

UCLA

UCLA Historical Journal

Title

Father Fiction: The Construction of Gender in England, Spain, and the Andes

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0m53j98x>

Journal

UCLA Historical Journal, 12(0)

Author

Gauderman, Kimberly

Publication Date

1992

Copyright Information

Copyright 1992 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

Father Fiction: The Construction of Gender in England, Spain, and the Andes

Kimberly Gauderman

"Do we decide questions at all? *Answers*, no doubt,
but surely the questions decide *us*." Lewis Carroll

"Who is your father?" Historically, the answer to this question could determine your racial and class position in society, your access to property and political power. Your father named you, thus inscribing you in a cultural matrix in which the biological ambiguity of paternity was socially regulated and reinscribed as an absolute position of power. Your social identity was defined through your relationship to a patriarch: to the male head of a household, the King and to God. Thus, the questioning of your paternity was intelligible because it was embedded within a historically and culturally specific construction of social relations emanating from a central and fixed source of power. Asking about one's father reaffirms the existence and potency of power relations organized around patriarchy. To glimpse other possibilities of existence, other formulations of power and points of resistance, historians must be theoretically self-conscious; we must ask different questions.

This essay is part of a larger project examining the connection between gender and power in indigenous societies in the Andean region during the colonial period. My goal here is to demonstrate the necessity to reconsider the universality of the patriarchal model of gender organization and to show the explanatory potential of a gendered history of Latin America. Because this work is in progress, my propositions should be seen as suggestive rather than

conclusive. I am working from two premises: first, that patriarchy has been used as a metahistorical concept to understand relations between men and women. I will argue that the promiscuous use of the concept of patriarchy has problematized historical research in two ways. The present use of the term patriarchy is more suited to English traditions of gender organization and thus leads to the imposition of alien cultural values onto other societies. Related to this issue is the implicit notion that gender relations are historically stable. This has led to the anachronistic application of gender codes from one era onto the gender relations of another. My second premise is that gender reflects and conditions relations of power. Because the concept of patriarchy has obscured our vision of other forms of gender organization it also masks more than it reveals about Spanish American social, political and economic relations.

Gender and Binarism

Sexual difference is based on the biological differences between men and women. Gender differences are constructed by societies on the basis of their perceptions of this sexual difference. Because gender refers back to the anatomical differences between men and women, there is a tendency for researchers to attempt to fix gender differences in binary opposition to each other. Strength and weakness, for example, are associated with male and female categories. But, as Foucault writes, even the body itself does not escape the influence of history.

The body is molded by a great many distinct regimes; it is broken down by the rhythms of work, rest, and holidays; it is poisoned by food or values, through eating habits and moral laws; it constructs resistances....Nothing in man--not even his body--is sufficiently stable to serve as a basis for self-recognition or for understanding other men.¹

Thus, even if one could construct gender as the ideological counterpart to the palpable concept of the human body, that body itself is unstable, molded through the regime of history. The strengths and weaknesses of material bodies are as prone to historical manipulations as are our attitudes concerning them. There is no reason to assume, then, materially or theoretically, that binary oppositions, such as strength and weakness, have been conceptualized by all so-

cieties as representing male and female principles.

Joan Scott attempts to escape this gendered binarism in her analysis of gender and politics.

The point of new historical investigation is to disrupt the notion of fixity, to discover the nature of the debate or repression that leads to the appearance of timeless permanence in binary gender representation.²

A gendered analysis of history would then reveal points of rupture, contestations in a field of discourse regulated through normative gender roles. However, perhaps because Scott is focusing on Western cultures, the power which is being disrupted is still constructed through binary oppositions based upon sexual difference.

To vindicate political power, the reference must seem sure and fixed, outside human construction, part of the natural or divine order. In that way, the binary opposition and the social process of gender relationships both become part of the meaning of power itself.³

The construction of power, then, requires legitimation through a referent seen as immutable, the biological differences between men and women. Gender, as the social manipulation of sexual difference, becomes an intrinsic element in the creation and maintenance of power.

Gendering power, however, and defining its basis as gender binarism are two separate operations. Gender refers to, but is not contained by, sexual difference. The social inscription of men and women does not necessarily encode their bodies as oppositional forms. Scott's analysis of totalitarian and democratic regimes in the twentieth century convincingly demonstrates that gender relations condition and are conditioned by relations of power.⁴ The cultures she examines are bifurcated through gendered distinctions that polarize sexual difference and invest power unequivocally in male experience. Cultural attempts to construct power through gender binarism, however, cannot be universalized. Patriarchy, reconfigured as gender binarism, cannot remain the anchor for gendered analyses of history; it cannot remain the subject of historical research, "a subject which is either transcendental in relation to the field of events or runs in its empty sameness throughout the course of history."⁵ The object of historical inquiry should not be limited

to an examination of how cultural interpretations of sexual differences have been used to bifurcate human experience into the powerful and powerless. Rather, the focus should be on how discourses on gender are implicated in power relations, realizing that domination may be maintained on other axes than fixed binary oppositions.

Gender and Power

Power is the ability to determine and enforce differentiations between what is true and false. Thus there are many possible codifications and recodifications of power relations.

Each society has its regime of truth, its "general politics" of truth: that is the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true.⁶

Power is not unified or centralized but instead is dispersed throughout a discursive field composed of both material and symbolic referents. Power is constructed from a variety of discourses which are subject to constant subversion and overdetermination. The discourse of gender has historically operated persistently and recurrently in enabling the signification of power.

Established as an objective set of references, concepts of gender structure perception and the concrete and symbolic organization of all social life. To the extent that these references establish distributions of power (differential control over or access to material and symbolic resources), gender becomes implicated in the conception and construction of power itself.⁷

A gendered historical analysis then will recognize the historic and cultural mutability of concepts of Man and Woman. It comprehends gender systems as both reflecting and conditioning other modes of cultural, political, and economic organization and experience. This analytical model does not deny the efficacy of underlying economic

and empirical forces; rather it insists that these forces must manifest themselves through discourse alongside other more purely discursive entities, such as cultural definitions of masculine and feminine. "Effective" history rejects metahistorical significations and recognizes that the possibilities of identity are projected onto a subject, that identity is not separate from history. "It disturbs what was previously considered immobile; it fragments what was thought unified; it shows the heterogeneity of what was imagined consistent with itself."⁸ History of the local and the particular shatters the universal by revealing myriad struggles over the social production of truth. Gender structures these relations of power and thus is an important analytic category for understanding the past.

The State and Normative Discourse

This essay will survey cultural attempts to establish normative gender roles by looking at English and Spanish civil and religious legislation concerning family organization and Spanish and indigenous chronicles. I will also examine the *Huarochirí Manuscript*, a seventeenth-century Quechua text, which contains information about Andean social structure. I am not imposing the state as central to these societies but view it as an arena of struggle where cultural gender codes have been temporarily fixed.

