

**HIDDEN SPANISH
TREASURE IN A
SEVENTEENTH-
CENTURY TEXT: THE
STRANGE CASE OF DR
GARCÍA AND MR
HOWELL**

Martin Beagles

Universidad Complutense / Universidad Pontificia Comillas

The paper deals with a previously undetected case of literary borrowing by the Anglo-Welsh letter-writer and pamphleteer James Howell (1594?-1666), best known for his *Familiar Letters* of 1645-55. I have discovered that Howell lifted quite large chunks of material for his second book (*Instructions for Forreine Travell*, 1642) from a text by the obscure and mysterious Spanish writer, Dr Carlos García, who published his *Antipatía de los franceses y españoles* in Paris in 1617. (This was an influential book in its day, running to several editions in various languages). In my paper, I will also consider the biographies of the two men and discuss the interesting possibility that Howell and García might have met and known each other in Paris, during Howell's first travels on the Continent.

The Spaniard is pleased to compare himself to a *tesoro escondido*, to a hidden treasure. Richard Ford, *A Hand-book for Travellers in Spain and Readers at Home* (London, 1845)

And who, in time, knows whither we may vent
The treasure of our tongue? To what strange shores,
This gain of our best glory shall be sent,
T'enrich unknowing nations with our stores?
Samuel Daniel, *Musophilus* (1599)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FORREINE TRAVELL

In her well-known study of seventeenth-century English travellers in Spain, published in 1981, Patricia Shaw Fairman quoted extensively from Sections V and VI of James Howell's *Instructions for Forreine Travell* of 1642, claiming that these sections provided useful insights into British notions about their contemporary European neighbours, and in particular Spain (Shaw 1981: 46).¹ In this paper, I would like to suggest that this claim is in need of refinement.

Instructions for Forreine Travell is a short book, running to about 20,000 words in its first edition, and divided into nineteen brief sections. (A second edition in 1650 incorporated a six-page appendix on "Turkey and the Levant parts," places which it is unlikely that Howell ever visited). Although the main purpose of the *Instructions* was to advise and prepare gentlemen on the practicalities of travel and the learning of languages abroad, Howell's literary aspirations are clear throughout the text, and they are reflected in the frequency and quality of his digressions from the main subject. Some idea of this diversity of material can be gained from reading the preliminary two-page "Substance of this Discours," a list of contents which begins as follows:

Of the advantage, and preheminance of the Eye.
Of Forraine Travell, and the progresse of Learning.
What previous abilities are required in a Traveller.
A caveat touching his Religion.
Precepts for learning the French Language.
What Authors to be made choyce of, for the Government and History of France.
Of Books, in generall.
Of Historians, and a method to reade them.
Of Private Meditation.
Of Poets.
An estimat of the expences of a Nobleman, or of a private Gentleman a broad.
Advertisements for writing of Letters. (Howell 1869: 9)

¹In this full-length study, Patricia Shaw repeated and extended assessments of Howell's work which had previously been formulated in her article on Howell (1976). For more on Howell, see Jacobs (1890 and 1892). Jacobs' introduction to the *Familiar Letters* remains the best general account of Howell's life and work. See also the introduction to Bennett (1890); and Sydney Lee's entry for James Howell in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, which, however, contains some mistakes. For more recent work, see: Nutkiewicz (1990); Woolf (1993). Potter (1989) contains references to Howell. Useful remarks can also be found in Sánchez Escribano (1996).

As can be seen, Howell covers a lot of ground in the *Instructions*, and this extract from the list of contents refers only to the first four of the nineteen sections in his book.

Of all the digressions in the *Instructions*, one of the most memorable and effective is that which spans Sections V and VI, in which Howell deals in a strikingly humorous way with supposed differences in character and customs between contemporary Frenchmen and Spaniards. In a strangely pithy or “Senecan” style which contrasts sharply with the more leisurely prose in the rest of his book, Howell presents the men of the two nations as “antipathetic” in almost every respect: whereas one wears his hair long, the other wears it short; one always buttons his doublet downwards, the other upwards, and so on. These were the passages quoted by Patricia Shaw in her survey of seventeenth-century travellers in Spain,² although she was certainly not the first commentator to feel their attraction. Sections V and VI had already been specifically recommended to readers by Edward Arber, editor of the 1869 reprint of the *Instructions*. Rather optimistically describing the *Instructions* as “our first Handbook for the Continent,” Arber pointed readers in the direction of Sections V and VI:

In itself the book is very discursive. A survey of foreign politics, much shrewd speculation in language, descriptions of foreign customs; and in particular, a notable discrimination of the differing characters of the Frenchman and the Spaniard of his day... (1869: 5)

Over a century later, Patricia Shaw followed Arber in highlighting these passages on the Frenchman and Spaniard of Howell’s day, and went so far as to describe parts of Section V as “párrafos magistrales” which she held it “worth copying almost entirely, because in a way they certainly summarise the ideas held in England at that time about the character and mentality of the Spaniards” [my translations] (Shaw 1981: 146). The paragraphs in question are reproduced below:

Having passed the Pyreneys hee [the foreign traveller] shall palpably discern (as I have observed in another larger Discours) the suddenest and strangest difference ‘twixt the Genius and Garb of two People, though distant but by a very small separation, as betwixt any other upon the surface of the Earth; I knowe Nature delights and triumphs in dissimilitudes; but here, she seemes to have industriously, and of set purpose studied it; for they differ not onely Accidentally and Outwardly in their Cloathing and Cariage, in their Diet, in their Speeches and Customes; but even Essentially in the very faculties of the Soule, and operations thereof, and in every thing else, Religion and the forme of a Rationall creature only excepted; which made Doctor Garcia thinke to

²For an introduction to seventeenth-century guidebooks, see Maczak (1995: 152-157). This book was first published in Polish in 1798, and contains some interesting references to Howell. A truly abominable Spanish translation also exists: Maczak (1996).

aske a Midwife once, whither the Frenchman and Spaniard came forth into the World in the same posture from the womb or no.

Go first to the Operations of the Soule, the one [the Frenchman] is Active and Mercuriall, the other [the Spaniard] is Speculative and Saturnine: the one Quick and Ayry, the other Slow and Heavy; the one Discursive and Sociable, the other Reserved and Thoughtfull; the one addicts himselfe for the most part to the study of the Law and Canons, the other to Positive and Schoole Divinity; the one is *Creatura sine Praeterito et Futuro*, the other hath too much of both: the one is a Prometheus, the other an Epimetheus; the one apprehends and forgets quickly, the other doth both slowly, with a judgement more abstruse and better fixed, *et in se reconditum*; the one will dispatch the weightiest affaires as hee walke along in the streets, or at meales, the other upon the least occasion of businesse will retire solemnly to a room, and if a Fly chance to hum about him, it will discompose his thoughts, and puzzle him: It is a kind of sicknesse for a Frenchman to keep a Secret long, and all the drugs of Egypt cannot get it out of a Spaniard.

The French capacity, though it apprehend and assent unto the Tenets of Faith, yet he resteth not there, but examines them by his owne reason, debates the businesse *pro et contra*, and so is often gravelled upon the quick sands of his own brain, the Spaniard cleane contrary by an implicate Faith and generall Obedience beleives the Canons and Determination of the Church, and presently subjects his Understanding thereunto, he sets bounds to all his Wisdome and Knowledge, and labours to avoyd all Speculation thereon, fearing through the frailty of his Intellectuals, to fall into some Error.

(*Instructions for Forreine Travell*, Section V)³

These paragraphs hold some curious observations on national characteristics which retain a genuine if stereotyped interest even today, and the analysis continues in the same vein for several more pages in the *Instructions*, often very amusingly. This is taut and powerful writing, which combines insight and a sense of detached fun in an undeniably seductive way, and it is not surprising that these pages have attracted the attention and praise of commentators down the years. Unfortunately, however, the true role of these passages in the development of James Howell's writing career has probably been misunderstood until now. Little of this material can easily be attributed to the original genius of Howell, for the simple reason that most of it made its first appearance elsewhere, in a bilingual French-Spanish treatise published some twenty-five years before the first edition of *Instructions for Forreine Travell*.

³Howell (1869: 30-31); Shaw Fairman (1981: 146-147).

