



www.senado2010.gob.mx

www.juridicas.unam.mx

MANY CONQUESTS: SOME TRENDS AND SOME CHALLENGES IN MEXICAN HISTORIOGRAPHY (1945-69): THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

JOHN LEDDY PHELAN

The obvious fact of the history and the historiography of this period is the conquest and its long-range cultural consequences. Since 1945 historians have become increasingly aware that the conquest was a process of cultural *mestizaje*. Ideologically speaking, the conquest was a “double conquest”. The conquerors and the conquered influenced each other reciprocally. It is this context which has provided the framework for much of the significant history of Hapsburg México published since the end of World War II.

This paper makes no pretense to a complete coverage of the literature in a quantitative sense. Its purpose is the more modest one of focusing attentions on some of the major new trends as reflected in a series of books that I consider to be representative. Some attention is also given to the challenges of the immediate future. Hence the criterion to some extent, at least, is subjective. Some may call it opinionated. Therefore this essay may provoke controversy. Hopefully more light than heat will ensue.

No attention will be paid to the republication of important primary sources unless those editions contain substantive prologues.

THE “DEMOGRAPHIC” CONQUEST

The central fact of early Mexican colonial history is demographic in nature. How many Indians were there in 1519 and what happened to the population curve between 1519 and 1700? The history of Hapsburg México can not be written without attempting to answer these questions. The institutional, the cultural, the religious, the economic and even the artistic developments of these two centuries were molded to a significant degree by the changes in the Indian population and the growth of the European and mestizo communities.

Demographic estimates are sharply divergent. Don Angel Rosenblat has given us no absolute population figures. His concern has been to delimit the trends and to analyze their causes. His thesis is that the Indian population in the sixteenth century remained essentially static. There was a slow replacement and absorption in mixed bloods rather

than massive destruction.¹ His arguments are founded on a technique of textual criticism developed by institutional and legal historians in Spain prior to 1936. This methodology consists of a complex series of rejections, selections and alternate interpretations of documents. As Woodrow W. Borah (admittedly a not disinterested observer) has pointed out, "Unfortunately, as the technique is used in this essay, scholars can disagree endlessly about which source is reliable, which ought to be discarded, which interpretation of the text is correct and so on."²

Señor Rosenblat is the most articulate opponent of the Berkeley school of Mexican colonial demography. In a remarkable series of monographs the first one of which was published in 1948 by Lesley Byrd Simpson and Sherburne Cook, Cook and Borah have presented us with some startling conclusions. In 1948 the Cook-Simpson estimate for the Indian population in 1519 was 11,000,000 with a drastic decline to about 1,500,000 by 1650. A gradual recovery took place in the eighteenth century until in 1793 the Indian population had climbed to 3,700,000. The 1963 Borah-Cook estimate has raised the preconquest population to an approximate figure of 25,200,000 million. The demographic nadir was reached in 1605 when the Indian population had declined to about 1,075,000.³

The Berkeley method is statistical reconstruction and verification based on a sophisticated use of the tribute rolls and other quantitative data which are amazingly plentiful by the middle of the sixteenth century.

My confidence in the findings of the Berkeley school rests in part on my own research in the history of ideas. The Franciscan chronicler Gerónimo de Mendieta, was a practical man who knew how to count and who likewise held positions of leadership in the Franciscan order. He was also a Franciscan mystic who was deeply troubled by the drastic diminution of the Indian population which occurred during his residence in New Spain between 1555 and 1596. His interpretation of the acute demographic crisis was personal and subjective. He saw it as an apocalyptic catastrophe.⁴ His contemporary, Friar Bernardino de

¹ Angel Rosenblat, *La población de América en 1492: Viejos y nuevos cálculos* (México, El Colegio de México, 1967). An earlier edition was published in Buenos Aires in 1945.

² Woodrow W. Borah's review of Rosenblat in *Hispanic-American Historical Review*, August, 1968, p. 475.

³ The first volume of the Berkeley school was published by Cook and Simpson in 1948 in the Ibero-American series of the University of California Press. In the same series volumes 43 (1960), 44 (1960), 45 (1963), 50 (1968) Borah and Cook have published their major demographic findings.

⁴ John Leddy Phelan, *The Millennial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New*

Sahagún, was equally explicit about the drastic decline of the Indian population, but he refused to give an apocalyptic interpretation to that event.⁵ Sahagún envisaged the future of New Spain as a community of mestizos rather than Indians. He turned out to be an accurate prophet.

Charles Gibson in his study of the valley of México agrees with the essential soundness of the Cook-Borah thesis. So does José Miranda.⁶

In dealing with colonial demography there is no alternative but to employ a statistical and quantitative approach. We have an abundant amount of data that lends itself to quantification. It could be that some of the Borah-Cook conclusions may be modified, but the Berkeley school must be met on their ground of quantitative methodology. No critic of the Berkeley school has yet met this challenge.

Hence, until modified or refuted, their demographic findings form the firm foundation upon which to reconstruct the whole history of early colonial Mexico.

Perhaps the most imaginative achievement of Cook-Borah and Simpson is to have demonstrated, nearly twenty years ago, how the social sciences can be profitably applied to the history of early colonial Mexico, just as these same methods have long been used to survey contemporary issues. While we can never renounce the humanistic tradition of historiography, the future of early colonial Mexican studies, to some extent at least, lies with those who will apply some social science methodologies with discretion, imagination and sophistication.

THE CONQUEST OF THE "CONQUERORS"

A whole new dimension to the conquest has been opened by Irving A. Leonard in his *Books of the Brave* (1949) and Ida Rodríguez Prampolini in her *Amadises de América: la hazaña de Indias como empresa caballeresca* (1948). Both scholars amply document how the conquistadores were deeply influenced by the novels of knight errantry and that the principal chronicles of the conquest vividly reflect this lifestyle. Thus popular culture clashed with the rationalist spirit of the Renaissance led by moralists and intellectuals molded in the image of Erasmus. Both authors persuasively argue that the ideal of chivalry with

World: A Study of the Writings of Gerónimo de Mendieta, 1525-1604 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1956), pp. 88-92.

⁵ See the second, revised edition of the *Millennial Kingdom* scheduled for release in the fall of 1969 by the University of California Press, Ch. X.

⁶ Charles Gibson, *The Aztecs Under Spanish Rule: A History of the Valley of Mexico, 1519-1810* (Stanford University Press, 1964), p. 142. José Miranda, "La población indígena de México en el siglo xvii", *Historia mexicana*, xii (1962-63), 182-189.

its reliance on faith and intuition and its scorn for prudence and reason were deeply embedded in the Spanish temperament.

On the occasion of the centenary of the death of William H. Prescott the *Hispanic-American Historical Review* dedicated its February, 1959 issue to the patriarch of North-American hispanists. David Levin in his seminal article in that issue subjected Prescott to a historicist analysis.⁷ Prescott articulated the bias of the Romantic age in which he lived. But Prescott was fortunate in that he did not have to impose "romantic formulae" on the sixteenth centuries accounts that he used. Bernal, Cortés, López de Gómara, Herrera were "romantics" three centuries before Romanticism was a literary vogue.