The state is superstructural in relation to a whole series of power networks that invest the body, sexuality, the family, kinship knowledge, technology, and so forth...[it] consists in the codification of a whole number of power relations which render its functioning possible.⁹

Effective history would examine these other discursive realms and expose challenges as well as support for normative discourse. Such a history must focus on culture beneath the institutional level, where individual struggles over meaning climax in blood and gold. It requires knowledge of mundane details and the vast accumulation of source material; it requires patience and constant erudition. That is not my goal in this essay. Here I will remain nomadic, describing the precarious outcomes of a multitude of struggles crystallized into rules of conduct. Because the serene and omnipotent gaze of patriarchy has obscured even the outcomes of these struggles over meaning, an examination of the metapower of the state can

propose new directions for historical research, even if it cannot offer a definitive path.

The Potency of the Patriarch

The term patriarchy is based upon *pater* Latin for father. The extension of *pater* into patriarchy connotes much more than mere fatherhood but "a social organization marked by the *supremacy* of the father in the clan or family, the legal dependence of wives and children, and the reckoning of descent and inheritance in the male line."¹⁰ Researchers have tended to use patriarchy as synonymous with fatherhood, however, conflating the male's discovery of his usefulness in reproduction with his perceived seizure of complete authority in society. The male claim to paternity has thus been seen as a revolution, "one of the most decisive ever experienced by mankind," an evolutionary step inaugurating male creation and control of a nuclear family, private property and the state apparatus.¹¹ This preferencing of the male reproductive experience as the "revolutionary" moment in social evolution, has led researchers to extend the patriarchal model to all societies where men have discovered their paternity, and fatherhood is socially recognized. The social regulation of fatherhood, however, is contextually, not metahistorically, connected to patriarchal power relations. Rather than naturalize this patriarchal negation of female experience, I will examine how such relations arose within a specific, historical moment, that of medieval England. I am not positing this epoch as the origin of patriarchy. The importance of British models of normative gender relations lies not in originality but in the resonance such paradigms continue to have in our analyses of other cultures.

Normative gender relations were codified in England using common law, jurisprudence concerned primarily with regulating relationships to property under feudalism. Under common law, the King had ultimate ownership of all land. Control over land parcels was given to citizens in exchange for loyalty and military service. Under British traditions, only men were capable of performing these feudal duties of homage and fealty and thus all land had to be in the possession of males. Common law granted a husband control over his wife's estate because only he could perform the required feudal duties. "Whether the wife's interest arose before or after marriage, the husband was entitled to the possession, use, and income of her estate for the duration of the marriage and their joint

lives."¹²

In marriage under common law, the husband had the status of head and master of the household. In a relationship analogous to that between a vassal and a lord, the wife was required to render obedience, domestic service and submission to her husband. Under common law, marriage resulted in the "civil death" of the woman, or coverture. Under coverture a woman could not convey or contract real property to or from her husband or acquire or dispose of property to third persons without her husband's consent. A wife could not draw up a testament, as she had no property to bequeath. She could not engage in trade or business, sue or be sued. A woman's property was owned absolutely by her husband and was held liable for her husband's debts. Even a wife's paraphernalia, her apparel and ornaments could be claimed by creditors. Her husband was responsible for her debts and all other wrongful or injurious acts committed by her before or after marriage. Though a husband was compelled to make suitable provision for his wife and children, he legally controlled his wife and had sole custody of his children. Even at his death, his wife did not necessarily gain custody of her children; he could entrust their children to someone else's care. If a wife survived her husband, she was only entitled to dower, one third of his estate, until she remarried. Normal inheritance patterns left the estate to a single heir, the eldest son.¹³

The only provision for a woman married to a man who was squandering money or had abandoned her was to appeal to the King for relief through equity. Those who "lamented that they were too poor, too sick, too old, too powerless or too disadvantaged by the rigidities of the law"¹⁴ could appeal to the King's chancellor for special treatment. Not specifically a remedy for women, the notion of equity, or fairness as opposed to legal strictness, developed into a body of precedents by the seventeenth century which in some circumstances could ameliorate the situations of wives, usually those from the upper class with access to competent legal advice. For the majority of women, however, the rigidity of marital unity, or female coverture, was not altered until the middle of the nineteenth century. (This occurred in the US, the recipient of British cultural values and common law jurisprudence, when states began to pass statutes that allowed married women to own some forms of property.)¹⁵ Until then, a wife's ability to control property was seen as a rupture in the normal course of law. To obtain the status of an "honorary single woman" she remained dependent upon others: "her husband for an antenuptial agreement, on relatives for a trust

estate, and on the state in abandonment, separation, and divorce."¹⁶

Marriage was, however, only one relationship among others in which "superior" protected and legally represented the "inferior." Common law was not interested in the family per se. As long as the family was intact, common law was only concerned with its head, the father.¹⁷ The father was the sole public representative of the family. The family unit itself was legally separated from community scrutiny; it became invisible, cloaked by a single male identity. In this system, marriage acted to fracture off individuals into households legally and economically dominated by a male; women's experiences and concerns were mediated through men. Through coverture, a man gained his power as a patriarch by causing the "civil death" of the woman he married. The ability to negate another, vested in the male as father, lord and king, regulated not only gender relations but a whole series of power relations concerning the economy and the state. The will to fix normative male and female roles in binary oppositions came to its most complete realization in the specific historical and cultural configurations particular to the English tradition. The negation of the other through binarism is not the only basis for power; power is much more malleable to the inventiveness of the humans who create it.

A Family Affair: Patriarchal Permeability

At the time of the Spanish invasion of Latin America, Spaniards had a long tradition of operating within a social structure characterized by its decentered power relations. Spanish governments during this period were not centralized bureaucracies representing activist, unitary states. The Crown's main function was to legitimate the outcomes of economic and social struggles occurring quite autonomously at local and regional levels. The state consisted of "various entities largely independent of each other, under loose control, competing with each other for a domain of action that was not tightly compartmentalized."¹⁸ Agencies, such as the Viceroy, the Archbishop and the local city council, had overlapping jurisdictions and were encouraged to watch and report on each other. The dynamism of this system depended upon the strength of each entity to operate autonomously rather than in compliance within a hierarchical chain of command. It is within this system, where power is maintained through dispersal rather than negation, that Spanish gender relations gain meaning.

Unlike the English legal tradition of male-dominated households, under Spanish law the extended family was a major institution performing all operating functions of society. The family unit included extended kin as well as those not related through blood or marriage but brought into the family network through the tradition of *compadrazgo*, or god parentage. Spanish households also included slaves and servants who were highly integrated into the family life and frequently took on the names of their masters or employers. Illegitimate children were incorporated into this network, receiving some recognition from the usually Spanish father, often taking his name and getting some support. The ideal model for the Spanish family encompassed many social levels and stretched from the city into the countryside.¹⁹ Both men and women were active agents in extending the family's social, economic and political influence into the community. Like the state, power was generated through extension and inclusion rather than consolidation and exclusion. The strength and dissolution of this network of power relations is codified in the changing nature of Spanish legislation concerning the family during the colonial period.

