

Rodrigo Antonio de Orellana O.Praem. (1755-1822) – Counter-revolutionary Bishop in Argentina

Introduction*

The Order of Prémontré has in its history given the Church close to two hundred bishops¹. But Premonstratensian research has tended to ignore the role of missionary bishops, particularly that of the Spanish Congregation in supplying bishops for the New World. It was only in the nineteenth century that the Order started expanding beyond Europe through missionary activity. But even before, individual Spanish Premonstratensians had been entrusted with bishoprics in America: Cristóbal Martínez de Salas (1572-1640), canon of San Saturnino (Medina del Campo), Abbot of Santa María de los Huertos (Segovia), Rector of Colegio San Norberto in Salamanca (1612-15), became Bishop of Panamá in 1626; Juan Pérez Carpintero (1646-1724), canon of San Norberto in Madrid, doctor of theology and abbot of Retuerta (1696-1699) and of Espíritu Santo of Avila (1690-1693), was appointed Bishop of Comayagua (Honduras) in 1701; Juan Benito Garret y Arloví (1665-1716) of Belpuig de les Avellanes was elevated as Bishop of León (Nicaragua) in 1708, Juan de Galavís (1689-1739), rector of Colegio San Norberto in Salamanca (1726-29) and abbot of Espíritu Santo of Ávila (1720-1723), professor of theology at the University of Salamanca, and General of the Spanish Congregation (1723-1726), as Archbishop of Santo Domingo (1729) and primate of America, and then as Archbishop of Santa Fé de Bogotá (1737), Pedro Alcántara Jiménez (1782-1843), as Vicar Apostolic of Montevideo (Uruguay) in 1830 and Bishop of Ciudad Rodrigo (Spain)

* Grateful recognition is due to Dr. William Hyland, Director of the Center for Norbertine Studies at St. Norbert College in De Pere, Wisconsin, for suggestions he made on a draft of this paper.

¹ A compilation of Premonstratensian bishops arrived at a number of 204 by 1929, but this includes some prelates who had never professed vows in the Order. See Alfons ZAK, "*Episcopatus ordinis Praemonstratensis*", *AnPraem* 4 (1928), pp. 64-84. 173-186. 294-311. 406-413; 5 (1929), pp. 46-56. 132-147. 239-249. The true number may be around 190 by 2010.

in 1835, and Manuel Abad Illana (1717-1780), formerly abbot of San Norberto in Valladolid and professor at the University of Salamanca, as bishop of Tucumán (Argentina) in 1764 and bishop of Arequipa (Peru) in 1774. It was the custom of the time for a bishop to bring typically two *confrères* along as part of his "family", which led to a modest acquaintance of the New World with the Premonstratensian Order. Because of his academic career and his writings on the history of the Order, particularly his *Historia del Gran Padre y Patriarcha San Norberto* (1755) and *Historia de los varones ilustres del orden premostratense* (1760), Abad may be the most notable person in this group. But with Rodrigo Antonio de Orellana (1755-1822), he had a Premonstratensian successor in the see of Córdoba del Tucumán (1809-1818) who played a significant role in the struggle for independence from Spain that led to the foundation of Argentina. Orellana was in fact the first to rule this bishopric, which had been founded in 1806 upon reorganization of the old diocese of Tucumán into two new sees. At the same time, he was the last bishop of the colonial period. There is nearly no mention of this theologian, bishop, and dedicated counter-revolutionary outside the Spanish-language literature on the revolution in the Río de la Plata². Historiographers of the Order have given him scarce attention³. In the history of the independence movement of Argentina, on the other hand, Orellana's name looms large as a defender of the Spanish monarchy⁴. His life is well documented from archival sources, particularly for his period in the New World. However, not only Orellana's biography but also his thought deserve a careful consideration, for his historical role as much as for the example he provided for a Premonstratensian response to political theology. This should therefore only be the first chapter of a history of the Spanish Congregation during the Enlightenment and its aftermath, and of Premonstratensian missionary bishops.

² Since the terms "revolutionary" and its antithesis were already used in 1810 and after synonymously with "patriotic" and its antithesis, Orellana's designation as "counter-revolutionary" is not only a historiographic category. Supporters of the independence movement often referred to the bishop as "enemy of the revolution".

³ See the very brief and incomplete entries in Léon GOOVAERTS, *Ecrivains, artistes, et savants de l'Ordre de Prémontré*, Vol. I, Brussels: Oscar Schepens, 1899, p. 639; Vol. III, Part 1, 1908, p. 164.

⁴ For an overview of the literature on Orellana, see Américo A. TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución*, Córdoba: Junta Provincial de Historia de Córdoba, 1981; Valentina AYROLO, *Funcionarios de Dios y de la República: Clero y política en la experiencia de las autonomías provinciales*, Buenos Aires: Biblos, 2007.

The Historical and Intellectual Setting

Riddled with corruption and mismanagement, the Spanish empire declined in power throughout the eighteenth century as the empires of Britain and France ascended. A series of costly wars between the great powers drained public finances, and Spain came to rely heavily on the wealth of her overseas territories. The Bourbon kings pressed for reforms that were designed to make the administration more efficient and to promote economic, commercial, and fiscal development. For the American provinces, which were integral parts of the empire rather than colonies, this meant stronger exploitation of resources, increased taxes, the opening of new ports allowed to trade only with Spain, and the establishment of several state monopolies. The provinces lost much of the autonomy they had enjoyed under the Habsburgs, and the creole élite of American-born Spaniards was marginalized⁵. Higher taxes in the Río de la Plata were hardly popular among the *criollo* élites of Buenos Aires and Córdoba. The French Revolution of 1789 at last started a process that made Spanish rule in America crumble. First, the revolution itself offered inspiration to would-be revolutionaries in Latin America. Spain was since 1796 allied with revolutionary France, having Britain as one of her principal enemies. When in 1806 and 1807, as part of the effort to contain Napoleon's advance, Britain invaded Spanish territory and briefly occupied Buenos Aires, the invading army was repelled largely by *criollo* militias and by troops commanded by the French exile Jacques Antoine (Santiago) de Liniers, who served as a Spanish naval officer. The abdication and confinement of King Ferdinand VII and the installation of Joseph Bonaparte on the throne in Madrid unravelled a process of emancipation. When news was received of the defeat of the Junta of Seville, which had assumed legislative and executive power in Spain during the Napoleonic invasion, a First Junta assumed control in Buenos Aires on 25 May, 1810, along the lines of several juntas that had formed in Spain to defend the territory. What is now referred to as the May Revolution was regarded as a defensive measure by the conspirators, who proclaimed their new authority in the name of Ferdinand VII. Since the Spanish viceroy appointed by this

⁵ See Ana María LORANDI, *Poder central, poder local. Funcionarios borbónicos en el Tucumán colonial. Un estudio de antropología política*, Buenos Aires: Prometeo, 2008, pp. 17ff.

king was ousted from office, opponents of the May Revolution saw it as a mere coup d'état lacking any legitimacy and that would put the Viceroyalty of the Río de la Plata on a dangerous path of confrontation with Spain. By the same token, the United Provinces of South America were founded, which were the predecessor of the Argentinian state. The very fact of renaming the Viceroyalty indicated that more was planned than merely precautionary measures to safeguard the monarchy. The city and province of Córdoba, already long in opposition to the capital, were a holdout by remaining loyal to Ferdinand VII⁶. In the interior of the viceroyalty, attitudes were overall more conservative than in the port city of Buenos Aires. In fact, Córdoba was an "environment of clear royalist predominance and Bourbon exaltation"⁷. Upon receiving news about the revolution, the city council (*cabildo*) now refused to recognize the authority of the First Junta and accepted instead that of the Viceroy of Peru, who had declared the revolution as illegal. Together with the local governor, Liniers, who had earlier been viceroy in Buenos Aires, led a counter-revolution against the First Junta. However, the ill-supported rising was quickly smothered and the insurgents were apprehended and executed. A series of short-lived juntas exercised power, first still in the name of an exiled king, but after the return of Ferdinand VII and the defeat of Napoleon without any intention to reestablish legitimacy. There were several invasions by Spanish troops from Peru, a battle with the Spanish navy, and an ill-organized anti-republican conspiracy by the pro-Spanish merchant and politician Martín de Alzaga, a former hero of the defense against the British, who together with thirty others was secretly tried and publicly executed. On 9 July, 1816, a Congress gathered in Tucumán finally issued a formal Declaration of Independence from Spain.

Since the conquest of the New World, Church and state had become so identified in Spanish America that they could hardly be separated, with the crown dominating the Church (*real patronato*). Catholicism was the established state religion of the Spanish Empire (and still is established under the current constitution of Argentina). A subject of the

⁶ See AYROLO, *Funcionarios de Dios* (see note 4), p. 34.

⁷ Estaban F. LLAMOSAS, "Tradición, regalismo, ilustración: bibliotecas cordobesas en las vísperas de Mayo", Congreso Internacional "Vísperas de Mayo", Córdoba, Argentina, 2008; see particularly also Valentina AYROLO, "Una Iglesia del interior de las Provincias Unidas: Córdoba en la primera mitad del siglo XIX", *Jahrbuch für Geschichte Lateinamerikas* 40 (2003), pp. 179-202.

Catholic Kings was *ipso facto* considered a member of the Church, and baptism was an incorporation not only into a spiritual but also a political body. The monarch was imbued with religious and not only secular authority, both of which served one system of Christendom⁸. In reality, the authorities of Church and state overlapped, as ecclesiastical legislation was absorbed into state jurisdiction, which thereby assumed a less secular nature, while the state set rules for catechesis, seminary education, the administration of the temporal goods of the Church, the exemption and the conventual life of regulars, and many other ecclesiastical issues. Pope Alexander VI in his bull *Inter caetera* (1493) had divided the newly discovered continent of America, allocating it to Spain and Portugal, and had blessed Spanish dominion over the Church in the New World. This patronage was therefore regarded as legitimate. But successive popes regarded Royal Patronage always as a free concession to the Spanish crown that would not automatically transfer to new rulers. The title of the Universidad de San Carlos, now the University of Córdoba, as “royal and pontifical” was symptomatic. However, the influence of the monarchy increased over that of the Church. Already Charles VI between 1749 and 1759 had forced monastic orders in his territories to give up control of many of the parishes they governed. Since then, the secular clergy was strengthened at the expense of the monks. However, the growing estrangement of America from Spain did not imply any estrangement from religion, which was deeply embedded in society. Even though institutional ties with the Holy See were interrupted for more than a decade after the May Revolution, the attitude of the American ecclesiastical hierarchy to the revolutionary developments was far from uniform⁹. The progress of the independence movement led to the formation of four types of groups of clerics in American society: the royalists clinged to their prerogatives under the Royal Patronage; the new governments argued that these rights had expired and had devolved to themselves; a secularist faction favored the disestablishment and nationalization of the Church following the thought of French philosophers; and an ultramontane group accepted abolition of the Royal Patronage but resented the Church being placed under the control of the

⁸ See Roberto DI STEFANO, “De la cristiandad colonial a la Iglesia nacional. Perspectivas de investigación en historia religiosa de los siglos XVIII y XIX”, *Revista Andes* no. 11 (2000), pp. 83-113.

