This is the accepted version of the following article: True, Micah. "Strange Bedfellows: Turks, Gauls, and Amerindians in Lescarbot's *Histoire de la Nouvelle France."* *French Review*, vol. 87, no. 4, 2014, 139-151., which has been published in final form at https://doi.org/10.1353/tfr.2014.0214. The text of this article is provided here with the permission of the *French Review.*

Strange Bedfellows: Turks, Gauls, and Amerindians in Lescarbot's *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*

by Micah True

EARLY MODERN EUROPEAN travelers to the New World often invoked familiar examples from the Old World's history in the portraits of Amerindian cultures that many of them published upon return home: "Through comparison of a few cultural affinities in word usage, dress, religious and other cultural traits, commentators linked Indians with most of the cultures known previously to westerners from Old World antiquity" (Berkhofer 35). Marc Lescarbot, the French parliamentary lawyer, poet, and traveler to New France, is often cited as a prominent user of this strategy, and with good reason. He peppered the sixth book of his 1609 *Histoire de la Nouvelle France* with comparisons between Amerindians and the Gauls, Greeks, and Romans, among other ancient groups, as well as the more recently encountered inhabitants of far-flung places like Sumatra, Brazil, and China, among others. Through such comparisons, the Amerindians emerge in the *Histoire* as a favorable cultural model, one that could bring into relief the shortcomings of Lescarbot's own home country. This article examines a point of comparison that so far has gone unremarked by scholars, and one that at least superficially would seem to undermine Lescarbot's favorable outlook on the Amerindian: the Turk. As the following pages will show, Lescarbot at least sometimes wrote about the inhabitants of the Ottoman

Empire in surprisingly positive terms, suggesting that the Turk was not without attributes that were useful in Early Modern France, despite having a generally negative reputation at the time. The use to which Lescarbot put the Turk in his descriptions of Amerindian cultures shows that colonial comparative ethnography may have much to tell us about cultures aside from those that are the stated subjects of texts like the *Histoire*.

Marc Lescarbot departed France in 1606 at the invitation of Jean de Biencourt, sieur de Poutrincourt, lieutenant governor of the fledgling Acadian colony that would eventually encompass what is today Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and parts of Maine and Quebec (Pioffet, "Introduction" 11). He traveled to New France not to conduct any particular business there, but rather, in his own words, to "fuir un monde corrompu" and "reconnaître la terre occulairement" (143-44).[1] After more than a year in Acadia, mostly spent in the French settlement of Port Royal, Lescarbot returned to France and set about writing his massive *Histoire de la Nouvelle France*, first published in 1609 and then revised and reissued twice by 1618 ("Introduction" 55). Although relatively little is known about Lescarbot aside from his famous voyage and some legal entanglements later in life, he is reputed to have been a gifted student, well read and conversant with the great texts of the classical tradition as well as more recent writings on the world's various non-European peoples ("Introduction" 8).[2] It was no doubt this broad cultivation that allowed him to cite a startling array of examples from the world's known cultures in his efforts to describe the Algonquian groups that he encountered in New France. So numerous are Lescarbot's references to seemingly unrelated examples in his portraits of Amerindian cultures, especially in the sixth book of his massive *Histoire*, that scholars tend to describe his ethnographic descriptions less as a straightforward account

of faraway people than as a "mosaïque textuelle" ("Introduction" 31) or "courtepointe historique" (Poirier 74).[3]

Thanks to Lescarbot's frequent comparisons of the New World's inhabitants to previously known cultures, scholars have recognized his book, along with the famous Jesuit *Relations* and François-Joseph Lafitau's *Mœurs des sauvages amériquains comparées aux mœurs des premiers temps*, as a prime example of the proto-ethnography that blossomed in the wake of Europe's contact with the New World.[4] As Mary Baine Campbell noted of such texts, comparison to previously-known cultures was a standard strategy for depicting newly-encountered peoples:

> Early 'cultural anthropology,' or ethnology, has a tendency to look rather like—and sometimes even to be—a kind of literary history, a collection of revealing parallels to the historical and cultural conditions of (variously) Homer's Greece, Herodotus's Scythia and Arabia, Livy's Rome, Tacitus's Germania, the Biblical Mesopotamia, Palestine and (especially) Ophir. Difference is glossed over, and the *context* of any given practice or craft ignored in deference to a parallel or analogous morphology. (45–46)

