

The Unstated Sources of Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa's *Varias noticias importantes a la humana comunicación* (1621)

The unacknowledged appropriation of materials carried out by writers of early-modern vernacular texts is a well attested phenomenon, whether such content is derived from works in the classical languages, shifted from one European tongue to another, or redeployed within the same language area.¹ Yet, the study of such surreptitious borrowings is fraught with uncertain nuances; a failure to appreciate the width and gradations of the spectrum between re-creative imitation and straight transliteration will result in heavy-handed and falsifying analysis, and an insufficient grasp of the peculiar demands and allowances of given fictional and non-fiction genres will lead to wrong-headed approaches.² Indeed, the very terminology we use to describe such processes is contested; to speak of 'plagiarism' may be anachronistic,

¹ A useful overview for the purposes of this study is provided by Paolo Cherchi, *Polimattia di riuoso. Mezzo secolo di plagio (1539-1589)* (Rome: Bulzoni, 1998), while essays in *Furto e plagio nella letteratura del Classicismo*, ed. by Roberto Gigliucci (Rome: Bulzoni, 1998), and *Borrowed Feathers. Plagiarism and the Limits of Imitation in Early Modern Europe*, ed. by Hall Bjørnstad (Oslo: Oslo Academic Press, 2008), illuminate various aspects of the question. The practice in the Spanish Golden Age has not garnered coverage equivalent to that dedicated to France and, especially, Italy, with some valuable exceptions being Joseph G. Fucilla, 'The Spanish and Portuguese Imitations from the Italian of Manuel Faria y Sousa', *Philological Quarterly*, 8 (1929), 124-44; Armand L. De Gaetano, 'The Plagiarism of Giambattista Gelli's *Capricci del Bottaio* by Francisco Miranda Villafañe', *Italica*, 32 (1955), 226-41; Robert H. Williams, 'Francisco de Cáceres, Niccolò Franco and Juan de la Cueva', *Hispanic Review*, 27 (1959), 194-99; Alicia de Colombí-Monguió, *Petrarquismo peruano: Diego Dávalos y Figueroa y la poesía de la 'Miscelánea austral'* (London: Tamesis, 1985), pp. 97-116.

² Non-fiction works are largely the focus of the papers collected in *Sondaggi sulla riscrittura del Cinquecento*, ed. by Paolo Cherchi (Ravenna: Longo, 1998), while Ángel García Galiano, *La imitación poética en el Renacimiento* (Kassel: Reichenberger, 1992) and David H. Darst, 'Imitatio' (*polémicas sobre la imitación en el Siglo de Oro*) (Madrid: Orígenes, 1985) provide an introduction to the ideas of literary 'imitation' and 'emulation' which held sway in the early modern period, with a particular focus on Spain.

in so far as it can imply relatively modern conventions regarding intellectual ownership, but to afford the label of ‘rewriting’ to passages simply recycled in a different context may in many cases be euphemistic or overly generous, for, while inconspicuous reiteration of materials originally presented by other authors can perform valuable functions in new environments, it just as often serves as fodder for the increasingly voracious printing presses.³ And this is not to mention the practical difficulties entailed by the need to identify sources and to account for possible intermediary works, as well the desirability of clarifying the circumstances of transmission. Nevertheless, it is vital to invest energy in illustrating such tendencies, investigating individual instances not simply as historical curiosities but, where appropriate, as representative or even constitutive of trends characterising a particular cultural milieu.

With the present study I aim to contribute to our understanding of the illicit re-use of materials in seventeenth-century Spain; the author chosen, Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa (1571?-1644?), is a minor one but, as a versatile member of that second rank of writers, he is typical of so many facets of his age, both literary and social.⁴ Having left his birthplace Valladolid as a young man to obtain a doctorate *in utroque iure* in Italy, he stayed on in that country to serve first as a legal advisor with the Spanish troops in Piedmont, and then in other roles connected to the law, finding time as well to make his literary debut with a Spanish translation of Guarini’s *Pastor fido* (1590) in Naples in 1602; it would be in that same city, in 1629, that he would publish his final new work, *Pusílipo*, effectively an urgent and extended plea for protection addressed to an incoming viceroy. Suárez de Figueroa’s return in 1604 to his native city, which was serving at the time as the seat of Philip III’s court, resulted

³ On the terminological and conceptual difficulties posed by ‘plagiarism’ in the early modern period, see Roberto Gigliucci, ‘Premessa’, in *Furto e plagio*, ed. by Gigliucci, pp. 9-13.

⁴ For a succinct account of Suárez de Figueroa’s life and works, and a list of critical materials on this author, see his entry in *Diccionario biográfico español*, vol. 47, pp. 373-76. The most detailed study of Suárez de Figueroa remains Ángeles Arce Menéndez, *Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa: nuevas perspectivas de su actividad literaria* (Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 1983).

in rapid disillusionment, and his subsequent unhappy wanderings around the peninsula led him to Madrid, before he obtained the patronage of Juan Hurtado de Mendoza; this period would be the most prolific in Suárez de Figueroa's writing career, resulting in a new and substantially different translation of Guarini's tragicomedy; commissioned works of pastoral and historiography relating to the Hurtado de Mendoza family; an epic poem, *España defendida* (1612), in whose foreword Suárez de Figueroa confesses his debts – general and specific – to Torquato Tasso, quite in accordance with accepted principles of literary *imitatio*, lest he be accused unjustly of 'encubrir o pasar de falso éste que él [el censor] llamará hurto'; and *Plaza universal de todas ciencias y artes*, a liberal translation in 1615 of Tomaso Garzoni's encyclopaedia of the professions, *Piazza universale di tutte le professioni del mondo* (1585).⁵ The broadness of genre in Suárez de Figueroa's career was off-set by a heavy reliance on Italian sources, whether explicitly signalled or implicitly modelled, a point not lost on those contemporaries with whom he had quarrelled, including

⁵ Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa, *España defendida* (Madrid: Juan de la Cuesta, 1612), 'Prólogo'. This prefatory passage, in which Suárez de Figueroa admits of his use of Tasso that 'supuesto me valí hasta de sus mismas comparaciones', before balancing this asseveration with an allusion to his own 'talento para trasladarle todo en nuestra lengua con la misma elegancia y énfasis que suena en la suya', appears altered in a later edition of the work; the supposed 1644 text, likely from 1636, which announces itself as the fifth edition, although we have no record of the intervening three, omits this confession, as Suárez de Figueroa goes only so far as to say of his debt to Tasso that 'imité en parte de la invención deste argumento', before underlining to a greater degree his own effort, his 'sudor estudioso', in making the material his own (Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa, *España defendida* (Naples: Egidio Longo, 1644 [1636?]), 'Prólogo'). Nevertheless, in both cases, he articulates the fundamental importance of imitation – and emulation – of authoritative sources, in this case a modern one, in the creation of original imaginative literature, a position which he re-states in *Pusílipo*, where a short discussion of the matter by the dialogue's interlocutors is capped by a sonnet, 'Débense al arte aciertos y primores', on the inadequacy of 'ingenio' alone and the necessity of precepts and models in artistic production. For an analysis of these latter comments, see García Galiano, *La imitación poética*, pp. 437-41.

Lope de Vega.⁶ In 1617, Suárez de Figueroa published what would be his most enduring work, a dialogue miscellany in the *alivio de caminantes* style, *El Pasajero*, in which erudite notes compete for space with social critique and poetic compositions; in this text, which he terms the ‘hijo de mi inclinación’, not published like his other books at ‘ajena instancia’, Suárez de Figueroa avowedly embraces greater freedom, both from patrons and literary precursors, though closer examination reveals a tissue of borrowings, especially from Italian sources, among them Giovanni Botero and Francesco Panagirola.⁷

It would be in his *Varias noticias importantes a la humana comunicación* (1621), however, published in Madrid shortly before he returned permanently to serve as an investigating magistrate in the Kingdom of Naples, that Suárez de Figueroa would vent his greatest intellectual ambition, in a text which ranges across numerous world civilisations, purporting to explore the bases of human interactions and social relationships. The book, most likely intended to be his last, before he was rudely

⁶ See Joaquín de Entrambasaguas, *Estudios sobre Lope de Vega*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1967), II, 365-93 (esp. pp. 365-73).

