

sexually incompatible pairs could be excused from their vows. Over the course of the century, however, it began to be interpreted more frequently to mean general unhappiness. Women and their lawyers successfully pushed this argument to encompass more than the strict interpretation. Through these court documents, Hunefelt demonstrates how women, by the end of the nineteenth century, were challenging the prevailing notions of patriarchy. Her conclusions are particularly interesting because historians have tended to see this change as related to rapid economic growth and change, as well as the massive immigration that brought many new ideas to Latin America. Also, her work contributes to a growing body of work on gender in late-colonial and national period Latin America.

Like Hunefelt's previous study on slaves and their families in nineteenth-century Lima, this book is the product of meticulous research. Hunefelt has veritably mined the archives. She is to be congratulated on such fine work. Her deft analysis provides an intimate portrait of families and neighborhoods as she weaves together the various strands of domestic conflicts and life stories. It is refreshing to read a book so strong on content and with little of the verbosity of theory that has become so trendy. This is not to say that Hunefelt's work is without its theoretical basis, just that evidence takes the foreground. My only quibble is that the author could make more efforts to relate her findings to the larger literature on Latin America, and that the sense of chronology in the book is often diffuse. She is not always clear on the timetable of alterations, and thus the reader is left with a sense that everything is happening all at once. Still, this is an excellent study that will be appreciated by specialists in the field, and is written in such a way that it ought to be considered for classroom adoption.

Sonya Lipsett-Rivera

Carleton University

WILLIAM H. BEEZLEY and DAVID E. LOREY (eds.): *Viva Mexico! Viva la Independencia!: Celebrations of September 16*. Wilmington, DE: SR Books, 2001.

Within the rapidly expanding historiography on the "invented traditions," "imagined communities," and "hegemonic" state- and nation-building projects of modern polities, a growing number of scholars have looked at public celebratory life in Mexico from the colonial period to the present. The public panoply of patriotic and religious ritual has been richly reconstructed empirically, and analyzed as state pedagogy, an appropriated festal vehicle for popular protest, a juggernaut of social and political control, deep cultural

text, and so forth. Both co-editors of the anthology under review have made significant contributions to this virtual sub-genre in recent years, David Lorey with an ongoing project on secular political holidays in the twentieth century, William Beezley with similar work of his own on the nineteenth century and as co-editor of an earlier, foundational collection of essays on cognate themes, *Rituals of Rule, Rituals of Resistance: Public Celebrations and Popular Culture in Mexico* (1994). Beezley and Lorey have produced a fascinating volume here on public observances of Mexico's Independence day, 16 September, since the years immediately following the Mexican colony's separation from Spain in 1821. The essays are for the most part empirically rich, evocative of the eras they portray, and of more than sufficient sophisticated conceptualization to speak to ongoing debates in political and cultural history about the function of public rituals not only as instruments of elite hegemonic projects, and as venues for struggle over public memory and national identity, but also as opportunities for the expression of more exuberant popular ideas and forms of subaltern resistance.

The volume begins with a brief but thoughtful introductory essay by the co-editors setting forth a number of ideas about the functions of patriotic ceremony in Mexico, and following a strongly culturalist line. Of the dozen essays that follow, stretching temporally from the early 1820s or so to the 1940s, among the most completely realized and interesting are those of Isabel Fernández Tejedo and Carmen Nava Nava on nineteenth-century celebratory, literary, and iconic portrayals of Father Miguel Hidalgo's *Grito de Dolores*, the clarion call to arms uttered by the parish priest of the village of Dolores in the early morning hours of 16 September 1810; Michael Costeloe's on the politics of Independence observance as exemplified by the activities of the capital's elite Junta Patriótica between 1825 and 1855; Javier Rodríguez Piña's on political conservatives' version of the events of 1810, and their insistence on the central role of Agustín de Iturbide's consummation of independence in 1821; Nora Pérez-Rayon E.'s on the commemorations of 1900; Mauricio Tenorio Trillo's strongly post-modernist and very thoughtful piece (previously published) on Mexico City and the Independence celebrations on the eve of the Mexican Revolution (1910); and Elaine C. Lacy's on the celebration of the Independence centennial by the Álvaro Obregón government in the capital, in 1921.

All the authors of these essays have passed well beyond the finger-pointing and giggling that characterized some earlier efforts in the cultural history field, in which practitioners took great pride in pointing to the range of meanings in public rituals of which the actors may not have been aware. Although the descriptions of the festivities—the speeches, the banquets, the floats, the parades, etc.—tend to become somewhat repetitive, with each

author adding variations that accreted over time, there is a great deal of value in the cumulative exercise itself. Working at more than just a simple 'decoding' of parades and speeches, the authors (as in Michael Costeloe's essay, for example) point to ways in which forms of popular nation-building emerged more or less spontaneously from civil society and an emergent public sphere as early as the first decades of the nineteenth century. Furthermore, what seems to have been at issue among the (primarily elite) groups contending to impose their versions of Mexican Independence was less the future of Mexico, or its "nationness," but its past, mostly the nature of the Spanish conquest, the colonial period, and who should receive credit for ending colonial rule. In this regard, one of the most striking themes of the book is the enduring argument about the role of Agustín de Iturbide in Mexican Independence; in fact, the entire collection can almost be regarded as an extended meditation on this theme, or as the history of recurrent plebiscites on whether to rehabilitate Iturbide or not. He was typically the darling of creole, conservative, and Hispanophile groups, and was vilified by liberals and Hispanophobes. The day on which his Army of the Three Guarantees entered the capital in triumph, 27 September 1821, was officially celebrated intermittently at least as late as 1858. Taken as a whole, the essays tell the story of how the symbols of this great national celebration became gradually stabilized over time, but still remained remarkably plastic and subject not only to manipulation by specific political groups, but to the *vaivenes* of Mexican political life.

If one were to raise criticisms about the essays, they would be of a pretty predictable sort. In the first place, our view of how people imputed meanings to the symbols of Independence, and through them developed and marketed a vision of Mexico's birth-event, is limited largely to the elite groups who wrote the programs, pamphlets, speeches, and descriptive accounts of these public celebrations. But this is a characteristic silence—that of subaltern voices—in many forms of cultural history, having to do with the absence of appropriate sources. In the second place, the collection focuses overwhelmingly on Mexico City for much the same reasons, with the exception of Sergio Canedo Gamboa's interesting but abbreviated essay on San Luis Potosí in the years 1824-1847, and the part of William Beezley's essay that deals with Puebla at the height of the *juarista* restoration. If there were important regional variations in Independence celebrations outside the capital, they do not show up here. Still, these are in the end relatively minor quibbles about a fascinating and sophisticated group of essays that illuminate the most imposing of Mexican patriotic rituals.