This strategy was rooted in Christian Europe's scripture-based understanding of the history of the world and mankind, into which outsiders had to be integrated in order to avoid undermining all that Europe thought it knew on the subject. The stakes of this effort to reconcile the existence of newly encountered peoples like Amerindians with pre-existing knowledge could not have been higher: "Or, dans son existence même, cet Autre

est dérangeant, incongru, déplacé au plus haut titre parce qu'il ne correspond à rien, à aucun modèle connu. Si l'on accepte tel quel, c'est toute l'autorité des Écritures qui s'effondre, c'est véritablement la fin du monde" (Deslandres 20).[5] By referring to previously-known cultures in describing the Amerindians that he encountered in the New World, Lescarbot and other writers who employed the same tactic could render the exotic familiar, and thereby diminish the threat that such groups may have posed to supposedly comprehensive scripture-based histories of mankind.

In Lescarbot's particular case, comparisons between the inhabitants of Worlds Old and New generally have been understood not only to diminish the startling difference of Amerindian cultures, but also to position them as an admirable model culture, one from which the French, in particular, could learn. Indeed Amerindians in the *Histoire* generally are depicted as being better than the French of Lescarbot's time (Carile 159). The admirable qualities of the inhabitants of the New World emerge particularly clearly through comparison to the ancient Gauls who once inhabited the territory that would become France. The Gaul is Lescarbot's most frequent point of comparison for the Amerindian, appearing, by one scholar's count, fourteen times in book six of the *Histoire* (Brazeau 91). The Gauls appear in the *Histoire* as "hardy, virtuous Gallic ancestors" of the French, who were, in turn, "frail, decadent shadows" of the Gauls (Welch 442). Lescarbot not only frequently compared the Amerindians to the Gauls, but also argued for literal kinship between the two groups.[6] Linking the Amerindians to the esteemed Gauls implied that the people Lescarbot encountered in Acadia were an admirable group indeed, a model for France to emulate: "La rencontre avec les vertus primitives indiennes permettra à la France 'antique' de renouer connaissance avec ses origines vertueuses, à

savoir celle des Gaulois" (Gosman 38). Lescarbot's comparisons serve not only to diminish the potentially troubling differences between the New World and the Old, but also, in many cases, to elevate the Amerindian in the service of Lescarbot's own harsh judgment of France, a corrupted place from which, as noted above, he described himself as fleeing to New France.

One point of comparison in the *Histoire* that at least superficially would seem to be a counterproductive parallel for a project to highlight the merits of Amerindian culture begs explanation. Although less frequently evoked than figures like the Gauls and Romans, the Turk nonetheless repeatedly is used as a point of comparison in Lescarbot's descriptions of Amerindians. In seventeenth-century France, the comparison would have been freighted with meaning due to the Turk's cultural and military power at the time: "The Ottomans were mighty military aggressors, wealthy traders, fearful Mediterranean neighbors; hence the French could entertain only uneasy and volatile relations with them. But, in addition, the Ottomans represented a highly organized and refined culture, which the French were obliged to recognize and even, grudgingly or covetously, admire" (Longino 224–25). A threat to France due both to its negative and positive attributes, the Ottoman Empire loomed large as a symbol of otherness in seventeenth-century France.

The French responded to the looming Ottoman threat by disparaging the Turk at every opportunity. Antoine Furetière's 1690 *Dictionnaire universel* records various unflattering uses for the word "Turk" in the seventeenth century: "On dit [...] traitter de Turc à More, pour dire, à la rigueur et en ennemy déclaré. On dit aussi en voulant injurier un homme, le taxer de barbarie, de cruauté, d'irréligion, que c'est un Turc, un homme inexorable, qu'il vaudroit autant avoir à faire à un Turc." Furetière's definition was

echoed by the 1694 *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, which also noted that labeling a person "un vray Turc" meant "qu'il est rude, inexorable, qu'il n'a aucune pitié, &c." Such expressions make it clear that "the Turk loomed large, and most often negatively, in the French imaginary" (Longino 14–15).[7] If the Turk's place in seventeenth-century French culture and literature often seems to obscure admirable aspects of Ottoman culture, it is because French writers at the time saw in those aspects a potent cultural competitor to France, as much of a threat as the Empire's military power. As Longino put it, the common recourse to negative depictions of the Turk "was a shield raised not only against difference but also against threatening competition" (17).