⁹ See Nancy CALVO, Roberto DI STEFANO, and Klaus GALLO (eds.), *Los curas de la Revolución*, Buenos Aires: Emecé, 2002.

new governments¹⁰. None of them advocated a separation of Church and state, with the third group coming closest, let alone a completely secular society. The clergy was split between these four attitudes. Initially the royalist position was strong, but over time it lost support, not least because the future of a sovereign Spanish monarchy and its hold over its American territories were uncertain after the French occupation. Already before the outbreak of revolution, it was common for Spanish bishops holding American sees to be called to more prestigious bishoprics or archbishoprics in the peninsula¹¹. The revolutionary events brought about bishops in exile. Seven bishops out of thirty-two in Spanish America returned to Spain between 1810 and 1825, six more hoped for a Spanish military intervention and were eventually expelled, with fifteen more bishops to be exiled for their defense of the Church. Orellana's counter-revolutionary position was shared by both other bishops in the Río de la Plata, Benito de Lué y Riega of Buenos Aires, and Nicolás Videla del Pino of Salta. All three refused to preach in favor of the new ideas¹². By 1825 the archbishop of Arequipa was the only legitimate bishop in the entire area covering the present-day states of Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Chile, and Argentina. The hierarchy had nearly totally disappeared and so had priests; the Church was without leaders for decades¹³. Ultramontanism became a less sustainable option the longer relations with the papacy were suspended; up to the declaration of independence and beyond, there were indeed no contacts between the former viceroyalties and Rome. In his encyclical *Etsi longissimo* of 30 January, 1816, Pius VII condemned the revolutionary movement in America, spoke of the "grave evils of rebellion" (*teterrima ac gravissima defectionum damna*), and of "our most beloved son in Jesus Christ, Ferdinand". But it is unclear when this document, which would certainly have influenced a part of the clergy, actually became known in the United Provinces. It did not stop the declaration of independence five months later. This left most clerics a choice only between accepting the factual influence of the new government over

¹⁰ See Robert F. SCHWALLER, "The Episcopal Succession in Spanish America 1800-1850", *The Americas* 24, no. 3 (1968), pp. 207-271; see also Roberto DI STEFANO, "La revolución de las almas: religión y política en el Río de la Plata insurrecto", in: CALVO, DI STEFANO, GALLO, *Los curas de la Revolución* (see note 9), 13-27, pp. 21ff.

¹¹ José Manuel CUENCA TORIBIO, "Iglesia y estado a fines del antiguo régimen: la elección del episcopado hispano americano (1789-1824)", *Anuario de Estudios Americanos* 33 (1976), 105-143, pp. 112f., n. 12.

¹² See AYROLO, *Funcionarios de Dios* (see note 4), pp. 61-65.

¹³ SCHWALLER, "The Episcopal Succession" (see note 10), pp. 270f.

the local Church or favoring the formation of a national Church under complete control by the new rulers. The latter option was of course the one chosen by the French Revolution.

In the Hispanophone area, intellectual life in the eighteenth century was first under the near-monopoly of the Jesuits but increasingly came under the impact of Enlightenment thought. In Spanish America, and particularly in Córdoba, the Jesuits had exercised total control over education and publication. Since the Society was committed to the *ancien régime* without fail, any reforms had to overcome its opposition, which was formidable because of its entrenched positions of power. However, the reform movement that developed under King Charles III was of a Catholic orientation, more in the spirit of the Italian historian and priest Lodovico Antonio Muratori than in that of Voltaire. It was not opposed to religion as were the *lumières*, but aimed primarily at purifying religious practices and improving religious education. There was no emphasis on reason over faith, or convention over tradition. But there was a strong interest in the early Church and a faith in a kingdom which is not of this world (John 18: 36). The Enlightenment in Spain, and particularly in Spanish America, was a Catholic Enlightenment, with similarities to that in Austria and Bohemia. It was very different from the French Enlightenment, which accommodated to Jansenism but was opposed by the monarchy. In Spain, Charles III's absolute monarchy imported values of the Enlightenment including the Jansenist preference for simplicity and purity. It has been claimed that the meaning of "Jansenism" in Spain was ambiguous between a name for Jansenius' teachings and, more generally, all opposition to the Jesuits' ultra-montanism¹⁴. In fact, five different elements in the Spanish transplant of Jansenism have been distinguished, the last two often trumping the others in importance: anti-Molinism, ethical rigorism, enlightened Catholicism, hostility to the Society of Jesus, and royalism (*regalismo*)¹⁵. The Spanish Catholic Enlightenment was anti-Jesuit, blaming the Society for its excessively conservative stance on theological and political issues, particularly for its embrace of scholasticism and Molinism. It was closer to an Augustinian understanding of man, society, and history, even accommodating a Jansenist undercurrent on issues of grace. But its

¹⁴ See Richard HERR, *España y la revolución del siglo XVIII*, Madrid: Aguilar Maior, 1964, p. 14; Antonio MESTRE SANCHÍS, "Religión y cultura en el siglo XVIII español", in: Ricardo GARCÍA-VILLOSLADA (ed.), *Historia de la Iglesia en España*, Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, Vol. 4, 1979, 583-743, pp. 639ff.

¹⁵ See Émile APPOLIS, *Les jansénistes espagnols*, Bordeaux: Sobodi, 1966.

representatives also accepted the Royal Patronage of the Church and fostered reforms brought about by the state and its educated representatives including clerics. Since the Jesuits stood in the tradition of the School of Salamanca with its assumption of sovereignty being vested in the people, Spanish Jansenism was committed to the sovereignty of kings. Jansenist reformers hoped that the new values would turn into new civic virtues. At least in the American territories, this expectation did not materialize, as social conduct continued to be guided by the old code based on honor and family interests and overlain with a mercurial morality¹⁶.

Thus the ideological landscape of Spain in the eighteenth century was by no means uniform. The Enlightenment and Jansenism split the clergy itself into opposing factions. Religious orders were aligned with these. Where the Augustinians favored educational reforms, the Dominicans (following the Jesuits) resisted the Enlightenment and were ultramontane. Religious and intellectual life in America was totally dependent on that of Spain, with liturgical practices following those of Sevilla¹⁷. In the eighteenth century, the monarchy favored the diocesan organization of the Church and disfavored religious orders, with an increasing aversion for the Jesuits, who were considered to be overly dogmatic, obscurantist, and ambitious. In particular, the Jesuits' methods of evangelization (especially on the Reductions) came under mounting criticism as being too lax, unorthodox, and unproven. The schools, seminaries and universities of Spanish America were until 1767 solidly under Jesuit control and thus conservative and opposed to the Enlightenment. But since the sixteenth century, a separate tradition of American theology developed which was inspired by the School of Salamanca but which espoused themes of its own, for example in questions relating to the Indios and to slavery¹⁸. Jesuit dominance explains why Jansenism never became a strong force, differently from several European countries, or was received only late. The intellectual situation changed as, upon the Society's expulsion, the Franciscans inherited the management of education. At least since this time, Enlightenment ideas trickled in, were absorbed by the small intellectual class, and

¹⁶ See LORANDI, *Poder central* (see note 5), pp. 53f.

¹⁷ See Ana María MARTÍNEZ DE SÁNCHEZ, "Influencias peninsulares en la iglesia indiana. El obispado del Tucumán", in: Enrique DE LA LAMA CERECEDA (ed.), *Dos mil años de evangelización: los grandes ciclos evangelizadores*, Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 2001, pp. 637-649.

¹⁸ See Josep-Ignasi SARANYANA (ed.), *Teología en América Latina*, 4 vols., Madrid: Iberoamericana and Frankfurt: Vervuert, 1999-2008.

supported thought that would later lead to political independence. The works of Rousseau, Voltaire, Diderot, Condillac and others found a receptive audience. But much more, it was the Catholic Enlightenment that influenced thought – the reformist ideas of Spanish statesmen and writers such as Pedro Rodríguez Conde de Campomanes and Gaspar Melchor de Jovellanos, or of the Benedictine savant Benito Jerónimo Feijóo. Muratori's work *Della regolata divozione de' cristiani* (1723) experienced four editions in Spanish translation between 1763 and 1790 and was widely read by the intellectual élite of Spanish America¹⁹. Literature in English was hardly represented in the libraries of the intellectual class of the Río de la Plata²⁰. Late Jansenism was received and played an ambiguous role in the overseas territories²¹. It was used on both sides of the debate on Royal Patronage and sovereignty. On the one hand, its ideas supported the independence of local churches from Rome and state intervention in religious affairs. American clerics influenced by Jansenism, Gallicanism, or Febronianism often supported the revolution, and for them it combined with the values of the Enlightenment²². On the other hand, the most formidable defenders of the Royal Patronage and of colonial rule such as the Premonstratensian bishop Manuel Abad Illana were also under the sway of Jansenism, which they applied rather towards a purification of the Church from worldly accretions and the defense of high moral standards. The Spanish version of Jansenism did not emphasize its theological pronouncements on grace and predestination. Its principal interests were rather a return to a more original and poorer Church bereft of worldly possessions, court episcopatism in the sense of the Royal Patronage, rejection of forms of popular devotion identified with superstition, and the role of laity in the organization of the Church. But for others influenced by late Jansenism, court episcopatism could also be practiced under a republic, and this ambiguity was characteristic of Spanish America²³. Three of the four groups of

¹⁹ DI STEFANO, "De la cristiandad a la Iglesia nacional" (see note 8), p. 97.

²⁰ See María Verónica FERNÁNDEZ ARMESTO, "Lectores y lecturas económicas en Buenos Aires a fines de la época colonial", *Información, cultura y sociedad* 13 (2005), pp. 29–56.

²¹ It has been claimed that the meaning of "Jansenism" in Spain was ambiguous between a name for Jansenius' teachings and, more generally, all opposition to the Jesuits' ultra-montanism. See Richard HERR, *España y la revolución del siglo XVIII*, Madrid: Aguilar Mayor, 1964, p. 14; Antonio MESTRE SANCHÍS, "Religión y cultura en el siglo XVIII", in: Ricardo GARCÍA-VILLOSLADA (ed.), *Historia de la Iglesia en España*, Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, Vol. 4, 1979, pp. 639ff.

²² DI STEFANO, "La revolución de las almas" (see note 10), pp. 22f.

²³ On a similar ambiguity of Jansenism between Gallican royalism and republicanism in France, see Monique COTTRET, "Aux origines du républicanisme janséniste: le mythe

American clerics could assimilate Jansenist ideas, which were irreconcilable only with ultramontaniam.

The prevalent thought was still influenced by the Spanish scholasticism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Particularly in a conservative setting such as that of Córdoba, the hierarchical structure of the world was taken for granted and was regarded as imposed by the natural order²⁴. On law and politics, the teachings of the School of Salamanca were prevalent, which had assumed an implicit contract between the people and the monarch, and since the *conquista* a contract between the monarch and his American subjects. Francisco Suárez had taught, against the absolutism of James I of England, that sovereignty and therefore legitimate political power resided directly with the people and was only indirectly derived from God²⁵. However, it was the people as a community that was vested with sovereignty, not any individuals, from which principle derived that of the common good. It were these deeply Catholic ideas of government that influenced the events of 1809-10 in Spanish America, which were a reaction to the perceived loss of the link with the motherland in the person of the king. Similarly to the constitutional construction of the Holy Roman Empire, the various kingdoms, principalities, and viceroyalties (including the American provinces) were held together only by the crown. In the Spanish tradition of *pactismo*, the bond with the monarch was deemed dissolved upon his abdication, and in accordance with Suárez's doctrine, sovereignty reverted to the people as a constituted community. Other philosophical currents such as Locke, Rousseau, the encyclopedists, or the Scottish empiricists were less or hardly known and played a role only in the thought of single revolutionaries²⁶. Particularly Rousseau's political ideas were nearly totally opposed to those of the Spaniards. Where Suárez had seen popular sovereignty as transferable, as an attribute of the community, and men as cultivated and social beings, Rousseau had assumed

de l'Église primitive et le primitivisme des lumières", *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine* 31 (1984), pp. 99-115.

²⁴ See AYROLO, "Una Iglesia del interior de las Provincias Unidas" (see note 7), pp. 186ff.

²⁵ "Hanc potestatem esse immediate ab hominibus, & mediate a Deo." Suárez, *De legibus* III, 4, 8.

