punished as a pretender to the throne, which made him a challenger of divine will, since the ruler was considered to have received his authority from "above." The story of Christ's Passion and the story of Dózsa's execution converge primarily at this point.

Jesus' crucifixion was neither the first nor the last use of such a death penalty. The events, depicted in the four Gospels, followed a well-known, frequently performed routine. It is doubtful, however, that such a competently organized and carefully orchestrated spectacle as Dózsa's public burning expressed merely the whim or spontaneous decision of any one individual. The arrangements alone (including the starving out of Dózsa's followers) make it obvious that elaborate preparations were needed for such a tightly structured happening: a full-blown pageant or a mock funeral, similar to those performed in Hungarian villages at carnival time.

The urban component of Dózsa's crusader army, as well as the urban setting of his sentencing, made me consider it a carnivalesque execution, and quite a unique one at that. As opposed to the usual carnivalizing practices, in which a make-believe replaces the real event, in Dózsa's case symbolic references alluding to the Crucifixion were carried out in reality.

The unique characteristic of Dózsa's story is that, in each of its contemporary renderings, the various topoi of Christ's Passion are employed in the service of the perpetrators, whose actions were unmitigatingly condemned in the Gospels. The social causes of the uprising were too pressing to permit the "straight" interpretation of the nobility's intentions. Thus a continuing role conflict permeates the text which, in turn, patently affects its reception. The ambivalence, built in the very texture of sixteenth-century social relations, renders the discourse partially dysfunctional. The conflicting norms are transformed into conflicting semiotic signals. Purpose and structure remain unreconciled: the social ambivalence inherent in Dózsa's persona and in the crusade's final outcome could not be fitted into the unidirectional framework of Christ's Passion.

The literary iconography of Dózsa, and the various illustrations accompanying the narrative, profess to the same ambivalence. Reflecting contemporary society at large, Dózsa's passion mirrors the norms and counter-norms of that period of ambiguity, uncertainty, and crisis which, twelve years later, drove the country into the battle of Mohács, ending its independence for many centuries to come.

CLAIRE FARAGO
(University of Colorado, Boulder)

Jean de Léry's Anatomy Lesson: the Persuasive Power of Word and Image in Framing the Ethnographic Subject

Jean de Léry's History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil (Histoire d'un voyage fait en la terre du Brésil), first published in 1578, was an instant success. It was Michel de Montaigne's main source of information for that famous critique of European society, Des Cannibales, which established the noble savage as a utopian theme in modern thought. De Léry's study of the Tupinamba people has recently attracted attention again. Claude Lévi-Strauss remarks in Tristes Tropiques, published in 1955, that he carried a copy of "that masterpiece of anthropological literature," when he arrived in Rio de Janeiro in 1934. Tristes Tropiques is itself a literary landmark because it is one of the first studies to call attention to the expository conventions of anthropological discourse. Michel de Certeau has called History of a Voyage the equivalent of a

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the John Carter Brown Library in November 1991. I am grateful to that audience for their comments, which have improved the present version. I would also like to thank my student Virginia Parks for sharing her bibliography with me.

1 J. de Léry, Histoire d'un voyage fait en la terre du Brésil autrement dite Americque, le tout recueilli sur les lieux par Jean de Léry (Geneva/La Rochelle: Antoine Chippin, 1578). Subsequent editions were published in 1580, 1585, 1594, 1599-1600, and 1611, and excerpts were incorporated in other works. For a modern critical edition see: de Léry, History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil, Otherwise called America, tr. and intro. Janet Whitley (Berkeley-Oxford: University of California Press, 1990). Subsequent references will be to this edition.


