one who has devoted a complete article to it readily accepts Paz's and Fuentes' dictum. Louis Quackenbush also views the male figure as Adam and asserts that the work represents Fuentes' deistic philosophy of a god, who though powerful and intelligent, is totally disinterested in his creation.[5] If we assume that Fuentes' and Paz's remarks about the play are more valid than the work itself, such an interpretation is all that is required.

But let us return, for a moment, to Fuentes' quotation of Paz. After discussing the metamorphoses of Duque and Donata, Paz states: "El único

que no cambia es el Señor, o sea dios padre o autor del texto." ["The only one who does not change is the Lord, that is God the Father or author of the text."][6] Paz, therefore, introduces the notion that Fuentes is not author of his own text, an idea that Fuentes does not contradict. However, Fuentes seems to attribute authorship to a different character. The point is made by visual references to the play's setting which must first be described.

Fuentes speaks of a horizontal space representing earth which is full of faded furniture belonging to the period of Napoleon III. This earth is contained within a gigantic egg of light and dust. The earth space is in turn enclosed by a vertical space of air, which is said to include all times and all spaces. Fuentes then tells us:

> "El eterno tejido de Donata, la señora, es el punto de reunión de ambos espacios y de todos los instantes; la tejedora cuenta cuentos en voz alta: como Penélope, para salvarse de la desesperación; como Cherezade, para salvarse de la muerte." ["The eternal weaving of Donata, the lady, is the meeting point of both spaces and of all instants; the weaver tells tales aloud: like Penelope, to save herself from desperation; like Sheherazade, to save herself from death."] (p. 132)

These are the final, and presumably, the most important words of the introduction. They are followed by the dedication of the play to María Casares (who played the role of Donata in the one stage presentation of the play).[7]

Who then, is the "author" of the text? We cannot dismiss the question as ridiculous since Fuentes, novelist that he is, can be various narrators, each incorporating fundamentally different viewpoints. Since he has shown us that all times and spaces converge in Donata, who is weaving the tale, is the play not also a vehicle for her viewpoint? Furthermore, she is the only survivor of the play, the only one who could logically tell the story. Yet the tragic hero of the play is not Donata; it is Duque, or *el Señor*, as he reveals himself to us. Thus, there is also evidence that Paz is correct (or that the story may have two authors, Duque and Donata, with Fuentes serving as their common tool).

However, although Paz may be correct about authorship of the text, there is little internal evidence, as Merlin Foster also points out, to make the idea of the Fall convincing.[8] Donata and Duque, with their constant metamorphoses, are far from the simple, original children of Genesis. Nevertheless, I do not agree with Foster when he states that the juxtaposition of incongruous objects and time periods is "an only partially successful illustration of the devices and the studied pointlessness of absurdist theatre."[9] Although *El tuerto* has not enjoyed the success of *Orquídeas*, the "surrealism" of the play is neither absurd nor pointless. The broken glass that reunites, the appearance of wolves and the hissing of serpents are symbols of the world of the unconscious, the locale of the play, and are devices whose iconographic meaning has been studied by many literary

critics.[10] The reunited broken glass, for example, is obviously a sign that time is running backwards, a state of affairs that would be impossible in the proverbial Eden before time was born.

Yet Fuentes repeated allusions to the garden and even the volume's general title, *The Original Kingdoms*, suggest that the action takes place outside of time. This viewpoint is expressed by Fuentes through Duque who incarnates the male principle of consciousness and of light. It is this principle, according to Erich Neumann, "which desires permanence and not change, eternity and not transformation, law and not creative spontaneity . . ."[11] A dialogue that at first glance may look insignificant tells us which viewpoint eventually prevails in the play. It begins by Duque's remark that there is the same smell as always. Donata replies: "As always? That's said quickly. Since when always?" And Duque says, "Or always since when?" They continue:

> Donata: When always.
> Duque: Always does not allow for when.
> Donata: What?
> Duque: If there is a when there can be no always. We have to choose.
> Donata: Always and when.
> Duque: Since the husband of the *señora* went away, six days ago. (p. 142)

Donata, therefore, wins the argument. Duque is forced to deal with the temporal. Since the Lord's departure there is time, the "when" and the "since." But as Donata has also insisted, there is an "always" *and* a "when"; we are in the realm of eternal time, of the unconscious and the irrational.

