

Intercalated Grace at Juan Palomeque's Inn

TIMOTHY MCCALLISTER

THE CAST OF INTERCALATED characters that share lodging at Juan Palomeque's inn come short of their desired allotment of happiness. Cardenio and Dorotea descend from their banishments in the Sierra Morena no closer to reconciling with their promised spouses. Don Fernando and a veiled and silent Luscinda arrive, both on their way to a loveless marriage. While Viedma and Zoraida have the prospect of marriage before them, they lack the certainty that any of Viedma's family remains to welcome them.

These same characters leave the inn with their highest hopes fulfilled. Cardenio reunites with Luscinda, Don Fernando with Dorotea, and Viedma with his brother and soon their father. How a half dozen plot lines intersect at a single point, how uniform gloom gives way to ubiquitous sunshine is the stuff of marvel. The principals credit the marvel's source. Luscinda praises "el cielo," which she sees working through "desusados y a nosotros encubiertos caminos" (I.36:449-50). Dorotea, seeing Luscinda and Cardenio in each other's arms, asks Don Fernando "si te estará bien, o te será posible deshacer lo que el cielo ha hecho" (I.36:453). Don Fernando's view amounts to a *deus ex ventis*, equating the inn itself with "[el] cielo, donde se rematan y tienen fin todas las desventuras de la tierra" (I.36:456). Others at the inn, equally beholden to Heaven's handiwork on display there, identify Heaven's hand well before they check in. Still in the Sierra Morena, Cardenio needs only Dorotea's intercalated tale to find a place in both their lives for optimism: "bien podemos esperar que el cielo nos restituya lo que es nuestro" (I.29:360). Reflecting on the first glimpse of his future wife and the agent of his salvation, Viedma praises her as "una deidad del cielo, venida a la tierra para mi gusto y para mi remedio" (I.41:497).

The curate speaks with the most precision and, as befits his profession, authority, as he gathers under one Church doctrine the inn's showcase of marvels. "[N]o acaso, como parecía, sino con particular providencia del cielo, se habían todos juntado en lugar donde menos ninguno pensaba" (1.36:453). He has plausibility on his side in dismissing chance in favor of special providence. The machinations of Lady Fortune, occupying a middle ground between randomness and divine control, anthropomorphized but not purposive (Ziolkowski 887-88), fail for the same reason: Fortune's wheel does not lock in place when its passengers reach the top.

While special providence (hereafter "Providence") might be the most defensible explanation for how the arcs of these characters all end as rainbows, the details of this Providence cannot be accounted for in a single sweep. The term carries with it centuries of biblical exegesis and theological speculation. At its broadest, it is the belief that "Dios crea todas las cosas, las conserva y las dirige a sus fines prefijados y determinados" (Garrote Pérez 21), the grounding for the curate's pronouncement. Appropriate here is the manifestation of Providence as a literary phenomenon, which John Allen labels "an integral part of all of Cervantes' fiction" (185). For him, Providence amounts to "general comic irony," the process "in which what appears to be disaster resolves itself into the reality of good fortune,' when good fortune is deserved, or in which the characters are punished by 'fortuitous' events or coincidences for their errors or for an undeserved or excessive confidence in themselves" (185).

Assuming the inquiry to be moral in nature, three of the inn's guests, Viedma, Cardenio, and Don Fernando, have claims on their good fortune that range, respectively, from some to none. With only a few letters and glancing dialogue to give insight into her interior, the evidence of Luscinda's moral standing is too thin to make the inquiry worthwhile. Only Dorotea and Zoraida survive as incontestable contenders deserving their happiness. More significant in examining the nexus of merit and fate is the realization of how little the text implies a connection. What will become evident after examining the interca-

lations in detail is that the Providence that leaves them smitten with good fortune does so with overpowering and inexplicable grace.

Using Allen's thesis as a guide, the preparatory step in the inquiry, and the least controversial aspect, is determining whether the characters ultimately find happiness or desolation. The lovers in the Cardenio-Luscinda-Dorotea-Fernando melodrama (hereafter "Cardenio melodrama") and the two principals of the *Captive's Tale* end up as winners. Barring an anomaly like Anselmo's curious impertinence, on the leeward side of nineteenth-century realism marriage means happiness. Further, Viedma is released from prison and reunited with his brother, Zoraida settles in a country that embraces her faith, and Don Fernando experiences salvation from his predacious past.

If Allen's thesis is correct, the text should reveal that, through a series of coincidences unmistakable as providential intervention, these characters are rewarded based on individual merit. Spotting coincidences is the easier of the two tasks. The one complication is that characters in this section of the novel are inclined to apply providential readings to their lives before the reader is fully able to determine whether or not their interpretations are justified. The crowning coincidence of the intercalations, the arrival of Luscinda and Don Fernando at the inn, is on its face so extraordinary that there is no reason to doubt an ascription to "el cielo." The same is true of the arrival of Viedma's brother and niece. Other invocations of Providence will require more scrutiny.

To determine whether a character deserves his fate requires the reader to act like the God of the Apocalypse, examining the value of each soul in order to separate the sheep from the goats. The inquiry is the most subjective, but it is far from outrageous. Consumers of the highest, lowest, and broadest culture are constantly sitting in judgment. Still, it is best to keep the criteria non-controversial and the judgments of these characters as generous as good sense permits. Assuming that their desired ends—marriage, freedom from captivity, reunion with family—are unobjectionable, do they take reasonable steps to realize them? If not, what shortcomings, what vices, hinder them? That readers must judge three of these characters—Cardenio, Dorotea, and Viedma—largely by their own tales creates both a challenge and an

opportunity. The challenge comes in separating third-person objectivity from first-person subjectivity; the characters serve as filters, both providing and withholding information, and then interpreting information through their prejudices. The opportunity comes in exploring how the interpretive impulse betrays the moral interior.