In the first illustration of the book (Fig. 1), we would tend to see a family portrait with a very large pineapple and a hammock in the background. However, as de Certeau and Clifford remind us, it is extremely important to exercise caution, so as not to project twentieth-century assumptions unnecessarily onto the material. The internal evidence of de Léry’s text and the scene of European discourse in which I am going to locate his contribution suggest, rather, that this image registers information primarily about the typical forms of the Tupinamba nation—male, female, child, along with typical productions of nature and of human ingenuity. "Family" is a category that de Léry inherited, most immediately from sixteenth-century cosmographers like Johann Boem and Jean Bodin who regarded it as the cornerstone of society. In de Léry’s narrative, discussion of customs different from our own predominate. De Léry confronted the problem of cultural difference, but his perceptions were filtered through inherited categories. His openness toward his subject, given that he was working with culturally-determined and textually-sanctioned categories like "family," "religious rites," "marriage customs," "food habits," and "burial practices," cannot be expected. Not at the position at the foundation of modern ethnographic study. The locus classicus of de Léry’s enlightened understanding of cultural relativism is his illustration of a Frenchman sitting in a native hammock, greeting his companions with the customary Tupi weeping gesture (Fig. 2). De Léry entitled a people who were previously known only for their sensational habit of cannibalism, but this is not the focus of the following discussion. To the contrary, I am interested in the rhetorical conventions that contribute to the credibility of de Léry’s account—why did his original readers believe him? Why do we still view his illustrations and others like it as "scientific," without artifice, completely objective? Before addressing these issues, let me note that I have used the words "nation" and "people" intentionally. The modern concept of "race" is applied completely anachronistically to this period. As a category, racial thinking emerged in the eighteenth century. In sixteenth-century

---


Europe, the unity of all humankind was explained by our common descent from Adam and Eve. There was no concept of or word for "race" in the sense of black or white, caucasian, negroid, oriental, and so forth. The sixteenth-century choices were different from our own: either the Tupi people were members of the human race, descended from wandering Ham or the lost tribes of Israel, or they were humanoids—that is, they were human in form only, lacking the distinctive rational powers that distinguish people from brutes (to use period language again). Since de Léry addressed these issues with his scientific reportage, it is important to bear in mind that sixteenth-century vernacular terms such as natione, gente, raza do not correspond to our own categories.

The text I am examining is at the foundation of later habits of classifying people according to their visual appearance. This is an important aspect of my interest in de Léry. But I am getting ahead of the discussion—let me return to the history of his illustrations. Since anthropologists and historians have been the only scholars to examine de Léry’s work, it has been doubly awkward to deal with the problems of authorship and authenticity presented by his images, which ideally call for an art historian to review the record. In turning to the problems of attribution—as a way of introducing more significant conceptual issues—let me clarify which illustrations I am talking about. I am not going to discuss the three narrative scenes which were added to subsequent editions, such one depicting combat between Tupis and the Marquis in the foreground and a cannibalistic barbecue prepared by the victors in the background. No doubt these tried-and-true formulas borrowed from earlier travel accounts like de Léry’s archrival André Thevet were intended to meet public demand, that is, to increase sales.


The illustrations that played an important role in the development of visual ethnography are quite unlike the narrative scenes derived from decorative paintings and manuscript illuminations. There are altogether five images of full-length figures engaged in typical daily activities. I would like to discuss the image (Fig. 3) that illustrates the chapters on war and cannibalism. Two extraordinarily muscular warriors are depicted with their weapons—we see not individual portraits, but two views of a single type, Tupi mannequins who display how their instruments of war function—how the bow is drawn, how well the combats’ physiques are developed to make it work. No violence. The reference to cannibalism is suppressed, but not excluded altogether, since the head on the ground, conveniently cut off at the neck by the frame, refers discreetly to the dismemberment described elsewhere in the text, in the following unilluminated chapter on ceremonies of war, which precedes the chapter on religious rites.

Even today, ethnographic illustrations based on the format de Léry developed are considered “neutral,” which is, as I hope to demonstrate, far from the case. The pictorial conventions that we have been observing—iconic, sculpturally-conceived figures, modeled in light and shadow, with only a bare indication of setting, are presented along with clear, conceptual contrasts—by which I mean the deliberate juxtaposition of subordinate features such as one head in frontal view next to the side view; or the juxtaposition of a pineapple in the foreground with a hammock in the background. Without other distracting elements (and in the case of the pineapple, with sufficient knowledge of Aristotle to recognize the rudimentary comparison of the products of nature and man), the visual juxtapositions can be "read out" of the image as a
conceptual contrast. De Léry's organization of the picture on this methodological level is striking. His visual syntax allows the image to function in close correlation with the literary text. Clear visual juxtapositions direct the viewer to draw specific comparisons.

