In an insightful essay on the representation of racial and religious difference in early modern English drama, Ania Loomba has pointed out the crucial significance of gender in this respect. More often than not, she observes, ‘a fair maid of an alien faith and ethnicity [is] romanced by a European, married to him, and converted to Christianity. Her story, unlike those of converted men, does not usually end in tragedy, nor does it focus on the tensions of cultural crossings’.1 The best known example in English drama of this ideologeme (to use Fredric Jameson’s useful term) of female romantic conversion, is surely the story of Jessica’s intermarriage and conversion in *The Merchant of Venice* (1596-7), a rewriting in some respects of Abigail’s less fortunate trajectory in Marlowe’s *The Jew of Malta* (1590).2 The most famous example of an opposite situation – the impossible cultural integration of a converted male – would probably be the tragic fate of Othello (1605). Loomba discusses Jessica’s case alongside other examples of successful female conversion, and unsuccessful male conversion, in later English plays about the Orient. But perhaps the most striking analogy with Jessica’s case is to be found not in English drama, but in Spanish literature: the story of the conversion from Islam of Zoraida, the beautiful young daughter of a rich Algerian Moor named Agi Morato.3

---


2 I have in mind Jameson’s definition of an ideologeme, in *The Political Unconscious*, Ithaca 1981, as ‘a historically determinate conceptual or semic complex which can project itself variously in the form of a “value system”, or in the form of a protornarrative, a private or collective narrative fantasy’ (p. 115).

3 There is an extensive body of scholarship on Jessica’s conversion in *Merchant
Cervantes had probably composed this tale around 1589-90 and later inserted it as an inset piece within the first part of Don Quixote de la Mancha (1605). For the sake of those who are not fully familiar with the tale, I will briefly describe some of its main features. The narrator, a Christian captain lately returned from Algiers in the company of a veiled lady in Moorish dress, tells Don Quixote and a group of other listeners about his recent deliverance from captivity by the hand of Zoraida. The captain relates how one day, while he and other captives were confined to the prison courtyard bordering Agi Morato’s house, Zoraida smuggled him some money, a hand-made cross, and a note in Arabic which said:

When I was a little girl my father had a slave woman who taught me in my own language a Christian zalá, or prayer, and told me many things about Lela Marién. The Christian slave died, and I know she did not go to the fire but to Allah, because afterward I saw her two times, and she told me to go to a Christian land to see Lela Marién, who loved me very much. I do not know how to go: I have seen many Christians through this window, and none has seemed a gentleman [but] you. I am very beautiful and young, and I have good deal of money to take with me; see if you can plan how we can go, and when we

as well as on Zoraida’s conversion in ‘The Captive’s Tale’. But surprisingly little critical energy has been dedicated to a comparative discussion of these two works. For a recent theorization of early modern European constructions of the enemy as at once, interdependently, Jewish and Muslim – a study that compares Shylock and Othello from this perspective but symptomatically does not allude, even in passing, to Jessica and Zoraida – see G. Anidjar, The Jew, the Arab: A History of the Enemy, Stanford 2003, esp. pp. 101-112. Anidjar suggestively points out that there ‘is to this day no comparative study, no extended association by way of literary analysis, of the two plays once best known as The Merchant of Venice and The Moor of Venice, an absence that has failed to be noticed even by the very few who do engage the comparison’ (p.102). Interestingly, one of the few to engage the comparison is B. Everett who is concerned, tellingly enough, with the Spanish context of the latter play. See her “Spanish” Othello: The Making of Shakespeare’s Moor”, in: Shakespeare and Race (above, n. 1), pp. 64-81, esp. p. 65.

are there you can be my husband if you like, and if you do not, it will not matter, because *Lela Marién* will give me someone to marry. I wrote this; be careful who you ask to read it: do not trust any Moor, because they are all false. I am very worried about that: I wish you would not show it to anybody, because if my father finds out, he will throw me in a well and cover me with stones. I will put a thread on the reed: tie your answer there, and if you do not have anybody who write Arabic, give me your answer is signs; *Lela Marién* will make me understand. May she and Allah protect you, and this cross that I kiss many times, as the captive woman taught me to do (p. 347).5

The captain promises to take Zoraida with him to the land of Christians, whereupon she begins to steal great quantities of money from her father in order to pay ransom fees for the captives and buy a vessel to carry them to Spain. Since Zoraida does not speak Spanish, and the captive does not speak Arabic, they use the services of a Spanish renegade who throughout the tale serves as their interpreter. On the night of their escape, the renegade demands that they take Zoraida’s father with them as well as everything that is of value in the house. Zoraida insists that her father should in no way be touched, and goes back into the house to bring out a casket (*cofrecillo*) so full of gold coins that she can barely carry it. Unfortunately, the father wakes up and the runaways are forced to carry him with them. They finally abandon him on shore just before taking sail to Spain with both his doubloons and his daughter.