LA ANTIPATIA DE FRANCESES Y ESPAÑOLES

Almost everything in Sections V and VI of the *Instructions* is translated from a bilingual French-Spanish treatise first published in Paris on 8 April 1617, approximately at the time of James Howell's first visit to the city. The full title of Howell's source text is *La Oposición y Conjunción de los dos grandes luminares de la tierra o La Antipatía de franceses y españoles*. The author of the *Antipatía* was one Doctor Carlos García, an enigmatic and little-known Spanish exile living in Paris.⁴

The treatise itself can only be fully understood in the precise contexts of the time and place of its publication: it was, above all, a late contribution to a very public debate about the so-called *Mariages Espagnols* of 1615. These double Royal marriage agreements, by which Philip III's eldest daughter Anne of Austria was married to Louis XIII whilst his ten-year-old son Philip, the future Philip IV, married Louis' sister Isabella of Bourbon, confirmed the existence of a new Franco-Spanish understanding after years of political and military antagonism. In France, "*les mariages*" were greeted by a barrage of pamphlets, many of them written in praise of the new accord. Nevertheless, it is clear from contemporary reports that anti-Spanish feeling in Paris, which dated back well into the previous century, was not extinguished overnight as a result of the marriages. A group of newly-marginalised courtiers ("*les malcontents*") who were opposed to the pro-Spanish turn of events had little trouble mobilising Hispanophobic sentiment in popular demonstrations against the Crown, and despite official efforts, these feelings also found their way into print. A debate ensued on the convenience of the *mariages* pact with Spain, and García's *Antipatía* must be seen as a direct contribution to that debate.⁵

As one might expect from a Spaniard living in France, García in the *Antipatía* comes down strongly in favour of friendship between the two nations and he greets the new opportunities provided by the marriage agreement. His

⁴All quotations from the *Antipatía de franceses y españoles* are taken from C. García (1979). Bareau's edition contains a very useful introduction, in which he provides detailed coverage of what is known of García's life and work. The *Antipatía* itself was an immediately successful book, going through seven French-Spanish editions by 1638. It was translated into Italian in 1636, and rapidly went through thirteen editions in that language by 1702. German and English translations also appeared in the course of the century (see note 7).

⁵See C. García (1979: 17-39). Bareau is particularly good on the political context and frenzied pamphleteering activity at the time of the publication of the *Antipatía*; he names more than forty pamphlets in the course of his introduction, and provides close analysis of several of them.

treatise mostly consists of an elaborately-structured framework of arguments justifying the “conjunction” of the two nations, together with explanation of the beneficial effects for European Christendom of the realisation of this union. However, as the title itself indicates, the *Antipatía* also contains a great deal on the supposed “natural enmity” between the two countries and even has a whole chapter (Chapter X) on García’s first-hand experience of Parisian Hispanophobia (he describes his first months in the city, when he claims that it was impossible for him to go out onto the streets without being surrounded by crowds of mocking children, who identified him as a Spaniard from his clothing, and he relates in detail an incident at a streetmarket when he was pelted with fruit and vegetables)⁶ (1979: 17-39). The book thus appears to lay itself open to the charge of ambiguity, and there is no question that its liveliest passages, chapters XI to XVII, are precisely those which seem to work against the main thesis by exploring the theme of antipathetic national characteristics. It is interesting to note that these are the passages which came to Howell’s mind when he was casting around for material with which to pad out his *Instructions for Forreine Travell* in 1642. By homing in on chapters XI to XVII of the *Antipatía*, Howell was to demonstrate from the start of his writing career that he had a journalist’s, or rather an editor’s, ability to recognise and remember good copy. It seems likely that the London publication in 1641 of the first English translation of the *Antipatía* may have jogged Howell’s memory of the book, but it is equally clear that his *Instructions* is based on his own use of the original French-Spanish text rather than the later English version.⁷

The strongest hint that Howell in the *Instructions* is about to lean heavily on the *Antipatía* is of course his mention of “Doctor Garcia” in the first paragraph quoted above, from the beginning of Section V. Howell’s phrase, “which made Doctor Garcia thinke to aske a Midwife once, whither the

⁶García (1979: 206-220). A very similar street incident, strongly reminiscent of the one described in the *Antipatía*, occurs in the anonymous picaresque novel *La vida y hechos de Estevanillo Gonzalez*, first published in Antwerp in 1646. See the following edition, which mentions García in a footnote: Carreira and Cid (1990: 251).

⁷The first English translation of the *Antipatía* was that by Robert Gentilys in 1641. Although it is striking that this translation of García’s book should have appeared just a year before the publication of Howell’s *Instructions*, Howell does not seem to have used it as the basis of his text. There is much that is different about Gentilys’ and Howell’s versions of García’s original. Thus there is no coincidence in phraseology between Gentilys and Howell: whereas Gentilys’ version is generally faithful, literal and somewhat dull, Howell takes more liberties as a translator, usually in the interests of concision, and he frequently hits upon more memorable solutions. Crucially, Gentilys appears to be working solely from the French version of the *Antipatía*, whilst Howell takes ideas from both the French and Spanish texts, which differ slightly at many points. Thus, to give one example, Howell uses the idea, only present in the Spanish version of the text, that a Frenchman wears his coat so short “that one might give him a Suppositor with his Cloake about him, if need were.” There is no mention of suppositors in Gentilys. Shaw Fairman (1976: 405, note); Shaw Fairman (1981: 146, note).

Frenchman and Spaniard came forth into the world in the same posture from the womb or no” (1869: 30), is itself a loose translation of the remark with which García opens Chapter XI of the *Antipatía*, the first of a series of chapters on French and Spanish characteristics. García’s exact words are as follows:

Mil veces he tenido tentación de pedir a las parteras de cual suerte salen del vientre de su madre los Franceses. Porque según la contrariedad que veo entre ellos y los Españoles tengo por imposible que nazcan todos de una mesma manera. (1979: 222)

This is one of two places in the *Instructions* where Howell specifically names García (1869: 30, 34), but at no point does he reveal the extent to which he is relying on García’s text, and this reliance has passed unnoticed until now. As far as I can tell, Patricia Shaw is the only previous commentator even to have attempted to identify “Doctor Garcia;” in 1976 and again in 1981, she suggested that Howell “probably refers to Dr. Pedro García Carrero,” a Court physician who rose to prominence under Philip III, retained his position under Philip IV and “also wrote comedies and poetry” [my translations]. Shaw did not state her reasons for the “probability” of this assertion; neither did she give any quotation from García Carrero’s work which might plausibly support it⁸ (1976: 405 note) (1981: 146 note).

In fact, Howell’s “midwife” phrase and the whole of the following two paragraphs can easily be shown to be based on passages from Chapter XI of the *Antipatía*. For example, when Howell writes that “the one [the Frenchman] addicts himselfe for the most part to the study of the Law and Canons, the other [the Spaniard] to Positive and Schoole Divinity” (1869: 30), this is his version of the following brief paragraph by García:

La mayor parte de los entendimientos franceses se dan al estudio de las leyes y cánones y muy pocos aman la teología positiva y escolástica; y entre los Españoles muy pocos, o los menos, estudian el drecho [sic] y casi todos la teología. (1979: 224)

When Howell writes about a Spaniard’s need “upon the least occasion of busnesse” to “retire solemnly to a room and if a Fly chance to hum about him,

⁸Claudio Guillén, in a recent collection of essays on comparative literature (1998: 336-367) dedicates an entire chapter to “Imágenes nacionales y escritura literaria” in which he shows himself to be familiar both with Shaw’s *España vista por los ingleses del siglo XVII* and Carlos García’s *Antipatía de franceses y españoles*. Strangely, however, Guillén fails to make the connection between Howell, whose borrowings from García feature so prominently in Shaw’s book, and García himself, whose *Antipatía* is nonetheless well described by Guillén as a “curious mixture of abstract, quasi-scholastic thought and realistic, quasi-picaresque satire” (“una curiosa mezcla de pensamiento abstracto, casi escolástico, y de sátira realista, casi picaresca”).

it will discompose his thoughts, and puzzle him” (1869: 31), he is also borrowing directly from Chapter XI:

Todo lo cual es contrario al entendimiento de un Español, porque si tiene algún negocio entre manos que requiera la consideración, se retira en un lugar solitario y es tan enemigo de la compañía y tumulto, que si una sola mosca le pasa cerca del oído cuando está engolfado en un negocio, le impedirá la resolución dél. (1979: 226)

Equally, where Howell has that “the Spaniard cleane contrary by an implicite Faith and general Obedience beleeves the Canons and Determination of the Church, and presently subjects his Understanding thereunto, he sets bounds to all his Wisdome and Knowledge, and labours to avoyd all Speculation thereon, fearing through the frailty of his Intellectuals, to fall into some Error” (1869: 31), it is not difficult to show that he is again translating from García:

El entendimiento del Español es muy medroso y cobarde en lo que toca a la Fe y determinación de la Iglesia, porque en el punto que se le propone un artículo de Fe, allí para y mete raya a toda su sciencia, sabiduría y discurso. Y no sólomente no procura saber si es, o no es, lo que la Fe le dice, pero hace toda suerte de diligencia por no especular licenciosamente sobre ello, temiendo, con la fragilidad del entendimiento, dar en algún error. (1979: 224)

Even the apparent non-sequitur at the end of Howell’s second paragraph above, about the inability of Frenchmen to keep a secret for long, and how “all the drugs of Egypt cannot get it out of a Spaniard” (1869: 31), is taken straight from the *Antipatía*. In García’s text, however, it occurs in a much more logical position over twenty pages later at the end of Chapter XV, a section which deals with contrasts in speech habits. The only (trivial) difference between the two versions is that Howell writes “Egypt” where García had written “India”:

No puede negarse que toda la industria del mundo será bastante para hacer callar un secreto a un Francés, pues no puede reposar hasta que lo publica; y para sacar una cosa secreta del pecho de un Español no tendrán virtud ni fuerza todas las drogas de la India. (1979: 250)

It would be perfectly possible to continue with such comparisons for the entirety of Sections V and VI of the *Instructions*. Just about everything in Howell’s lengthy digression has its origin somewhere in Chapters XI to XVII of the *Antipatía*.⁹ I do not, however, propose to account for every sentence in this way. I would, however, like to comment briefly on certain aspects of Howell’s translation methods. Howell’s procedures here are particularly interesting for

⁹Some parts were also taken from Howell’s own *Dendrologia. Dodona’s Grove, or the vocall forrest* (Howell 1640). See note 10.

the light they shed on his development as a writer: to some extent, the techniques of appropriation which he can be seen acquiring as he writes his *Instructions* were precisely those which were to prove useful in the composition of many of his other works, including even the *Familiar Letters*.