⁷ Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa, *El Pasajero*, ed. by María Isabel López Bascuñana, 2 vols (Barcelona: PPU, 1988), I, 54. On his use of Botero’s *Ragion di stato* (1589), see Jean-Marc Pelorson, *Les ‘Letrados’ juristes castillans sous Philippe III: recherches sur leur place dans la société, la culture et l’état* (Poitiers: Université de Poitiers, 1980), pp. 429-43; and on his borrowings from the preacher Panagirola, see Francis Cerdan, ‘Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa y la oratoria sagrada de la España de Felipe III (En torno al *alivio* IV de *El Pasajero*)’, *Criticón*, 38 (1987), 57-99. More complicated is Suárez de Figueroa’s supposed re-writing of Góngora’s *Polifemo* in the sixth chapter of the miscellany (II, 433-34). After positing the Cordovan’s poem as a prime example of the use of mythology in contemporary poetry, he proposes to resume the action of Góngora’s text in an emulative sonnet of his own (‘No tanto ardor por su rebelde Fedra’), a task which he appears to complete with some skill, but this composition is in fact calqued more substantially (and entirely silently) on Giambattista Marino’s sonnet ‘“ Ah, che ben ti vegg’io, ti veggio, ahi lasso’, from the *Polifemeide* cycle of his *Rime boscherecce* (1602); on this manipulation, see Rafael Bonilla Cerezo, ‘Fortuna y legado del *Polifemo*: en torno a un soneto de Suárez de Figueroa’, *Ínsula*, 781-782 (2012), 34-37.

forced out of his literary retirement at the end of the decade, deliberately eschews systematic analysis, opting instead to provide case-studies of the multifariousness of the human condition, in its historical, philosophical and ethical aspects. While the work did not achieve a second edition, and any repercussions it might have had in the period itself are difficult to ascertain, it was seized upon by José Antonio Maravall as one of the texts emblematic of the Spanish Baroque's 'conciencia muy agudizada de la multiplicidad y variabilidad de las manifestaciones del humano'.⁸ Yet, it is also a prime example in the seventeenth century in Spain of undeclared reuse of materials originally penned by other authors, drawing on at least four books from the previous century: there are smaller borrowings from Girolamo Garimberto's *Della fortuna libri sei* (1547) and Bartolomeu Filipe's *Tractado del conseio y de los conseiros de los príncipes* (1584), and more substantial usages of Louis Le Roy's *De la vicissitude ou variété des choses en l'univers* (1575) and Pierre de La Primaudaye's *Academie françoise* (1577).⁹ Unlike the borrowings found in *El Pasajero*, Suárez de Figueroa's hidden employment of passages from these works has remained undetected until now, perhaps due to their more skilful integration within the new work or, more likely, because of a lack of critical scrutiny of a largely forgotten book. In this article, therefore, I shall begin to remedy this oversight, examining the techniques implemented and the effects achieved, and positing some provisional

⁸ José Antonio Maravall, *La cultura del Barroco: análisis de una estructura histórica*, 3rd edn (Barcelona: Ariel, 1983), p. 368. Outside of canonical figures such as Lope and Calderón, Suárez de Figueroa is one of the most cited authors in this study of the mentality of Baroque Spain, with Maravall's references largely split, fairly equally, between *El Pasajero* and *Varias noticias*. He does not recognise, however, that a majority of Suárez de Figueroa's material in *Varias noticias* is taken from other writers.

⁹ Suárez de Figueroa also appropriates without attribution a small amount of material from La Primaudaye's sequel to his *Academie françoise*, the *Suite de l'Academie françoise* (1580), through its Italian translation: parts of *Continuazione dell'Academia francese*, trans. by Alessandro Raverii (Venice: Giovanni Guerigli, 1596), pp. 66-78, are excerpted in Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa, *Varias noticias importantes a la humana comunicación* (Madrid: Tomás Iunti, 1621), fols 240^v-44^r. Subsequent references to *Varias noticias* will be given in the body of the essay when appropriate.

conclusions regarding the legitimacy and value of a practice which to the modern reader appears uncomfortably close to plagiarism.

At the outset, we must recognise the genre in which Suárez de Figueroa has chosen to compose this work: namely, a prose miscellany of the sort inaugurated in the previous century by Pedro Mexía's *Silva de varia lección* (1540).¹⁰ *Varias noticias* makes less of a virtue of abrupt change of topics than many of its predecessors, but in its discontinuous development, erudite and historical content, and overwhelming emphasis on variety, it is every inch a *miscelánea*. As a result, it makes a virtue of excerpting, both as a method of composition and a product of reading: in his opening comments, Suárez de Figueroa terms himself a 'jardinero que de ajenas plantas coge y ofrece regaladas frutas' ('Prólogo'), and he later invites a variegated readership to pluck all that they wish from the resultant 'garden': 'Cualquiera en su estado inquiera lo que le conviene, y coja, como en fecundo jardín, las flores que más agradaren a olfato y vista' (fol. 113^r), calling to mind miscellanies such as Antonio de Torquemada's *Jardín de flores curiosas* (1570), and echoing also the terminology of Mexía who, in his prologue to Charles V, describes his miscellaneous practice as extracting material 'de muy grandes auctores, como el que corta planta de muy buenos árboles para su huerta o jardín', even if botanical imagery of this sort is by no means confined to this class of works.¹¹ Such permissiveness inherent to the genre,

¹⁰ On the genre of the miscellany in Spain, see Asunción Rallo Gruss, 'Las misceláneas: conformación y desarrollo de un género renacentista', *Edad de Oro*, 3 (1984), 159-80; Mercedes Alcalá Galán, 'Las misceláneas españolas del siglo XVI y su entorno cultural', *Dicenda. Cuadernos de Filología Hispánica*, 14 (1996), 11-20; Rafael Malpartida Tirado, 'Deslindes de la miscelánea en el Renacimiento español', *Epos: Revista de filología*, 23 (2007), 39-60.

¹¹ Pedro Mexía, *Silva de varia lección*, ed. by Isaías Lerner (Madrid: Castalia, 2003), p. 38. The early-modern period sees a slew of compilatory works of various sorts, in Latin and the vernaculars, manifesting differing focuses and degrees of systematisation, along with varying ease of re-use; however, the basic aim of genres from the encyclopaedia to the commonplace-book to the miscellany is the same, that of making available in a single text a variety of opinion and quotation from an array of identifiable, authoritative writers on given topics. On such books and their utilisation, see Ann Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the*

and arrogated proudly by the miscellanist, will undoubtedly complicate our assessment of Suárez de Figueroa's mining of his four sources, but it should be weighed alongside other relevant comments made by the author: in one of his additions to his translation of Garzoni's tome on the professions, for instance, Suárez de Figueroa utilises one of the stronger classical images relating to the misappropriation of the work of others, Horace's "stolen feathers", to criticise those apprentice humanists who pass off the intellectual labours of their masters as their own in print.¹² Furthermore, in *Varias noticias* itself, Suárez de Figueroa quotes another classical complaint of this nature, that found in Pliny the Elder's preface to the *Natural History* regarding copying of factual materials without attribution to their originator: 'Plinio, hombre de singular lección, afirma haber hallado confiriendo cantidad de autores muchos de los antiguos copiados palabra por palabra, callando sus nombres del todo quien los usurpa' (fol. 236^r). The apparently delightful irony of these lines being themselves taken silently from Le Roy's *De la vicissitude* will be blunted once we have seen the breadth and tenacity of Suárez de Figueroa's unacknowledged borrowings, although the Spaniard's omission here of Pliny's formulation *deprehendi in furto*, being 'caught red-handed in the act of thieving', which was rendered faithfully by Le Roy as 'estre surprins en larcin', and its replacement by the still legalistic but less forceful 'quien los usurpa', may hint at a

Structuring of Renaissance Thought (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Amedeo Quondam, 'Strumenti dell'officina classicistica: Polyanthea & Co.', *Modern Philology*, 101 (2003), 316-35; Ann M. Blair, *Too Much to Know. Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

¹² 'Discípulos se han visto en nuestros tiempos tan libres y descarados [...] que, usurpando los sudores de sus maestros, osaron como cornejas vestirse de ajenas plumas, entregando al tipo obras que les sirvieron más de afrenta que de honor, por conocerse el verdadero dueño' (Tomaso Garzoni, *Plaza universal de todas ciencias y artes*, trans. by Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa (Madrid: Luis Sánchez, 1615), fol. 359^v). The reference is to Horace, *Epistles*, I. 3.18-20, a passage discussed in Scott McGill, *Plagiarism in Latin Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 26-27.

slightly guilty conscience.¹³ It is with these considerations in mind, therefore, that we must assay an initial approach to Suárez de Figueroa's unstated sources, and with a recognition that the nature of his borrowing will not necessarily be congruent in each of the cases examined.

The sections drawn from Filipe's *Tractado del conseio* occupy part of the fourteenth chapter of *Varias noticias* only, where counsel to kings and rulers, the overarching subject of the source text, is not the topic under discussion; rather, the material transplanted from the fifteenth *discurso* of Filipe's book – which Suárez de Figueroa consults not in its original Spanish form but in its Italian translation of 1599 – comes in *Varias noticias* at the beginning of a long discussion of military matters, and concerns specifically the desirability of peace and the concomitant necessity of readiness for war.¹⁴ These borrowings are reasonably straightforward, with the principal modifications being linguistic, albeit ones which do not ultimately obscure the source of the calque; so, in rendering a cluster of three examples from the ancient world regarding shields (Roman soldiers wearing their 'anillo militar' on their left hand, the one used to hold their shield and not to brandish the sword; the Spartans asking returning soldiers whether they had lost their shield as it was considered the most important piece of kit; the Theban general Epaminondas asking on his deathbed for his cherished shield), Suárez de Figueroa subtly improves on his

¹³ Pliny's comments are located in *Natural History*, Praef. 21-24, and are discussed in McGill, *Plagiarism in Latin Literature*, pp. 46-56. Louis Le Roy's allusion to this passage can be found in *De la vicissitude ou variété des choses en l'univers* (Paris: Pierre l'Huillier, 1579), fol. 115^v. Suárez de Figueroa uses Cato's Italian translation of Le Roy's text, where the phrase is rendered similarly forcefully as 'essere colti in furto' (*Della vicissitudine o mutabile varietà delle cose nell'universo*, trans. by Ercole Cato (Venice: Aldine Press, 1592), p. 324). On 'usurping', see Kirsti Sellevold, 'Some "hardis repreneurs" in Sixteenth-Century France: Du Bellay, Aneau, Chappuys', in *Borrowed Feathers*, ed. by Bjørnstad, pp. 53-65 (pp. 58-59).

