

These rebels not only subverted the hierarchies sanctioned by both the republicans and the colonial society by refusing to pay the indigenous contribution (the ethnic, most tangible, mark of subordination of the early republic), but also forced the landowners to pay a salary for their work through an original revolution of the tithe that installed a “modern code of work”. Given the reality of personal service across the Andes, even till recent times, this system should be judged as *avant-garde*.

The Huantinos have been traditionally considered conservative or even retrograde due to their monarchism, deprived of motivations of their own, and a submissive and unstable mass. The Huantinos’ history under review here discusses these and other stereotypes, offering at the same time an intelligent and sensible way of reading the complexities of a society and a moment that requires such a reading. The work of Cecilia Méndez attempts to unravel the deep motivations that led the peasants to engage in the different episodes of the early republican life, and it warns about the importance of making allowance, at least as a hypothesis, for the existence of motivation behind the actions of these people. Such work requires a different way of reading the sources and a strong determination to find new answers.

Raquel Gil Montero
CONICET Argentina

MEYERS, Debra — *Common Whores, Vertuous Women, and Loveing Wives: Free Will Christian Women in Colonial Maryland*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2003. Pp. 249.

Debra Meyers’s fine book studies the social behaviour and culture of English women who settled in Maryland between 1634 and 1713. These the author separates by religion — not in the outmoded manner of Catholics and Protestants, but between those she calls “Free Will Christians” (the majority) and “Predestinarians” (the minority). The former includes Catholics, Arminian Anglicans (those who emphasized human freedom), and Quakers, the latter Particular Baptists, Presbyterians, and Puritans (Calvinist Congregationalists). The Free Willers believed that, through the saving power of Jesus, a life-long exercise of their free will leading to a lifetime struggle to attain virtue would be rewarded thereafter. By contrast, the Predestinarians, following Calvin, believed that their destiny had been arbitrarily determined by God, either to salvation or perdition.

Adherence to one group or the other produced, among other results, two very different views of women. In Maryland this meant that Free Will Christians tended much more toward social, political, and economic equality between the genders than Predestinarians, whose view embraced the close control of women — weak vessels — through hierarchical and patriarchal family structures.

The differences are marked. Much intermarriage occurred among Free Will Christians but almost never with Predestinarians. For their part, Predestinarians tended to marry only within their own religious group. While the Free Willers retained the idea of marriage as a sacrament and, as a private affair, that it held legal implications for

women, the Calvinists made marriage a public and secular act. Free Will Christian women were much more likely than the others to become involved in trade or other sorts of business activity. Free Willers bequeathed their real estate to their wives, while Predestinarians principally left it to their sons. Predestinarians “conceived of their wives as dependents, not unlike children”, whereas a Free Will Christian wife “occupied a position of authority in the family both before and after the death of her husband” (p. 7). Predestinarian widows frequently asked the courts to relinquish their duties as executrix of their late husband’s will in favour of a son, while Free Will Christian widows almost invariably assumed this important role. The role as executrix of a will or administrator of an estate usually involved the pursuit of debtors in the civil courts, and Meyers provides evidence of this. Interestingly, some of the Free Will group also acted as their late husband’s attorney in such cases.

As is well understood, seventeenth-century England witnessed acute tension in religious matters. Intolerance of the right, one might say, under the Tudors and early Stuarts, was replaced by intolerance of the left under Cromwell’s rule, this then to be overturned by the long-lived intolerance ushered in by the Restoration of the monarchy after 1660. By contrast, the author reminds us that Maryland was created to become an example, rare in that era, of religious toleration.

Meyers’s sources are varied, the most important being the 3,190 surviving wills. Of these only 211 (6.6 per cent) were by women (p. 145), three-quarters having been drawn up by widows (pp. 146, 148). Of the 2,979 wills left by men, some 61 per cent were by married men and the balance by bachelors. With such evidence, she convincingly discerns marked “differences between Calvinist Predestinarians and Free Will Christians in their gendered inheritance practices” (p. 127). This is a significant finding, especially for colonies like Maryland, which tolerated a diversity of religions, with New York, Nova Scotia, and Upper Canada as other prime examples.