Scholars have paid scant attention to the cultural specificity or the historical fluidity of Spanish legislation concerning the regulation of gender norms. Some view Spain as belonging to an "Anglo-European" tradition where a woman was an "imbecilitas sexus," an imbecile by her very nature.²⁰ Others interpret colonial gender relations through nineteenth-century legislation and travel accounts.²¹ These ahistorical practices insert a model of patriarchy based upon a male-centered household into colonial society and define women as "chattel" and their three hundred years of colonial heritage as subjugation. This simplification of the colonial experience is caused in part by the mistaken belief that little documentation is available concerning gender relations during this period.²² In fact, a great deal of scholarship on gender has been generated from a number of Spanish colonial sources: testaments, letters, financial records, church and government reports and records of litigation, as well as state and local legislation.

In addition to the methodological procedures used by researchers, late colonial Spanish officials themselves are implicated in the fabrication of a colonial patriarchal tradition. The Royal Pragmatic of 1776, promulgated in the colonies in 1778, extended parental control over children's marriage decisions. During this same time the father's authority was designated absolute in important family issues such as marriage decisions. The govern-

ment ministers who designed this legislation cited the practices of other Catholic nations of Europe, two minor eighteenth-century Italian canonists and Spanish civil law and the Toledan councils from the early medieval era.

The completed Pragmatic...relied on the creation of a myth of "national" tradition. It cited the *Fuero Juzgo*, lib. III tit. 2, and without specific reference to any subsequent legislation intimated that Spanish law had always followed this early precedent, when, in fact, it had not.²³

Thus there are at least two displacements separating us from understanding colonial society. The first is found in the historians themselves, in their unexamined preconceptions within which they frame the source material. The second is found in the historical documents, containing the conscious or unconscious agenda of their authors. It is within these displacements that the apparent stability and universality of patriarchy has been created.

Castilian private law was based primarily on Germanic, Roman and canonical precepts and was reformulated throughout the colonial period. The seventh century *Fuero Juzgo* (mentioned above as the basis for the Pragmatic) was based on Germanic law and was modified, expanded and recodified as the *Fuero Real* in the thirteenth century. *Las Siete Partidas*, based on Roman and cannon law, was also codified during this century and formulated the legal guidelines governing the bridal dowry. Both the *Fuero Real* and the *Partidas* became the basis for the *Leyes de Toro*, enacted in 1505. The *Leyes de Toro* paid special attention to the status of women in Spanish society. This body of legislation outlined women's legal capacities, the dimensions of husbands' authority, the rules governing community property, inheritance, the dowry (*dote*) and the *arras* (groom's contribution to the bride).²⁴

At the beginning of the sixteenth century Spanish women, unlike their English contemporaries, could own, bequeath, and inherit property on their own account. Wives shared the *Patria Potestas* (parental authority) with their husbands which gave them custody of their children.²⁵ Legally, a woman could choose to live separately from her husband, which gave Spanish women the right not to join their husbands who had left Spain for Spanish America. In fact, the burden was on the husband to seek certification from his wife allowing him to remain apart from her or legally he could face deportation back to Spain.²⁶

A wife's separate private estate consisted of her dowry, the *arras*, and any supplementary goods or capital obtained prior or during marriage. A woman's dowry was the basic element of her estate and, though administered by her husband, the dowry remained her private property. In addition to her dowry, a groom often gave his bride a gift of capital and goods, an *arras*, legally limited to ten percent of his total worth at the time of marriage. A wife was free to retain for her own administration any part of her estate not explicitly incorporated into the dowry or *arras*. The dowry and *arras* were unalienable from her estate and legally the husband's authority over his wife's property was not absolute. Legislation spelled out that "his function as an honest, prudent manager was to redound more to the good of wife and family than to his personal aggrandizement and profit."²⁷ If her dowry and *arras* were badly administered, she could sue her husband to compel him to surrender them to her. When the marriage ended, the husband was compelled to return the value of both to his wife's estate and his private estate was forfeited if he did not meet this obligation.²⁸

Because a wife's property was legally separate from her husband's, it could not be seized by his creditors. This provided economic insurance for the family and gave her husband mutual interest in preserving its value and in keeping her capital apart from his estate. The desire for a sound economic base for the family superseded the husband's individual interest in increasing his own private estate. This ability to shelter a part of the family's income from creditors promoted the artificial inflation of the wife's estate through increasing the wealth of her dowry. At the time of marriage a husband could claim that his wife had brought with her more money than she actually had, sometimes even more than the entire worth of the couple, in order to safeguard the family income.²⁹

In addition to the husband and wife's private estates, they also shared community property, all property acquired jointly during the marriage. When the marriage ended, usually at death, their joint property was divided equally between their separate estates. Husbands and wives bequeathed their estates separately to their children; the same legal guidelines for testaments applied to both. All legitimate children, regardless of their sex, inherited equally from both their parents. If no children were living, the law mandated that the estates be divided between grandchildren, parents, the surviving spouse or, in some cases, illegitimate children.

Only a person who "lacked both descendants and ascendants was at liberty to dispose of the estate as he or she saw fit."³⁰

Proper functioning of the Spanish family required that husbands and wives retain separate legal and economic identities. Power relations within the family were therefore similar to those at other levels of society. Like the state as a whole, the prosperity of the family depended upon the power of its members acting semi-autonomously within a union in which their interests both converged and remained distinct. This model also extended to the relations between parents and their children. Though the economic and social status of the original family and the children's future families were linked, parents did not have ultimate authority over their children's marriage choices. The Council of Trent in 1545 codified the right of sons and daughters to exercise free will in marriage choice and prevented their parents from disinheritting them.³¹

The Council of Trent decreed that church courts had exclusive jurisdiction over marriage. Though the doctrine of free will and the sacrament of marriage had long been upheld by the Church, the Council sought to codify these traditions in reaction to the Protestant Reformation. Protestant doctrine relegated marriage to the control of civil authorities and mandated parental consent for children to marry.³² The Council's decrees were embraced by the Spanish Crown. "Philip II sent no less than 14 *cedulas* urging prelates, *corregidores* and town councils to observe the decrees of Trent."³³ The decrees were not, however, accepted by Protestant countries or even in other Catholic countries. In France, the King refused to receive the decrees and issued laws mandating parental consent for marriage.³⁴

Not only was Spain unique in accepting the Council's decrees, the Church was also empowered to enforce its codes through access to the state apparatus and community support. The Church married children without their parents' knowledge, temporarily took custody of children whose parents attempted to reverse their marriage choices through psychological or physical abuse, and could call on the support of the Royal Police to enforce the parents' compliance with Church doctrine.³⁵ In addition, Church litigation records show that members of the community were eager to involve themselves in family disputes. Witnesses intervened to stop family violence and volunteered to testify about what they considered parents' unjust interference in their children's marriage plans.³⁶

Community involvement in the family could even extend into

conjugal relations. The Church only condoned sexual relations if they occurred within marriage. Married couples were expected to satisfy the sexual desire of their partner whenever it was requested; to refuse a partner's request was a mortal sin.³⁷ This marital duty (*debito matrimonial*) was conceptualized in contractual terms. Couples were encouraged to seek balance in their requests and payments of this debt. Excessive requests were considered unjust and, though sexual problems were usually veiled in litigation, a couple's disagreement over the frequency of their sexual relations could become the basis for legal action.³⁸ In a Mexican divorce case in 1715 the ecclesiastical judges called on the husband and wife's friends and neighbors to give their opinions on the couple's sexual relations.³⁹ The willingness of members from the community to testify in these cases exemplifies the extent to which public intervention could be considered legitimate even in the most intimate relations between family members.