The most curious aspect of Howell's translation technique is perhaps the selective way in which he raids different parts of García's text, skipping back and forth as he sees fit, sometimes to the detriment of the logical development of the original ideas. Carlos García's treatise is a highly-organised piece of writing, with strict sense divisions between chapters, but Howell is unable or unwilling to accommodate these qualities in the *Instructions*. The order of ideas in García's original is rarely respected. Sentences translated from one chapter of the *Antipatía* are placed in Howell's text alongside sentences taken from another chapter, very often on a different subject altogether. One example of this is the sentence about keeping secrets quoted immediately above, but there are several other places in the *Instructions* where Howell indulges in this sort of mixing.

A good example is provided by the following long paragraph from Section V of the *Instructions*. Most of it is based on Chapter XIV of the *Antipatía*, a very short chapter on "Antipathy in Walking" ("De la Antipatía del andar") (1979: 242-245), but with García's ideas reduced in length and presented in a completely different order. García begins by describing how Frenchmen walk up and down the streets in a "disorderly" way by comparison with Spaniards, but Howell chooses to open with material taken from later in the chapter, on the speed at which each nationality proceeds. Howell follows this with García's opening point about disorderliness, then another from later in Chapter XIV on eating in the street, and so he goes on, in his usual irregular way. In addition, this passage rather illogically contains material first used by Howell in his *Dodona's Grove* two years earlier, mostly about differences between Frenchmen and Spaniards when playing tennis or shuffling cards ("The one like the Wind in the Fable... plays his game more cunningly")¹⁰ (Howell 1640: 7); and finally, it closes with a translation of a single phrase extracted from the end of an entirely different chapter of the *Antipatía* altogether, Chapter XII, on different styles of clothing ("for when hee goeth to the Field...") (1979: 238). This passage is thus a typical example of the jumbled and derivative way in which Howell had learnt to write:

¹⁰Howell had written there: "The one takes the ball before the bound; The other stayeth for it, and commonly fetcheth a surer stroke: The one in the cariage of his designes is like the Wind, the other like the Sunne in the Fable; when they went to try their strength upon a passenger's cloake: The one knows how to shuffle the Cards better; The other playeth his game more cunningly."

Go to their Gate, the Frenchman walks fast, (as if he had a Sergeant always at his heeles,) the Spaniard slowly, as if hee were newly come out of some quartan Ague; the French go up and down the streets confusedly in clusters, the Spaniards if they be above three, they go two by two, as if they were going a Procession; the French Laquays march behind, the Spaniards before; the one beckons upon you with his hand cast upwards, the other downward; the Frenchman will not stick to pull out a Peare or some other thing out of his pocket, and eate it as he goes along the street, the Spaniard will starve rather than do so, and would never forgive himselfe, if he should commit such a rudenesse; the Frenchman if he spies a lady of his acquaintance, he will make boldly towards her, salute her with a kisse, and offer to Usher her by the hand or arme, the Spaniard upon such an encounter, useth to recoyle backward, with his hands hid under his Cloack, and for to touch or kisse her, he holds it a rudenesse beyond all barbarisme, a kind of sacriledge; the Frenchman is best and most proper on Horseback, the Spaniard a foot; the one is good for the Onset, the other for a retreat: the one like the Wind in the Fable, is full of ruffling fury, the other like the Sun, when they went to try their strength upon the Passengers Cloake. The one takes the ball before the bound, *A la volée*, the other stayeth for the fall; the one shuffleth the Cards better, the other playes his game more cunningly; your Frenchman is much the fairer Duellist for when hee goeth to the Field, he commonly puts off his doublet and opens his breast; the Spaniard cleane contrary, besides his shirt, hath his doublet quilted, his coat of maile, his cassock, and strives to make himselfe impenetrable. (Howell 1869: 32)

It is not immediately clear why Howell mixes his material like this —his text certainly cannot be said to gain coherence as a result, when he starts a paragraph with a phrase like “Go to their Gate...” and ends it with discussions of tennis, card-shuffling and duelling. Whatever the reason, it can be said generally to support a notion first put forward by Verona Hirst:

I have found, in a study of Howell’s other works, especially his histories, that he regularly uses a particular method of compiling his books. He takes other writers’ works and, usually without acknowledgement or by-your-leave, snips them up to his own purposes, taking a little here or a lot there, digesting, abstracting and condensing as necessary, leaving the dull bits out like the good journalist he was. (1959)

This is in fact a fair description of what Howell does with García’s text, and as Hirst pointed out forty years ago, it may well be the sort of procedure that Howell applied to the raw material of his own original letters when he set out to compile his *Familiar Letters* in 1645. The answer to the much-vexed question of the “authenticity” of Howell’s *Familiar Letters* is quite possibly to be found here: if Howell used his own original material in the same way that he used the *Antipatia* and other books, “taking a little here or a lot there,” this might explain the *Familiar Letters*’ confusing juxtapositions of descriptions of

events from entirely different periods, and it might account for the difficulties associated with their dating.¹¹ Even so, it is not easy to decide exactly what this tells us about Howell's writing methods when he was working on his *Instructions*. Does it suggest something about the way he stored notes in a commonplace book (a practice he specifically recommends to gentlemen travellers in *Instructions for Forreine Travell*), or is it perhaps best interpreted as a deceitful, if rather naive, attempt to conceal his original sources? It may well be that Howell's work as a spymaster for Thomas Wentworth, collecting and collating reports from sources all over Europe and preparing them for his master's consumption, had made him something of an expert in this sort of summary-writing even before he became an established author. The techniques of "digesting, abstracting and condensing" might already have been second nature to Howell when he set out on his new career in literature, having spent so many years doing precisely the same thing for his master.

It is worth noting that Howell continues to translate from the *Antipatia* in Section VI of the *Instructions*, even when he appears to be expressing personal views of his own about the numerous examples of "antipathy" he has just cited. Reproduced below is the opening paragraph of Howell's Section VI, immediately followed by the first paragraph of Chapter XVII of García's *Antipatia*. Howell can be seen here clearly attempting to pass off as thoughts of his own a series of ideas which were first elaborated by García at the time of the *mariages espagnols* debate. On introducing them, Howell seems to "over-compensate" in his desire to convince readers that the ideas originate with him, by stressing the amount of mental labour he has supposedly undertaken in order to arrive at his conclusions:

And truly I have many times and oft busied my spirits, and beaten my brains hereupon, by taking information from dead and living men, and by my own practicall observations, to know the true cause of this strange antipathy betwixt two such potent and so neare neighbouring Nations, which bringeth with it such mischief into the World; and keepes Christendome in a perpetuall alarme: For although the Ill Spirit bee the principall Author thereof, as being the Father and fomenter of all discord and hatred (it being also part of the Turkes letany, that warres should continue still betweene

¹¹Discussion of the *Familiar Letters* has tended to concentrate almost exclusively on the issue of their possible "authenticity." See Jacobs (1890 and 1892: lxiii-lxxxii); Hirst (1959); Warner (1894). The *Familiar Letters* include references to events from different periods as if they were completely contemporaneous, and the dates which they contain are, in Jacobs' words, "perfectly untrustworthy." This has made it difficult to reconstruct several parts of Howell's biography: the *D. N. B.* is particularly misleading for the period of Howell's first foreign travels, saying that he left London in 1616 and did not return until 1622, which contradicts Howell's own account of his "three years' Peregrination by Land and Sea" (Jacobs 1890: 99) and does not leave him anything like enough time to carry out the working engagements which are known to have occupied him before he travelled to Madrid in the spring of 1623.