While an important factor for all the interpolators, the link between narrative form and character construction is indispensable with respect to Cardenio. From the outset, Cardenio controls the narration of his tale, if not by design then by default. Readers looking over Don Quijote and Sancho's shoulders must form their opinion of this new character based solely on a lovelorn sonnet and a letter. Cause and context are absent. The pain of the wound has subsumed its source, leaving the complaint as the one reality. The setup is a narcissist's dream, an op-ed page without a section A referent. All that readers can decipher are the victim's "terrible dolor" and the nearness of his death ("[p]resto habré de morir") (1.23:282). While the speaker lunges indistinctly at reified "Amor," he stops short of blaming God ("ni me viene del cielo esta rüina") or his beloved ("Si digo que sois vos, Fili, no acierto; / que tanto mal en tanto bien no cabe") (1.23:282). The gesture goes less to show Cardenio's magnanimity than his obsession with his misery.¹

The same Heaven and beloved that escape blame in Cardenio's sonnet will soon come under assault. In the letter that follows, Cardenio attacks Luscinda outright (1.23:283). And in a later poem, Cardenio indicts Heaven with a single tidy rhyme: "Y ¿quién consiente en mi duelo? / El cielo" (1.27:330). The one person not to blame is the man squeaking with moral superiority. "Mas si la virtud fuera riqueza que se estimara," he boasts, "no envidiara yo dichas ajenas ni llorara desdichas propias" (1.23:283). Cardenio's God is not Allen's Providence punishing the wicked. Cardenio's God punishes the blameless.

As easy as it is to glean evidence of Cardenio's narcissism from his first appearances in print, the conclusion becomes justified only once the circumstances behind his complaint emerge. Given the power of

1 The casting of Cardenio as desperate lover and the setting in the Sierra Morena invite comparisons to Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de amor* and, more generally, the *novela sentimental*. For an analysis of how Cervantes engages the genre see Severin.

the willing suspension of disbelief, readers may be inclined at first to respond sympathetically to this mysterious tormented soul. Cervantes is able to cultivate our sympathy then gradually upend it with evidence that the narrator is unreliable. The irony with Cardenio is that he himself makes the case for his unreliability. The tale he relates once Don Quijote and company track him down is by itself sufficient to belie his insistence that the loss of his love, and of secondary importance, the loss of his job, are the result of a cruel universe conspiring against a character of Job-like blamelessness.

With respect to Cardenio's claim on Luscinda, the question is how a man trying to lose her would have acted differently. That he even brings his suit to Luscinda's father occurs because she has directed him by letter to do so (I.27:333). He shelves his plan to seek his father's consent when presented with an offer of employment out of town. The next time he brings up the prospect of marriage is in dismissing it. "[M]e parecía," he confides to Don Fernando, "que lo que yo desease jamás había de tener efeto" (I.27:333). This is not to say that Cardenio values his career over the prospect of marriage. The character who has no difficulty expressing himself is never explicit about his career aspirations, preferring to deflect the onus of decision-making on his father. Whatever Cardenio's career aspirations, once Don Fernando snatches Luscinda, Cardenio shows no interest in keeping his job. Plotting to crash the wedding of the son of one's employer will not advance one's career, nor will taking an extended leave-of-absence in the Sierra Morena. Reading Cardenio as ambitious fails even to mesh with Cardenio's own self-aggrandizing account, no matter how much leeway is given to his penchant for revision.

As a foil to the waffling Cardenio, the "astuto" Don Fernando (I.24:295) lends his will where Cardenio's has never been exercised. He first takes the responsibility of speaking to Cardenio's father about his employee's desire to marry (I.27:333). Cardenio, meanwhile, despite his knowledge of Don Fernando's history with Dorotea, dangles before him just the kind of treat to satisfy someone for whom love is nothing but an insatiable "apetito" (I.24:295). Don Fernando's second contrast in action is to take Luscinda for himself. To this treachery Cardenio-

the-narrator² reacts with seven melodramatic vocatives (“¡Oh Mario ambicioso,” etc.) and three self-justifying rhetorical questions (“¿qué deservicios te había hecho este triste, que con tanta llaneza te descubrió los secretos y contenidos de su corazón? ¿Qué ofensa te hice? ¿Qué palabras te dije, o qué consejos te di, que no fuesen todos encaminados a acrecentar tu honra y tu provecho?” [1.27:333]). To Cardenio’s mind, the answer is *ninguno*. He is as innocent as Don Fernando is lecherous, Luscinda faithless, and Heaven indifferent. Cardenio would agree with Myriam Yvonne Jehenson, who ascribes to the entire melodrama a “postmodernist focus” that seeks to “foreground a world where characters are systematically manipulated by external forces” (214)—except that the foregrounding is of Cardenio-the-narrator, and the potent external forces are bogeymen he concocts to justify his failure. When Don Fernando sends Cardenio on an errand so that the former can carry out his treachery, Cardenio-the-narrator, like a zealous political operative, is on hand with the official spin: “¿Pude yo prevenir esta traición? ¿Pude, por ventura, caer en imaginarla? No, por cierto” (1.27:334). Along with his innocence, he insists on his helplessness: “cuando traen las desgracias la corriente de las estrellas, como vienen de alto a bajo, despeñándose con furor y con violencia, no hay fuerza en la tierra que las detenga, ni industria humana que prevenirlas pueda” (1.27:333). And a man who cannot bring himself to ask his father’s permission to marry is not going to stand in the way of the stars.

The tale’s climax all but predicts itself. Cardenio arrives on Luscinda’s wedding day, having been summoned by her in a letter, but not to whisk her off, to plead his love to Luscinda’s father, or to challenge Don Fernando; rather, to stand dutifully at Luscinda’s window and listen to her plan for their salvation (1.27:337). He will demand of her, “Hagan, señora, tus obras verdaderas tus palabras que si tú llevas daga para acreditarte, aquí llevo yo espada para defenderte con ella o para matarme si la suerte nos fuere contraria” (1.27:337). But the sword never leaves its sheath. When Cardenio emerges from behind a tapestry, it is to make a dash for his waiting mule (340). This turn of events

2 Throughout, I will distinguish narrating character from acting character using this locution.

is unsurprising given the remarkable consistence and harmony of Cardenio's character flaws, a trifecta of narcissism, cowardice, and obtuseness. David Quint wonders why Cardenio does not "step out from behind the tapestry to stop Don Fernando from marrying Luscinda" and then suggests that his inaction is a feint "in the game of male rivalry" (30), as if any explanation that relied on Cardenio's abundant weaknesses would be inadequate. "Cardenio subsequently accuses himself of cowardice for not stepping forward," Quint goes on to write, "but that is itself a mystification of his motives" (30). On the contrary, in labeling the inaction of his character "cobarde y necio" (1.27:339), Cardenio-the-narrator shows a rare, refreshing moment of clarity. Unfortunately, as he further ruminates on the climax, Cardenio-the-narrator falls back on his usual excuse making. First, when Luscinda pronounces her decisive "Sí quiero," he bewails Heaven's abandonment: "Quedé falto de consejo, desamparado, a mi parecer, de todo el cielo" (1.27:339). His second interpretation is equally deflective: "[P]ero mi suerte, que para mayores males, si es posible que los haya, me debe tener guardado, ordenó que en aquel punto me sobrase el entendimiento que después acá me ha faltado" (1.27:340). A strained evaluation: Fate orders that his wits be sharpened, so rather than taking vengeance on Luscinda or Don Fernando ("que [...] fuera fácil tomarla," the narrator's hollow boast) or turning his sword on himself as he had promised Luscinda a few minutes before, he runs off. In the convoluted psyche of Cardenio-the-narrator, his character's actions at the wedding proceed from the overflow of reason. The only implication, then, is that his character's earlier sword-rattling at Luscinda's window betrays a shortage of reason, the markings of madness.