The cultural specificity of Spanish gender norms during the majority of the colonial period has been largely overshadowed by the changes which occurred in the late eighteenth century. Codified through the Royal Pragmatic, civil authorities gained control over marriage and parental consent was mandated for all persons under the age of twenty-five. This was followed in 1783 with legislation preventing wives from bequeathing to children who had married without their father's consent.⁴⁰ By 1787 the Council of the Indies ruled that the father's veto of a marriage partner was absolute; even if children accepted disinheritance, the couple could not marry.⁴¹ The growing power of the father in the family coincides with the Spanish state's increasing centralization during the late colonial period. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, a single body, the Council of the Indies, controlled appointments and promotions for both ecclesiastical and royal officials in Spanish America.⁴²

Historians have tended to posit the state and the father as the stable centers of colonial relations of power. In fact, for most of this period, the power matrix was maintained on a much different basis than the English model of a patriarchal hierarchy. The power of the father in Spanish America was simultaneously produced and constrained by his position in a larger network of competing and overlapping interests. The family was represented by both the husband and the wife and their family was in turn part of a larger kinship network. The ideal family extended visibly into the community, incorporating many generational and social levels. At

the same time, the community intervened in relationships within the family. The concept of patriarchy conceals the inclusive and permeable nature of the colonial Spanish American family.

Tucoy hinantin huc yuric canchic. "We are all of one birth."⁴³

In 1532, when Spaniards seized the Incan emperor Atahualpa in Cajamarca, Andean cultural transmission occurred primarily orally. Though statistical records were kept through the *quipu* method (knotted-string calculation), Andeans used no writing.⁴⁴ Thus, for the first generations after conquest, we are dependent upon records and chronicles in Spanish for information on this region. The earliest work in Quechua only dates from the beginning of the seventeenth century. Because the available documents were created largely under Spanish auspices or influence, one must be circumspect in using these sources to interpret Andean cultural practices. Nevertheless, with careful reading, these texts reveal concepts and beliefs which are strikingly different from Spanish traditions. In this essay, I will establish Andean gender norms using information drawn from Spanish, mestizo, and indigenous chroniclers, including the *Huaro-chirí Manuscript*, the earliest known source in Quechua. This last text, an early seventeenth-century composition on Andean indigenous religion, was written by Quechua speakers and was written in relative independence from Spanish preconceptions about native traditions.⁴⁵ This manuscript thus provides a unique perspective for interpreting Andean cultural norms.

Some historians have characterized Andean society as rigidly hierarchial with a centralized state controlling the roles and responsibilities of all individuals. Regional identities and kinship relations were meaningless. The state controlled all land; even personal clothing, cooking implements, etc. were considered state property. There was no inheritance as there was no private property to pass on to heirs. Society was patriarchal; women held no positions of power or prestige. Instead, women were considered property.⁴⁶ Recent scholarship has shown, however, that the Inca state operated as an imperial network connecting provincial kingdoms that retained their languages, religion, internal organization and dynasties. The state incorporated these local entities through a system of reciprocity wherein the Inca supported the local ruling powers in exchange for tribute in goods, labor, and people. In fact, some provincial kingdoms actually expanded their power base in alliance with the Inca. Even local deities could become state spon-

pis tam - Tucey runa curapas niqu Suagui nín
 llaí ta curallaca améas amaula cay nínpi allo
 carcan y may callagur ruraspa cay curallaca
 qui pampim rú. so. r.

Capit^o 16

cay pím quillca son pazaca pise ca runto
 montay yucic, Suagui ybecdes carcan
 Cay xi parlacarabo pay cu
 napay ja h
 Bay ta

Nom ari puzac nin capitulopi Su non carcan die
 pazac cachpi carurita montay yucionus pa Suagui
 nic camasot carcan cay xi Suagui nin curaca paai
 acacas eluxin: sus tar can Bay curallaca, Bay man
 Friday curap sapampi sutinirai quillca son ta emi
 cali pise carunto montay yucic parlacaca nús can die
 ca y ma nom 14 capit^o p^o pas xi m^o can die curirayap
 buinii nús pa y natasí pay curaca Suagui yoca
 ma carcan Cay curap sutin: mi nauge nin mar
 ta pazaca caca, Bay montam curap, Bay montam
 pitebo, Bay montam, pazac carco, Suagui tam
 manayalbanesico cay pím qui pazin blancopi ya
 clapa curan curdie pa Sullcayiu pa Bay manca
 cay pazac nús can die si canin antiman yaicu
 napt Suallallo caruindos curimur man nús paca
 nan camapas tian Bay ta Suamp^o Su non carcan
 die mi nái, cay Suallallo curuindosi manataxi
 tuyllaca mifi curuindo may pa. tam Bay mullo
 coesa nús can die ta curap pazaca cap Suagui
 yaicupa coesaman tucobirean Bay padas Bay
 montay Suallallo ca pisco ya pa sua murca Bay si

o's' sulloyllapa
 hutioci carcan

Figure 1: Quechua-language writing from the Huarochiri Manuscript.

sored cults. The power of the Inca depended upon the ability of these regional kingdoms to retain their own productive resources and ruling structures so that tribute could be produced and channeled through the local ruler to the Inca state.⁴⁷ The Andean region was incorporated into the Inca empire through a complex system of alliances legitimated through cultural traditions of reciprocity rather than a rigid hierarchy. It is within this cultural matrix that one must interpret Andean gender norms.⁴⁸

Environmental and social relations in the Andean region were conceptualized in explicitly gendered relations of reciprocity and complementarity. Deities were gendered depending on their particular arena of activity. In general, the earth has predominantly female associations and water predominantly male. These gendered associations could be partially overdetermined by a second set of associations: altitude and motion were conceptualized as male, while depth and stability were considered female.⁴⁹ Much of the action in the *Huarochirí Manuscript* revolves around female deities of low lying plains seducing the male mountain deities to irrigate them. The prosperity of a region depended upon the cooperation of both male and female ecological forces.⁵⁰

