



Theses and Dissertations

2019-04-01

The Second Coming of Don Quixote: Painting and the Quixote as Eucharistic Art

Scott Hawkley Raines
Brigham Young University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Spanish and Portuguese Language and Literature Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Raines, Scott Hawkley, "The Second Coming of Don Quixote: Painting and the Quixote as Eucharistic Art" (2019). *Theses and Dissertations*. 8268.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/8268>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

The Second Coming of Don Quixote: Painting and the *Quixote* as Eucharistic Art

Scott Hawkley Raines

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

John R. Rosenberg, Chair
Valerie Hegstrom
Dale J. Pratt
Anna-Lisa Halling

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

Brigham Young University

Copyright © 2019 Scott Hawkley Raines

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

The Second Coming of Don Quixote: Painting and the *Quixote* as Eucharistic Art

Scott Hawkley Raines
Department of Spanish and Portuguese, BYU
Master of Arts

This thesis examines a new reading of Cervantes's immortal *Don Quixote*: reading the *Quixote* as eucharistic art. Just as the Catholic Eucharist, when consumed by the believer, is transubstantiated into the literal flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, so too is this proposed reading of the *Quixote*. Using Michel Foucault's work in *The Order of Things*, the author employs Foucault's statement—that Don Quixote is “the book in flesh and blood” (48)—to explore a eucharistic reading of the novel as the reader's internalization of Don Quixote's being. The end of the novel is read not as Don Quixote's return to sanity, but rather a sacrifice of the self, sealing the text to his being. The “disciple reader” then, through eucharistic reading, metaphysically internalizes the text that is Don Quixote transubstantiated, acquiring his madness in the process: a new Don Quixote. The author lays out a theory for eucharistic reading, noting the *Quixote*'s singular place in world literature as a prime novel fit for this type of mystical reading. The thesis then examines and analyzes the theory and its effects on intratextual metafictional readers of the novel. As a kind of measuring tool, the author looks at painted representations of Don Quixote within the novel as eucharistic self-portraits of the metafictional disciple reader's “quixotic” self. The thesis closes with a proposal for future studies regarding artistic representations outside of the text as products of eucharistic reading worthy and in need of future analysis.

Keywords: Don Quixote, Eucharist, painting, reading

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my wife. If I could I would thank her both first and last since she has been the driving motivator to help me continue working on this project and has exhibited sublime patience during many late nights and early mornings of writing and reading. I would like to then thank my thesis committee in chronological order of their influence in my graduate studies here at BYU. First to Dr. Rosenberg, who taught a life-changing and inspiring course on painting and literature that opened my eyes to a world I had never experienced, completely changing my career goals. I also would like to express unfeigned appreciation for his patient and thorough edits of each of the many drafts of this paper—it would not be what it is without his benevolent mentorship. To Dr. Pratt, who inspired the title and taught me how to read the *Quixote*: a book much more worthy of enjoyment by a *desocupado lector* than serious study. To Dr. Hegstrom, who in many ways has taken me under her wing and exhibited greater faith in me than perhaps she ought to have. To Dr. Halling, for her patience with my feeble Portuguese and her constant kind mentorship in everything Early Modern. To my committee both collectively and individually, I give a most sincere *gracias*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE i
ABSTRACT ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS iv
FULL LENGTH ESSAY 1
 Introduction 1
 Eucharistic Reading: Developing a Theory 3
 Painting in the Quixote as Manifestation of Eucharistic Reading 10
 Conclusion 25
 Works Cited 28
CONFERENCE LENGTH VERSION OF ESSAY 31
 Eucharistic Reading and Quixotic Resurrection: A New Approach to the Quixote 31
SAMPLE SUBMISSION LETTER 40

FULL LENGTH ESSAY

“Vês este livro? É Dom Quixote. Se eu destruir o meu exemplar, não elimino a obra que continua eterna nos exemplares subsistentes e nas edições posteriores. Eterna e bela, belamente eterna, como este mundo divino e supradivino.”

Quincas Borba, capítulo VI

Introduction

In an episode of the 1615 *Quixote* (chapter LXII), Sancho and Don Quixote eat with Don Antonio Moreno, a reader of both the 1605 *Quixote* and Avellaneda's apocryphal 1614 *Quixote*. While in the company of his friends, Don Antonio asks Sancho about his gluttony displayed in chapter XII of the false sequel. Sancho responds, correcting the assertions of Avellaneda: “No señor, no es así... porque tengo más de limpio que de goloso.” Don Quixote, as the true knight that he is, backs up his squire's claim by stating: “Por cierto... que la parsimonia y limpieza con que Sancho come se puede escribir y grabar en láminas de bronce, para que quede en memoria eterna en los siglos venideros” (DQ, II.LXII; 843). While this comedic passage could be viewed as simply another moment of fraternal bonding between the two protagonists, a religious reading may reveal the scene to be a Cervantine simulacrum of Christ's Last Supper. If the buccal habits of Sancho really were worthy of “*memoria eterna*,” then there might be an element of piety beyond Don Quixote's simple affirmation. Being faithful Catholics in seventeenth century Spain, the most sacred oral rite for Don Quixote and Sancho would have been the Holy communion: the Eucharist. H. E. Baber, in an attempt to prove the literal nature of the doctrine of transubstantiation, analyzes the Eucharist by employing a different word to explain the metamorphosis of the body and blood of Christ: transignification, in that the consecrated

elements act as signifiers that call the physical presence of Christ (341). The physical intake of the signifier into the body, in this case the sacramental wafer, causes the believer to literally incorporate part of the sign (Christ) into their body. Inasmuch as the internalization of the host, a sign of spiritual and physical sustenance, invokes the infinite within the mortal frame, reading the *Quixote*, an orthographic sign of a *quasi*-infinite signified (Don Quixote), can be observed in the same way.

Richard Kearney's work allows this meta-reading of the *Quixote* with his proposal of the contemporary anatheistic paradox which presents religion as art and art as religion. Kearney employs what he calls "eucharistic imagination" to explore the interconnectedness of the Eucharist and art, developing a theory regarding the signifying elements of the Eucharist beyond the host, extending eucharistic semiotics to "acts of quotidian experience where the infinite traverses the infinitesimal" (12). Kearney embeds his argument in the work of his mentor, Paul Ricoeur, who also theorized on a eucharist-like nature existing between reader and author:

Ricoeur goes so far as to construe the double surrender of (1) the author to the implied author (or narrator) and (2) the implied author to the reader, as an act of kenotic service to the other that ultimately amounts to a transubstantiation of author to reader: "Whereas the real author effaces himself in the implied author, the implied reader takes on substance in the real reader." In short, the author agrees to die so that the reader may be born. (12)

If, as Ricoeur purports, the *Quixote* can read as the death of Cervantes facilitating the birth of the reader, then a reading of the novel, as though it were eucharistic, is also possible. This eucharistic reading of the *Quixote* is the focus of this article, in that Don Quixote (rather than Cervantes), who died as a "consecrated" sacrifice within the text, is eucharistically reborn in each disciple reader. Kearney's work facilitates a reading of the *Quixote* as though it were

eucharistic art: art which transforms the subjectivity of the reader who believes “con la fe que crea lo que no [ve], creyendo firmemente que Don Quijote existe y vive y obra” (Unamuno 83). This analysis attempts to examine the *Quixote* as eucharistic art in which the disciple¹ reader (s/he who acquires the nature and being of Don Quixote to such an extent that s/he represents this metamorphosis in some artistic form) consumes (takes in) part of Don Quixote’s being through the text: reading the *Quixote* as a *humanistic* and mystical rite rather than a *divine* and mystical one. The reader then literally becomes quixotic, a term I engage with not in the traditional sense of extreme idealism, but rather in the sense that the reader *becomes* (a) Don Quixote. Because of Don Quixote’s ultimate end as Alonso el Bueno, the essence or spirit of Don Quixote as character remains embedded in the text allowing the reader to internalize and personally acquire Don Quixote’s being through eucharistic reading. This article limits its scope to painted² expressions of the quixotic self as manifestations of eucharistic readings from intratextual “disciple readers” like Sansón Carrasco. However, much could be said, and perhaps needs to be said, regarding music, writing and other artistic media as manifestations of eucharistic readings not only intratextually but also extratextually.

Eucharistic Reading: Developing a Theory

Anne J. Cruz in her work on Luísa de Carvajal’s eucharistic poetry, reminiscent of Baber and his theory on transignification, explores “the poetics of transubstantiation,” noting that

¹ I choose the word “disciple” to express the idea of a “faithful” reader, one who believes—as per Unamuno’s distinction—that Don Quixote “existe y vive y obra” (83). This reader is a true disciple of Don Quixote and thus comes to the literary alter ready to be transformed through eucharistic reading.

² Barbara E. Kurtz’s work enhances this reading of the *Quijote* and painting as she analyzes the play between allegory and the Eucharist in Calderón’s *Autos Sacramentales*: “After all, philosophical speculation regarding substance and accidents, and the Eucharist, shares with contemporaneous art theory (and Calderón’s allegorical theory) a concern with the limitations of material reality and how those limitations are overcome (in the Eucharist, through perspective, by means of allegory). Furthermore, art and allegory are in this light intrinsically philosophical, theological” (55).