these two potent Nations) to hinder the happy fruit that might grow out of their Union: yet nevertheless it must be thought that hee cannot shed this poyson, and sow these cursed tares, unlesse hee had some grounds to work his designe upon. (1869: 33-34)

Mil veces he procurado con particular especulación buscar la causa fundamental del odio y ojeriza entre estas dos naciones, porque si bien es verdad que el Demonio ha sido el autor principal desta antipatía y mortal discordia por estorbar el fruto que podía nacer de la unión de ambas naciones, con todo eso se debe creer que halló algún fundamento y raíz en ellas para multiplicar tan maldita cizaña y pernicioso veneno. (1979: 262)

Howell follows this paragraph almost immediately with what is his second reference in the *Instructions* to “Doctor Garcia,” stating that the author is on record as attributing the antipathy of the two nations to influences of the stars. Howell’s partial recognition of his original source is quickly succeeded by another brief paragraph in which he repeats the procedure I have just explained above, i.e. he peddles material from the *Antipatía*, about Hippocrates, as if it were the result of his own reading rather than the straightforward translation from García that it really is:

Some as Doctor Garcia, and other Philosophicall Authors, attribute this opposition to the qualities of the clymes and influences of the Stars, which are known to bear sway over all Sublunary bodies, insomuch that the position of the Heavens, and Constellations, which hang over Spaine, being of a different vertue and operation to that of France, the temper and humours of the Natives of the one, ought to be accordingly disagreeing with the other.

An opinion which may gaine credit and strength from the authority of the famous Hippocrates, who in his Book of Ayre, Water, and Climes, affirmeth that the diversity of Constellations, cause a diversity of Inclinations, of humours and complexions; and make the bodies whereupon they operate, to recive sundry sorts of impressions. Which reason may have much apparence of truth, if one consider the differing fancies of these two Nations, as it hath reference to the Predominant Constellations, which have the vogue, and qualifie the Seasons amongst them. (1869: 34)

Algunos atribuyen esta contrariedad a la diferencia de los astros e influjo de las estrellas, como causas universales destes inferiores. Y así dicen que siendo el sitio del cielo y constelación de España muy diferente dél que tienen los franceses, por necesidad el temperamento y humores de entrambos serán muy diversos. La cual doctrina fortifican con la que el grande Hipocrates dejó escrita en el libro: *De aere, aquis, et locis*, afirmando que la varia constitución de los astros es causa de la variedad y mudanza de los temperamentos, complexiones y humores del hombre. (1979: 262)

Howell continues to borrow from the *Antipatía* for most of the rest of Section VI, making occasional authoritative first-person statements which are in fact always direct translations from García’s work. He introduces one of

García's anecdotes about Louis XI with the phrase "I read it upon record in the Spanish Annales....," as if he had dug up the story himself; he reproduces disparaging comments of García's about the kind of Gascoigne and Bearnese "scumme" who make it over the border into neighbouring Spain¹² (1869: 34-37); and then he comes to an abrupt halt when he appears to realise, several pages into his digression, just how far he has wandered from his original aim in a text purporting to give practical advice to foreign travellers:

But I have been transported too farre by this speculation, considering that I proposed to my selfe brevity at first in this small discours. (1869: 37)

Section VI ends suddenly with this sentence. With the exception of one short paragraph in Section VII¹³ (1869: 39), Howell ceases to borrow from García at this point.

CONCLUSION

This is not the place to consider Carlos García or his work in any detail.¹⁴ It seems reasonable to assume that James Howell might have become familiar with the *Antipatía de franceses y españoles* during the period of his first travels on the European Continent, which coincided roughly with the publication date of García's book. The two authors may even have had the chance to meet in Paris between about 1617 and 1619, although there is no direct evidence that this ever happened.

¹²For a parallel example of another Royalist writer given to the appropriation of "not only the words but the experience of his predecessor," see Lois Potter's comments on work by the pamphleteer Samuel Sheppard in Potter (1989: 122-130). Especially relevant to my discussion of Howell and García are the following words on Sheppard's blatant borrowings from John Suckling: "Personal and confessional passages... are among the most attractive in Sheppard's work, so it is disconcerting to find that they are neither personal nor confessional."

¹³Howell writes of a "Spanish doctor, who had a fancy that Spanish, Italian, and French, were spoken in Paradise, that God Almighty commanded in Spanish, the Tempter perswaded in Italian, and Adam begged pardon in French."

¹⁴For the mysterious García, see García (1979: Introduction); Pelorson (1969); Pelorson (1994); López-Barrera (1925). As López-Barrera pointed out in 1925, there is an intriguing, and none too flattering, contemporary description of "el dotor Garcias" in Fernández (1655).

My examination of *Instructions for Forreine Travell* has revealed a Spanish influence as yet undetected by commentators of Howell, the unveiling of which should serve as a corrective to some previous appraisals of the book. My intention is not so much to denounce Howell for plagiarism—a fairly anachronistic procedure, in any case—as to study one of the ways in which he borrows from a foreign text in order to develop his art. A further and more general intention is, by implication, to advocate the placing of all seventeenth-century English literature in a more appropriately European context. I have shown that in the case of at least one English writer, a foreign literary model inspired imitation in a way which has remained unsuspected for 350 years. It seems likely that further readings of Howell might throw up evidence of other foreign influences and tell us more about his working methods as a writer: above all, such research might be expected to cast new light on the process by which he put together the work for which he is best known, the *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae*, or *Familiar Letters*, of 1645-55.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank John Beagles, Jonathan Holland and Glenn Hubbard for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Particular thanks are also due to Sir John Elliott and Richard Kagan for their suggestions and advice. Above all, I wish to express my gratitude to Dámaso López García of the Universidad Complutense, Madrid, and to Rob Iliffe of Imperial College, London, without whose sustained encouragement and help none of this work would ever have been carried out.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bennett, W. H. ed. 1890: *Epistolae Ho-Eliaanae. The Familiar Letters of James Howell*. London.

- Carreira, A. and Cid, J. A. eds. 1990: *La vida y hechos de Estebanillo González*. Madrid.
- Fernández, M. 1655: *Olla podrida a la española, compuesta y sazonada en la descripción de Munster en Vesfalia, con salsa sarracena i africana*. Antwerp.
- García, C. 1979 (1617): *La Oposición y Conjunción de los dos grandes luminares de la tierra o La Antipatía de franceses y españoles*. M. Bateau ed. Alberta.
- Gentilys, R. 1641: *The Antipathy betweene the French and Spaniard*. London.
- Guillén, C. 1998: *Múltiples Moradas. Ensayo de Literatura Comparada*. Barcelona.
- Hirst, V. M. 1959: The authenticity of James Howell's Familiar Letters. *The Modern Language Review* 54: 558-561.
- Howell, J. 1640: *Dendrologia. Dodona's Grove, or the vocall Forrest*. London.
- Howell, J. 1869 (1642): *Instructions for Forreine Travell*. E. Arber ed. London.
- Jacobs, J. ed. 1890 and 1892: *Epistolae Ho-Elianae. The Familiar Letters of James Howell*. 2 vols. London, D. Nutt.
- López-Barrera, J. 1925: Libros raros y curiosos. Literatura francesa hispanófoba en los siglos XVI y XVII. *Boletín de la Biblioteca Menéndez y Pelayo*, VII, VIII, IX.
- Maczak, A. 1995: *Travel in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge. (Spanish ed. 1996: *Viajes y Viajeros en la Europa Moderna*. Barcelona.)
- Morrell, J., Slack, P. and Woolf, D. eds. 1993: *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford.
- Nutkiewicz, M. 1990: A Rapporteur of the English Civil War: The Courtly Politics of James Howell (1594?-1666). *Canadian Journal of History* 25: 21-40.
- Pelorson, J.-M. 1969: Le docteur Carlos García et la colonie hispano-portugaise de Paris (1613-1619). *Bulletin Hispanique*: 518-576.
- Pelorson, J.-M. 1994: Pour une réappreciation de La Antipatía de Carlos García. > *Hommage à Robert Jammes* 3: 899-905. Toulouse.
- Potter, L. 1989: *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist literature 1641-1660*. Cambridge.
- Sánchez Escribano, F. J. 1996: *Proverbios, Refranes y Traducción: James Howell y su colección de refranes españoles (1659)*. Zaragoza.
- Shaw Fairman, P. 1976: James Howell: un galés del siglo XVII curioso de las gentes y de las cosas de España. *Archivum* 26: 403-419.
- Shaw Fairman, P. 1981: *España vista por los ingleses del siglo XVII*. Madrid.
- Warner, G. F. 1894: Two letters of James Howell. *The English Historical Review* 9: 127-130.
- Woolf, D. 1993: Conscience, Constancy, and Ambition in the Career and Writings of James Howell. > Morrell, J., Slack, P. and Woolf, D. eds.: 243-278.

