h-diplo *Article* REVIEW

Eliga H. Gould. "Entangled Histories, Entangled Worlds: The English-Speaking Atlantic as a Spanish Periphery." *American Historical Review* 112.3 (June 2007): 764-786.

Reviewed by **Matt J. Schumann**, Eastern Michigan University
Published by H-Diplo on 12 October 2007

How English was the English Atlantic? Over the past forty years, Atlantic historians have grappled with this and other questions about the vast, empty maritime space between Europe, Africa and the Americas. Primarily European in focus, Atlantic historians struggle with the apparent contradiction between the plurality of Christianities in the Atlantic World and the claims of late medieval Christianity to universal dominion.[1] This fragmentation manifested itself not only in the religious rivalries between European powers during the first century and a half of colonization, but also in dynastic and later national rivalries from the mid-seventeenth to the early nineteenth century. Among the many contests over space in the Atlantic and on its shores was the one between Catholic Spain and a polyglot England[2]—one the earliest and by far the largest American colonial power (pp.768-772), and the other, in time, operating with substantial advantages of diplomatic precedent, financial wealth, commercial privilege and power projection at sea.

Anglophile histories of this rivalry contain well-worn references to the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 and to British maritime supremacy more generally. Using a new paradigm, however, and borrowing methodologies from cultural and borderlands studies to divert our gaze from Britain's sometimes dazzling military successes, scholars such as Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra[3] have proposed that English entry into the Atlantic took substantial inspiration—both positive and negative—from the Spanish experience; that Spain always held the demographic upper hand, with substantial consequences for legal and cultural influence; and that a more rigorous de-centering of Anglophile narratives locates the English, later British, and early American worlds not at the center of Atlantic studies, but rather on the periphery of Spain's more substantial dominions. Moving

[1] This struggle figured prominently among many topics discussed at a conference on Religion and Empire in the Early Modern Atlantic, University of Michigan, 28-29 September 2007.

[2] Although England under Elizabeth's rule was notionally Anglican, there were still substantial pockets of Catholicism within the kingdom, as well as a small Mennonite faction and emerging Puritanism. Under the Stuarts (from 1603) and later Hanoverians (from 1714), English and later British domains comprehended Irish Catholics and Episcopalians, Scottish Presbyterians and a variety of Christianities both throughout the British isles and in the North American colonies.

[3] Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra, *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550-1700* (Stanford, 2006).

beyond comparative methods which risk setting a monolithic Anglophone world against an equally reductive Spanish counterpart, Eliga Gould proposes an "entangled history", focusing his inquiries in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when peoples of the English- and Spanish-speaking Atlantic worlds disputed their frontiers not only in the realm of military actions and diplomatic negotiations, but also in prize courts, low-level border disputes, missions to convert Native Americans and contests over oaths of loyalty.

Gould provides a diverse, compelling mix of considerations among ministers and issues on the ground. Using Colonial Office records from Britain's National Archives, a few contemporary newspapers and a wealth of secondary literature, he challenges the narrative—familiar to most Americans—of British and later American interests featuring centrally in understandings of the Atlantic world. Rather, drawing on histories of both land and maritime frontiers, he offers a more nuanced view of international relations than is usually contained in strictly diplomatic and military accounts. Rejecting the notion of unitary nation-states as subsisting outside the popular imagination of the era (pp.766-767), he moves to the level of individual sailors, settlers, slaves and colonial officials. In so doing, he blurs the legal bounds between empires that appear so bold and tangible in the official maps, for example, of French Royal Cartographer Robert de Vaugondy.[4]

Starting with the privateering case of Peter Vezian and Francisco Menéndez in 1741 and moving well into the nineteenth century, Gould demonstrates the degree to which Anglo-American and Anglo-Caribbean histories should be understood as being intertwined with that of Spanish America, and the extent to which the latter occupied a superior position. The English-speaking Atlantic truly begins to appear as a Spanish periphery, from proceedings in British prize courts (pp.764-766) to Andrew Jackson's proclamation of loyalty to Spain in 1789 (p.782). Gould adroitly presses his case by presenting the ambiguous international status of the territory that would become British Honduras (pp.772-773), the shifting loyalties among slaves and disenchanted natives (pp.773-779), the distinctions between the Túpac Amaru uprisings and the American War of Independence, and the hesitancy with which Spanish colonies finally left the crown's protection and dominion after the latter's defeat by Napoleon in 1808 (pp.779-780). These are not merely statements about borderlands, but about major overlaps between the two continental empires and their surrounding maritime routes, so that one feels hard-pressed to render historical judgment, particularly on the Anglophone side, without due consideration for the Spanish perspective. Thus, Gould illustrates not only the potential for further exploration of entangled histories in the Atlantic world, but also the increasing impossibility of coming to a full understanding of the Anglophone Atlantic in the absence of at least some contact with its Spanish-speaking counterpart.