Carvajal's poems, like the Eucharist, "not only reappropriate the figure of Christ through his voice, but also intend to make present his corporeality" (258-59) through transignification in text. Carvajal appropriates and transforms the signifier for the body of Christ, typically consumed through transubstantiated bread, into transignified language, causing 'faithful' participants to appropriate part of Christ within their own being through reading. Adam Glover similarly elaborates on the idea of the Eucharist as the ultimate signifier, claiming that through transubstantiation, as well as transignification, the Eucharist breaks down the barrier between the signifier and the signified. He states that "the Eucharist thus appears as something like the upper limit of signification, the boundary towards which language, insofar as it attempts to be meaningful, always tends. Indeed, one might even say that to the extent that language attempts to signify at all it attempts to implicitly become eucharistic" (121). The very verbiage of the Bible further reinforces these ideas of the Eucharist in connection with literary text: for indeed, "in the beginning was the *Word*, and the *Word* was with God, and the *Word* was God" (John 1:1, emphasis mine)³.

The "poetics of transubstantiation" then become particularly intriguing in relation to reading the *Quixote*. While the incorporation of the Eucharist, a signifier for Christ's body,

³ *Oxford Companion to the Bible* regarding "the Word" and λόγος states: "Grk. "word." In the prologue of the gospel according to JOHN, the *logos* is the divine word, a self-communicating divine presence that existed with God and was uniquely manifested in Jesus Christ. The Johannine *logos* is strongly parallel to the concept of WISDOM in Hellenistic Jewish thought, where already wisdom and word were associated (Wisd. of Sol. 9.1-2). Wisdom or Word was God's creative presence through which the world came into being. John's gospel affirms that this same divine presence was fully and (in contrast to the usual thinking about wisdom) uniquely present in Jesus Christ. It was a redemptive presence that was necessary because the world had rejected the original creative presence. The word was not in Jesus simply as verbal communication, but entered fully into human life. The INCARNATION of the word brought life to human beings, to whom it was otherwise unavailable (John 1.1-18)... In Greek, *logos* meant both spoken word and pervading principle. STOIC philosophy, using the latter meaning, saw the *logos* as the ordering principle of the universe; the wise person aims to live in harmony with it. This meaning, though not a direct background for John's *logos*, was quickly drawn into the interpretation of John as "*logos* theology" developed in the second century CE. This was a principal means of making Christian thought intelligible to its environment; but this later *logos* theology was more rationalistic than was the gospel of John" (Beardslee).

causes the believer to become⁴ (like) Christ incrementally by consuming His divine flesh, the eucharistic internalization of the *Quixote* causes the reader to *become* (a) Don Quixote by means of reading—the reader eliminating parts of the self to incorporate the madness of Don Quixote, similar to what we see happening with Don Antonio and others in the 1615 sequel. However, as such, this reading of the text runs counter to much of twentieth century literary theory. Raman Selden explains that while “structuralism was heroic in its desire to master the world of man-made signs, poststructuralism is comic and anti-heroic in its refusal to take such claims seriously... Poststructuralist thought has discovered the essentially *unstable* nature of signification” (1989). A 21st-century reading of a text in which the signified is metaphysically present in its signifier clearly disregards that previously delineated “*unstable* nature of signification.” Yet, while the conceptual gap between the signifier and signified began to expand in the 20th century given the work of Saussure, Derrida, Kristeva, Lacan, Barthes, and others, Michel Foucault notes that “up to the end of the sixteenth century... it was resemblance that largely guided exegesis and the interpretation of texts” (17). As a product of that time, the *Quixote* elaborates and challenges the socio-cultural context that bound the resemblance of signs with their referents, an essential and explored theme in the novel. While Don Quixote is perhaps the ultimate believer in the intimate unity between signifier and signified, the novel as text seems to want a poststructuralist reading to expose the ‘self-evident’ gap and disclose the “*unstable* nature of signification,” making it a novel well ahead of its time. Nonetheless, because of Don Quixote’s persistent and faithful belief in resemblance which leads him to act—i.e. realize his own faith in the chivalric novel—his efforts to see the world through his novels produce what

⁴ The Catholic Cardinal Christoph Schönborn stated the following: “In Christ, our human existence is to be made divine, while it does not cease to be ‘human flesh and blood.’ The icon, depicting Christ in his human likeness, serves as a final assurance, a kind of imprinted seal, of this belief” (Sokolowski 74).

Alexandre Kojève would refer to simply as ‘work.’ Don Quixote, “in his work... trans-forms things and trans-forms himself at the same time, he forms things and the World by transforming himself” (116). As such, his ultimate transformation through his ‘work’ is to become both signified and signifier, a text and a being, only accessible through reading.⁵ In a saussurean interplay of signified and signifier, the referent becomes the reader, who like Alonso Quijano, becomes (a) Don Quixote through reading—the *renacimiento* of Don Quixote, his second coming, if you will. Thus, Don Quixote’s life work, as per the records of Cide Hamete Benengeli, defies postmodern instability of signification and seals the signs to his being as he sacrifices himself as Don Quixote, becoming Alonso Quijano for future readers to give life to a new quixotic self. A eucharistic reading is then valid in the context of poststructuralism only because of the nature of Don Quixote’s work (his faithful realization of the chivalric novel and creation of Don Quixote). Through his work, Don Quixote transforms himself beyond phenomenological text into noumenological being within the text for the reader to consume—which consumption and ensuing transformation is then manifest through characters like Don Antonio Moreno.

Beyond the intratextual examples of eucharistic reading that this article intends to explore, evidence also exists of the *Quixote* as eucharistic art in the realms of the ‘real.’ In an interview with Debra A. Castillo in 1988, Carlos Fuentes stated: “in a way *I am* Don Quixote, and every writer in the Spanish language is Don Quixote, in the sense that we too come from an orthodox and unitary and dogmatic language which is out of the Spanish counter-reformation”

⁵ Kearney’s article quotes Merleau-Ponty in his *Phenomenology of Perception* (1945): “Just as the sacrament not only symbolizes, in sensible species, an operation of Grace, but *is* also the real presence of God, which it causes to occupy a fragment of space and communicates to those who eat of the consecrated bread, provided that they are inwardly prepared, in the same way the sensible has not only a motor and vital significance, but is nothing other than a certain way of being in the world suggested to us from some point in space, and sized and acted upon by our body, provided that it is capable of doing so, so that sensation is literally a form of communion... I am brought into relation with an external being, whether it be in order to open myself to it or to shut myself off from it” (14).

(Castillo, emphasis mine). The idea Fuentes portrays engages with Michel Foucault's claims on Don Quixote's being: "his whole being is nothing but language, text, printed pages, stories that have already been written down" (46). Carlos Fuentes insightfully notes that, like Don Quixote, every Spanish language writer comes out of the same language as Don Quixote, and thus is a product, like Don Quixote, of that language; but such a claim raises the question: why is every Spanish writer Don Quixote as opposed to Lazarillo, *La Celestina*, or even the Virgin Mary? The answer is simple—because of Don Quixote's final self-sacrifice the *Quixote* becomes eucharistic art, leaving *Lazarillo de Tormes*, *La Celestina*, *Milagros de Nuestra Señora* wanting. While it remains true that Spanish speakers (in Fuentes's case Spanish writers) and Don Quixote share the same linguistic genetics, as do Lazarillo, *La Celestina* etc., Fuentes displays the full metaphysical impact of the *Quixote* on himself personally by claiming both he and all other Spanish writers *are* Don Quixote, having experienced the quixotic metamorphosis of the *Quixote*; he said it himself, he *is* Don Quixote, having become (a) Don Quixote not simply through shared linguistic culture, but also through eucharistic reading.

Michel Foucault's work further reinforces the possibility of reading the *Quixote* as eucharistic art: first, claiming that Don Quixote (character) is not only "nothing but language" but is also the *Quixote* (novel), or "the book in flesh and blood" (48), and second, that the *Quixote* is "the boundary... the end of the old interplay between resemblance and signs" (46). With the notion of Don Quixote (the character) as the book in "flesh and blood," the metaphysical reading of the book then, like the Eucharist, leads to the incarnation and the physical internalization of the flesh and blood of Don Quixote within the reader; the flesh being both text and the flesh of Don Quixote himself. The book then reaches those "upper limit[s] of signification" completely breaking down the poststructuralist barrier between signifier and

signified: Don Quixote being “a sign wandering through a world that [does] not recognize him” (Foucault 48), available through the internalization (eucharistic reading) of the page because of his determination to live out medieval resemblance of signs. Foucault’s second insight allows one to again look at the singularity of the *Quixote*’s eucharistic nature. While the *Quixote* is considered by many to be “the first modern novel,” and by Fuentes to be “perhaps the most eternal novel ever written” (1986), Foucault observes that the *Quixote* is the marker, the boundary, “the end of the old interplay between resemblance and signs.” Foucault’s delimitation of the *Quixote* as “the end” of “resemblance and signs” is, in reality, a remark on the *Quixote*’s liminality, which is hard to demarcate. While Don Quixote is the medieval apotheosis of resemblance, the *Quixote* itself is the nascency of modern difference. The novel becomes what Mircea Eliade explains as “the threshold... the limit, the boundary, the frontier that distinguishes and opposes two worlds—and at the same time the paradoxical place where those worlds communicate, where passage from the profane to the sacred world becomes possible” (25). Foucault and Eliade both provide a second uniquely eucharistic take to the *Quixote*, apart from Don Quixote’s self-sacrifice, in that the world of the reader and that of the novel can commune through the text because it is the boundary “between resemblance and signs.” The liminal nature of the text, comprising of an internal desire for referent = sign (Don Quixote) and external materialization of referent ≠ sign (physical text) provides the paradoxical tension which ultimately gives way to a eucharistic harmony as Don Quixote becomes metaphysically present in the *Quixote*—the profane becomes sacred. As such, the reader can appropriate the world of the novel through eucharistic reading because it is made available through its liminality. This internal paradox, blending modernity with antiquity, creates the perfect baroque juxtaposition of *engaño* and *desengaño*, leaving the reader, once again, to decide on his/her own where the novel

lies in relation to resemblance and difference. For the idle reader, the signs are not their referents, but for the disciple reader, they are. While Foucault does not define what exactly *is* that boundary set by the *Quixote*, he does realize that after the *Quixote*, the new boundary, resemblance is lost and *différence* is found—perhaps suggesting that all novels which follow will never reach the level of eucharistic art that is the *Quixote*.