The palimpsest continues. In running from the scene of the wedding, according to Cardenio-the-narrator, "quise tomar [la venganza] de mi mano y ejecutar en mí la pena que ellos merecían, y aun quizá con más rigor del que con ellos se usara si entonces les diera muerte" (1.27:340). Cardenio here reeks of cheap messianism. He vows to inflict on himself the punishment his enemies deserve at the very moment he shrinks from inflicting on himself the death he had promised. What Francisco Márquez-Villanueva cautiously judges to be "timidez

patológica” (51), Salvador de Madariaga is unabashed to give the trait the name it is due: “la cobardía” (90).³

Try as Cardenio may to ascribe his unhappiness to Heaven, there is little reason but to conclude that Cardenio’s misfortunes are largely his own doing. Heaven does not brag about Luscinda’s beauty before a libidinous companion, or temporize in seeking her hand, or run from the scene of her marriage without attempting to avert disaster. Still, Cardenio’s tale does not preclude Allen’s providential reading because the story has yet to be concluded. It is possible that Cardenio could experience a drastic change for the better and through a marvelous coincidence be rewarded with his longed-for Luscinda.

A step toward his needed salvation comes a few chapters later when Dorotea provides her account of Luscinda’s wedding. Cardenio-the-narrator finally lets the ink dry on a self-reproaching gloss: “Yo soy el que no tuvo ánimo para ver en qué paraba su desmayo, ni lo que resultaba del papel que le fue hallado en el pecho, porque no tuvo el alma sufrimiento para ver tantas desventuras juntas” (1.28:360). In Cardenio’s mind, all he lacks is a stout heart, “si tuviera corazón,” he says in an earlier iteration (1.27:339). As an epiphany, the admission is too narrow to satisfy. Madariaga’s diagnosis notwithstanding, there is more ailing Cardenio than cowardice. As a conversion, his admission is best gauged by how much of the familiar, knee-knocking Cardenio is on display with the appearance of Don Fernando and Luscinda at the inn.

The moment of mutual recognition is captured with a dramatic Baroque pose. “Callaban todos y mirábanse todos: Dorotea a don Fernando, don Fernando a Cardenio, Cardenio a Luscinda y Luscinda a Cardenio” (1.36:449). Cardenio’s opportunity to be the first to speak expires when Luscinda breaks the silence to beg of Don Fernando that

3 As incisive as is Madariaga’s analysis, he struggles to contain Cardenio’s character, and Cervantes’s presentation of Cardenio’s character, in the borders of this single vice. Not once does Madariaga mention narcissism as a constituent of the Cardenio psyche. One could imagine a coward who recognizes his weakness, who blames himself for his failings and candidly confesses that his lack of mettle stands between him and his success. This character would not be Cardenio, at least not the Cardenio prior to his supposed conversion in chapter 28 (“Yo soy el que no tuvo ánimo,” etc.) (1.28:360).

he release her to her mute betrothed (1.36:449). His opportunity to be the first to act expires when Dorotea throws herself at Don Fernando's feet (1.36:450). While Luscinda and Dorotea are emptying their souls to the man who holds in his power their future, Cardenio has placed himself "a las espaldas de don Fernando [...] porque no le conociese" (1.36:452), this in spite of the fact that a few paragraphs earlier, Don Fernando identifies him ("Don Fernando conoció luego a Cardenio") (1.36:449). The staging provides a perfect emblem of Cardenio's ridiculous solipsism. Like a child closing his eyes so no one will see him, Cardenio believes that by retreating from the periphery of his nemesis he will be invisible.

Not until Don Fernando pronounces the pivotal "[v]enciste, hermosa Dorotea, venciste" does Cardenio risk stepping into view (1.36:452). As Luscinda faints, Cardenio noiselessly emerges to catch her, "pospuesto todo temor y aventurando a todo riesgo" (a comment that begs an ironic reading) (1.36:452). The last time Luscinda fainted, she landed in the arms of her mother. This time the fainting bride is given away to the one man she loves. The temptation to read evidence of Cardenio's reformation should be tempered with the realization that, if catching a fainting woman is the one hurdle to divine reward, Cervantes's Providence is easily impressed. The description that follows adds to the call for caution. "[A]unque Cardenio tenía abrazada a Luscinda, no quitaba los ojos de don Fernando, con determinación de que, si le viese hacer algún movimiento en su perjuicio, procurar defenderse y ofender como mejor pudiese a todos aquellos que en su daño se mostrasen, aunque le costase la vida" (1.36:453). The window to Cardenio's interior closes with a reprise of his pipsqueak belligerence. The aporia is comic. He will do whatever it takes to win his lady, even risk his life—as long as he does not get hurt.

Dorotea, the interpolator who follows Cardenio, is unlike him in that her invocation of Providence is not as a shield for her failings but as a lamp to shed light on the mysterious. When her servant makes threatening overtures to her, Dorotea pushes him over a precipice. A rationalist would say that the force that saves her is gravity, allowing someone with "pocas fuerzas" and "poco trabajo" to work fatal vio-

lence (1.28:358). Steeped in the Catholic worldview of her age, however, Dorotea calls this force “el justo cielo, que pocas o ningunas veces deja de mirar y favorecer a las justas intenciones” (1.28:358). She likewise sees Providence working in her favor when she learns of Don Fernando’s failed attempt to marry Luscinda. The “impedimento,” she believes, is Heaven’s way of reminding Don Fernando “lo que al primero debía” (1.28:357). Where Providence seems to have stayed its hand, Dorotea maintains a stoic attitude; like her servant, the *ganadero* that subsequently hires Dorotea tries to force himself on her. This time Dorotea has to flee: “como no siempre la fortuna con los trabajos da los remedios, no hallé derrumbadero ni barranco de donde despeñar y despenar al amo” (1.28:358). Had the story been Cardenio’s, we would be bracing for a torrent of woe-is-me, curse-the-heavens melancholia.