The play, although it encompasses the eternal (the "siempre") which is graphically illustrated by the vertical airy space represented on the stage, also contains the immense egg of light and dust, of life and death, the horizontal space of time. This is the domain of Donata, the blind old woman who must complete her weaving before the *Señor's* return.

Apart from Penelope and Sheherazade, who is Donata? As Paz observes, "she is capable of many metamorphoses: she is Donata—woman of the world, Donata-Bovary, Donata-Electra, Donata-Eva, etc." (p. 130). To Quackenbush she incarnates the frustrated condition of servile woman. "She is subordinated to man and unhappy in her condition."[12] Yet, as he also admits, she is mistress and Duque is the servant. From Fuentes we learn that like Duque she is Latin American, typical in her oscillation between hope and nostalgia. (p. 132). In the course of the play he depicts her as sensual, temperamental, vain, seemingly defenseless and dependent upon Duque in her blindness but proud and vindictive when she realizes that Duque is also blind. Above all, Donata is ageless. She is in time but independent of time. She speaks of refrigerators, electric gadgets, Fiats, etc., yet she has memories of 19th-century Europe and of her triumphant arrival in Veracruz as the consort of Maximilian. Like the ghost of "Tlactocatzine, del Jardín de Flandes" ["Tlactocatzine, of the Garden of Flanders"], Donata is Carlota. Duque assures her that she is the Queen (p. 176).

She is the ancient, insane, possibly blind Carlota, locked up with a servant in a European castle, the Carlota who imagines that Maximilian is still alive and who expects his letters from moment to moment. She herself admits:

> Soy una pobre ilusa. Quise creer que él volvía a escribirme . . . cartas como las que me escribió desde el frente . . . [I am a poor madwoman. I wished to believe that he would again write me letters like the ones he wrote me from the front.] (p. 174)

The fascination with the idea of letters exchanged by ghosts (perhaps a reflection of Fuentes' pessimism about human solitude and the impossibility of real communication either in life or in death) is also expressed in Fuentes' letter to me of December 8, 1968. Speaking about his impressions of Carlota when he was six years old and saw in rapid succession a painting of the young Carlota and a photograph of the same woman "now old, dead, resting within her cushioned tomb and wearing the nightcap of a little girl: the Carlota who died, insane, in a castle the same year I was born," Fuentes adds: "Perhaps Carlota never found out that she grew old. Until the end she was writing love letters to Maximilian. A correspondence between ghosts. It is all a part of our history and of our life: the history of everything that cannot die because it has never lived."[13]

And yet Donata is Carlota only in time. Among her many metamorphoses we must include that of Marina, La Malinche, the mistress to Cortés. When the *Señor* returns, he also calls her by the earlier name. As in most of his fiction, *Aura*, *Zona sagrada* [*Holy Place*], *Cumpleaños* [*Birthday*], *Cambio de piel* [*Change of Skin*] etc., Fuentes is obviously depicting an archetypal woman, a fusion of opposites who culminates in the androgynous Celestina of *Terra Nostra*. Since Donata, like Celestina, is also a weaver, we see that she encompasses far more than the historical Carlota, that she is also a goddess of destiny, weaving life as she weaves fate.