Especially interesting in this captivity narrative – one among several other works by Cervantes inspired by his five and a half years of

---

5 Throughout this discussion I will be using E. Grossman’s recent and highly acclaimed translation of *Don Quixote*, New York 2003. All further references to the novel are from this edition and will be given parenthetically in the text. On the whole I have found this translation more faithful to the Spanish original than previous English translations. However, I still have a few occasional emendations to make to this translation as well, which are particularly important to my discussion, and these will be marked by square brackets within Grossman’s text. In this passage I have changed Grossman’s ‘as you’ into ‘but you’, since the latter is more reflective of the original: ‘sino tú’. In addition, the insistence in the original that, of all Christians, this captive alone is gentlemanly is of direct relevance to my reading, as could be gathered below.
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captive in Algiers\(^6\) – is the relative absence of contemporary constructions of alterity as hereditary and racial. Such constructions had their origin in late fifteenth-century Spain where ‘purity of blood’ was used to distinguish between Old and New Christians, that is to say, between thoroughbred Catholics and Catholics of Jewish or Muslim origin. By the end of the sixteenth-century, this specifically Spanish idea became fairly widespread all over Europe, not the least in England.\(^7\) Shakespeare is clearly aware of both the idea and its Spanish roots in *Merchant*. He portrays Portia’s Spanish suitor, the Prince of Aragon, as particularly fussy about his honorable descent – a fussiness about ‘honor’ that was regarded as prototypically Spanish and, in sixteenth-century Spain, was as much about race as about class. Later on in *Merchant*, Lancelot denies Jessica the possibility of salvation on account of her Jewish ancestry. Most significantly perhaps, Lorenzo emphasizes the ‘fairness’ of Jessica’s hand, as well as handwriting, as soon as he receives her note specifying the time and circumstances of their prospective elopement:

\[
\text{I know the hand; in faith, 'tis a fair hand,}
\text{And whither than the paper it writ on}
\text{Is the fair hand that writ.}
\]

(2.4.12-14)\(^8\)

Here, sexual and racial factors virtually overwrite strictly religious parameters in effecting successful integration into Christian society:

---


8 William Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, M. M. Mahood ed., Cambridge 1987. All further references to the play are from this edition and will be given parenthetically in the text.
both the whiteness and the femaleness of the converted subject are vital for reproducing her as Christian in the eyes of gentile society, in stark contrast with the inassimilable physical Otherness of circumcised Jews and Muslims or the visual distinctiveness of Negroes in general.

Something of that sort is admittedly also at play in Cervantes’s tale, where the captain looks up the window and sees Zoraida’s ‘extremely white hand emerge’ (p. 345). The whiteness of the hand suggests to him that it may belong to ‘a renegade Christian, for they are often taken as legitimate wives by their masters, who consider this good fortune since the men esteem them more than the women of their own nation’ (p. 345). Cervantes reiterates here a common European belief, or fantasy, that Turks and Moors are especially attracted to European women, allegedly on account of their fairer skin. But had Cervantes really wanted to drive home the point about Zoraida’s racial propriety, he could have done so much more effectively: the fictive character of Agi Morato, Zoraida’s father, was inspired by the historical figure of Hajji Murad, a Christian renegade of very high social and political standing in Algiers whose daughter in real-life ended up marrying the Sultan of Fez and Morocco. Cervantes, however, portrays Morato as a veritable Moor, making sure to leave that bit of historical information out of the text. In the beginning of the tale, when the ladies in the audience, puzzled by Zoraida’s Moorish dress and her complete silence, ask the captain whether she is a Christian or a Moor, the captive responds: ‘She is a Moor in her dress and body, but in her soul she is a [great] Christian because she has a very [great] desire to be one’ (p. 327). Race, it would appear, is hardly of the essence here, even less, I would argue, than in Merchant. Interestingly, while the

---

9 Hajji Murad was a native of Ragusa (present-day Dubrovnik) and one of the wealthiest and most powerful alcáides in Algiers at the time of Cervantes’s captivity there. For historical discussions of Hajji Murad and his daughter, see J. O. Asín’s classic study, ‘La hija de Agi Morato’, Boletin de la Real Academia Española 27 (1947-1948): pp. 245-339; and, more recently, J. Canavaggio, ‘Agi Morato entre historia y ficción’, in his Cervantes: Entre vida y creación, Alcalá de Henares 2000, pp. 39-44.