Our knowledge of the conquest has been broadened by several regional case-studies. One is Robert S. Chamberlin's *The Conquest and Colonization of Yucatán, 1517-50* (1948), and Philip Wayne Powell's *Soldiers, Indians and Silver: The Northward Advance of New Spain, 1550-1600* (1952). The Spanish advance into the Chichimeca country, the "second conquest" of México, took forty years to accomplish in contrast to the rapidity of the "first conquest". Employing all the techniques of guerrilla warfare, the nomadic Chichimecas could not be conquered until the Spaniards could make them sedentary. The Spanish recipe for victory was the proverbial carrot and the stick, sixteenth century style. The importance of the "second conquest" can scarcely be exaggerated, for it laid the territorial basis of what was to become the modern Mexican nation.

Another original contribution is C. Harvey Gardiner's *Naval Power in the Conquest of Mexico*, a study with some fresh insights into this heretofore neglected aspect. Maurice G. Holmes' *From New Spain by Sea to the Californias: 1519-1668* (1964) is a well-researched synthesis of the activities of New Spain's most active explorers of the Pacific from Cortés to Ulloa.

The controversial and brilliant personality of Hernán Cortés has been the subject of continuing polemic. Salvador de Madariaga, now a venerable octogenarian and one of the last surviving spokesmen of the Spanish Republican generation, has given us an elegantly written biography that is zestfully Spanish in tone (*Hernán Cortés*, 1941). The late, distinguished Manuel Giménez Fernández in his *Hernán Cortés y su revolución comunera en la Nueva España* (1948) advanced the arresting but not totally convincing thesis that there was a parallel between the revolt of Cortés against Velásquez and the contemporary Comunero revolt in Spain. R. H. Wagner in his *The Rise of Fernando*

⁷ David Levin, "History as Romantic Art: Structure, Characterization and Style in the *Conquest of Mexico*", February, 1959, pp. 20-45. Also see James D. Cockcroft, "Prescott and His Sources", *Ibid.*, February, 1968, pp. 59-74.

Cortés (1944) has unearthed some new documentation and has offered some new interpretations.

One of the most insightful innovations in the historiography of the conquest are two essays of the late Ramón Iglesias on the endless debate between the partisans of Bernal Díaz and López de Gómara. Lesley Byrd Simpson has commented:

[These essays were] in reality a study of the growth of a historian, himself, in the light of experience. He had written the first essay prior to 1936. Like most of us he had written in his study, working from documents. Upon the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War he joined the Loyalist army in which he served until the débâcle of 1939. In those heart-breaking years he learned something of history in the raw and a great deal about the virtues of military leadership, and by 1939 he found himself in complete disagreement with the Ramón Iglesias of 1936 with respect to Bernal Díaz's evaluation of Cortés. In this reversal he discovered a new regard for Gómara, and in his second essay he re-established Gómara as our first authority on the conquest of Mexico.⁸

Ramón Iglesias saw history as an art form. He realized more than most of us that to be a historian was also to be a philosopher of history. Another contribution was the volume he supervised in which his students at the *Colegio de México* subjected some of our most respectable primary sources on the history of the conquest of Mexico to a critical and still largely valid analysis. The *Estudios de historiografía de la Nueva España* (1945) is still indispensable reading.

Controversial and partisan though it may be, Eulalia Guzmán's *Relaciones de Hernán Cortés* (1958) cannot be ignored. Doña Eulalia, who began her career in José Vasconcelos' ministry of education, writes with passion and hatred for everything Spanish. Her history is *l'histoire engagé*. She sets out to prove that Cortés was a Machiavellian villain, a confirmed liar and ruthless tyrant. Her examination of Cortés' letters against the other sources, in particular the Indian accounts, is rigorous if not selective and often partisan. Yet no one can now accept the account in Cortés' letters as the simple veracity of specific events of the military conquest. Señorita Guzmán has raised too many questions that can not be brushed under the carpet. Although the *Relaciones de Hernán Cortés* can not be discounted, any new interpretation of Cortés character and role will scarcely conform to doña Eulalia's one-sided portrait.

The literature of the conquest has been polemical and acrimonious since Francisco Javier Clavijero published his *Historia antigua de México* in 1780-81. The often agonizing process of Mexicans searching for the Mexican has been characterized by a wide polarity. Ideological traditionalists and conservative politicians have identified with *lo Cortés*,

⁸ *Ibid.*, May, 1948, p. 163.

and ideological innovators and supporters of political liberalism have sought historical justification in *lo Cuauhtémoc*. Eulalia Guzmán may be one of the last representatives of the liberal identification with *lo Cuauhtémoc*.

As Mexicans achieve a more secure and articulate sense of national identity, a reconciliation between the Hispanic and the indigenous traditions seems both desirable and possible. The history of the conquest in recent years is beginning to be written in the spirit of those accurate words inscribed on a plaque in the Plaza de Tres Culturas:

El 13 de Agosto de 1521
 Heroicamente defendido por Cuauhtémoc
 Cayó Tlatelolco en Poder de Hernán Cortés
 No fue Triunfo ni Derrota
 Fue el Doloroso Nacimiento del Pueblo Mexicano
 Que es el México de Hoy

THE CONQUEST OF THE "VANQUISHED"

Evidence of the gradual rapprochement of the Hispanic and the indigenous traditions is the non-polemical tone with which the conquest of the "vanquished" has been written in recent decades. A most significant innovation is that the conquest is no longer seen only in a Spanish perspective. The Indian response, at long last, has been documented with compassion, sophistication and with some objectivity.

The Aztecs are no longer judged by the standards of Renaissance Europe but are now understood in terms of the historical development of Nahuatl culture and society. This important innovation owes much to the anthropological investigations of Manuel Gamio, Alfonso Caso, Robert H. Barlow, Wigberto Jiménez Moreno, S. G. Morley, G. S. Vaillant, to mention only a few. These contributions, important though they may be, are somewhat beyond the scope of this paper. Attention now needs to be focused on the new historical portrait of Aztec society on the eve of the conquest and the dramatic confrontation of the two cultures at the time of the conquest.

An outstanding contribution is that of the French anthropologist, Jacques Soustelle, *La vie quotidienne des Azteques a la veille de la conquete espagnole* (Paris, 1959). This richly documented study is an outstanding example of social history in the classic tradition of French synthesis. As Ralph L. Beals has commented:

For him the calpulli was a territorial organization, not a clan or clan-derived, and Mexico-Tenochtitlan is not an overgrown pueblo but a great urban center of civilization, head of an expanding empire. Aztec

society is not an emergent tribalkingship structure but a markedly hierarchical society in vigorous development. While avenues of upward mobility still existed for the freemen, an increasingly powerful nobility was facing the growing wealth and power of the merchant class.⁹

Manuel Moreno has given us new insights and new data in his *La organización política y social de los Aztecas* (1962).