²⁶ Particularly Latin American historiography has returned to emphasizing the rootedness of the independence movement in Spanish scholastic thought. See Demetrio RAMOS PÉREZ, "Formación de las ideas políticas que operan en el movimiento de Mayo de Buenos Aires en 1810", *Revista de Estudios Políticos* no. 134 (1964), pp. 139-218; Miguel MOLINA MARTÍNEZ, "Pactismo e independencia en Iberoamérica, 1808-1811", *Revista de Estudios Colombinos* no. 4 (2008), pp. 61-74, especially pp. 64f.

the contrary. Neither did Montesquieu's emphasis on a separation of powers in the state, which was so influential for the independence movement in the United States, reverberate in Spanish America. With the expulsion of the Jesuits, their favored scholastic authors were of course questioned. At the Universidad de San Carlos, the doctrines of Suárez and Juan de Mariana on the natural rights of man, on popular sovereignty, and even on the legitimacy of tyrannicide, had been taught and were then prohibited by the authorities²⁷. Under control of the Franciscans, between 1767 and 1807, Jansenism became an influential force and partially supplanted the scholastic tradition. The theological direction shifted to a new Augustinianism. Bishop Abad Illana was involved in deciding on St. Augustine, St. Thomas, Melchor Cano, and the two rigorist moral theologians Natal Alejandro and Daniel Concina as the main authors to be studied instead of Suárez. Another substitute work was the six-volume *Institutiones theologicae* (1780-84) by the French Oratorian Joseph Valla, which was clearly of Jansenist inspiration and was therefore in 1792 placed on the Index of Prohibited Books²⁸. Nonetheless the "theology of Lyon" expressed in Valla's writings continued to be taught in the diocese until 1852²⁹. The indigenous clergy in its political views increasingly differed from the clergy sent from Spain, and a tension between the two groups developed. Already the first Premonstratensian Bishop of Tucumán, Manuel Abad Illana, thought little of the creole élite because of its low intellectual aspirations and its conquistador attitudes. Abad reduced many social ills he saw in his diocese to the increased self-confidence of women, to disrupted families of the American-born Spaniards, and to their disdain for manual labor, industry, and commerce³⁰. He also deplored that the "miserable creoles" of his diocese were greatly attached to the Jesuits³¹. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, parts of the American clergy became increasingly estranged from the motherland and

²⁷ Enrique DE GANDÍA, "Primeras ideas políticas del Deán Gregorio Funes", *Revista de Historia de América* 49 (1960), 173-181, p. 175.

²⁸ See Estaban F. LLAMOSAS, "Jansenismo, regalismo y otras corrientes en la Universidad de Córdoba", *Cuadernos de Historia* 16 (2006), pp. 64-74.

²⁹ GANDÍA, "Primeras ideas políticas" (see note 27), p. 176.

³⁰ See Juan Domingo ZAMÁCOLA Y JÁUREGUI, *Vida de Monseñor Manuel Abad Illana, Obispo de Arequipa. 1793*, Arequipa: Editorial UNSA, 1977 (originally published in 1793), pp. 77. 86f.; LORANDI, *Poder central* (see note 5), pp. 88f.

³¹ José Antonio BENITO RODRÍGUEZ, "Un vallisoletano ilustrado en el Perú: el prelado Manuel Abad Yllana (1713-1780)", in: *Luces y reformas en el Perú, siglo XVIII*, Lima: Universidad de Piura (= Cuadernos de Humanidades 10), 2005, 25-104, pp. 52. 63f.

inclined to embrace "patriotic" thought. Economic interests of the local landowning and merchant class were at least an equal reason for the disaffection as was ideology.

There were of course clerics who sided with independence³². One of their leaders was Gregorio Funes (1749-1829), a native of Córdoba who had studied canon law in Spain and brought the ideas of the Enlightenment to Argentina, where he became dean of the cathedral of Córdoba and a hopeful to become bishop of the see that would instead go to Orellana. The appointment of a "peninsular" cleric was seen as one more slighting of a deserving local candidate. Cayetano José Rodríguez (1761-1823), a Franciscan monk and theology professor who would become provincial superior of his order, supported independence and became deputy to the Congress of Tucumán³³. But despite advocating a republican form of government, and in a sense even democracy, these members of the American clergy did not subscribe to the modern philosophical currents that bolstered these movements. Funes rejected Descartes, Leibniz, and Locke, deeming traditional scholasticism a more secure basis from which to argue for political reform³⁴. He did accept Rousseau's ideas on the social contract but considered them not different in substance from St. Thomas' teachings on the origin of society or Suárez's *pactum translationis*. He prohibited the study of Voltaire and other "dangerous philosophers" at a college over which he ruled, as even Orellana's successor as Vicar Apostolic of Córdoba, Benito Lascano, would later punish the reading of heretical works with excommunication³⁵. Yet Funes was hardly a revolutionary and perhaps not even a true liberal, since he believed that the civil war of 1810 was to be decided neither by laws nor rights but by "real arms". His development from a pragmatic acceptance of local rule in the face of the paralysis of Spanish power during occupation to a more assertive embrace of political independence was triggered by realities in the overseas territories and by personal aspirations as much

³² See CALVO, DI STÉFANO, GALLO, *Los curas de la Revolución* (see note 9).

³³ See Rómulo D. CARBIA, *La Revolución de Mayo y la Iglesia*, Buenos Aires: Huarpes, 1945, pp. 18ff. This work appeared previously in *Anales de la Facultad de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales de la Universidad de La Plata* 5 (1915).

³⁴ María Cristina VERA DE FLACHS, "El Colegio de Nuestra Señora del Monserrat: del antiguo régimen a la nacionalización", in: Enrique GONZÁLEZ Y GONZÁLEZ and Leticia PÉREZ PUENTE (eds.), *Colegios y universidades: del antiguo régimen al liberalismo*, Mexico City: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 2001, Vol. 1, 111-156, pp. 141ff.; GANDÍA, "Primeras ideas políticas" (see note 27), p. 177.

³⁵ VERA, "El Colegio de Nuestra Señora del Monserrat" (see note 34), p. 144.

as by ideology. It was similar with much of the local clergy, which at least at the time of the May Revolution was in its majority fervently royalist and, as contacts with the motherland were interrupted and Spain had fallen under the influence of liberal ideas, only gradually warmed up to the new régime. The political ideas that animated the leaders of the May Revolution were of multiple origins, but those of Spanish vintage and coming from the Catholic tradition of natural law certainly predominated whereas classical liberalism was hardly known. Whereas Funes advocated religious toleration, most "patriotic" clerics did not countenance any separation of Church and state and would not do so long into the history of Argentina. Sixteen among the twenty-nine signers of the Declaration of Independence of the United Provinces were priests. This "patriotic" clergy was not yet representative for the Church in the country, but it would increasingly become so.

The Situation of the Spanish Congregation

The Spanish Congregation had been independent of the Order at large since 1573, as the result of a reform process that revived regular life but that also assimilated the role of canons more to that of monks and that integrated the Premonstratensians fully into the project of a Church dominated by the crown³⁶. Since then there had been little contact with Prémontré although the Spanish houses continued to excel in the veneration of saints and blessed of all circaries. Where the Premonstratensians in Spain had reached an apex of cultural creativity during the Golden Age, in the eighteenth century they were on a continuous decline, and the Congregation contributed relatively little. Manuel Abad Illana wrote a biography of St. Norbert and another history of the Order; Manuel de Paz contributed a textbook of music, particularly of plainchant; José Esteban de Noriega wrote works on the history of the Order with doubtful accuracy; and five Premonstratensians including Abad Illana, Ildefonso González de Apodaca, and Lorenzo del Castillo y Mostense, served as professors of theology at the University of Salamanca³⁷. Five profes-

³⁶ See Tomás MORAL, "*Hacia una historia de la orden Premonstratense en España y Portugal*", *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 165 (1969), pp. 219-252; Norbert BACKMUND, "*La orden premonstratense en España*", *Hispania Sacra* 35 (1983), pp. 57-85.

³⁷ Luis Martínez Moreno (1732-1786) and Francisco Echevarría (1690-1740) had less illustrious careers and did not leave important publications.

sors out of ninety-nine who occupied chairs in theology during the century is not a large percentage, and Dominicans, Benedictines, and Jesuits continued to dominate at this university. However, the influence of the University, which in the sixteenth century had followed the Sorbonne in being the theological authority for all of Europe, had declined. With the group of historiographers at the abbey of Santa María de Bellpuig de les Avellanes (Lérida) around abbot Jaume Caresmar (1717-1791), there was a single exception to the process of cultural erosion. Most monasteries shrank during the period of the Spanish Enlightenment, when French ideas infused the country; in 1774, the total Spanish Congregation counted no more than 356 members. From 1730 to 1737 alone, the novices resident at Colegio de San Norberto in Salamanca who studied at the University dropped from 64 to 45. The number of monks at San Norberto in Valladolid, where Orellana entered, dropped from 24 in 1645 to 17 in 1752³⁸. Falling numbers were a result of an anti-monastic policy conducted by the court and by bishops, which was supported by the secular clergy. Where the state of the Church in Spain was in general not impressive during the eighteenth century, that of many orders, and particularly of the old orders, was deplorable³⁹. Among the Premonstratensians it was exacerbated by an increasing neglect of learning. Abad Illana expressed his exasperation at this fact by writing that "the study of theology is so indispensable for Premonstratensian religious that whoever ignores it voluntarily is but a bastard son and ought to be ejected as an illegitimate son of St. Norbert"⁴⁰. The scholar did not use such words without reason, for even dedication to theology had receded in much of the Order.

It is not surprising that Spanish rather than French Premonstratensians engaged in overseas missions. It was not only the opportunities offered by the Spanish territories (which would to a smaller extent also have applied to the French colonies) but also the fact that in Spain, since the sixteenth century, the Order of Prémontré had increasingly lost a unique identity. As bishops assumed control over religious orders, and the king over bishops, and the office of abbots had been shortened to three years,

³⁸ BENITO RODRÍGUEZ, "*Un vallisoletano ilustrado en el Perú*" (see note 31), p. 40.

³⁹ See William J. CALLAHAN, "*The Spanish Church*", in: William J. CALLAHAN and David HIGGINS (eds.), *Church and Society in Catholic Europe of the Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979, 34-50, pp. 42f.

⁴⁰ Manuel ABAD ILLANA, *Historia del gran padre y patriarca San Norberto, Fundador del Orden Candido Premonstratense de canónigos reglares del gran padre y doctor de la iglesia San Agustín, y de los varones ilustres del mismo orden*, Salamanca: Eugenio García de Honorato y San Miguel, 1755, lib. I, c. IV, p. 57.

the identity of members had changed from that of canons to that of monks, and the specific Premonstratensian culture of place was lost. Like all religious orders, the Premonstratensians during the eighteenth century were under public pressure to prove their "utility" to society and the state. As they became "fungible" more like Jesuits and mendicants and could be placed wherever the Church or the king needed them, the religious lost commitment and increasingly abandoned education, science, and cultural pursuits. Napoleon's brother Joseph, who had been imposed as king of Spain, in 1809 abolished all male orders, dispersed the monks, and seized their property. After the defeat of Napoleon, the Premonstratensians could reclaim their houses. But the readiness with which the Spanish Congregation could be placed into the service of the wider Church, or of the state, may go a long way to explaining the lack of any attempt to reestablish (the male branch of) the Order after its definitive abolition by the liberal régime in 1836. By surrendering its identity, the Spanish branch had been dying a slow death by asphyxiation over more than two centuries. Because of its isolation from the rest of the Order, no resuscitation could come from outside, different from what happened during the nineteenth century in the revival of monasteries of other circaries.

On philosophical issues, the Spanish Premonstratensians of the period tended to be traditional Thomists opposed to the direction propagated by the Jesuits Francisco Suárez and Luis de Molina. On theological issues, they stood in the Augustinian tradition of their Order and opposed rationalist and historicist explanations in favor of traditionalism and orthodoxy with a penchant for fideism and moral rigorism (or tutiorism)⁴¹. The influence of Jansenism was strong, particularly in the Low Countries, but to a smaller extent also in France and Spain. Ildefonso González de Apodaca, three times abbot of Colegio de San Norberto, Vicar General of the Spanish Congregation (1755) and professor at the University of Salamanca (1733-1779), opposed Jesuit theology by holding a middle knowledge (*scientia media*) for explaining future counterfactuals to be useless and unfounded⁴². He rather held a medieval-metaphysical worldview, based on the "pure sources" of St. Augustine and St. Thomas, according

⁴¹ See Wolfgang GRASSL, *The Premonstratensian Order. An Intellectual Profile*, Turnhout: Brepols, 2011.