10 I have changed Grossman’s ‘devout’ and ‘strong desire’ into ‘great’ (grande) and ‘very great desire’ (grandísimos deseos) respectively; I did so in order to downplay the somewhat more orthodox overtones of ‘devout’ as well as in order to preserve and emphasize the parallelism, suggested in the original, between Zoraida’s great desire to be a Christian and her being a great Christian already.
maternal provenance of Zoraida is completely effaced in Cervantes’s tale, the historical daughter of Hajji Murad, who served as a source of inspiration for the character of Zoraida, was in fact a granddaughter of Christians on both her father’s and mother’s side. Thus, Cervantes can be said to deliberately turn a blind eye to the legitimate racial makeup of the historical daughter of Hajji Murad when insisting that her literary counterpart is — in body as well as dress — a moor.¹¹

By this I do not mean to suggest that race is of prime or decisive importance in Shakespeare’s play either but rather to emphasize what I find to be quite remarkable, namely, that contemporary racial theories, although Spanish in origin and most closely associated with early modern Spain, find their way into Merchant to a much greater extent than in Cervantes’s tale. What is of the most crucial importance in Shakespeare is a conflict between moral and immoral economic behavior, to borrow E. P. Thompson’s helpful terminology, for which everything else — religion, race, gender — is a metaphor.¹² And yet this very ‘economistic’ dimension, as Lisa Lampert has recently very keenly observed, keeps bringing forth the issue of race, since it undermines the traditional framework of Christian exegesis according to which ‘to understand and interpret as a Christian is to be able to see beneath the external in order to grasp internal spiritual meaning’.¹³ Whereas a recovery of this exegetical principle — seeing beneath the external in

¹¹ For a more detailed discussion of the genealogy and biography of Hajji Murad’s daughter, see Garcés (above, n. 6), pp. 208-209.

¹² I find particularly apposite here the classical study by G. K. Hunter according to which what we have primarily in Merchant is ‘a world of Finance, where lovers, Christian gentlemen, friends, enemies, servants, daughters, dukes, fathers, Jewish usurers, all express themselves in terms of financial relationship; and where the differences between love and hate, bounty and selfishness, Mercy and Justice, Christianity and Jewry are all treated in terms of money and how to handle it’ (‘Elizabethans and Foreigners’, in: Shakespeare and Race [above, n. 1], p. 51).

¹³ L. Lampert, Gender and Jewish Difference from Paul to Shakespeare, Philadelphia 2004, p. 141.
order to grasp internal spiritual meaning – is a major concern of the play, the imperatives of trade and profit demand nonetheless a very close attention to the letter rather than the spirit of the law (this is after all what wins the trial for the Christians), and this legalistic predisposition comes largely at the expense of religious considerations properly speaking. Thus, when Lancelot who is anxious about the rising price of pork insists that Jessica could not be saved on account of her inherited ‘formal’ Jewishness, Jessica does not justify herself by asserting her true inner faith or intrinsic moral and spiritual qualities but resorts instead to the ‘formality’ of her being married to a Christian: ‘I shall be saved by my husband; he hath made me a Christian’ (3.5.15). Jessica’s statement is of course a reference to Paul’s first epistle to the Corinthians where the apostle says: ‘For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband’ (I Cor. 7-14). But whereas Paul insists on the total equality between wives and husbands in this respect, and even mentions wives first, Jessica’s exclusive attention to the redeeming qualities of the Christian male body, although wholly apposite in the situation, serves to put this entire exchange within an early modern context where conversion is to a large extent both a racial and a gendered undertaking having to do with the ‘body’ no less than with the spirit.14

In *Don Quixote*, by contrast, what matters most is the inner faith and intrinsic moral qualities of the believer. Zoraida does not even