Social activities were also specifically gendered in the Andean region. Weaving and spinning, both of economic and religious importance, were associated with women, while plowing and combat were considered male activities. The Inca tributary system recognized the interdependence of male and female activity for social reproduction and thus the household, not the individual, was the minimal entity responsible for payment of tribute.⁵¹ Pictures drawn by Guaman Poma, an indigenous chronicler, at the beginning of the seventeenth century show that the complimentary tasks of men and women were essential for the maintenance of Andean life. He shows men and women involved in all aspects of agricultural production: plowing, sowing and reaping. Men, associated with altitude, are pictured as standing, while women are shown closer to the earth.⁵² Pachacuti Yamqui, an early seventeenth-century indigenous chronicler, drew a schema of Inca perceptions of the universal order. In his drawing a deity of ambiguous gender heads male and female parallel descent groups which are united on earth through the depiction of a native storehouse, the product of the labor of both men and women. For the Inca, universal and social harmony was not the product of a rigid hierarchy. Instead, balance was created through the separate activities of gendered entities of equal importance in the maintenance of social order. The

relationship between gendered entities was conceptualized as relativistic. Pachacuti's work shows that in any given realm of activity male and female power relations were contextually driven. Male or female could predominate depending upon the activities, interests or associations involved.⁵³

Concepts of gender complementarity and parallelism are central themes in the *Huarochirí Manuscript*. In this region's cosmography no single central deity emerges; instead, a pantheon of male and female deities are interrelated through kinship. Pacha Camac, a widely worshipped coastal deity who Garcilaso claimed as the forerunner of the Christian God the Father,⁵⁴ here is depicted in complex interactions with other powerful deities. According to some religious accounts, Pacha Camac was married to Chaupi Ñamca, the region's supreme female land and river deity.⁵⁵ Chaupi Ñamca's relationship to Pacha Camac is ambiguous in the manuscript as she is also noted as being married to a poor man.⁵⁶ Whatever her conjugal status, marriage is not seen as a stable relationship or source of identity for her. She is characterized in the manuscript as traveling around in human form and seducing other deities.⁵⁷

Chaupi Ñamca's ambiguous marital situation and her frequent trysts are characteristic of the instability of conjugal unions throughout the manuscript. All couplings are seen as contextually defined, requiring constant rearticulation to achieve positive social value. Chaupi Ñamca must be continually wooed in her pastoral festival by men dancing around naked singing "Chaupi Ñamca enjoys it to no end when she sees our private parts" (*chaymantaca llantanlla caytam runacuna taquispa chaupi Ñamca pincayninchicta rucuspam ancha cusicon ñic carcan*).⁵⁸ In irrigation myths, the complimentary pairing of female land deities with male mountain deities is always portrayed as an active, potentially conflictual, social process. Agricultural fertility is only achieved through negotiations whose outcomes are not predetermined but are open to renegotiation. Thus Chuqui Suso, a female land deity, and Paria Caca, the region's supreme mountain deity, consummate their relationship not when her field is initially irrigated as they had originally agreed, but only after she renegotiates for the building of a canal.⁵⁹ Likewise, flooding caused by the union of two other deities is prevented later in the manuscript through renegotiations over water distribution. The resulting accord required constant intervention by men and women in the region to maintain balanced distribution.⁶⁰

As Salomon notes, "all the myths related to marriage treat it as an image of social stress and change latent in union."⁶¹ Only through negotiations could tensions inherent in unions of opposing principles be submerged and the ideal of complementarity instituted. Male and female power relations were not static but were socially dynamic and contextually defined. Harmony, based on the ideal of gender complementarity, resulted from fluid interactions between gendered agents whose positions of power were precariously and temporarily fixed through a constant process of negotiation, intervention, rearticulation.

Conjugal relations, then, were sites of social dynamism, arenas where the ideal of complementarity bred its own negation, conflict and competition. Relations between husbands and wives symbolize the uncertainty of history; it is relationships between siblings which provide the paradigm of social stability. Chaupi Ñamca and Paria Caca, sister and brother, were the supreme deities in the Huarochirí region. Each represented opposite ecological and social concepts. Chaupi Ñamca, the original deity of the region, represented low lying plains and rivers and the original valley inhabitants. Paria Caca, a mountain deity, represented the high land invaders. The symbolic integration of these two groups is represented through fraternal, not conjugal, ties between the deities.⁶²

Both Chaupi Ñamca and Paria Caca were five-fold deities; the nature of the plurality of their persons is ambiguous in the manuscript. Both deities are referred to in both plural and singular tenses. This could arise from the little distinction made between plural and singular in the Quechua language at this time. But, descriptions in the manuscript of Chaupi Ñamca's idols depict both a singular stone with five arms, or wings, representing her five elements, as well as singular idols dedicated to each of her persons, conceptualized as five sisters.⁶³ The ambiguous distinctions between plurality and singularity, then, are not simply grammatical quirks of an inexperienced writer but indicate broader patterns in Quechua symbolic representation.⁶⁴ It was not, however, the ease with which the Quechua writers slid between plural and singular representations which demanded explanation by the Spanish clerics who partially edited the work. In fact, they may have felt relief in finding an indigenous religious concept that expressed the same ambiguity as the Christian Trinity. It was the specific relationship between Paria Caca's five selves which needed clarification.

Paria Caca emerged as five eggs, which turned into five falcons and then into five people.⁶⁵ Throughout the manuscript the re-

lationship between these five selves remains unclear. The elements are represented as brothers as well as sons of Paria Caca. At one point the Spanish note in the margin demands a clarification of the status of these five selves.⁶⁶ For the Quechua scribes, however, identifying the father in Paria Caca's existence was not considered imperative. In chapter fourteen it is mentioned that he might have been the son of Cuni Raya Viracocha⁶⁷ and yet in chapter one the writers comment that it's not known which one of these deities existed first.⁶⁸ The same ambiguity arises in establishing Chaupi Ñamca's paternity.

Others say, "she was Tamta Ñamca's [a deceptive lord] daughter." Still others say, "she was the Sun's daughter." So it's impossible to decide.

*hucmi tamta Ñamcap churinsi carca Ñincu...huaquinmi
canan yntip churinsi Ñincu chay ynam mana
hunanchaypaccho*⁶⁹

For Chaupi Ñamca, not only is her father not identified but it is clear that her identity is entirely separate from the possibilities mentioned. Whether she is the daughter of a lord who cheats his people or that of the supreme Inca deity, neither impacts upon her own status as the supreme female deity of the region. Neither Chaupi Ñamca nor Paria Caca derive their power through marriage or through their father; rather, it is their relations to each other as siblings which provides the stable base for the humans who are their descendants.

Inhabitants of Huarochirí viewed Paria Caca as their father and Chaupi Ñamca as their mother.⁷⁰ Symbolic descent from a sibling pair is a recurrent theme in creation myths throughout the Andean region.⁷¹ The Inca not only legitimated their political power through their symbolic descent from the siblings, the sun and the moon, but within the Inca dynasty itself, the emperor married his own eldest sister.

