

Multimedia identities: an analysis of How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman

Article

Accepted Version

Nagib, L. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8808-9748>
(2019) Multimedia identities: an analysis of How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman. *Screen*, 60 (1). pp. 160-171. ISSN 1460-2474 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/screen/hjy067> Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/79204/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/screen/hjy067>

Publisher: Oxford University Press

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Multimedia Identities

Lúcia Nagib

This article will draw on tropicalist intermediality as a means to gain a deeper insight into the political contribution made by the film *Como era gostoso o meu francês/How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman*, directed in 1970 by Cinema Novo exponent, Nelson Pereira dos Santos, and first screened in 1971. I will argue that, beyond its sensational focus on cannibalism, the film's intermedial structure, under the influence of Tropicalism, brings about a new dimension of hybridity and transnationalism hitherto absent from the Cinema Novo agenda.

Shot in the most repressive period of the military dictatorship then reigning in the country, the film resorts to the allegorical discourse that had become a staple among Cinema Novo directors prevented from directly addressing the political problems of their day. Thus, the story is set at the dawn of the nation, in the year of 1557, when French Calvinist admiral Nicolas de Villegaignon¹ and his company set foot in the area of today's Rio de Janeiro, in Guanabara Bay, and erected the Fort of Coligny, in an attempt at usurping Brazil (which they called 'Antarctic France') from the hands of the Portuguese. Frenchman Jean, the film's protagonist, is a mercenary working under Villegaignon who is accused of mutiny, tied to iron balls and thrown into the sea. He manages to swim back to the shore, but falls prey to the Tupiniquim Indians, allies of the Portuguese, and made to fight on their behalf. He is then captured by the Tupinambá Indians, allies of the French, who mistake him for a Portuguese colonist and hold him captive until his final ritual killing and devouring. Many of these episodes, such as Jean's summary trial and demise at the hands of the Villegaignon soldiers, are blatant allusions to the systematic torturing and murdering of political prisoners and activists taking place in Brazil at the time. The film also contains references, in the form of title cards, to the extermination of entire Indian nations, which resonate with the massive displacement and massacre of indigenous populations then being carried out to make room for the Trans-Amazonian Highway, one of the military regime's most disastrous megaprojects.²

Both for the storyline and the general characterisation, the film draws on the accounts of Renaissance travellers, such as those by the adventurer from Hessen Hans Staden, the Huguenot explorer Jean de Léry, the Franciscan abbot André Thevet, Jesuit missionaries José de Anchieta and Manoel da Nóbrega, and Portuguese governmental representatives such as Mem de Sá, with their varying degrees of benevolence or mistrust towards the indigenous habits. Not accidentally, this is the same literature that had inspired the Brazilian modernists in the 1920s and provided the basis for the Anthropophagic Movement, whose principles are detailed in Oswald de Andrade's famous 'Anthropophagic Manifesto' of 1928, which champions the devouring of imported cultural and artistic techniques in order to change them into export products.³ In the film, however, one would look in vain for any signs of modernist metaphorical anthropophagy, finding instead a candid portrayal of historical, literal cannibalism, with little to recommend or to condemn it. As Sadler rightly points out, 'The Tupinambá in the film are neither the noble-savage heroes of the nineteenth-century European imagination nor the fierce mythopoetic symbols of twenties literary nationalism'.⁴ Richard Peña concurs, by stating: 'the film avoids any sort of facile presentation of the "Indian's point of view" on colonization or on the narrative action, as we might find, say, in a film merely "sympathetic" to native American rights', going on to observe that the camera often declares its 'independence from the point of view of any character'.⁵

Whilst not partaking in the modernist or romantic indigenist utopia, *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman* also refrains from surrendering to the sombre scepticism that had engulfed most Cinema Novo productions after the 1964 military coup, which put an abrupt and unexpected end to the revolutionary hopes hitherto entertained by the Brazilian left-wing intelligentsia. None of the characters – least of all the Frenchman in the title – stands for the director's alter ego reduced to endless soul-searching after the revolutionary debacle, as exemplified by Paulo Martins, the tormented hero of Glauber Rocha's 1967 *Terra em transe/Entranced Earth*.⁶ Characters like him had proliferated in the post-coup Cinema Novo films, appearing even in Pereira dos Santos's own *Fome de amor/Hunger for Love*, dating from the same year as Rocha's film. Played by the same Arduíno