Where Cardenio escapes to the Sierra Morena, if we are to believe his account, to play the suffering messiah, Dorotea, if we are to believe her account, has more circumscribed plans in mind. She explains that she has sought refuge there to “rogar al cielo se duela de mi desventura y me dé industria y favor para salir della, o para dejar la vida entre estas soledades, sin que quede memoria desta triste” (1.28:358). This statement is in some tension with one that follows. On finishing her story, Dorotea forestalls a sympathetic response when she cautions, “veréis que será en vano el consuelo, pues es imposible el remedio della” (1.29:359). She may mean that any remedy that humans try to hatch will be in vain, as only divine intervention can save her, or it could mean that she has come to the conclusion that her case is too hopeless to be set right. Whatever questions there may be of her motivation in escaping to the Sierra Morena, they become moot when Don Fernando appears at the inn and she sees the opportunity to remedy her misfortune. The “industria” she claims to have sought from Heaven materializes as she grovels for her beloved to take her as his wife. The fierceness with which she pleads for a happy fate sets her apart from both Cardenio and Viedma.

If one could fault Dorotea it would be for an excess of initiative rather than a deficiency. There exists the potential to read her as an arriviste-in-waiting, too eager to enmesh herself with a grandee’s son.

This view of Dorotea would undermine her portrayal as victim petitioning Providence to vindicate her. Instead, she would appear more as a schemer whose cry for divine succor is a ploy to gain sympathy. The evidence for this view comes ironically from Dorotea herself. The problem of a character who takes no second in communicating her self-awareness is that she is bound to expose herself to points of criticism. From the beginning of her narration of Don Fernando's advances she is forthright in confessing the flattery inherent in being pursued by a nobleman: "me daba un no sé qué de contento verme tan querida y estimada de un tan principal caballero" (1.28:350). Later, as she recounts her thought process the night of her secret wedding, she addresses the possibilities of her own advancement directly:

Sí, que no seré yo la primera que por vía de matrimonio haya subido de humilde a grande estado, ni será don Fernando el primero a quien hermosura, o ciega afición, que es lo más cierto, haya hecho tomar compañía desigual a su grandeza. Pues si no hago ni mundo ni uso nuevo, bien es acudir a esta honra que la suerte me ofrece, puesto que en éste no dure más la voluntad que me muestra de cuanto dure el cumplimiento de su deseo; que, en fin, para con Dios seré su esposa. (1.28:353)

The phrase "bien es acudir a esta honra que la suerte me ofrece" is the very definition of opportunism: fortune has presented her with honors that she would be foolish to pass up. Context, however, complicates what should be an easy fit. Dorotea makes this decision from a position of powerlessness rather than strength. Don Fernando is already in her room. Her household staff has been bribed into complicity with the intruder. Rape looms as a certainty, and neither Dorotea nor her father would have any political clout to prosecute the crime, let alone mitigate the damage to Dorotea's marketability as a bride. What begins as opportunism now looks more like rationalization. Fate has given her an ultimatum. She copes by painting the corner in which she is trapped in cheery colors, at the same time never letting go of the possibility that Don Fernando might leave her. Deciphering any more

about her motivations is made difficult by the fact that she remains coy about whether she even loves Don Fernando.

The more pointed question is whether she deserves better. Don Fernando would be a candidate for the same eternal torment as a kindred treacherous cad, Don Juan, up to the moment he pronounces “venciste.” Given that our acquaintance with him is filtered through the two characters who feel that he has monstrously wronged them, it is legitimate to wonder whether a more objective account would portray him in a better light. Our opinion of him is poisoned from the first mention of his name, through an introduction made third hand. A goatherd recounts to Don Quijote and Sancho that the madman wandering the Sierra Morena, later to be identified as Cardenio, is known to rave, “¡Ah, fementido Fernando! ¡Aquí, aquí me pagarás la sinrazón que me heciste: estas manos te sacarán el corazón, donde albergan y tienen manida todas las maldades juntas, principalmente la fraude y el engaño!” (I.23:288). Dorotea’s first gloss on Don Fernando is just as damning, albeit more literary: “no sé yo de qué sea heredero, sino de las traiciones de Vellido y de los embustes de Galalón” (I.28:348). Cardenio will candidly confess to Don Quijote and Sancho that he initially thought better of his companion, a “mozo gallardo, gentil-hombre, liberal y enamorado” (I.24:294). This contrast in perceived character and subsequent actions serve to strengthen Cardenio’s case that Don Fernando is treacherous. Were Don Fernando’s depravity apparent from the start of the relationship, neither Cardenio nor Dorotea would have grounds to call him false.

The possibility that the Don Fernando of Cardenio and Dorotea’s intercalations is incompatible with the Don Fernando that arrives at Juan Palomeque’s inn is negligible. If the reader can divorce the facts of Cardenio’s story from his self-serving interpretation, not a difficult task, Don Fernando seems to be a stable static character: motivated principally by non-monogamous sexual desire with no moral scruples regarding the means to his gratification. Bribing Dorotea’s servants, consenting to a secret wedding, and stealing Cardenio’s sweetheart are functional equivalents: all are means to his libidinous end.