They also said that the princes married their sisters so that the heir might inherit the kingdom as much through his mother as through his father....As an additional reason, they considered that the majesty of being the queen should not be granted to any woman unless she inherited it in her own legitimate right and not as the king's con-

sort.⁷²

The power of the queen did not stem from her husband. Furthermore, the legitimacy of an heir depended upon his descent from both his father and mother, who were brother and sister. Likewise in Huarochirí, "To be an ancestrally entitled worshipper of *both* Chaupi Ñamca and Paria Caca...was the crux of belonging."⁷³

The law of Paria Caca, ("We are all of one birth") exemplifies the unifying concept of descent from a sibling pair. The word used for birth (*yuric*) in this phrase is a different term than patrilineage (*yumay*); male descent, or kindred (*ayllu*), localized descent. The focus is not on the creative agents but on the process of creation, the birth. It is the inhabitants' descent from the product of this birth, the sibling pair, which unites the region through kinship.

Insofar as all the people of the region are "born" of unions between descendants of a brother and a sister, all are siblings at the apical level of kinship and religious reckoning.⁷⁴

Though both men and women claimed Chaupi Ñamca and Paria Caca as their mother and father, they credited these deities with engendering same sexed images of themselves. "Chaupi Ñamca was a great maker of people, that is, of women and Paria Caca of men" (*cay chaupi Ñamucas ancha runa camac carcan huarmipac caripacri paria caca*).⁷⁵ Likewise, the Inca believed that women were descendants of the moon and men of the sun.⁷⁶ In fertility rituals in Huarochirí, the engendering of men and women was considered separate activities. Festival participants invoked male and female offspring through separate, parallel activities given equal importance. Set up as a competition between ayllus, men threw spears at straw effigies gendered male and female, while women danced and chanted. The engendering of males was not given priority. The goal was to strike specific targets in both effigies to engender both male and female offspring. This same ritual was used for the fertility of llamas, animals of economic and religious importance.⁷⁷

The separate parallel engendering of males and females operated in a larger system of religious parallelism common to the Andean region. Chaupi Ñamca and Paria Caca were worshipped in separate festivals considered of equal importance for the well-being of the community.

This time of worship [for Paria Caca], as we know, is called the Auquisna. Similarly the worship of Chaupi Ñamca is called the Chaycasna.

*cay muchacuy pacham auquisna sutioc ynatacmi chavpi Ñamca muchacoypas chaycasna sutioc*⁷⁸

The manuscript's writers later describe parallel rituals.

People, would race each other to reach her, just as they did when they went racing to worship Paria Caca....They'd lead to her the very same llamas that went to Paria Caca.

*payta muchaypacri yma nam paria cacaman yallinacupa rircan ynallatacsi ña chayaipac yallinacuc carcan llamanta ymantapas catispa chay llama paria cacaman ric quiquillan(ta)tacsi chaymanpas pusac carcan*⁷⁹

When people asked for supreme advice, they addressed their requests to each deity separately. In responding, the deities did not consult with each other but with their component selves.⁸⁰ To the inhabitants of Huarochirí, Chaupi Ñamca and Paria Caca's union did not dissolve their individual identities, desires, or gifts.

Physical as well as symbolic unions of men and women did not negate their individual attributes in order to solidify the two into a single entity. Individuals retained their identity constructed through their participation in communal kinship and gender specific activities. The Western concept of a family as a sphere closed off from the community is not descriptive of Andean experience. In fact, there is no single word for family in older Quechua. Instead, the concept of family relies on multiple word constructions that refer to those who share or were raised in a certain household.⁸¹ An Andean family, then, could include not only the nuclear family but extended kin as well as individuals not related through blood. Families were not isolated from the larger community; their access to productive resources was based on their membership in an ayllu, or larger kinship structure.⁸² Ayllu membership was the basis for a man or woman's identity and carried much more importance than their household affiliation. Men and women acquired their rights

to community lands and herds through parallel transmission from their parents. Men inherited from their fathers and women from their mothers.⁸³

Women's occupations were not confined within the household but extended into the larger community. In vital projects such as insuring a community's access to water, women not only fulfilled the ritual role as receivers of water rights for their households but also participated with men in the physical labor of damming lakes and channeling water.⁸⁴ Women were active in trade and curing.⁸⁵ In religion, women acted as priestesses and even founded cults that became community and state sponsored religions.⁸⁶ Women, alongside men, participated in important public festivals by leading worship, drinking, playing music, singing and dancing.⁸⁷ Indeed, representation by both men and women at all levels of society was considered essential for the community's economic and spiritual well-being. When twins were born to a couple the entire community considered it a portentous event. Both the mother and father, overseen by extended kin and representatives of the community, underwent elaborate rituals of purification for one year after the birth. If the twins were of the same sex, the community considered the birth a bad omen. Only if they were born male and female did people interpret it as a good sign.⁸⁸

Their Names

Social relations are exemplified in naming patterns. The three cultures examined in this essay all used different means to mark the identity of their members. In the English tradition of coverture, a woman took the name of her husband, symbolizing her civil death.⁸⁹ She and her original family's interest in her person and property was severed; her husband was the legal representative of a nuclear family and she became "Mrs. Man."⁹⁰ This tradition, one of the last vestiges of coverture operating in the United States today, is still practiced by the majority of women.⁹¹ Though more women are choosing to keep their own last names, this practice is still considered controversial. Hilary Rodham Clinton's decision to retain her surname after her marriage to Bill Clinton had negative political consequences for her husband in Arkansas. Her eventual decision to add his name to her's, rather than deleting her own, formed part of the basis for the national debate over her proper role as the President's wife.

In Spanish tradition, naming patterns for men and women were

far more fluid. Women did not take on the names of their husbands at marriage. In fact, there are examples of husbands taking on the names of their wives. In mid-seventeenth Catalonia, a woman inherited a house that had remained in the family for centuries through heiresses whose husbands had taken on the women's family name upon marriage. In general, both men and women, as their social positions rose, sought out the most prestigious sounding names throughout their family trees. Names were therefore not fixed; changing status resulted in changing names and some people switched back and forth, never deciding which surname they preferred.⁹² The fluidity of Spanish naming patterns reflect the importance of men and women in promoting the social and economic success of their extended families. Both men's and women's identities did not lie within the nuclear family but were based in a larger kinship network.

Andean men and women headed parallel lineages through which property and surnames were transmitted. Daughter's took their names from their mothers, sons from their fathers.⁹³ An individual's access to community wealth depended upon her gendered lineage's incorporation into the larger community, itself defined in gendered kinship terms. Gender parallel transmission of names, thus, located an individual temporally within a lineage extending back to creation and spatially within a specific community. Individuals' relationship to this gendered social organization provided a stronger basis for their identity than their relationship to their spouse or their household. Within this cultural matrix, representation by both men and women was considered essential to the preservation of lineages and the community.