Colasanti of *How Tasty*, the protagonist Felipe, in *Hunger for Love*, is a disillusioned painter plotting the death of his former political comrade Alfredo, turned blind, deaf and dumb after a failed revolutionary coup, as well as that of his own politicised girlfriend. In contrast, *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman*, with its warm colours and dazzling cast performing in full nudity on pristine beaches, exudes an atmosphere of liberation which points to a different and more positive political strategy.

In this paper, I shall test the hypothesis that the film draws on intermediality as a platform where the utopian impulse, provisionally disrupted by Brazil's political downturn, could continue to thrive. The film's multiperspectival structure, intuited by Peña, Sadlier and others, derives, I will argue, from the self-revealing and self-standing form in which its raw materials are presented. Take, for example, Hans Staden's travel account:⁷ it is not only a source for the fictional plot, but actual chunks of the text are displayed in the form of title cards, alongside drawings representing Staden's plight extracted from Jean de Léry's book *History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil*,⁸ which appear as stills occupying the entire screen. Several other sixteenth-century letters, poems, decrees and testimonials by French and Portuguese colonisers are shown in the form of title cards or voiceover commentary, often in contradiction with the images and between themselves, thus multiplying the narrative layers that preserve their own, original semantic agency. All these interferences are purposely designed to undermine the specificity of the medium, causing the film to constantly mutate into poetry, epistolography, drawing and other forms of communication.

In itself, this technique was not entirely original, as it resonated with the aesthetics of collage introduced by Tropicalism just a couple of years before, radically inflecting the visual arts, theatre, music and not least films produced in Brazil at that time, examples ranging from the Marginal Cinema milestone *O bandido da luz vermelha/The Red Light Bandit* (Rogério Sganzerla, 1968) to the adaptation of Mario de Andrade's modernist masterpiece *Macunaíma* (Joaquim Pedro de Andrade, 1969).⁹ As much as in *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman*, anthropophagy was central to the tropicalist *Weltanschauung* as a means to legitimise the movement's indiscriminate

appropriation of low and high cultures, artistic and non-artistic media, popular and experimental genres. Tropicalism as a movement, however, was born from cinema, and more precisely from the aforementioned *Entranced Earth*. It is Caetano Veloso, the mastermind of Tropicalism in music, who recounts the kind of 'epiphany' he experienced when watching this film, and a particular scene within it, in which the protagonist Paulo Martins covers the mouth of a member of the working class and accuses him of being illiterate, alienated and unfit to ever govern the country. For Veloso, this scene decreed the death of left-wing populism, liberating his mind to 'see Brazil squarely from a broader perspective, enabling new and undreamt-of critiques of an anthropological, mythic, mystical, formalist, and moral nature'.¹⁰ Coming full circle by inflecting cinema, tropicalist-inspired multimedia procedures in *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman* ruptured the attachment to medium specificity that had hitherto characterised political cinema, not only by endowing other media with narrative agency, but also by deconstructing the unified figure of the auteur, held as the supreme creator in the early Cinema Novo days.

In what follows, I will examine the possible political utopia contained in the film's hybrid form, which opens up to a supra-national view of the world where humans, whatever their origin or standing, are regarded as mere vessels of their cultural capital.