¹⁴ *Varias noticias*, fols 159^v-62^v is based in part on Bartolomeu Filipe, *Trattato del consiglio et de' consiglieri de' principi*, trans. by Giulio Cesare Valentino (Venice: La Compagnia Minima, 1599), pp. 164-68. This Italian version of the text would probably have been more accessible to Suárez de Figueroa, given the nature of his travels, than the Castilian original, which had been printed in Coimbra in 1584 and London (with the false imprint of Turin) in 1589.

concealed source text by eliminating repetition, substituting more elegant verbs, and introducing slight expansions, so that, for example, a simple 'morì' is converted into 'despidió el espíritu' (fol. 162^r), more fitting for a commander on the point of expiration. After two pages of material not found in the Portuguese author's book, Suárez de Figueroa then reproduces two more historical curiosities from Filipe, concerning peace treaties between Sparta and Athens, and Clusium and Rome, respectively, making the reported speech more vivid and the syntax smoother. Coming to the end of this fifteenth chapter of *Tractado del conseio*, we note that Suárez de Figueroa has borrowed Filipe's penultimate sentence, on Roman representations of Athena, although, in a structural manoeuvre typical of the integration of borrowed content within *Varias noticias*, the position of the comment is transferred, so that it now precedes the cases noted above, a reversal which has no discernible effect on the overall sense of the material on this theme, given the looser logic of compilation governing *Varias noticias*. Finally, we see another example from this last paragraph of Filipe's chapter, concerning Gelo, tyrant of Syracuse, placed even earlier in Suárez de Figueroa's treatment of war and peace, but in this case the Spaniard appears also to have effected a considerable compression of the original text. Yet, his actual method of appropriation in this case is more oblique, for Suárez de Figueroa has not reproduced the text from the body of Filipe's work, but rather has rendered the summary rubric for this section found in the contents pages of the Italian translation, a rubric not found in Filipe's Spanish original, a choice which thus represents another, related but distinct, form of appropriation.

If these seven borrowings of historical examples contribute to the fulfilment of Suárez de Figueroa's promise to furnish his readership with the 'breve narración de vulgares historias' ('Prólogo'), diverse snippets of knowledge from a common cultural patrimony, they also combine to promote an impression of easy familiarity with the classical world.¹⁵ Such an image, though, is dependent on one text above all

¹⁵ Arce Menéndez envisioned that Suárez de Figueroa might not be entirely honest in his claims to erudition ('Si estas afirmaciones fueran ciertas, la cultura del escritor vallisoletano sería una de las más relevantes del siglo XVII' (*Nuevas perspectivas*, p. 598)), but she did not identify his likely sources.

others, La Primaudaye's *Academie françoise*, which provides unacknowledged materials for most of the latter half of *Varias noticias*. Here, too, Suárez de Figueroa consults not the original text, but an edition of the Italian translation, published in Venice, although in both this case and that of Filipe the mediating function of the translations is not especially complicated, given the fidelity with which these had rendered the respective source languages into Italian.¹⁶ Of the four sources examined in this study, La Primaudaye's work is the most similar to Suárez de Figueroa's, both in terms of its uncompromising moral ethos and of its working methods, as an encyclopaedic text abundant in classical and biblical authorities composed with significant, but unstated, components taken from other works.¹⁷ Although the French work is nominally a dialogue, its conversation does not aim for verisimilitude or to foster dialectical reasoning, but rather functions as a largely cumulative endeavour for the propounding of sound doctrine, with the result that, apart from some minor alterations to eliminate obvious points of transition between speakers, its rudimentary interlocution is easily translocated into the plain prose of Suárez de Figueroa's miscellany. The Spanish author ranges over the whole length of the French text, from its second 'day' of conversation to its eighteenth and last, and, although Suárez de Figueroa is hesitant to alter the order of materials found within La Primaudaye's individual chapters, he has no such aversion to altering the sequence in which those chapters are combined in the larger fabric of *Varias noticias*.

His earliest sustained borrowings from La Primaudaye derive from the fourth, fifth and sixth of the seventy-two chapters of the French work, as Suárez de Figueroa

¹⁶ There is a Spanish manuscript translation of La Primaudaye's *Academie françoise* held in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid (MSS 2107) whose seventeenth-century owner was one Gonzalo Guajardo. The translator is unknown, but the content bears no definitive resemblance to the covert renderings effected by Suárez de Figueroa in *Varias noticias*. Although one of the title leaves proclaims the work to be 'La Academia Francesa traducida de francés en español', it too relies on the Italian version.

¹⁷ On La Primaudaye's own borrowings, see Neil Kenny, *The Palace of Secrets: Béroalde de Verville and Renaissance Conceptions of Knowledge* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 20-21.

appropriates almost in their entirety and with few substantial changes these consecutive discussions on the concepts of philosophy, virtue and vice respectively; in the original text, these define the moral parameters of a relatively ordered work which begins with a discourse on the human condition and ends with a consideration of death, while in the new context of *Varias noticias* they appear more haphazardly, in the tenth of twenty longer chapters, albeit still inaugurating a part of the miscellany which will be generally more concerned with ethics – especially in its practical incarnations – than the sections which have preceded it.¹⁸ In later treating prudence, to which Suárez de Figueroa will return frequently in his miscellany as the cardinal virtue fundamental to human actions, personal and political, he translates with little modification the tenth chapter of La Primaudaye's book, given over entirely to that same virtue, paying particular attention, as is typical in his usage of the French work, to the reproduction of erudite references and authoritative quotations, drawn from writers and thinkers such as Aristotle, Bias, Cicero, Isocrates, and Demosthenes, and crammed in close proximity.¹⁹ Suárez de Figueroa continues to follow the Frenchman by discussing the corresponding vice or deficiency, imprudence, for, like La Primaudaye, Suárez de Figueroa believes that 'como quien no conoce el bien, no sabe amarlo, así quien no tiene noticia del mal, jamás lo podrá bastantemente aborrecer'.²⁰ However, while the two opposing qualities garner more or less the same amount of attention in *Academie françoise*, a structuring principle based on balancing pairs which holds true for much of the French work, Suárez de Figueroa effects notable shortening in the latter case, preferring to accentuate the positive and undermine to some extent the schematic nature of the undeclared source text.²¹ The Spaniard then returns to aping his model more precisely by

¹⁸ *Varias noticias*, fols 114^r-23^v are based on Pierre de La Primaudaye, *Academia francese*, trans. by Alesandro Raverii (Venice: Giovanni Guerigli, 1601), pp. 26-48.

¹⁹ These are all found on a single page of Suárez de Figueroa's source text (*Academia francese*, p. 71), and appear similarly clustered in *Varias noticias*, fol. 143.

²⁰ *Varias noticias*, fol. 121^r, based on *Academia francese*, p. 42.

²¹ So, while *Varias noticias*, fols 142^v-46^v, on prudence, follow *Academia francese*, pp. 70-77, *Varias noticias*, fols 146^v-47^v, on imprudence, compress *Academia francese*, pp. 77-85.

applying the virtue of prudence to the exercise of speech, but, by choosing not to render La Primaudaye's following chapter, a general one on the nature of friendship, the first from a new 'day' of conversation in the French original, and moving directly to chapter fourteen of *Academie françoise* instead, Suárez de Figueroa segues from prudent uses of speech into the correct and constructive ways to reproach and admonish, unseen editing which creates a conceptual flow different from, but at least equal to, that found in the source text.²²

Borrowings such as these from La Primaudaye help Suárez de Figueroa to make good on the ambition expressed in the latter part of his title, ensuring that the 'noticias' he presents – from which we should not infer any great desire for novelty, but rather, as per Covarrubias's definition, simply 'el conocimiento de alguna cosa' – contribute to the improvement of 'humana comunicación'. So, for instance, after having treated military matters, in a long section (fols 159^v-90^r) which is mainly pilfered from La Primaudaye, but which also incorporates borrowings from Filipe, as we have seen, and from Le Roy, Suárez de Figueroa introduces a discussion of the institution and characteristics of marriage cribbed from the forty-fifth to forty-eighth chapters of *Academie françoise*, during which he omits some of the more risqué portions of his source text concerning the misdemeanours of lascivious or lonely housewives.²³ However, the Spaniard declines to proceed to the material contained in the following chapter of *Academie françoise*, which begins logically with the duties of the head of a household, preferring to introduce a counterpoint, albeit of a fairly approximate sort, by appropriating instead material on the topic of betrayal, which is found earlier in La Primaudaye's book, in chapter thirty-nine. The correspondence between the two texts is still an extremely close one, and, when La Primaudaye finishes this dialogue and commences a new one, in which his speakers discuss ingratitude, Suárez de Figueroa is happy to make the same progression, although he curtails this section, and takes another step backwards in his source text, employing material now from the thirty-third and thirty-fourth chapters, on wealth and poverty

²² *Varias noticias*, fols 148^r-51^r are based on *Academia francese*, pp. 85-92; and *Varias noticias*, fols 151^r-54^v on *Academia francese*, pp. 101-08.