The cosmic egg which Fuentes first describes as the central point of his stage setting is a direct reference to the importance of Donata. The feminine, as Neumann points out, is characterized as a totality, as containing vessel and cosmic egg. Seen as "The Great Mother, adorned with the moon and the starry cloak of night, [she] is the goddess of destiny . . ."[14] Surely Donata's moon-like pallor, her blindness (the dark world of night) and her weaving lift her out of time and into the eternal world of archetypal figures. And yet, as Neumann also states: "Since she governs growth, the Great Mother is goddess of time. That is why she is a moon goddess, for moon and night sky are the visible manifestations of the temporal process in the cosmos . . . so it is she who determines time—to a far greater extent than the male, with his tendency toward the conquest of time, toward timelessness and eternity."[15] If Paz and Quackenbush, as well as Fuentes himself, have based their interpretations of Fuentes' play upon the figure of the absent god, el *Señor*, this choice may well be explained

as part of the male tendency to focus on eternity and to overcome or conquer time which is the fabric woven by the female archetype and dyed with the blood of birth and death.

Let us see how closely Donata fits the Great Mother archetype with respect to the first of these female functions, birth. Although she is not presented as a "mother," she seems obsessed with sexuality and overtly jealous of Duque's relationship with Marina. She also attempts to inspire jealousy in Duque by flaunting memories of her intimate life with *el Señor*. As a weaver, she is also seen crossing threads, which is symbolic of the crossing of animals and plants and the weaving of life, the sexual union. The product of her weaving is birth, the tissues of the human body. However, in the limited time frame of the play, the eve of the *Señor's* return, we see Donata mainly as the siren tempting Duque to incest, not as the maternal figure.

Within the life cycle, however, Donata shows that she exercises great control over man's destiny, that she spins or weaves fate as well as life. Duque says that he has been marking days on a calendar since the departure of the Lord. And Donata replies, "Like a prisoner, no?" (p. 143). Just as the ghost of Tlactocatzine . . . (Carlota again) and the ancient Consuelo (*Aura*) captures a male protagonist within the locked doors of a dark mansion, Donata, the weaver who ties knots, must also tie her servant inside, not allowing him to escape to the outside world.

As for Donata's association with death, we need only examine the second act of the play where she relishes her imaginary account of Duque's death in a traffic accident. And Fuentes is even more specific about Donata's identity in the surrealistic scene that Merlin Foster has criticized as being nearly impossible to stage. In this scene she is presented with hands like claws of a bird as she raises the dust of a male corpse to her mouth while Duque's scream is drowned by the beating of a heart (p. 192). Surely here the reference to the goddess is specifically to Coatlicue, the Eater of Filth, the terrible earth goddess, depicted in Aztec statues with claw-like hands and wearing a necklace of human hands and hearts. Duque's cries reveal that he is aware of the spectacle (in spite of his blindness)—as does the instinctive act of raising his own hands to his eyes. Duque's awareness, which is immediate, visceral, and not imparted through narration, can only be explained by assuming that Duque *is* the corpse being devoured by Donata, a Donata who is now no longer Carlota or even Marina but the primitive archetypal figure embedded in Mexican mythology.

By the conclusion of the play, therefore, it becomes fairly obvious that the locale of *El tuerto es rey* is not Eden or Paris (which for many Latin Americans is a kind of earthly paradise) but the historical and mythological setting of Mexico. There are too many references to Carlota, Marina, and Cortés (who places an advertisement in the newspaper asking for a native, female translator) to doubt that Fuentes is once again preoccupied with Mexican history. And speaking on the level of history,

who is Duque, with his false blond beard and dark hair, but a composite figure of Cortés and Maximilian? As the Hapsburg archduke, he is confined in a dank crypt, but now not by Juárez but by a domineering Carlota. (Here, as in the later *Terra Nostra*, Fuentes attempts to depict a truer, deeper, and consequently mythical version of history.) And as the sixteenth-century conquistador, Duque deceives his wife with Marina, whose name is the only one he uses in the play's concluding scene.

Carlota-Maximilian, Marina-Cortés, these two interchangeable couples form the historical foundation of the play, the horizontal section within the egg of life which represents man in time and is controlled by woman. The drawback of focusing on the obvious theme of the *absent* father is that this focus obscures the more pervasive theme of the *present* mother figure, who is the driving force behind time and history.