As well as in the story's allegorical potential, director Nelson Pereira dos Santos nourished a genuine interest in the figure of the anthropophagic Indian and the wars waged at this early stage of the nation. As he recounts in the extras of the DVD containing the recently restored version of *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman*, the initial spark for the film came from his regular commuting by ferry between Rio de Janeiro and Niterói and thinking about the Indians who once inhabited the area. The book *Tristes Tropiques*, by Claude Lévi-Strauss, was another source of inspiration, in particular the passage in which the author contemplates the rocky island in Guanabara Bay where the Fort of Coligny was once erected, imagines the French misadventures in Brazil in the sixteenth

century and exclaims: '*Que! cenário!*', i.e. what a film it would make!¹¹ This may explain the choice of a Frenchman for the title role of a story that stems essentially from Hans Staden's account of his narrow escape from cannibalism at the hands of the Tupinambá in Brazil, 'Jean' being a mere French translation of the German 'Hans'. Dos Santos justifies this choice by the fact that 'the French participated directly in Brazilian colonisation' and were therefore 'a more interesting object [than a German] for the appreciation of a cultural shock'.¹² Another decisive factor is that the film was originally a French co-production that never came to fruition.

The cannibalistic theme, in turn, goes back to dos Santos's adaptation of Graciliano Ramos's *Vidas Secas/Barren Lives* in 1963, shot at the border between Pernambuco and Alagoas states where another of Ramos's novel, *Caetés* (1933), is set. *Barren Lives*, a Cinema Novo milestone, has nothing to do with cannibalism; however, at the origin of the novel *Caetés* is the famous anthropophagic feast held by the Caeté Indians in which Brazil's first Bishop, Dom Pero Fernandes Sardinha, and his companions were devoured, leading to the extermination of this ethnic group by the Portuguese. As dos Santos explains:

Ramos wrote his novel in an attempt to recover Brazilianness, as if he were screaming: 'We are all Indians!' He was trying to establish an internal point of view and find within himself what could have survived from Brazil's early Indians – an Indian capable of devouring a bishop – and make him feel like 'a man of his time'. I found this starting point interesting, although I did not draw on Ramos's story, which is psychological.¹³

The connection between the Bishop Sardinha episode and national identity is in fact a modernist idea, enshrined in Oswald de Andrade's 1928 'Anthropophagic Manifesto', which is dated from this very inaugural moment, i.e. the 'Year 374 since the devouring of the Bishop Sardinha'. It proclaims: 'Only Anthropophagy unites us. Socially. Economically. Philosophically.'¹⁴

Whilst drawing on these approaches, dos Santos gave to the anthropophagic identity a new, open-ended, interpretation, inflected by the situation he was in at the time. With the recrudescence of the military regime, after the introduction of the 5th Institutional Act in December 1968,¹⁵ many Brazilian filmmakers and artists were exiled in Europe. Dos Santos had also sought refuge, but inside Brazil, in the historical town of Parati, today a popular tourist resort, but in those days a remote, abandoned village. Here is how Helena Salem describes it:

The film is now Parati. A pretty colonial town, with narrow lanes and secluded corners, calm, almost paradisiac. On the seaside south of Rio. The town itself is a film set. This is where Nelson and his tribe have taken refuge. Away from the cold and bitterness of the European exile. Enjoying the sun and the beach, and above all continuing to create. Experiencing and elaborating on the madness of that moment.¹⁶

The 'tribe' referred to by Salem was formed by the crew and cast of the three films dos Santos directed in Parati and its surroundings, *Azyllo muito louco/The Alienist* (1970), *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman* and *Quem é Beta?/Who Is Beta?* (1972). Living in this retreat in the manner of a hippie community, Nelson's team thus continued to enjoy, in their own way, the freedom suppressed by the conservative turn. In particular, sexual freedom, championed by the modernists as constitutive of the national character and represented by the phallic symbol of the Brazil-wood from which the country got its name, became almost palpable in *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman*. The film's own title qualifies the protagonist as 'tasty',¹⁷ in a pun with the taste of his flesh, savoured by his Indian lover Seboipepe in the final cannibalistic feast, and his sexual attributes which Dib Lutfi's camera relishes in highlighting, in a pioneering display of male frontal nudity in Brazilian cinema. More significantly to my analysis, sexual and cannibalistic intercourse are used, in the film, to fuse characters, whatever their origin, into a single, universal humanity. This can be observed in the egalitarian treatment dispensed to the Tupi, French and Portuguese cultures,

achieved through recourse to the intermedial properties of cinema, as the next sections will further explain. Granting autonomy to its various sources, even allowing for other languages, such as French, Tupi and European Portuguese,¹⁸ to prevail over Brazilian Portuguese, the film promotes the dissolution of national identity, proposing instead a supra-national and multicultural platform on which to retrieve Cinema Novo's lost political programme.

