siempre por proyectar-comunicar una imagen suya muy determinada; una imagen que imponía el temor, el terror, la reverencia y la supeditación. El espectáculo de un terror muy terrenal que se había convertido operativamente en el elemento estratégico más efectivo de su avance hacia Tenochtitlán” (p. 215). Este libro profundiza, además, tanto en la dimensión mítica como en la pragmática en la sociedad azteca, algo que no hace en la misma medida al abordar la sociedad española. Queda para otras investigaciones profundizar en cómo aprovechó Cortés la conciencia colectiva mexica para asentar su poder, una vez fundada Nueva España.

Diana Carrió-Invernizzi

Universidad a Distancia de Madrid


Matthew D. O’Hara’s book, A Flock Divided, is a sophisticated and elegantly written addition to a growing body of literature on the social history of religion in Mexico. Eschewing easy dichotomies, deeply researched, and subtly considered, A Flock Divided challenges historians and sociologists of religion to reconsider some basic units of analysis. The book does not offer a strident revisionism, but its evidence and conclusions produce nuanced revisioning of several areas of consideration in the standard Mexicanist literature. These range from methodological to thematic and the book, taken as a whole, offers a wealth of new ways to think about perennial questions of the topic.

The goal of the book is to examine community formation in Mexico City and its broader environs from the mid-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth centuries. As O’Hara points out, this study challenges the presumed ways that we often go about considering community formation: some study cities, others rural areas; some study race and ethnicity, others religious mentality. O’Hara argues that we can learn a great deal about the ways that Mexico became, in essence, Mexican, by reconsidering some of the presumed dichotomies implicit in community formation. Thus O’Hara combines the study of ethnicity with that of religion; he compares the urban formation of parish life and community with the immediate rural environs of Mexico City. And, finally, the study spans the traditional breakdown between colonial and national periods. Some readers will find this unsatisfying or too ambitious, and some critics have viewed the book as outrunning the evidence for bridging the colonial and national period, though this reviewer does not share those concerns. Nevertheless, the navigation
of these complex dualities is well considered, buttressed by extensive archival evidence, and forceful writing.

The fundamental question of the book is: how do communities come to form identities? We often think of this as explicitly a national, ethnic, or racial question. O’Hara demonstrates that in the case of central Mexico, the ethnic formation of a community was explicitly tied up with religious formation. In this sense, parishes were formed explicitly as ethnically defined spaces. Churches, physical buildings, and associations were ethnically bound. In chapter one he shows how indigenous and mixed-ethnic peoples faced the difficulties of heavy tribute requirements even as many parishes in Mexico City were explicitly formed as indigenous only. Thus indigenous or vaguely mixed ethnic peoples often attempted to claim non-indigenous status to avoid onerous tribute. Yet at the same time ethnic categories became increasingly complex in the eighteenth century, even as the relationship between the Church and indigenous peoples continued to be fraught with paradox and indecision. Chapter two examines the question of “Indianness” on two levels: in the quotidian, religious level in everyday life in Mexico City’s parishes, and in the broader debate about empire and the Church. So we have the cross-currents of evangelization coupled with the deep distrust of Spaniards of indigenous intellectual capacity, refracted in the debate about training an indigenous clergy—a project that was quashed, ultimately. At the same time, by the eighteenth century a formal policy of secularization of indigenous parishes was undertaken. As a result, the long-standing control of indigenous parishes was taken from the mendicants. In the process, O’Hara argues, a move toward the “re-Indianization” of indigenous parish life was promoted.

Part two of the book examines “reform and reaction” of religious and ethnic definitions. Chapter three takes up the secularization of indigenous parishes as it occurred on the ground. Ironically, perhaps, as the Church promoted this secularization, many indigenous communities opposed the reforms that presaged the later Reforma of the 1850s. Likewise, chapter four examines the tension between the late eighteenth-century impetus toward a less communal and more individualist spiritual Catholicism. As others, like Daniela Traffano, have shown, ironically enough, many of the reforms presumably designed to “ease” the burden of communal religion in Mexico were most actively opposed by indigenous communities. For indigenous peoples, communal rites and organizations were not simply religious; they were deeply central to indigenous social life. Reforms intended, for example, to secularize parishes, as O’Hara shows, resulted in the unintended consequence of indigenous peoples often re-asserting their indigenous ethnic status to lay claim to communal possessions or buildings in the parish.
Part three examines the continuity of ethnic identities through the early nineteenth century, despite the formal abolition of ethnic categories in the civic world. Likewise, O’Hara rejects the view that Mexico somehow lacked a sufficient longue durée basis for republican values emergent in the nineteenth century. Instead, O’Hara shows that the long three-century tradition of indigenous community combined neatly with republican ideology.

Taken as a whole, *A Flock Divided* offers a complex picture of everyday life in Mexico City. Instead of simple chaos, the building blocks of ethnic identity, religious formation and participation, and parish identity would, in O’Hara’s assessment, provide more continuity from the colonial to the national period than is often assumed. Ethnic identity is fluid; this is not an especially startling conclusion, but O’Hara has passed this old truism of the colonialist literature through the prism of religious sociology and found that ethnicity was at times bound up with ideology, yet practical and opportunistically self-interested at times. The book offers a fine addition to the scholarly literature on ethnicity, empire, community formation, and religious social life.

**Martin Nesvig**  
*University of Miami*


*Marginados y consagrados* es un grueso e interesante volumen en el que se reúnen trabajos de quince jóvenes investigadores, doce de ellos argentinos, que abordan en sus investigaciones, de modos muy distintos, diversos aspectos de la vida judía en la Argentina en los siglos XX y XXI.

El libro permite constatar la confluencia –señalada por Elizabeth Jelin en su prólogo– entre los estudios judíos y los desarrollos contemporáneos de las ciencias sociales, a la par que la normalización de la historia de los judíos argentinos postulada por Raanan Rein –siguiendo a Paula Hyman– en su presentación del volumen. En este contexto, “normalización de la historia” implica un enfoque que abandona las miradas parroquialistas y esencialistas para dar cuenta de aspectos antes poco trabajados o directamente no advertidos, tales como las trayectorias de personas judías exitosas en distintos campos, los judíos no afiliados a instituciones israelitas o la dimensión trasnacional de la experiencia judía.

Estos procesos se articulan, además, con otras transformaciones en la historia y las ciencias sociales del último cuarto de siglo, en las que predominan