

rather than by the categories of ethnic nation common in earlier years. An evidentiary problem arises here: such records allow Nishida to comment adeptly on familial patterns but fall short of supporting her central point about the development of a collective African identity. That state authorities narrowed categories for identifying Africans tells us more about their own concerns than how the African-born saw themselves.

The third section addresses the Brazilian-born population of colour. Nishida confirms long-held assumptions of firm divisions between Africans and Afro-Brazilians. Expectedly, she finds higher rates of manumission among creole slaves, particularly those of mixed race. The fundamental transformation among the Brazilian-born after 1850, she asserts, was the emergence of a racial identity. Here she demonstrates that the Society for the Protection of the Needy excluded from its membership all but Brazilian-born black males. The 1872 census provides another key source. Nishida acknowledges uncertainty over how officials determined a subject's race but nonetheless concludes that "most likely census taking relied largely on self declaration". "The majority of the Brazilian-born free population of color identified themselves as *pardos*" (mixed race) rather than *pretos* (black) (pp. 146–147). Perhaps; but extant knowledge of the census process simply does not permit us to know whether racial categories represented self-perceptions or merely the assumptions of bureaucrats.

Mieko Nishida successfully demonstrates that African culture survived as it adapted in response to enslavement and manumission, as previous works have established. Her evidence makes clear that state authorities altered their perceptions of people of colour over the century but less convincingly elucidates self-identity. Nishida compiles a good deal of useful material on Salvador's urban slave society, including ways in which gender influenced work patterns. While experts on Brazilian slavery will find much familiar in *Slavery and Identity*, it offers a convenient English-language source for non-specialists disinclined to read earlier works in Portuguese by historians such as Kátia Mattoso, Maria José de Souza Andrade (1988), and Maria Inês Côrtes de Oliveira (1988, 1996). Nishida adds to a small collection of monographs on urban slavery available in English.

Alexandra K. Brown
Florida Atlantic University

NOËL, Françoise — *Family Life and Sociability in Upper and Lower Canada, 1780–1870*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003. Pp. 372.

Françoise Noël's purpose in this study is to describe and explain both the domestic culture and the cult(ure) of domesticity that were common, she argues, among Canadians and *Canadiens* in colonial British North America. Noël's frame of reference is the life-cycle of families, from courtship, marriage, and family formation through childbearing, child-rearing, home work, and household management, to old age and death. The voyage of life unfolds, almost exclusively, through an examination of carefully selected personal diaries and intra-familial correspondence of men and

women who are frequently allowed to speak for themselves on such matters as pregnancy, the proper deportment of children, spousal love, relations with kin and neighbours, leisure pursuits, family economics, grief, and mourning. Noël admits that her arbitrarily restricted primary sources reflect the life experiences and familial preoccupations of the literate middle classes (although I suspect that both Amédée Papineau and Susanna Moodie would resent the categorization) and were deliberately chosen for their emphasis on domestic themes to the exclusion of more introspective concerns, religious experience for example, or public pursuits such as business and travel. She contends, however, that her diarists and correspondents represent a broad spectrum of Upper and Lower Canadian society whose shared domestic culture was the principal subject of their private confidences and shared communications.

Noël argues that the affective family, a product of the eighteenth century, was well established in colonial Canada. Couples married, if not for love, then with the expectation of achieving a companionate relationship of which the product was love. Affection also characterized the relationship between parents and children who, following Rousseau, were to be valued as individuals, their natural sensibilities cultivated and nurtured by caring parents who might spare the rod while insisting, nevertheless, on cheerful deference to age and experience. In this, as in other domestic concerns, especially in times of family crisis, husband and wife shared responsibility, their respective spheres of authority converging and blurring as fathers cared for sick children, wives managed farms and businesses during spousal absences, and constant consultation and interdependence modified the sway of patriarchy. As children matured and parents aged, the culture of intra-familial reciprocity and mutual assistance, informed by affection, persisted in spite of the barriers imposed, for example, by distance. Absence made the heart grow fonder.