Some scholars, including Quint and Cesáreo Bandera have sought to complicate the nature of Don Fernando's desire, and Cardenio's as well, by applying elements of Girard's mimetic theory. Quint succinctly states the argument's crucial claims: "The actions of the two male lovers [Cardenio and Don Fernando] have all along been motivated by their desire to best each other," (52) and "[t]heir desire for the woman has been conditioned by the fact that the other desires her" (52). It is temporally impossible for Cardenio's desire for Luscinda to be in any way dependent on Don Fernando's desire for her. Don Fernando does not appear in Cardenio's life until well after Cardenio's desire for Luscinda has been established (1.27:332). With respect to Don Fernando, applications of mimetic theory are equally superfluous. He is a man attracted to beautiful women who does not consider conventional morality an obstacle to his sexual satisfaction. There is no textual support for the claim that Don Fernando's desire for Luscinda is motivated by the fact that Cardenio desires her. Cardenio narrates the birth of Don Fernando's desire for Luscinda in this way: "mis alabanzas movieron en él los deseos de querer ver doncella de tantas buenas partes adornada" (1.24.296). Cardenio's praise of Luscinda's "buenas partes"⁴ is the catalyst of Don Fernando's interest. On seeing her for the first time, Don Fernando, according to Cardenio, "[e]nmudeció, perdió el sentido, quedó absorto y, finalmente, tan enamorado" (1.24:296). While Cardenio is the companion to Don Fernando's voyeurism at Luscinda's window, he does nothing to mediate the onset of Don Fernando's attraction. Don Fernando is simply smitten with her beauty. However unreliable a judge of human nature Cardenio may be, his account is the only one readers have. The one snippet of the intercalation that shows his rival taking an interest in Cardenio's desire for Luscinda occurs when Cardenio notes that Don Fernando "[p]rocuraba siempre [...] leer los papeles que yo a Luscinda enviaba y los que ella me respondía, a título que de la discreción de los dos gustaba mucho" (1.24:296). But

4 Cardenio uses the same phrase, "buenas partes," to describe Don Fernando's interest in Dorotea (1.24: 294). Cervantes seems to be underscoring in both cases that Don Fernando's desire consists wholly of an attraction to physically beautiful women. The existence of a mediator to pique this desire is as unnecessary with Dorotea as it is with Luscinda.

by this time, Don Fernando's desire for Luscinda has already been well established. The pleasure that Don Fernando derives from "la discreción" of Luscinda and Cardenio's romance more likely is due to the perverse satisfaction he derives knowing the futility of their discretion, for he is erstwhile plotting how he will make Luscinda his own. Finally, were Cardenio's desire a mediating factor in Don Fernando's desire for Luscinda, we would expect Don Fernando's interest in her to abate once Cardenio, the supposed mediator, has disappeared. This is not the case.

Any doubts as to whether Don Fernando is motivated by any other desire than amoral sexual rapacity, or whether he has been unjustly or inaccurately portrayed, should be quelled by Luscinda's revelations at the inn. After she botches their wedding, in effect denying herself to Don Fernando, he tries to kill her, then later abducts her from a convent. The Don Fernando who arrives at the inn, without any encouragement from Cardenio, is still intent on having Luscinda for himself. Furthermore, with an attempted murder and kidnapping behind him, Don Fernando has degenerated from reprobate to criminal fugitive. Dorotea will kneel before Don Fernando and recapitulate her entire relationship with him, to which Don Fernando will bless as "tantas verdades juntas" (1.36:452). This imprimatur on Dorotea's reliability marks the end of a sentence that Don Fernando begins with "[v]enciste, hermosa Dorotea, venciste," an admission which is rightly remembered as the more famous clause in his reply, for it heralds the most dramatic of dramatic changes. Dorotea kneels before Don Fernando, and when she rises, he is a different character. "[E]l valeroso pecho de don Fernando—en fin, como alimentado con ilustre sangre—se ablandó y se dejó vencer de la verdad, que él no pudiera negar aunque quisiera" (1.36:454). The description might indicate that reasoned entreaties plus noble blood will inevitably yield a favorable outcome, except for the detail that Don Fernando's change is beyond his control ("no pudiera negar aunque quisiera"). Something outside the character seems to be reaching in. Don Fernando speaks the language of spiritual conversion in signaling "disculpa de todos mis yerros," as does the narrator when marking Don Fernando's sentimental effusion as "indubi-

tables señas de su amor y arrepentimiento” (1.36:454). The possibility of conversion, a fortuitous change of character, is consistent with this section's fortuitous changes of plot if Providence is the force behind both. The key Scripture for understanding this brand of Providence is not the apocryphal “God works in mysterious ways his wonders to perform” but God's self-revelation to Moses in Exodus 33:19, repeated in Romans 9:15: “miserebor cuius misereor et misericordiam praestabo cuius miserebor” (*Biblia Sacra Vulgata*).⁵

The impulse to bring a sharper focus to the mechanism of Don Fernando's salvation would have been stronger among Cervantes's first generation of readers. Not until 1607 would Pope Paul V settle (if a decree of tolerance can be considered a settlement) the half-century feud between the Jesuits and Dominicans over God's role in the imputation of grace. The *de auxiliis* controversy, which Márquez-Villanueva aptly describes in another context as the “ruidosa cuestión de *auxiliis*” (*Orígenes* 132), had two generations of theologians fighting to occupy the pinhead's width space allowed between God's sovereignty and human free will.⁶ That Cervantes would be using Don Fernando to concretize the theological arcana of one position over the other is dubious. It is possible, however, that Cervantes has incorporated the basic framework of the controversy. Providence has plotted the junction of this set of characters at this place, Juan Palomeque's inn, and at this time—after Cardenio and Dorotea have debriefed each other on key pieces of information that the other lacked but before Don Fernando has consummated his relationship with Luscinda.⁷ In effect, Providence has orchestrated the one scenario in which Don Fernando would be swayed by the entreaties that he leave Luscinda for Dorotea. This would be a gloss suitable for the *molinista* camp. A partisan of the opposing view, that espoused by Domingo Báñez, would latch on to the narrator's hint that Don Fernando is already inclined for the better,

5 “I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion” (*The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version*).

6 For an overview of the *de auxiliis* controversy, see “Congregatio de Auxiliis.”

7 For Cardenio, the knowledge that Luscinda's love for him kept her from finalizing her marriage to Don Fernando; for Dorotea, the knowledge that the man Luscinda loves is still alive and loves her.

a “valeroso pecho [...] en fin, como alimentado con ilustre sangre,” as evidence of Providence’s role in priming him to accept the opportunity offered to him. One could imagine the puckishness that might have moved Cervantes to communicate in the *de auxiliis* register without giving either side the satisfaction of knowing whether he was singing its anthem.