---

14 There is evidently no female body in the whole of Venice capable of ‘sanctifying’ Shylock’s circumcised body, even if only in order to crown the comedy with yet another marriage and in so doing proclaim Shylock’s conversion as truly valid. By the same token, when another converted male, Othello, takes a Christian wife the effect is not so much sanctification as a tragic relapse into alterity. The chapter in Corinthians is highly relevant to *Merchant*, since it consists of a wholesale dismissal of ‘externals’ such as celibacy and circumcision as indifferent to salvation. The issue of circumcision, on the other hand, has been regarded as crucial in *Merchant* by a host of new historicist and feminist critics including, among many others, J. Shapiro, *Shakespeare and the Jews*, New York 1996, pp. 119-130, and M. J. Metzger, ‘“Now By My Hood, a Gentile and No Jew”: Jessica, The Merchant of Venice, and the Discourse of Early Modern English Identity’, *PMLA* 113 (1998), pp. 52-63. It is interesting to notice how the Pauline take on miscegenation – originally intended, in Scripture, to facilitate universal conversion – is re-deployed, in *Merchant*, so as to both counter and bring into sharp relief early modern racial arguments against conversion imported to a large extent from Catholic Spain.
need a Christian husband in order to be a Christian. Her romantic feelings towards the captive, though undeniably there, are curiously ancillary: the captive is needed, first and foremost, in order to take Zoraida to the land of Christians, the rest is a bonus. There is in general something distinctly matriarchal about Zoraida’s Christian faith: males are somehow neither the prime cause, nor the necessary condition, nor the ultimate purpose of conversion; they are just a logistic necessity, so to speak. Zoraida’s faith is portrayed primarily as a womanly devotion to the most consecrated of females, Mother Mary, which is transferred from one female to another, from the female slave to Zoraida; Christ, it is important to note, is not mentioned even once. Admittedly, this matriarchal aspect is in agreement with Catholic sensibilities of the period, especially given Protestant tendencies to do away with the cult of Mary and, in general, with the veneration of saints, many of whom were women.\footnote{Garcés (above, n. 6) has convincingly read Zoraida as a Mary-like figure: ‘Constant allusions to Lela Maríen or the Virgin Mary traverse the Captive’s tale [. . .], especially regarding the beauty and Christian qualities of Zoraida. Indeed, even before the Captive’s tale begins, Zoraida’s identification with the Virgin Mary is suggested by the image of the couple’s arrival at the inn, the Moorish woman mounted on a donkey and the Captive at her side, playing the role of St. Joseph, an identification reiterated by Zoraida herself when she pronounces her new name: María’ (p. 215).} But Zoraida’s piety also goes beyond and even against Catholicism in various significant ways: it is uniquely hybrid for one, constantly mixing Arab and Christian terms in what is clearly a very basic and uninformed version of the faith. It is also markedly non-sacramental: when asked whether Zoraida has been baptized, the captive responds that there has been no opportunity for that yet, nor a real necessity to do so, since she had not found herself in imminent danger of death ‘that would oblige her to be baptized without first knowing all the ceremonies required by our Holy Mother Church’ (p. 327). There have been in fact both a necessity and an opportunity to baptize Zoraida: during their flight from Algiers, the runaways are dangerously attacked by pirates, and one of the first things the captive and Zoraida do upon reaching Spain is pay a solemn visit to a local Church. But the sacrament of Zoraida’s baptism is suggestively pushed beyond the scope of the narrative. While in Merchant Shylock’s conversion is never actually shown on stage in a dramatic gesture that is possibly
meant to undercut its very legitimacy, a similar thing also happens in *Don Quixote*, but here the reason seems to be that official conversion is, *au fond*, immaterial and unnecessary: Zoraida does not have to be formally baptized in order to be ‘a great Christian’; she is one already, in her own singular way, thanks to her great internal desire to be one. In the specific context of early modern Spain, this stance is strongly reminiscent, not only of traditional Christian exegetics, but interestingly also of a predominant tendency among *cristianos nuevos* – the descendent of Spain’s converted Jews and Moors – to emphasize the importance for salvation of true inner faith as opposed to outward ceremony and ritual.16