Another new dimension is the emphasis now being placed on intellectual history. Angel María Garibay has published an important *Historia de la literatura náhuatl* (1953) as well as several other monographs and texts of literary history. Miguel León-Portilla's *La filosofía náhuatl* (1956-59), also translated in English, has taken Werner Jaeger's *Paideia* as a model. León-Portilla has reconstructed with imagination and sensitivity the philosophical world-view of the Aztecs, an indispensable prerequisite to any understanding as to why Montezuma II acted the way he did in his confrontation with Cortés.¹⁰

There is not a more zestfully written nor a more imaginatively conceived portrait of Montezuma than R. C. Padden's *The Hummingbird and the Hawk, Conquest and Sovereignty in the Valley of Mexico* (1967). The recreation of the world of the priestly monarch of the Aztecs is moving, lively and three-dimensional. The Renaissance world of Cortés, on the other hand, is flat and insipid.

Miguel León-Portilla's *Visión de los vencidos, relaciones indígenas de la conquista* (1956), a series of translations from Aztec sources, is a many-sided picture of the responses of the Indians to the apocalyptic event of the Spanish conquest.

A common spirit animates all of these studies. It is the desire to reconstruct the Aztec world in Aztec terms without falling into the trap of the dichotomy between *lo Cortés* and *lo Cuauhtémoc*.

THE "IDEOLOGICAL" CONQUEST

Some exciting history has been written within the framework of the conquest as a clash of ideas and ideals. Nowhere can this new approach to the conquest as an intellectual enterprise be more fully appreciated than in the celebrated polemic between Lewis Hanke and Edmundo O'Gorman. Hanke believed that the great debate concerned the nature of the American Indian. O'Gorman, a spiritual student of Dilthey and Ortega, argued that the issue in the debate was the nature of

⁹ *Ibid.*, February, 1956, p. 102.

¹⁰ Also see by Miguel Leon-Portilla *Ritos, sacerdotes y atavios de los dioses* (Mexico City, 1948) and *Siete ensayos sobre la cultura náhuatl* (Mexico City, 1958).

man apropos of the American Indian. Hanke saw Las Casas' ideal as justice *per se* with Las Casas' opponents as champions of injustice. O'Gorman preferred to view the great debate as a struggle between two different conceptions of justice, which were reflections of the ideological and spiritual crisis of the sixteenth century. While focusing clearly on the philosophical differences between Las Casas and Sepúlveda, O'Gorman also stressed the *zeitgeist* that the two thinkers shared in common.¹¹

At the Valladolid debate Las Casas and Sepúlveda were mutually incomprehensible. Las Casas was a Scholastic philosopher working for the universal interests of the Christian commonwealth and Sepúlveda a Renaissance Aristotelian serving the political interests of Spanish nationalism. Both men shared the Aristotelian view that the more perfect should rule the less perfect. To Las Casas this proposition meant spiritual assistance to pagan peoples by converting them rationally and peacefully to Christianity. To Sepúlveda this Aristotelian principle meant the abrogation of pagan peoples' sovereignty and their conquest by force. Las Casas expressed the ancient-medieval ideal of the brotherhood of man linked together by a common supranatural destiny. Sepúlveda spoke for the more modern ideal of the fraternity of all men belonging to one nation that was destined to include all humanity. Only in this context can one understand how Las Casas might accuse his opponents of being unchristian, and they in turn denounce him for being unpatriotic.

Scholars will be debating for some time to come the issues raised in the Hanke-O'Gorman polemic. These questions, of course, will never be resolved, for each generation will see a new dimension in these ancient juridical-theologian disputes. But all of us, who have written about the history of early colonial Mexico, should be deeply grateful to both Lewis Hanke and Edmundo O'Gorman for having raised these issues.

One of the major contributions to the ideological aspect of the conquest has been the important role that the thought of Erasmus and Thomas More played. Silvio Zavala was the pioneer who first explored this road.¹² George Kubler, Fintan B. Warren, Marcel Bataillon among others have also made additional contributions.¹³ The late José Mi-

¹¹ For the bibliography on the Hanke-O'Gorman polemic see Edmundo O'Gorman's edition of Fray Bartolomé de las Casas, *Apologética historia sumaria* (2 vols., Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1967), I, cxiii-cxv, cxvii-cxviii.

¹² The most concise statements of Zavala's contribution are *Recuerdo de don Vasco de Quiroga* (México, 1967) and *Filosofía de la conquista* (México, 1947).

¹³ Marcel Bataillon's has a concluding chapter on Erasmian influence in Mexico in the Spanish edition of *Erasme et l'Espagne* (Paris, 1937). Fintan B. Warren, *Vasco de Quiroga and his Pueblo-Hospitals of Santa Fe* (Washington, Academy of American Franciscan History, 1963).

randa and Richard E. Greenleaf have expressed some reservations and doubts. Miranda in his *Victoria y los intereses de la conquista de América* (1947) pointed out that Archbishop Zumárraga's borrowings from the European humanists were selective and opportunistic. Many of the affinities, he argued, were in fact coincidental. On such major issues as worship of the saints and the adoration of images the first Archbishop of Mexico and the Northern European humanists were poles apart. Richard E. Greenleaf in his *Zumárraga and the Mexican Inquisition: 1536-43* (1962) has provided us with a meticulously documented portrait of the Archbishop as a intolerant burner of heretics. I would argue that being a witchhunter and being an Erasmus humanist were not mutually exclusive. Such were the contradictions of the time. Be this as it may, *philosophia Christi* left a recognizable imprint on ideological developments. The critical skepticism of Miranda and Greenleaf refines but actually fortifies this important fact.

Ever since the publication of James Brown Scott's *The Spanish Origin of International Law* in 1934 scholars have recognized the central role of the thought of Thomas Aquinas in the ideological conquest of America. This influence found its most articulate expression in Aquinas's two most significant, sixteenth century disciples —Francisco de Vitoria and Bartolomé de las Casas. All those who have worked on Las Casas have made significant contributions to defining this Thomistic influence. Among them are Marcel Bataillon, Lewis Hanke, Manuel Giménez Fernández and Edmundo O'Gorman. Once again the late José Miranda played the role of skeptic. While not denying the importance of Vitoria's theories as an ideological defense of the natural rights of the Indians, Miranda also stressed that these were also theories that defended ecclesiastical authority against the encroachments of temporal power. Hence the Dominicans were not totally disinterested defenders of the Indians.