So widespread was the Turk's negative position in the French imagination that even texts produced in and about colonial New France, seemingly as far removed as possible from Franco-Ottoman relations, sometimes include portrayals of the Ottoman Empire and its inhabitants as adversaries whose characteristics could also be used to highlight the shortcomings of others. Poutrincourt, in a letter to Pope Paul V that was published in Lescarbot's *Histoire*, declared himself ready to exhaust all of his resources to colonize and Christianize Acadia, "surtout maintenant que les armes sont silencieuses et que la valeur ne peut non plus remplir son office, à moins que nous ne tournions nos épées contre les Turcs" (233). In his observation that resources were available to be devoted to New France, Poutrincourt apparently thought only of the Turk when considering potential enemies that could divert France's attention. Elsewhere, the word "Turk" appeared as an insult meant to highlight the appalling degree of barbarity in the persons to whom it was applied. The Jesuit missionary Jérome Lalemant's 1661 *Relation* used the word to describe the Iroquois—the five Amerindian groups that generally appear

in Jesuit missionary reports as a shadowy menace waiting to pounce on, torture, and eat unsuspecting Frenchmen and their Amerindian allies—calling them "ces petits turcs de la Nouvelle France" (MNF 9.599). By identifying them with the reputedly violent Turks of the Ottoman Empire, Lalemant highlighted the supposed essential ferocity and pitilessness of the Iroquois.[8]

Like his countrymen and fellow travelers to New France, Lescarbot himself sometimes cast the Turk as an adversary to be feared and viewed with suspicion, and whose very name could be used to cast aspersions. For example, he lashed out in the *Histoire* at the cruelty of Spaniards toward other groups, and suggested a more appropriate enemy: "Car quand je me représente que par son avarice il a allumé & entretenu la guerre en toute la Chrétienté, & s'est étudié à ruiner ses voisins, & non point le Turc, je ne puis penser qu'autre que le diable ait été auteur de ses voyages" (94). The inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire, Lescarbot suggests, would be a more appropriate target for Spanish aggression than Amerindians or other Europeans. Elsewhere, Lescarbot used the Turk's poor reputation to insult one of his own countrymen. In his short text "la Conversion des sauvages qui ont esté baptizés en la nouvelle-france cette année 1610," the author denigrated the religious piety of a Frenchman who had undermined efforts to convert Amerindians to Catholicism. Lescarbot labeled the alleged corrupter of would-be converts "un mauvais Français, non français mais turc, non turc mais athée" (MNF 1.76-77). Strongly disapproving of his fellow Frenchman's actions, Lescarbot demoted him first to a Turk and then, as if that insult were not sufficient to denote the lack of piety that would be required to commit such acts, demoted him further to atheist. The Turk appears

in this formulation as an impious figure to be sure: perhaps not the worst, but by no means a positive model for Amerindian behavior.

In light of the negativity with which Lescarbot, his fellow travelers, and his countrymen in France generally invoked the inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire, the Turk would seem to be a strange point of comparison for the Amerindian, about whom, as noted above, Lescarbot was overwhelmingly positive. And yet, the Amerindian is compared directly to the Turk several times in the *Histoire*. What sense would it make, in a text intended to elevate Amerindian groups out of perceived barbarity, to invoke France's Ottoman adversary, who occupied a mostly negative place in the French imagination? One answer might be found in a strategy that Marie-Christine Pioffet has called "[la] rhétorique du pire" ("Introduction" 32), by which distasteful Amerindian practices could be rendered less offensive through comparison to the even worse customs of other groups (such as the Brazilians described by Jean de Léry): "Chaque fois, la comparaison tourne en faveur des peuples d'Amérique du Nord tandis que se répète à peu près le même raisonnement: '[...] nos Souriquois, Canadaiens, et leurs voisins, voire encore les Virginiens et Floridiens ne sont pas tant endurcis en leur mauvaise vie'" ("Introduction" 32). From this point of view, negatively-perceived cultures could be useful for Lescarbot's project, mentioned above, to position Amerindians as a favorable cultural model from which the French had much to learn. Comparisons to such cultures could make Amerindian look good, or at least less bad than they might otherwise have initially appeared.