²³ *Varias noticias*, fols 193^r-208^v are based on *Academia francese*, pp. 335-66.

respectively, before jumping forward again, to La Primaudaye's forty-second chapter to explore the nature of avarice and prodigality. As in the French original, the next quality to be expounded is envy, although Suárez de Figueroa renders less than half of his source chapter, rounding out his discussion instead with biblical examples and patristic quotations not found in La Primaudaye.²⁴

Given that the following chapter, the forty-fourth in *Academie françoise*, is 'De la Fortune', and that the topic of fortune also occurs next in *Varias noticias*, we might assume that Suárez de Figueroa's appropriation of the French text is coming full circle, since he began this run of borrowings with La Primaudaye's forty-fifth chapter, on marriage. This would be inaccurate, however, for, in expanding on his statement that a man's happy luck provokes envy, the Spaniard looks back instead to the thirty-first chapter, 'De l'Heur et Malheur', a discourse whose primary aim is to clarify the meaning of terms relating to fortune which have been deformed by continual incorrect usage. His concealed editing of this chapter is noteworthy, as he strips out much of the abstract material, and concentrates on translating instead the erudite references and quotations furnished by La Primaudaye's text.²⁵ What theoretical material there is comes after this, as Suárez de Figueroa proposes to look in greater detail at the mysterious workings of fortune ('Pero acercándonos más a los particulares accidentes desta fantasma aparente, llamada fortuna, es de saber nacen todos los efetos de sus causas' (fol. 228^r)), and it does not hail from *Academie françoise*, but rather from Garimberto's *Della fortuna*, in this case through its 1572 Spanish translation, which bears the far more eye-catching title of *Teatro de varios y maravillosos acaecimientos de la mudable fortuna*, a choice perhaps betrayed by Suárez de Figueroa's original declaration that 'En el teatro donde se representan de continuo las humanas acciones, preside según común opinión la buena o mala fortuna' (fol.

²⁴ *Varias noticias*, fols 208^v-15^v correspond to *Academia francese*, pp. 288-302; *Varias noticias*, fols 215^v-20^v to *Academia francese*, pp. 242-55; *Varias noticias*, fols 220^v-25^r to *Academia francese*, pp. 311-22.

²⁵ *Varias noticias*, fols 225^v-28^r are based on *Academia francese*, pp. 226-32

225^v, my italics) some pages before he begins to borrow from Garimberto's work.²⁶ Although Garimberto's treatise is structured in six books, Suárez de Figueroa concentrates solely on the first half of the first book, and his appropriation presents few challenges, for there is little stylistic re-writing, and re-ordering of the source is largely absent, with the principal alterations being the compression and excision of content. Suárez de Figueroa frequently omits the beginnings and ends of chapters from *Della fortuna* in order to maintain a consistent discursive pace, and he also discards the second, eighth and eleventh chapters in their entirety, along with half of the tenth.²⁷ The resultant material is a taut, summary examination of fortune, encompassing its status as a secret cause in human affairs, and its inscrutability; its consequences; the importance of prudence, the keystone of *Varias noticias* and indeed the subject of reams of debate in Spain in the period, in protecting against these effects; the impossibility of good or bad fortune being inherent conditions; and – of particular interest in the broader context of the Golden Age – the philosophical and terminological differences between 'fortuna', 'caso' and 'providencia'. Finally, in rendering Garimberto's thoughts on the notion of 'natural impetus', which should be embraced if one is to make the most of good fortune, and how this causes certain men to manifest 'singular inclinations' towards specific arts and sciences, he uses the

²⁶ A more recent text than Garimberto's which covers the same ground as Suárez de Figueroa's examination and much more besides, and demonstrates the interest in the topic of fortune and its associated concepts in early seventeenth-century Spain, is Gutierre Marqués de Careaga's *Desengaño de fortuna*, published in 1611 in Barcelona, with a second edition the following year in Madrid. Suárez de Figueroa's decision not to draw upon this later work, assuming he knew it, might have various explanations: a consideration on his part that use of a contemporary text might more easily be discovered; Suárez de Figueroa's possible drafting of this section of *Varias noticias* before 1611; the heavily and consistently religious slant imposed on the topic by Marqués de Careaga which finds little echo in the more 'scientific' approach adopted by Suárez de Figueroa.

²⁷ Between fols 228^r-31^v, *Varias noticias* utilises material from Girolamo Garimberto, *Theatro de varios y maravillosos acaecimientos de la mudable fortuna*, trans. by Juan Méndez de Ávila (Salamanca: Juan Baptista de Terranova, 1572), fols 1^r-15^r.

Italian's list of notable examples to transition into a discussion of innovation, in a section which is largely taken from Le Roy's *De la vicissitude*.²⁸

Despite the relative straightforwardness of these borrowings, Suárez de Figueroa's treatment of the Italian source does manifest one small but very significant alteration: namely, he seeks to confer upon his comments on 'natural impetus' an impression of plurality: '*Los que tratan de propósito esta materia, concluyen sea la fortuna en los mortales un ímpetu natural, privado de razón. Inténtanlo probar con que no habiendo cosa tan cara al hombre como la vida [...]*' (fol. 230^v, my italics). This allusion to a broad scholarly consensus is disingenuous, however, given that its direct origin is a single one, the tenth chapter of *Della fortuna*, which Suárez de Figueroa manipulates from its rubric onwards: '*Capítulo décimo. Que la fortuna es un ímpetu natural privado de razón en los hombres. No habiendo cosa alguna que más cara sea al hombre que la vida [...]*'.²⁹ While it is true that Garimberto's examination, as befitting its status as a treatise, does encompass a range of erudition, Suárez de Figueroa's modification of the wording dishonestly implies a personal survey of the topic on the part of the miscellanist himself which he quite simply has not carried out. A similar, and even more flagrant, falsification can be located only a short time before, at the beginning of Suárez de Figueroa's section on fortune; we have seen that these initial reference and citations are mainly taken from La Primaudaye, but Suárez de Figueroa prefaces them with his own claim: '*Recogeremos de lo mucho que en varias partes esparcieron graves autores lo que pareciere más esencial y más propio de la materia*' (fol. 226^r). Such diligent compilation of the most pertinent material on a given topic from a variety of different primary sources is indeed one of the principal – and perhaps most laudable – authorial roles performed by a miscellanist, and Suárez de Figueroa's statement of intent here actively promotes a misleading picture of his having done so. Indeed, it is hard to discern any real distinction between Suárez de Figueroa's concealed practice with regard to La Primaudaye in *Varias noticias* and his acknowledged indebtedness to Garzoni in his translation of the *Piazza universale* six years previously; although in his version of the Italian tome

²⁸ *Varias noticias*, fols 232^r-33^r are based on *Della vicissitudine*, pp. 274-76.

²⁹ Garimberto, *Theatro*, fol. 11^v (italics in the original text).

Suárez de Figueroa demonstrates an attitude which holds the original work to be open to improvement, through shortening and re-arrangement of, and additions to, the source material, he accepts that he will largely be ‘escogiendo lo mejor’ of the erudite and technical content which had already been ‘recogido’ by the Italian author, material in whose aggregation Garzoni has invested great and praiseworthy labour: ‘Las gracias deste beneficio se deben a su autor primero, que gastó años en la fábrica destes discursos’.³⁰

We have noted above that Suárez de Figueroa draws some of his material for his lengthy military discussions from Le Roy’s *De la vicissitude*; the passages in question concern types of antique weaponry, and then an overview of empire-building through force of arms by Turks and Tartars.³¹ This material is largely historical, and knits together with sections from Filipe and La Primaudaye, while introducing the theme of strong and forward-thinking leaders. Other borrowings from Le Roy’s text, which provides content cumulatively for almost a third of *Varias noticias*, cannot be categorised so straightforwardly, however, for, although Le Roy’s book is a trove of historical examples and curiosities, these are pressed into the service of a complex central thesis, that of vicissitude, understood as mutability, succession and cyclicity. Le Roy’s treatise represents the pinnacle of his career and the apotheosis of his thoughts on history and politics, building on both his translations of classical authors such Plato, Aristotle and Xenophon, and his pamphlets of the 1560s and early 1570s.³² Burke places the Le Roy of *De la vicissitude* in the intellectual line of Polybius, Patrizzi, and the Machiavelli of the *Discorsi*, and posits him as a precursor of Francis Bacon, while Severini sees the clear influence of

³⁰ *Plaza universal*, ‘Prólogo’.

³¹ *Varias noticias*, fols 168^v-77^v select from, and re-order parts of, *Della vicissitudine*, pp. 253-98.

³² On these two aspects, see respectively Richard Crescenzo, ‘Louis Le Roy et le statut du traducteur des Anciens au XVI^e siècle’, *Travaux de Littérature*, 20 (2007), 215-28, and Bodo Richter, ‘The Thoughts of Louis Le Roy According to His Early Pamphlets’, *Studies in the Renaissance*, 8 (1961), 173-96. For an overview of his career, see Enzo Sciacca, *Umanesimo e scienza politica nella Francia del XVI secolo: Loys Le Roy* (Florence: Olschki, 2007), in which pp. 99-127 examine *De la vicissitude*.

the Frenchman in Giordano Bruno's writings.³³ Suárez de Figueroa demonstrates no compunction in reproducing the Frenchman's material with fidelity, although he avoids entirely the term *vicisitud*, perhaps due to its rarity in Spanish in the period and the consequent possibility of his hidden source text being identified.³⁴ Although he winnows the French text, thinning out in particular its dense, comparative sections, he effects no significant alterations to the contours of Le Roy's argumentation, concurring with the Frenchman in his assessment of diversity and change, and processes of growth, progress and decline, and thus creates a miscellany which possesses an intellectual sophistication rare in the genre.