With the *Quixote* as the boundary between resemblance and signs—the boundary of artistic eucharistic possibility where signs are their referents with no “clearly defined frontiers of difference” (46)—the modern era is introduced where signs lose their resemblance and difference is defined. If the *Quixote* is the first modern novel, all novels which follow it are both a “variation of the theme of ‘Don Quixote’:... the problem of appearance and reality” (Fuentes 1986), and, to some degree, attempts at eucharistic art, the words wanting but never reaching beyond the “upper limits of signification”—the boundary that is the *Quixote*. As such, while the novel as genre may reach a kind of readership identification, or even what Suzanne Keen calls narrative empathy, no other book can attain a eucharistic aesthetic where the signified is present in the signifier as does the *Quixote*—the incorporation of such giving birth to the signified Don Quixote within the referent self of the participant-reader. Don Quixote then becomes the *hostia*, etymologically meaning the “victim” (Cruz 263-264);⁶ Don Quixote being the victim sacrificed for the world, both by his own accord (his self-sacrifice) and through mockery, to see not what it is to be perfect, but what it is to be imperfect—to be human. As such, when one partakes of the literary eucharist of the *Quixote*, one is left wanting not to state *ecce homo*, but rather *ecce homo imperfectus, pulchrum est*. The book then is not the “site of mystical union” (Cruz 267), but

⁶ Cruz states, “Christian sacrifice, etymologically derived from *sacrum-facere* (to make sacred), requires the death of Christ as *pharmakos* (sacrifice) for the redemption of humanity (D.R. Jones 11). The sacrificial term *hostia* assumes both its literal meaning of victim and the representational value of the Communion wafer.”

rather the site of the humanistic (though still marvelously mysterious) union between the disciple reader and Don Quixote—the reader *becoming* (a) Don Quixote. The disciple reader can then reasonably state that in this place (the text) is one greater than the novel.⁷ As one may kneel before the priest, receive the blessed eucharist and remain unaffected, so too may one read the *Quixote* with no real transformation. It is the earnest reader, the diligent and disciple reader, who, like Don Quixote, “transcends himself by working” (Kojève 116)—which work is, for the purposes of this study, the representation of quixotic metamorphosis in paint. The result of this union (the reader becoming (a) Don Quixote) and the action (artistic production) by the disciple reader allows him/her to see him/herself in the quixotic mirror, “a tool by which to ‘know thyself,’” inviting the reader “to *not* mistake himself for God, to avoid pride by knowing his limits, and to improve himself.” This quixotic mirror then is “not a passive mirror of imitation but an active mirror of transformation” (Melchoir-Bonnet 106), giving new life to and prolonging the name of Don Quixote.

Painting in the Quixote as Manifestation of Eucharistic Reading

Mario Vargas Llosa stated that “*Don Quixote de La Mancha*, Cervantes’ immortal novel, is first and foremost an image” (57), which he then paints for the reader by describing the image of Don Quixote with detailed precision. In the same vein, at the end of the second half of the novel, Sancho makes a *quasi*-prophecy regarding his adventures with Don Quixote: “Yo apostaré que antes de mucho tiempo no ha de haber bodegón, venta ni mesón o tienda de barbero donde

⁷ Christ, in a rebuke to the sanctimonious Pharisees in Matthew 12:6, tells them “that in this place is *one* greater than the temple,” meaning His presence was the very presence of God. Brant Pitre explains that “it is almost impossible to overestimate just how staggering such a claim would have been to Jesus’ original Jewish audience. As any of the Pharisees would have known, the Temple was nothing less than *the dwelling place of God’s presence on earth*” (140).

no ande *pintada* la historia de nuestras hazañas” (DQ II.LXXI; 900, emphasis mine). The more than 400 year-long realization of both Sancho’s refiguration and Vargas Llosa’s claim is manifest in Eduardo Urbina’s 1995 database of the corpus of visual representations of Don Quixote. The collection now houses “1,365 items...concentrated in eighteenth and nineteenth century English, French, and Spanish illustrated editions” of the *Quixote* (Urbina). It also boasts a total of “50,671 images from 1003 editions,” expecting to grow to some “55,000 fully annotated and searchable high-resolution images, linked to editions of the *Quixote* in Spanish and English” (Urbina). Urbina’s collection of quixotic representation, while comprehensive with regards to illustrations (generally engravings), lacks a catalogue of painted works. Urbina’s collection is one example of the *Quixote*’s influence on artist-readers over the centuries. These artist-readers are “‘absorbed’ by the object that [they contemplate and] can ‘be brought back to himself’ only by a Desire” (Kojève 98). The contemplated object is the novel and the desire is the quixotic self-representation. The desire to represent Don Quixote “disquiets him and moves him to action” (99), which action is the restoring and perpetuating, even resurrecting of Don Quixote in paint—it is the desire to make manifest the new quixotic self. While painting a literary character into reality is not unique to Don Quixote, the disciple artist-readers distinguish their work through new self-portraiture gained from eucharistic reading. Each artist driven by this desire to paint *el Caballero de la triste figura* validates and makes literal what Don Quixote exclaimed to the men from Yanguas: “Yo valgo por ciento” (DQ I.XV; 102). While clearly filled with Cervantine irony, Don Quixote’s statement also demonstrates the eucharistic nature of his being which offers more than merely one hundred versions of Don Quixote, each one coming to life through the artist-reader recorded in paint and finding its way into Urbina’s temple of images. The painter of Don Quixote, through work and desire (literary faith, a desire to believe

in Don Quixote and the work to realize him into paint, respectively), creates a painted mirror in which to see his or herself (the artist reader) reflected in the semblance of Don Quixote. Thus, the painted image of Don Quixote captures the *desdoblamiento* of the artist as he or she sees the self in Don Quixote's image, offering "above and beyond appearances, an enigmatic and transfigured knowledge of [him or herself]" (Melchoir-Bonnet 105). The painted representation then becomes a quasi-quixotic-self-portrait congruent with Girolamo Savonarola's fifteenth century teaching that "Every painter paints himself... he paints himself as a painter... and although the *fantasie* and figures that the painters paint will be diverse, they will all correspond to his concept" (Kemp 242). Alexandre Kojève explains that such a man, or woman, is one who "recognizes *himself* in [the work], he sees in it his own human reality, in it he discovers and reveals to others the objective reality of his humanity" (118, emphasis mine). The realization of the quixotic self through painting occurs both within the text metafictionally, and without in the "real." A eucharistic reading of the *Quixote* causes intratextual characters to appropriate Don Quixote in their own being, which leads to a personal metamorphosis as recorded in their painted representation. Painting in the *Quixote*, however, is not limited to simple lines and colors and an in-depth look at how it functions intratextually sheds light on aspects relevant to eucharistic metafictional readers of the 1615 *Quixote*.

Throughout both volumes of the *Quixote*, the word *pintar* appears frequently and distinctively. For example, in chapter XVI of the 1605 novel, Cide Hamete Benengeli uses the verb *pintar* during the encounter between Don Quixote and Maritornes to portray the idea of "imagination" or "creation in the mind." This use of *pintar* becomes important to our study as it introduces the idea of Don Quixote as a painter in his own right: i.e. one who paints the subjective *imago* into *quasi*-objective existence. Cide Hamete Benengeli begins describing

Maritornes's fetid breath, which "[pudiera] hacer vomitar a otro que no fuera arriero," (DQ I.XVI; 112) her personal appearance described as "ancha de cara, llana de cogote... del ojo tuerta y del otro no muy sana," and "las espaldas, que algún tanto le cargaban, la hacían mirar al suelo más de lo que ella quisiera" (DQ I.XVI; 108). Despite this array of grotesqueries, Don Quixote still perceives Maritornes as if she were the ideal described by Garcilaso de la Vega: "los cabellos... cuyo resplandor al del mismo sol escurecía"—thus "él la *pintó* en su imaginación" (DQ I.XVI; 112, emphasis mine). Instead of perceiving her face as the natural eye would inevitably read it—i.e. ugly, distorted, perturbed etc.—Don Quixote reads it by painting his own conceptualization, giving a new interpretation to who it is that Maritornes may be beyond the visual capacities of the 'real' as recorded by Cide Hamete Benengeli. As Maritornes's "face is signification" to Don Quixote of beauty, it is also "signification without context...the face is meaning all by itself. You are you" (Levinas). Or rather, she is she. As Don Quixote paints beauty onto the undesirable, he also un-paints her ugliness. While the idle reader might mock Maritornes, the disciple reader will (perhaps over time) read with awe as Don Quixote lifts the curtain to paint an unimaginable reality onto her being. The narrator notes "la ceguedad del pobre hidalgo" (DQ I.XVI; 112), making him a Milton-like figure who reveals a reality of Maritornes to which even she is blind. In this context, each quixotic moment at once read as insanity—the windmills, *los galeotes*, the many events at the inn etc.—now becomes a narrative painting of Don Quixote's own ideal concerning the people and events of La Mancha. Ortega y Gasset puts it this way: "The fact is that what is related in the books of chivalry has reality in the imagination of Don Quixote, who, in his turn, enjoys an unquestionable existence" (137).