From a literary perspective, the most striking aspect of Don Fernando’s conversion is its static nature, static in the sense that Don Fernando goes from evil to good without moving through time or space. The entire conversion occupies the length of a few paragraphs, or a few narrative minutes. Perhaps Cervantes had some concern that the conversion could be perceived as too rapid, and therefore less plausible, for the scene plays out as an odd two-stage conversion in rapid succession. The first stage is Dorotea’s entreaty that Don Fernando accept her as his rightful spouse, followed by his acquiescence. The second stage centers on Don Fernando’s desire to take vengeance on Cardenio after Cardenio catches Luscinda in his arms. The narrator recounts Dorotea’s supplication that he let Cardenio and Luscinda alone and makes passing reference to the supplications of practically everyone else in the room, from the curate and barber to Sancho Panza. It is not clear what would be Don Fernando’s lingering grief against Cardenio. Cardenio’s only conflict with Don Fernando is that they both have designs on the same woman, but accepting Dorotea as spouse necessarily implies that Don Fernando give up Luscinda. Don Fernando would have to be occupying some irrational moment in which he thinks he can still have both women for himself. The remonstrations are effective, and Don Fernando relents, but by drawing out the tension for a few paragraphs more, Cervantes is able to convey the idea, if only in a limited way, that Don Fernando’s passage from villain to hero comes with some internal struggle. In no sense, however, does the passage involve physical movement on Don Fernando’s part. Cervantes flouts any conventions of character reformation. There is no trial through which Don Fernando learns the error of his ways. He simply stands in place and receives grace.

In summary, a providential reading of the Cardenio melodrama of the kind Allen advocates for the larger novel fails as an interpretation that would link a character's merit to his reward. The fate of the four lovers is unquestionably happy and the mechanism of bringing them all to the inn, with an accompanying radical change of heart in Don Fernando, is unquestionably beyond the scope of the natural. Something greater is at work. But do they deserve their fates? Dorotea has a strong case to make; Don Fernando and Cardenio do not. In any event, the text does not seem to be concerned with whether these characters merit their rewards. Outcomes simply happen, and the best the characters can do is thank God for their good fortune.

As with the Cardenio melodrama, submitting the Captive's Tale to Allen's Providence thesis leaves readers asking, "What has this character done to deserve such good fortune?" Viedma is the last interpolator to share his tale, an intriguing polarity of action and passivity. His adulthood begins, and in terms of the confines of the tale, the plot of his character is set in motion by the actions of someone else: his father gives him a choice of three professions (1.39:473-74). On the other hand, he does not hesitate to accept the career of soldier; and he remits to his father a portion of the inheritance, an example that his brothers follow (1.39:475).

The boldness he evinces in leaping from his ship to Uchalí's galley (1.39:477) would rise to bravery, except that his resultant capture begs that that bravery be recast as rashness. Once imprisoned, he speaks of making numerous unsuccessful attempts to escape but never elaborates (1.40:485). Zoraida's money buys his liberty. The renegade provides the plan of purchasing a vessel in Algiers. Even accepting Viedma's limited powers as a prisoner, he could still have contributed ideas. The two times he does offer suggestions in the course of the escape—to send a freedman to Europe for a ship and, later, to release Zoraida's father and servants—the renegade overrules them as imprudent. In the entire affair of Viedma's flight from Algiers to Spain there is only one instance of resolve meeting utility. The narration rings with welcome authority: "Y así, determiné de ir al jardín y ver si podría hablarla" (1.41:496). Besides

speaking with Zoraida, Viedma is able to study the entrances and exits to her home, useful intelligence in plotting her willing abduction.

One early insight into Viedma's interpretive style comes when he is promoted to captain, which Viedma-the-narrator attributes to "buena suerte," rather than to his "merecimientos" (1.39:477). Like Cardenio, and to a lesser extent Dorotea, Viedma has the habit of interpreting the vicissitudes of his life as the product of forces beyond his control. But where Cardenio uses this technique to obscure his failings, Viedma seems merely to be deflecting attention from himself. The effect is modesty. More broadly, the interpretive gesture shows how Viedma identifies himself as a small part in a larger whole. Stationed in Navarino with his master Uchalí, Viedma describes in this way Spain's missed opportunity to capture the Turkish fleet: "Pero el cielo lo ordenó de otra manera, no por culpa ni descuido del general que a los nuestros regía, sino por los pecados de la cristiandad, y porque quiere y permite Dios que tengamos siempre verdugos que nos castiguen" (1.39:478).⁸ Viedma seems as comfortable seeing Providence's role on a grand scale as in the arc of his individual life.

The ambiguities of Viedma's character find their most memorable representation at the turning point of the story, also of Viedma's life, and so demand a close reading. "Acaeció, pues, que un día, estando en un terrado de nuestra prisión con otros tres compañeros, [...] alcé acaso los ojos y vi que por aquellas cerradas ventanillas que he dicho parecía una caña, y al remate della puesto un lienzo atado, y la caña se estaba blandando y moviéndose" (1.40:486-87). The only interpretive footprints are "acaeció" and "acaso." It "happens" that Viedma is standing on the terrace; he "happens" to raise his eyes. An atheist might tell the same story the same way, as would a neutral journalist—the "what" without mention of the "why." The clause that follows provides interpretation but only in the narrow, descriptive sense: "casi como si hiciera señas que llegásemos a tomarla"—a reasonable conjecture, par-

⁸ Paul Descouzis notes that Viedma's gloss here and regarding the capture of the Goleta fortress ("fue particular gracia y merced que el cielo hizo a España en permitir que se asolase aquella oficina y capa de maldades" [Cervantes 1.39:480]) track closely, if not phrase by phrase, with the Council of Trent's decretal of November 25, 1551 on "obras de satisfacción" (479-80).

ticularly Viedma's identification of the potential recipient as his group (the *nosotros* of "llegásemos") rather than himself (1.40:487). "Miramos en ello," begins the next sentence, implying that Viedma has alerted his three companions to the waving reed. The sentence continues with a striking change of subject: "y uno de los que conmigo estaban fue a ponerse debajo de la caña, por ver si la soltaban, o lo que hacían" (1.40:487). Viedma is the one who notices the waving reed, yet it is one of his companions who takes the initiative to approach it. Another instance of Viedma's passivity? More is at work. Each of Viedma's three companions stands under the reed and each is spurned. The action produces an echo that has both biblical and mythic sources. Without narratorial overlay, the account begins to reinterpret itself, infusing purpose where chance seemed the governing principal. The rewrite is not complete. In an ambiguous admission that may indicate that he thinks he stands as good a chance as the other three to induce the reed to fall, along with a guarded hope that he might be the one for whom the reed is intended, Viedma-the-narrator goes on to say, "[N]o quise dejar de probar la suerte" (1.40:487).

