

4-1-1995

Getting Beyond Bolton: Columbian Consequences and the Spanish Borderlands: A Review Essay

Light T. Cummins

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr>

Recommended Citation

Cummins, Light T.. "Getting Beyond Bolton: Columbian Consequences and the Spanish Borderlands: A Review Essay." *New Mexico Historical Review* 70, 2 (1995). <https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/nmhr/vol70/iss2/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New Mexico Historical Review* by an authorized editor of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Getting Beyond Bolton: *Columbian Consequences* and the Spanish Borderlands, A Review Essay

LIGHT T. CUMMINS

David Hurst Thomas, ed. *Columbian Consequences*, Vol. I: *Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands West* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989).

David Hurst Thomas, ed. *Columbian Consequences*, Vol. II: *Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands East*. (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990).

David Hurst Thomas, ed. *Columbian Consequences*, Vol. III: *The Spanish Borderlands in Pan-American Perspective*. (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991).

Columbian Consequences resulted from a 1988 decision by the Society for American Archaeology to mark the quincentennial with a series of scholarly conferences devoted to exploring "the social, demographic, ecological, ideological, and human repercussions of European–Native American encounters across the Spanish Borderlands."¹ The Society asked the distinguished historical archaeologist David Hurst Thomas of New York's American Museum of Natural History to coordinate the conferences, supervise the selection of paper presenters, and edit the resultant volumes. Thomas, working with the Society's executive committee, decided on a series of nine topical seminars that would showcase "overviews prepared by leading scholars in the field [which] synthesized current thinking about the specific geographical setting, the Native American context, the history of European involvement, and the history of schol-

Light T. Cummins is the Bryan Professor of History at Austin College. His most recent work is *Spanish Observers and the American Revolution*. Currently, he is working on a monograph, *Oliver Pollack: American Merchant on the Spanish Frontier*.

arly research.”² Three volumes of published proceedings resulted from these meetings, contained in 93 articles written by sixty four archaeologists, eleven historians, nine physical anthropologists, nine ethnohistorians, six cultural anthropologists, five art historians, and three geographers. “I think it fair to conclude,” Thomas later reflected about the project, “that we have looked to a broad community of scholars representing widely different intellectual persuasions.”³ Such is most certainly the case as these three volumes constitute a remarkably thorough compendium of recent scholarship which merits attention and assessment by historians.⁴ In assessing the scholarly importance of these volumes, I will examine current perceptions of borderlands history as a field of historical investigation. Thereafter, I relate how recent interdisciplinary scholarship in the social sciences as represented in the *Columbian Consequences* volumes might be changing the current historiographical foundation of borderlands scholarship. Finally, I suggest why the traditional delineation of the Spanish Borderlands may no longer be valid for historians in the face of this scholarship.

Columbian Consequences, like all academic works dealing with the Spanish Borderlands, rests firmly on the scholarly accomplishments of Herbert Eugene Bolton. It must be noted that almost seventy-five years have passed since Bolton published his landmark volume *The Spanish Borderlands*. Bolton defined the borderlands as “the regions between Florida and California, now belonging to the United States, over which Spain held sway for centuries.” “These were,” he explained, “the northern outposts of New Spain, maintained chiefly to hold the country against foreign intruders and against the inroads of savage tribes.”⁵

Three ensuing generations of historians have built upon Bolton’s early work.⁶ Some of this scholarship has reinforced Bolton’s interpretations, while other parts of it have questioned his fundamental assumptions. All of it has greatly enriched historical knowledge about the comparative colonial eras of United States and Latin American history.⁷ Yet, in spite of all this scholarly production, the Spanish Borderlands suffers as an historical paradigm from an inherent debility: it is a synthetic frame of reference. The borderlands—as an idea—is an interpretive model of scholarship which is superimposed backwards on the past by its practitioners across time and place for purposes of historical analysis. It is a twentieth century concept which permits the historian to reorder and restructure past events within the context of modern geopolitical and societal assumptions.⁸

As such, the Spanish Borderlands idea exhibits the limitations of any analytical model in that it fails to reveal the integrated reality of historical experience. In particular, its organizing assumptions are not based on the contemporaneous world view and consciousness of those peoples who actually lived the history being studied. The “Spanish Bor-

derlands" is not a national history, nor that of a specific group or people. It has shifting frames of perspective and definition across time and geography.⁹ It is in some respects an orphan history because there is no distinct society or geo-political entity that in our own time views the entire history of all the Spanish Borderlands as its special story. The borderlands as an idea thus fails to provide a usable history for any appreciable segment of society today in forming group singularity, self-concept, or identity.¹⁰ In short, the Spanish Borderlands as an historical touchstone has no modern-day proprietary constituency in society at large beyond the historical community, except in the southwestern United States where a limited number of citizens extol the Hispanic colonial heritage from a state-based historical perspective. This fact has forced borderlands historians to perpetually justify their historical focus.