A second use of the verb *pintar* corresponds with “una difundida idea de la filosofía antigua y escolástica, el *alma* es como una ‘superficie en blanco’ en la que va pintando la experiencia” (DQ 2008 II.XLVI; 897). This second use of *pintar* expresses a kind of permanent engraving drawn upon the blank canvas of the *ser* by an event or person. In this sense *pintar* is the philosophical transcendent power of painting for remembrance to which Don Quixote refers in his prophecy: “Dichosa edad y siglo dichoso aquel adonde saldrán a la luz las famosas hazañas mías, dignas de entallarse en bronces, esculpirse en mármoles y pintarse en tablas, para *memoria en lo futuro*” (35, emphasis mine). This type of painting could also be interpreted as a parallel of our theory of eucharistic art. Perhaps the incorporation of the transubstantiated Don Quixote is the imprint of his image onto the being of the disciple reader. If so, the eucharistic nature of the text metaphysically paints upon the subjective reality of the reader Don Quixote’s face which s/he then identifies as part of who s/he is as s/he ‘sees’ him or herself, analogous to 1 John 3:2: “but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.” This use of *pintar* is illustrated in chapter XLVI of the 1615 novel, when Don Quixote sings a *romance*: “Pintura sobre Pintura / ...Dulcinea del Toboso / del alma en la tabla rasa / tengo pintada de modo / que es imposible borrarla” (DQ II.XLVI; 735). This poem exposes the metaphysical image painted on Don Quixote’s being that drives him to act and be as he is. His faithful *realization* of Dulcinea in word and deed comes from his desire to realize fiction into the visual reality of his life. Cristina Müller states that “Dulcinea as negativity confronts him with the meaning of death and temporality” (168), which negativity is fictionality. Fiction, or rather the ability to write one’s subjectivity into reality, becomes the death drive for Don Quixote—more than a simple return to sanity, as I will demonstrate later—leading him to his final repose and self-sacrifice. Don Quixote sacrifices everything including his beloved novels, “ya soy

enemigo de Amadís de Gaula y de toda la infinita caterva de su linaje” (DQ II.LXXIV; 912) and his own identity as Don Quixote, that fiction may continue on living beyond his physical death. While the appearance of Alonso Quijano’s ultimate sacrifice seems sincere, the characters surrounding his bed perceive the reality of the situation. Cide Hamete records that “cuando esto le oyeron decir los tres, creyeron sin duda, que alguna nueva locura le había tomado” (DQ II.LXXIV; 912). Similarly, Cide Hamete continues to record his name as Don Quixote rather than Alonso Quijano. The baroque *desengaño* behind Don Quixote’s final *engaño* is that, for Don Quixote anything was necessary to perpetuate the realization of fiction. Edward Friedman states: “In the final chapter, the chronicle of a death foretold, the predominant image is of birth: ‘Para mí sola nació don Quijote, y yo para él.’ The death is symbolic, and the birth may be more so” (49). Thus, Alonso Quijano sacrificially extracts from himself the fictional Don Quixote, binding him (Don Quixote) to the novel for rebirth in the future reader as he (Alonso Quijano) is buried in the grave. This final sacrifice of the self⁸ is ultimately what makes possible a metaphysical eucharistic reading for all who engage diligently with the text.

A similar use of this mode of painting also takes place in chapter XXXII of the second volume. The duke and duchess mock Don Quixote by asking him to tell them about Dulcinea’s beauty, i.e. to illustrate her image for them. Don Quixote, however, does not feel worthy to describe her with words, stating that such a task is “carga digna de otros hombros que de los míos” (DQ II.XXXII; 654). In light of eucharistic reading and painting, however, perhaps his humility is a façade invented to avoid exposing his own being to the unworthy dukes. Müller states that “the symbolic power of Dulcinea’s figure comes from the implication that her

⁸ Christ’s sacrifice of the self makes possible the transubstantiation of the Eucharist: “the Eucharist [becomes] the perpetual sign of the new covenant, *sealed in his blood*” (Pitre 145, emphasis mine), which blood is the metonym for Christ’s self-sacrifice. Similarly, the sacrifice of the self is what validates Don Quixote’s final claim as Alonso Quijano, in that all that he is and desires to be he leaves behind in the text for the future reader to experience.

being...is secondary to her significance in [Don Quixote's] individuation" (169). As Dulcinea, a painted fiction, only exists in Don Quixote's subjective being, a paradox forms in which the only way for the duke and duchess (or any reader for that matter) to know her is through Don Quixote's mediation, in whose being she exists as a living portrait—a symbolic portrait of fiction. To this end he states: "Si yo pudiera sacar mi corazón y ponerle ante los ojos de vuestra grandeza... quitara el trabajo a mi lengua de decir lo que apenas se puede pensar, porque Vuestra Excelencia la viera en él toda retratada" (DQ II.XXXII; 654). Müller further explains that "Dulcinea represents at first the denial of the possibility of ekphrasis, for example, the inability of language to represent in the world an imaginary being previously deposited in memory" (169). Müller continues: "Language speaks the unspeakable through the subject's inability to grasp it." While Cide Hamete Benengeli records a verbal image of Dulcinea in the first half of the novel, he also discloses, through language, the unspeakable reality of Don Quixote that the duke and duchess are unable to grasp. As they mock Don Quixote and his fictional lady in waiting, Don Quixote verbally conceals her (which is to say his own painted subjectivity), symbolically further individualizing himself from them. Words, then, become both the medium in which Cide Hamete Benegeli paints a portrait of Don Quixote's being and the means by which Don Quixote conceals himself in the solitude of his individuation. This juxtaposition of narrator and protagonist offers yet another baroque play of appearance vs. reality in that what Cide Hamete paints as reality is only the appearance of such, which reality then resides in the subjective sovereignty of the protagonist.

The duke and duchess employ a fourth use of *pintar* when they again insist that Don Quixote "la pintase," referring to Dulcinea, for them regardless of his unwillingness to do so. Don Quixote responds: "más estoy para llorarla que para describirla" (DQ II.XXXII; 655). Here,

the duke and duchess exhibit the most common usage of *pintar* throughout the novel: *describir*. Cide Hamete Benengeli uses this verb to paint, or describe, the house of Don Diego de Miranda. The second author comments on the narrative, saying that he (Cide Hamete's) paints "todas las circunstancias... pintándonos en ellas lo que contiene una casa de un caballero labrador y rico" (DQ II.XVIII; 563). Another example of this type of literary painting occurs when Don Quixote becomes aware of the existence of that "sabio encantador" at the beginning of the 1615 novel. He is not amused with the way in which Cide Hamete paints him and his adventures, subsequently denouncing his (Cide Hamete) work by comparing it with the infamous Orbaneja, whose technique displays an inability to re-present through paint, requiring the mediation of words: "tal vez pintaba un gallo de tal suerte y tan mal parecido, que era menester que con letras góticas escribiese junto a él: 'Éste es gallo'" (DQ II.III; 478). A third example, among many, comes near the end of the second half, when Don Quixote foreshadows his own death: "Para todo hay remedio, si no es para la muerte." To which Sancho replies: "Muy bien lo pinta y facilita vuestra merced... [que] del dicho al hecho hay gran trecho" (DQ II.LXIV; 861). Here Sancho exhibits the descriptive power of painted text, illustrating Don Quixote's philosophy that "el pintor o escritor, *que todo es uno*" (DQ II.LXXI; 900, emphasis mine). Don Quixote again becomes a painter in his own right; he paints and describes for the world to see what only he can see. He is an artist, one to be memorialized and reborn through eucharistic reading.

Near the end of the 1615 novel, when Don Quixote again recalls the infamous Orbaneja, he does so to analyze or critique painted images. As Sancho and Don Quixote arrive at the inn for the last time, they see a few "sargas viejas pintadas" with the classical stories of Helen of Troy and of Dido and Aeneas. These paintings on loose canvases are perhaps the original inspiration which provoke Sancho to make his famous "prophecy," doing so with a small caveat:

“querría yo que la pintasen manos de otro mejor pintor que el que ha pintado a éstas.” Don Quixote, as though a seasoned art critic, responds to Sancho: “tienes razón, Sancho, porque este pintor es como Orbaneja...que cuando le preguntaban qué pintaba, respondía: ‘Lo que saliere’” (DQ II.LXXI; 900). Don Quixote also puts on the cloak of art historian/critic in the 1605 novel when he justifies his reasoning as to why he decides to imitate Amadís de Gaula: “digo asimismo que cuando algún pintor quiere salir famoso en su arte procura imitar los originales de los más únicos pintores que sabe y esta misma regla corre por todos los más oficios o ejercicios de cuenta.” (DQ I.XXV; 191) It becomes apparent that Don Quixote not only understands the apothotic potential of painting, but that he also knows how to arrive at such an artistic product as artist and critique himself. He makes apparent his ability to distinguish correctly between poor and high art by recognizing the imitation of the masters—which imitation Don Quixote exemplifies in his reflection of Amadís.