The intermedial construction of *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman* relies on an inventive take on its Renaissance sources. Even before the initial credits, the spectator is presented with the reading in voiceover of a section of Villegaigon's letter to Calvin, dated 31 March 1557 (which is reproduced in its entirety in Léry's *History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil*) that says:

The country was all wilderness, and untilled; there were no houses, nor roofs, nor any use of wheat. On the contrary, there were wild and savage people, remote from all courtesy and humanity, utterly different from us in their way of doing things and in their upbringing; without religion, nor any knowledge of honesty or virtue, or of what is just or unjust; so that it seemed to me that we had fallen among beasts bearing a human countenance.¹⁹

In this passage, Villegaigon is resorting to what Christian Marouby termed a 'negative rhetoric',²⁰ a technique in vogue in the sixteenth century and equally apparent in Montaigne's positive assessment of the anthropophagic Amerindians, as seen in his greatly influential essay 'Of Cannibals',²¹ when he says:

I should tell Plato, that it is a nation wherein there is no manner of traffic, no knowledge of letters, no science of numbers, no name of magistrate or political superiority; no use of service, riches or poverty, no contracts, no successions, no dividends, no properties, no

employments, but those of leisure, no respect of kindred, but common, no clothing, no agriculture, no metal, no use of corn or wine.²²

Rather than to the savages, Montaigne's definition in this excerpt applies, through negation, to his own society. The Indians themselves remain entirely idealised and their social structure ignored, for their occupations, agricultural activities, kin relations and laws are dismissed as nonexistent.

Montaigne's positive evaluation of the Indians, says Todorov, 'derives from a misunderstanding, the projection on the other of an image of oneself – or, more precisely, of an ideal of oneself, which, for Montaigne, was incarnated by classical civilisation'.²³

This procedure of changing the other into the negative mirror of oneself becomes a structuring ironic device in the film, in which different narrative instances are concomitantly presented to cancel each other out. For example, when Villegaignon's letter in voiceover informs that 26 mercenaries, 'incited by their carnal cupidity', had planned to kill Villegaignon, the images show, on the contrary, how said rebels, including Jean, are subjected to slave labour. The voiceover narration then claims that Jean was freed from his chains in order to better defend himself during his trial, but instead ran away, threw himself in the sea and drowned; the images again contradict this by showing the defendant, chained to two iron balls, being thrown into the sea in a summary execution.

The use of Villegaignon's letter, dated from a distant past, is typically allegorical, as it presents an obvious parallel with the current political situation in Brazil, where torture and murder of political prisoners had become routine, and their death was often reported in the official news as the result of accident or suicide. Equally allegorical is the image of the female Indians who rid themselves of the white gowns imposed on them by Villegaignon's soldiers, a fact registered by Léry in the following terms:

...even our women prisoners of war, whom we had bought and whom we held as slaves to work in our fort – even they, although we forced clothing on them, would secretly strip off the shirts and other rags, as soon as night had fallen, and would not be content unless, before going to bed, they would promenade naked all around our island.²⁴

The images shown at this point are of naked female Indians running in the field waving their white gowns over their heads. Allegory here takes a feminist turn, reminding us of the symbolic burning of brassieres that took place around the world in May 1968.

Finally, the tone and style of the voiceover speaker, who announces ‘the latest news from Antarctic France sent by Admiral Villegaigon’ are the same as that of 1960s newsreels, called ‘Atualidades Francesas’ (French News), which were customarily screened in cinemas across Brazil. The light-hearted, cheerful ‘Concerto n. 1 for Horn’, by Mozart, playing in the background, was also typical of these newsreels, but is here ridiculed by the contrast it presents with the rebellion and violence described in the voiceover narration and the images of persecution and murder. In short, this entire introduction is composed of a parodic collision of *dispositifs* through which images, text and music constantly disavow one another. Being initiated by this veritable media war, the film story then develops through an equivalent clash of languages and identities, bringing into question the concept of nation as much as the authority and authorship of the film itself.