What is more, side-by-side with the text’s overt celebration of Zoraida’s intensely personal faith, there is also a covert tendency in the narrative to suspect actual Christians, again, because what really matters is not the nominal and external status of the believer but the internal and essential quality of the faith. Zoraida, even as she praises the one Christian with whom she intends to elope, reveals that, except for him, no other Christian has ever seemed to her to be a gentleman. Likewise, even that single Christian who she finds worthy of praise reveals on occasion a degree of materialistic self-interest that could be said to expose, from behind the shoulders of the narrator, what is lurking in the back of his mind. Cervantes, in typically tongue-in-cheek attitude, has the captain enthuse about the first time he saw Zoraida face to face but replaces the *sine qua non* of romantic literature – the hyperbolic paean to the beauty of the beloved – with an equally rapturous description of her financial value. The narrator says he could not possibly hope to effectively communicate Zoraida’s great beauty, so he contents himself with saying only that:

More pearls hung from her lovely neck, ears, and tresses than she had hairs on her head. Around her ankles, which were bare,  

---

in accordance with Moorish custom, she wore two carcajes (the Moorish name for bracelets and bangles for the feet) of purest gold, studded with so many diamonds that, as she told me later, her father had valued them at ten thousand doblas, and the ones on her wrists were worth the same amount. She wore a large quantity of very fine pearls, because the greatest pride and joy of Moorish women is to adorn themselves with rich pearls, both large and small, and so the Moors have more pearls than any other nation; Zoraida’s father was said to own many of the best pearls in Algiers and to have more than two thousand Spanish escudos, and she who is now mistress of my heart was mistress of all this (p. 354).17

No less suggestive is the overall tendency of the narrative to see through cultural clichés and stereotypes of the other, even as it brings these clichés and stereotypes into play. If looking beneath the external in order to grasp the internal spiritual meaning becomes, as Lampert puts it, ‘both a hermeneutics and an anthropology’,18 it is precisely this hermeneutic and anthropological thrust, coupled with Cervantes’s close, first-hand knowledge of Muslims and Jews in both Algiers and Spain which allows him to see, and show, the human interior of his characters underneath the external surface of alterity. In her first note to the captain Zoraida writes that if her father knew about her plans to escape, he would stone her. This is indeed the official punishment for apostasy in classic Islamic jurisprudence. But in the tale Zoraida’s father is portrayed as exceedingly generous and loving to his daughter, with no trace of an unfeeling or cruel disposition towards her. Upon discovering that she had conspired against him he does initially curse her in the strongest of terms and prays for the destruction and perdition of everyone

17 Grossman’s translation manages to preserve to some extent the alliterative qualities of the original (through the repetitive use, in the first line, of the voiceless glottal fricative /h/ in such words as ‘hung’, ‘had’, ‘hairs’, ‘her’, and ‘head’). But the voiceless and voiced stops in the original, especially the bilabial /p/ and /b/ and the velar /k/, contribute further to the feeling of density and, in my ears at least, accentuate the worldliness of the description. The Spanish reads: ‘Sólo diré que más perlas pendían de su hemosisimo cuello, orejas y cabellos que cabellos tenía en la cabeza’. I am grateful to my colleague Prof. Yishai Tobin for his help with the phonetic terms and symbols.

18 Lampert (above, n. 13), p. 141.
on board. But upon watching his daughter sailing away, he promptly changes his curses to sorrowful lamentations, plucking his beard, tearing his hair, and lying writhing on the ground. Unlike Shylock, who can only mourn for the combined loss of his daughter and his ducats and even wish that his daughter ‘were dead at [his] foot, and the jewels in her ear’ (3.1.70), the old man – as he is sympathetically referred to in Cervantes’s tale – cries to the departing Zoraida: ‘Come back, my beloved daughter, come ashore, I forgive everything! Give those men the money, it is already theirs, and come and console your grieving father, who will die on this desolate strand if you leave him’ (p. 363).

In *The Merchant of Venice*, Jessica – or rather Lorenzo – finally remain with half of Shylock’s goods (provided Antonio does not squander it all first), and this in addition to the riches they have already stolen from Shylock. In *Don Quixote*, by contrast, Zoraida and the captain remain with not even a single escudo of the Moor’s money. Whether on account of sheer bad luck or, as the captain puts it, as ‘the result of the curses the Moor had hurled at his daughter, for a father’s curses, no matter who he may be, are always to be feared’ (pp. 363-364), the runaways’ vessel is attacked by French corsairs who plunder everything on board, rob Zoraida of her casket of gold, and strip her of all the precious stones she has carried about her. Thus, the captain and Zoraida reach Spain divested of anything acquired unlawfully from the Moor, in what perhaps constitutes at least some sort of wild poetic justice.