The publication of Robert Ricard's magisterial study underscored the decisive role of the Franciscans in the missionary enterprise. In his *Millennial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World*, John L. Phelan explored with a historicist criterion the "political theology" of the Franciscans of which the missionary enterprise was its practical expression. The heir of a long tradition of Franciscan apocalyptic mysticism which was closely identified with the followers of the prophet Joachim of Fiore, the discovery of the New World foreshadowed the End of the World, according to Mendieta. Before that awesome event could come to pass, the Franciscans and the Indians together could create the millennial kingdom on earth. Mendieta's Franciscan stance differed sharply from Philip II's policies and also from the aims of both the Dominicans and the Jesuits.

Others who have explored the Franciscan ideology are Luis Gon-

zález Cárdenas, the late Ramón Iglesias and José Antonio Maravall.¹⁴ The biographical study of Sahagún published by Luis Nicolau D'Olwer deserves special mention. Howard Cline, Alejandra Moreno Toscano and John L. Phelan have reestablished the importance of Juan de Torquemada's *Monarquía indiana*, which has been unjustly disdained as a work of plagerism ever since Joaquín García Icazbalceta's pioneer study.¹⁵

The Franciscan view will soon be enriched by two forthcoming studies. Edmundo O'Gorman's seminar is currently preparing a new edition of Motolinía's works, an edition which will also contain one of O'Gorman's lucid prologues. Miguel León-Portilla's seminar is preparing a similar critical edition of Torquemada's *Monarquía indiana*.

THE "PHILOSOPHICAL" CONQUEST

Edmundo O'Gorman has developed a highly original and ecumenical vision of the discovery of the New World which he calls the "philosophical" discovery. Deeply influenced by the "perspectivism" of José Ortega y Gasset, the historicism of Wilhelm Dilthey and the existentialism of Martin Heidegger, O'Gorman asked the ontological question: "What is America"? For O'Gorman America is not merely a geographical entity: it is an idea.

In his *Crisis y porvenir de la ciencia histórica* O'Gorman lucidly explained his historicist philosophy of history. In 1951 he published his *Idea del descubrimiento de América*. Columbus did not "discover" America. America did not yet exist as a "thing in itself" fully predestined and constituted and thus an object ripe for discovery.

In a sequel, *La invención de América: el universalismo de la cultura de Occidente* (1958) O'Gorman argued that America was "invented" rather than discovered. The when and the how of America's appearance in the historical consciousness of Europe is the principal focus of America: 1) the "geographical" and 2) the "historical". The focus is this book. O'Gorman concentrated on two aspects of the invention of on a rigorous analysis of the texts of Columbus and Vespucci.

O'Gorman's approach to the philosophical invention is dialectical

¹⁴ Luis Gonzalez Cardenas, "Fray Geronimo de Mendieta, pensador politico e historiador", *Revista de historia de America*, núm. 28 (December, 1949), pp. 331-376. Ramon Iglesia, "Invitación al estudio de Fr. Jeronimo de Mendieta", *Cuadernos americanos*, iv (July-August, 1945), 156-72. Jose Antonio Maravall, "La utopia politico-religiosa de los franciscanos en Nueva España", *Estudios Americanos*, i (January 1949), 197-227.

¹⁵ See Howard Cline's article on Torquemada's sources in the Spring, 1969, issue of *The Americas*.

and Hegelian. Richard Morse defined the paradox of O'Gorman's analysis when he wrote:

Western culture is at once Europocentric and universalistic. The "invention" of America is therefore a step toward the historic fulfillment and toward the "ontological disintegration" or "self-liquidation" of Europe. Likewise, America both fulfills and "annihilates" herself as she becomes aware of her ecumenical role.

Morse added:

One may criticize Professor O'Gorman for his oracular tone, for his tendency to verbalize, for the narrow range of evidence with which he supports sweeping ideas, and for his parochialism that tinges his ecumenical vision. He opens a fruitful approach, however, for studying the Americas as a whole, and he provides moments of intellectual stimulation rarely matched in the often pedestrian historiography of the lands of Amerigo.¹⁶

THE "SPIRITUAL" CONQUEST

Our knowledge of the missionary enterprise still rests on the firm foundation laid by Robert Ricard in his now classic, *La "conquête spirituelle" du Mexique*. First published in 1933 it has been translated into both Spanish and English. This study is epochal not only for the high quality of its research but also for the historical moment in which it was published. Mexico in 1933 was then emerging from more than two decades of turmoil and bloodshed out of which was painfully evolving a new definition of nationhood. In that agonizing quest for self-identity Mexicans were often anti-Hispanic, anti-clerical and anti-Catholic. Ricard, a Frenchman, implicitly told the Mexicans: "Know yourself, look back into your past and examine it with compassion and with as much objectivity as possible."

What has been done since 1945 has been to build a superstructure on Ricard's foundation. The Spanish Franciscan, Pedro Borges, in his *Métodos misionales en la cristianización de América* (1960) has published a readable, learned and objective survey of the whole missionary enterprise in the Indies, of which Mexico was a very important chapter. Dionisio Victoria Moreno has given us an interesting study in failure in his *Los Carmelitas descalzos y la conquista espiritual de México: 1585-1612* (1967). This monograph is an analysis as to why the discalced Carmelites did not enter the missionary field. Fidel de Lejarza, another Franciscan, has written on the spiritual conquest of Nuevo Santander

¹⁶ *Hispanic-American Historical Review*, May, 1959, p. 274.

(*La conquista espiritual del Nuevo Santander*, 1947). Still another Franciscan, Francis Borgia steck has published a study on the famous Franciscan college of Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco, some of whose founders initially favored training an Indian clergy (*El primer colegio de América, Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco*, 1944).

Arthur Ennis' *Fray Alonso de la Veracruz, O. S. A., 1507-84: A Study of His Contribution to the Religious and Intellectual Affairs of Early Mexico* (1957) and Amancio Bolaño e Isla have added to our knowledge about the life and times of that important Augustinian friar. Richard E. Greenleaf's study of Archbishop Zumárraga as an inquisitor is sharply focused. A meticulously documented monograph by Georges Baudot on the struggle of the second archbishop to impose the collection of tithes on the Indians in the face of the bitter opposition of the friars sheds much new light on this old controversy.¹⁷

Rafael Heliodoro Valle's *Santiago en América* (1946) is an arresting study of social iconography. Santiago and St. Christopher were the two most popular saints in early colonial Mexico. Santiago, the fighting saint with his sword unleashed, was the symbol of men at war. And Saint Christopher, recently banished from the calendar of saint, with his staff and an infant on his back, represents the peaceful traveller and the colonist who seeks good and on which to build his home and to rear his family.

Where do we go from here? A series of regional studies which would test Ricard's hypotheses might be useful. Another promising approach would be to study the missionary enterprise with methods borrowed from the social sciences as case-studies in culture change.

One of the most prominent lacuna is a deeper awareness of the religiosity of the Baroque world of the seventeenth century. The social functions of *cofradías*, *compadrazgo*, particular cults of saints and the popularities of certain sanctuaries need to be studied systematically. In that plural and multi-racial society religion was the one common bond that could cut across ethnic divisions. Hence a greater understanding of the social aspects of seventeenth century religious sentiment could reveal the historical roots of *mexicanidad*, that life-style that lends to Mexico its unique personality.