One of the film’s most distinctive features is its multilingualism, whose purpose is not only to respect the characters’ different origins, but also to change them into unconscious vehicles of their cultural heritage. Jean, the Frenchman, is played by an Italian-Brazilian actor, Arduíno Colasanti, whose foreignness is evidenced by the contrast his white skin, blue eyes and blond hair present with the Indians’s copper-brown skin and black hair and eyes, all enhanced by make-up of course, but also natural on a cast partially drawn from actual native Brazilians or displaying their physical attributes,

such as Ana Maria Magalhães, in the prime of her beauty in the role of Seboipepe. The other important European character in the film is the French tradesman played by Colasanti's father, Manfredo Colasanti, who had made his screen debut in *Hunger for Love*, in which he speaks his native Italian.

When Jean is captured by the Tupinambá, the method they employ to establish his nationality and whether or not to kill and eat him is particularly telling of the role of language in the film. One Tupinambá warrior and then the great chief Cunhambebe himself point to their own tongues and summon Jean and two other Portuguese to speak. Jean recites a strophe of Etienne Jodelle's poem, 'Ode sur les singularitez de la France Antarctique d'André Thevet' (Ode on the singularities of André Thevet's Antarctic France). The Portuguese, in turn, recite a recipe of lamprey stew, in an unequivocal, though obviously unintended, allusion to the indigenous cannibalistic rituals, given that the lamprey must first be killed with 'one blow' on the head before being cooked, just like war prisoners are killed by the Tupi natives with a single blow of the *ibirapema* (their typical, decorated club). The comic effect of these speeches derives from the fact that they are delivered in an automatic, detached manner, by speakers who have no share in the authorship of their words, being instead the mere vehicles of a pre-existing text. As such, they constitute the perfect figuration of what Michel Foucault had famously defined as 'the author-function', i.e. a disembodied author, devoid of an essence, whose role is 'to characterize the existence, circulation, and operation of certain discourses within society'.²⁵ They also resonate with Barthes, who declared the death of the author in modern literature, which he defined as nothing but 'a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture'.²⁶

Not accidentally, Foucault's and Barthes' demise of the author had taken place just a few years before *How Tasty* was made, as a political act that qualified the author, in the words of Barthes, as the 'epitome and culmination of capitalist ideology'.²⁷ In tune with this idea, *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman* denies individuality to historical agents in order, not to diminish their responsibility in the events, but to highlight the prevalence of the context over the individual, i.e.

over the heroicised protagonist as portrayed both in conventional cinema and in earlier Cinema Novo works in which the hero functioned as the spokesperson for the almighty auteur.

In *How Taste Was My Little Frenchman*, there is an obvious parallel between reducing the character to a mere function and disavowing the film's authorship, in that the film text itself is composed by a multiplicity of voices from diverse origins and media, as if the director himself were simply regurgitating pre-existing texts. The self-destructive potential of such a procedure is evident, as the medium is denied autonomy as conveyor of meaning and, ultimately, truth. Nothing could be more opposed than this to the figure of the auteur hailed by Glauber Rocha at the dawn of Cinema Novo as 'a noun meaning the creator of films, [who] heralds a new kind of artist for our time'.²⁸ In the early Cinema Novo days, however, Glauber had his reasons to stay away from self-destructive reflexivity. Referring to a conversation with Godard, whose aesthetic project is marked by the deconstruction of cinema through self-negation and the recourse to other arts, most prominently literature, but also painting and music, Rocha observes: 'I understand Godard. He is a European filmmaker, French; it's logical that he would propose to destroy cinema. But we, here, cannot destroy that which doesn't exist'.²⁹