Bolton led the way in this effort. Although he initially explained his work as an attempt to highlight the "non-British" aspects of North American colonial history, Bolton eventually cloaked the borderlands in the more sophisticated protective coverings of his "Greater America" thesis.¹¹ Dozens of later essays advancing various other ideas have since been written across the decades by additional Borderlands historians seeking to define their field of inquiry, delineate its generic attributes, and justify its social utility to a society that finds its usable past elsewhere.¹²

It may be that the justifiers of the Spanish Borderlands as a legitimate field of historical inquiry have failed in their task. "The fecund tradition of borderlands historiography established by Herbert Eugene Bolton during the 1920s," historian Gwendolyn Midlo Hall of Rutgers University recently noted, "has, to a great extent, died on the vine since World War II. . . The Bolton school did not ask the questions, nor use the type of sources that interest historians who strive to create a universal, American consciousness within an increasingly diverse population."¹³ The first reaction to this assertion by a borderlands historian might be to take vigorous exception, if for no other reason than academic "family pride."

Many of the university-trained historians in the United States who today publish on the Spanish Borderlands descend in an educational genealogy of academic training from Bolton and his students. Others are the present-day intellectual progeny of various graduate professors in Southern Colonial and Southwestern Frontier history who were active concurrently with Bolton, especially France V. Scholes, Arthur P. Whitaker, Eugene C. Barker, and Isaac J. Cox. Although not Boltonians in the technical sense, these latter historians established related scholarly traditions prior to World War II that shared a common focus with the Boltonians. All of them manifested consistent interests in the study of European exploration, colonial settlement, frontier institutions, impe-

rial structures, and inter-European rivalries. In addition, the Boltonians themselves exhibited in their publishing a marked pro-Spanish viewpoint, a fondness for identifying "great men" in history, and little interest in indigenous peoples except as they related to Europeans. "Heroic figures and the high drama of exploration and international policy captivated him," David J. Weber has noted of Bolton, "and the establishment of Spanish institutions in the Borderlands interested him intensely."¹⁵

Professor Hall is correct when she notes that post-World War II scholarship has indeed moved away from the questions asked by Bolton, his own contemporaries, and the students he trained prior to World War II. New questions, varied methodologies, and fresh perspectives have enriched Borderlands history during the last three decades.¹⁶ If Bolton's own work became the symbol of the pre-war school, that of Father John Francis Bannon may be characterized as the normative standard of Spanish Borderlands scholarship from the 1950s to the 1970s. Father Bannon's scholarly reputation will probably never surpass that of Bolton. As one of Bolton's University of California students, Bannon's own accomplishments will probably always lie in the shadow of his mentor. Nonetheless, it was Bannon who wrote in the 1960s the first synthetic survey text that summed-up a half-century of borderlands scholarship.¹⁷ Much of Bannon's orientation depended upon Bolton's viewpoints: "Bannon perpetuated Bolton's approach to the Borderlands even as the field began to move away from Bolton's framework and to fragment—as so many areas of history have done since the 1950s."¹⁸ It is this fragmentation that has given recent decades of Spanish Borderlands scholarship a vitality and volume of production that is unprecedented. Hundreds of new studies written during the 1970s and 1980s have examined the demography, ethnography, geo-politics, and economy of the region, along with more traditional institutional topics.¹⁹ Nonetheless, Professor Hall is accurate when she asserts: "The colonial history of these regions has been lost in a no-man's-land. It is peripheral to Latin American history and not yet integrated into the colonial history of the United States."²⁰

What, then, is the Spanish Borderlands and what is its place in current historiography? Those questions can be addressed by considering and assessing the three volume collection of essays *Columbian Consequences*. These volumes highlight two significant matters about the nature of the Boltonian Borderlands as an idea of continuing utility historians. First, a quiet revolution in borderlands scholarship outside the discipline of history has been occurring during the last several decades and, for the most part, without the participation of many historians. This scholarly literature is being produced by historical archaeologists and ethnologists who have been conducting research which has transformed knowledge about the Borderlands. The *Columbian Consequences* vol-

umes are to date the most complete and representative examples of that scholarship. Second, these volumes rest on assumptions and suppositions about the Spanish Borderlands which have the potential to serve as guideposts for a redefinition of the idea of a Spanish Borderlands. A new, emerging definition may well reject the conceptualizations that historians have long used to delineate the Boltonian Borderlands. This is readily apparent in examining the first volume.