In addition, Meyers studies church architecture, burial liturgy, gravestone inscriptions, inheritance practices, marriage customs, and the role women were “permitted to play” (p. 3) to extract implied or underlying theological, religious, and cultural significance. From these may be gleaned detailed information on, for instance, piety and charitable bequests, as well as gender roles.

Her research adds substantially to the historiography of inheritance practices in colonial North America. Through her sophisticated use of prerogative court records, Meyers is able to inject colourful evidence into her analysis, by which dozens of Marylanders, hitherto unknown, are, in a sense, reborn. One of the most interesting was Henrietta Maria Neale (pp. 103–107), a Catholic, “blessed at birth with wealth and land”, who entered both her marriages “with considerable power and moved freely within the civic arena as well as the church”.

There is strangely little mention of slavery, though slaves, of course, did not make wills. The author limits her comments to note only that 45 per cent of the almost 2,300 slaves entering Maryland between 1705 and 1707 were imported by women (p. 173) and that Jesuit priests in Maryland insisted that slaves be permitted to marry and have such weddings blessed by the church (p. 50). Meyers fails to address the evidence among slave-holding women in Maryland to distinguish Free Will Christian owners from Predestinarian, and thus the behaviours and practices particular to each

group. Did slaves, for instance, habitually attend church services as baptized Christians? If so, were there significant differences between the two groups of Christians in their treatment of church-attending slaves? Which group was more likely to manumit their slaves when drawing up a will?

I am reminded that, when Lawrence Stone published his celebrated study of the Elizabethan and early Stuart aristocracy, he wrote in his preface that, as he himself held religion in such poor regard, he had written the book with religion left out. In an era when every Englishman believed in the existence of God, it was an unacceptable omission, especially from a brilliant scholar. In a world such as was occupied by Marylanders in the seventeenth century, it would also have been a serious oversight. Debra Meyers has made it a central theme, working and writing about her evidence in professional and provocative ways. As a consequence, this extremely interesting study deserves to be widely cited, and wills both of men and women extensively studied elsewhere by historians.

Julian Gwyn
University of Ottawa

NEEL, Carol (ed.) — *Medieval Families: Perspectives on Marriage, Household, and Children*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004. Pp. 438.

On trouvera dans cet ouvrage onze articles parus en langue anglaise de 1974 à 1996 sur l'enfance et la famille, du Bas Empire au XV^e siècle, par ordre chronologique de publication.

Trois contributions portent sur l'enfance. Mary Martin McLaughlin, dans un article pionnier de plus de cent pages (« Survivors and Surrogates... », paru en 1974 dans le collectif *The History of Childhood* dirigé par Lloyd de Mause), éclaire les relations entre parents et enfants en Occident entre le IX^e et le XIII^e siècles. John Boswell (1984) développe l'idée, controversée et aujourd'hui dépassée, que l'*expositio* et l'*oblatio* ont été des modes de régulation des naissances, le recul de l'oblato à partir du XII^e siècle ayant fait augmenter progressivement le nombre d'abandons. Enfin, Michael Goodich (1995) s'intéresse aussi (thème relativement nouveau à l'époque de la publication de l'article) à l'adolescence à partir d'une documentation hagiographique.

Deux articles permettent de mesurer ce que l'histoire des femmes puis l'histoire du genre ont apporté à l'étude de la famille et du mariage. Diane Owen Hugues (1975), dès le milieu des années 1970, adoptait résolument les théories élaborées par l'histoire des femmes pour étudier le milieu domestique génois des XII^e–XIV^e siècles. En articulant différence de genre et différence de classe, elle éclaire les diverses attitudes adoptées à l'intérieur des familles d'artisans et des familles nobles lors des événements majeurs de la vie que sont la naissance, le mariage, la mort et le veuvage. Elle oppose des groupes élargis (*extended family*) nobles à forte inflexion patrilinéaire à une famille artisanale plus restreinte, davantage centrée sur le noyau conjugal, aux structures de parenté plus souples. Pamela Sheingorn (1990), dans une perspective de