⁴² See Ildefonso GONZÁLEZ DE APODACA, *Theologia scholastica: ex puris fontibus M.P.N. Augustini et Angelici praeceptoris deprompta et eisdem SS. doctoribus toto cordis affectu dicata*, 6 vols., Salamanca: Eugenio García de Honorato y San Miguel, 1764-68.

to which God was the free original cause of all of creation, and there was no domain within free man that was (at least conditionally) exempt from his intervention. This position rather followed the theologies of Báñez's Thomism and Baius's Augustinianism as these had already long been influential in the Premonstratensian Order⁴³. Lorenzo del Castillo y Mostense, a former abbot of Retuerta and General of the Spanish Congregation (1717-1720), as professor at the University of Salamanca resisted the Jesuit proposal of establishing a chair dedicated to Suarezianism. In moral theology, the Premonstratensians tended to reject probabilism, which they saw as suborning moral laxism, and to take a more rigorist position. And Abbot Noriega exhorted the professors of philosophy and theology in his Order that they "neither in word nor in writing retreat from the Thomist doctrine or school"⁴⁴. Too much intellectual innovation might in any case have been prosecuted by the Holy Inquisition under the strict censorship laws. In 1791, the Procurator General of the Premonstratensian Congregation requested from the Tribunal of the Inquisition of Valladolid a judgment that withdrew from a certain monk of his order the faculty to read books because "he talks about thorny issues the penetration of which transcends his limited talent and scarce education"⁴⁵.

On matters of politics, their Augustinian theology prompted the Premonstratensians to be conservative. St. Augustine's distinction between the City of Man and the City of God, where the vision of the latter gives guidance to the culture of the former, was of course common currency in the Order. Concessions to wordly governments were undisputed, and thus the circaries in France supported Gallicanism while some abbeys in the Empire sided with the reforms under Maria Theresa and Joseph II. But with very few exceptions, nearly all members of the Order were opposed to the ideas and even more the practice of the French and North American revolutions. These were seen as opposed to the Christian religion, founded in an abstract and false philosophy, and as lacking in legitimacy. Numerous Premonstratensians in several circaries and countries condemned the revolutionary movement in preaching and writing⁴⁶.

⁴³ See GRASSL, *The Premonstratensian Order* (see note 41), 3.2, 3.3.

⁴⁴ "[...] ne vel verbo vel scripto à Thomistica doctrina, aut Schola recedant." Quoted in José Estebán DE NORIEGA, *Dissertatio Historica de Sancto Dominico de Guzman, Ordinis Prædicatorum Patriarcha*, Salamanca: Francisco Garcia Onorato y San Miguel, 1723, p. 173.

⁴⁵ Ángel DE PRADO MOURA, "El Tribunal de la Inquisición de Valladolid y el control de las ideas en la España del siglo XVIII", *Cuadernos Dieciochistas* 3 (2002), 13-31, p. 27.

⁴⁶ See GRASSL, *The Premonstratensian Order* (see note 41), 3.4.

The Spanish Premonstratensians in particular did not belong to the *africanizados* among the reform circles of Spain. Orellana's religious and intellectual position must be understood against this historical background of the Napoleonic period and against that of the development of the Spanish Congregation.

Orellana's Life

Rodrigo Antonio de Orellana was born in Medellín (Badajoz) on 13 March, 1756, into a family of nobility⁴⁷. He grew up and received his first education in Valladolid and there entered the Premonstratensian monastery of San Norberto at a young age. The abbey of Santa Cruz had been founded at Monzón de Campos (Ribas) around 1176 and was translocated to Valladolid in 1628⁴⁸. It was small but prosperous and one of the most prestigious and productive abbeys of the Spanish Congregation⁴⁹. Illustrious men like the poet Luis Tineo de Morales and the theologian and bishop Manuel Abad Illana had been canons and abbots there⁵⁰. After seven years of studies at Colegio de San Norberto, Orellana transferred to the University of Valladolid, where he achieved bachelor degrees in philosophy and in sacred theology, followed by a license (master's degree) and doctorate in 1783⁵¹. In the same year, he was ordained a priest. He immediately took up teaching experimental physics at his university. In 1785, he won his first chair in theology. All positions at Spanish universities were obtained through competitions. For this competition, on 12 June, 1789, he presented a lecture on *Romanae Sedis dignitas et auctoritas in Conciliis Oecumenicis adstruitur*, for a later competition on 6 May 1793 a lecture *De Episcoporum institutione et auctoritate*⁵². Orellana's academic career was illustrious in terms of successive promotions

⁴⁷ A brother was to serve as minister in the royal government and would later assist in supporting the efforts to nominate Rodrigo Antonio for the see of Ávila. Whether Juan Antonio Orellana, who served as abbot (1801-1804) of the Premonstratensian abbey of Santa María de la Caridad at Ciudad Rodrigo, was a relative remains unknown.

⁴⁸ Francisco ANTÓN, *Monasterios medievales de la provincia de Valladolid*, Valladolid: Maxtor, 2005 (original: Valladolid: Librería Sataren, 1942), pp. 294ff.

⁴⁹ BACKMUND, "La orden premonstratense" (see note 36), p. 71.

⁵⁰ See GRASSL, *The Premonstratensian Order* (see note 41), 4.12, 4.22.

⁵¹ Américo A. TONDA, "Itinerario de Orellana", in *El Obispo Orellana. Sus cartas a las Carmelitas de Córdoba*, Rosario: Facultad de Humanidades, 1973, p. 7.

⁵² TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 22.

to the most prestigious chairs (*Vísperas de Teología* and *Prima de Teología*)⁵³. The breadth of his teaching included mathematics, physics, and theology, which was not untypical for Spanish universities at the time. He also served as examiner in Latin, was elected honorary member of the Real Academia de Jurisprudencia Práctica, of the Real Sociedad de Valladolid, and of the Real Academia de Matemáticas y Nobles Artes⁵⁴.

Orellana was in 1795 elected to a three-year term as Abbot of San Norberto in Valladolid. In 1798, he was included in the *terna*, or list of three candidates, for the episcopate of Gerona (Catalonia), but was not chosen⁵⁵. In 1801, the Spanish Congregation elected Orellana to its highest office, as one of four Masters General (*maestro general*). On 22 May, 1805, King Carlos IV nominated him Bishop of Córdoba (Tucumán), and on 8 September he received the papal assent. As such, he also became a member of the Crown Council (*Consejo del Rey*) although he never exercised any political functions. Not least because of the unstable political situation on both sides of the Atlantic, Orellana reached Buenos Aires only in 1809. He was accompanied by two *confrères*, José Calasanz Centeno and Pedro Alcántara Jiménez (Ximénez). The first served the bishop as personal secretary (*secretario de cámara*) whereas the latter was his chaplain and confessor and would in 1830, while most sees in the newly independent republics lacked bishops, become Vicar Apostolic of Montevideo at episcopal rank. In Buenos Aires, Orellana received episcopal consecration from Bishop Benito de Lué y Riega, with the Bishop of Asunción concelebrating, and on 8 October, 1809 he took possession of his see as the eighteenth bishop of Córdoba. He was soon elected Rector of the Universidad de San Carlos, which had been founded in 1610 as a Jesuit seminary and was the predecessor of the University of Córdoba. One of Orellana's first orders of business was to pacify a diocese that was torn by factious strife between Americanists and "peninsulars", reformers and royalists, advocates of federalism and of regionalism, and between various personal interests and those of established patrician families. The appointment of a "peninsular" bishop had caused opposition by the local élite, which had favored the dean of

⁵³ In the Faculty of Theology, chairs were distinguished by the set times lectures were held, the *Prima* ("prime") being early in the morning and the *Vísperas* ("vespers") being in the late afternoon.

⁵⁴ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 21.

⁵⁵ CUENCA TORIBIO, "Iglesia y estado" (see note 11), pp. 132f., n. 38.

the cathedral, Gregorio Funes, who in many ways became Orellana's counterweight and antagonist.

The new bishop could not count on support from Spain and was for most of the time cut off from any contact with the motherland and with the Holy See. There is no record of contact with the Spanish Congregation or monasteries of his Order. It was even difficult to maintain communications with the metropolitan see of Charcas in Upper Peru (today's Bolivia), which was a royalist stronghold. Spain was engaged in her own "war of independence" from 1808 to 1814, and then her own "revolution" from 1820 to 1823. As a result, in the eyes of Spanish policy-makers the long wars of independence in America were insurrections or rebellions of less direct consequence than the events then transpiring at home. And yet the overseas territories for long still followed Spanish patterns. The institutions and practices of the see of Córdoba were those of the Spanish Church, including confraternities and the cult of saints, with very few local colorings⁵⁶. The new prelate's preaching soon made an impact in Córdoba, and not least among the female orders of Dominicans and Discalced Carmelites, who were confirmed in their royalist and legitimist attitudes⁵⁷. But the bishop had hardly gotten to know his diocese of considerable size when in May 1810 the revolution broke out. During the night after news had been received in Córdoba about the expulsion of the viceroy and the formation of the First Junta in Buenos Aires, the local notables met in the bishop's residence to discuss their options. Liniers, the provincial governor, and other officials reasoned that if Ferdinand VII had been legitimately empowered to abdicate at all, the Regency Council of Spain and the Indies surely held sovereignty *pro tempore* on behalf of the nation. This was the traditional interpretation of Spanish constitutional law, and it excluded the usurpation of royal powers by a self-appointed junta⁵⁸. In Buenos Aires, Bishop de Lué protested against the deposition of the legitimate viceroy. Orellana also opposed the liberal principles of the movement, which he saw as merely a belated continuation of the errors of the French revolution. He realized that the ultimate goal of the revolution was not to safeguard the sovereignty of the people and return it to the monarch upon his restoration to the throne but complete political independence. He therefore refused to recognize the new

⁵⁶ See MARTÍNEZ DE SÁNCHEZ, "Influencias peninsulares" (see note 17).

⁵⁷ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 73.

⁵⁸ See RAMOS PÉREZ, "Formación de las ideas políticas" (see note 26), pp. 171ff.

authorities and instead supported the short-lived attempt by Liniers and the governor to organize armed resistance. Upon its defeat, the bishop together with Liniers, the governor, four other leaders and some troops fled to the north, in order to join with loyal troops arriving from Potosí (Bolivia). But the counter-revolutionaries were captured by soldiers despatched by the Junta. The bishop and the other conspirators, including Orellana's Premonstratensian chaplain Jiménez, swore a holy oath not to betray their cause even at the risk of death. Several days later they were without trial condemned to death for treason by order of the First Junta. Five counter-revolutionaries including the former viceroy and the governor were shot at Cabeza de Tigre on August 26, 1810, only Orellana having been pardoned because of his ecclesiastical estate. His chaplain and *confrère* Jiménez, who had played a minor role in the insurrection, was also spared. Some historians now ascribe the persecution of the royalists "uniquely and exclusively" to Gregorio Funes, the dean of Orellana's cathedral and former contender for his episcopal see, who acted as "perfect traitor" by informing the First Junta⁵⁹. Yet upon condemnation, Funes (together with his brother Ambrosio and with other notables) asked for Orellana to be pardoned. The bishop had to administer the sacraments to the condemned and was present at their execution. The two Premonstratensians were then incarcerated in the prison of Luján. Orellana's personal possessions and even his official property were confiscated, and this included his extensive library, parts of which derived from that taken from the Jesuits upon their expulsion. The collection is now part of the Public Library of Buenos Aires, with a smaller part being held by the University of Córdoba⁶⁰. The Triumvirate, which had followed the Junta, allowed Orellana to defend himself. In a voluminous and tightly argued script, the bishop argued that he had committed no "crimes of state" of which he had been accused. A tribunal of twenty "wise men"

⁵⁹ GANDÍA, "Primeras ideas políticas" (see note 27), p. 179; TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), pp. 65f.