The first volume of the trilogy, *Columbian Consequences: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands West*, was published in 1989. In it, Professor Thomas provides an introductory essay entitled "Columbian Consequences: The Spanish Borderlands in Cubist Perspective" that sought to afford an interpretive framework for the entire project. Historians should give this essay special attention because of the "cubist perspective" that Thomas adopted in attempting to answer the question "Why the Spanish Borderlands?" He acknowledges that borderlands scholarship has perpetuated the geographical parameters first defined by Bolton and still accepted today as valid by most historians. "Bolton," he notes, "perceived the borderlands as both a place and a process—a shifting frontier on the margins of the Spanish empire in North America."²¹

Thomas contends that this "spatiotemporal framework," as he calls it, has become obsolete in the face of modern scholarship. He argues that this is so for at least three reasons. First, the Spanish Borderlands were historically more than a frontier since they developed characteristics which were singularly self-perpetuating. Second, the Hispanic perspective adopted by the Boltonians provided an *a priori* restrictive viewpoint which has retarded scholarship conducted from other perspectives. Third, this Hispanic viewpoint encouraged several subsequent generations of historians to view Native Americans as little more than "Borderland irritants." Thomas observes that, for Bolton and his students, the mission system was little more than an arm of the Spanish imperium dedicated to pacifying and civilizing an inferior race. "So defined," Thomas contends of the Boltonians, "Native Americans became only peripheral participants in the borderlands experience, to be discredited and dismissed."²² Given this, it is not surprising that Thomas advocates a new perspective for considering the Spanish Borderlands: what he terms a "cubist" viewpoint. In using this term, he makes an analogy to the artistic movement in which painters rejected the graphic orientation in their work by which a spectator contemplated the scene being rendered from a single, fixed position. "Rejecting this time-honored perspective," Thomas says, "the cubists enlarged the spectator's vision to include multiple, simultaneous views of the subject—as if one could move instantaneously from point to point, up and down."²³ In short, Thomas has called for the end of the Boltonian view of the Spanish Borderlands as the normative standard for an analytical model.

The content of the first volume, by its range and scope, certainly provides a cubist perspective. It focuses broadly on the southwestern borderlands in what might appear to be an eclectic fashion to a "traditional" Borderlands historian. Essays range from material culture of the missions, effects of European contact on Native American health, new technologies for document retrieval in Spanish archives, vegetational changes based on fossil remains, and economic analyses of agricultural production. Nonetheless, the organizational scheme of the volume is centered on three separate geographical areas: the southwestern "heartland" composed of the Pimeria Alta, Sonora, Sinaloa; Texas and the north-eastern frontier of New Spain; and upper and lower California. Each section begins with an overview essay written by a noted authority, thereafter followed by a variety of specialized studies relating to particular aspects of the region's history, ethnography, material culture, demography, or selected aspects of field archaeology.²⁴ In keeping with the cubist perspective, no attempt was made in the selection of topics for the various articles to provide unifying themes or even to highlight points of commonality.

Book reviewers in various scholarly journals greeted publication of the first volume with critical acclaim. Not surprisingly, anthropologists and archaeologists tended to be more lavish in their praise since the majority of the essays reflected those disciplinary orientations. As well, they saw diversity and lack of central themes as a strength. "In accordance with Thomas's definition of a cubist perspective on the Borderlands," Amy C. Earls noted, "involving multiple, simultaneous views of the subject, the articles use a wide range of sources, including archival and archaeological data and also oral history, ethnohistorical, and physical-anthropological viewpoints, in addition to nonanthropological perspectives such as art history."²⁵ Thomas D. Hall, in fact, thought that the entire collection of essays held together very well and felt its primary strength would be to "bring the reader up to date on recent research." He also realized that the emphasis on ethnography, material culture, demography, and natural history represented an historiographical departure. "This counterbalances the general trend," Hall observed, "in writings on the Southwest, and highlights some of the most exciting and promising developments in archaeological research."²⁶

Publication of a second volume followed in 1990, under the title *Columbian Consequences: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives on the Spanish Borderlands East*. It continued the general organizational structure of the first volume, with geographical sections dealing with early Spanish explorations of the colonial Southeast, the impact of Hispanic colonization on the Southeast and the Caribbean, and the missions of La Florida. An overview essay introduces each section, while thirty articles dealing with a diversity of topics complete the remainder

of the volume.²⁷ As in the first volume, the topical articles exhibit great divergence from common themes. Noteworthy topics include explanations of differential persistence, postcontact biocultural change, cultural diversity among Native American groups, African presence in the region, subsistence strategies, biological adaptation among indigenous peoples, and Spanish mission paleoethnobotany.