THE "BUREAUCRATIC" CONQUEST

The reigns of Charles V and Philip II were dominated in part, at least, by bureaucratic institution-making. During the seventeenth century, on the other hand, as the creoles were developing a self-cons-

¹⁷ Georges Baudot, "L'institution de la dime pour les Indes du Mexique", *Mélanges de la casa de Velazquez* (Madrid, 1965).

sciousness and as centralized control from Spain was weakening, these bureaucratic institutions served new ends. It is surprising how little has been done in the field of institutional history since 1945. There can be no quarrel with its quality, but the quantity is somewhat disappointing.

The foundation of our knowledge is the one provided by Clarence Haring in his classic *The Spanish Empire in America* (1947). Although not confined exclusively to Mexico, no Mexicanista can afford to neglect this still useful synthesis. Haring should be supplemented by John H. Parry's *The Spanish Seaborne Empire* and Charles Gibson's *Spain in America*, both published in 1966. Both books are well-structured syntheses which incorporate the new scholarship of their generation.

John H. Parry, *The Audiencia of New Galicia in the Sixteenth Century: A Study in Spanish Colonial Government* (1948) is a meticulously documented monograph that is a model for institutional history. What is surprising is that it stands alone. What happened to the Audiencia of New Galicia in the seventeenth century when social conditions were quite different? We do not know yet. Someone should enlighten us. There is not to my knowledge well-documented and soundly interpreted study of the Audiencia of Mexico. This is an embarrassing gap. We need several studies on the role of the Audiencia as the intermediary between the central authorities in Spain and the local elites and non-elites. We should look forward to the eventual publication of Woodrow W. Borah's study on the *Juzgado de Indios*, the Audiencia as a tribunal for Indian litigations.

What the study of the bureaucracy probably needs most of all is a powerful injection of new theoretical constructs. The place to begin is S. N. Eisenstadt's *The Political Systems of Empires* (1963). Unreadable though this book may be, it does contain a wealth of hypotheses that could be profitably applied to the Habsburg bureaucracy in New Spain and, for that matter, the whole Spanish Empire.

The year, 1598, is one important watershed in Mexican history. By the end of the reign of Philip II massive demographic changes had taken place. Indian Mexico was giving way to creole and mestizo Mexico. That is the meaning of the seventeenth century. The institution-making of Philip II's time was replaced with institution-consolidation of the later Hapsburgs. 1598 also represents the beginning of the end of the plural society in which economic, political and social functions were largely determined in terms of ethnic origins and the genesis of the multi-racial society that did not come to dominate Mexico until the twentieth century.

José Miranda in his *España y Nueva España en la época de Felipe II* (1962) has well synthesized the larger meaning of the sixteenth century

characterized by the growth of bureaucratic centralism, the subjection of the remaining Indians to the demands of the new silver economy and the emergence of latifundia and stockraising.

The outlines of a synthesis for seventeenth century, which would provide a larger conceptual framework for the writing of institutional and bureaucratic history, have been suggested by Lesley Byrd Simpson, François Chevalier and Irving Leonard.

José Ignacio Rubio Mañé's *Introducción al estudio de los virreyes de la Nueva España 1535-1746* (1959-61) is a solid documentary base for beginning to study the viceregal institution. Much more needs, however, needs to be done. Two types of studies should be on any priority list. Monographs on individual vicerys would be useful. Even more desirable would be a series of studies dealing with the origin and the development of certain key functions of viceroys studied over a long time span. Among these topics might be: the viceroy as captain general, the viceroy as president of the Audiencia, the viceroy vis-à-vis the local elites and non-elites.

Above all else, institutional and bureaucratic history should not be written in the old-fashioned legalistic spirit of the past but rather in the new and vital framework of social history. Here again we should not be shy in borrowing from the social sciences. Viceroys, audiencias and alcaldes mayores were men of fresh and blood, seeking to maneuver in the face contradictory pressures in a society undergoing gradual but meaningful social change. They should be portrayed as skilled bureaucratic politicians, practitioners of the art of the possible.

The field of regional institutionalized history is virtually a *tabula rasa*. Studies such as those of Charles Gibson and François Chevalier contain a host of insights on local government but that perspective clearly is not their major focus. What we first need is a broadbased synthesis of the rich primary sources comparable to what Guillermo Lohmann Villena did for the *corregidor de Indios* in Habsburg Peru. But such a survey, useful though it would certainly be, will not suffice. We need a whole series of regional studies with a time focus depth in which the societal, economic and political roles of the alcaldes mayores will be tested by hypotheses borrowed in part, at least, from the social sciences.

The Mexican cabildos have not been well studied. Dominated by the creole elites, the cabildos should not be examined in a narrow, legalistic sense but rather for their vital and dynamic socio-political role. They were the spokesmen of the emerging creole elites. And the Council of the Indies, the viceroys and the Audiencias acted at their own peril if they did not seriously take into account the views of the cabildos.

THE "SOCIAL" CONQUEST

The acculturation of the Indians to Spanish norms has been the topic of Charles Gibson's two major works. His methodological approach is one that all social historians might well emulate. His focus is regional and multi-disciplinary. The historical geographer, Carl Sauer's *Colima of New Spain in the Sixteenth Century* (1948) is another example of the usefulness of the regional and multi-disciplinary approaches.

In his first major book published in 1952 Gibson examined Tlaxcala in the time span of the sixteenth century. His conclusions stressed the humanitarian concern of Spanish colonial policy for the welfare of the Indian community. Gibson stressed the wide variety of Tlaxcala responses to hispanization from rejection to full acceptance in the course of one generation. The clear implication is that a new kind of Hispano-Indian society was emerging as a consequence of the conquest in which the Indians were playing a creative cultural role.

Quite a different perspective emerges from Gibson's second major work published fifteen years later. Again he concentrates on a particular region, this time the valley of Mexico, but his time span is much longer covering the three hundred years of Spanish colonial rule. Out of his massive documentation comes a somber conclusion:

The Black Legend provides a gross but essentially accurate interpretation of the relations between the Spaniards and the Indians . . . The substantive content of the Black Legend asserts that the Indians were exploited by the Spaniards and in empirical fact they were . . . The hacienda combined its essential control of land with secondary controls over labor and tribute, and the result was the most comprehensive institution yet devised for Spanish mastery and Indian subordination.¹⁸

The Indian pueblo did survive aided by the *cofradia* and the *fiesta*, but the incipient cultural florescence of the early sixteenth century was aborted. Societal demoralization expressed itself in the form of alcoholism.