The visual antitheses in de Léry’s illustrations mirror more complicated contrasts described in the text. A dialectic between image and text reinforces certain habits of conceptualization. For example, when de Léry describes the Tupinambá warrior, he treats his human subject as if it were a plant or animal—something you might see in real life or in a zoological or botanical text, but not a portrait of an individual, not a real person to engage in conversation. De Léry explains, moreover, that he has constructed this visual reference with specific contrasting elements for the reader’s benefit, so that one can connect the appearance of the Tupi warrior (and I might add, trigger one’s memory) with the author’s discussion of a nonvisual topic, namely the ritual context in which cannibalism is practiced among the Tupi people. The visual substitution of body decor for war activities makes the subject more attractive and less threatening—as de Certeau says, it turns the Tupis into the object of the viewer’s pleasure—while the emotionally charged topic of Tupi anthropophagy is cut up and dispersed throughout the body of de Léry’s work. We might say that the author’s textual reproduction reproduces the ritual dissection and re-assembly of the fragmented subject into a new body, namely the ethnographic text. In the chapter under discussion, the subject of cannibalism is occluded under the neutral category of “life and manners,” subcategory “dress,” that de Léry inherited ultimately from Herodotus. De Léry avoids a sensationalist presentation and writes with scientific detachment:

As for those who have committed these murders, they think that it is to their great glory and honor; the same day that they have dealt the death blow, they withdraw and have incisions made, to the point of drawing blood, on their chests, thighs, the thick part of their legs, and other parts of the body. And so that it may be visible all their lives, they rub these stabs with certain mixtures and with a black powder that cannot ever be effaced. The more slashes they carry the more renowned they will be for having killed many prisoners, and they are consequently esteemed the more valiant by others. (So that you can understand this more clearly, I have repeated the illustration

14 A rich and varied commentary tradition is based on Aristotle, *Physics*, Book II (192b8-200b10).

15 It is difficult, by which I mean impossible, to say whether de Léry saw the same correlations between his authorial activities and the subject of his study that we might construe in terms of the continuity between literal and literary “cannibalism.” We can be certain, however, that he consciously manipulated his discourse in numerous ways that I would now like to consider more fully. As we have already observed, he controls the reader’s reading by illustrating some passages and not others, thus directing attention (and memory) to certain topics and certain thematic connections over others. With this skillful play of word and image in mind, let us first examine the immediate sources for de Léry’s illustrations. No direct studies for the five woodcuts survive, but part of their history can be pieced together from extant copies of watercolors by the Huguenot artist Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues. Some of Le Moyne’s studies survive second hand, in copies made by the English watercolorist John White when Le Moyne was in England from 1572 until his death in 1588.16 Both Le Moyne and White were trained artists who accompanied early explorers and afterwards worked for Theodor de Bry, a Frankfurt printmaker who beginning in 1588 published lavishly illustrated accounts of European explorations. We might think of his *Great Voyages as Life magazines or National Geographics* of the early modern period. De Bry engraved drawings by both White and Le Moyne. Some of these illustrations accompanied his new edition of *de Léry’s Voyage.*

Various solutions have been proposed to account for the relationship among the images produced by de Léry, Le Moyne, White, and de Bry. Based on the surviving visual evidence and documentation, a straightforward explanation would be the following. Le Moyne’s drawings, known

16 Hulson and Quinan, *The Drawings of John White* (as in n. 10), includes an illustrated catalogue of White’s drawings. To complicate matters further, some of White’s drawings are known only in copies, made by members of his family between 1593 and 1614: on the “Slavon copies” and the British Museum copies, see 24-30, 145-47.