In emphasizing the mother figure rather than the father, I do not wish to deny the importance of the latter, but merely to present a more balanced interpretation of the work. Furthermore, by analyzing the female figure we are given a clue to the identity of *el Señor*. Surely he is not Yahweh, God the Father, but rather the expression of this archetype within the Mexican culture. Just as Coatlicue, the Terrible Mother, hovers behind Carlota and Marina, so Quetzalcoatl is the undeniable presence behind Cortés and Maximilian. History and mythology fuse in Fuentes' vision of the Mexican past. He has stated that "the history of indigenous Mexico is the history of absence and waiting . . . Hernán Cortés, by disembarking in Mexico on the day foretold for the return of Quetzalcoatl, fulfilled the promise [of returning] by destroying it."[16]

In her *Carlos Fuentes*, Wendy Faris has already mentioned the theme which we might call "waiting for Quetzalcoatl" that is found in *Terra Nostra* and *All Cats Are Grey*. She remarks that "[In this sense Quetzalcoatl resembles the absent master in *The One-Eyed Man is King*."][17] I would carry Faris' observation one step farther and say that Duque *is* Quetzalcoatl in that he is also *el Señor*. Of course, Fuentes in his love for ambiguity provides a certain amount of dialogue suggesting that Duque is also Jesus,[18] particularly the Jesus depicted by Dostoyevsky in the Grand Inquisitor scene of *The Brothers Karamazov*. But the references to Quetzalcoatl are far more numerous. For example, Duque receives letters begging him to return and says, "Si regresara, dejarían de necesitarme." ["If I were to return, they would stop needing me."] To which Donata replies:

> "Recordamos sólo el bien que hiciste. Cada planta que crece, cada mosaico que se fabrica, cada manta que se teje y cada jade que se pule son un recuerdo agradecido. Son mensajes de la tierra." ["We remember only the good that you did. Every plant that grows, every mosaic that is made, every blanket that is woven, every jade that is polished are a grateful memory. They are messages from the earth."] (p. 178)

But the episode that provides the conclusive key to Duque's identity is his recurrent dream of the sculptor who refuses to sell his statues and is

forced by his creditors to look at himself in a mirror. Up to this point the sculptor had seen no difference between himself and his creations. But once he realizes that he is of flesh and blood and they are not, he destroys them and goes away, never to return (p. 137). In both the Quetzalcoatl legend, as retold by Fuentes in *Todos los gatos son pardos*,[19] and *El tuerto es rey*, there are forces of evil (the god of death and night in the first case; the creditors in the second) who confront the creator with his own image, show him how different he is from his creations, destroy his sense of solidarity with them, force him into an awareness of his own solitude, and finally cause him to flee from the world of men. And Duque, whose dreams are prophetic, must reenact every detail of the Quetzalcoatl legend, including the drink-induced fornication with his sister, Donata.[20] By the second act the dream is no longer a third-person dream but a first-person reality. Duque repeats: "Yo era un hombre y ellos eran estatuas. Yo los amaba con la vida. Ellos sólo podían amarme con la muerte. No pude hacer estatuas idénticas a mí . . . ["I was a man and they were statues. I loved them with life. They only could love me with death. I couldn't make statues identical to myself . . ."] And as Quetzalcoatl he addresses the audience swearing that "I drink, fornicate, rob, murder, and humiliate myself in order to eliminate the difference" (p. 179).

Thus it is the archetypal character of the protagonists rather than "the studied pointlessness of absurdist theatre" that explains the presence of wolves, serpents, and empty mirrors where the blind can read the future. Since Duque is also "The Plumed Serpent," it is natural that Donata should hear and smell the presence of a snake. Furthermore, Jung tells us that the role played by the serpent in mythology is analogous to the end of the world and that it is interchangeable with the figure of the wolf, since both are typical destroyers.[21] Duque is both of these creatures in order to eliminate the difference between himself and man. As for the agate mirror, this, too, is part of the Quetzalcoatl mythologem and reinforces the ontological framework of the play. Duque, for example, tortures Donata at one point by asserting that the mirror is more real than she is since it can see her, but she cannot see it:

> La señora, sin el espejo, es inútil, carece de la identidad que le presta un objeto vivo . . . el espejo ha dejado de ser el anuncio de la señora. La señora se ha convertido en el presagio del espejo. [The lady, without the mirror, is useless, lacks the identity that is lent her by a living object . . . the mirror has ceased to be the announcement of the lady. The lady has become the omen of the mirror.] (p. 168)

Seen from the perspective of Mexican myth, *El tuerto es rey* ceases to be an absurdist tale of the love-hate relationship between a blind woman and her servant and in fact becomes a cosmological struggle waged by two of the principal deities in the Aztec pantheon. Quetzalcoatl, like Prome-

theus, is the father and creator of men, who are like statues in their ingratitude for the gifts of civilization which he gave them.[22] Also like Prometheus, Quetzalcoatl is punished for his generosity by the other gods. However, in Fuentes' Mexican version of the myth, it is not Zeus but Coatlicue, the mother figure, who is both antagonist and lover to Quetzalcoatl. As Earth Mother, she begs him to return. This is the birth aspect of the archetype. And as the Terrible Mother of death, surrounded by serpents, human hearts and hands, she devours the hero.

Undone by the smoking mirror of her death partner, Texcatlipoca, Duque, or Quetzalcoatl, tries to use the weapon against her, to convince her that her sightlessness robs her of reality. Always the defender of soul against matter, of the eternal against the temporal, Duque also seeks to deny Donata her very words and thoughts, claiming that they were preexistant to her and have merely used her as a vehicle (p. 190). But Donata, as usual, has the last word when she proclaims that the corpse will remain, and not Duque (p. 192). Duque's death by firing squad at the end of the play is a foregone conclusion, dictated by the historical death of Maximilian and the gleeful prediction of his death by the angered goddess. The present-day guerillas who shoot him, while in the background Gardel sings the tango, "Adiós Muchachos," duplicate the ending of *Todos los gatos son pardos* in which a university student is shot. But dramas make the point that Mexican history repeats itself, that sacrificial death is still very much in vogue.

The only survivor of the drama is life itself, Donata, the earth goddess who forces Duque to again look into the mirror and desire the body of his sister (herself). "With her hands she passes over the entire body of the man, she caresses him as if she were modeling him" (p. 181). We are explicitly told that someone who resembles Quetzalcoatl, a Cortés, a Maximilian, etc., will be born again and "will suffer in my name the insults, the abuses, the death that they will give me if I return . . . one and another and another will return to die in my name until the need for blood is exhausted and they are equal to me as I try to be equal to them" (p. 179).

Duque-Quetzalcoatl, as these words reveal, is a rejected god, unable to lift men up to his perfection. He, therefore, descends to their level in order to become one with his creatures. How can we reconcile this portrait with Fuentes' introduction in which he states: "La culpa máxima del señor es que no ha sido solidario con sus criaturas?" ["The great guilt of the lord is that he has not been as one with his creatures".] (pp. 130, 131).

There *is* an explanation for the discrepancy between Fuentes' condemnation of *el Señor* (echoed by Paz and Quackenbush), which is presented as the thesis of the play, and the subsequent dramatization of the same character. It lies *in the author's tendency to become overwhelmed by archetypes of the collective unconscious.* The introduction represents Fuentes' conscious purpose in writing the play and his understanding of his accomplishment. But in the creative process, the conscious goal is

subverted. The play reveals not a powerful, supercilious God but a deceived and half-blind deity who, furthermore, has no monopoly on the process of creation. Donata and Duque together create our lives and reflect their mutual power struggle through us. The view is polytheistic, not monotheistic. We desire Father because he is not here. When he appears, we kill him. But there is no alternative to putting up with Mother. In none of Fuentes' works does he destroy the female archetype of life.

Fuentes' unconscious dominates the drama just as his consciousness dominates the introduction. Fuentes is author of his own introduction. But the author of the play is the anima, Donata. The emanuensis of the play is Fuentes.