The Turk indeed sometimes appears as just such a negative example in the *Histoire*, a figure that could make certain Amerindian practices seem less shocking by

comparison. To cite just one example,[9] Lescarbot's chapter on medical and surgical practices describes how some Amerindian men burned themselves with hot coals in order to prove their courage, and compares their behavior to a reputedly worse practice among the Turks. In the Ottoman version, various body parts reportedly were pierced with metal objects. Lescarbot concludes that the Amerindian practice was "rien au pris de" Turkish customs, because "tout ce qu'ils [les Amérindiens] font" (366) is burn themselves with hot coals. Obvious differences between the practices—the apparent preference for burning in New France instead of the cutting and piercing preferred by the Turks, and the role of embedded hardware versus scars in proving bravery in each place—go unexamined by Lescarbot, who focuses instead of the degree of brutality in each custom, all to the Amerindians' favor. Lescarbot goes on to compare the tests of bravery he described to a case from Ancient Rome, in which Mutius Scevola "avait bien fait davantage" (366) by roasting his own arm over a fire. In the context of comparisons to the worse cultural practices of the Turks and the ordeal of a single Roman figure, bizarre Amerindian rites appear less horrifying than they otherwise might have. In addition to helpfully mitigating the alarming nature of Amerindian practices, such passages also participate in France's general strategy for coping with the threats posed by the Ottoman Empire: disparaging the Turk.

Curiously, the inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire sometimes appear as a more neutral point of comparison, equivalent to the Amerindian instead of so much worse as to reduce the troubling nature of the Amerindian's most appalling qualities. In his chapter on "La Civilité," for example, Lescarbot wrote that "N'ayant les artifices de menuiserie, ils dînent sur la grande table du monde, étendant une peau là où ils veulent manger, &

sont assis en terre. Les Turcs en font de même" (383). It is tempting to read the passage as a celebration of the simplicity of Amerindian and Turkish dining practices. Although the word "artifice," which Lescarbot applies to the joinery used to construct tables in Europe, could simply mean "art" or "industrie" in Lescarbot's time, it could also mean ruse, fraud or disguise.[10] And the phrase "grande table du monde" has poetic resonance, perhaps suggesting that Lescarbot found an admirable authenticity in Amerindian and Turkish dining practices, especially in contrast to the "artificial" dining practices of those who ate at tables. On the other hand, Lescarbot prefaces his comparison with a catalog of complaints about Amerindian dining practices. He writes that he has no grounds on which to laud the manners of the Amerindians, who, he claims, washed themselves only when extremely dirty, wiped their hands on dogs or their own hair, and belched shamelessly while eating. Whether intended as a positive or negative assessment of Amerindian dining practices, the comparison is remarkable because it places the Amerindians, about whom Lescarbot is generally positive, on equal footing with the disreputable Turks. Unlike the previous example, the Turk does not appear to serve here as a negative example that could mitigate distasteful Amerindian practices. Instead, Amerindians and Turks were, in this instance, the same.

More than one observer of New France's inhabitants who had more reason than Lescarbot did to portray Amerindians in a negative light made the same comparison between Ottoman and Amerindian dining practices. An anonymous missionary commented in the Jesuit ***Relation*** published in 1659 that "Les Romains et quelques Asiatiques se couchoient autrefois sur de petits lits pour prendre leurs repas; leurs tables estoient faites en demy-lunes. La pluspart des Européans sont maintenant assis sur des