**HIDDEN SPANISH
TREASURE IN A
SEVENTEENTH-
CENTURY TEXT: THE
STRANGE CASE OF DR
GARCÍA AND MR
HOWELL**

Martin Beagles

Universidad Complutense / Universidad Pontificia Comillas

The paper deals with a previously undetected case of literary borrowing by the Anglo-Welsh letter-writer and pamphleteer James Howell (1594?-1666), best known for his *Familiar Letters* of 1645-55. I have discovered that Howell lifted quite large chunks of material for his second book (*Instructions for Forreine Travell*, 1642) from a text by the obscure and mysterious Spanish writer, Dr Carlos García, who published his *Antipatía de los franceses y españoles* in Paris in 1617. (This was an influential book in its day, running to several editions in various languages). In my paper, I will also consider the biographies of the two men and discuss the interesting possibility that Howell and García might have met and known each other in Paris, during Howell's first travels on the Continent.

The Spaniard is pleased to compare himself to a *tesoro escondido*, to a hidden treasure. Richard Ford, *A Hand-book for Travellers in Spain and Readers at Home* (London, 1845)

And who, in time, knows whither we may vent
The treasure of our tongue? To what strange shores,
This gain of our best glory shall be sent,
T'enrich unknowing nations with our stores?
Samuel Daniel, *Musophilus* (1599)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FORREINE TRAVELL

In her well-known study of seventeenth-century English travellers in Spain, published in 1981, Patricia Shaw Fairman quoted extensively from Sections V and VI of James Howell's *Instructions for Forreine Travell* of 1642, claiming that these sections provided useful insights into British notions about their contemporary European neighbours, and in particular Spain (Shaw 1981: 46).¹ In this paper, I would like to suggest that this claim is in need of refinement.

Instructions for Forreine Travell is a short book, running to about 20,000 words in its first edition, and divided into nineteen brief sections. (A second edition in 1650 incorporated a six-page appendix on "Turkey and the Levant parts," places which it is unlikely that Howell ever visited). Although the main purpose of the *Instructions* was to advise and prepare gentlemen on the practicalities of travel and the learning of languages abroad, Howell's literary aspirations are clear throughout the text, and they are reflected in the frequency and quality of his digressions from the main subject. Some idea of this diversity of material can be gained from reading the preliminary two-page "Substance of this Discours," a list of contents which begins as follows:

Of the advantage, and preheminance of the Eye.
Of Forraine Travell, and the progresse of Learning.
What previous abilities are required in a Traveller.
A caveat touching his Religion.
Precepts for learning the French Language.
What Authors to be made choyce of, for the Government and History of France.
Of Books, in generall.
Of Historians, and a method to reade them.
Of Private Meditation.
Of Poets.
An estimat of the expences of a Nobleman, or of a private Gentleman a broad.
Advertisements for writing of Letters. (Howell 1869: 9)

¹In this full-length study, Patricia Shaw repeated and extended assessments of Howell's work which had previously been formulated in her article on Howell (1976). For more on Howell, see Jacobs (1890 and 1892). Jacobs' introduction to the *Familiar Letters* remains the best general account of Howell's life and work. See also the introduction to Bennett (1890); and Sydney Lee's entry for James Howell in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, which, however, contains some mistakes. For more recent work, see: Nutkiewicz (1990); Woolf (1993). Potter (1989) contains references to Howell. Useful remarks can also be found in Sánchez Escribano (1996).

As can be seen, Howell covers a lot of ground in the *Instructions*, and this extract from the list of contents refers only to the first four of the nineteen sections in his book.

Of all the digressions in the *Instructions*, one of the most memorable and effective is that which spans Sections V and VI, in which Howell deals in a strikingly humorous way with supposed differences in character and customs between contemporary Frenchmen and Spaniards. In a strangely pithy or “Senecan” style which contrasts sharply with the more leisurely prose in the rest of his book, Howell presents the men of the two nations as “antipathetic” in almost every respect: whereas one wears his hair long, the other wears it short; one always buttons his doublet downwards, the other upwards, and so on. These were the passages quoted by Patricia Shaw in her survey of seventeenth-century travellers in Spain,² although she was certainly not the first commentator to feel their attraction. Sections V and VI had already been specifically recommended to readers by Edward Arber, editor of the 1869 reprint of the *Instructions*. Rather optimistically describing the *Instructions* as “our first Handbook for the Continent,” Arber pointed readers in the direction of Sections V and VI:

In itself the book is very discursive. A survey of foreign politics, much shrewd speculation in language, descriptions of foreign customs; and in particular, a notable discrimination of the differing characters of the Frenchman and the Spaniard of his day... (1869: 5)

Over a century later, Patricia Shaw followed Arber in highlighting these passages on the Frenchman and Spaniard of Howell’s day, and went so far as to describe parts of Section V as “párrafos magistrales” which she held it “worth copying almost entirely, because in a way they certainly summarise the ideas held in England at that time about the character and mentality of the Spaniards” [my translations] (Shaw 1981: 146). The paragraphs in question are reproduced below:

Having passed the Pyreneys hee [the foreign traveller] shall palpably discern (as I have observed in another larger Discours) the suddenest and strangest difference ‘twixt the Genius and Garb of two People, though distant but by a very small separation, as betwixt any other upon the surface of the Earth; I knowe Nature delights and triumphs in dissimilitudes; but here, she seemes to have industriously, and of set purpose studied it; for they differ not onely Accidentally and Outwardly in their Cloathing and Cariage, in their Diet, in their Speeches and Customes; but even Essentially in the very faculties of the Soule, and operations thereof, and in every thing else, Religion and the forme of a Rationall creature only excepted; which made Doctor Garcia thinke to

²For an introduction to seventeenth-century guidebooks, see Maczak (1995: 152-157). This book was first published in Polish in 1798, and contains some interesting references to Howell. A truly abominable Spanish translation also exists: Maczak (1996).

aske a Midwife once, whither the Frenchman and Spaniard came forth into the World in the same posture from the womb or no.

Go first to the Operations of the Soule, the one [the Frenchman] is Active and Mercuriall, the other [the Spaniard] is Speculative and Saturnine: the one Quick and Ayry, the other Slow and Heavy; the one Discursive and Sociable, the other Reserved and Thoughtfull; the one addicts himselfe for the most part to the study of the Law and Canons, the other to Positive and Schoole Divinity; the one is *Creatura sine Praeterito et Futuro*, the other hath too much of both: the one is a Prometheus, the other an Epimetheus; the one apprehends and forgets quickly, the other doth both slowly, with a judgement more abstruse and better fixed, *et in se reconditum*; the one will dispatch the weightiest affaires as hee walke along in the streets, or at meales, the other upon the least occasion of businesse will retire solemnly to a room, and if a Fly chance to hum about him, it will discompose his thoughts, and puzzle him: It is a kind of sicknesse for a Frenchman to keep a Secret long, and all the drugs of Egypt cannot get it out of a Spaniard.

The French capacity, though it apprehend and assent unto the Tenets of Faith, yet he resteth not there, but examines them by his owne reason, debates the businesse *pro et contra*, and so is often gravelled upon the quick sands of his own brain, the Spaniard cleane contrary by an implicate Faith and generall Obedience beleives the Canons and Determination of the Church, and presently subjects his Understanding thereunto, he sets bounds to all his Wisdome and Knowledge, and labours to avoyd all Speculation thereon, fearing through the frailty of his Intellectuals, to fall into some Error.

(*Instructions for Forreine Travell*, Section V)³

These paragraphs hold some curious observations on national characteristics which retain a genuine if stereotyped interest even today, and the analysis continues in the same vein for several more pages in the *Instructions*, often very amusingly. This is taut and powerful writing, which combines insight and a sense of detached fun in an undeniably seductive way, and it is not surprising that these pages have attracted the attention and praise of commentators down the years. Unfortunately, however, the true role of these passages in the development of James Howell's writing career has probably been misunderstood until now. Little of this material can easily be attributed to the original genius of Howell, for the simple reason that most of it made its first appearance elsewhere, in a bilingual French-Spanish treatise published some twenty-five years before the first edition of *Instructions for Forreine Travell*.

³Howell (1869: 30-31); Shaw Fairman (1981: 146-147).