The second volume attracted an even greater number of scholarly reviews than the first, with most of them favorable. Some reviewers did note the heavy emphasis in this volume on both archaeology and the contact period of the sixteenth century. Michael Mathes, for example, observed that "the studies are predominately archeological, although numerous ethnographic, ethnohistorical, and historical works are included" while primarily providing "insight into the earliest years of European contact."²⁸ Patricia Galloway, while generally lauding the book, noted the uneven quality of selections which were composed variously of "preliminary studies of recent projects, analytical results from long-term research, and theoretical statements." Galloway, however, noted the major problem with this volume:

Overall, it still demonstrates the lack of communication between historians and archaeologists that the project was intended to start to rectify, since most of the (very few) pure historians represented here show little interest in or sympathy with the native side of the story, and no grasp of the methods of ethnohistory; many of the pure archaeologists seem to be working with only a passing knowledge of the available documents.²⁹

In spite of these weaknesses, the second volume provided a valuable and useful introduction to recent scholarly literature that was unavailable elsewhere.

The third and final volume of the trilogy was published in 1991 under the subtitle *The Spanish Borderlands in Pan-American Perspective*. It contains three sections which in comparison to the two previous volumes exhibit greater eclecticism in the selection of topics.³⁰ The first part consists of a series of interpretive or historiographical essays on the nature of the Borderlands experience, including a reprinting of David J. Weber's intelligent essay "The Idea of a Spanish Borderland." Other chapters deal in diverse fashion with Roman models for Spanish colonization, the portrayal of Native Americans at the Chicago World Exposition of 1893, and the "Ramona" legend in late nineteenth century California as an impetus for the popularity of mission-style architecture.

The second section of the final volume constitutes one of the greatest departures of the series, at least in the definition and delineation of the borderlands. It focuses on the border regions of Central America and southern Mesoamerica, with special emphasis on Native American culture. The inclusion of this Hispanic–Native American historical border zone carries forward a notion of comparative history that has been growing steadily in acceptance during the last twenty years among various historians; namely, that the “Boltonian Borderlands” of North America is a concept that might have historical commonality to other geographical border areas across time and place in the past. There seems to be, at least in some scholarly quarters, the feeling that the time has arrived for a new synthesis which permits historical examination of a borderland as a special, recurring, and unique type of historical phenomenon in world history.³¹

Historian Alistair Hennessy cogently advanced this proposition for Latin America in 1978.³² He argued that historical frontiers in Hispanic America could be of two types: inclusive or exclusive. He contended “border zone” frontiers were of an inclusive nature. As such, these regions constituted frontiers of inclusion which moved forward by incorporation of territory and assimilation of native peoples, resources, and indigenous folkways into the host society with an identifiable degree of symbiosis. Although the most profound impact was on the assimilated, this type of border frontier also altered the character of the dominating power from its previous condition. Its institutions and value assumptions responded to new realities created by the processes of adaptation and accommodation, thereby rendering it historically unique from its own origins.

In the third volume, the essays dealing with “the Native context of colonialism” in Central America and southern Mesoamerica support Hennessy’s characterization of inclusive border frontiers in Latin American history. Historians of the Boltonian Borderlands will see many implicit analogies in this section, yet the authors of the various essays seldom make explicit such connections between the two geographic regions. Essays dealing with the political economy of Indian survival, geographical perspectives of Spanish–Indian relationships, social uses of writing among the Cakchiquel Maya, riots among Native American groups, and comparison of cultural assimilation amongst various Native American groups all have profound methodological implications for the study of the Spanish Borderlands. Although most journal reviewers of the third volume failed to comment on the importance of including Central America as part of the borderlands experience, Professor Thomas D. Hall noted in his comments about these essays that there is a clear link

between the two regions. "Events in Central America," he observed, "are connected to events in the Borderlands and, apropos of a cubist composition, these essays give new perspectives on Spanish-Indian interactions."³³

The final section of the last volume deals with "portents for the future of borderlands scholarship." It is here that some of the most provocative and intriguing essays of the trilogy can be found, especially Ann F. Ramenofsky's "Beyond Disciplinary Bias: Future Directions in Contact Period Studies."³⁴ Professor Ramenofsky reviews in this essay the development of anthropological theory regarding contact period studies from the era of Franz Boas to the present. In so doing, she appropriately contends that there was the "lack of theoretical framework" among anthropologists prior to World War II "for explaining postcontact change." Since that time, ethnohistory and cultural history, as employed within an anthropological framework, provided a workable theoretical foundation for important scholarly advances in contact period studies, especially those in archaeology. She believes, however, that such a model is no longer relevant since it depended upon an analogue between precontact and postcontact societies which has retarded focus on the contact period. The time has come, she argues, for a new theoretical basis upon which to base contact period studies. "Because this research is interdisciplinary," Ramenofsky contends, "the presence of theory could eliminate the factionalism between science and antisience that pervades the entire discipline."³⁵ Although Professor Ramenofsky's call for a new, unified theory of contact period studies is rooted solely in a consideration of anthropological issues related to the contact period, her observations can be validly extrapolated by an expanded analogy across time and space to apply to the entire Spanish Borderlands. All scholars of the Spanish Borderlands, for every time period and geographic location, would profit from a new unified theory that links together their interests beyond that delineated by Bolton and his students.