The aesthetics of painting in the *Quixote* appear to be defined not only as a motif for description, the imagination, eucharistic transformation and the immortalization of man on earth, but also for creation and representation. When the duke and duchess desire their own representation of Dulcinea, Don Quixote exclaims that to describe “la sin par” is “empresa en quien se debían ocupar los pinceles de Parrasio, de Timantes y de Apeles y los buriles de Lisipo” (DQ II.XXXII; 655). Despite his initial humility in negating the invitation to paint her, Don Quixote subtly and simultaneously elevates himself to the same level as three of the great Greek painters of history. Note that the duke and duchess don’t request the painter of the court to portray her for them, but rather they insist that she be painted by Don Quixote. The duke and duchess also simultaneously expose their in-depth experience with the text. They know he is the only one equipped to paint Dulcinea; only he could theoretically paint her due to her purely

conceptual ontology. As such, Don Quixote, within the text, once again becomes a painter, but this time a painter approved by the nobility—a social apotheosis in and of itself. Though the text never refers to a specific painting created by Don Quixote he is still a creator, a painter who paints his reality into words for the reader to consume. Don Quixote’s painting becomes transformative art for the reader as s/he eucharistically participates in the text, leading to an individual metamorphosis. With the establishment of Don Quixote as an artist, the reader can now see how his interaction with the represented image of himself transfigures his self-conscious knowledge (that knowledge being validated as painter-creator) from the beginning of the novel to the end. As such, Don Quixote becomes the first real beneficiary of the many representations of himself inasmuch as seeing himself in those quixotic reflections reveals “not only physical traits but also interior bearings...[helping] man conquer his vices...[showing] him simultaneously what he is and what he ought to be.” (Melchior-Bonnet 106-107)

Although Don Quixote does not directly interact with the first painted image of himself⁹, it does serve as a base for future eucharistic painted representations by intratextual readers of the novel. The second narrator, in an ekphrastic expression, describes the first documented painted image of Don Quixote. The painting represents the encounter between Don Quixote and the man from the Basque country in chapter IX of the first half. William Worden says of the ekphrastic text: “The passage begins by describing the battle as ‘pintada muy al natural’ ... the figures themselves are admired: while the image of the Biscayan’s mule is termed ‘al vivo,’ the portrayal of Rocinante is praised as ‘maravillosamente pintado.’” Worden further comments that “the

⁹ William Worden explains that the manuscript written by Cide Hamete Benengeli contained “not only words chronicling don Quixote’s adventures, but also a visual depiction of the knight’s battle with the Biscayan. In this early moment of the first part of his novel Cervantes sets a precedent to be followed by countless artists over the four hundred years since the work’s initial publication. Indeed, by describing in detail how don Quixote’s battle has been pictorialized, Cervantes in some sense becomes the first illustrator of his own novel, thereby incorporating a secondary level of artistic creation—illustrated image—into the primary, literary world of *Don Quixote*” (144).

illustration appears to present the three human figures meticulously and unambiguously” (147). In chapter III of the second half, Sansón Carrasco easily recognizes Don Quixote because of his disciple reading of the ekphrastic passage: “Deme vuestra grandeza las manos, señor don Quijote... que es vuestra merced uno de los más famosos caballeros andantes que ha habido, ni aun habrá, en toda la redondez de la tierra” (DQ II.III; 475). Here Sansón further exemplifies the accurate portrayal of *el Caballero de la Triste Figura*, the realism and naturalism with which Don Quixote is represented. The ekphrasis of the painted image of Don Quixote, due to the technique as painted “muy al natural,” becomes a second mirror into which Sansón reflects upon himself. As he both consumes the text and visualizes the described image, he sees Don Quixote as though he were seeing himself. The ekphrastic mirror then focuses back to the text and the metaphysical consumption of the very madness of Don Quixote. The result is the *desdoblamiento* of the reader-self of Sansón as both knight errant and bachelor in direct imitation of Don Quixote.

The product of Sansón’s personal *desdoblamiento* is the first painted image of Don Quixote from out of eucharistic reading, painted *a lo vivo*. Helena Percas de Ponseti states that Sansón appears to Don Quixote as the *Caballero de los Espejos*, “designed by him [Sansón] in jest to mirror Don Quijote’s madness” while simultaneously claiming “that his motives are altruistic: he wants to restore Don Quijote to sanity” (28, 32). The arrival of the new competitor for Don Quixote, dressed in “una tela de parecer de oro finísimo, sembradas por ella muchas lunas pequeñas de resplandecientes espejos,” (DQ II.XIV; 541) results in a challenge to joust. Don Quixote agrees to the challenge and unexpectedly wins. The victory of *el Caballero de la Triste Figura* augments Don Quixote’s faith in himself to the point that he is given a new title as the “espejo donde pueden mirar todos los valientes del mundo” (DQ II.XVII; 559). This scene,

however, like most scenes of the *Quixote*, must be analyzed beyond appearances alone. Percas de Ponseti also gives a nuanced reading of the battle scene, seeing the demeaning defeat of Sansón as a revelation of his psychological weakness. She states that “the mirror as self-knowledge leading to wisdom” is “turned into an antithetical symbol of self-deception leading to madness when applied to Sansón” (28-29). While this idea is fascinating, the theory of eucharistic reading takes it a step further. One could also read the text as a reflection of the internal painted image not of Sansón’s being, but rather of Don Quixote’s being—another glimpse at his now painted *tabula rasa*, adorned with the knights of old: adorned with fiction. Despite the valiant external appearance of Don Quixote’s victory, the reader must not forget that *el Caballero de los Espejos* was not named as such *al azar*. He carried on his armor mirrors crafted in the shape of little moons, portraying a double symbolic reflection of both his own ontological status as a kind of living painting, as well as a metaphysical reflection of something much deeper. Up until this point in the novel Don Quixote fought windmills as giants without personal repercussion—i.e. painting his own reality into being—but now he is obligated to face an altogether different opponent: himself, whom he appears to ‘defeat,’ but not transform. Sansón discloses through what Heidegger calls *aletheia*, “the mirror image of the structure of the thing” (258), the interior being of Don Quixote: a simulacrum of the knight errant, a fiction that had yet to be tested in full. The battle between *el Caballero de la Triste Figura* and *el Caballero de los Espejos* becomes a moment of disclosure, showing “a happening of truth at work” (Heidegger 262). The battle becomes the revelation of Don Quixote to his previously unknown edenic nakedness¹⁰ and

¹⁰ At the beginning of the novel, Don Quixote seems to live in a state of innocence, a paradisiacal state in which he can live the life of a knight as he pleases regardless of the social surroundings that constantly challenge his beliefs. When confronted with *el Caballero de los espejos*, he sees, in a sense, his own naked innocence and is forced to either “grow up” and leave his fictions behind or conquer his own realization. He is made aware of the ridiculousness of his enactment, as a child who grows to realize their nakedness is not socially acceptable. Mircea Eliade elaborates on these ideas of Eden in his book *The Sacred and the Profane* when he explores “nostalgia for

vulnerability. Thus Sansón's "many mirrors on his surcoat or *casaca*" do not "[reflect] onto the bachelor his own lack of self-knowledge" (Percas de Ponseti 28) but rather, they reflect to Don Quixote his interior being. *El Caballero de los Espejos* becomes "a mirror [making] what it reflects visible to someone only for as long as he looks in it and sees his own image or whatever else is reflected in it" (Gadamer 139).

At the end of the second half of the *Quixote*, in the representational mode of *superatio*, Sansón comes back to avenge his humiliating defeat in the form of *el Caballero de la Blanca Luna*. This second painted representation of *el Caballero de la Triste Figura a lo vivo* is described as "armado asimismo de punta en *blanco*, que en el escudo traía *pintada* una luna resplandeciente" (DQ II LXIV; 862, emphasis mine). The painting on the shield, similar to the mirrors, can again be read both as a representation of the interior being of the one who bears it, and as an echo, or imitation, of what Don Quixote says when Sancho first calls him by the name of *el Caballero de la Triste Figura*: "y para que mejore me cuadre tal nombre, determiné de hacer pintar, cuando haya lugar, en mi escudo una muy triste figura." (DQ I.XIX; 138) When *el Caballero de la Blanca Luna* defeats Don Quixote, Sansón accomplishes the *superatio* of his earlier imitation as *el Caballero de los Espejos*. The painted white moon becomes the literary *superatio* to the previous lunar-mirrored garb. Furthermore, the white moon symbolizes Sansón's painted imitations of Don Quixote *a lo vivo*—the enactment of Sansón's own eucharistic quixotic self. Regarding his renewed form, the singular whiteness of the *Caballero de la Blanca Luna* reflects "his single-mindedness" (Percas de Ponseti 32) and communicates a metaphysical foreshadowing of the novel's finale. Percas de Ponseti explains that "the white, called argent (or silver), of the moon painted on the Knight of the White Moon's shield speaks of peace, sincerity,

Eden... the desire to re-establish the paradisaical state before the Fall, when sin did not yet exist and there was no conflict between the pleasures of the flesh and conscience" (207).

and *the promise of rebirth* in the symbolism of heraldry” (32, emphasis mine). While *el Caballero de la Blanca Luna* defeats Don Quixote, the whiteness of Sansón’s reflective moon projects across time the future possibility of eucharistic representation. The white moon then becomes a symbol for quixotic resurrection through disciple readers of the text. The white moon of *el Caballero de la Blanca Luna* alludes to both Sansón’s total eucharistic transformation—a sign of who he has become in imitation of Don Quixote—and the future possibility of quixotic rebirth for all other disciple readers. By the same token, Sansón’s quixotic painted manifestation again results in a lunar mirror reflecting the brilliant transformation not of Sansón, but of Don Quixote. The painted moon on the surface of the shield reflects the interior radiance within the *triste figura* showing a personal growth from within. Though Don Quixote falls “half dead” following the battle, his lived reflection in *el Caballero de la Blanca Luna* illustrates plainly a visceral victory that Don Quixote himself is experiencing as he clothes his edenic nakedness in a metaphysical chivalric shining armor.