LA ANTIPATIA DE FRANCESES Y ESPAÑOLES

Almost everything in Sections V and VI of the *Instructions* is translated from a bilingual French-Spanish treatise first published in Paris on 8 April 1617, approximately at the time of James Howell's first visit to the city. The full title of Howell's source text is *La Oposición y Conjunción de los dos grandes luminares de la tierra o La Antipatía de franceses y españoles*. The author of the *Antipatía* was one Doctor Carlos García, an enigmatic and little-known Spanish exile living in Paris.⁴

The treatise itself can only be fully understood in the precise contexts of the time and place of its publication: it was, above all, a late contribution to a very public debate about the so-called *Mariages Espagnols* of 1615. These double Royal marriage agreements, by which Philip III's eldest daughter Anne of Austria was married to Louis XIII whilst his ten-year-old son Philip, the future Philip IV, married Louis' sister Isabella of Bourbon, confirmed the existence of a new Franco-Spanish understanding after years of political and military antagonism. In France, "*les mariages*" were greeted by a barrage of pamphlets, many of them written in praise of the new accord. Nevertheless, it is clear from contemporary reports that anti-Spanish feeling in Paris, which dated back well into the previous century, was not extinguished overnight as a result of the marriages. A group of newly-marginalised courtiers ("*les malcontents*") who were opposed to the pro-Spanish turn of events had little trouble mobilising Hispanophobic sentiment in popular demonstrations against the Crown, and despite official efforts, these feelings also found their way into print. A debate ensued on the convenience of the *mariages* pact with Spain, and García's *Antipatía* must be seen as a direct contribution to that debate.⁵

As one might expect from a Spaniard living in France, García in the *Antipatía* comes down strongly in favour of friendship between the two nations and he greets the new opportunities provided by the marriage agreement. His

⁴All quotations from the *Antipatía de franceses y españoles* are taken from C. García (1979). Bareau's edition contains a very useful introduction, in which he provides detailed coverage of what is known of García's life and work. The *Antipatía* itself was an immediately successful book, going through seven French-Spanish editions by 1638. It was translated into Italian in 1636, and rapidly went through thirteen editions in that language by 1702. German and English translations also appeared in the course of the century (see note 7).

⁵See C. García (1979: 17-39). Bareau is particularly good on the political context and frenzied pamphleteering activity at the time of the publication of the *Antipatía*; he names more than forty pamphlets in the course of his introduction, and provides close analysis of several of them.

treatise mostly consists of an elaborately-structured framework of arguments justifying the “conjunction” of the two nations, together with explanation of the beneficial effects for European Christendom of the realisation of this union. However, as the title itself indicates, the *Antipatía* also contains a great deal on the supposed “natural enmity” between the two countries and even has a whole chapter (Chapter X) on García’s first-hand experience of Parisian Hispanophobia (he describes his first months in the city, when he claims that it was impossible for him to go out onto the streets without being surrounded by crowds of mocking children, who identified him as a Spaniard from his clothing, and he relates in detail an incident at a streetmarket when he was pelted with fruit and vegetables)⁶ (1979: 17-39). The book thus appears to lay itself open to the charge of ambiguity, and there is no question that its liveliest passages, chapters XI to XVII, are precisely those which seem to work against the main thesis by exploring the theme of antipathetic national characteristics. It is interesting to note that these are the passages which came to Howell’s mind when he was casting around for material with which to pad out his *Instructions for Forreine Travell* in 1642. By homing in on chapters XI to XVII of the *Antipatía*, Howell was to demonstrate from the start of his writing career that he had a journalist’s, or rather an editor’s, ability to recognise and remember good copy. It seems likely that the London publication in 1641 of the first English translation of the *Antipatía* may have jogged Howell’s memory of the book, but it is equally clear that his *Instructions* is based on his own use of the original French-Spanish text rather than the later English version.⁷

The strongest hint that Howell in the *Instructions* is about to lean heavily on the *Antipatía* is of course his mention of “Doctor Garcia” in the first paragraph quoted above, from the beginning of Section V. Howell’s phrase, “which made Doctor Garcia thinke to aske a Midwife once, whither the

⁶García (1979: 206-220). A very similar street incident, strongly reminiscent of the one described in the *Antipatía*, occurs in the anonymous picaresque novel *La vida y hechos de Estevanillo Gonzalez*, first published in Antwerp in 1646. See the following edition, which mentions García in a footnote: Carreira and Cid (1990: 251).

⁷The first English translation of the *Antipatía* was that by Robert Gentilys in 1641. Although it is striking that this translation of García’s book should have appeared just a year before the publication of Howell’s *Instructions*, Howell does not seem to have used it as the basis of his text. There is much that is different about Gentilys’ and Howell’s versions of García’s original. Thus there is no coincidence in phraseology between Gentilys and Howell: whereas Gentilys’ version is generally faithful, literal and somewhat dull, Howell takes more liberties as a translator, usually in the interests of concision, and he frequently hits upon more memorable solutions. Crucially, Gentilys appears to be working solely from the French version of the *Antipatía*, whilst Howell takes ideas from both the French and Spanish texts, which differ slightly at many points. Thus, to give one example, Howell uses the idea, only present in the Spanish version of the text, that a Frenchman wears his coat so short “that one might give him a Suppositor with his Cloake about him, if need were.” There is no mention of suppositors in Gentilys. Shaw Fairman (1976: 405, note); Shaw Fairman (1981: 146, note).

Frenchman and Spaniard came forth into the world in the same posture from the womb or no” (1869: 30), is itself a loose translation of the remark with which García opens Chapter XI of the *Antipatía*, the first of a series of chapters on French and Spanish characteristics. García’s exact words are as follows:

Mil veces he tenido tentación de pedir a las parteras de cual suerte salen del vientre de su madre los Franceses. Porque según la contrariedad que veo entre ellos y los Españoles tengo por imposible que nazcan todos de una mesma manera. (1979: 222)

This is one of two places in the *Instructions* where Howell specifically names García (1869: 30, 34), but at no point does he reveal the extent to which he is relying on García’s text, and this reliance has passed unnoticed until now. As far as I can tell, Patricia Shaw is the only previous commentator even to have attempted to identify “Doctor Garcia;” in 1976 and again in 1981, she suggested that Howell “probably refers to Dr. Pedro García Carrero,” a Court physician who rose to prominence under Philip III, retained his position under Philip IV and “also wrote comedies and poetry” [my translations]. Shaw did not state her reasons for the “probability” of this assertion; neither did she give any quotation from García Carrero’s work which might plausibly support it⁸ (1976: 405 note) (1981: 146 note).

In fact, Howell’s “midwife” phrase and the whole of the following two paragraphs can easily be shown to be based on passages from Chapter XI of the *Antipatía*. For example, when Howell writes that “the one [the Frenchman] addicts himselfe for the most part to the study of the Law and Canons, the other [the Spaniard] to Positive and Schoole Divinity” (1869: 30), this is his version of the following brief paragraph by García:

La mayor parte de los entendimientos franceses se dan al estudio de las leyes y cánones y muy pocos aman la teología positiva y escolástica; y entre los Españoles muy pocos, o los menos, estudian el drecho [sic] y casi todos la teología. (1979: 224)

When Howell writes about a Spaniard’s need “upon the least occasion of busnesse” to “retire solemnly to a room and if a Fly chance to hum about him,

⁸Claudio Guillén, in a recent collection of essays on comparative literature (1998: 336-367) dedicates an entire chapter to “Imágenes nacionales y escritura literaria” in which he shows himself to be familiar both with Shaw’s *España vista por los ingleses del siglo XVII* and Carlos García’s *Antipatía de franceses y españoles*. Strangely, however, Guillén fails to make the connection between Howell, whose borrowings from García feature so prominently in Shaw’s book, and García himself, whose *Antipatía* is nonetheless well described by Guillén as a “curious mixture of abstract, quasi-scholastic thought and realistic, quasi-picaresque satire” (“una curiosa mezcla de pensamiento abstracto, casi escolástico, y de sátira realista, casi picaresca”).

it will discompose his thoughts, and puzzle him” (1869: 31), he is also borrowing directly from Chapter XI:

Todo lo cual es contrario al entendimiento de un Español, porque si tiene algún negocio entre manos que requiera la consideración, se retira en un lugar solitario y es tan enemigo de la compañía y tumulto, que si una sola mosca le pasa cerca del oído cuando está engolfado en un negocio, le impedirá la resolución dél. (1979: 226)

Equally, where Howell has that “the Spaniard cleane contrary by an implicite Faith and general Obedience beleeves the Canons and Determination of the Church, and presently subjects his Understanding thereunto, he sets bounds to all his Wisdome and Knowledge, and labours to avoyd all Speculation thereon, fearing through the frailty of his Intellectuals, to fall into some Error” (1869: 31), it is not difficult to show that he is again translating from García:

El entendimiento del Español es muy medroso y cobarde en lo que toca a la Fe y determinación de la Iglesia, porque en el punto que se le propone un artículo de Fe, allí para y mete raya a toda su sciencia, sabiduría y discurso. Y no sólomente no procura saber si es, o no es, lo que la Fe le dice, pero hace toda suerte de diligencia por no especular licenciosamente sobre ello, temiendo, con la fragilidad del entendimiento, dar en algún error. (1979: 224)

Even the apparent non-sequitur at the end of Howell’s second paragraph above, about the inability of Frenchmen to keep a secret for long, and how “all the drugs of Egypt cannot get it out of a Spaniard” (1869: 31), is taken straight from the *Antipatía*. In García’s text, however, it occurs in a much more logical position over twenty pages later at the end of Chapter XV, a section which deals with contrasts in speech habits. The only (trivial) difference between the two versions is that Howell writes “Egypt” where García had written “India”:

No puede negarse que toda la industria del mundo será bastante para hacer callar un secreto a un Francés, pues no puede reposar hasta que lo publica; y para sacar una cosa secreta del pecho de un Español no tendrán virtud ni fuerza todas las drogas de la India. (1979: 250)

It would be perfectly possible to continue with such comparisons for the entirety of Sections V and VI of the *Instructions*. Just about everything in Howell’s lengthy digression has its origin somewhere in Chapters XI to XVII of the *Antipatía*.⁹ I do not, however, propose to account for every sentence in this way. I would, however, like to comment briefly on certain aspects of Howell’s translation methods. Howell’s procedures here are particularly interesting for

⁹Some parts were also taken from Howell’s own *Dendrologia. Dodona’s Grove, or the vocall forrest* (Howell 1640). See note 10.

the light they shed on his development as a writer: to some extent, the techniques of appropriation which he can be seen acquiring as he writes his *Instructions* were precisely those which were to prove useful in the composition of many of his other works, including even the *Familiar Letters*.