⁶⁰ The library, which was built by the Jesuits over two centuries, was at the time of its confiscation housed in the Dominican monastery in Córdoba and meant for use of the Universidad de San Carlos. It contained 3,524 folio and quarto volumes and 1,561 volumes in octavo format. See Hugo ACEVEDO, "Biblioteca Nacional de Argentina", *Boletín de la Anabad* 42 (1992), no. 3-4, 13-37, pp. 17f.; Roberto Ignacio PEÑA, "Expediente de inventario, secuestro y confiscación de los bienes del obispo de Córdoba del Tucumán Dr. Rodrigo Antonio de Orellana", *Revista de Historia del Derecho* 24 (1966), pp. 483-509; id., "La biblioteca del Obispo de la Diócesis de Córdoba del Tucumán: Dr. Rodrigo Antonio de Orellana, 1810", *Cuadernos de Historia* 7 (1997), pp. 13-28.

composed of theologians and (canon and civil) lawyers appointed by the government was to hear the case. The bishop prevailed, was acquitted, and since his defense seemed to make concessions at least in language to the new power structure, in January 1812 was set free. He never admitted guilt nor went beyond recognizing the *de facto* rule of revolutionary circles⁶¹.

Having received a renunciation of the declaration the junta had issued after his condemnation that the see of Córdoba had become vacant, in February 1812 Orellana could again occupy his bishopric. He sent a circular letter to all clerics informing them "very clearly" that he would "not join any other party than that of justice and truth" and that he would "not govern by other principles than those of his conscience"⁶². He did not openly reject the principles on which the independence movement was based and had to find a *modus vivendi* with the *de facto* government of the day if he was to be an effective shepherd of his flock. Córdoba was at the time a hotbed of conflicting interests, both in favor of and in opposition to the new power structure. In the meantime, Martín de Alzaga's alleged conspiracy of 1812 against the government had been stomped out even more brutally than the resistance against the May Revolution. Orellana's consecrator, Bishop Lué of Buenos Aires, had been placed under house arrest for his sympathies with the previous government. Orellana was biding his time, possibly in the expectation that Ferdinand VII would be restored to his throne after Napoleon's fortune had changed with his disastrous Russian campaign. He treaded carefully in matters of politics, but his relations with the civil authorities remained strained, which explains his preference for time spent outside Córdoba. He went on extended pastoral visits to parishes in his large diocese and tried to remedy shortcomings in religious knowledge and practice – due to a stark lack of priests. In less than three full years as bishop, Orellana founded and consecrated churches and reorganized the common life and regular observances of the Dominican convent of St. Catherine of Siena in Córdoba⁶³. Already his Premonstratensian predecessor Abad had imposed more austerity on this convent so that they could live a truly common life⁶⁴. No doubt both bishops were in this

⁶¹ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), pp. 123ff.

⁶² Ibid., p. 133.

⁶³ Fray Rafael MOYANO, *Origen y coronación de Ntra Sra del Rosario del Milagro*, Vol. I, 2nd ed., Buenos Aires: P.E. Coni, 1893, pp. 573f.

⁶⁴ See Victoria COHEN IMACH, "Decir verdad. Pesquisa secreta en un convento femenino (siglo XVIII)", *Acta Literaria* 28 (2003), pp. 19-32.

inspired by their Premonstratensian experience. The bishop also had to subdivide large parishes and found new ones. Various sources speak of his exemplary pastoral qualities and great dedication to strengthening the Church⁶⁵. But his travels also took a toll on his health, as he frequently fell ill. When Ferdinand VII returned to Madrid but initially had to make compromises with advocates of a liberal constitution, Orellana must have realized that a restoration of Spanish rule in the Río de la Plata was not immediate or even likely. Several invasions of Spanish troops from neighboring viceroyalties had no lasting success, but they tested the bishop's loyalty. The pressure on him increased, for example when the Triumvirate demanded that, just as the liturgy of the Mass included a prayer for the king, it should now include one "for the pious and sacred cause of our liberty"⁶⁶. All three bishops demurred, with the argument that the Council of Trent and Pius V had explicitly prohibited even the most minor deviations from the Roman Missal. Orellana decided to preserve the integrity of the Mass but for diplomatic reasons tried to accommodate imposed patriotism elsewhere, for example in the following ambiguous collect to be said after Mass: "Mayst thou free the United Provinces of South America and its rulers from all servitude and tyranny and protect them in Christian civil and political liberty. We ask thee this, hear our prayer."⁶⁷ The government compelled Orellana to swear an oath of obedience to the Assembly of the Year XIII, which was a congress that prepared a Declaration of Independence from Spain, a constitution, and the insignia and symbols of statehood. Instructions from Buenos Aires ordered his immediate suspension in case of the slightest alteration of the prescribed formula or any other resistance⁶⁸. This oath opened the door for receiving the citizenship of the United Provinces. The government interfered in affairs that canon law places in the exclusive jurisdiction of bishops, for example by withdrawing the license to preach and hear confessions from priests who were considered to be insufficiently loyal to the new régime⁶⁹. In his letters to the government, Orellana had to write about "the just cause of our liberty" and use

⁶⁵ MOYANO, *Origen y coronación* (see note 63), pp. 574f.

⁶⁶ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), pp. 154ff.

⁶⁷ "*Ut Australis Americae Provincias Unitas earumque Moderatores ob omni servitute vel tyrannide liberare, easque in christiana libertate civile et politica protégere digneris, Te rogamus audi nos.*" Ibid., p. 157, n. 114 and 158.

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 193.

⁶⁹ AYROLO, *Funcionarios de Dios* (see note 4), p. 63; TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), pp. 203ff. 212ff. 288ff.

the language of what its advocates styled the "American system" although his mental reservation was evident. When in February 1814 Francisco Antonio de Ocampo was sent to Córdoba as the new governor of the province, with greater political ambitions and more revolutionary zeal than his predecessors, the confrontation between the secular and the ecclesiastical authorities intensified. The governor doubted the bishop's republican convictions, suspected him to be "antipatriotic", and controlled and persecuted him in many ways, several times by infringing his sole jurisdiction in matters of ecclesiastical appointments. Orellana was accused of favoring royalist priests, of associating with enemies of the "American system", and of not preaching in favor of the revolution. The state curtailed his income as a bishop. Whereas Orellana had still complied, at least for some time, with the central government's request that he suspend *a divinis* several priests including his two *confrères* Jiménez and Centeno, for the simple reason of lacking "patriotic sentiments", he resisted the forced removal and arrest of the abbot of the Bethlehemite friars (*Orden de los Hermanos de Nuestra Señora de Bethlehem*). This order maintained a hospital for the poor in Córdoba⁷⁰. The bishop also refused to comply with a request by the junta to appoint as rector *ad interim* of his cathedral one of two favored "patriotic" candidates and insisted on nominating a deserving priest the officials suspected of royalist sympathies⁷¹. He defended the right to fair judicial procedures of clerics or regulars accused of some malfeasance but who were in fact known to oppose the régime. When Orellana's private secretary and *confrère* Centeno was to lose his position for lack of citizenship papers, and the government refused to issue such papers because of the applicant's alleged pro-Spanish sympathies, the bishop saw it as a clear breach of his own ability to function effectively but had no means to seek redress. A year later the Augustinian community of San Juan in Cuyo elected Centeno as their superior, which conflicted with a canonical prohibition for a member of one order to become prelate of another, exceptions being reserved to the pope. Orellana could have used his extraordinary powers to decide the case, but he could not be forced to delegate them in order for a "patriotic" priest to decide in the interest of government⁷². During the year 1814, Orellana seems to have decided no longer to comply with

⁷⁰ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), pp. 210ff. 221ff.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 231ff.

⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 442ff.

the demands of the state but, as he had promised his flock upon his return in 1812, to be bound only by his conscience. He devoted much of his last year in effective office to solving the problems of rural parish priests, who were facing innumerable hardships and were lacking in number and quality. He showed great pastoral sensitivity, for example in a case where an Indio accused the curate and vicar of Anguinán of having carried on a sacrilegious relationship with his wife. Since no truth of the allegation could be established in a formal ecclesiastical trial, Orellana sentenced the Indio to a formal apology but let the matter rest⁷³. In reports to the central government, Ocampo denounced the "public and private conduct of the Illustrious Bishop" as "harmful and destructive [*perjudicial y ruinoso*] for our political existence". By spreading "incendiary doctrines [*doctrinas seductoras*]" and being "obsequious to the country he favors", his subtle but persistent opposition in words and deeds to "truly enlightened principles" and to "the progress of our liberty" was a pernicious influence on the "three quarters of the population" that the governor deemed to be pious and even superstitious Catholics⁷⁴. This "episcopal cancer" had to be extirpated, mainly for his "antipatriotic conduct" that defied authority not derived from the Spanish crown⁷⁵. Eventually the constant complaints about the bishop, which also came from some "patriotic" clergy, bore fruit. In January 1815, the newly appointed Supreme Director of the United Provinces had Orellana arrested but, on the bishop's request, desisted from the plan of a renewed incarceration at Luján and opted instead for confinement to the Franciscan monastery of San Carlos in San Lorenzo (Santa Fe), which was a missionary order under the jurisdiction of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide. The Carmelite nuns, who shared the bishop's religious and political convictions and supported him before and during his exile, provided him a personal servant⁷⁶. Fathers Centeno and Jiménez accompanied him. From a distance, Orellana continued to the extent possible to influence the religious life of his diocese. A number of prominent clerics and members of the society of Córdoba kept close contact with the exiled

⁷³ Nelson C. DELLAFERRERA, "*Biblioteca Nacional de Argentina*", *Anales de la Academia Nacional de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales de Córdoba* 40 (2001), pp. 194f.

⁷⁴ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), pp. 229f.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 324; Américo A. TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y el Alcalde de Rosario*, Rosario: Facultad de Humanidades, 1972, pp. 10f.

⁷⁶ Orellano referred to this José (Pepe), who was black or a mulatto, with great respect and tenderness. See his letters to the Carmelites of 24 April and 6 November, 1816, pp. 65 and 72. He taught Pepe to read and write.

bishop, and he corresponded with successive governors and with his diocesan vicar⁷⁷. Orellana was inclined to return to Córdoba, an intention that Gregorio Funes, still dean of the cathedral, in a letter to his brother Ambrosio, who had been appointed governor, pledged to resist⁷⁸. Orellana excommunicated another newly appointed governor because he had dared to interfere with a personnel decision exclusively within the bishop's jurisdiction⁷⁹. A "trench warfare" with the governor of Córdoba ensued, particularly after he had declared, with no authority in canon law, that the exiled bishop was deprived of any jurisdiction in his diocese⁸⁰. Orellana steadfastly refused to accept appointments by the government or by the cathedral chapter (*cabildo eclesiástico*) to positions in the curia of his see, asserting his sole right with canonical arguments. Thus he declared null and void the election of Lascano as provisor and episcopal vicar⁸¹. His private secretary Centeno participated with other clerics in a riot against the governor in Córdoba, was confined, and upon release decided not to immediately rejoin the bishop in his exile. A letter to the Carmelite Sisters shows that Orellana was offended by what he saw as a possible defection by his *confrère*, which then turned out not to be such⁸². Jiménez, on the other hand, wanted to join him but had been arrested in November 1816 under the accusation of an "escape" to Rio de Janeiro, from where he could have contacted Ferdinand VII. He was kept in a prison in the vicinity of Buenos Aires, where Centeno unsuccessfully attempted to obtain his release⁸³. But Orellana himself no longer enjoyed safety at the Franciscan friars, as his presence attracted pro-revolutionary vigilantes. In December 1816, the bishop relocated to Coronda, and later to Santa Fe, where he celebrated many confirmations and several ordinations. The faithful of Santa Fe had not seen a bishop since 1803, and the provincial governor supported Orellana despite his conflicts with the central government. In the same month, the bishop wrote to the Carmelites

⁷⁷ TONDA, "Itinerario de Orellana" (see note 51), pp. 20ff.

⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 27.

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 19.

⁸⁰ Rodrigo Antonio DE ORELLANA, *Justa defensa del Obispo de Córdoba, Dr. D. Rodrigo Antonio de Orellana, contra las violencias de aquel Gobierno*, Buenos Aires: Imprenta M.J. de Gandarillas y socios, 1816, in two parts, 4°, Part II, 4.

⁸¹ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), pp. 453ff.; AYROLO, *Funcionarios de Dios* (see note 4), p. 70.

⁸² Letter of 6 November, 1816, in *El Obispo Orellana. Sus cartas a las Carmelitas de Córdoba* (see note 51), p. 70.

⁸³ Letter of December 1816, in Ibid., p. 74.

that he had been nominated for the see of Ávila, which put him into a "major conflict" between serving the "great saint" St. Theresa of Jesus in her native city and his commitment to the fate of Catholics in the diocese of Córdoba⁸⁴. In April 1817, a representative of the government in Buenos Aires offered him and his companions passports for returning to Spain on the condition that Orellana come to Buenos Aires for the papers and for embarkation. But in the meantime, Jiménez had been sentenced to six months in prison, and the bishop did not trust the junta's promise of safe conduct⁸⁵. Already on 3 January 1816, the governor of Córdoba had deprived Orellana of his citizenship status, confiscated his remaining property, and stopped his income from tithes. Realizing that his royalist convictions would never be acceptable to a country that had embarked on a republican path, he decided to return to Spain⁸⁶.

At the beginning of 1816, Orellana wrote a defense of his conduct as bishop that appeared in print later in the same year⁸⁷. The *Justa Defensa* was composed before the Congress of Tucumán convened, also in 1816, at which the irregular situation of the diocese of Córdoba received ample discussion. Apart from the general question of an ordinary forced into exile, two issues of importance were the legitimacy of Lascano's election as provisor of the diocese, and Orellana's involvement in Jiménez's travel to Brazil. The bishop presented a defense against these charges and a vindication of his policies since taking possession of his see. His enemies sought to have the see declared vacant but knew that this would turn a factual irregularity into a canonical schism. Orellana decided to declare Lascano's status valid but in his printed defense rejected any misconduct or breach of law. He accepted the *de facto* authority of the Congress of Tucumán but refused to recognize the Declaration of Independence it issued and to swear allegiance to the new and sovereign republic⁸⁸. He knew that this act of defiance would mean renewed imprisonment unless he left the country. An attempt to cross over into Paraguay failed. By way of Corrientes he then reached the Brazilian border, largely on foot, in disguise, and accompanied only by his servant Pepe. In Portuguese Brazil,

⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 73.

⁸⁵ Letters of 29 April and 1 May, 1817, in Ibid., p. 81 and p. 83. Orellana cited the sentence as six months, but it appeared to have been for six years in prison; see TONDA, "Itinerario de Orellana" (see note 51), p. 30.

⁸⁶ Letter of 1 May, 1817, in *El Obispo Orellana. Sus cartas a las Carmelitas de Córdoba* (see note 51), pp. 82f.

⁸⁷ ORELLANA, *Justa defensa* (see note 80).

⁸⁸ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 494.

which was in an intermittent state of war with the revolutionary régime of the United Provinces, Orellana was received well both by the authorities and by the nuncio, and in a letter to Pope Pius VII he reported on the state of affairs. At the end of May 1818, the bishop embarked for Lisbon, from where he made his way to Madrid. The reason for Orellana's escape was not so much his fear of impending new persecution but simply the fact that because of the mounting pressure he had no longer been able to function as a bishop. Deprived of financial means, he had also become dependent on the mendicant monks of San Carlos. The diocese of Córdoba, however, remained without a resident ordinary until 1831 or, if one is to count only actual exercise of powers, until 1857.

In Madrid, Orellana was received by Ferdinand VII, who awarded him the Cruz Americana de Isabel la Católica. The bishop wrote an extensive document in Latin about the ecclesiastic and political conditions in Argentina and in January 1819 sent it to Pope Pius VII. It was the first report the papacy received on the independence of Argentina. The official appointment to the see of Ávila dates of 21 December, 1818, and Orellana served as bishop of this diocese until his death in 1822. He was convinced that the lost territories in America should be recovered for the Spanish monarchy. During this time, he supported the preparations for a Spanish expeditionary force staging an invasion in the Río de la Plata, which were only aborted by the liberal revolution of January 1820. After a long illness, Bishop Orellana died in Bonilla de la Sierra (Ávila) on 22 June, 1822.

Orellana's Thought

In his intellectual orientation, Orellana was a traditionalist. He showed few influences of the Enlightenment. As was typical for Spain, this movement precipitated rather in a drive towards a reform of institutions so that they would better support the aims of the monarchy. Like his earlier *confrère* in the see of Tucumán, Manuel Abad Illana, Orellana was conservative and dedicated to the Royal Patronage. This is why he was not willing to accept that a royal authority seen to be derived from God was transferred to a mere populace or, even worse, to a self-appointed junta as its agent. However, since his university career he also saw the limits of royalism and was not willing to condone infringement on the rights of the papacy. In particular, the Royal Patronage freely granted to

the Spanish crown would not automatically devolve upon a revolutionary regime that defied the authority of the papacy. Orellana's emergence as a counter-revolutionary was a logical consequence of his convictions. Already soon after taking possession of his see, Orellana released a letter in which he condemned the "pestiferous books [*pestilenciales libros*] of some impious and libertine philosophers, particularly those of Voltaire" that he knew to circulate in his diocese. He saw himself compelled to take decisive action in order to protect his "beloved flock" from the "ravages that the delusions and paradoxes of the false philosophy have caused in Europe"⁸⁹. He was horrified when on 13 January, 1812 he heard Bernardo de Monteagudo, a politician of the radical and Jacobin wing of the nationalist movement, lecture in Buenos Aires about the Abbé Raynal and Abbé de Mably, two priests and Enlightenment thinkers whose anti-royalist and anti-colonialist attitudes influenced the later French revolutionaries⁹⁰. Orellana referred to Napoleon as "the tyrant of the Church and of Europe"⁹¹. Anti-revolutionary intransigence derived from the question of political legitimacy is the single most characteristic hallmark of his thought.

Although there are many references to his lectures at Valladolid, the professor left no written works from this period. His thought is known from his published defense of his conduct as bishop, from letters, homilies, reports by contemporaries, and from his own actions. In particular, over several years he wrote twenty-nine letters to the Discalced Carmelite Sisters at Córdoba, from his travels, his confinement, and one letter later from Spain⁹². Orellana was a political thinker only by the necessity of his episcopal office in a revolutionary environment. His own inclination was clearly pastoral. Yet all extant sources suggest five particular characteristics of Orellana's thought: rejection of the Jesuit conceptions of society and the state, particularly of Suárez's theory of law and government; absolute priority given to the legitimacy and legality of civil and ecclesiastical rule; embrace of political Augustinianism; support for federalism over centralism; and a deeply felt piety and dedication to traditional Catholicism.

⁸⁹ "[...] para precaver a nuestra amada grey de los estragos que han causado en Europa los delirios y paradojas de la falsa filosofía." Quoted from VERA, "El Colegio de Nuestra Señora del Monserrat" (see note 34), p. 143.

⁹⁰ See TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 131.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 158. 421.

⁹² See *El Obispo Orellana. Sus cartas a las Carmelitas de Córdoba* (see note 51).

Until their expulsion from Spain and her territories in 1767, the Jesuits had actively promoted their philosophical and theological tradition, and it had nearly come to monopolize universities in Spain and her empire. At the University of Valladolid, "Suárez classes" had become mandatory in 1720, but were again abolished in 1768 under Carlos III by royal decree. Orellana will certainly have studied the works of the Jesuit and of the School of Salamanca but is more likely to have been influenced by the reaction to Suarezianism coming not least from Premonstratensians. In the eighteenth century, all professors of theology belonging to the Spanish Congregation, and many *confrères* in other circaries, opposed the Jesuit version of scholasticism, whether in the form of the Molinist compatibility of divine providence with human freedom or of moral probabilism. One of Orellana's predecessors as bishop (before the division of the see of Tucumán), Manuel Abad Illana, was a known opponent of Jesuit thought and policies, and as bishop willingly executed the royal decree of expulsion⁹³. There is no evidence of any antipathy for the Jesuits in Orellana's life, though he was certainly influenced by his Order's disavowal of their theology and was undoubtedly influenced by Jansenism. The time of partisan fights in America over the work of the Society had long passed, and many of the bishop's closest associates were beneficiaries of a Jesuit education. Though Orellana's library was replete with Jansenist literature, it seemed primarily to support his penchant for asceticism and moral rigorism⁹⁴. The disdain for popular devotion characteristic of Jansenism never found acceptance in the first place. As for other Premonstratensians influenced by this neo-Augustinianism, Orellana's devotion to the Blessed Virgin and the saints was not in the least clouded by Jansenist purism, nor was his support for pious religious practices. In a sense, then, Orellana might be understood as having belonged to a *tiers parti catholique* of those prelates who found a Jansenist approach to theology desirable but who were not willing to follow its puritanical lead in matters of worship and cult⁹⁵. This "third party" followed an Augustinian theology without committing itself to Jansenism as an ecclesiological or political program. This positioning did not detract

⁹³ See GRASSL, *The Premonstratensian Order* (see note 41), 4.22.

⁹⁴ See Juan Pedro GREÑÓN S.J., "Dos bibliotecas episcopales de la época de la Revolución", *Archivum* 5 (1961), pp. 263-274.

⁹⁵ On the "third Catholic party", which reached its apogee in France between 1740 and 1758 but later elsewhere, see Émile APPOLIS, *Entre Jansénistes et Zelanti: le «Tiers Parti» catholique au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris: A. et J. Picard, 1960.

from Orellana's closeness to Jansenist thought, as it was indeed widespread within the Premonstratensian Order at large. In fact, Orellana subscribed to all elements constitutive of Spanish Jansenism: anti-Molinism, moral rigorism, enlightened Catholicism, hostility to (at least some) Jesuit ideas, and royalism.

Orellana tended to reject some social and political teachings of the School of Salamanca, especially the contractual nature of society. He repudiated the political theory proposed by Suárez, in *De legibus* (1612) and *Defensio fidei catholicae* (1613), that the authority of the state was only indirectly of divine but directly of human origin, its nature therefore being chosen by the people involved. In order to vindicate his refusal to accept the authority of the revolutionary government, the bishop did refer to the "people establishing by way of social contracts their reciprocal rights", and temporal power deriving from "the will of men, or of peoples"⁹⁶. However, the genuineness of this argument must be doubted since it remained rather a singular occurrence and it was used in defense of his personal liberty and rights to the see of Córdoba. Orellana never located sovereignty – a term that was not part of the scholastic vocabulary, which instead used *principatum* – in the people but exclusively in God. If government indeed received its power from the sovereignty of the people, they would have the right to reclaim it, and a justification would be provided for local élites constituting themselves as *ad hoc* governmental juntas in times of crisis. Orellana's "social contracts" need also not be understood in the sense of Rousseau but rather in that of the Spanish tradition of *pactismo* that went back to Francisco Suárez, Juan de Mariana, and Francisco de Vitoria⁹⁷. But not even from this tradition, which was in essence Catholic, did Orellana seem to borrow. As an alternative, he clinged to the patriarchal theory of government, and he saw the monarchy as a paternalistic rule, more in the sense of the Bourbon dynasty and its Jansenist-influenced apologists. He thought that even after the abdication of Ferdinand VII, the voluntary nature of which was in doubt, allegiance would automatically devolve to the Regency Council of Spain and the Indies to hold legitimate authority during the vacancy on the throne or its occupation by an illegitimate ruler. This transition of authority to an institution with which the American provinces had not entered into an original contract was unacceptable to the revolutionaries

⁹⁶ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 119.