The definitive study of the *encomienda* is Lesley Byrd Simpson's *The Encomienda in New Spain: The Beginning of Spanish Mexico* was first published in 1929 but extensively revised in 1950. The only incomplete aspect is that Simpson did not unearth the kind of social data of how particular *encomiendas* actually functioned as social units. James Lockhart did just this for the same period in Perú.¹⁹

Silvio Zavala's *La libertad de movimiento de los Indios de Nueva*

¹⁸ Gibson, *The Aztecs*, pp. 403, 407.

¹⁹ James Lockhart, *Spanish Peru, 1532-60, A Colonial Society* (University of Wisconsin Press, 1968), pp. 11 ff.

España (1948) is a model of its kind, which stresses the dynamic interplay between the law and its observance. Deriving from a royal cedula of 1480 the Indians did enjoy substantial freedom of movement, however, with some notable restrictions.

The most promising approach to the study of acculturation of Indian communities is that of ethnohistory, which combines historical techniques with those of the social sciences, in particular, anthropology. Howard F. Cline, Ralph Roys, Charles Gibson, George Kubler, John Rowe, John L. Phelan and Herbert Harvey have all experimented with this method.²⁰ This approach should serve as a model for subsequent research.

One aspect of the class structure in Indian society, i. e., the survival of the Indian nobility, has been studied from a rather narrow genealogical view by both Delfina López Sarrelangue and the late Guillermo S. Fernández de Recas.²¹ Both authors gave ample evidence that *cacicazgos* survived in many areas until the time of independence. What now needs to be done is to formulate a few bold hypotheses about the dynamic role of the caciques as cultural brokers between the conquerors and the conquered, which might best be tested in a series of regional studies.

A solidly documented study of the Negro in Mexico is Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán's *La población negra en México* (1946). Blacks and Afro-mestizos played a vital role in Mexico prior to 1650, far out of proportion to their actual numbers, in pulling New Spain through her "century of depression". Their participation in the urban craft guilds, the *obrajes*, mining and stockraising increased production in those key sectors of the economy at a time when the Indian labor force was drastically declining. In capitalist industries such as the *obrajes*, mining and sugar plantations Mexican Black slavery could be as "oppressive" and as "exploitative" as its betterknown Anglo-Saxon version. Such is the well-documented conclusion of a Ph. D. thesis recently written by Colin Palmer at the University of Wisconsin.

Social changes among the Spanish colonists were as significant as they were among the Indians. José Durand's pioneer study, *La transformación social del conquistador* (1953) broke new ground, but much more needs to be done. The comprehensive use of notarial archives will afford a more complete picture of the whole process of the Spaniards' adaptation to the New World scene. James Lockhart's *Spanish Peru:*

²⁰ See especially Howard Cline, "Problems of Mexican Ethno-History, The Ancient Chinantla", *The Hispanic-American Historical Review* August, 1957, pp. 273-95.

²¹ Guillermo S. Fernández de Recas, *Cacicazgo y nobiliario indígena de la Nueva España* (México, 1961) and Delfina López Sarrelangue, *La nobleza indígena de Patzcuaro en la época virreinal* (Mexico, 1965).

1532-1560: *A Colonial Society* (1968) provides a model for the same period in Mexico.

Another useful study in social transformation is Norman F. Martin's *Los vagabundos en la Nueva España, siglo XVI* (1957). C. F. Marshall has written a pioneer article about the origins of the single most important social fact of Mexican history—*mestizaje*.²² While not concentrating exclusively on Mexico Magnus Mörner has provided us with a broad framework inside of which to study the emergence of the mestizo community.²³

One of the most exciting challenges facing the social historians of the next generation is to explore the emergence of the non-elites—in particular, the Mestizos—and to probe the complex web of relationships between the elites and the non-elites. The French historians have formulated some stimulating theoretical constructs. Let us apply them by going into the archives.

As has already been mentioned, 1598 is a convenient watershed in early Mexican colonial history. Much needs to be done in the field of social history of the seventeenth century. We have only made a beginning, a few striking monographs.

Lesley Byrd Simpson's short article, "Mexico's Forgotten Century" is seminal in its implications.²⁴ Simpson cogently argues the case for the historical importance of the seventeenth century, the century in which some of the basic social characteristics of Mexico emerged. A century, which saw the growth of the creole elite and the Mestizo non-clite, the rise of latifundia, the consolidation of neo-Scholasticism in the universities and the flowering of the Baroque style in architecture, needs to be studied far more intensively than it has been.

The pathos, the grandeur and the misery of the exotic Baroque world comes to life in the elegantly written pages of Irving Leonard's *Baroque Times in Old Mexico* (1959). This book is a worthy sequel to the monograph of his youth, *Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora* (1929) which still remains the standard text of that topic. Leonard has made a promising beginning, but much more remains to be done before all the facets of the Baroque mentality will come to life. Francisco de la Maza's *El guadalupanismo Mexicano* (1953) is an excellent example of the kind of socio-intellectual history of the Baroque period that can and should be done.

²² C. E. Marshall, "The Birth of the Mestizo in New Spain", reprinted in *Readings in Latin American History*, Lewis Hanke, ed., (2 vols., Thomas Y. Crowell, 1966), I, 139-153.

²³ Magnus Mörner, *Race Mixture in the History of Latin America* (1967).

²⁴ Lesley Byrd Simpson, "Mexico's Forgotten Century", reprinted in *Latin American History: Essays on Its Study and Teaching, 1898-1965*, Howard Cline, ed. (2 vols., University of Texas Press, 1967), II, 500-506.

E. P. Simmons has made a useful summary of the recent literature of the most spectacular jurisdictional battle of early colonial Mexico, that is, the clash between Bishop Palafox and the Jesuits.²⁵ In this connection Alberto María Carreño also has a helpful monograph.²⁶ While the main contours of the ideological struggle have become visible, the societal implications have not yet been sufficiently exploited.

The life-style, the imagery and the folk customs of Baroque times need much study. A systematic exploration of the abundant archives of the Inquisition is one place to begin. The chronicles of the seventeenth century might be examined for their implicit and explicit "world-views". A historicist approach would be desirable in such a quest.

Stimulated by an earlier evocative study by Richard Morse, Lyle N. McAlister has given us a seminal article on social structure and social change in colonial Mexico.²⁷ His formulation of a neo-medieval corporate society divided into racial "estates" and socio-economic functional corporations has provided us with a stimulating set of questions with which to interrogate the documents of social history. His abstract model should be given some flesh and blood by a host of monographic studies.

The myth of the seventeenth century as a "colonial siesta" has fortunately been laid to rest. It was in fact a period of significant social change. Behind a Baroque façade of apparent immobility, society was seething with unrest. We need to take a careful look at social disturbances in this period. Under what conditions does the conciliatory machinery of the bureaucracy break down, thus creating a vacuum which is filled by armed violence? Revolts on the northern frontier, which fall under the category of primary resistance of superficially hispanized Indians, must be distinguished from social disturbances in the more hispanized central-southern Mexico. Concern should center on those movements where there was considerable interaction among the various racial groups.