Borrowings from Le Roy's text, which is consulted in its Italian translation, published, like those of *Tractado del conseio* and *Academie françoise*, in Venice, are found almost immediately in the opening chapter of *Varias noticias*, and they inform especially the first half of the Spanish work, although we do find content from the final page of *De la vicissitude* in the last chapter of Suárez de Figueroa's book.³⁵ As happened with La Primaudaye's material, the text culled from Le Roy's treatise is fragmented and its original order frequently altered or inverted. Although 'variety' is examined in its cosmic and elemental manifestations, both Le Roy and Suárez de Figueroa are ultimately more interested in its human aspects; so, after being

³³ Peter Burke, *The Renaissance Sense of the Past* (London: Arnold, 1969), pp. 87-89; Maria Elena Severini, 'La *Vicissitudine o mutabile varietà delle cose*. La traduzione italiana di Ercole Cato', in *Loys Le Roy, renaissance et vicissitude du monde*, ed. by Danièle Duport (Caen: Presses Universitaires de Caen, 2011), pp. 139-52 (pp. 148-52). The influence of Le Roy on other Spanish authors and thinkers is beyond the remit of the present study, but an investigation of it would very likely yield valuable results.

³⁴ See Pilar Montero Curiel, 'Vecero, vecera y otros derivados de vez en la historia del léxico español', *Anuario de Estudios Filológicos*, 32 (2009), 175-91 (pp. 178-80). To her examples, we can add the usage made of the term by Pérez de Moya in 1585: 'En esto quisieron denotar la vicisitud de las cosas, y que la corrupción de una cosa es generación de otra' (Juan Pérez de Moya, *Philosophía secreta de la gentilidad*, ed. by Carlos Clavería (Madrid: Cátedra, 1995), p. 126).

³⁵ *Della vicissitudine*, pp. 1-3 feature in *Varias noticias*, fols 4^v-5^v, while *Della vicissitudine*, p. 327 provides material for *Varias noticias*, fol. 237.

instructed in the principle of climatic determinism,³⁶ we are assured that this is a divine scheme to unite men of differing provenance by allowing them to complement and help each other, and we note that Suárez de Figueroa is content to state the point in general terms and not apply the supposition to the obvious case of Spain's own vast and varied empire:

En esta forma cualquier provincia tiene su gracia y singularidad, distribuidas así por la divina providencia, para bien común del universo, que sin tal variedad no pudiera durar en su perfección, para que estos hombres tengan necesidad de aquéllos, y en esta conformidad se comuniquen, y recíprocamente se socorran.³⁷

Individual men's characters also possess this same providential diversity, for God has 'distribuido en todos (distintos en personas particulares) distintas y diferentes gracias, poniendo la mira en el bien común y en la conservación del humano consorcio'.³⁸ If these considerations amplify in a more ambitious Grotian key Suárez de Figueroa's comments, examined earlier in this paper, on individual human relationships, the picture of human variety with which we are presented is not an unquestioningly positive one, for Suárez de Figueroa recognises that difference can also be a source of tension and conflict. In comments thoroughly in keeping with Le Roy's ambivalent and nuanced conception, but which Suárez de Figueroa actually draws from a more succinctly phrased section of La Primaudaye's *Academie françoise*, itself owing a debt in such passages to *De la vicissitude*, we hear that excessive dissimilarity within a society can even cause the downfall of countries and empires. Two particularly damaging instances, both arising from weak governance, are 'la diferencia entre las religiones, por cuya diversidad tienen de ordinario origen las mayores guerras',³⁹ a reality in the France of the sixteenth century and a present fear

³⁶ *Varias noticias*, fol. 16^v is based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 23.

³⁷ *Varias noticias*, fol. 17, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 28.

³⁸ *Varias noticias*, fol. 35^v, also based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 28.

³⁹ *Varias noticias*, fol. 108^v, based on *Accademia francese*, p. 502.

for Spain in the seventeenth century, both in the Peninsula and, more concretely, as an element in the Eighty Years' War, which was on the verge of re-starting in earnest after just over a decade of truce as Suárez de Figueroa published his book, although, in keeping with his reluctance to broach contemporary events, the miscellanist maintains generalities; and the dissension generally sown by an overbearing influx of foreigners into a particular place to the detriment of the natives,⁴⁰ a complaint made by Suárez de Figueroa – in his own terms – in *El Pasajero* with specific reference to contemporary Spain, 'la que de continuo es pródiga en favorecer a extranjeros y avarísima en beneficiar a sus naturales'.⁴¹ Thus, although God has provided the tools needed to derive harmony from variety, it is by no means certain that man will wield these wisely.

Suárez de Figueroa, once more following Le Roy, proposes another type of difference which separates men, 'la variedad de lenguas que se conoce entre los mortales esparcidos por la tierra habitable, sin percibirse en alguna manera unos a otros'; this especially piques Suárez de Figueroa's professional interest and leads to hearty praise of a trade in which he had invested heavily: translation.⁴² These comments, which are a version of Le Roy's discourse, are congruent with the sentiments expressed in *Plaza universal* six years earlier, when Suárez de Figueroa followed Garzoni in affirming the nobility of translators' endeavours, going so far as to compare them to angels in their act of bridging linguistic divides.⁴³ Indeed, we

⁴⁰ *Varias noticias*, fol. 108, based on *Academia francese*, p. 501.

⁴¹ *El Pasajero*, I, 59.

⁴² *Varias Noticias*, fol. 81^v is based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 44.

⁴³ *Plaza universal*, fol. 208. In addition to his two versions of Guarini's *Pastor fido* and his translation-adaptation of Garzoni's encyclopaedia, Suárez de Figueroa translated, in 1614, Fernão Guerreiro's *Relaçam annal das cousas que fizeram os padres da Companhia de Iesus, nas partes da India Oriental [...] (1611)*. In his contribution to the preliminaries of Suárez de Figueroa's *Hechos de don García Hurtado de Mendoza (1613)*, Gabriel Caravajal de Ulloa refers to a forthcoming version by the author of the first volume of Battista Vernazza's *Opere spirituali (1588)*, although there is no extant copy of this translation and it is not mentioned in the lists of Suárez de Figueroa's books provided in subsequent works.

imagine that Suárez de Figueroa might consider his borrowing of materials from abroad in *Varias noticias* valuable as acts of translation, at least in the cases of La Primaudaye and Le Roy's texts, which had not previously appeared in Spanish, although the covert nature of his appropriation renders a plain declaration of this worth impossible. However, as he subsequently makes clear, translation is a means not only of closing the gap between diverse languages, but it is also necessary to combat 'la variedad y mutación continua que se ve en las lenguas', as we now perceive the other major aspect of variety which Suárez de Figueroa derives from Le Roy's treatise: mutability.⁴⁴ This is not limited, of course, to linguistic matters: 'Mas no por eso las lenguas son de mejor condición que lo demás. Tan mudables vienen a ser como los edificios, trajes, costumbres, leyes, magistrados, modos de vivir públicos y privados, armas, máquinas, instrumentos'.⁴⁵ The Italian translator of Le Roy's work evidently understood the centrality of mutability in the French text, rendering in his title as 'mutabile varietà' what was simply 'variété' in the original heading, and, the notion of variety as constant change is present from the earliest stages of *Varias noticias*; it is observable from the most basic level of the individual, for whom 'desde la infancia hasta la vejez es todo variedad, [...] recibiendo alteración tanto en el cuerpo, en pelos, carne, huesos y sangre, cuanto en el alma, mudando por instantes costumbres, usos, opiniones y apetitos',⁴⁶ to the macrocosm of the world which surrounds us, for we hear early in the preliminaries that 'no hay cosa que justamente merezca atributo de ser, si todo como se ve padece continua mudanza' ('Prólogo').⁴⁷

From Le Roy's book, Suárez de Figueroa chooses as the most conclusive and most eye-catching example of such mutability the rise and fall of kingdoms. Although he reproduces material from the French text on Egypt and Assyria, he

⁴⁴ *Varias noticias*, fol. 124^v, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 46.

⁴⁵ *Varias noticias*, fol. 128^r, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 41.

⁴⁶ *Varias noticias*, fol. 17^v, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 25.

⁴⁷ Maravall (*Cultura del Barroco*, pp. 368-82) notes that a dual understanding of variety as both multiplicity and change characterises seventeenth-century Spain: 'El Barroco radicaliza el nuevo planteamiento y hace de la variedad tal vez el primero de los valores que el mundo encierra' (p. 377).

proposes to concentrate particularly on the cases of the Persian, Greek and Roman empires, and their most notable embodiments: Cyrus the Great, Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar.⁴⁸ In introducing the first of these, Suárez de Figueroa adds a comment which distinguishes his readership from that of Le Roy's book upon which he is so dependent: 'La historia del primero, aunque de algunos sabida, pienso será agradable el representarla a muchos que por ventura la ignoran' (fol. 44^v).⁴⁹ There is no such expectation of novelty in *De la vicissitude*, for the cultured readership of this treatise is envisioned as well versed in world history. Suárez de Figueroa recapitulates the essential aspects of Cyrus's career, most significantly the expansion of the Persian territories which he oversaw and which continued most notably under the reign of his grandson Darius the Great; he proceeds to outline its decline, too, which began to set in as early as the reign of Xerxes I and reached its nadir with Darius III, whose defeat at the hands of Alexander the Great effectively brought to an

⁴⁸ On Le Roy's treatment of such individuals, see Danièle Duport, 'Loys le Roy et la représentation psychique du grand homme dans *De la vicissitude ou variété des choses en l'univers*', *Elseneur*, 25 (2010), 61-70. The same three figures are evoked together by Juan de Mariana in the prologue to his *Historia general* (1601) as exemplars of great kings whose empires have disappeared and whose greatness lives on only in the annals of history: 'De los edificios soberbios, de las estatuas y trofeos de Ciro, de Alejandro, de César, ¿qué ha quedado? [...] Las historias solas se conservan, y por ellas la memoria de personajes y de cosas tan grandes' (Juan de Mariana, *Obras del padre Juan de Mariana*, ed. by Francisco Pí y Margall, 2 vols (Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra, 1854), I, lii.