17 Theodor de Bry, *America, tertius pars: Memorable provinciar Brasiliae historiam...* (Frankfurt: T. de Bry, 1592), and *De Rade Bisch, Americae dasinae Brasiliae durch Johann Staden...* (Frankfurt: T. de Bry, 1593).
through White's copies, must either be studies for the woodcuts or copies after them. Discrepancies between the woodcuts and the watercolors rule out the possibility that Le Moyne depended on the published illustrations, as is often assumed. The two versions of the Tupi dancing pair, for example (Figs. 4 and 5), indicate that revisions were made to conform with de Léry's text. The author writes that women did not dance: in the final woodcut but not in the drawing, the sexual identity of the female dancer is suppressed. Similarly, the study for the so-called family does not contain a hammock, which de Léry mentions in his text. The visual evidence strongly suggests that Le Moyne's watercolors were preparatory studies. Even though no direct link has ever been established between Le Moyne and de Léry, they must have come into direct contact through their Huguenot involvements.

These discrepancies in content are accompanied by numerous visual adjustments which we can now argue were made after Le Moyne completed his sketches. Le Moyne's visual formulas are, like White's, indebted to costume book illustrations. A considerable number of sixteenth-century publications were devoted to this topic. An innovative example would be the illustrations in one of the most lavish collections of manners and customs of the period, Braun and Hogenberg's Civitates Orbis Terrarum. Sixteenth-century European audiences learned about voyages of discovery and conquest through the publication of sumptuous illustrated atlases organized by "nation" or "people." These "cosmographies," as they were often called, filtered information through long-established categories in the manuscript tradition of Herodotus, Pliny, Solinus, Isidore of Seville, Bartolomaeus Anglicus, and their printed counterparts beginning with the Nuremberg Chronicle. One reason for the continued popularity and credibility of this textual tradition must

18 Even the current editors of White's drawing corpus, Hulon and Quinn, The Drawings of John White (as in n. 10), are reluctant to set out the lines of transmission among these sources.

19 For these descriptions of discrepancies, see Hulon and Quinn, The Drawings of John White (as in n. 10), 145-47, with further references. De Léry, History of a Voyage, 62, describes the accompanying illustration (Figure 1): "Next to the three [Tupi] were there is a cotton bod, made like a fishing net, strung in the air, in how they sleep in their country."

20 George Braun, Simon Novellis, and Franz Hogenberg, Civitates Orbis Terrarum, 6 vols. (Cologne, 1572-1618). The first important example of this illustrated literature on manners and customs, is Johannes Boemus, Ornament Gentium: mores, leges, and ritus... (1520).

21 See Hodgson, Early Anthropology (as in n. 7), 20ff.

have been its flexibility—that is, due to the nature of the genre, pictorial encyclopedias were continually assimilating new information. Printing technology encouraged the constant development of novel visual models to attract a broad readership. Although the scale of de Léry's Voyage is modest judged against the most elaborate illustrated cultural geographies, his innovations were part of this new market for popular culture.

In comparison with White's watercolors, the figures in the printed edition of de Léry's Voyage are more muscular, the compositions are more compressed, the empty page is closed in around the figures. Further contrasts between individual elements are developed in the design—such as the juxtaposition of full-face and profile view that I have already mentioned. These formal elements, along with a sophisticated engraving technique employing multiple kinds of crosshatchings to give the sculpturally-conceived figures strong relief, the artist's command of anatomy, the energetic contours and daring foreshortenings of his figures, all indicate that another professional artist[s] played a role in the production process after Le Moyne. De Léry's education only prepared him for the ministry. A professional engraver and a trained artist must have been responsible for the bold graphic designs of the final composition. On the other hand, de Léry must have been responsible for certain corrections, such as the sexual identities of the dancing figures, so he must have worked closely with the artist or artists. He claimed to be responsible for the images—"speaking out of my own knowledge, that is, my own seeing and experience"—in a different sense from our modern understanding of artistic authority. The sixteenth-century idea that the patron of the work is its author encouraged de Léry to use a rhetorical technique as old as John Mandeville's account of dogheaded people and other monsters that de Léry actively sought to discredit. The difference in de Léry's appeal to experience is that no one questioned the veracity of his images, not even modern revisionist writers like de Certeau who have studied the expository conventions of his writing.