As Don Quixote tires, and after many adventures and sallies, he and Sancho arrive at the summit of a large hill to contemplate their crusade and La Mancha as a whole. Sancho declares to the city: “Abre los brazos y recibe también tu hijo don Quijote, que, si viene vencido de los brazos ajenos, viene vencedor de sí mismo, que, según él me ha dicho, es el mayor vencimiento que desearse puede” (DQ II.LXXII; 905). In light of eucharistic reading, Don Quixote’s victory is not a regress to sanity, but the eventual binding of his being to the text “para memoria en lo futuro” (DQ I.II; 25). If the figure of Don Quixote, his expressions as they are perceived by the other, represent appearances, the imitations or artistic representations by Sansón Carrasco again reflect the internal reality of his (Don Quixote) being. Like an active and transformative mirror (Melchoir-Bonnet), *el Caballero de la blanca luna* illuminates Don Quixote metaphysically. *El*

Caballero de la blanca luna becomes a physiological representation of what Don Quixote's interior ontology looks and acts like as "vencedor de sí mismo." Due to the eucharistic nature of Sansón's quixotic representation and *desdoblamiento*, Don Quixote once again comes face to face with himself—*el Caballero de la Blanca Luna* being a mirror which "throws back an image and not a copy: what is in the mirror is the image of what is represented and is inseparable from its presence" (Gadamer 140). Though Sansón's mirrored shield is metaphorical, Don Quixote is nonetheless reflected back because of his presence. Don Quixote sees himself as if in a mirror, allowing him to look beyond the physical and see the internal conquering of the external appearance. Don Quixote's subjective transformation is prefigured in the images of the saints painted as knights in chapter LVIII of the second half—symbols that reflect a steady interior sanctification of Don Quixote as he begins the necessary outward disassociation from knighthood. If by means of representation Don Quixote comes to a higher knowledge of himself, leading to a certain sanctity found at his death as Alonso Quijano *el Bueno* and eternal life as text, then he can be read as an absolute universal figure since the artistic recreation of Don Quixote manages to circularly transform even him who is represented. As such, how much more would this metamorphosis of the self be the case for someone other than Don Quixote? At the same time, Don Quixote's transformation divulges the bifurcation between the *quasi*-eucharistic nature of the text and mirror-like nature of the painted image. While reading the text seems to cause disciple readers to appropriate Don Quixote—to paint him onto their being—the manifestation of their metamorphosis through paint appears to simply mirror the transformation of the one who paints the quixotic self. This all ultimately points to the eucharistic power of the *Quixote* as text to transform the nature of the reader. Eucharistic reading of the disciple reader paints upon their being the semblance of Don Quixote so powerfully and movingly that the

subject then must act, as did Sansón. The painted image, then, acts only to reflect what is represented, whether eucharistic or not. The painted images of Don Quixote, then, by a eucharistic reader will reflect their personal transformation but will not produce the same metamorphosis in the beholder. These painted images reflect interior being, echoing back to the text where the true transformation takes place. Thus, painting, in refraction back to the text, resurrects Don Quixote for the new generation more familiar with images than text. In the twenty-first century and beyond, with society driven by internet, film and photographs, painting reflects back to the written word where each new diligent reader can become “vencedor de sí mismo.”

Conclusion

In the prologue to first half of the novel, Cervantes explains that although Don Quixote resembles the mirrored reflection of his “hijo del entendimiento,” and that Cervantes “parezca padre” of the work, he makes explicit that he sees himself as the “padraastro de don Quijote” (DQ I.Prologo; 4). Nonetheless, the *desdoblamiento* between Cervantes and Don Quixote is manifest between the two as between father and son: mother earth giving to children “the traits of their parents so that parents might contemplate themselves through their offspring” (Melchior-Bonnet 108). Roberto González Echevarría elaborates on what this father-son relationship may have been like for Cervantes:

Halfway through his sixties, to read his own work, to come face to face with the Cervantes he had been, while in the process of re-making himself as an author, must have been a profound process of reflection and of self-definition that cannot be reduced to a formalized game of shuffling texts, repeating them, and pondering the theoretical questions raised by such a process. Cervantes must have been aware of how significant it

would be to return to the *Quixote* and re-write it... Seeing himself in the mirror of his own creation may have been the spark that generated the Second Part of the *Quixote* and the key to understanding and appreciating it fully. (55)

What was it that Cervantes saw in that quixotic/filial mirror? Did he see anything, or was he blinded by his self-proclaimed step-fatherhood? Perhaps Don Quixote's own ambiguous nature contained and concealed the painted image of Don Quixote on the blank canvas of Cervantes's soul: his reflection in the quixotic mirror which he desired not to disclose to the world. Though we can never reasonably know the answers to these questions, Cervantes did leave the reader this famous phrase through his *Caballero de la Triste Figura*: "Retrátame el que quisiere, pero no me maltrate, que muchas veces suele caerse la paciencia cuando la cargan de injurias" (DQ II.LIX; 827). The challenge stands for any who wish to attempt to give life to another of the hundreds of Don Quixotes. It becomes apparent, as Ana María G. Laguna states, that Cervantes usage of painting "connects not only word and sound, but also word and image, offering with this connection a solid link between present and past. Unlike sculptures and reliefs, classical paintings had vanished with time, and the detailed descriptions of ekphrastic literature provided the only means by which they could come to be appreciated." (31) Cervantes seems to appreciate the deeper significance of the painted image as captured by the limitations of language. In the same vein, Howard Nemerov theorized on the idea of painting as the written word. He stated: "writing and painting could come together, though I don't know in the least what their offspring would look like." He continues the thought, stating "it is here that I get the vaguest glimmer of a hint from music." He goes on to quote Proust who stated: "I asked myself if music were not the unique example of what might have been—if there had not come the invention of language, the formation of words, the analysis of ideas—the means of

communication between one spirit to another” (13). Is it Cervantes’s clever appropriation of visual art in his writing that produces the effects of the most metaphysical and philosophical of arts: music¹¹? Perhaps Cervantes’s own disciple reading of his creation produced a eucharistic change within himself as creator; the creation being the perfection of the creator. More research is needed to explore how perhaps, of all the arts, music¹² may be the most eucharistic in nature and the one to which Cervantes himself aspired—the *Quixote* being not so much a novel as a musical *opus*, an *opera* for man to understand humanity on earth.

¹¹ Ramón Avello said the following regarding musical correspondences in Cervantes’s literary work: “En la novela de Cervantes se recogen unas setenta referencias relacionadas directamente con la música. Esto nos indica no sólo que Cervantes poseía una alta imaginación sonora, sino también que el lenguaje musical de su época le era sumamente familiar. Un apasionado historiador de la música española, Mariano Soriano Fuertes, basándose más en conjeturas que en documentos, llegó a defender que Cervantes, antes de perder la mano izquierda, era un diestro guitarrista. Tal vez esa afirmación sea excesiva; sin embargo, es indudable un amplio bagaje musical de Cervantes” (86).

¹² In *Writing for the Eyes in the Spanish Golden Age* (2004), Frederick A. de Armas offers a “vision of possibilities to those who wish to study the fascinating and intricate relations between the verbal and the visual during the Spanish Golden Age” (16). As part of this scholarly vision he notes that “much can be said about other links and collaborations” apart from the visual within the verbal, such as “a text and its illustrations... its poetry and music” (15) etc., opening an invitation to explore the Spanish Golden Age of literature in the context of other artistic media, the *Quijote* in particular. Though much has been said regarding painters of Don Quixote (Strauss, Dalí, Doré, Picasso, Daumier and others) as well as adaptations of the *Quijote* in music (Robert Gerhards’s 1950 ballet *Don Quixote*, *El retablo de maese Pedro* by Manuel de Falla, “guiñol escénico estrenado en París en 1923,” Richard Strassus’s 1897 *Don Quixote*, particularly the performance by Yo-Yo Ma in Carnegie Hall (2004), Georg Philipp Telemann’s 1762 Opera *Don Quichotte der Löwenritter* etc.) still more could be done regarding these painters/composers as possible eucharistic readers of the *Quijote*.

Works Cited

- Avello, Ramón. "Música en el *Quijote*; música sobre el *Quijote*." *EL QVIJOTE: 1605-1615 IV Centenario*, KRK Ediciones, 2005.
- Baber, H. E. "Eucharist: Metaphysical Miracle or Institutional Fact?" *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*, vol. 74, no. 3, 2013, pp. 333–352. *JSTOR*
- Beardslee, William A. "Logos." *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*, Oxford University Press, January 01, 2004. Oxford Reference. Date Accessed 4 Mar. 2019
<http://www.oxfordreference.com.erl.lib.byu.edu/view/10.1093/acref/9780195046458.001.0001/acref-9780195046458-e-0440>
- Castillo, Debra A. "A Conversation with Carlos Fuentes." *The Review of Contemporary Fiction*, Elmwood Park, III, 1988.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel De. *El Ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha*. Edited by Salvador J. Fajardo & James A. Parr, Asheville, NC, 2017.
- . *El Ingenioso hidalgo don Quijote de la Mancha*. Edited by Francisco Rico, Perú: Santillana Ediciones Generales, 2008.
- Cruz, Anne J. "Words Made Flesh: Luisa de Carvajal's Eucharistic Poetry." *Studies on Women's Poetry of the Golden Age: Tras el espejo la musa escribe*. Tamesis, 2009.
- De Armas, Frederick A. "Introduction." *Writing for the Eyes in the Spanish Golden Age*. Bucknell University Press, 2004, pp. 7-20.
- González Echevarría, Roberto. "Cervantes as Reader of the First Part of *Don Quixote*," *A Novel Without Boundaries: Sensing Don Quixote 400 Years Later*. Juan de la Cuesta, 2016, pp. 55-72.
- Eliade, Mircea. *The Sacred and the Profane: the Nature of Religion*. Translated by Willard R. Trask, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, 1987.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things*. Vintage Books, 1994.
- Fuentes, Carlos. "When Don Quixote Left His Village, The Modern World Began." *New York Times*, The New York Times, 23March.1986
<https://www.nytimes.com/1986/03/23/books/when-don-quixote-left-his-village-the-modern-world-began.html>.
- Friedman, Edward H. "Books Errant: The Objects of Invention in *Don Quixote*," *Bloom's Modern Ciritcal Interpretations: Miguel de Cervantes's Don Quixote New Edition*. Infobase Publishing, New York, 2010.

- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall, Bloomsbury, 2004.
- Glover, Adam. "Music, Poetry, and the Eucharist." *Religion & Literature*, vol. 46, no. 1, 2014, pp. 117–136.
- Heidegger, Martin. "The Origin of the Work of Art." *Deconstruction in Context Literature and Philosophy*. Edited by Mark C. Taylor, The University of Chicago Press, 1986, pp. 256–279.
- Kearney, Richard. "Eucharistic Imaginings in Proust and Woolf." *Material Spirit: Religion and Literature Intranscendent*. Fordham University Press, 2014.
- Kemp, Martin. *Behind the Picture: Art and Evidence in the Italian Renaissance*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Kojève, Alexandre. "Introduction to the Reading of Hegel," *Deconstruction in Context: Literature and Philosophy*. Edition by Mark C. Taylor, University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Kurtz, Barbara E. *The Play of Allegory in the Autos Sacramentales of Pedro Calderón de la Barca*. The Catholic University of America Press, 1991.
- Laguna, Ana María G. *Cervantes and the Pictorial Imagination: A Study on the Power of Images and Images of Power in Works by Cervantes*. Bucknell University Press, 2009.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. *Ethics and Infinity*, Translated by Richard A. Cohen, Duquesne University Press, 2017.
- Melchior-Bonnet, Sabine. *The Mirror: A History*. Translated by Kathrine H. Jewett, New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Nemerov, Howard. "On Poetry and Painting, With a Thought of Music." *The Language of Images*. Edition by W. J. T. Mitchell. The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. *Meditations on Quixote*. Translated by Evelyn Rugg and Diego Marín, University of Illinois Press, Chicago, 2000.
- Müller, Cristina. "Individuation, Ekphrasis, and Death in *Don Quixote*." *Ekphrasis in the Age of Cervantes*. Bucknell University Press 2005, pp. 156-71.
- Pitre, Brant. *Jesus and the Jewish Roots of the Eucharist*. Doubleday Religion, 2011.
- Percas de Poseit, Helena. *Cervantes the Writer and Painter of Don Quijote*. University of Missouri Press, 1988.

- Selden, Raman. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. The University Press of Kentucky, 1989.
- Sokolowski, Robert. *Christian Faith & Human Understanding: Studies on the Eucharist, Trinity, and the Human Person*. Catholic University of America Press, 2006, pp. 69-85.
- Unamuno, Miguel De. *El Caballero De La Triste Figura*. N.p.: n.p., 1944. Print.
- Urbina, Eduardo. "Proyecto Cervantes." *Proyecto Cervantes*. N.p., n.d. Web. 05 Dec. 2016.
- Vargas Llosa, Mario. "A Novel for the Twenty-First Century," *Bloom's Modern Critical Interpretations: Miguel de Cervantes's Don Quixote New Edition*. Infobase Publishing, New York, 2010.
- Worden, William. "The First Illustrator of *Don Quijote*: Miguel De Cervantes," *Ekphrasis in the Age of Cervantes*. Bucknell University Press, 2005, pp. 144-55.

CONFERENCE LENGTH VERSION OF ESSAY

Eucharistic Reading and Quixotic Resurrection: A New Approach to the Quixote

In an episode of the 1615 *Quijote* (chapter LXII), Sancho and Don Quixote eat with Don Antonio Moreno, a reader of both the 1605 *Quijote* and Avellaneda's apocryphal 1614 *Quijote*. While in the company of his friends, Don Antonio asks Sancho about his gluttony displayed in chapter XII of the false sequel. Sancho responds, correcting the assertions of Avellaneda: "No señor, no es así... porque tengo más de limpio que de goloso." Don Quixote, as the true knight that he is, backs up his squire's claim by stating: "Por cierto... que la parsimonia y limpieza con que Sancho come se puede escribir y grabar en láminas de bronce, para que quede en memoria eterna en los siglos venideros" (843). While this comedic passage could be viewed as simply another moment of fraternal bonding between the two protagonists, a religious reading may reveal the scene to be a Cervantine simulacrum of Christ's Last Supper. If the buccal habits of Sancho really were worthy of "memoria eterna," then there might be an element of piety beyond Don Quixote's simple affirmation. Being the faithful Catholics that they were in 17th-century Spain, the most sacred oral rite for Don Quixote and Sancho would have been the communion: the Eucharist. H. E. Baber, in an attempt to prove the literal nature of the doctrine of transubstantiation, analyzes the Eucharist by employing a different word to explain the metamorphosis of the body and blood of Christ: transignification, in that the consecrated elements act as signifiers that call the physical presence of Christ (341). The physical intake of the signifier into the body, in this case the sacramental bread, causes the believer to literally incorporate part of the sign (Christ) into their body. Inasmuch as the internalization of the host, a sign of spiritual and physical sustenance, invokes the infinite within the mortal frame, reading

the *Quijote*, an orthographic sign of a *quasi*-infinite signified (Don Quixote), can be observed in the same way.

Richard Kearney's work allows this meta-reading of the *Quijote* with his proposal of the contemporary anatheistic paradox which presents religion as art and art as religion. Kearney employs what he calls "eucharistic imagination" to apply the Eucharist to art, developing a theory regarding the signifying elements of the Eucharist beyond the host, extending eucharistic semiotics to "acts of quotidian experience where the infinite traverses the infinitesimal" (12). Kearney embeds his argument in the work of his mentor, Paul Ricoeur, who also theorized on a eucharist-like nature existing between reader and author:

Ricoeur goes so far as to construe the double surrender of (1) the author to the implied author (or narrator) and (2) the implied author to the reader, as an act of kenotic service to the other that ultimately amounts to a transubstantiation of author to reader: "Whereas the real author effaces himself in the implied author, the implied reader takes on substance in the real reader." In short, the author agrees to die so that the reader may be born. (12)

If, as Ricoeur purports, the *Quijote* can read as the death of Cervantes facilitating the birth of the reader, then a reading of the novel, as though it were eucharistic, is also possible. This eucharistic reading of the *Quijote* is the focus of this paper, in that Don Quixote (rather than Cervantes), who died as a "consecrated" sacrifice within the text, is eucharistically reborn in each disciple reader. Kearney's work urges us to read the *Quijote* as though it were eucharistic art: art which transforms the subjectivity of the reader who believes "con la fe que crea lo que no [ve], creyendo firmemente que Don Quijote existe y vive y obra," (Unamuno 83). This analysis attempts to examine the *Quijote* as eucharistic art in which the disciple reader (s/he who acquires the nature and being of Don Quixote to such an extent that s/he represents this metamorphosis in

some artistic from) consumes (takes in) part of Don Quixote's being through the text: reading the *Quijote* as a mystically humanistic rite. The reader then literally becomes quixotic, a term I will engage with not in the traditional sense of extreme idealism, but rather in the sense that the reader *becomes* (a) Don Quixote. In this version I will develop a theory of eucharistic reading particular to the *Quijote* with the intent of examining its role intratextually for the metafictional readers in the 1615 *Quijote* in a longer article length paper. As there are many possible modes of artistic representation available to manifest eucharistic reading, I intent to focus primarily on painted expressions of the quixotic self within the novel, though much could be said on music, writing and other artistic media as manifestations of eucharistic readings not only intratextually but also extratextually.

Anne J. Cruz in her work on Luísa de Carvajal's eucharistic poetry, reminiscent of Baber and his theory on transignification, explores "the poetics of transubstantiation," noting that Carvajal's poems, like the Eucharist, "not only reappropriate the figure of Christ through his voice, but also intend to make present his corporeality" (258-59) through transignification in text. Carvajal appropriates and transforms the signifier for the body of Christ, typically consumed through transubstantiated bread, into transignified language, causing 'faithful' participants to appropriate part of Christ within their own being through reading. Adam Glover similarly elaborates on the idea of the Eucharist as the ultimate signifier, claiming that through transubstantiation, as well as transignification, the Eucharist breaks down the barrier between the signifier and the signified. He states that "the Eucharist thus appears as something like the upper limit of signification, the boundary towards which language, insofar as it attempts to be meaningful, always tends. Indeed, one might even say that to the extent that language attempts to signify at all it attempts to implicitly become eucharistic" (121). The very verbiage of the Bible

further reinforces these ideas of the Eucharist in connection with literary text: for indeed, “in the beginning was the *Word*, and the *Word* was with God, and the *Word* was God” (John 1:1, emphasis mine).