The urban riots in Mexico City in 1624 and in 1692, reminiscent of recent urban explosions in the United States, are particularly apropos. A useful over-view of these two celebrated riots is the article of Chester Lyle Guthrie.²⁸ More attention needs to be focused on the interaction

²⁵ E. P. Simmons, "Palafox and His Critics: Reappraising a Controversy", *Hispanic-American Historical Review*, November, 1966, pp. 394-408.

²⁶ *Cedulario de los siglos XVI and XVII: El obispo don Juan de Palafox y Mendoza y el conflicto con la compañía de Jesus*, Alberto María Carreño, ed. (Mexico, 1947).

²⁷ Both Richard M. Morse's article "Toward a Theory of Spanish American Government" and L. N. McAlister's "Social Structure and Social Change in New Spain" are reprinted in *Cline's Latin American History*, II, 506-521 and 750-764.

²⁸ Chester Lyle Guthrie, "Riots in Seventeenth Century Mexico City", in

of creoles, mestizos, mulattoes, Blacks and Indians. Herbert Klein's article on the Tzeltal revolt is an illuminating example of how a Hispanized Indian community bursts into revolt.²⁹ David Davidson's article on Negro resistance also deserves special mention.³⁰

If we agree that 1598 is a convenient watershed, I would submit that 1700 is a meaningless terminal date. The same social forces operating in the seventeenth century continued during the reigns of Philip V and Ferdinand VI. The decisive change does not come until 1759, when Charles III begins the intensive introduction of some phases of the Enlightenment. Nancy Parriss' illuminating *Crown and Clergy in colonial Mexico, The Crisis of Ecclesiastical Privilege* (1968) underscores the usefulness of considering the period from 1598 to 1759 as a single unity in Mexican history.

THE "ECONOMIC" CONQUEST

In the field of economic history three books stand out, not only because of their intrinsic merit but also because they are seminal in the questions they pose and the methodologies they employ. Those authors are François Chevalier, Lesley Byrd Simpson and Woodrow Borah.

In commenting on François Chevalier's *La formation des grands domaines au Mexique* (1952) Simpson remarked: "This work should be a challenge and an inspiration to the rest of us."³¹ Chevalier used the methodology that Marc Bloch applied to medieval French agricultural society to the vast amount of then incoherent data about the origins and the rise of latifundia in New Spain. What emerges is an impressive example of Gallic synthesis. Woodrow Borah has asked a pertinent question: "Has M. Chevalier's splendid French training with its emphasis on synthesis led him to detect a pattern not in the data? In the present state of Mexican studies, we cannot answer the question with assurance."³²

The ultimate justification of a book as good as this one is that it should stimulate other books. Chevalier did not use quantitative data.

Greater America, Essays in Honor of Herbert Eugene Bolton (University of California Press, 1955), pp. 243-58. Also see Rosa Feijoo, "El tumulto de 1624", and "El tumulto de 1692", in *Historia mexicana*, July-September, 1964 and April-June, 1965, pp. 42-70 and 656-679.

²⁹ Herbert S. Klein, "Peasant Communities in Revolt: The Tzeltal Republic of 1712", *Pacific Historical Review*, August, 1966, pp. 247-263.

³⁰ David Davidson, "Negro Slave Control and Resistance in Colonial Mexico," *Hispanic-American Historical Review*, August, 1966, pp. 235-53.

³¹ *Ibid.*, February, 1953, p. 113.

³² *Ibid.*, November, 1957, p. 506.

Such a method now is a necessity. Another new approach would be to pay much more attention to the social implications of the emergence of the rise of latifundia than Chevalier did. What was the social impact of the rise of commercial production of sugar and wool? What were the effects of these changes on the people who did the work? Above all else the hypotheses formulated in the Chevalier synthesis for the whole of New Spain should be tested in a series of regional studies in order to learn patterns of divergences. Certainly the latifundia complex operated somewhat differently in areas as diverse as Yucatán, the valley of Mexico, the Bajío or northern Mexico. Chevalier has made a splendid beginning. Now the job should be finished.

Lesley Byrd Simpson's *The Exploitation of Land in Central Mexico in the Sixteenth Century* (1952) is of pioneer importance in that he used a quantitative method to measure the extent of ecological change between 1519 and 1620. The future of the field of economic history in early colonial Mexico lies in the use of quantitative, statistical data. Simpson's study was one of the first to point the way. Simpson estimates that almost 80 per cent of Indian agricultural land came to be vacated and that this land was taken over by other forms of plant and animal life. An outgrowth of his first demographic study with Cook published in 1948, Simpson's conclusion is that livestock to a considerable extent replaced Indians on the Mexican landscape.

The economic history of early colonial Mexico cannot be written without taking into account Woodrow W. Borah's *New Spain's Century of Depression* (1951). Borah shattered the view that New Spain from 1521 onward had enjoyed a steadily expanding economy. This depression, beginning with the great epidemic of 1576-79, was precipitated by the rapid decline of native labor available, the increase of the non-Indian population and the lavish use of native labor especially by the regular and secular clergy for their extensive architectural enterprises. The non-Indian population was determined to maintain its customary standard of living with the result that the pressure on the rapidly diminishing Indians became all but intolerable. Stop-gap measures such as the establishment of public granaries and a crude system of price fixing did not prove effective. What eventually arrested the contracting economy during the second half of the seventeenth century was the end of Indian demographic decline, the *repartimiento* and most important of all the consolidation of latifundia.

The Borah hypothesis undoubtedly needs to be tested in a series of regional studies with the use of statistical data.

No economic historian of this period cannot be grateful to Silvio Zavala and María Castelo for the publication of their many volumed *Fuentes para la historia del trabajo en México* (1946). Lesley Byrd Simpson did ask a question that must vex every editor of a collection

of primary sources. The difficulty of answering the question, however, should not discourage an editor of primary source materials. Simpson queried:

Hence he had to make a violent selection, admittedly based on a "subjective criterion", but he fails to come to grips with the nature of that subjective criterion and he leaves us with the uneasy feeling that another person might have made a selection totally at variance with his.³³

In the somewhat neglected topic of inter-colonial trade Woodrow Borah and Eduardo Arcila Farías have published useful monographs on Mexico's trade with Peru and Venezuela respectively.³⁴ In a suggestive monograph Pierre Chaunu has incorporated the Manila galleon trade into his grand design of imperial commerce. Thus he has added a new dimension to William L. Schurz's pioneer study on the Manila Galleon.³⁵ In the *Archivo de la Nación* in Mexico City there is a large amount of material on the Manila Galleon trade, which no one heretofore has explored.

Our knowledge of early colonial economic institutions has been enriched by several studies. Among them are M. Carrera Stampa on the gremios, Fernando B. Sandoval on sugar, Willim Dusenberry on the mesta and Woodrow Borah on silk raising.