---

[4] See, for example, Vaugondy's map of Acadie, or Nova Scotia (1755), in the collections of the William L. Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Gould unquestionably succeeds in demonstrating the merits of entangled histories as a viable methodology, but he does so despite some surprising omissions. For the parts of the article concerned with British privateers and maritime law, he might have used records from the High Court of Admiralty (HCA). Equally surprising is the absence of State Papers Series 94, with letters to and from British envoys in Madrid. Both the HCA records and SP 94 reside at Kew along with the Colonial Office records that Gould did use, but the former might have allowed him to explore Anglo-Spanish entanglements in the eastern Atlantic as well as in the Americas. This might include the *Antigallican* affair of 1757, for example, concerning a French prize taken under the guns of Cadiz.[5] Indeed, narratives of entanglement between imperial Spain and the Anglophone Atlantic need not go nearly as far as Nootka Sound (p.772) and Tennessee (pp.782-783), when ministerial papers in the British Library reveal, for example, Lieutenant-General Thomas Fowke's hesitation in May 1756 about reinforcing the then-threatened island of Minorca from his post at Gibraltar.[6] Finally, the article shows a surprising lack of Spanish archival sources and material in the Spanish language more generally. It leaves the question at least partly unanswered whether the Spanish themselves perceived an Anglophone periphery. It is simply unclear, or rather unstated, exactly what the Spanish authorities thought—whether in Madrid or Mexico or occupied Manila[7]—about Americans and especially British who harassed and threatened almost every frontier of their expansive colonial empire.

All said, Gould makes a convincing case that there is more work to be done on entanglement between the Anglophone Atlantic and its Spanish counterpart, and presents a wide variety of starting points. He gives several hints on how aspiring historians might explore the wide-ranging and porous continental and maritime frontiers between the two colonial empires, and offers through his footnotes a substantial pool of secondary sources for background and further reading. Indeed, there is a lot more reading to be done, from considerations on even more of the contested Anglo-Spanish frontiers such as Gibraltar and the Falkland Islands (or Islas Malvinas, where the British won a

---

[5] The affair created a flurry of correspondence in NA SP 94/154-155 and NA 30/8/92 (Pitt correspondence concerning Spain), which the Spanish apparently won. See also Anon. (perhaps Captain William Foster), *An Account of the Antigallican Privateer* (London, 1757); David Starkey, *British Privateering Enterprise in the Eighteenth Century* (Exeter, 1990), pp.184-186.

[6] It appears likely that Fowke's hesitation arose at least in part from his fear of Spanish pretensions to the island. See Anson to Newcastle, 31 May 1756, BL Add. MSS 32865 (Newcastle MSS), f.159; Fowke to Fox, 2 June 1756, *ibid.*, ff.177-179. Within the British National Archives, see "Proceedings against Lt. Gen. Fowke, Gov. of Gibraltar, for Disobedience of Orders," NA SP 41/22 (unfoliated). The importance of the Gibraltar station was manifestly evident at the battles of Lagos (1759) and Trafalgar (1805)—both spectacular British victories, and the latter involving a joint-Franco-Spanish fleet.

[7] British forces under General Sir William Draper, including a large number of Sepoys from India, took Manila and the Philippines from Spanish rule during the closing campaign of the Seven Years War. See Shirley Fish, *When Britain Ruled the Philippines, 1762-1764* (Milton Keynes, England, 2003); Nicholas Tracy, *Manila Ransomed: The British Assault on Manila in the Seven Years War* (Exeter, 1995).

diplomatic dispute in 1770-71),[8] to deeper exploration of foreign language sources and the archives in London, Simancas and perhaps even Paris. Then, perhaps, historians might test more rigorously the degree to which the Anglophone Atlantic was indeed a Spanish periphery.

Copyright © 2007 by H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online. H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for nonprofit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author, web location, date of publication, H-Diplo, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online. For any other proposed use, contact the H-Diplo Editors at h-diplo@h-net.msu.edu.

[8] For one of the more prominent London commentaries, see Samuel Johnson, *Thoughts on the Late Transactions regarding Falkland's Island* (London, 1771), http://www.samueljohnson.com/falklands.html .