sieges relevez, se servant de tables rondes ou carrées. Les sauvages mangent à terre, aussi bien que les Turcs, comme font aussi plusieurs peuples de l'Asie" (MNF 9.298). According to the Jesuit, Europeans both contemporary and ancient ate from tables, protected from the ground by seats of some kind. Amerindians and Turks, in contrast, ate off the ground. Although he stops short of offering a clear judgment of the relative merits of the two methods of dining, the priest draws a bright line between his own European culture and heritage and that of the Amerindian and Ottoman Others. The Jesuit Historian François Du Creux repeated the comparison in similar terms in his 1664 *Historiae Canadensis* (96). Although Jesuit missionaries sometimes, like Lescarbot, took pains to explain away differences between European and Amerindian cultures—especially when it came to religious beliefs[11]—they also, unlike Lescarbot, had an incentive to portray Amerindians as different from Europeans in order to demonstrate the necessity of their own work. Missionaries, after all, sought to change Amerindian cultures, rather than merely minimize their differences from Old World cultures. Comparison to a notorious adversary, the Turk, could have helped make the case that urgent change was needed.

Although Lescarbot similarly compared Amerindian and Ottoman dining practices, he nonetheless went one surprising step further than his contemporaries who noted the same parallel, adding that "Nos vieux Gaulois n'étaient pas mieux, lesquels Diodore dit avoir fait pareille chose, étendant à terre des peaux de chiens, ou de loups, sur lesquelles ils dînaient et soupaient, se faisant servir par des jeunes garçons" (383). Whereas Jesuit authors who may have been most interested in demonstrating the need for their own intervention insisted on a clear distinction between Amerindian and European cultures, Lescarbot compared the Amerindian and Ottoman custom to one practiced by

the Gauls, a favorable model to be sure, and one whose status in this instance as an "us" rather than a "them" is reinforced by Lescarbot's use of the possessive adjective "nos." By implicating his own ancestors in a comparison between Amerindians and Turks, Lescarbot finds a cultural link between Worlds Old and New in a parallel that elsewhere served as a sign of the radical difference of Amerindians. The Amerindians were like the Turks, but they were also like France's own esteemed ancestors. In light of Lescarbot's negative comments about Amerindian manners, noted above, this three-way comparison could be read as a condemnation of all three cultures. On the other hand, the Turks, Amerindians, and Gauls all benefit from comparison to yet a fourth example, one that is cast as even less refined. The Germans, wrote Lescarbot, ate "encore plus rustiquement. Car ils n'avaient pas tant de délicatesse que notre nation" [Gauls] (383).[12] Although the implication of this comparison was not particularly favorable to any of the figures involved—Turks, Gauls, and Amerindians alike were, it is suggested, "rustic"—Lescarbot nonetheless maintains the argument that was his signature: the Amerindian, however troubling at times, was not an example of radical otherness, but was instead like more familiar models. Not only are the Turks not worse than the Amerindians in this equation, they are portrayed as equivalent to two figures about whom Lescarbot is overwhelmingly positive in the ***Histoire***: the Gaul and the Amerindian.

Other passages are more explicitly positive on the subject of the Turk. In the same chapter in which he described Amerindian dining practices, Lescarbot briefly commented on the behavior required when addressing a monarch in the Old World:

> Plusieurs Princes d'aujourd'hui se font servir à genoux. Mais le grand Seigneur Empereur des Turcs ne souffre point d'agenouillements devant soi, disant qu'il faut laisser ce devoir à Dieu, auquel on ne peut rendre davantage: ains se contente d'une humble submission de tête, la main à la poitrine. Ce qui était l'adoration de laquelle est parlé dans la version vulgaire de la Bible, quand on faisait révérence au Roi. (388)

Lescarbot here elevates a Turkish custom—the apparent modesty and piety with which the Ottoman emperor received those seeking an audience—by drawing a parallel to a practice described in the Bible. By comparison, the reverence paid to certain unnamed princes appears extravagant and even impious. In light of Lescarbot's expressions of disapproval of France in his own time, mentioned above, it is tempting to read the comparison as a veiled criticism of his homeland and its monarch. There is not enough information in the passage to draw that conclusion, but it is nonetheless interesting that Lescarbot clearly deviates from France's generally negative depictions of the Turk. Although Lescarbot is vague on the matter of which "princes d'aujourd'hui" he means to critique, the passage at least suggests that the Ottoman Empire's admirable qualities could be useful in intensifying criticism of Old World practices.