Taken as a whole, a close reading of all the essays in *Columbian Consequences* highlight four weaknesses in the Boltonian model of the Spanish Borderlands. First, many borderlands studies written from the standpoint of "pure" history assume a Hispanic perspective. They trace the territorial expansion of Spanish colonizers into the vacant lands of northern New Spain and the Gulf coast. Then, once this process was well underway, they analyze the cultural, political, and economic development of these regions with either comparison to Native American cultural change or inter-European colonial rivalry, sometimes both. Second, many borderland historical studies—especially those written prior to the 1970s—have had a tendency to de-emphasize social and cultural matters, except as they relate to the political and economic history of the

region. This can be ascribed to the nature of the documents available to Bolton, Bannon, and those who followed them. A preponderance of Borderlands historical writing has been based on the official archival records of governmental offices and the *pliegos* of the Spanish empire in the Indies. Granted, by expert extrapolation, questions of a social, cultural, and private economic nature have been answered by borderlands historians in many fine studies using these records, but in some cases only after adding an element of careful conjecture. Moreover, the southeastern and southwestern borderlands have become increasingly separated from one another because their institutional histories are distinct. Greater reliance upon social and cultural history, however, will no doubt provide the opportunity to find similarities between these two borderland regions. The time has come to employ new sources and insights: ethnographic materials, comments on material culture stemming from historical archaeology, the techniques of the historical geographer, demographers, and others making interdisciplinary contributions from the social and natural sciences. In some cases, information from these scholarly precincts might have greater importance to the historian than the documentary record itself.

Third, the Boltonian time frame which comprehends the Spanish Borderlands as a colonial phenomenon limits its applicability. It was John Francis Bannon who noted: "The Spanish Borderlands became the Mexican Borderlands, and the story closed after three centuries."³⁶ The paucity of that viewpoint is self-apparent to the present-day scholar, both in terms of its restrictive chronology and its blatant hispanophilia. Precontact eras must receive greater attention throughout the entire range of scholarship dealing with Native Americans. The themes developed in these studies should be traced into the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As well, there are important implications for the significant social, cultural, political, and economic developments that continued after the 1820s.

Fourth, the Boltonian delineation of the Spanish Borderlands as an historical model still suffers in the 1990s from confusion with the Greater American thesis. Rather than define a free-standing analytical model for the study of the borderlands as a recurring historical phenomenon, Bolton devoted the latter stages of his career to issuing a call for the unified study of the common American experiences of European exploration, discovery, colonization, colonial administration, and imperial rivalry.³⁷ The study of the Spanish Borderlands as a particular historical phenomenon merely provided Bolton with a case study from which the Greater American thesis could be extrapolated, thereby causing him to underestimate its generic uniqueness.

The rich diversity of scholarly production in the three volumes of *Columbian Consequences* underscores the need for a concerted effort among all scholars working in the geographical region encompassed by the Spanish Borderlands to develop an analytical model which will provide a new paradigm. The time has arrived for a new synthesis which permits historical and archeological examination of a borderland as a special, recurring, and unique type of historical phenomenon. Bolton's model must be altered to provide for scholarly consideration of other geographic locations which have undergone analogous processes across time and place. The nature of these analogies must be defined by historians and related to the contexts provided by historical archaeology, demography, ethnohistory, folklore, historical geography, and other relevant scholarly perspectives.³⁸ Such a synthesis would profit from adopting what is sometimes called a "theory of the middle range." This level of theory involves analytical models "that lie between the minor but necessary working hypotheses that evolve in abundance during day-to-day research, and the all-inclusive systematic efforts to develop a unified theory that will explain all the observed uniformities of social behavior, social organization, and social change."³⁹

David Hurst Thomas's "cubist" perspective offers a foundation upon which to begin that process since it encourages a continuing dialogue between historians and other social scientists.⁴⁰ Such a dialogue in comparative history, as Raymond Grew has noted, "is likely to result in the recognition of unexpected connections between aspects of society previously thought to be unrelated."⁴¹ The development of a new synthesis for borderlands study that embraces documentary history, historical archaeology, and ethnography should be an important task embraced by all interested scholars. These scholars should begin by opening research-oriented dialogues with one another across the range of involved disciplines. As well, they would profit from giving greater attention to the theoretical nature of the borderlands as a unique sort of historical experience throughout human history. The new interpretive model of the Spanish Borderlands which might emerge from such activities ought to de-emphasize the Hispanic viewpoint, increase its focus on social history, highlight ethnic diversity, and recast itself as a type of recurring, generic frontier history.⁴² *Columbian Consequences* provides a significant benchmark in beginning such a process. As David Hurst Thomas recently recalled about the project: "The Columbian Consequences seminars attempted to provide an over-arching mechanism of balance, criticism, and synthesis—stressing throughout the importance of recognizing multiple pasts, and the necessity of de-coupling intellectual inquiry from its associated mythologies."⁴³ That, in itself, is an important first step in the process of getting beyond Bolton.