⁴⁹ On the representation of Cyrus in Le Roy and its cultural context, see Sciacca, *Umanesimo*, pp. 112-14. Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* had enjoyed great success in Renaissance Europe, especially in Latin translation, influencing Machiavelli and Bodin among others, and a Spanish translation by Diego Gracián was published in his *Obras de Xenophon* in Salamanca in 1552. Cyrus's deeds were also known through the *Histories* of Herodotus, which circulated in Latin translation from the beginning of the sixteenth century; on this, and its use in a late play by Lope de Vega, performed after the publication of *Varias noticias*, on the early life of Cyrus, see Naomi R. Walker, 'The Greek, the Roman, and the Persian King: Lope de Vega's Use of Historical Source Material for the Play *Contra valor no hay desdicha*', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 91.3 (2014), 225-41.

end the empire.⁵⁰ Suárez de Figueroa notes the proximate causes of this downfall, from the poor judgement of Xerxes, who is reduced to fleeing from Greece in a fishing boat, an astonishing event which illustrates ‘la variedad de los hechos humanos, viendo en corto bajel escondido a quien poco antes apenas había podido suplir todo el mar’,⁵¹ to the louche living of the last Darius: ‘Bien es verdad que esta manera de vivir con tanto exceso lasciva fue causa eficiente de su entera perdición’.⁵² However, like Le Roy, Suárez de Figueroa immediately inserts these events into a broader existential paradigm: ‘Ni es justo cause maravilla esta mudanza tan grande, siguiendo a las cosas humanas (tan inestables por sí) esta orden fatal de precipitarse y confundirse, cuando han llegado al mayor colmo de felicidad’.⁵³ The same point is made, perhaps even more forcefully, when avarice and its associated vices are identified as other principal mechanisms through which change, and especially decline, occur, and Suárez de Figueroa generalises a comment which in Le Roy’s original referred to the specific case of the Roman Empire:

Ni hay si se mira bien, cosa tan cierta como la caída y declinación de las cosas que llegaron a suma alteza. Después que con el medio de industrias y fatigas, se asciende al colmo de potencia y sabiduría, parece la corrompe incontinente el torpe descuido en la frecuentación y el uso licencioso de las riquezas.⁵⁴

The ineluctability of this type of variety should not be cause for despair, however, for this mutability is of a particular sort, vicissitude, the avowed focus of Le Roy’s text, which Suárez de Figueroa promotes similarly:

⁵⁰ *Varias noticias*, fols 44r-53r are based on *Della vicissitudine*, pp. 104-19.

⁵¹ *Varias noticias*, fol. 50r, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 113.

⁵² *Varias noticias*, fol. 52v, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 118.

⁵³ *Varias noticias*, fol. 52v, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 118.

⁵⁴ *Varias noticias*, fol. 74r, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 191.

Ésta es la natural revolución de los gobiernos, por quien el estado de la República se muda y remuda, haciendo de nuevo el mismo retorno. [...] En esta conformidad los imperios son transferidos de los menos en los más idóneos, de familia en familia, de nación en nación. [...] Verdad es que donde el uno [dominio] acaba, comienza el otro, y por la ruina del precedente o muchos estados en un grande se reducen o el grande en muchos menores se desmiembra.⁵⁵

Decline in one place is off-set by generation in a new context, and so, contrasted to the faltering and fall of the Persian empire is the military might of Philip II of Macedon, Alexander the Great, and his successors, and the growing prestige of Greek civilisation; the rise of one culture and the desuetude of another are not posited as consecutive, though, but rather they will overlap to an extent, as Suárez de Figueroa further demonstrates when he goes on to examine the ascent of Rome.⁵⁶ Lest Suárez de Figueroa's position be misconstrued as wholly fatalistic, however, we should note that much of the military content in the latter half of the miscellany has at its heart a conception of arms in peacetime in which they serve not only to deter external causes of disruption, but to strengthen men's character and prevent moral rot setting in, as Suárez de Figueroa builds upon an idea postulated early in his

⁵⁵ *Varias noticias*, fol. 19, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 40. On Le Roy's conception of 'vicissitude', see Werner L. Gundersheimer, *The Life and Works of Louis Le Roy* (Geneva: Droz, 1966), pp. 102-06, and Danièle Dupont, 'L'ordre naturel et l'écriture de l'histoire dans *De la vicissitude ou variété des choses en l'univers*', in *Loys Le Roy, renaissance et vicissitude du monde*, ed. by Dupont, pp. 67-80.

⁵⁶ Suárez de Figueroa, following Le Roy, expounds in his work, therefore, a number of the Renaissance theories of decline identified by Burke, such as the Frenchman's eponymous vicissitude; the idea of *translatio imperii*, especially involving the Persian, Greek and Roman empires; the natural impossibility of a nation or kingdom remaining at the peak of its powers indefinitely; and the inevitability of wealth and comfort leading to vulnerability (Peter Burke, 'Tradition and Experience: the Idea of Decline from Bruni to Gibbon', *Daedalus*, 105 (1976), 137-52 (esp. pp. 140-44, pp. 147-48)).

miscellany: namely, that successful empires carry within them the seeds of their own destruction, for the consolidation of numerous territories within a superstate leads to less competition and greater pacification, which in turn occasion a loss of valour and virtue.⁵⁷ And, although Suárez de Figueroa is quite aware that political systems are but a temporary bulwark against unforgiving change, he appropriates a sentiment from La Primaudaye which holds that the virtuous conjunction of prudence, fortitude, temperance and justice in matters of governance can stave off the depredations of vicissitude for a time at least:

Así por la diversidad destas cuatro virtudes, esparcidas entre los hombres, la República se conserva en buena constitución y disciplina. Que si ella no puede durar por causa de la variedad de las cosas humanas perpetuamente en este decoro [...] se conservará con todo muchos años.⁵⁸

Despite this detailed analysis of political decline and its concomitants appearing to occupy common ground with arguments adumbrated by those contemporaries of Suárez de Figueroa who were seeking to diagnose and remedy Spain's current – supposed – *declinación*, Suárez de Figueroa opts not to apply these principles in any sustained way to his own time or place.⁵⁹ That such an application

⁵⁷ *Varias noticias*, fol. 40, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 34.

⁵⁸ *Varias noticias*, fol. 161r, based on *Academia francese*, p. 523.

⁵⁹ *Varias noticias* received its approbations in 1620 and was published the following year in the Spanish capital, dates which are very significant; Maravall adduces a number of writings, particularly from the years 1619-1621, in which Spanish decline is investigated, and conservative suggestions made to stem it (*Cultura del Barroco*, pp. 271-75), and Elliott locates more ambitious efforts from 'arbitristas, sections of the bureaucracy, and the urban patriciate' to develop a movement for reform in 'the last four years of the reign of Philip III [i.e., 1618-1621]', noting, however, that 'it was not until 1621, with the advent of a new king [Philip IV] and a new government, that Spain acquired a regime which, in its sense of urgency, seemed to match the mood of the times' (J. H. Elliott, 'Self-Perception and Decline in Early

would have been possible, however, is demonstrated by Suárez de Figueroa's re-use, eight years later in *Pusílipo*, of many of these ideas on governance and decline, some expressed with the same wording as in *Varias noticias*, in relation to the specific and intractable case of the Spanish Viceroyalty of Naples, a treatment during which he implicitly frames Pedro Afán de Ribera, Viceroy between 1559 and 1571 and great-uncle to the current holder of the post, the dedicatee of *Pusílipo*, as a modern Cyrus and ideal ruler.⁶⁰ Why Suárez de Figueroa was chary of entering this especially live debate is hard to say. Was he loathe to impart a service to a homeland which, as he articulates in *El Pasajero*, had so under-appreciated and mistreated him? Or did he prefer not to expose himself to the inevitable barbs launched at whoever broached contentious topics, perhaps made reticent by the bruising received after his participation in the anti-Lope polemic of the now lost *Spongia* (1617)? This reluctance is not to say, however, that *Varias noticias* neglects the contemporary world absolutely; in fact, the mixture produced by Suárez de Figueroa's appropriation of Le Roy's material and his own original content presents elements of contradiction in this regard. The French treatise recognises that each fresh beginning in the cycles of vicissitude represents a potential new and valuable flowering of arts and sciences. The precise mechanics of these efflorescences are, asserts Le Roy, obscure; he identifies particular cultural high-points in illustrious periods in the history of Egypt, Assyria, Greece and Rome, but he confesses himself unable to decide whether the ultimate cause is found in the stars, in environmental factors, or in the propitious

Seventeenth-Century Spain', *Past & Present*, 74 (1977), 41-61 (p. 51)). On the nature of this 'decline' and its basis in reality, see Henry Kamen, 'The Decline of Spain: a Historical Myth?', *Past & Present*, 81 (1978), 24-50.