In another passage, Lescarbot is more direct in his use of favorable Ottoman qualities to shame France, this time in the context of a description of an Amerindian custom. Lescarbot's chapter "La Tabagie," begins by comparing Amerindian hospitality practices to the reputed hospitality of the ancient Gauls, regrettably mostly disappeared from French culture:

> Ils ont aussi l'Hospitalité propre vertu des anciens Gaulois (selon le témoignage de Parthenius en ses Érotiques, de César, Salvien, & autres) lesquels contraignaient les passants & étrangers d'entrer chez eux & y prendre la réfection: vertu qui semble s'être conservée seulement en la Noblesse: car pour le reste nous la voyons fort énervée. (349)

More than one scholar has cited this passage as an example of Lescarbot's efforts to establish a link between Amerindian cultures and the Gauls and to criticize France. But most have not mentioned the fact that Lescarbot went on to draw another comparison on the matter of hospitality, to the reputedly vicious Turk:[13] "Et ainsi font les Turcs mêmes presque en tous lieux, ayant des Hôpitaux fondés, où les passants (voire en quelques-uns, les Chrétiens) sont reçus humainement sans rien payer. Chose qui fait honte à la France" (Lescarbot 350). The first part of the passage has been understood to effect a rapprochement between the French and the Amerindians while simultaneously suggesting that the French had strayed from the laudable customs of their Gallic ancestors. The second, overlooked part sharpens the criticism by suggesting that France was worse not only than an earlier incarnation of itself, but also its own looming adversary. Even France's military and cultural foe, the reputedly cruel and violent Turk, behaved charitably toward others, something that supposedly Christian France could not manage. This contrast, in Lescarbot's own words, "shames France." French culture had strayed from its roots by turning its back on strangers in need, and had only to look to its enemy, its ancestor, and to the untainted nature of Amerindian cultures for clues on how to live

more virtuously. Through association with the laudable behavior of the Gauls and the Amerindians, the Turk once more is depicted in a surprisingly positive light.

Lescarbot's various uses of Ottoman culture as a point of comparison in the *Histoire* suggest that it was a more complicated adversary than one might expect from the Turk's generally negative reputation in France at the time. Perhaps not surprisingly, the Turk's alleged negative attributes were on display in the text, useful for making certain Amerindian practices look less troubling by comparison. At the same time, another key part of Lescarbot's project—criticism of his home country—allowed for a more explicit acknowledgement of admirable Ottoman qualities than was typical in seventeenth-century France. In light of the Turk's poor reputation at the time, few comparisons could have been more effective at shining a light of shame on the Old Country's shortcomings. Although Lescarbot's contemporaries typically reacted to the Ottoman Empire's perceived negative and positive attributes with the same strategy—disparaging the Turk in order to raise a rhetorical shield against a perceived threat—Lescarbot's particular project did not require such a defensive posture, and therefore reflects positive Ottoman attributes that perhaps would have been omitted or suppressed in other contexts. Indeed, the Turk even appears as equivalent in some ways to Lescarbot's favorite cultural model, the Gaul, a comparison that would imply by extension a distant cultural connection between France and its fearsome Ottoman adversary. Far from an example of radical Otherness, the Turk emerges in the text as a useful point of reference for characterizing positive and negative aspects of Amerindian and French cultures alike.

Many scholars have rightly pointed out that frequent comparison of the inhabitants of the New World to previously known cultures constituted a defense against

potential challenges to Europe's existing knowledge of humanity and its history. But the example of the Turk in Lescarbot's *Histoire de la Nouvelle France* suggests that the comparative ethnography practiced by early modern travelers might have just as much to tell us about cultures aside from those directly under consideration. Lescarbot himself described the sixth book of his *Histoire* as containing information on the "Mœurs et façons de vivre" (241) of the Algonquian people he encountered in New France, and accounting for that group is indeed its primary focus. This article nonetheless has shown that Lescarbot's efforts to make sense of the Amerindian by means of comparison to more familiar cultures also results in a more positive characterization of the inhabitants of the Ottoman Empire than was common in France's literature and culture at the time. Comparison clearly was a useful tool for travelers and writers who, like Lescarbot, tried to make sense of Amerindian cultures during the early days of France's colonization of the New World. But that strategy also, it turns out, may have just as much to tell us about how cultures on the other side of the comparative equation were perceived and understood in early modern France.