Going back to the use of the ode by Jodelle, a member of the Pléiade group, which is dedicated to Thevet, its use can also be seen as political insofar as it compares 'the savage and the civilised man in a manner largely favourable to the former', as Afonso Arinos de Melo Franco notes,³⁰ in particular in this passage: 'The country we should love/ Would find that Arctic France/
Has more monsters, I believe/ And is itself more uncivilised/ Than Antarctic France./ *Those barbarians walk about quite naked,/ Whereas we walk about incognito,/ Powdered and masked*'.³¹ The italicised lines are uttered by Jean in the film, but what precedes them in the actual poem depicts the French as more barbarian and uncivilised than the Indians, demonstrating that the speaker is channelling a discourse entirely against his own interests, as much as the Portuguese unwittingly indicate to the Indians how to cook their own flesh.

More pointedly, the foreigners' alienated and alienating speeches mean that everyone, including the Indians, become members of a single humankind, with the same ambitions and needs. Examples of this proliferate in the film. Chief Cunhambebe, portrayed in all his glory in the Renaissance drawings which inform his characterisation in the film, wants canons to exterminate his Tupiniquim relatives, not the mirrors and other knick-knacks offered by the French tradesman. Jean certainly provides the axis for spectatorial identification and catharsis, given the screen time he occupies, however, just like his enemies, he is equally moved by greed and does not hesitate to murder his fellow Frenchman with a single blow of a hoe on his head, when the latter threatens to take away the treasure left behind by the dead husband of Jean's lover Seboipepe. Between this murder and that perpetrated by the Indians with their *ibirapema* there is hardly any difference, the *ibirapema* and the hoe being entirely interchangeable as weapons. As a gruesome anecdote, it is worth remembering that Jean de Léry and his wife themselves were eye-witness to the boiling and cannibalisation of their own daughter by his fellow Huguenots, during the famine in Sancerre, in his native France, an episode narrated in Léry's *Histoire memorable du siege et de la famine de Sancerre*,³² written after the author's Brazilian adventures.

A last question to be asked is how the demise of cultural differences, authorship and medium specificity can be the carrier of the film's political message. As I have explained in previous writing,³³ intermediality penetrated art and cultural studies in the wake of structuralism and poststructuralism, which replaced ideas of purity, essence and origin with those of intertextuality and dialogism, as represented respectively by Kristeva and Bakhtin, the latter a defender, as much as Foucault, of the author as 'orchestrator of pre-existing discourses'.³⁴ Stam suggests, furthermore, that intertextual and intermedial studies are necessarily intercultural insofar as they contribute to 'de-segregate' and 'transnationalize' criticism itself, as well as to abolish unavowed hierarchies between different artistic forms.³⁵ *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman* is transnational from its inception, though its French production never actually materialised. The French identity of its protagonist was nonetheless maintained, as this suited the interchangeable character of the

nationalities thematised in the plot. Hans Staden himself, according to his own account, had been the victim of mistaken identity, being taken for a Portuguese for having collaborated with them and for this reason threatened with cannibalism. As much as Frenchman Jean, Staden lived in a globalised world which, thanks to the navigations and discoveries, Wallerstein tells us, was already a modern world system made of composite subjectivities.³⁶

This in itself, however, does not secure a political grounding to the film insofar as, according to Stam, hybridity can easily 'be recoded as a symptom of the postmodern, postcolonial and post-nationalist moment',³⁷ along with its nihilism and aversion to political programmes. A similar criticism is levelled by Roberto Schwarz against Caetano Veloso's attack on left-wing populism in the following terms:

The victory of the counter-revolution in 1964-70, with the ensuing suppression of the socialist alternatives, had propitiated a precocious move from a modern to a postmodern situation in the country, the latter understood as that in which capitalism ceases to be relativised by the possibility of its overcoming.³⁸

I believe however that the openness to hybrid media, forms and cultures in *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman*, endowing it with multicultural values as much as commercial appeal, gave Brazilian art and popular cinema from the late 1960s onwards a chance to survive under the banner of freedom of thought and expression, and the right to belong to the world beyond the nation of Brazil, which had provisionally fallen into the wrong hands. Indeed, thanks to the multiplicity of equivalent media and subjectivities, the film succeeds in ascribing equal complexity, for better or worse, to native Brazilians and Europeans from different cultural and religious extractions, as had never happened before in Brazilian cinema.