The “poetics of transubstantiation” then become particularly intriguing in relation to reading the *Quijote*. While the incorporation of the Eucharist, a signifier for Christ’s body, causes the believer to become Christ incrementally by consuming His Divine flesh, the eucharistic consumption of the *Quijote* causes the reader to *become* (a) Don Quixote by means of reading—the reader eliminating parts of the self to incorporate the madness of Don Quixote, similar to what we see happening with Don Antonio and others in the 1615 sequel. However, as such, this reading of the text runs counter to much of 20th-century literary theory. Raman Selden explains that while “structuralism was heroic in its desire to master the world of man-made signs, poststructuralism is comic and anti-heroic in its refusal to take such claims seriously... Poststructuralist thought has discovered the essentially *unstable* nature of signification” (1989). A 21st-century reading of a text in which the signified is metaphysically present in its signifier clearly disregards that previously delineated “*unstable* nature of signification.” Yet, while the conceptual gap between the signifier and signified began to expand in the twentieth century given the work of Saussure, Derrida, Kristeva, Lacan, Barthes and others, Michel Foucault notes that “up to the end of the sixteenth century... it was resemblance that largely guided exegesis and the interpretation of texts” (17). As a product of that time, the *Quijote* elaborates and challenges the socio-cultural context that bound the resemblance of signs with their referents, an essential and explored theme in the novel. While Don Quixote is perhaps the ultimate believer in the intimate unity between signifier and signified, the novel as text seems to want a poststructuralist reading to expose the ‘self-evident’ gap and disclose the “*unstable* nature of signification,”

making it a novel well ahead of its time. Nonetheless, because of Don Quixote's persistent and faithful belief in resemblance which leads him to act—i.e. realize his own faith in the chivalric novel—his efforts to see the world through his novels produce what Alexandre Kojève would refer to simply as 'work.' Don Quixote, "in his work... trans-forms things and trans-forms himself at the same time, he forms things and the World by transforming himself" (116). As such, his ultimate transformation through his 'work' is to become both signified and signifier, a text and a being, only accessible through reading. In a saussurean interplay of signified and signifier, the referent becomes the reader, who like Alonso Quijano, becomes (a) Don Quixote through reading—the *renacimiento* of Don Quixote, his second coming, if you will. Thus, Don Quixote's life work, as per the records of Cide Hamete Benengeli, defies postmodern instability of signification and seals the signs to his being as he sacrifices himself as Don Quixote, becoming Alonso Quijano for future readers to give life to a new quixotic self. A eucharistic reading is then valid in the context of poststructuralism only because of the nature of Don Quixote's work (his faithful realization of the chivalric novel and creation of Don Quixote). Through his work, Don Quixote transforms himself beyond phenomenological text into noumenological being within the text for the reader to consume—which consumption and ensuing transformation is then manifest through characters like Don Antonio Moreno.

Beyond the intratextual examples of eucharistic reading that this article intends to explore, evidence also exists of the *Quijote* as eucharistic art in the realms of the 'real.' In an interview with Debra A. Castillo in 1988, Carlos Fuentes stated: "in a way *I am* Don Quixote, and every writer in the Spanish language is Don Quixote, in the sense that we too come from an orthodox and unitary and dogmatic language which is out of the Spanish counter-reformation" (Castillo, emphasis mine). The idea Fuentes portrays engages with Michel Foucault's claims on

Don Quixote's being: "his whole being is nothing but language, text, printed pages, stories that have already been written down" (46). Carlos Fuentes cleverly notes that, like Don Quixote, every Spanish language writer comes out of the same language as Don Quixote, and thus is a product, like Don Quixote, of that language; but such a claim raises the question: why is every Spanish writer Don Quixote as opposed to *Lazarillo*, *La Celestina*, or even the Virgin Mary? The answer is simple—because of Don Quixote's final self-sacrifice the *Quijote* becomes eucharistic art, leaving *Lazarillo de Tormes*, *La Celestina*, *Milagros de Nuestra Señora* wanting. While it remains true that Spanish speakers (in Fuente's case Spanish writers) and Don Quixote share the same linguistic genetics, as do *Lazarillo*, *La Celestina* etc., Fuentes displays the full metaphysical impact of the *Quijote* on himself personally by claiming both he and all other Spanish writers *are* Don Quixote, having experienced the quixotic metamorphosis of the *Quijote*; he said it himself, he *is* Don Quixote, having become (a) Don Quixote not simply through shared linguistic culture, but also through eucharistic reading.

Michel Foucault's work further reinforces the notion of the *Quijote* as eucharistic art: first, claiming that Don Quixote is not only "nothing but language" but is also the *Quijote*, or "the book in flesh and blood" (48), and second, that the *Quijote* is "the boundary... the end of the old interplay between resemblance and signs" (46). With the notion of Don Quixote as the book in "flesh and blood," the metaphysical reading of the book then, like the Eucharist, leads to the incarnation and the physical internalization of the flesh and blood of Don Quixote within the reader; the flesh being both text and the flesh of Don Quixote himself. The book then reaches those "upper limit[s] of signification" completely breaking down the poststructuralist barrier between signifier and signified: Don Quixote being "a sign wandering through a world that [does] not recognize him" (Foucault 48), available through the internalization (reading) of the

page because of his determination to live out medieval resemblance of signs. Foucault's second insight allows one to again look at the singularity of the *Quijote's* eucharistic nature. While the *Quijote* is considered by many to be "the first modern novel," and by Fuentes to be "perhaps the most eternal novel ever written" (1986), Foucault observes that the *Quijote* is the marker, the boundary, "the end of the old interplay between resemblance and signs." Foucault's delimitation of the *Quijote* as "the end" of "resemblance and signs" is, in reality, a remark on the *Quijote's* liminality, which is hard to demarcate. While Don Quixote is the medieval apotheosis of resemblance, the *Quijote* itself is the nascency of modern difference. The novel then becomes what Mircea Eliade explains as "the threshold... the limit, the boundary, the frontier that distinguishes and opposes two worlds—and at the same time the paradoxical place where those worlds communicate, where passage from the profane to the sacred world becomes possible" (25). Foucault and Eliade both provide a second uniquely eucharistic take to the *Quijote*, apart from Don Quixote's self-sacrifice, in that the world of the reader and that of the novel can commune through the text because it is the boundary "between resemblance and signs." This internal paradox, blending modernity with antiquity, creates the perfect baroque juxtaposition of *engaño* and *desengaño*, leaving the reader, once again, to decide on their own where the novel lies in relation to resemblance and difference. While Foucault does not define what exactly *is* that boundary set by the *Quijote*, he does realize that after the *Quijote*, the new boundary, resemblance is lost and *différence* is found—meaning all novels which follow will never reach the level of eucharistic art that is the *Quijote*.

With the *Quijote* as the boundary between resemblance and signs—the boundary of artistic eucharistic possibility where signs are their resemblances with no "clearly defined frontiers of difference" (46)—the modern era is then introduced where signs lose their

resemblance and difference is defined. If the *Quijote* is the first modern novel, all novels which follow it then are both a “variation of the theme of ‘Don Quixote’:... the problem of appearance and reality” (Fuentes 1986), and, to some degree, attempts at eucharistic resemblance, the words wanting but never reaching beyond the “upper limits of signification”—the boundary that is the *Quijote*. As such, while the novel as genre may reach a kind of readership identification, or even what Suzanne Keen calls narrative empathy, no other book can attain a eucharistic aesthetic where the signified is present in the signifier as does the *Quijote*—the incorporation of such giving birth to the signified Don Quixote within the referent self of the participant-reader. Don Quixote then becomes the *hostia*, etymologically meaning the “victim” (Cruz 263-264); Don Quixote being the victim sacrificed for the world, both by his own accord (his self-sacrifice) and through mockery, to see not what it is to be perfect, but what it is to be imperfect: to be human. As such, when one partakes of the literary eucharist of the *Quijote*, one is left wanting not to state *ecce homo*, but rather *ecce homo imperfectus, pulchrum est*. The book then is not the “site of mystical union” (Cruz 267), but rather the site of the humanistic mystical union between the disciple reader and Don Quixote—the reader *becoming* (a) Don Quixote. The disciple reader can then reasonably state that in this place (the text) is one greater than the novel. As one may kneel before the priest, receive the blessed eucharist and remain unaffected, so too may one read the *Quijote* with no real transformation. It is the earnest reader, the diligent and disciple reader, who, like Don Quixote, “transcends himself by working” (Kojève 116)—which work is, in the case of this article, the representation of quixotic metamorphosis in paint. The result of this union and the action (artistic production) by the disciple reader allows him/her to see him/herself in the quixotic mirror, “a tool by which to ‘know thyself,’” inviting the reader “to *not* mistake himself for God, to avoid pride by knowing his limits, and to improve himself.” This quixotic mirror then

is “not a passive mirror of imitation but an active mirror of transformation” (Melchoir-Bonnet 106), giving new life to and prolonging the name of Don Quixote.

SAMPLE SUBMISSION LETTER

Bruce R. Burningham
Languages, Literatures, and Cultures
Campus Box 4300
Illinois State University
Normal IL 61790-4300
burningham@ilstu.edu

Professor Burningham:

I submit the attached article entitled “The Second Coming of Don Quixote: Painting and the *Quixote* as Eucharistic Art” (Word Count: 9763) for consideration in a future issue of *Cervantes Journal*. I feel that my work is both innovative and relevant to Cervantes studies generally and the *Quixote* in particular and would contribute to the work of this journal.

Thank you for your consideration. All correspondences regarding this paper should be addressed directly to me. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S Raines". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "S" and a stylized "R".

Scott Raines
1088 E. 2250 N.
Lehi UT, 84043
sraines7@gmail.com