What ultimately made the affective Canadian family an effective social and economic unit, Noël concludes, was that “[g]rowing up, courting, marriage, childbirth, childrearing, illness, aging, and death, all took place within [the] protected environment” provided by a “dense matrix” of relatives, friends, and neighbours who willingly participated in the reciprocal exchange of assistance, support, intervention, and affection that made family life a public — that is to say a community — rather than a private affair (p. 276). Courtships frequently began as friendships. Family formation invited, indeed counted upon, the advice and assistance of relatives and neighbours in every event from the marriage festivities to the socialization of children through the final sharing of the widow’s grief. The grand balls, picnics, sleighing parties, fairs, public lectures, and circuses that provided out-of-doors relief from unrelieved domesticity were simply public assemblages of the extended family and therefore also domestic occasions. Habitual “visiting”, sharing intimate family correspondence, and generally foregoing privacy in the interests of friendship all contributed to the creation and maintenance of support networks essential to the family’s survival. One important result, argues Noël, was that the Victorian concept of “separate spheres” of activity and authority, one domestic, the other public, one the purview of women, the other the realm of masculinity, was abrogated by the family’s collective occupation of a much broader social space than the concept of a “domestic sphere” admits.

Family Life and Sociability in Upper and Lower Canada makes an informative Canadian contribution to the accumulated international scholarship of the last 25 years on the history of the family and of domesticity in the nineteenth century, employing similar sources and methods. The book's strength lies in Noël's ability to harvest subtly nuanced insights out of often stony literary ground. Homespun diarists and correspondents were neither as direct, nor as garrulous, nor as literate as historians would like them to be. For that reason, one might reasonably question Noël's methodological strategy of arbitrarily restricting her source material to a limited class of diaries and letters. Time and again, they either fail to yield any meaningful insights into critical family and personal events — pregnancy, miscarriages, birth, festive occasions (anniversaries, birthdays, Christmas) — or fail to suggest topics that a study of domestic life ought to consider. The obvious example here is childless marriages. Families are simply assumed to consist of parents and children: more properly, two parents and their offspring. It may be that the "public" family and its individual members were more "private" and more circumspect in what they confided to their diaries or their correspondents than Noël admits. In any event, other sources might have filled in important gaps. For example, there is a substantial corpus of nineteenth-century immigration tracts, memoirs, reminiscences, and essays that can be mined for life-cycle experiences (see my "The Prose of Life": Literary Reflections of the Family, Individual Experience, and Social Structure in Nineteenth-Century Canada", *Journal of Social History*, vol. 9 [1976], pp. 367–381). Nowhere are the hallmarks of the cult of domesticity held up to closer scrutiny than in the lengthy obituaries that, for example, the *Christian Guardian* afforded Methodist wives and mothers in whose lives religion defined the substance of both earthly and spiritual love and duty. Nor are the National Archives of Canada and the Archives of Ontario the only repositories of nineteenth-century Canadian family correspondence, personal diaries, and other sources of family and domestic history.

These disagreements aside, *Family Life and Sociability in Upper and Lower Canada* is a challenging and informative reconsideration of the social organization of pre-industrial Upper and Lower Canada.

David Gagan
Simon Fraser University

SCHNAPP, Jeffrey T. — *Building Fascism, Communism, Liberal Democracy: Gaetano Ciocca – Architect, Inventor, Farmer, Writer, Engineer*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2004. Pp. 291.

This brief, and forgiving, biography of the twentieth-century Italian inventor Gaetano Ciocca does the reader the service of bringing to light one of the forgotten avatars of modern rationalization, but neglects the opportunity to examine the subject critically. This is the first work in English dedicated uniquely to the life of Gaetano Ciocca (1882–1966), and it reads more like a documentation of his life than a critical interpretation of a man caught up in three political philosophies that competed