II

To better understand the rhetorical power of de Léry's scientific prose and pictorial presentation, I would now like to introduce another source, or rather context, for de Léry's designs, one that no anthropologist or

22 On de Léry's reputation of Mandevillian lies, which have been extensively studied with relation to his archival André Thevet, see Whately, Introduction to de Léry, History of a Voyage, xxii ff. and Mary Campbell, The Witness and the Other World: Exotic European Travel Writing, 400-1600 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988).
modern sciences of anatomy and optics, and were familiar with ancient theories of human proportion.

Even beyond these extensive similarities in aim and procedure, Vesalius's flayed muscle-men provided de Léry with convincing visual prototypes for illustrating his text. Perhaps we could cautiously suggest that Vesalius's illustrations even conditioned the terms in which de Léry described the Tupinamba—their classicizing but excessively developed musculature, their bold but strange rhetorical gestures, the patterns incised in their skins, filled with black powder and worn as the sole body adornment, the representation of fragments—mimic the most characteristic and cherished qualities of the Vesalian musculenum: the overt references to classical sculpture appreciated in its modern decay; the humorous device of presenting a cadaver as a speaking, moving figure; the technique of modelling the forms with parallel lines of hatching and bold simplifications of the main lines of musculature.

I do not wish to argue, however, that de Léry's illustrations are indebted to Vesalius only for their convincing visual formulas or references to ancient sculpture. Vesalius's Fabrica and Epitome coordinate word and image in a minutely methodological sequence.27 Vesalius balanced visual economy with anatomical completeness so that his reader could experience the procedure of dissection through the illustrations as if he were an eyewitness. The illustrations generally follow a linear method of demonstration from superficial to deep structures, but with sufficient complexity to incorporate visual comparisons, didactic devices to guide the student through the verbal, critical commentary (Fig. 8). As Martin Kemp has discovered, sometimes Vesalius included details referring to the authority he disputes and sometimes he synthesized multiple dissections in a single image.28 In other words, Vesalius's images, like de Léry's, function in an artificially constructed dialectic relationship with his verbal descriptions, masquerading under the sign of the natural. Reprinted in a revised and enlarged edition in 1555, plagiarized by a wide variety of authors who quickly disseminated Vesalius's ideas into English, French, German, and Spanish, there is no chance that the illustrated anatomical method of Vesalius was unknown to de Léry.

---


24 See Gilbert, Concepts of Method (as in n. 23), 39, on Aristotle, Topics 100a18; and Gilbert, 100-125, on methodological controversies in Padua and Bologna on Melanchthon's Loci communes theologici, which includes remarks on method in preface by the Lutheran theologian Victorinus Strigelius (d. 1569).


27 As stated by Martin Kemp, "A Drawing for the Fabrica; and Some Thoughts upon the Vesalius Muscles-Men," Medical History 14 (1970): 277-283. This essay contains a valuable discussion of Vesalius's interaction with the artists who helped him design the plates.

28 See n. 27.
The unusual circumstances that led de Léry to publish his account have been told many times. A brief recapitulation at this juncture will clarify the specific historical context in which his appropriation of anatomical demonstration arose. De Léry trained for the ministry with Calvin in Geneva, from where he was summoned in 1556 by Admiral Gaspard de Coligny, a Huguenot sympathizer, and Nicolas Durant de Villeragon, to establish a reformed refuge and mission in Brazil. Villeragon also engaged as his chaplain the Franciscan friar and Royal Cosmographer André Thevet. Such bitter disputes broke out between the Calvinist and Catholic factions in Brazil that de Léry sought shelter with the Tupinambas while he waited for a ship to take him home in 1558. The bitter dispute continued in Europe, where the main participants published rival accounts. De Léry first drafted his in Geneva in 1563, but due to his involvement in the Huguenot resistance, it did not appear in print until 1578.