Concluding Thoughts

In this essay I have examined the gender norms of three different cultures. I have given patriarchy an historical and cultural context, showing how it operated within English legal tradition. Within this tradition a woman's identity was subsumed by her husband, and the father was the sole representative of the family. Under Spanish tradition, women were not defined by their husbands, the family encompassed extended kin and was extended out into the community. Both men and women were legally acknowledged as representing a family's political, economic, and social status. In the Andean region, gender roles were complimentary with households integrated into the community. Symbolic and social space was

explicitly gendered; yet the relationship between men and women was not fixed but contextually determined.

I have used information drawn from legal and ecclesiastical texts to establish normative gender roles in England and Spain. For the Andean region I have used chronicles and indigenous manuscripts. I am not positing that these documents reflect the actual behavior of men and women. I examine these texts to understand how these cultures imagined ideal gender relations. I have also considered that these gender norms are incorporated into other power relations. In the case of England, the ideal of a strong, centralized bureaucracy mirrors the position of the father as lord of his household. In Spain, the decentered state encouraged the autonomy of individual entities within overlapping jurisdictions. The Spanish family also promoted the separate interests of husbands and wives while recognizing their joint interest in community property. The Inca empire legitimated its expansion through the model of complementarity, supporting existing structures while imposing obligations. The Andean community reflected this model in its own parallel organization of gender roles. Unlike gender binarism, which promoted one identity by negating another, here, gendered identities were strengthened through social interaction. The model of patriarchy has obscured then, not only our understanding of male and female relationships but, by defining power as a centralized force, has distorted our view of ways in which the Spanish and Inca constructed their state power.

In this essay, I am not trying to answer the question of how women have been historically constrained and repressed. Concurrently, I am not attempting to identify societies in which gender relations were more or less "equal." In fact, I would argue that the very questioning of gender equality can only be meaningful within a society bifurcated into the powerful and powerless, social relations which arise specifically out of patriarchy. The concept of gender equality thus becomes more problematic and nebulous in societies organized around different power relations. The Spanish model based on inclusion and the Andean model of gender complementarity do not in themselves guarantee social justice. But the discourse of equality is not more certain of a path, as recent Supreme Court decisions limiting affirmative action, to ensure the rights of historically dominant groups, attest to. Instead, my interest lies in understanding how male and female identities were historically and culturally constructed and used to support relations of power. Gender thus becomes an element of power, power,

that traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than a negative instance whose function is repression.⁹⁴

Patriarchy must be seen as a cultural and historical construction, not as a universal paradigm for understanding human behavior. Used generically to label male domination, the definition of patriarchy tells us nothing about the form of that domination. If given a precise definition of centralized control by males, its use simplifies the mechanics of domination. Naturalizing patriarchy masks other forms of power relations and colonizes the experiences of "non-Western" cultures.

Notes

1. Foucault 1984: 88.

2. Scott 1988: 43.

3. *Ibid.*, 49.

4. *Ibid.*, 46-50.

5. Foucault 1980: 117.

6. *Ibid.*, 131.

7. Scott 1988: 45.

8. Foucault 1984: 82. Effective history is Foucault's term for the genealogical approach to historical research. The history of the genealogy of a topic does not seek the origins of a concept, but instead traces its effects on the construction of power relations. For an example of an application of this methodology, see Seed 1983. Her work is an analysis of discourses competing to define the nature of marital relations on the basis of love or economic interest in colonial Latin America. The subject of her analysis, marital relations, is not prefabricated and projected back on to history. The concept of marriage becomes discontinuous, continually redefined by societies within their specific historical settings.

9. *Ibid.*, 64.

10. *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*. Springfield, MS: Merriam-Webster Inc., 1984. Emphasis mine.

11. Engels 1979: 67.

12. Rabkin 1980: 20.

13. *Ibid.*, 19. See also, Basch 1982: 17, 54 and 55. For inheritance pat-

terns see, Vries 1984: 63, 76 and 223.

14. Basch 1982: 21.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid., 26-27.

17. Ibid., 17.

18. Lockhart 1983: 11. For a detailed analysis of Spanish bureaucratic agencies and their struggles over competing jurisdictions, see John Leddy Phelan. *The Kingdom of Quito in the Seventeenth Century*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1967. For an alternative view of the colonial Spanish state as a strong, centralized bureaucracy, see for example: Stein, Stanley J. and Barbara H. Stein. *The Colonial Heritage of Latin America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

19. See Lockhart 1983: 7-9.

20. See for example: Pescatello, Ann M. *Power and Pawn: The Female in Iberian Families, Societies, and Cultures*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1976. Pescatello conflates British and Spanish legal and social traditions. For example, she finds that primogeniture existed in Spain, with a son always inheriting the family estate (p. 23). In fact, Spanish law mandated that all children inherit equally, regardless of sex.

21. See for example: Arrom, Silvia Mariana. *The Women of Mexico City, 1790-1857*. Stanford, CA: Stanford, 1985. This book contains a section on Spanish women's legal status in the colonial period and uses predominantly nineteenth century sources to establish women's status throughout this period.

22. Pescatello 1976: 150.

23. Seed 1988: 299.

24. Korth and Flusche 1987: 396.

25. Seed 1988: 235.

26. Lockhart 1976: 120-121.

27. Korth and Flusche 1987: 401.

28. Ibid., 401.

29. Lockhart 1968: 156. This often occurred when a man of wealth but of lower social status, such as a merchant, married a woman of less wealth but of higher status.

30. Korth and Flusche 1987: 399.

31. Seed 1988: 32-40.

32. Ibid., 34.

33. Ibid., 255.

34. Ibid., 35.

35. Ibid., 77-79.

36. Ibid., 44.

37. Lavrin 1992: 53.

38. Ibid., 73.

39. Ibid., 75-76.

40. Seed 1988: 285.

41. *Ibid.*, 204.

42. *Ibid.*, 167. This growing trend towards centralization of power coincides with the growth of capitalism and economic rationalism. "Capitalism, or more accurately the changes in attitudes about control of property and acquisitiveness that accompanied capitalism, provided for the reevaluation of the role of fathers by stressing the significance of their economic function and by strengthening their authority as consequence of their management not only of the immediate family's well-being but also of its ambitions within new realms of economic activity" (235).

43. The Law of Paria Caca, in *The Huarochirí Manuscript*, translated from Quechua by Frank Salomon and George L. Urioste. The introduction by Salomon includes information on linguistic and cultural traditions in the Andean region.

44. Lockhart 1983: 48.

45. *Huarochirí Manuscript* 1991: 2. Salomon suggests that the Quechua writer was attempting to preserve Andean myth rather than rework it within Spanish norms. He also notes that Avila, the cleric who later used this text to identify indigenous religious practices and idols in his extirpation campaigns, would have achieved much more information by not interfering with his informants' accounts.

46. See Pescatello 1976. See also Burkett, Elinor C. "Indian Women and White Society: The Case of Sixteenth-Century Peru," in *Latin American Women: Historical Perspectives*. Ed. Asunción Lavrin. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978.