⁹⁷ See MOLINA MARTÍNEZ, "*Pactismo e independencia*" (see note 26), pp. 63ff. 70ff.

whereas Orellana understood the Suarezian *pactum translationis* exactly to imply this. Similarly, Orellana could not accept the decision by the First Junta in 1810 to declare his see vacant; it was not his loss of office as such that mattered to him but the violation of canon law, according to which a vacancy could occur only by the death or renunciation of the ordinary or by an action of the supreme pontiff. Even in vindicating his conduct during the May Revolution, Orellana declared to have been placed into his see "by the grace of God and anointment by the Holy Spirit". It is the bishop who blesses his flock rather than standing in need of their blessing, and he must "be in their midst as a father, govern them as a teacher, and take care of them as a shepherd"⁹⁸. Paternalism extended both to the secular and the ecclesial realm. In his *Justa Defensa*, Orellana did not claim a right to resist political tyranny, as might have been an argument based on natural law, but the divine duty derived from Revelation and the just authority of the pope to exercise the teaching authority of the Church.

The idea that was most central to his political thought was legitimacy both in the sense of a source of authority and in that of governmental action under the rule of law. The legality of administrative acts depended on the legitimacy of the power to legislate and execute. Already in his defense of his attitude towards the May Revolution, he argued that there was no ground on which a revolutionary arrogation of power by the First Junta could be considered legitimate. Even if sovereignty resided in the people, these had not yet had the opportunity to grant it to the Junta, which had rather seized power. The Junta's directives could therefore not be considered laws, and because *nullum crimen sine lege*, his own conduct could not be considered culpable⁹⁹. Orellana never explicitly conceded that sovereignty might originally or naturally be vested in the people but in the case of a vacancy in the throne saw it devolve to the Regency Council. Contrary to the legal thought of the revolutionaries, even if the people held authority *pro tempore*, it would not be free to use it in any way they chose, for example by abolishing the monarchy, but only through constitutional institutions such as the Regency Council, which would hold it in trust until a legitimate monarch would again ascend to the throne. Orellana recognized the crux of all revolutionary régimes – their lack of legitimacy even though a semblance of legality

⁹⁸ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 120.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

may be preserved¹⁰⁰. And he knew that as no junta or assembly could replace a king, no provisor or cathedral chapter could replace a bishop. Where in subsequent years he had to compromise on preaching his political thought, after 1814 he became increasingly outspoken and was denounced for it. In the numerous conflicts both with pro-republican clerics and with the civil authorities, which often concerned appointments, Orellana tenaciously defended the respective rights of bishops and of the pope. In the Church, plenary power was vested only in the Roman Pontiff, which was a declaration that moved Orellana closer to the ultramontane camp than was typical of Jansenists¹⁰¹. Orellana was willing to make accommodations in exercising his own rights but not in defining what these rights comprised. In a letter to the Dominican provincial Julián Perdiel of 10 June, 1815, the exiled bishop referred to the institution of a General Commission for Regulars (*Comisaría General de Regulares*) by the General Constituent Assembly as "schismatic, anti-canonical, anomalous and, to repeat it, absolutely and irredeemably null and void"¹⁰². The *Justa Defensa*, written in a Franciscan monastery with a much smaller library than could have been accessed in Córdoba, made ample use of arguments from canon law, with its author citing many arguments from memory. The sources of Orellana's defense of the rights of the Church were the decretals, the decrees of the Council of Trent, Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, Benedict XIV, Diego de Covarrubias (despite his otherwise scarce attention given to the School of Salamanca), and many other theologians and canon lawyers¹⁰³. These included jurists with a strong Jansenist leaning such as the canon lawyer of Louvain, Zeger Bernard van Espen (1646-1728), and despite the fact that this author's works had in 1704 been placed on the Index of Prohibited Books. Van Espen was a convinced episcopalist who defended the primacy of bishops over the pope but would stop short of claiming jurisdiction in civil matters. There is no reference in Orellana's writings or homilies to the encyclical *Etsi longissimo*, which made some of the same

¹⁰⁰ See AYROLO, *Funcionarios de Dios* (see note 4), pp. 70. 106.

¹⁰¹ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 421.

¹⁰² Perdiel summarized the letter's content in these words. See Alfonso ESPONERA, "La Bula «*Inter graviores*» y los Dominicos de la América Hispana (1805-1835)", in: José BARRADO BARQUILLA (ed.), *Los Dominicos y el Nuevo Mundo, siglos XVIII-XIX*. Actas del IV Congreso, Santafé de Bogotá, 6-10 septiembre 1993, Salamanca: Editorial San Esteban, 1995, 79-104, p. 93.

¹⁰³ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 478, n. 87.

claims he was making. Possibly the bishop in his isolation never became aware of it before his departure.

In a sense, then, Orellana's thought was that of political Augustinianism. He referred to the phrase attributed to Christ, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's" (Matthew 22:21; Mark 12:17; Luke 20:25)¹⁰⁴. But he used it to emphasize the illegitimacy of the government meddling in affairs of the Church. Orellana certainly saw two different authorities, but he understood them as interlocked by a common divine purpose. He was committed to the ideal of Christendom with the Church lending legitimacy and thus authority to a monarchy which in turn had to protect the Church and give her the proper autonomy. Where in the Middle Ages the Holy Roman Empire was seen as the political and the Church as the spiritual manifestation of the *corpus Christi*, Orellana saw, in the sense of a *translatio imperii*, the Spanish monarchy as imbued with similar legitimacy as long as it remained truly Catholic. Differently from Locke, he saw political legitimacy derive not from human but from divine consent. Authority lastly comes from God and can be legitimately exercised only in the name of God according to the teaching of the Church. Established religion, absolute monarchy, and the divine right of kings were essential elements of the Augustinian fusion of secular and ecclesiastical rule, which could be separated only procedurally and institutionally but not by their common source. This was at the core of the Royal Patronage. The reign Christ has come to set up in this world was "totally divine and spiritual, and therefore accommodates to all governments, and even sustains them once they have established themselves"¹⁰⁵. Yet *regalismo* was for him not unlimited, but constrained by the authority of the Church, to which is owed her rightful autonomy. Like St. Augustine, the Premonstratensian bishop did not view the Church and the *Civitas Dei* as simply identical or coterminous. The City of God was an invisible community consisting of all those – past, present, and future – who loved God rather than self whereas the visible, institutional Church was an earthly city that could be sinful, corrupt, and characterized by love of self to the contempt of God. Like St. Augustine, Orellana cared little about liberty in the modern sense of the term, although he cared very much about governmental respect for the proper sphere of the Church. He certainly was not

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 210.

¹⁰⁵ Letter to the First Junta of 31 October 1811, in Ibid., p. 111.

a proponent of popular rule. And like St. Augustine, he proposed no clear and comprehensive concept of the good society or of the best system of government even though he affirmed various social and political norms.

One of the political norms Orellana defended was federalism as against the increasing centralism of the régime in Buenos Aires (*unitarios*)¹⁰⁶. Like elsewhere, centralism (or unitarianism) in the Río de la Plata was allied with political liberalism whereas federalism was conservative. The bishop's preference for regional autonomy derived certainly from the emphasis on subsidiarity in Catholic social thought. Since the late Middle Ages, political thinkers had regarded the Holy Roman Empire, and later the Spanish Empire, as hallmarks of freedom and good government because government was local and regional, and of multiform nature, and the emperor merely a *primus inter pares* rather than a ruler over kings and princes. In Spanish constitutional thought, the emphasis on the *fue-ros*, or ancient rights of constitutive parts of the realm, had traditionally been strong. Orellana's nearly instinctive rejection of centralism aligned well with the interest of the élites of Córdoba to keep the federal government out of their affairs. This was nearly the only concern on which his antagonist Gregorio Funes agreed with the bishop. The same sentiment made Orellana support the autonomy of religious orders, against a *Zeitgeist* that wanted to place them under episcopal or governmental control. He may certainly have drawn on his own experience as a regular canon when he expressed his conviction that at least the masculine orders must be under the natural authority of local superiors¹⁰⁷. When in 1815 the central government appointed a cleric from outside the diocese to the office of vicar of Córdoba who intended to subject the masculine orders under his authority, the regulars rebelled, the city refused to comply, and the exiled bishop withheld recognition for reasons of an *ultra vires* arrogation of his own powers. Yet Orellana could, in defense of his own decisions, also be pragmatic. When in the last two years of his episcopacy attacks against him came from the governor of Córdoba, he appealed to the central government, with the argument that any obedience to regional authority would amount to recognizing a *de facto* independence of the province, which was not his intention¹⁰⁸. In yet another decree against the exiled bishop (3 January, 1816), in which he derived Orellana

¹⁰⁶ See DI STEFANO, "De la cristiandad colonial a la Iglesia nacional" (see note 8), pp. 100ff.

¹⁰⁷ See AYROLO, *Funcionarios de Dios* (see note 4), p. 105.

¹⁰⁸ See TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y el Alcalde de Rosario* (see note 75), pp. 11f.

of his citizenship and episcopal temporalities, the governor wrote not only of his "antipatriotic crimes" and "obstinate audacity" but also of his unwillingness to accept that the independence and authority of the government ultimately derived from the people¹⁰⁹.

Orellana's Augustinianism manifested itself also at a deeper level of anthropology. He saw society under an *ordo amoris* and some human aspirations as properly ordered towards love while others were not. The bishop showed his Augustinian pedigree by deriving charity (*la charidad christiana*), as the "highest and most sublime virtue", from the perfect equality and love between the persons of the Trinity¹¹⁰. While love was central, it had to be guided by prudence, and particularly in the last years of his episcopal ministry he gave ample proof of his ability to manage this tenuous relationship. Love was also not in opposition to justice but rather its motivation. In numerous cases of exercising episcopal jurisdiction over priests and parishioners, Orellana applied the law and respected the customs of his diocese but also showed mercy and compassion¹¹¹. A letter to the highest court in the land (*Real Audiencia de Buenos Aires*) gave proof of the bishop's deep humanism in describing the enormous hardships and deprivations pastors in the rural areas had to endure¹¹². Orellana was not a detached member of the hierarchy but had an acute understanding of the human soul, which served him well in his pastoral work. His extended travels helped to give him a realistic picture of human greatness and failing. Thus he deplored the extra domestic chores imposed on women by the "reprehensible carelessness" (*reprensible descuidez*) of their husbands¹¹³. Only few months after taking up his episcopal ministry at Córdoba, in March 1810, Orellana sought to open a primary school for *pardos* on the grounds of the university over which he presided. In the Spanish colonial system of racial castes, *pardos* were derived from all three races – White, Black, and Amerindian – and often suffered even more exclusion than did *mulatos*, *zambos*, or *mestizos*. Only implacable opposition by the faculty prevented implementation of the plan¹¹⁴. Orellana sought to be charitable also to his worst enemies, by trying to judge their motivations

¹⁰⁹ See *Ibid.*, pp. 15f.

¹¹⁰ Letter of 27 December, 1812, in *El Obispo Orellana. Sus cartas a las Carmelitas de Córdoba* (see note 51), pp. 42f.

¹¹¹ See AYROLO, *Funcionarios de Dios* (see note 4), pp. 140f.

¹¹² TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 259.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

¹¹⁴ LESLIE B. ROUT, *The African Experience in Spanish America. 1502 to the Present Day*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976, pp. 145f.

justly. Even when he was exasperated, for example at the “cowardice and fear” of priests, who were complacent like “dumb dogs” (*unos perros mudos*) instead of “raising their voices like an awful trumpet”, he tried to be just in his prophetic judgment¹¹⁵.