The most curious aspect of Howell's translation technique is perhaps the selective way in which he raids different parts of García's text, skipping back and forth as he sees fit, sometimes to the detriment of the logical development of the original ideas. Carlos García's treatise is a highly-organised piece of writing, with strict sense divisions between chapters, but Howell is unable or unwilling to accommodate these qualities in the *Instructions*. The order of ideas in García's original is rarely respected. Sentences translated from one chapter of the *Antipatía* are placed in Howell's text alongside sentences taken from another chapter, very often on a different subject altogether. One example of this is the sentence about keeping secrets quoted immediately above, but there are several other places in the *Instructions* where Howell indulges in this sort of mixing.

A good example is provided by the following long paragraph from Section V of the *Instructions*. Most of it is based on Chapter XIV of the *Antipatía*, a very short chapter on "Antipathy in Walking" ("De la Antipatía del andar") (1979: 242-245), but with García's ideas reduced in length and presented in a completely different order. García begins by describing how Frenchmen walk up and down the streets in a "disorderly" way by comparison with Spaniards, but Howell chooses to open with material taken from later in the chapter, on the speed at which each nationality proceeds. Howell follows this with García's opening point about disorderliness, then another from later in Chapter XIV on eating in the street, and so he goes on, in his usual irregular way. In addition, this passage rather illogically contains material first used by Howell in his *Dodona's Grove* two years earlier, mostly about differences between Frenchmen and Spaniards when playing tennis or shuffling cards ("The one like the Wind in the Fable... plays his game more cunningly")¹⁰ (Howell 1640: 7); and finally, it closes with a translation of a single phrase extracted from the end of an entirely different chapter of the *Antipatía* altogether, Chapter XII, on different styles of clothing ("for when hee goeth to the Field...") (1979: 238). This passage is thus a typical example of the jumbled and derivative way in which Howell had learnt to write:

¹⁰Howell had written there: "The one takes the ball before the bound; The other stayeth for it, and commonly fetcheth a surer stroke: The one in the cariage of his designes is like the Wind, the other like the Sunne in the Fable; when they went to try their strength upon a passenger's cloake: The one knows how to shuffle the Cards better; The other playeth his game more cunningly."

Go to their Gate, the Frenchman walks fast, (as if he had a Sergeant always at his heeles,) the Spaniard slowly, as if hee were newly come out of some quartan Ague; the French go up and down the streets confusedly in clusters, the Spaniards if they be above three, they go two by two, as if they were going a Procession; the French Laquays march behind, the Spaniards before; the one beckons upon you with his hand cast upwards, the other downward; the Frenchman will not stick to pull out a Peare or some other thing out of his pocket, and eate it as he goes along the street, the Spaniard will starve rather than do so, and would never forgive himselfe, if he should commit such a rudenesse; the Frenchman if he spies a lady of his acquaintance, he will make boldly towards her, salute her with a kisse, and offer to Usher her by the hand or arme, the Spaniard upon such an encounter, useth to recoyle backward, with his hands hid under his Cloack, and for to touch or kisse her, he holds it a rudenesse beyond all barbarisme, a kind of sacriledge; the Frenchman is best and most proper on Horseback, the Spaniard a foot; the one is good for the Onset, the other for a retreat: the one like the Wind in the Fable, is full of ruffling fury, the other like the Sun, when they went to try their strength upon the Passengers Cloake. The one takes the ball before the bound, *A la volée*, the other stayeth for the fall; the one shuffleth the Cards better, the other playes his game more cunningly; your Frenchman is much the fairer Duellist for when hee goeth to the Field, he commonly puts off his doublet and opens his breast; the Spaniard cleane contrary, besides his shirt, hath his doublet quilted, his coat of maile, his cassock, and strives to make himselfe impenetrable. (Howell 1869: 32)

It is not immediately clear why Howell mixes his material like this —his text certainly cannot be said to gain coherence as a result, when he starts a paragraph with a phrase like “Go to their Gate...” and ends it with discussions of tennis, card-shuffling and duelling. Whatever the reason, it can be said generally to support a notion first put forward by Verona Hirst:

I have found, in a study of Howell’s other works, especially his histories, that he regularly uses a particular method of compiling his books. He takes other writers’ works and, usually without acknowledgement or by-your-leave, snips them up to his own purposes, taking a little here or a lot there, digesting, abstracting and condensing as necessary, leaving the dull bits out like the good journalist he was. (1959)

This is in fact a fair description of what Howell does with García’s text, and as Hirst pointed out forty years ago, it may well be the sort of procedure that Howell applied to the raw material of his own original letters when he set out to compile his *Familiar Letters* in 1645. The answer to the much-vexed question of the “authenticity” of Howell’s *Familiar Letters* is quite possibly to be found here: if Howell used his own original material in the same way that he used the *Antipatia* and other books, “taking a little here or a lot there,” this might explain the *Familiar Letters*’ confusing juxtapositions of descriptions of

events from entirely different periods, and it might account for the difficulties associated with their dating.¹¹ Even so, it is not easy to decide exactly what this tells us about Howell's writing methods when he was working on his *Instructions*. Does it suggest something about the way he stored notes in a commonplace book (a practice he specifically recommends to gentlemen travellers in *Instructions for Forreine Travell*), or is it perhaps best interpreted as a deceitful, if rather naive, attempt to conceal his original sources? It may well be that Howell's work as a spymaster for Thomas Wentworth, collecting and collating reports from sources all over Europe and preparing them for his master's consumption, had made him something of an expert in this sort of summary-writing even before he became an established author. The techniques of "digesting, abstracting and condensing" might already have been second nature to Howell when he set out on his new career in literature, having spent so many years doing precisely the same thing for his master.

It is worth noting that Howell continues to translate from the *Antipatia* in Section VI of the *Instructions*, even when he appears to be expressing personal views of his own about the numerous examples of "antipathy" he has just cited. Reproduced below is the opening paragraph of Howell's Section VI, immediately followed by the first paragraph of Chapter XVII of García's *Antipatia*. Howell can be seen here clearly attempting to pass off as thoughts of his own a series of ideas which were first elaborated by García at the time of the *mariages espagnols* debate. On introducing them, Howell seems to "over-compensate" in his desire to convince readers that the ideas originate with him, by stressing the amount of mental labour he has supposedly undertaken in order to arrive at his conclusions:

And truly I have many times and oft busied my spirits, and beaten my brains hereupon, by taking information from dead and living men, and by my own practicall observations, to know the true cause of this strange antipathy betwixt two such potent and so neare neighbouring Nations, which bringeth with it such mischiefe into the World; and keepes Christendome in a perpetuall alarme: For although the Ill Spirit bee the principall Author thereof, as being the Father and fomenter of all discord and hatred (it being also part of the Turkes letany, that warres should continue still betweene

¹¹Discussion of the *Familiar Letters* has tended to concentrate almost exclusively on the issue of their possible "authenticity." See Jacobs (1890 and 1892: lxiii-lxxxii); Hirst (1959); Warner (1894). The *Familiar Letters* include references to events from different periods as if they were completely contemporaneous, and the dates which they contain are, in Jacobs' words, "perfectly untrustworthy." This has made it difficult to reconstruct several parts of Howell's biography: the *D. N. B.* is particularly misleading for the period of Howell's first foreign travels, saying that he left London in 1616 and did not return until 1622, which contradicts Howell's own account of his "three years' Peregrination by Land and Sea" (Jacobs 1890: 99) and does not leave him anything like enough time to carry out the working engagements which are known to have occupied him before he travelled to Madrid in the spring of 1623.