NOTES

1. David Hurst Thomas, "A Retrospective Look at *Columbian Consequences*," *American Antiquity*, 57 (October 1992), 613.
2. *Ibid.*, 613.
3. *Ibid.*, 615.
4. See Ezra Zubrow, "Goodbye Columbus," *Antiquity*, 67 (September 1993), 669-676. These volumes lack an index limiting their utility as an easy reference. Moreover, the diverse character of the essays (and their sometimes technical nature) work against reading these volumes from cover to cover as narrative literature. Luckily, Anthropologist Ezra Zubrow of the State University of New York, Buffalo, has prepared a short title abstract of each of the articles, listing the volume in which it appears, its author, title, area of coverage, time frame, and providing a one sentence description of the essay's main point. For that reason, I will not mention in this review many of the articles by author or title in favor of recommending Zubrow's calendar.
5. Herbert Eugene Bolton, *The Spanish Borderlands: A Chronicle of Old Florida and the Southwest* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1921), vii.
6. Over the years, the concept of the borderlands has gradually expanded to include the northern frontiers of New Spain and Mexico. See Jose Cuellar, "Beyond the 'Borderlands' is the North of Colonial Mexico: A Latin-Americanist Perspective to the Study of the Mexican North and the United States Southwest," in *The Idea of Spanish Borderlands*, ed. David J. Weber (1982; reprint, New York: Garland, 1991), 279-302.
7. For an introduction to Bolton and his work, see John Francis Bannon, *Herbert Eugene Bolton: The Historian and the Man* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1978). The diversity of historical scholarship that flowed from Bolton's work can be gauged in the respective bibliographies of Bannon, *The Spanish Borderlands Frontier, 1513-1821* (1963; reprint, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1974), 257-87 and David Weber, *The Spanish Frontier in North America* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1992), 491-553. See also, Frank Friedel, et al., "Non-English Settlements in America," in *The Harvard Guide to American History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974), 617-24. Bolton's historical concept of the Spanish Borderlands has moved forward in time to provide a point of geo-political reference for all sorts of scholarship touching on United States/Mexico border studies. See Ellwyn R. Stoddard, et al., eds., *Borderlands Sourcebook: A Guide to the Literature on Northern Mexico and the American Southwest* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1983). This latter volume was sponsored by the Association of Borderlands Scholars, an organization founded in 1976.
8. W. H. Walsh, *Philosophy of History: An Introduction* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), 186. Walsh succinctly points out the problems inherent in this historical approach when he notes: "It seems to me that what is true of foreign travel is also true of history. To go backwards in time is in many ways comparable to going outwards in space, and not least in the circumstance that those who undertake the journey feel the need both to report and to assess. The stories they bring back are not simple descriptions, but what we many call slanted ones: slanted not because they distort facts or deliberately omit them, but because they present them in the light of certain preconceptions which matter to the narrator and to his audience."
9. The transitory nature of the North American Borderlands through time and place has been admirably developed by Abraham P. Nasatir in *Borderland in Retreat: From Spanish Louisiana to the Far Southwest* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1976).

10. Henry Steele Commager, *The Search for a Usable Past and Other Essays in Historiography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967), 3-27. Commager highlights this social usage of history by individuals and groups in the United States. He makes the point that the normative U.S. historical view is from the perspective of the Atlantic coast. Although Commager does not address Spanish Borderlands history, his rejection of it as part of the national historical consensus is implicit in his argument. The U.S. Colonial historian Merrill Jensen in "The Colonial Phase," *The Comparative Approach to American History*, ed. C. Vann Woodward (New York: Basic Books, 1968), 22-23. Jensen is more explicit in his dismissal: "The histories of the independent nations in the New World have many differences, differences rooted in the colonial past which did much to shape their institutions, ideas, and political practices... Yet the differences among the American colonies were more important than their similarities... The Spanish, French, and Portuguese colonies were remarkably alike, but they were quite unlike the English colonies."

11. Herbert Eugene Bolton, "The Epic of Greater America," reprinted in *Do the Americas Have a Common History? A Critique of the Bolton Theory*, ed. Lewis Hanke (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), 69. In the 1932 essay, Bolton argued that all of the Americas had common generic aspects of historical development, much of which was played out on the canvas of the borderlands. He noted that, in the colonial history of the Americas, there are "phases common to most portions of the entire Western Hemisphere; that each local story will have clearer meaning when studied in the light of the others; and that much of what has been written of each national history is but a thread out of a larger strand." Bolton continued, "In a larger framework... many things which have seemed obscure and secondary become outstanding and primary. This applies especially to borderland researches," 98-99.