Once the reed is dropped at his feet, any doubt about the randomness of the event disappears. "Si me holgué con el hallazgo, no hay para qué decirlo, pues fue tanto el contento como la admiración de pensar de dónde podía venirnos aquel bien, especialmente a mí, pues las muestras de no haber querido soltar la caña sino a mí claro decían que a mí se hacía la merced" (1.40:487). Not by chance is Viedma on the terrace that day, raising his eyes to the window, and holding back as his companions try unsuccessfully to win a favorable response from the strange sight in the window. Zoraida, as the metonymic waving reed, becomes an emblem of providential intervention and an agent in the larger story of how Providence guides Viedma to his rescue. No overt act of his can account for his salvation, or, for that matter, his marriage. Zoraida demands both.

Luis Andrés Murillo asks the pertinent question, "Why, indeed, would she choose from among all the captives (and caballeros) she saw in the baño a lover and husband who was twice her age?" (235). His answer explores the way in which Cervantes develops archetypes

from extant captivity narratives. Zoraida herself provides an enigmatic clue to solving the mystery. In her first letter she writes, “No sé yo cómo vaya: muchos cristianos he visto por esta ventana, y ninguno me ha parecido caballero sino tú.” (1.40:489). As a sufficient justification for Viedma’s good fortune, the comment would go to show, as with Cardenio’s catching the fainting Luscinda, that Providence has a low favor threshold. All Viedma has to do is hold a caballero’s pose in the prison yard to have piles of gold and an Algerian beauty thrown his way. This scene of Viedma’s salvation from prison parallels Don Fernando’s salvation from his depravity. Both men simply stand in place and let a woman mediate their rescue. Read with the “ilustre sangre” comment at the moment of Don Fernando’s conversion, Zoraida’s revelation suggests that, while Providence may see a kernel of something worthwhile in the object of its blessings, the full extent of its outpouring is inexplicable except by grace. One authority that never reflects on the merits of Zoraida’s choice is Viedma-the-narrator. The rationales range from humility to false humility to disinterest to the satisfaction that the wisdom of Zoraida’s choice speaks for itself. If anything, Viedma’s lack of curiosity about Zoraida’s interest in him puts a final tally in the passivity column.

Lest readers have any doubts about Viedma’s tendency toward inertia, Cervantes provides a point of reference in the highly motivated character of Zoraida. A woman, a onetime infidel, a non-Spanish speaker—these indicia of marginality do nothing to hinder her dynamism. Had her role in the tale been nothing other than that of a convert, she would be rightly remembered as the most driven character in the intercalation. To pass from one religion to another, especially when the passage is from Islam to Christianity, two civilizations at war, each faith condemning the adherents of the other to eternal damnation, is to show unparalleled initiative. In an age in which every human endeavor, from war to philosophy to art, was informed by religious dogma, choosing a new religious faith meant completely redefining oneself and one’s outlook. Gender reassignment might be the only suitable analogy in today’s world. Zoraida’s conversion goes to the core of her personhood.

Her self-motivation continues past her conversion. In all her dealings with Viedma, Zoraida shows herself to be the go-getter, the mover, the planner—all of which Viedma is not. Even when she claims not to have a plan she has a plan. “Yo no sé, mi señor, cómo dar orden que nos vamos a España, ni Lela Marién me lo ha dicho, aunque yo se lo he preguntado” (1.40:492). And then in the next sentences she lays out what the group ought to do:

[L]o que se podrá hacer es que yo os daré por esta ventana muchísimos dineros de oro; rescataos vos con ellos, y vuestros amigos, y vaya uno en tierra de cristianos y compre allá una barca y vuelva por los demás; y a mí me hallarán en el jardín de mi padre, que está a la puerta de Babazón, junto a la marina, donde tengo de estar todo este verano con mi padre y con mis criados. De allí, de noche, me podréis sacar sin miedo y llevarme a la barca[.] (1.40:492)

Nowhere in Viedma's narration does he show a comparable clarity of purpose.

If the crowning act of decisiveness in Zoraida's life is her religious conversion, the crowning act of decisiveness in the *Captive's Tale* is Zoraida's election of her spouse and savior. In Cervantes's Spain, the idea of a woman proposing to a man would be absurd. In an exotic heathen land, a prison yard abutting a noble's castle becomes a liminal space where free-floating social norms can be pinned down and rearranged by whoever is the first to take the initiative. Márquez-Villanueva aptly summarizes Zoraida's starring role. “En el caso de Zoraida y el Capitán es inútil partir de ninguna inclinación erótica ni mutuamente compartida. La iniciativa pertenece por completo a la dama, presencia oculta tras la celosía y elección manifestada por el lenguaje inapelable de la caña” (116). What Cervantes gives us is not Edmond Dantès sailing off with Princess Haydée as much as Rochester being led away by Jane Eyre. “Reader, I married him” (Brontë 482). Had Zoraida been able to share her story, the line could have easily been hers.

Michael Gerli includes the *Captive's Tale* among those Spanish works that betray “a deep nostalgia for a multicultural world governed

by a humane ethos of tolerance, peaceful coexistence, and assimilation” (59). On the level of religion, the Captive’s Tale vindicates the need for assimilation to Christianity. As Gerli argues, the intercalation is Cervantes’s rewriting of the myth of *La Cava Rumía*, where “la mala mujer cristiana” (I.4I:506) becomes the touchstone of Christian piety. The blessings that accrue to Zoraida—a husband, freedom from her palatial confinement, a new life in a new country—are only blessings if one considers Christianity the true religion. In Zoraida’s continual acknowledgement of Lela Marién, her intercessor and providential avatar, she seeks to cast her own narrative as the triumph of Christian faith. In this way she fulfills the promise Jesus makes to his disciples in Mark 10:29-30:

Respondens Iesus ait amen dico vobis nemo est qui reliquerit domum aut fratres aut sorores aut matrem aut patrem aut filios aut agros propter me et propter evangelium qui non accipiat centies tantum nunc in tempore hoc domos et fratres et sorores et matres et filios et agros cum persecutionibus et in saeculo futuro vitam aeternam.⁹ (*Biblia Sacra Vulgata*)

By the same token, if Zoraida represents *la buena mujer cristiana* she must also represent *la mala mujer musulmana*. From the vantage of Islam, Zoraida is an infidel. Her abandonment of her father undermines patriarchal culture as much as her marriage proposal to Viedma. In discarding the wealth and prestige she knew in Algiers for an uncertain future as the wife of a rootless and penniless soldier she displays a madness no less quixotic than that of the novel’s title character.