¹ His name is also frequently spelt as ‘Villegagnon’.

² See in this respect Darlene J. Sadlier, *Nelson Pereira dos Santos* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2003), p. 70.

³ Oswald de Andrade, ‘Manifesto antropofágico’, in *A utopia antropofágica* (Rio de Janeiro: Globo, 1990), pp. 47-52.

⁴ Sadlier, *Nelson Pereira dos Santos*, p. 72.

⁵ Richard Peña, ‘How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman’, in Randal Johnson and Robert Stam (eds), *Brazilian Cinema*, expanded edition (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), p. 193.

⁶ See note 11, in the Introduction to this dossier.

⁷ Edition utilised here: *Hans Staden: Primeiros registros escritos e ilustrados sobre o Brasil e seus habitantes*, trans. Angel Bojadsen (São Paulo: Terceiro Nome, 1999). This edition was translated from: *Hans Staden: zwei Reisen nach Brasilien*, updated by Karl Fouquet (Marburg: Trauvetter & Fischer, 1981).

⁸ Brazilian edition utilised here: Jean de Léry, *Viagem à terra do Brasil*, trans. Sérgio Milliet (Belo Horizonte/São Paulo: Itatiaia/Universidade de São Paulo, 1980). English edition utilised here: *History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil, Otherwise Called America*, trans. Janet Whatley (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press).

⁹ For a comparison between *How Tasty Was My Little Frenchman* and the film *Macunaíma*, as well as the film *Hans Staden* (Luís Alberto Pereira, 1999), see Lúcia Nagib, *Brazil on Screen: Cinema Novo, New Cinema, Utopia* (London/New York, I.B. Tauris, 2007), pp. 59-80.

¹⁰ Caetano Veloso, *Tropical Truth: A Story of Music and Revolution in Brazil*, trans. Isabel de Sena (London: Bloomsbury, 2003), p. 61. Curiously too, at a much later stage in 1989, Veloso would refer to Lévi-Strauss’s cinematic vision, by singing that ‘the anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss hated Guanabara Bay/it reminded him of a toothless mouth’, verses from the song ‘O estrangeiro’ (Foreigner), by Caetano Veloso, originally: ‘O antropólogo Claude Levi-Strauss detestou a Baía de Guanabara:/Pareceu-lhe uma boca banguela’.

¹¹ Nelson Pereira dos Santos in ‘Como era gostosa a nossa filmagem’, extra of the DVD of *Como era gostoso o meu francês* (Bretz Filmes/Regina Filmes, 2017). See also Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Tristes trópicos* (Lisboa: Edições 70, 1986), pp. 75ff. Lévi-Strauss himself was a pioneer in contacting, photographing and filming Brazilian

Indians in the 1930s, and his long stay in the country, initially as a professor at the University of São Paulo, together with his structuralist theory, left a long-lasting impression on Brazilian intellectual life.

¹² Apud Helena Salem, *Nelson Pereira dos Santos: o sonho possível do cinema brasileiro* (Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1987), p. 259.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 257-259.

¹⁴ Oswald de Andrade, 'Anthropophagic Manifesto', *op. cit.* It is worth noting the pun, much to the modernist taste, with the name 'Sardinha', which means 'sardine'.

¹⁵ The infamous 'AI-5' allowed the President Artur da Costa e Silva, a military dictator, to annul mandates, directly intervene in the government of municipalities and states, and suspend any constitutional guarantees against the practice of torture and murder by the repressive State.

¹⁶ Salem, *Nelson Pereira dos Santos*, p. 247.

¹⁷ *Gostoso* (or *gostosa*, in the feminine) also means 'sexually attractive', in Portuguese.