47. Lockhart 1983: 46, and Karen Spalding 1968 and 1984. See Garcilaso, p. 209, "After they were conquered by the Incas, just as they were not deprived of their estates, so they were allowed to keep the customs they had in former times."

48. Silverblatt 1987: 44-47.

49. *Huarochirí Manuscript* 1991: 15.

50. *Ibid.*, 62, for an example of Andean conceptualization of the irrigation process as a gendered activity.

51. Silverblatt 1987: 14.

52. *Ibid.*, 11-13, for an example of Guaman Poma's work.

53. *Ibid.*, 44-45, for a discussion of Pachacuti Yamqui's drawing.

54. Garcilaso de la Vega, *el Inca* 1989: 71. Garcilaso was a mestizo of Inca and Spanish noble descent, whose chronicle dates from the early seventeenth century. His claim for Pacha Camac's status as a forerunner to the Christian god must be seen in his overall strategy of representing Inca imperial expansion as the civilizing precondition for Christian occupation of the Andes. This depiction of the Inca as necessary forerunners of the Spaniards was used by Garcilaso to legitimate his claims to continued privileges for Inca descendants in Spanish colonial society.

-
55. *Huarochirí Manuscript* 1991: 9 and 47.
56. *Ibid.*, 56.
57. *Ibid.*, 78.
58. *Ibid.*
59. *Ibid.*, 62-63.
60. *Ibid.*, 139-143.
61. *Ibid.*, 10.
62. *Ibid.*, 9, for discussion of the principle of fraternal ties as representation of the union between aborigines and invaders. See p. 77, for declarations in the manuscript of the deities' fraternal ties.
63. *Ibid.*, 77 and 84-87.
64. Modern Quechua has a precise and complex system for differentiating between plural and singular linguistic elements.
65. *Huarochirí Manuscript* 1991: 54 and 59.
66. *Ibid.*, 68.
67. *Ibid.*, 89.
68. *Ibid.*, 44.
69. *Ibid.*, 87.
70. *Ibid.*, 75 and 77.
71. See for example creation myths recorded by: Juan de Betanzos, 1551, quoted in Zuidema 1990: 9; Bernabe Cobo, 1653, quoted in Silverblatt 1987: 46; Garcilaso, (1609) 1989: 42.
72. Garcilaso 1989: 207-208.
73. Salomon and Urioste 1991: 7, emphasis in original.
74. *Ibid.*, 71, for the original phrase in the manuscript as well as Salomon's discussion of the terms used in this phrase and his interpretation of its significance.
75. *Ibid.*, 84.
76. Silverblatt 1987: 51.
77. *Huarochirí Manuscript* 1991: 121-124.
78. *Ibid.*, 72. See also Salomon's discussion of parallel religious practices p. 9 and p. 21.
79. *Ibid.*, 77.
80. *Ibid.*, 78 and 79.
81. González Holguin, (1608) 1989: 523, defines family using derivatives of the word for house, *huaci*. *Huacipicak cuna* and *Huaciyoccuna*: those who reside in or possess the same house. Also *Huyhuascca cuna*, those who have been raised or cared for.
82. *Ayllu* is a difficult term to define. González Holguin (*Ibid.*, 39) defines it as a lineage. Salomon (1991: 22) defines it as "a named, landholding collectivity, self-defined in kinship terms, including lineages but not globally defined as unilineal, and frequently forming part of a multi-ayllu settlement." See also, Karen Spalding 1968 and 1984.
83. Silverblatt 1989: 5.

84. *Huarochirí Manuscript* 1991: 142.

85. See *Ibid.*, 73 and Cobo 1990: 160 and 164.

86. See Cobo 1990: 123, for women priests acting as confessors to other women. Also see *Huarochirí Manuscript* 1991: 65, 85, 131, 140 for women as priests. See p. 101, for example of a woman who found an object in her field which later became the basis for a state sponsored cult. The object remained in her home, which was enlarged and supported by the community, and she acted as the cult's priestess.

87. See *Huarochirí Manuscript* 1991: 72, 80, 100, for examples of men and women worshipping together. See also Cobo 1990: 136 and 244 for examples of women dancing, drinking and playing music.

88. *Huarochirí Manuscript* 1991: 147-150.

89. See Basch 1982: 53.

90. See Basch 1989: 49, for the legal doctrine of coverture.

91. Unfortunately, the belief that husbands possess their wives is not limited to naming practices. Many states do not recognize marital rape and in those where it is recognized, such as California, it is prosecuted under more lenient statutes than other forms of rape.

92. See Lockhart 1968: 154.

93. See Spalding, 1968 and 1984.

94. Foucault 1980: 119.

References

- Basch, Norma. *In the Eyes of the Law*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982.
- Cobo, Father Bernabé. *Inca Religion and Customs* (1653). Translated and edited by Roland Hamilton. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990.
- Engels, Frederick. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State* (1884). New York: Pathfinder Press, 1979.
- Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.
- _____. *The Foucault Reader*. Edited by Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.
- Garcilaso de la Vega, El Inca. *Royal Commentaries of the Incas and General History of Peru, Part One* (1609). Translated by Harold V. Livermore. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1989.
- González Holguin, Diego. *Vocabulario de la lengua general de todo el Perú llamada Qqichua o del Inca* [1608]. Lima: Instituto de historia, U.N.M.S.M., 1952.
- Korth, Eugene H., S.J. and Della M. Flusche. "Dowry and Inheritance in

- Colonial Spanish America: Peninsular Law and Chilean Practice." In *Americas*, V. XLIII, No. 4, April, 1987.
- Lavrin, Asunción. "Sexuality in Colonial Mexico: A Church Dilemma." In *Sexuality & Marriage in Colonial Latin America*. Edited by Asunción Lavrin. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1992.
- Lockhart, James. *Spanish Peru 1532-1560: A Colonial Society*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.
- _____. *Early Latin America, A History of Colonial Spanish America and Brazil*. New York: University of Cambridge Press, 1985.
- Rabkin, Peggy A. *Fathers to Daughters: The Legal Foundations of Female Emancipation*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1980.
- Salomon, Frank and George L. Urioste. *The Huarochirí Manuscript (1608?)*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1991.
- Scott, Joan Wallach. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Seed, Patricia. *To Love, Honor, and Obey in Colonial Mexico: Conflicts over Marriage Choice, 1574-1821*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988.
- Silverblatt, Irene. *Moon, Sun, and Witches, Gender Ideologies and Class in Inca and Colonial Peru*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Spalding, Karen. *Indian Rural Society in Colonial Peru: The Example of Huarochirí*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1968.
- _____. *Huarochirí: An Andean Society Under Inca and Spanish Rule*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1984.
- Vries, Jan De. *The Economy of Europe in an Age of Crisis, 1600- 1750*. New York: University of Cambridge Press, 1984.
- Zuidema, Tom R. *Inca Civilization in Cuzco*. Austin: University of Texas, 1990.