⁶⁰ On this reorientation of material between the two works, see Jonathan David Bradbury, 'Advice Fit for a King: Some Proposals on Governing Spanish Naples', in *Artifice and Invention in the Spanish Golden Age*, ed. by Stephen Boyd and Terence O'Reilly (Oxford: Legenda, 2014), pp. 184-94. Leadership and, in particular, kingship are key concerns in *Varias noticias*, albeit they are not treated systematically; it is beyond the remit of this study to explore this aspect of the miscellany, but such an examination would no doubt add to our understanding of these debates in the period.

circumstances created by liberality of noblemen and rulers. In any case, he is unequivocal in his assertion that the arts and sciences of his present day are not caught in decline, but are equal to, and indeed the heirs of, those great achievements of previous epochs, in positive comments which Suárez de Figueroa replicates: ‘En particular en nuestra edad, donde tras haber estado sepultadas tan grande espacio, resucitaron otra vez, recobrando el valor antiguo’.⁶¹ However, at the end of this same passage, where Le Roy notes the importance of patronage, Suárez de Figueroa tacks on a significant qualification to ‘la liberalidad de los príncipes’, adding that they are ‘hoy en premiar tan flojos y remisos’ (fol. 23^r). If we examine other writings by Suárez de Figueroa, we see that this added criticism is wholly characteristic, but it is disconcerting here nevertheless.⁶² Later in the work, Suárez de Figueroa, following Le Roy, emphasises the innovativeness and usefulness of three modern developments: printing, the compass, and artillery. He refers the reader back to *Plaza universal* for a discussion of the first of these, and curtails Le Roy’s material on the third, preferring to appropriate in full the content on the compass and seafaring, in which he is more than happy to reproduce the comments on Spanish primacy in this area.⁶³ However, he cannot resist prefacing this section with a warning of his own concerning the numerous vested interests deserving men must overcome to bring their innovations to public attention (fols 231^v-32^r), striking once more a negative note not found in the source text.

The most significant addition of this type by Suárez de Figueroa, though, comes in a section of Le Roy’s text which is an explicit rendering of three passages from Pliny’s *Natural History*.⁶⁴ In these, the ancient author surveys the intellectual achievements of the past and compares his own time unfavourably to them; Pliny is

⁶¹ *Varias noticias*, fol. 22^v, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 79.

⁶² For instance, in *El Pasajero*, the preferment shown by rulers of the past to poets and artists is underlined, with the assertion that ‘en esta edad [...] se han ido resfriando los favores, convirtiéndose en odio el amor’ (I, 194).

⁶³ *Varias noticias*, fols 232^r-33^r are based on *Della vicissitudine*, pp. 274-77.

⁶⁴ The passages alluded to in *Della vicissitudine*, pp. 192-94, are *Natural History*, 2.45, 14.1, 25.1. Suárez de Figueroa’s version of them, through Le Roy, is found in *Varias noticias*, fols 75^r-76^v.

astonished that in times of war and strife scholarly endeavour thrived, while in the current time of peace and prosperity, people shy away from undertaking significant cultural projects and neglect their responsibility towards posterity. Le Roy tempers what is essentially nostalgia, however, with a lengthy list of ‘eloquent and learned men’ from Pliny’s own time and successive generations, albeit recognising that they were ultimately inferior in ‘purity and facility of expression’.⁶⁵ Suárez de Figueroa not only does not include this enumeration, but, rather, he renders the tenor of the passage even more negative by interpolating a parallel but infinitely more vehement denunciation of the seventeenth century, in which he asserts that all is pomp and appearance, external beauty and internal corruption; soldiers, lawyers, doctors, and clergymen come in for special opprobrium, and he finishes with the reprehensible ‘ancianísimos humanistas que pasan el curso de sus años en tragar sin digerir, en leer sin aprovechar’ (fols 75^v-76^r).⁶⁶ Despite Suárez de Figueroa coming close here to falling into the trap which he himself had recognised in another passage taken from Le Roy, that of an excessive deference towards the past skewing one’s perception of the merits of the present day, the scorn manifested above towards those who do not make a positive and dynamic contribution to the culture of their own time is nevertheless indicative of an attitude held by Suárez de Figueroa and Le Roy alike which views intellectual progress as a moral obligation.⁶⁷ That is, while never wavering on the inevitability of mutability, vicissitude and the patterns that humankind is destined to repeat, neither the French treatise nor the Spanish

⁶⁵ Le Roy, *De la vicissitude ou variété des choses en l’univers*, fol. 70^r.

⁶⁶ The metaphor of digestion to figure the assimilation and transformation of one’s wide reading into a distinct intellectual product is of Senecan origin, one of the analogies posited by the Roman in the eighty-fourth of his *Epistulae Morales*, on the subject of gathering ideas and making them one’s own; see Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books*, pp. 12-13.

⁶⁷ ‘Por otra parte hay algunos con tanta afición dados a la antigüedad que ignoran el tiempo y tierra en que viven, ni les parece puede haber cosa loable donde se alegue autoridad moderna’ (*Varias noticias*, fol. 235^r, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 321). On the idea of ‘progress’ in Spain in the period, see José Antonio Maravall, *Antiguos y Modernos*, 2nd edn (Madrid: Alianza, 1986), pp. 481-611.

miscellany advocate unthinking submission to these processes, but rather they see the present day as being made potentially more fertile yet by the cumulative progress made in previous cultures.⁶⁸ Indeed, to the passage on innovation taken from Le Roy's book, Suárez de Figueroa adds a statement calqued not on the body of *De la vicissitude*, but on part of the sub-title of its Italian translation: 'El [...] desmayo se apodera de los profesores de ciencias, pareciéndoles no poderse ya decir cosa que antes no esté dicha. Conocido error es éste. Conviene aumentar con la propia invención la doctrina de los predecesores'.⁶⁹ It is at first glance difficult to reconcile this opinion with the affirmation made in Suárez de Figueroa's own preliminaries that '[p]oco se puede ofrecer que ya no se halle dicho y por lo menos imaginado' ('Prólogo'), even with the leeway afforded by 'poco', and we may initially be inclined to attribute this inconsistency to the injudicious exercise of borrowing. However, this would be to misunderstand the limits which Suárez de Figueroa has set for himself, for, although he acknowledges, along with Le Roy, the necessity of scholars and inventors who maintain and propel human knowledge forward, the hackneyed image that he adds to Le Roy's comments ('es necesario produzgan nuevas plantas frutos nuevos que a los antiguos sucedan') (fol. 236^v), in so far as it can be counterpointed against his own expressed role in *Varias noticias* as a 'jardinero que de ajenas plantas coge y ofrece regaladas frutas' ('Prólogo'), illustrates quite clearly that they are working in two different categories. Suárez de Figueroa in his miscellany is not seeking to break new ground, he is not a 'profesor de ciencias', but rather he aims simply to 'instruir al hombre en tanta diversidad de objetos' (fol. 5^r), a striving for instruction in variety which he fulfils largely through his tacit recourse to La Primaudaye and Le Roy, and, in lesser quantities, to Filipe and Garimberto.

⁶⁸ Richter describes Le Roy's worldview as a 'philosophy of progress which is the manifesto of the moderns' ('The Thoughts of Louis Le Roy', p. 180).

⁶⁹ *Varias noticias*, fol. 232^r, based on the last part of the sub-title of *Della vicissitudine o mutabile varietà delle cose nell'universo*: '[...] concludendosi in fine, non esser in tutto vero, niente dirsi che non sia stato detto prima; ma che bisogna affaticarsi con le proprie inventioni per aumentare la dottrina degli antichi.'

In conceding this distinction, however, we are still left with a nagging doubt: can Suárez de Figueroa's appropriation of the labours of others be legitimate? Is his technique really that of a gardener-miscellanist grafting from the plants of others in order to feed his reader a combination of sweet fruits, or is it not more accurate to see him as uprooting whole gardens carefully tended by those with truly green fingers? As we have seen, from Filipe, Suárez de Figueroa draws references to certain historical cases or customs in order to exemplify a section on war and peace within a broader discussion which is otherwise taken almost entirely from La Primaudaye and Le Roy. In *Tractado del conseio*, in both its Spanish original and in the Italian version used by Suárez de Figueroa, printed marginal notes – not replicated in *Varias noticias* – indicate Filipe's own reliance on a range of classical and humanistic texts to illustrate and decorate his discourse on counsel and counsellors: for instance, the episodes re-appropriated by Suárez de Figueroa hail from Pliny's *Natural History*, Valerius Maximus's *Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium*, Boccaccio's *Genealogia Deorum Gentilium*, and Robertus Britannus's *Agriculturae Encomium*. By reaching through Filipe's book to grasp such historical curiosities, Suárez de Figueroa is effectively ignoring the theoretical thrust of *Tractado del conseio*, treating Filipe's book as a repertory, a practice which he might consider as justified further by the fact that Filipe's snippets are themselves drawn, albeit with an indication of their provenance, from Latin and humanist works which are themselves of a compilatory nature.⁷⁰ The same basic point can be made of Suárez de Figueroa's employment of *Academie françoise*; that is to say, he mines the encyclopaedic French work for a succession of commonsensical moral arguments, vouchsafed especially by antiquity and the biblical and patristic traditions, and for historical examples.⁷¹ This is not, however, to

⁷⁰ On repertories and the permissive attitude surrounding their use, see Paolo Cherchi, 'Plagio e/o riscrittura nel Secondo Cinquecento', in *Furto e plagio*, ed. by Gigliucci, pp. 53-68 (esp. pp. 61-63).