these two potent Nations) to hinder the happy fruit that might grow out of their Union: yet nevertheless it must be thought that hee cannot shed this poyson, and sow these cursed tares, unlesse hee had some grounds to work his designe upon. (1869: 33-34)

Mil veces he procurado con particular especulación buscar la causa fundamental del odio y ojeriza entre estas dos naciones, porque si bien es verdad que el Demonio ha sido el autor principal desta antipatía y mortal discordia por estorbar el fruto que podía nacer de la unión de ambas naciones, con todo eso se debe creer que halló algún fundamento y raíz en ellas para multiplicar tan maldita cizaña y pernicioso veneno. (1979: 262)

Howell follows this paragraph almost immediately with what is his second reference in the *Instructions* to “Doctor Garcia,” stating that the author is on record as attributing the antipathy of the two nations to influences of the stars. Howell’s partial recognition of his original source is quickly succeeded by another brief paragraph in which he repeats the procedure I have just explained above, i.e. he peddles material from the *Antipatía*, about Hippocrates, as if it were the result of his own reading rather than the straightforward translation from García that it really is:

Some as Doctor Garcia, and other Philosophicall Authors, attribute this opposition to the qualities of the clymes and influences of the Stars, which are known to bear sway over all Sublunary bodies, insomuch that the position of the Heavens, and Constellations, which hang over Spaine, being of a different vertue and operation to that of France, the temper and humours of the Natives of the one, ought to be accordingly disagreeing with the other.

An opinion which may gaine credit and strength from the authority of the famous Hippocrates, who in his Book of Ayre, Water, and Climes, affirmeth that the diversity of Constellations, cause a diversity of Inclinations, of humours and complexions; and make the bodies whereupon they operate, to recieve sundry sorts of impressions. Which reason may have much apparence of truth, if one consider the differing fancies of these two Nations, as it hath reference to the Predominant Constellations, which have the vogue, and qualifie the Seasons amongst them. (1869: 34)

Algunos atribuyen esta contrariedad a la diferencia de los astros e influjo de las estrellas, como causas universales destes inferiores. Y así dicen que siendo el sitio del cielo y constelación de España muy diferente dél que tienen los franceses, por necesidad el temperamento y humores de entrambos serán muy diversos. La cual doctrina fortifican con la que el grande Hipocrates dejó escrita en el libro: *De aere, aquis, et locis*, afirmando que la varia constitución de los astros es causa de la variedad y mudanza de los temperamentos, complexiones y humores del hombre. (1979: 262)

Howell continues to borrow from the *Antipatía* for most of the rest of Section VI, making occasional authoritative first-person statements which are in fact always direct translations from García’s work. He introduces one of

García's anecdotes about Louis XI with the phrase "I read it upon record in the Spanish Annales....," as if he had dug up the story himself; he reproduces disparaging comments of García's about the kind of Gascoigne and Bearnese "scumme" who make it over the border into neighbouring Spain¹² (1869: 34-37); and then he comes to an abrupt halt when he appears to realise, several pages into his digression, just how far he has wandered from his original aim in a text purporting to give practical advice to foreign travellers:

But I have been transported too farre by this speculation, considering that I proposed to my selfe brevity at first in this small discours. (1869: 37)

Section VI ends suddenly with this sentence. With the exception of one short paragraph in Section VII¹³ (1869: 39), Howell ceases to borrow from García at this point.

CONCLUSION

This is not the place to consider Carlos García or his work in any detail.¹⁴ It seems reasonable to assume that James Howell might have become familiar with the *Antipatía de franceses y españoles* during the period of his first travels on the European Continent, which coincided roughly with the publication date of García's book. The two authors may even have had the chance to meet in Paris between about 1617 and 1619, although there is no direct evidence that this ever happened.

¹²For a parallel example of another Royalist writer given to the appropriation of "not only the words but the experience of his predecessor," see Lois Potter's comments on work by the pamphleteer Samuel Sheppard in Potter (1989: 122-130). Especially relevant to my discussion of Howell and García are the following words on Sheppard's blatant borrowings from John Suckling: "Personal and confessional passages... are among the most attractive in Sheppard's work, so it is disconcerting to find that they are neither personal nor confessional."

¹³Howell writes of a "Spanish doctor, who had a fancy that Spanish, Italian, and French, were spoken in Paradise, that God Almighty commanded in Spanish, the Tempter perswaded in Italian, and Adam begged pardon in French."

¹⁴For the mysterious García, see García (1979: Introduction); Pelorson (1969); Pelorson (1994); López-Barrera (1925). As López-Barrera pointed out in 1925, there is an intriguing, and none too flattering, contemporary description of "el dotor Garcias" in Fernández (1655).

My examination of *Instructions for Forreine Travell* has revealed a Spanish influence as yet undetected by commentators of Howell, the unveiling of which should serve as a corrective to some previous appraisals of the book. My intention is not so much to denounce Howell for plagiarism—a fairly anachronistic procedure, in any case—as to study one of the ways in which he borrows from a foreign text in order to develop his art. A further and more general intention is, by implication, to advocate the placing of all seventeenth-century English literature in a more appropriately European context. I have shown that in the case of at least one English writer, a foreign literary model inspired imitation in a way which has remained unsuspected for 350 years. It seems likely that further readings of Howell might throw up evidence of other foreign influences and tell us more about his working methods as a writer: above all, such research might be expected to cast new light on the process by which he put together the work for which he is best known, the *Epistolae Ho-Elinae*, or *Familiar Letters*, of 1645-55.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank John Beagles, Jonathan Holland and Glenn Hubbard for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Particular thanks are also due to Sir John Elliott and Richard Kagan for their suggestions and advice. Above all, I wish to express my gratitude to Dámaso López García of the Universidad Complutense, Madrid, and to Rob Iliffe of Imperial College, London, without whose sustained encouragement and help none of this work would ever have been carried out.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bennett, W. H. ed. 1890: *Epistolae Ho-Elinae. The Familiar Letters of James Howell*. London.

- Carreira, A. and Cid, J. A. eds. 1990: *La vida y hechos de Estebanillo González*. Madrid.
- Fernández, M. 1655: *Olla podrida a la española, compuesta y sazonada en la descripción de Munster en Vesfalia, con salsa sarracena i africana*. Antwerp.
- García, C. 1979 (1617): *La Oposición y Conjunción de los dos grandes luminares de la tierra o La Antipatía de franceses y españoles*. M. Bateau ed. Alberta.
- Gentilys, R. 1641: *The Antipathy betweene the French and Spaniard*. London.
- Guillén, C. 1998: *Múltiples Moradas. Ensayo de Literatura Comparada*. Barcelona.
- Hirst, V. M. 1959: The authenticity of James Howell's Familiar Letters. *The Modern Language Review* 54: 558-561.
- Howell, J. 1640: *Dendrologia. Dodona's Grove, or the vocall Forrest*. London.
- Howell, J. 1869 (1642): *Instructions for Forreine Travell*. E. Arber ed. London.
- Jacobs, J. ed. 1890 and 1892: *Epistolae Ho-Elianae. The Familiar Letters of James Howell*. 2 vols. London, D. Nutt.
- López-Barrera, J. 1925: Libros raros y curiosos. Literatura francesa hispanófoba en los siglos XVI y XVII. *Boletín de la Biblioteca Menéndez y Pelayo*, VII, VIII, IX.
- Maczak, A. 1995: *Travel in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge. (Spanish ed. 1996: *Viajes y Viajeros en la Europa Moderna*. Barcelona.)
- Morrell, J., Slack, P. and Woolf, D. eds. 1993: *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford.
- Nutkiewicz, M. 1990: A Rapporteur of the English Civil War: The Courtly Politics of James Howell (1594?-1666). *Canadian Journal of History* 25: 21-40.
- Pelorson, J.-M. 1969: Le docteur Carlos García et la colonie hispano-portugaise de Paris (1613-1619). *Bulletin Hispanique*: 518-576.
- Pelorson, J.-M. 1994: Pour une réappreciation de La Antipatía de Carlos García. > *Hommage à Robert Jammes* 3: 899-905. Toulouse.
- Potter, L. 1989: *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist literature 1641-1660*. Cambridge.
- Sánchez Escribano, F. J. 1996: *Proverbios, Refranes y Traducción: James Howell y su colección de refranes españoles (1659)*. Zaragoza.
- Shaw Fairman, P. 1976: James Howell: un galés del siglo XVII curioso de las gentes y de las cosas de España. *Archivum* 26: 403-419.
- Shaw Fairman, P. 1981: *España vista por los ingleses del siglo XVII*. Madrid.
- Warner, G. F. 1894: Two letters of James Howell. *The English Historical Review* 9: 127-130.
- Woolf, D. 1993: Conscience, Constancy, and Ambition in the Career and Writings of James Howell. > Morrell, J., Slack, P. and Woolf, D. eds.: 243-278.