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Notes

[1]All references to Lescarbot's text are from Pioffet's critical edition of the fourth and sixth books of the *Histoire*.

[2]For more on Lescarbot's life, see Thierry.

[3]For more on Lescarbot's comparisons, including examinations of specific points of comparison, see Lestringant; Poirier; Gosman; Carile (151–62); Pioffet "Le Scythe."

[4]See Sayre (131); Pioffet, "Introduction" (41); Berkhofer (45–46).

[5]See also Sayre (131); Hazard (10).

[6]A papal ruling in 1493 and the Treaty of Tordesillas that followed one year later gave exclusive rights to New World colonization to Spain and Portugal, thereby forbidding the French to settle in the Americas or to engage in trade or missionary work there. One important exception to that prohibition was that lands held by a Christian king before Columbus's voyages were to remain in the hands of that monarch (Gliozzi 27). France could therefore justify its attempt to colonize Acadia, in apparent defiance of the papal ban, by arguing for a Gallic connection between inhabitants of New France and the Old Country, an argument that Lescarbot took up with vigor: "This lineage justified colonization by making the French and Native Americans long-lost kin. This logic circumvented the lack of papal sanction, or so Lescarbot argued" (Melzer 178). On Lescarbot's efforts to promote colonization, see also Sayre (130); Pioffet, "Introduction" (13–19); Zecher; Welch. Lescarbot's interest in the relationship between the inhabitants of Worlds Old and New also anticipated later developments, during the famous *Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes*, in France's understanding of its own identity in relation to its Gallic ancestors and former Roman colonizers. As Melzer argues, the example of the

Amerindian Other helped French thinkers "dethron[e] the Greeks and Romans and negotiat[e] a new, independent path to greatness and a new understanding of what constitutes civilization" (217). For more on Amerindians, Gauls, and Romans in the context of the *Querelle*, see Melzer.

[7]On the place of the Turk in French literature and culture at the time, see Longino.

[8]To cite one more example, early in the following century, another Jesuit missionary, Luc-François Nau, used the Turk somewhat differently in a letter to Society of Jesus authorities in France while describing a ship's passengers who had been afflicted by vermin during the trans-Atlantic crossing. So extreme was the misery experienced by the passengers that "Ces misérables auroient fait pitié aux plus barbares des Turcs" (JR 68.228). The reputedly hard-hearted figure of the Turk serves, in this example, to amplify the severity of the test endured by those crossing the Atlantic to settle in New France. I endorse Campeau's *Monumenta Novae Franciae* as the best critical edition of the Jesuit *Relations* currently available, but am constrained in this instance to refer to Thwaites's century-old *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*. Campeau's edition ends with the 1661 *Relation* due to his untimely death.

[9]For another example, see Lescarbot's description of an Amerindian ritual that he interpreted as an effort to summon a spirit, and that he found similar to an Ottoman practice. As chaotic and alarming as the Amerindian ritual may have been, Lescarbot at least finds reassurance in the fact that its participants did not foam at the mouth like Turks (271).

[10]According to the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, the word artifice in the seventeenth century meant "Art, industrie [...] Se prend plus ordinairement pour Ruse,

deguisement, fraude." Furetière's *Dictionnaire universel* offers a similar definition: "adresse, industrie de faire les choses avec beaucoup de subtilité, de precaution" and notes that the word "signifie aussi fraude, déguisement, mauvaise finesse."

[11]See True.

[12]Pioffet's edition is based on the 1618 edition of the text. Two earlier editions were more detailed in their criticism of the Germans, claiming that they "n'avaient pas les lettres, la philosophie, ni tant de délicatesse que notre nation" (383, note 1052).