¹⁸ The dialogue was translated into a reconstructed Tupi by Humberto Mauro, Brazil's most prolific pioneering filmmaker, whose *O descobrimento do Brasil/The Discovery of Brazil* (1937), with music specially composed by Heitor Villa-Lobos, stands as a nationalistic monument in Brazilian cinema.

¹⁹ In Jean de Léry, *History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil, Otherwise Called America*, trans. Janet Whatley (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press), p. xlix.

²⁰ Christian Marouby, *Utopie et primitivisme : Essai sur l'imaginaire anthropologique à l'âge classique* (Paris: Seuil, 1990), pp. 115ff.

²¹ *Essays of Michel de Montaigne*, trans. Charles Cotton, ed. William Carew Hazlitt, Book I, Chapter XXX, 'Of Cannibals', available on: <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3600/3600-h/3600-h.htm#link2HCH0030>, last consulted on 26 January 2018.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 309.

²³ Tzvetan Todorov, *Nous et les autres: la réflexion française sur la diversité humaine* (Paris: Seuil, 1989), p. 70.

²⁴ Léry, *History of a Voyage to the Land of Brazil*, p. 66.

²⁵ Michel Foucault, 'What Is an Author?', in *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews by Michel Foucault*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), p. 124

²⁶ Roland Barthes, 'The Death of the Author', in *Image, Music, Text*, essays selected and translated by Stephen Heath (London: Fontana Press, 1977), p. 146.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 143.

²⁸ Glauber Rocha, 'Introdução', in *Revisão crítica do cinema brasileiro* (São Paulo: Cosac & Naify, 2003), p. 36.

²⁹ Glauber Rocha, 'Tropicalismo, antropologia, mito, ideograma 69', in *Revolução do Cinema Novo* (São Paulo: Cosac & Naify, 2004), p. 152.

³⁰ Afonso Arinos de Melo Franco, *O índio brasileiro e a revolução francesa* (Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks, 2000), p. 159.

³¹ In the original: 'Celuy là fait beaucoup pour soy/ Qui fait en France comme moy,/ Cachant sa vertu la plus rare,/ Et croy veu ce temps vicieux,/ Qu'encore ton livre seroit mieux/ En ton Amerique barbare,/ Car qui voudroit un peu blasmer/ Le pays qu'il nous faut aymer/ Il trouveroit la France Arctique/ Avoir plus de monstres, je croy/ Et plus de barbarie en soy/ Que n'a pas la France Antarctique./ Ces barbares marchent tous nus,/ Et nous nous marchons incognus,/ Fardez, masquez. Ce peuple estrange/ A la pieté ne se range./ Nous la nostre nous mesprisons,/ Pipons, vendons et deguisons./ Ces barbares pour se conduire/ N'ont pas tant que nous de raison,/ Mais qui ne voit que la foison/ N'en sert que pour nous entreuire?'. Translation in English kindly provided by Honor Aldred.

³² *Histoire mémorable du siège et de la famine de Sancerre, 1573: au lendemain de la Saint-Barthélemy* (Paris : Anthropos).

³³ Lúcia Nagib, 'The Politics of Impurity', in *Impure Cinema: Intermedial and Intercultural Approaches to Film*, ed. Lúcia Nagib and Anne Jerslev (London/New York: I.B. Tauris, 2014), p. 26.

³⁴ Robert Stam, *Literature through Film: Realism, Magic, and the Art of Adaptation* (Malden/Oxford/Victoria: Blackwell, 2005), p. 4.

³⁵ Ibid., p. 17.

³⁶ Immanuel Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction* (Durham, NC: Durke University Press, 2004).

³⁷ Robert Stam, 'Beyond Third Cinema: The aesthetics of hybridity', in Anthony R. Guneratne and Wimal Dissanayake (eds), *Rethinking Third Cinema*, (New York/London: Routledge), p. 32.

³⁸ Schwarz, Roberto (2012). 'Verdade tropical: um percurso de nosso tempo', in *Martinha versus Lucrecia. Ensaios e entrevistas* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras), p. 13.