I would like to conclude this paper by going back to the essay by Loomba, which served as a starting point for my discussion. Loomba insists that when inscribed on the body of a ‘fair’ but ‘alien’ woman, the turn towards Christianity is expressed through a vocabulary of romance and marriage – the vocabulary, I would add, of comedy. At some level, this is undeniably true, both in *Merchant* and in *Don Quixote*. In *Don Quixote*, we do not see the couple properly wedded, but later in the novel the captain serendipitously meets his brother, regains his inheritance, and one can almost hear church bells in the background. In *Merchant*, Shakespeare clearly portrays Jessica, at some level at least, as a successfully integrated member of genteel society,

19 Loomba (above, n. 1), p. 213.
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sanctified in her husband, versed in classical knowledge, fully at home in Belmont.

And yet, despite the undeniably comedic conclusions of both the captive’s tale and *The Merchant of Venice*, the representation of female conversion in both works can hardly be said to effectively smooth away the tremendous strains and conflicts of cultural crossings. On the contrary, even with such successful conversions as those of Jessica and Zoraida, there is so much tension and anxiety at play that what seems to be at stake is not just the capacity of the Other to be integrated into Christian society but also, more radically, the composition and integrity of Christian identity itself. In other words, Shakespeare and Cervantes, far from reenacting early modern discourses of alterity as a way of reinforcing pre-given notions of what it means to be Christian, do so in ways that actually interrogate and destabilize any simple and straightforward understanding of what this common identity is.

In Cervantes, the desperate cries of the betrayed, abused, and finally abandoned father reverberate much more strongly than any future church bells. In Shakespeare, Jessica’s trading of her parents’ ring for a monkey re-inscribes upon her fair body the signs, not of romance and marriage, but of foul lust: the monkey, apart from being a rare and expensive pet, a sort of status symbol that signals Jessica’s admission into fashionable society, was commonly associated in early modern England with strong sexual appetite: Falstaff, for example, says about Justice Shallow that he is as ‘lecherous as a monkey’ (3.2.254-5), and Iago says about Desdemona and Cassio that they are as ‘hot as monkeys’ (3.3.404); in the seventeenth century, John Mennes and James Smith even warned husbands (i.e., future cuckolds), in their *Musarum Deliciae* (1655), that they should ‘suspect [woman’s] faith withall, and all mistrust / she’ll buy a Monkey to supply her lust’.20

---

As Mary Janell Metzger has very perceptively observed, there is also a darker and ominous side to Jessica’s conversion. In act 5, she argues, Jessica and Lorenzo try to make sense of their relationship by looking back to mythological love affairs that all end tragically: Troilus and Cressida; Pyramus and Thisbe; Aeneas and Dido; Jason and Medea. Disturbingly, Lorenzo’s own construction of their relationship foregrounds the more sordid, pecuniary aspects of the affair: ‘In such a night / Did Jessica steal from a wealthy Jew, / And with an unthrift love did run from Venice, / As far as Belmont’ (5.1.14-17). Jessica on her part, takes up the imagery of stealing and uses it to question Lorenzo’s faith as both lover and Christian, not just teasingly but with a tinge of bitter disillusionment as well: ‘In such a night / Did young Lorenzo swear he loved her well, / Stealing her soul with many vows of faith, / And ne’er a true one’ (5.1.17-20). 21

Rather than stories of smooth female conversion – stories which, according to Loomba, do not usually end in tragedy, nor focus on the tensions of religious turning – what we have then, in both Shakespeare and Cervantes, are stories of restless tossing and turning. In the case of Cervantes, one cannot help thinking, in retrospect, that by the time the second part of Don Quixote was out, in 1615, conversions such as Zoraida’s would have suffered a far from happy fate. For if the captive’s tale is an attempt to recover for Catholic Spain a multiculturalism that was already in full process of being suppressed and repressed in the Iberian peninsula, this attempt would soon be countered, only four years after the publication of the first part of Don Quixote, by the en masse expulsion of the Moriscos from Spain, women and men alike.

21 Metzger (above, n. 14), pp. 59-60.