[13]Brazeau (92) and Carile (158) note Lescarbot's comparison of Amerindian and Gallic hospitality, but do not mention that he also drew a parallel to an Ottoman practice. Émont, to his credit, notes in passing this extra point of comparison, but does not pause to analyze it (314).

Works Cited

Berkhofer, Robert. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present*. New York: Vintage, 1979.

Brazeau, Brian. *Writing a New France, 1604–1632: Empire and Early Modern French Identity*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

Campbell, Mary Baine. *Wonder and Science: Imagining Worlds in Early Modern Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2004.

Campeau, Lucien, ed. *Monumenta novae franciae*. 9 vols. Rome: Monumenta Hist. Soc. Jesu, 1967–2003.

Carile, Paolo. *Le regard entravé: littérature et anthropologie dans les premiers textes sur la Nouvelle France*. Sillery: Septentrion, 2000.

Dictionnaire de l'Académie française. Paris: Coignard, 1694.

Deslandres, Dominique. *Croire et faire croire: les missions françaises au XVII^e^ siècle*. Paris: Fayard, 2003.

Du Creux, François. *History of Canada or New France*. Trans. Percy J. Robinson. Toronto: Champlain Society, 1951.

Émont, Bernard. *Marc Lescarbot: mythes et rêves fondateurs de la Nouvelle-France*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2002.

Furetière, Antoine. *Dictionnaire universel*. La Haye: Leers, 1690.

Gliozzi, Giuliano. *Adam et le nouveau monde: la naissance de l'anthropologie comme idéologie coloniale: des généalogies bibliques eux théories raciales (1500–1700)*. Lecques: Théétète, 2000.

Gosman, Martin. “Espace autre: espace français—le refus de la dissemblance dans *L’Histoire de la Nouvelle-France* de Marc Lescarbot”. *Frontières flottantes: lieu et espace dans les cultures francophones du Canada/Shifting Boundaries: Place and Space in the Francophone Cultures of Canada*. Éd. Jaap Lintvelt et François Paré. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001. 33–47.

Hazard, Paul. *The European Mind, 1680–1715*. Trans. J. Lewis May. Cleveland: World, 1963.

Lescarbot, Marc. *Voyages en Acadie (1604–1607) suivis de la description des mœurs souriquoises comparées à celles d’autres peuples*. Éd. Marie-Christine Pioffet. Québec: PU de Laval, 2007.

Lestringant, Frank. “Champlain, Lescarbot et la ‘conférence’ des histoires”. *Scritti sulla Nouvelle-France nel seicento* 6 (1984): 69–88.

Longino, Michèle. *Orientalism in French Classical Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Melzer, Sara E. *Colonizer or Colonized: The Hidden Stories of Early Modern French Culture*. Philadelphia: UP of Pennsylvania, 2012.

Pioffet, Marie-Christine. “Introduction”. Lescarbot 1–57.

---. “Le Scythe et l’Amérindien: esquisse d’une ethnologie comparée dans les textes de la Nouvelle-France”. *Études Canadiennes/Canadian Studies* 56 (2004): 207–21.

Poirier, Guy. “Marc Lescarbot au pays des Ithyphalles”. *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* 17.3 (1993): 73–85.

Sayre, Gordon. *Les Sauvages Américains: Representation of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature*. Chapel Hill: UP of North Carolina, 1997.

Thierry, Éric. *Marc Lescarbot (vers 1570–1641): un homme de plume au service de la Nouvelle-France*. Paris: Champion, 2001.

Thwaites, Reuben Gold, ed. *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents: Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France 1610-1791*. 73 vols. Cleveland: Burrows, 1896–1901.

True, Micah. "Retelling Genesis: The *Jesuit Relations* and the Wendat Creation Myth." *Papers on French Seventeenth-Century Literature* 34.67(2007): 465-484.

Welch, Ellen R. "Performing a New France, Making Colonial History in Marc Lescarbot's *Théâtre de Neptune* (1606)." *Modern Language Quarterly* 72.4 (2011): 439–60.

Zecher, Carla. "Marc Lescarbot Reads Jacques Cartier: Colonial History in the Service of Propaganda." *L'Esprit Créateur* 48.1 (2008): 107–19.