

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 preconquest 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 postconquest 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.

José Urquiola is the author of the quantitative essays (chaps. 4–7). These are extraordinary pieces of scholarship. Urquiola's findings on productivity and wages are quite arresting. Based on an analysis of nearly a thousand labor contracts, Urquiola finds that most workers freely contracted to work in the manufactories. They typically demanded nearly all of their salary in advance. Their implicit discount rates were very high; they valued present far more than future income. Most contracts ran for a year, but only half the workers of a typical *obraje* could be found there a year later. So lots of workers got their money up front, then fled or died before their contracts expired. No wonder physical security was at a premium; it could keep people from escaping, if not from dying.

The labor market for *obrajes* was not in equilibrium. Wages in the Bajío (Querétaro) were three times those in Tlaxcala at the turn of the seventeenth century. This was presumably the mechanism that drew resources to the Bajío over the next hundred years. Yet the implied disparity in productivity is striking. Sheep are sheep and looms are looms. Simple calculations suggest that *obrajes* in the Bajío could not have paid a large premium for labor and remained competitive, even if their location spared them the costs of transporting raw wool. The source of Querétaro's large productivity advantage is still undetermined.

There is not enough space to discuss Urquiola's studies of real wages or of the prices of raw wool or woolens. Every student of early Mexican history should purchase and read this valuable and provocative study.

RICHARD J. SALVUCCI, Trinity University

When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500–1846. By RAMÓN A. GUTIÉRREZ. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991. Notes. Bibliography. Index. xxxi, 424 pp. Cloth. \$49.50.

This well-written, exhaustively researched book is part of an emerging trend among historians of colonial Latin America to pull areas long viewed as peripheral—such as Spanish New Mexico—more centrally into their purview. Using marriage practices as the key organizing theme for his social history, Ramón Gutiérrez examines a long span of time (1500–1846) and the varying groups of people, differentiated by ethnicity, status, or class, who interacted, competed, and warred with each other in this region.

The book is divided into three parts. Part 1 analyzes sixteenth-century marriage practices of the Pueblo Indians. Using the work on marriage and inequality of anthropologists Jane Collier and Sylvia Yanagisako, Gutiérrez shows how Pueblo marriage customs served to perpetuate culturally defined inequalities and differential access to power, even though marriage often united households of roughly equivalent material wealth. Part 2 shifts the focus to a description of the long, drawn-out process of the Spanish conquest of the region and the institution of colonial rule during the seventeenth century. Until the eighteenth century, religious