12. The best examples of this historiographical literature may be seen in the seventeen essays reprinted in David Weber's *The Idea of Spanish Borderlands*. The respective authors include Bolton, Daniel G. Brinton, Marc Simmons, Raymond A. Paredes, Burl Nogle, John W. Caughey, Russell C. Ewing, France V. Scholes, Howard F. Cline, Jose Cuello, Ralph H. Vigil, Donald E. Worcester, Antonio Jose Rios-Bustamente, Michael Scardaville, David J. Weber, Gerald E. Poyo, and Gilberto M. Hinojosa.

13. Gwendolyn Midlo Hall, "Review of *Columbian Consequences*," *Western Historical Quarterly* 22 (August 1991), 359-60.

14. David J. Weber, "Turner, Bolton, and the Borderlands," *American Historical Review* 91 (February 1986), 68.

15. For recent historiography dealing with various parts of the Spanish Borderlands, see: Donald Chipman, "Spanish Texas," in *Texas Through Time*, ed. Walter Buenger and Robert S. Calvert (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1991), 102-33; William S. Coker, "West Florida: The Spanish Presidios of Pensacola, 1686-1763," Amy Turner Bushnell, "Spanish Florida, 1565-1763, and Spanish East Florida, 1784-1821," and Jack D. L. Holmes, "West Florida, 1779-1821," in *A Guide to the History of Florida*, ed. Paul S. George (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), 29-36, 49-62, 63-66; Light Townsend Cummins, "Texas Under Spain and Mexico," in *A Guide to the History of Texas*, ed. Light Townsend Cummins and Alvin R. Bailey, Jr. (New York: Greenwood Press, 1988), 3-16; Light Townsend Cummins, "Spanish Louisiana," in *A Guide to the History of Louisiana*, ed. Light Townsend Cummins and Glen Jeansonne (New York: Greenwood Press, 1982), 3-16; Kimberly S. Hanger, "Spanish Louisiana," *Louisiana Library Association Bulletin* 55 (Summer 1992), 3-12; Iris H. W. Engstrand and Daniel Tyler, "Hispanic California, 1542-1848," in *A Guide to the History of California*, ed. Doyce B. Nunis, Jr. and Gloria Ricci Lothrop (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), 3-20; Frances L. Swadesh, *20,000 Years of History: A New Mexico Bibliography* (Santa Fe, New Mexico: Sunstone Press, 1973); James E. Officer, *Hispanic Ari-*

zona, 1536-1856 (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1987), 409-34; Henry Putney Beers, *Spanish and Mexican Records of the American Southwest: A Bibliographical Guide to Archive and Manuscript Sources* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1979), and Beers, *French and Spanish Records of Louisiana: A Bibliographical Guide to Archive and Manuscript Sources* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1989).

16. John Francis Bannon, *The Spanish Borderlands Frontier, 1513-1821* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962). For a short history of publication data about this book and Bannon's other work, see David J. Weber, ed., "John Francis Bannon and the Historiography of the Spanish Borderlands: Retrospect and Prospect," *Journal of the Southwest* 40, 332-63, in Weber, *The Idea of Spanish Borderlands*

17. Weber, "John Francis Bannon," 339.

18. *Ibid.*, 358-62.

19. Hall, "Review of *Columbian Consequences*," 528. Although Professor Hall does not address it, one might argue that Spanish Borderlands scholarship was more universally accepted by the historical profession prior to World War II than it is today. Indeed, the specialized study of Latin American history in the universities of the United States can be traced to the influences of Bolton and his contemporaries in the training of their graduate students prior to the 1950s. That historiographical link, however, was broken by the time the current generation of borderlands historians came into the full flower of their academic production.

20. Thomas, "Columbian Consequences: The Spanish Borderlands in Cubist Perspective," in *Columbian Consequences*, Vol. 1, 3.

21. *Ibid.*, 5.

22. *Ibid.*, 7.

23. The overview essays are written respectively by Linda S. Cordell (the Heartland), Thomas Hester (Texas), Julia G. Costello and David Hornbeck (Alta California), and W. Michael Mathes (Baja California). Some of the other authors are John L. Kessell, Charles W. Polzer, Kathleen A. Gilmore, Anne Fox, Jack D. Eaton, Ed D. Castillo, Roberta S. Greenwood, and John R. Johnson.

24. Review by Amy C. Earls, *American Antiquity* 56 (October 1991), 733.

25. Review by Thomas D. Hall, *American Indian Quarterly* 15 (Spring 1991), 258-59.

26. Introductory articles were written by Jerald T. Milanich (entradas in the Southeast), Kathleen A. Deagan (Hispanic colonization in the Southeast and the Caribbean), and David Hurst Thomas (the Florida missions). Some of the authors of specialized articles were Ann F. Ramenofsky, Charles R. Ewen, Charles M. Hudson, Eugene Lyon, Jane Landers, Stanley South, John W. Griffin, David J. Weber, and Gary N. Shapiro.

