

individual Spaniards, the relationship to the Indian world in which these Spaniards lived and worked is less clearly articulated than it might be.

The remaining three sections are consistently strong. The section on Nahuas defines the field of indigenous history written from Indian-language sources, demonstrating their value in revealing the characteristics of indigenous life. The section on Nahuatl philology looks closely at indigenous texts, analyzing them not only for historical data but for more subtle indications of the internal dynamics of the communities themselves. Included in this section is a carefully crafted and balanced review of John Bierhorst's *Cantares mexicanos*, one that is sure to provoke discussion. The two chapters devoted to historiography are particularly valuable; in the first Lockhart assesses Charles Gibson's contributions to the field of Mexican ethnohistory, and in the second details the work of five younger scholars whom he considers to be on the cutting edge of Nahua and Nahuatl-language studies. Throughout, one cannot help but be impressed by Lockhart's meticulous scholarship; he has recognized the incomparable value of Nahuatl materials and presents clear proof of their usefulness. Mohar and Lockhart complement each other; bringing together their distinct sources deepens our knowledge of the indigenous world in the contact era.

LESLIE S. OFFUTT, Vassar College

*Indigenous Rulers: An Ethnohistory of Town Government in Colonial Cuernavaca.* By ROBERT HASKETT. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1991. Map. Tables. Appendix. Notes. Bibliography. Index. xii, 294 pp. Cloth, \$37.50. Paper, \$17.50.

This book studies Indian political structure in colonial Morelos through an analysis of officeholders, offices, and the nature of village government. The author argues that much of the area's preconquest political structure survived three centuries of colonialism with only minor modifications; that village governments were run by political elites of considerable durability and adaptability; and consequently that the political impact of colonialism on the native people was not nearly so disruptive as argued by Charles Gibson and others.

Although this book contributes to our knowledge of colonial Mexico, it has shortcomings. The author's knowledge of Spanish city government seems to be limited, and consequently he exaggerates the functional differences between Spanish and Indian cabildos. The book is also marred by vague tables and inaccurate use of accents (e.g., Yautepéc, *seménteras*). More serious, however, is Haskett's cursory treatment of demography, especially when this is the only cause of historical change mentioned in the book. Merely repeating that the Indian population declined in the sixteenth century, stagnated in the seventeenth, and expanded in the eighteenth is inadequate; precision is required. Similarly, in tables, the author

divides villages into “larger” and “smaller” (than what?) without providing data on settlement size.

What’s more, the neglect of demography is symptomatic of the lack of attention to factors of change, a natural result of the functionalist approach used in this and many similar studies. The book covers three centuries of history, yet whenever data are scarce—as is especially the case for the sixteenth century—Haskett simply assumes continuity, thereby obviating the need to consider change, let alone account for it. Most important, he fails to demonstrate continuity between prequest and colonial elites; his case studies even suggest the contrary. The evidence proves that *an* elite ran the villages—a tautological argument—not that *the original* elite did so. Haskett focuses exclusively on officeholders, thereby ignoring the social elite and social stratification; and he fails to discuss tribute, religious taxes, labor drafts, and commercial *repartimientos*—all of which affected village political structure in major ways, as demonstrated by Karen Spalding and Steve Stern for Peru. As a result, all the issues connected with elite rule—the changing basis of class, status, and power—are left out. Revealingly, John Chance and William Taylor are cited for data, but their Weberian analysis is ignored. So too is historical materialism; a great deal of Mexican and Andean ethnohistory is thus deemed unmentionable.

In the end, Haskett’s thesis is difficult to accept, for it would mean that indigenous culture in early nineteenth-century Morelos was stronger than it actually was. One suspects that future scholars, most likely Mexicans, will put together a more convincing argument.

ROBERT W. PATCH, University of California, Riverside

*Los obrajes en la Nueva España, 1530–1630.* By CARMEN VIQUEIRA and JOSÉ I. URQUIOLA. Mexico City: Consejo Nacional Para la Cultura y Las Artes, 1990. Graphs. Tables. Bibliography. 374 pp. Paper.

We have learned much in recent years about the textile industry in colonial Mexico. This volume breaks more new ground and adds substantially to our knowledge. Carmen Viqueira’s essays (chaps. 1–3) have been published elsewhere, but not all of them are easy to find. Viqueira argues that the Spanish crown did not oppose the creation of manufactories in New Spain on mercantilist grounds. This is not a novel conclusion; Woodrow Borah said much the same in 1943. The crown turned against silk production only at the end of the sixteenth century.

Viqueira thinks there were important continuities between pre- and postquest labor practice. In essence, wage labor emerged from the Spaniards’ modification of indigenous slavery. Sixteenth-century labor codes were less a response to the conquerors’ oppression than a considered effort to turn an existing institution to the Spaniards’ advantage. This may be carrying matters a bit far, but I think Viqueira is probably correct.