

although not clearly demonstrated, is his generalization that southern Africans resisted slavery by joining brotherhoods and forming *quilombos* while Nagôs and Hausas chose violent rebellion.

Reis is successful at integrating the 1835 rebellion into the broader context of both Brazil and Africa, effectively relating events and practices in Brazil to African developments. While the 1835 rebellion was organized by Malês, it was more broadly an African movement that sought to destroy all those born in Brazil, including creole slaves; only 5 of the more than 250 people arrested were born in Brazil. This “creole pacifism” is described as characteristic of the Bahian slave rebellions. Conversely, regardless of status or race, anti-Africanism was a sentiment that united those born in Brazil. Significantly, the author argues that the rebellion was not an Islamic holy war. Brazilian-born slaves participated in rebellions, but in concert with other sectors of the poor in what Reis calls “plebeian revolts.” Finally, post-rebellion Portuguese repression revealed strong anti-African feelings.

With this largely successful excursion into the recesses of a major urban center in the 1830s, Reis makes available to a broader audience a series of insights into the world of Africans living in New World bondage and their efforts, violent and nonviolent, to redress the injustices and indignities they suffered.

DONALD RAMOS, Cleveland State University

*The Family in Bahia, Brazil, 1870–1945.* By DAIN BORGES. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1992. Maps. Graphs. Tables. Appendix. Notes. Glossary. Bibliography. Index. vi, 422 pp. Cloth. \$52.50.

Rarely have historical studies of the family in Brazil extended far into the present century. For the most part, the scholarly literature has been confined to the colonial period, with increasing attention to the nineteenth century. Now Dain Borges ambitiously jumps squarely into the twentieth century to tackle family evolution in Bahia. And he does so in terms of the most important historical issue in family organization over the long run: confrontation with the expanding modern state.

Borges situates his analysis in a challenging chronological framework that takes 1870s urbanization and republicanism as a starting point, then follows change from the separation of church and state under the aegis of the republic through the rise of the “welfare state” in the 1920s and 1930s to the decisive reshaping of family life during the Estado Novo (1937–1945). Along the way, extended families, as private corporate groups, gradually saw patriarchal or parental control yield to freedom of matrimonial choice (exogamous spouses) and companionate marriage, individual liberty in an increasingly secular public culture, and, above all, the superior patronage resources of corporate public power. The province and, later, state of Bahia as a case study contrasts sharply with that other, geographically preferred focus of family in Brazil, São Paulo. Appropriately, however, Borges often narrows “Bahia” to the city of Salvador and its adjacent Recôncavo, managing

nevertheless to sustain the counterpoint of a statewide sweep, not to mention a class perspective.

The choice of Bahia means that the comparative literature gains by getting much closer to the reality of continuity in Brazilian family organization. That key figure in republican center-south social evolution, the European immigrant, in Bahia falls to a marginal level. In a postponed collision with industrialization, Bahia's *famílias tradicionais* seem nearly impervious to the forces of modernity—which Borges investigates in richly researched consecutive chapters on medicine and hygiene, secularization and the disestablishment of the church, the importation of gender notions challenging “honor and shame” (public courtship, flirting, divorce, and female emancipation), marriage strategies (especially celibacy) and mobility, and, most significant, “law and political reforms.”

Where law serves as evidence for assessing change, Borges fills in big gaps in scholarship with material that many readers will welcome, especially his valuable treatments of civil marriage and the lost cause of divorce. His reliance on law as a criterion is two-edged, however. Sometimes it overlooks major transitions, as when he argues that family law in republican Brazil reflected little significant change; indeed, that legal reform had affected “only minor details” in the 1603 Ordenações Filipinas by 1916 (p. 112). By failing to mention the most important reform of Brazilian inheritance law since Pombaline times—the 1907 Law of Intestate (legitimate) Succession incorporated in the 1916 Civil Code—that conclusion is more readily sustained. In 1907, surviving spouses were given legal precedence in succession rights over all collateral heirs; by enlarging testamentary freedom to an unprecedented one-half of the *legítima*, this reform similarly reinforced the new emphasis on companionate marriage and conjugal family that Borges makes his central theme.

The appropriate emphasis this book gives to consensual unions or legal concubinage is, unfortunately, often undercut whenever the author turns to the succession rights of illegitimate individuals. Law is misconstrued or interpreted in contradictory fashion. Rather than admitting “even illegitimate heirs” to succession, “extending [their] rights” to inheritance, or providing that recognized illegitimate offspring would share equally in paternal succession with legitimate offspring—“suppressing favoritism” and thus “level[ing] the inheritance rights of legitimate and bastard children” (pp. 120, 122)—the watershed Law of September 2, 1847, withdrew ancient prior equal rights in succession enjoyed by recognized and unrecognized natural offspring. The 1847 law suppressed altogether the judicial investigation of paternity, meaning also that Borges cannot interpret the Civil Code of 1916 as innovative for permitting the latter. On balance, however, *The Family in Bahia* is mandatory reading for social historians of Latin America because it opens new methodological directions for the study of the family, attempting throughout to tie the local scene to important change at the national level.

LINDA LEWIN, University of California, Berkeley