27. Review by W. Michael Mathes, *Western Historical Quarterly* 33 (August 1991), 359-60.

28. Review by Patricia Galloway, *Ethnohistory* 39 (Winter 1992), 65-68.

29. Some of the authors for this volume included David J. Weber, David Hurst Thomas, William R. Fowler, Jr., Elizabeth Graham, Murdo J. MacLeod, Mary W. Helms, Ann F. Ramenofsky, Patricia Galloway, William R. Swagerty, Henry F. Dobyns, and Marvin Harris.

30. For an important example of the modern scholarly literature of comparative frontier history, see Howard Lamar and Leonard Thompson, eds., *The Frontier in History: North America and Southern Africa Compared* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1981). The editors, in acknowledging that the Spanish frontier of North America also fit their comparative criteria, noted: "We regard a frontier not as a boundary or a line, but as a territory or zone of interpenetration between two previously distinct societies. Usually, one of the societies is indigenous to the region, or at least has occupied it for many generations; the other is intrusive," 7.

31. Alistair Hennessy, *The Frontier in Latin American History* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1978), 17-20.

32. Review by Thomas D. Hall, *American Indian Quarterly* 17 (Winter 1993), 138.

33. Professor Ramenofsky serves on the Anthropology faculty at the University of New Mexico. Her own scholarly interests blend together demography, traditional historical research, and historical archaeology while her research interests join the southeastern and southwestern regions of the Boltonian Borderlands. She recently authored *Vectors of Death: The Archaeology of European Contact* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987).

34. Ramenofsky, "Historical Science and Contact Period Studies," *Columbian Consequences Vol. III*, 447.

35. Bannon, *The Spanish Borderlands Frontier*, 228.

36. Hanke, *Do the Americas Have a Common History?*, 10-21.

37. Recent decades have witnessed important collaborations between documentary historians of the Spanish Borderlands and scholars from the social and natural sciences. These have been especially noteworthy in the study of the sixteenth-century southeastern borderlands. Paul Hoffman, Eugene Lyon, Robert S. Weddle, and others have long worked in close collaboration with historical archaeologists, geographers, and ethnologists.

38. Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (New York: Macmillan, 1968), 39-45.

39. Foundations for this cooperation can be seen in the success of a recent publishing project that seeks to place previously published Spanish Borderlands historical articles in the hands of archaeologists, anthropologists, and ethnographers. The Garland Publishing Company of New York City has undertaken this ambitious reprint project and has assembled several hundred borderlands articles into a twenty-six-volume collection entitled *Spanish Borderlands Sourcebooks*. The general editor for the series is David Hurst Thomas.

40. Raymond Grew, "The Case for Comparing Histories," *American Historical Review* 85 (October 1980), 773.

41. In that regard, the term "Spanish Borderlands" itself ought to be avoided in favor of nomenclature that averts confusion with the Boltonian model. David J. Weber has pointed the way with the title of his synthetic overview entitled *The Spanish Frontier of North America*. Indeed, the historical field of frontier studies might be a more appropriate scholarly home for a new paradigm than Latin American history, which has been for so long the historiographical refuge of Spanish Borderlanders.

42. David Hurst Thomas, "A Retrospective Look at *Columbian Consequences*," 615.

New Mexico Historical Review

The *New Mexico Historical Review* provides a forum for high-quality research and writing on New Mexico and the region, its people, and their cultures. The region encompasses all of the states of the American Southwest, including Texas, as well as northern Mexico. A typical issue contains three to five articles, a review essay, book reviews, notices of conferences, calls for papers, announcements of scholarships and fellowships, and other information of interest to scholars and general readers alike.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Individuals \$24
Institutions \$28
Students \$18
Sponsors \$50
Patrons \$100
Single copies \$6

RECENT CONTRIBUTORS INCLUDE:

Félix D. Almaráz, Jr.	John L. Kessell	Joseph C. Porter
Charles R. Cutter	Victoria Lerner	Albert H. Schroeder
G. Emlen Hall	William H. Lyon	Marc Simmons
Rick Hendricks	Michael P. Malone	Dwight L. Smith
A. Yvette Huggins	Gerald D. Nash	William E. Tydeman
Albert H. Hurtado	Charles S. Peterson	Daniel Tyler
Elizabeth Jameson	Donald J. Pisani	Robert Wooster

**SUBMISSIONS AND SUBSCRIPTION
ORDERS SHOULD BE SENT TO:**

New Mexico Historical Review
University of New Mexico
Mesa Vista 1013
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131-1186
Ph: 505-277-5839 Fax: 505-277-0992