⁷¹ In describing *Academie françoise* as 'an encyclopaedia of morals', Lake Prescott states that 'La Primaudaye's speakers hope to possess and arrange solid nuggets [...] of moral discourse, nuggets fit to store in the encyclopaedia's close relative, the commonplace book' (Anne Lake Prescott, 'Pierre de la Primaudaye's French Academy: Growing Encyclopaedic',

make light of the differences of scale in his use of *Tractado del conseio* and *Academie françoise*, or of his nearly verbatim renderings of substantial tranches of the French work, a step which would have been viewed by at least some of his contemporaries as an abuse, despite *Academie françoise's* status as a 'non-fiction' work and despite Suárez de Figueroa's often skilful re-arrangement of his source material.⁷²

Although early works in the miscellany tradition, as Cherchi has claimed, may have enjoyed a certain dispensation with regard to their unacknowledged use of intermediary works in the divulgation of historical and other curiosities,⁷³ the tendency of some Spanish miscellanies of the seventeenth century to engage in more complex debates on matters as diverse as politics and literary theory renders such a benevolent approach more problematical when the hidden appropriation also relates to the expression and argumentation of ideas.⁷⁴ Suárez de Figueroa's use of

in *The Renaissance Computer. Knowledge Technology in the First Age of Print*, ed. by Neil Rhodes and Jonathan Sawday (London, New York: Routledge, 2000), pp. 157-69 (p. 158).

⁷² For an example of such a judgement, see Daniela Pastina, 'La Grammatica di Lodovico Dolce', in *Sondaggi sulla riscrittura*, ed. by Cherchi, pp. 63-73. Suárez de Figueroa himself, following Le Roy, speaks disparagingly of books which repeat material found in others, even if they re-phrase or re-order it: 'Entre otros no se hallan sino réplicas molestas, mudando órdenes y términos' (*Varias noticias*, fol. 236^r, based on *Della vicissitudine*, p. 324).

⁷³ Cherchi, *Polimatia di riuso*, pp. 211-12, and for a case-study see Paolo Cherchi, 'Juan Luis Vives: a Source of Pedro Mexía's *Silva de varia lección*', in *Sondaggi sulla riscrittura*, ed. by Cherchi, pp. 149-57. Nevertheless, authors writing in the Spanish miscellany tradition, like their classical and humanist counterparts, do make a very conspicuous fetish of the supposed breadth of their own reading which is now presented in condensed form; among these is Pérez de Montalbán, who, in the preliminaries to his *Para todos* (1632), states that he has eschewed an index of sources, for in his case these are simply too abundant: 'No hago tabla de los autores que cito y alabo porque son tantos, que el referirlos más tuviera de embarazo que de divertimento' (Juan Pérez de Montalbán, *Obra no dramática*, ed. by José Enrique Laplana Gil (Madrid: Turner, 1999), p. 471).

⁷⁴ On complaints regarding the illicit re-use of ideas in the period, see Stefano Benedetti, 'Accusa e smascheramento del "furto" a metà Cinquecento: riflessioni sul plagio critico

Garimberto's *Della fortuna* not only harnesses the historical material and examples provided by the text, as happens with the content filched from La Primaudaye on this same topic, in both cases deliberately promoting a false impression of Suárez de Figueroa's supposed breadth of reading, but it also replicates the theoretical posture of the source work, allowing the Spaniard to participate, however marginally, in a live intellectual debate. Nevertheless, the fact that Suárez de Figueroa avails himself only of the first half of the opening book of Garimberto's text, even if this does simply bespeak laziness on the part of the borrowing author, ensures that the material taken from the Italian is introductory – and ultimately superficial – in tone and argumentation, rather than casting Suárez de Figueroa in the dubious role of an acute thinker on the subject. It is, instead, the unrecognised utilisation of Le Roy's seminal treatise which most inculpates Suárez de Figueroa, for not only the rudiments of the Frenchman's arguments are reproduced, but a significant number of its complexities and nuances as well, converting *Varias noticias* from merely providing 'notice of a variety of things' to exploring the very nature of 'variedad' itself in its manifold aspects. This unspoken translation is, of course, a potentially valuable contribution to the Spanish Baroque, but we are left with an awkward choice: do we judge Suárez de Figueroa as a crow in borrowed feathers, like those upstart pseudo-humanists whom he berated in *Plaza universal*, as the furtive Plinian figure transcribing without attribution, or, more generously, as an antidote to a class of scholar which we saw ridiculed above, the 'ancianísimos humanistas que pasan el curso de sus años en tragar sin digerir, en leer sin aprovechar', men whose learning remains undigested and of no use to themselves or the wider reading community?

At the risk of proffering an unsatisfactory fudge, we might view his behaviour to some extent in both ways. He cannot escape fully the charge he himself had laid against brazen plagiarists four years earlier in *El Pasajero*. In that work, the principal interlocutor, the disillusioned El Doctor, a version of the middle-aged Suárez de Figueroa, advises the aspiring poet Luis with black irony that, should he wish to publish a bulkier volume and be generally acclaimed, he should supplement his

intorno alla polemica tra G.B. Pigna e G.B. Giraldo Cinzio', in *Furto e plagio*, ed. by Gigliucci, pp. 233-61.

poems by passing off as his own those of other authors.⁷⁵ Although such sharp practices should properly be called ‘hurto’, says El Doctor, nowadays they are given the euphemistic label of ‘aprovechamientos’, and, even if Luis is reproached for such borrowings, the protests will be short-lived, for his detractors will not want their own output scrutinised for evidence of similar irregularities. He sums up the regrettable situation with a familiar image: ‘Todos cuantos escriben en todo género de facultades son corneas vestidas de ajenas plumas’.⁷⁶ In fact, that the Suárez de

⁷⁵ The counsel given by El Doctor re-figures in a satirical key the complaint made by Carvallo in the fourth dialogue of *Cisne de Apolo* (1602), in which the theft of whole poems is condemned in the strongest of terms (‘En ninguna manera [sería permitido], porque eso es hurtar. [...] [D]even ser affrentados y vituperados los que hurtan lo que otros escriben y lo publican por proprio suyo’), a criticism which is buttressed not only by reference to Horace’s ‘stolen feathers’ imagery, but also with another notable comment from Antiquity, that found in the preface to the seventh book of Vitruvius’s *De Architectura* (Luis Alfonso de Carvallo, *Cisne de Apolo*, ed. by Alberto Porqueras Mayo, 2 vols (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1958), II, 177-78). This latter opinion is used by Carvallo to highlight the shameful practice of wholesale appropriation of creative literature, but in the original Latin text its scope is wider, encompassing both artistic creation, and ideas and factual research of the sort found in works like Vitruvius’s manual; on this passage in *De Architectura*, see McGill, *Plagiarism in Latin Literature*, pp. 34-46.

⁷⁶ *El Pasajero*, I, 194-96. The sentiments articulated here, for all the irony inherent in their expression, sit uncomfortably with Suárez de Figueroa’s own illicit use of poems by his good friend Luis Carrillo y Sotomayor in precisely this fashion in his pastoral novel, *La constante Amarilis* (1609); this borrowing, of eight as then unpublished sonnets by Carrillo y Sotomayor, five of which are carried over almost identically, was identified by Erasmo Buceta (‘Carrillo de Sotomayor y Suárez de Figueroa’, *Revista de Filología Española*, 6 (1919), 299-305), and has been examined further by María Asunción Satorre Grau (‘Estudio y edición de *La constante Amarilis*, de Cristóbal Suárez de Figueroa’, 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 1995), I, 397-406). It is true that in *El Pasajero* Suárez de Figueroa confesses, through El Doctor, to having ‘flown with someone else’s wings’ in that work and disowns *La constante Amarilis* in any case as an ‘adulterino’ (I, 203), but the admission here is more likely to relate to his more extensive use of Juan de Jáuregui’s

Figuerola of *Varias noticias* mines a majority of his content from other writers would seem to rob him of even the saving grace that his fictional counterpart affords those who augment their own collections with others' poems, that they at least include alongside them much of their own original material ('habiendo mucho de casa, ¿qué importa pedir al vecino algo prestado para lucir en semejante fiesta?') and thus prevent their book from becoming 'como información de letrado: nada propio, todo ajeno'.⁷⁷ If we can accept, in an avowedly compilatory work such as *Varias noticias*, that the pilfering, even on a massive scale, of quotations, episodes and examples from other authors' stockpiles, is not comparable to such outright theft of poetry, a privileged artistic product which, however dependent it may itself be on imitation, bears its creator's hallmark, the unattributed appropriation of intellectual enquiry is much closer to this disreputable habit, and the injury is compounded by Suárez de Figuerola seeking to render his immediate conceptual sources untraceable, an occultation achieved most notably by the studied omission of the term 'vicissitude' from his treatment of Le Roy's materials. On the other hand, although he cannot be said to have emulated his predecessors by conferring on their thoughts a consistently Hispanic focus, he has nevertheless digested and conjoined ideas from books which might otherwise have remained beyond the purview of the reader of a vernacular Spanish miscellany, whether because of their foreignness or their being specialised works not intended for the generalist readership whose more modest expectations configure the popular genre of the *miscelánea*.

UNIVERSITY OF EXETER
JONATHAN DAVID BRADBURY

Dr Jonathan Bradbury
College of Humanities
The Queen's Building

1608 translation of Tasso's *Aminta* (1573); see Joaquín Arce, 'Un desconcertante plagio en prosa de una traducción en verso', *Filología Moderna*, 46-47 (1972-73), 3-29.

⁷⁷ *El Pasajero*, I, 195.

University of Exeter

Exeter

EX4 4QH

j.bradbury@exeter.ac.uk