The abundant archives of the *Hospital de Jesús* offers a striking challenge to the economic historian, for the *Marquesado* along with the Jesuit estates were the two most profitable capitalist enterprises of the colonial period. Cortés himself was the first capitalist entrepreneur of New Spain. His heirs and their administrators were indeed successful capitalists. A suggestive monograph by Richard E. Greenleaf points up the possibilities of this rich archival collection now housed in the AGN, where statistical data abounds.³⁶ The operations of the Jesuit estates invites further study.³⁷ Woodrow Borah's article on the collection of tithes in the Bishopric of Oaxaca suggests possibilities

³³ *Ibid.*, May, 1947, pp. 290-91.

³⁴ Woodrow W. Borah, *Early Colonial Trade and Navigation Between Mexico and Peru* (University of California Press, Ibero-Americana: 38). Eduardo Arcila Farías, *Comercio entre Venezuela y México en los siglos XVI y XVII* (México, 1950).

³⁵ Pierre Chaunu, *Les Philippines et le Pacifique des Ibériques (XVI^e, XVII^e, XVIII^e Siècles)* (Paris, 1960).

³⁶ Richard E. Greenleaf, "Viceregal Power and the Obrajes of the Cortés Estate," *Hispanic-American Historical Review*, August, 1968, pp. 365-79. For a juridical analysis of the Cortés Estate see Bernardo García-Martínez, *El marquesado del valle* (El Colegio de México, 1969).

³⁷ See Francois Chevalier, ed. *Instrucciones a los hermanos jesuitas administradores de haciendas* (Mexico, 1950).

for similar studies for other episcopal sees.³⁸ In this connection there is valuable data in the *Archivo General de Indias* in Sevilla. A dynamic and vibrant history of the early colonial Mexican economy can be written from a comprehensive exploitation of the abundant data on the tithes.

In short we have only made a beginning in exploring the economic history of this period. The future lies with those who are willing to acquire the tools of economic analysis and quantitative methodology.

THE "ARCHITECTURAL" CONQUEST

In surveying all the many cultural consequences flowing from the conquest one of the most durable and the most universal is in the field of ecclesiastical architecture. A general history of the Baroque style, for example, cannot be written without taking into account the Mexican contribution.

One Mexican art historian stands out as the pioneer in the study of Mexico's rich and varied colonial art. As Elizabeth Wilder Weisman commented on the work of the late Manuel Toussaint: "Everyone working in the field of colonial art in Mexico must think of himself as Toussaint's pupil."³⁹ Among his major works were his studies of Mudéjar art in America and his monumental study of that noble building, the Cathedral of Mexico. His general synthesis, *Arte colonial de México* (1948) is still a classic. Durable though his own achievements as a scholar were, don Manuel was equally important in stimulating and guiding other students in the field of Mexican art for both the pre-conquest, colonial and modern periods. He played a decisive role in organizing the *Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas* of the *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México* and in founding its scholarly journal, *Anales*. Both the journal and the *Instituto*, ably led by Dr. Justino Fernández from 1955 until 1968, have provided institutional vehicles for a wide-ranging series of publications covering the whole field of Mexican art.

The accomplishments and the trends in the historiography of colonial art since 1945 are personified in the works of George Kubler, John McAndrew and Francisco de la Maza.

George Kubler's *Mexican Architecture in the Sixteenth Century* (1948) connects the design of ecclesiastical buildings with the mainstream of sixteenth century life. Therein lies its importance. Kubler relates architecture to the lay-out cities, building methods, recruit-

³⁸ Woodrow W. Borah, "Tithe Collection in the Bishopric of Oaxaca", *Hispanic-American Historical Review*, November, 1941, pp. 498-517.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, May, 1956, p. 270.

ment of labor, the acculturation of the Indians and the ideological formation of the missionary-architects. The result is that no historian of the sixteenth century, whatever his particular specialty may be, can afford to neglect Kubler's two volumes.

John McAndrew's general thrust was the same as Kubler's —to relate architecture to the larger fabric of society. But in contrast to Kubler, who looked at the whole achievement of architecture in the sixteenth century, McAndrew concentrated on only one aspect in his *The Open Air Churches of Sixteenth Century Mexico* (1965). The Open Air Churches were an art form unique to sixteenth century Mexico. In order to point up their uniqueness McAndrew ranged far beyond the more technical aspects of architectural history. In so doing he throws new light on missionary methods, the role of children as missionaries and preachers and the special efficacy of European music in catechizing the natives. He also pays particular attention to how native craftsmen subtly changed Spanish styles.

One of the most prolific and imaginative disciples of Manuel Toussaint is Francisco de la Maza. One example of his many monographs is *Las piras funerarias en la historia y en el arte de México* (1946). Art history, yes, but it also illuminates social history written by a person with sensitive insights into the subtle, often elusive relationships between art and society.

SOME SUGGESTIONS

The study of Mexico's colonial past is no longer submerged in the anti-Hispanic tradition of the Revolution of 1910. Now it is viewed as just one of Mexico's many historical experiences that should be understood in its own terms. The study of New Spain is increasingly divorced from the ideological trends of today and tomorrow.

From this discussion five principal trends seem to have emerged since 1945. They are 1) ethno-history, 2) historicism, 3) the broad synthesis, 4) the multi-disciplinary approach, and 5) the statistical-quantitative method.

Ethno-history has been practiced by Mexicans, North-Americans and Frenchmen alike. The result has been the emergence for the first time of a three-dimensional perspective of the history of the Indians both before and after the Spaniards. The conquest has become a "double conquest". This indeed is a major accomplishment.

Partially as a consequence of the appeal of the philosophies of Ortega, Dilthey and Heidegger in Mexico (and there are sound historical reasons for this trend) some Mexican historians have been strongly attracted to historicism. Some North Americans have also tried it.

Among the former are Durand, Iglesia, León-Portilla, Maza and O'Gorman. Among the latter are Levin, Padden and Phelan. Historicism is subjective and relativist to some extent, at least. It puts a high priority on the importance of ideas and the desirability of defining the *Zeitgeist* of a particular period. Historicism has been most often applied to the sixteenth century. It now should be used for the seventeenth century.

The French have excelled in broad synthesis that have created some order out of heretofore incoherent masses of raw data. Although these syntheses represent some of the most evocative scholarship done since 1945, they should be considered not as end but as a beginning to research in these topics. Synthetic hypotheses should be tested by regional case-studies.

The multi-disciplinary approach has enjoyed popularity among the North Americans. Some very exciting history can be written by those who generously but discriminately borrow from the social sciences.

However deeply tied we as historians may be to the humanist tradition, we should not hesitate to use a statistical and quantitative approach to social and to economic history when the data is available. And available it often is.

Our view of history should be pluralistic. None of us can practice all of these methods simultaneously, but each of us can profit from the application of these various methods by others.

Although much remains to be done in writing the history of the "many conquests" of Mexico, I would venture that some of the most exciting opportunities lie in the fields of social and economic history. Historicism and quantification, contrasting though they may be, offer some stimulating challenges.