Like other intercalated characters, Zoraida’s own attempts to write divine purpose into her life, as these ascriptions come filtered to us through Viedma’s account, prejudice the question of teleology. She is most like Dorotea in her constant effort to invoke divine power while

9 Jesus said, “Truly I tell you, there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or fields, for my sake and for the sake of the good news, who will not receive a hundredfold now in this age—houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and fields, with persecutions—and in the age to come eternal life” (*The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version*).

simultaneously effacing the role she plays in effecting her desired ends. Their own interpretations aside, Zoraida and Dorotea tend to undermine Allen's Providence thesis, not by showing themselves unworthy of divine intervention, as their male counterparts do, but by showing through their deeds that, even if Heaven plants the seeds of their good fortune, it is only by their diligence that those seeds are brought to fruition.

Amid the dazzling and at times chaotic first-person narrations and reinterpretations, piecemeal plot development, fusing of past and present, irruptions and interruptions, the reading of "El curioso impertinente," set in the center of the narrative storm like the eye of a hurricane, affords the reader a few tranquil pages of linearity. An examination of the content of the *novela ejemplar* is beyond the scope of this article. A brief look at its effect on the inn's guests is worthwhile. At the close of the story's reading, the curate dwells on its fictionality:

—Bien —dijo el cura— me parece esta novela; pero no me puedo persuadir que esto sea verdad; y si es fingido, fingió mal el autor, porque no se puede imaginar que haya marido tan necio, que quiera hacer tan costosa experiencia como Anselmo. Si este caso se pusiera entre un galán y una dama, pudiérase llevar, pero entre marido y mujer, algo tiene del imposible; y en lo que toca al modo de contarle, no me descontenta. (1.35:446)

While generally dangerous in *Don Quijote* to affix the author's imprimatur on a character's literary commentary, here Cervantes may be emphasizing the distance between the universe of "El curioso impertinente" and the universe of the *venta* looking in on it. Anselmo's laboratory is not the messy place where people come straggling in, tell their tales, reinterpret their tales, and without respect to flashes of virtue or mountains of vice feel the tug of Providence dragging them to happiness.

Ample room remains for irony, for the providential world of the intercalations is no less improbable than Anselmo and Lothario's world of marital experimentation. The curate can scoff at the story's implau-

sibility and in the next chapter marvel how Providence shepherds his flock to Juan Palomeque's front room and keeps the sheep penned in until everyone can leave satisfied. It bears remembering that the same curate was ready to excise Felicia and her enchanted water from the pages of Don Quijote's copy of *La Diana* (1.6:118). In *La Diana*, distraught characters set out for Felicia's castle intent that the enchantress will magically resolve their problems. Providence, Cervantes's Felicia, works from the outside in, orchestrating the convergence of distraught characters on a place where dynamos like Dorotea, at the inn, and Zoraida, in the prison yard, can catalyze a resolution. Whether the mechanism is called Providence or Felicia, both are ways to divinize the author's heavy hand.

As a descriptive account of nonfictional reality the intercalations must fail. Insert a character no matter how narcissistic and cowardly (Cardenio), depraved (Don Fernando), or stolid (Viedma) and he will come out with the patriarchy's jackpot: an impossibly beautiful bride. As an aspirational account, the teleology of the Cardenio melodrama and *Captive's Tale* depends on its connection to the teleology of the larger novel. It may be that these intercalations are another fiction, close enough in their account of Providence to cohere to each other but indistinct from the way in which Don Quijote's universe is organized, if that universe is organized at all. Cardenio and company, Viedma, and Zoraida all speak for themselves—not for the protagonist, not for the protagonist's novel. These characters are as much guests of Don Quijote as they are of Juan Palomeque. Just as “El curioso impertinente” is returned to its trunk once Don Quijote resumes his adventures, so too the interpolators and the extravagant Providence watching over them are returned to oblivion.

tam6s@virginia.edu
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Works Cited

- Allen, John J. "The Providential World of Cervantes' Fiction." *Thought* 55 (1980): 184-95.
- Bandera, Cesáreo. "Monda y desnuda": *La humilde historia de don Quijote*. Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2005.
- Biblia Sacra Vulgata*. Ed. Roger Gryson, et al. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publications, 2006.
- Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. New York: The Century Company, 1906.
- Cervantes Saavedra, Miguel de. *El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Ed. Luis Andrés Murillo. 2 vols. Madrid: Castalia, 1982.
- "Congregatio de Auxiliis." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. 28 Feb. 2011. <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen>>.
- Descouzis, Paul M. "Reflejos del Concilio de Trento en el *Quijote*." *Hispania* 47 (1964): 479-84.
- Garrote Pérez, Francisco. *La naturaleza en el pensamiento de Cervantes*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1979.
- Gerli, E. Michael. *Refiguring Authority: Reading, Writing, and Rewriting in Cervantes*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1995.
- Jehenson, Myriam Yvonne. "The Dorotea-Fernando/Luscinda-Cardenio Episode in *Don Quijote*: A Postmodernist Play." *MLN* 107 (1992): 205-19.
- Madariaga, Salvador de. *Guía del lector del QUIJOTE*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1976.
- Márquez-Villanueva, Francisco. *Orígenes y elaboración de «El burlador de Sevilla»*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca: 1996.
- . *Personajes y temas del QUIJOTE*. Salamanca: Taurus, 1975.
- Murillo, Luis Andrés. "Cervantes' Tale of the Captive Captain." *Florilegium Hispanicum: Medieval and Golden Age Studies Presented to Dorothy Clotelle Clark*. Ed. John S. Geary. Madison, WI: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, 1983. 229-43.
- The Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version with Apocrypha*. Ed. Bruce M. Metzger, et al. New York: Oxford UP, 2006.
- Quint, David. *Cervantes's Novel of Modern Times*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003.
- Severin, Dorothy S. "Diego de San Pedro's *Arnalte y Lucenda*: Subtext for the Cardenio Episode of *Don Quijote*." *Studies on the Spanish Sentimental Romance: 1440-1550*. Ed. Gwara, Joseph J. and E. Michael Gerli. London: Tamesis, 1997. 145-52.
- Ziolkowski, Eric. J. "Don Quijote's Windmill and Fortune's Wheel." *Modern Language Review* 86 (1991): 885-97.