Gloria Durán
University of Connecticut
Waterbury

NOTES

1. *Orchids in the Moonlight*, written directly in English by Fuentes, enjoyed a six weeks presentation by the American Repertory Theatre in Cambridge, Mass. ('82) and, according to Fuentes, is to be produced again in Madrid.

2. The volume containing both plays is entitled *Los reinos originarios [The Original Kingdoms]* (Barcelona: Barral, 1971). All page references are to this edition.

3. For an analysis of *Orquídeas . . . [Orchids in the Moonlight]* see my article, "*Orchids in the Moonlight*, Fuentes as Feminist and Jungian Playwright," in *World Literature Today*, LVII, 4 (Fall, 1983).

4. Fuentes, *El tuerto es rey [The Half-Blind Is King]*, p. 130.

5. Louis H. Quackenbush, "La desavenencia religiosa: Una clave a *El tuerto es Rey*," ["A Religious Misunderstanding: A Clue to *The Half-Blind Is King*"], *Explicación de Textos Literarios*, 4 (1975–76), p. 85.

6. *El tuerto es rey*, p. 130.

7. According to Merlin H. Forster's "Carlos Fuentes as Dramatist," *Carlos Fuentes, a Critical View*, ed. Robert Brody and Charles Rossman (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1982), p. 184, *El tuerto . . .* "has been presented on stage at least once. The premier performance was in Vienna on May 25, 1970, in French and with the title *Le Bourne est roi*."

8. Forster, p. 191.

9. Forster, loc. cit.

10. For example, the symbolism of the mirror as it appears in Hermann Hesse's work has been studied by Bettina Knapp in *The Prometheus Syndrome* (Troy, N.Y.: Whitston Publishing Co., 1979), pp. 229–230. The same author pursues the mirror symbolism in her study of Baudelaire in *Dream and Image* (Whitston, 1977), p. 242 and of Mallarmé, pp. 365–367. The wolf symbol is dealt with by Knapp in her chapter on Hesse's *Steppenwolf, The Prometheus Syndrome*, pp. 207–239. Max Luthi, in *Once upon a Time: On the Nature of Fairy Tales* (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1976) deals with one aspect of the serpent symbol, pp. 67–70. Erich Neumann in *The Great Mother* (Princeton University Press, 1970) deals with the serpent and related symbols throughout his text.

11. Erich Neumann, *The Great Mother*, p. 233.

12. Quackenbush, p. 84.

13. Gloria Durán, *The Archetypes of Carlos Fuentes* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon Books, 1980), p. 204. (I include this letter in the Appendix to my study of Fuentes.)

14. Neumann, p. 226.

15. Neumann pp. 226–227.

16. Carlos Fuentes, *El mundo de José Luis Cuevas*, bilingual edition, trans. Consuelo de Aerenlund (Mexico City: Galería de Arte Misrachi, 1969), pp. 7–8.

17. Wendy B. Faris, *Carlos Fuentes* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1983), p. 87.

18. On p. 179, for example, he says "¡Arrojen la primera piedra!" ["Let them throw the first stone!"]

19. Here reference is made to the edition of this work published by Siglo XXI (Mexico, 1970), pp. 28–34 in which the figure of Quetzalcoatl is more fully portrayed than in the edition included within *Los reinos originarios*.

20. *El tuerto es rey* (*Los reinos Originarios*, Barral edition), p. 161. Speaking of his dreams, Duque says "siempre se han cumplido" ["they have always come true"].

21. Carl G. Jung, *Symbols of Transformation* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1967), p. 438.

22. The dream of creating statues and subsequently destroying them because of their unlikeness to their creator seems to be taken rather from the *Popol Vuh*, the Mayan *Genesis*, rather than the Quetzalcoatl legend. The clay and then the wooden dolls who precede real human beings were destroyed by "Heart of the sky" because they did not have hearts nor feelings. See *El Popol Vuh*, ed., Ermilio Abreu Gómez (México: Biblioteca Enciclopédica Popular, Secretaría de Educatión Pública, 144), p. 14.