De Léry’s preface is written in a polemical style entirely different from the scientific exposition of the rest of his text. This shift in expository techniques should alert us to his sensitivity to different modes of argumentation. In the extended preface to the 1585 edition, de Léry contrasts Thevet’s “paradigme cosmographique,” with its false representations and geographical errors, its rhetorical figures that are “more appropriate to paintings and other metal things that can be engraved and decorated artistically,” to his own authentic report of what he has seen with his own eyes. In the context of the present discussion of the unity of text and image in de Léry’s discourse on the Tupinamba, and considering the care that he put into the production and description of his scientific illustrations, it is significant that he used an example of pictorial seductiveness to criticize Thevet’s rhetorical method of argumentation. To the contrary, de Léry’s own dissection of the evidence is grounded in Aristotelian methods of scientific demonstration, with its clear definition of the subject and subordinate sets of comparisons and contrasts. In keeping with these scientific underpinnings, his criticism of Thevet points away from the value of optical naturalism per se: a text can be embellished with superficial luster, but praiseworthy elocutio also has substance, because it is the manifestation of scientific method.

In conclusion, to emphasize why it is so important to recognize the rhetorical strategy of de Léry’s scientific presentation—why the persuasive power of word and image in framing the ethnographic subject is of such great historical significance—I would like to refer his illustrations to the general context of printed images produced by Reformation writers. There is no room to develop this discussion here, but perhaps I can briefly indicate a productive direction for further investigation. Ambiguities circulating within de Léry’s text—internal contradictions that I have characterized as rooted in tension between rhetorical and scientific modes of discourse—point to even greater ambiguities experienced by his readership. The strange French experiment in Rio de Janeiro that brought Catholics and Huguenots to blows three hundred and fifty years before Levi-Strauss disembarked in his tropical paradise, was a tempest in a teapot compared to religious conflicts brewing in Europe. Both Reformation and Catholic factions used the Tupinamba and other native American societies to make points about the religious opposition, and these complicated political alliances introduced a great deal of ambiguity into the new, ostensibly secular iconography. Current scholarly debate over the reception of Reformation broadsheets indicates how difficult it is to interpret the so-called popular imagery.

The politics of Reformation images are important to bear in mind, however, because de Léry was himself a Calvinist minister who, only two years before History of a Voyage appeared, published a scientific, descriptive account of the devastating siege of Sancerre, in which he participated. The earlier publication confirms de Léry’s commitment to peaceful resistance and also suggests that his representation of the Tupinamba conceals an ironic dimension. As de Léry himself notes in his account of the famine he endured in the besieged city following the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre, the Tupinambas’ programmed, ritual practice of war and cannibalism is a striking contrast to arbitrary acts of savage, cannibalism and mob violence associated with the ongoing

---

29 See nn. 1-3.
European religious conflicts. Judging from the brief observations on the Tupinamba in the Sancerre volume, it is likely that de Léry also intended to provide his readers with a hortatory example in his extended, second account of Brazilian society. Most significantly for the modern discipline of anthropology, his implicit comparison between good Brazilian savages and bad European civilians, while it ennobles the savage it also assigns the Tupinamba to an inferior position in the social and intellectual hierarchy—the equation is between all Indians (regardless of the actual structure of their own society) and all unruly peasants and artisans. In other words, a diametric contrast issuing from the double inversion of a negative stereotype endowed both Indians and Peasants with the attributes of a generalized category of humanity and relegated them both to an inferior position in society. Even in de Léry’s verbal descriptions the pictorial dominates; and in the case of his History of a Voyage, as we have already seen in the comparison with Vesalius, he treats the image as primary evidence. The relations of power embodied in his illustrations and his text deserve to be carefully explored.

34 De Léry in Nakai, Saint-Barthélemy (as in n. 33), 290-93.

ILLUSTRATIONS

1 Tupinamba “Family.” From J. de Léry, Histoire d’un voyage fait en la terre du Brésil autrement dite Amérique, le tout recueilli ses lieux par Jean de Léry (Geneva/LaRochelle: Antoine Chuppin, 1578), 107.
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