Orellana’s theology made him oppose the revolution in the Río de la Plata. Despite his occasional compliance with the language of the “American system” that was required for him to exercise his episcopal functions, there can be no doubt of his “total rejection of the revolution” (*su total rechazo a la revolución*)¹¹⁶. He has been accused of nurturing “a thick sediment of animosity towards the American cause”¹¹⁷. His position derived from a strong sense for legitimacy and the rule of law, which the vicissitudes of a revolution could never change. Orellana may indeed be placed in a tradition of Spanish traditionalist, legitimist, and integralist thought that in the peninsula would later be carried on by the statesman Juan Donoso Cortés, marqués de Valdegamas (1809-1853), and in Latin America much later by the Colombian writer Nicolás Gómez Dávila (1913-1994). Neither of them referred to Orellana or may even have known of him, but their arguments in favor of a Catholic society were largely anticipated by the Premonstratensian bishop. In Donoso’s *Ensayo sobre el catolicismo, el liberalismo y el socialismo* (1851), legitimacy was discussed as the core problem of politics, and its source was seen to lie in God rather than in any contract among humans. Orellana would certainly have agreed with his compatriot’s astonishment, derived from Proudhon, at “how in all of our political questions we encounter theology”¹¹⁸.

Orellana saw the fundament of legality in political legitimacy, but most of his arguments defending episcopal and papal rights could remain at the level of formal legality. One of his main concerns was that the central authorities might force him to consecrate bishops of their choice against the provisions of canon law¹¹⁹. While canon law was codified and had to

¹¹⁵ ORELLANA, *Justa defensa* (see note 80), doc. 22.

¹¹⁶ Gustavo Ernesto DEMARCHI, “1810: Conspiraciones, delaciones, intrigas y traiciones diocesanas”, <http://www.cayomecenass.com/mecenas2896.htm>.

¹¹⁷ “[...] un grueso sedimento de animosidad contra la causa de América.” TONDA, “Itinerario de Orellana” (see note 51), p. 35.

¹¹⁸ “Es cosa que admira el ver de qué manera en todas nuestras cuestiones políticas tropezamos siempre con la teología.” JUAN DONOSO CORTÉS, *Ensayo sobre el catolicismo, el liberalismo y el socialismo*, Madrid: La Publicidad, 1851, Lib. I, cap. 1.

¹¹⁹ See ALFONSO ESPONERA, “Un representativo caso de la elección de la Jerarquía episcopal hispano-americana en el siglo XIX”, *Studium: Revista cuatrimestral de filosofía y teología* 29 (1989), 299-327, p. 300, n. 1.

be seen as augmented by other authoritative documents such as the decrees of the Council of Trent, Orellana's dogged insistence on the law as opposed to the mere political will of the governments of the day may be understood as deriving from a deeper insight: Catholicism is not an unordered and "footloose" set of beliefs and practices but one that is cast in a particular institutional and legal form. The Gospels must not, as Lutheran theology would have it, be pitched against the Law. More than maybe anyone else, the political theorist and lawyer Carl Schmitt has pointed out that the *repraesentatio Christi* by the Church requires a certain form. The genius of Catholicism lies exactly in having imposed such a form, through canon law and its structured levels of authority, but also through an order of worship and liturgy, which has melded a *complexio oppositorum* of beliefs and practices into a theological unity¹²⁰. Orellana wrote little about theology but much about law. He seems to have intuited that within the Church, legal form takes on a substantive meaning and theological importance. And this makes the juridical foundation of the Church a public matter.

Orellana's rejection of political independence did not entirely determine his decisions as a bishop. Before the May Revolution, in 1810, he appointed the prominent priest and professor, Pedro Ignacio de Castro Barros (1777-1849), to the important parish of La Rioja despite his known sympathies for independence. Orellana in 1813 conferred upon the doctor of theology the title of "Apostolic Missionary" although he was a deputy to the Assembly of the Year XIII and would later participate in the Congress of Tucumán and sign the Declaration of Independence. The Premonstratensian bishop was also less than conservative on administrative matters. He criticized the inherited system of tithes (*diezmos*), which he saw as particularly ineffective to sustain the Church in rural areas, and questioned the original constitution of the Church in the Indies. When the Assembly of the Year XIII debated a new distribution of income from tithes, Orellana developed an innovative plan for reforming ecclesiastical revenues, sent it to the Supreme Director of the United Provinces, but never saw it materialize. It was based on a more equitable imposition of ecclesiastical fees (*aranceles eclesiásticos*) that were charged for weddings, burials, processions, etc.¹²¹. In the

¹²⁰ Carl SCHMITT, *Roman Catholicism and Political Form*. Trans. G. L. Ulmen, Westport: Greenwood Press, 1996 (original: *Römischer Katholizismus und politische Form*, Hellerau: Jakob Hegner, 1923).

¹²¹ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), pp. 274ff.; see also Valentina AYROLO, "Una Iglesia del interior de las Provincias Unidas" (see note 7), p. 192.

spirit of the Spanish Enlightenment, he wanted to make the Church more efficient both in supporting the faithful and in serving the Spanish Empire. Thus he embraced ecclesiastical bidding processes as allowed by the Council of Trent, and he chaired such a process for selecting a parish priest in 1814¹²². In fact, when protesting against the imposition by the government of a vicar at his see, he argued that the rules of bidding for offices had been flouted. Candidates for various benefices had to sit a written case-based examination in moral theology and canon law held in Latin and Castilian. Orellana in fact raised the previously expected level and thus gave proof of his appreciation of deep knowledge and sound judgment. The former professor proved his interest in and support for education by strengthening the university and raising standards of knowledge among the clergy. Already early in his episcopal ministry, he decided to dedicate a third of his income to the creation of professorial chairs¹²³.

Knowledge for Orellana never came at the expense of faith. There is ample evidence attesting to Orellana's deeply religious and pious life, as exhibited by his support for practices of popular devotion. He frequently offered indulgences, for example for the observance of the feast of San Pedro Nolasco, for pilgrimages to the Capilla de Nuestra Señora del Rosario in San Miguel de Pocho, for attending Mass or vespers, or for prayer at the exhibition of the Blessed Sacrament¹²⁴. He supported confraternities, processions, and the veneration of statues and images, all of which were widely disseminated in his diocese. In his letters to the Carmelites, Orellana gave proof of his reliance on the intercession of the Virgin Mary and of St. Joseph. A sentiment of mysticism pervades these and other writings. He was also strongly devoted to St. Theresa. The revolutionary authorities in Buenos Aires were impressed by the bishop's "enviable conduct" and "edifying religiosity" during his captivity at Luján, where he ministered to other prisoners¹²⁵. His religion was not based on rationalism but showed a penchant for fideism; it was more affective than speculative; and it was characterized by interiority. His letters, reports, and homilies as a bishop show a great deal of pastoral

¹²² Valentina AYROLO, "Concursos eclesiásticos como espacios de ejercicio de poder. Estudio de caso: los de la sede cordobesa entre 1799 y 1815", *Hispania Sacra* 60 (2008), 659-681.

¹²³ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 55.

¹²⁴ Ana María MARTÍNEZ DE SÁNCHEZ, "Fuentes de archivo para el estudio del derecho canónico indiano local", *Revista de estudios histórico-jurídicos* 30 (2008), pp. 485-503.

¹²⁵ TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), pp. 112f.

and practical concern but no abstract theological speculation or political argument. All these attitudes evince elements of the Premonstratensian style of thought¹²⁶. On the other hand, Orellana seems not fully to have followed the Premonstratensian Christology with its emphasis on the humanity of Christ¹²⁷. Like the first generation of Premonstratensian writers, especially Philip of Harvengt, he had a tendency to emphasize the divine nature of Christ over His humanity. He did refer to Christ as "this God-Man" (*este Dios-Hombre*), but in his letters to the nuns addressed Him appropriately as the Divine Spouse and saw Him primarily as Christ the King¹²⁸. And despite mounting political pressure on him, he never ceased to consider which course of action would be the best "for the spiritual good of my soul"¹²⁹.

It may not have been a coincidence that across the circaries, several of Orellana's *confrères* were at the same time also devoted to the anti-revolutionary (if not counter-revolutionary) cause. Abbots Gilbert Pfrogner of Tepl (Bohemia), Nikolaus Betscher of Rot an der Rot (Swabia), Bohuslav Herwig of Strahov (Bohemia), and Markus Egle of Wilten (Tyrol), together with canon Jan Marian Mika of Strahov, in writings and sermons castigated revolutionary ideology and practice. Jean-Baptiste L'Écuy, the last abbot of Prémontré and abbot general, managed to survive the terror and the Napoleonic régime through hesitant conformity, but had gone into intellectual exile. The reason why the Order could not accede to Enlightenment values was that these were fundamentally at odds with the Augustinian basis of Premonstratensian spirituality¹³⁰. Against this background, Orellana's defiance can be understood. It was supported by the two Premonstratensian canons of San Norberto in Valladolid that had accompanied their *confrère* on his episcopal ministry. Fathers Centeno and Jiménez shared his beliefs, spirituality, and problems with revolutionary régimes. Both were involved in their own acts of insurrection against what they considered an illegitimate exercise of power. After his release from prison and Orellana's departure, Jiménez

¹²⁶ GRASSL, *The Premonstratensian Order* (see note 41), 5.1-5.12.

¹²⁷ See Martin FITZTHUM, *Die Christologie der Prämonstratenser im 12. Jahrhundert*, Planá: Deutscher Heimatverlag, 1939.

¹²⁸ See, for example, TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y la Revolución* (see note 4), p. 111, and the letters of 8 October, 1812 and 29 May, 1815, in *El Obispo Orellana. Sus cartas a las Carmelitas de Córdoba* (see note 51), p. 41 and p. 57.

¹²⁹ "[...] para el bien espiritual de mi alma". TONDA, *El Obispo Orellana y el Alcalde de Rosario* (see note 75), p. 17.

¹³⁰ See GRASSL, *The Premonstratensian Order* (see note 41), 3.4.

himself first went into hiding among the Indios of the Misiones Province, and then left the country for Brazil, which was at the time the seat of the entire Portuguese Empire. He served as chaplain to the Spanish ambassador in Rio de Janeiro, where also the court in exile resided. In or before 1822, he transferred to Uruguay, which in 1825 would declare independence from Brazil but remain a territory contested by both Argentinian and Brazilian interests. Jiménez in 1828 returned to Rio and served as confessor to Princess Maria da Glória (1819-1853), daughter of King Pedro IV of Portugal (and Emperor Pedro I of Brazil) and his wife Maria Leopoldina of Habsburg-Lorraine. He accompanied the Princess, who had just abdicated as Queen of Portugal (1826-1826) and would later again ascend to the throne (1834-1853) as Maria II of Portugal, on travels to Europe, where they had extended sojourns in Vienna and Rome. The principal interest of the Premonstratensian priest was at the time the erection of a bishopric in Montevideo by splitting it off the see of Buenos Aires, in accordance with the wishes of Uruguay and Brazil¹³¹. He hoped to be nominated to the new see. In a letter to Leo XII, he referred to the "impious party of the libertines ruling in Buenos Aires" who has established the freedom of religion¹³². From 1828 Jiménez lived in Rome, obtained there a doctorate in theology, and was appointed Titular Bishop of Cinna in 1830 and Vicar Apostolic of Montevideo. He was the first to fill this new see, but because of the continuing Spanish claim to the *ius patronatus* and the Uruguayan refusal to accept a known royalist as resident ordinary, he never could take up his office¹³³. During his stay in Rome, Jiménez served the Portuguese Church and its hospital, and he walked a fine line between defending Spanish and Portuguese interests, which coincided only in opposing the independence movement in America. In 1832, Jiménez was considered for the see of Osma (Castile and León), but the nomination was not successful, not least because it was unclear whether he was still to be considered a Premonstratensian canon. After Maria Cristina of Spain, who ruled as Queen Regent following the death of Ferdinand VII, had in 1834 nominated him for the see of Puerto Rico, an appointment that failed because of the turmoil of the First Carlist War, Jiménez was, in 1835, finally made Bishop of Ciudad Rodrigo

¹³¹ ESPONERA, "Un representativo caso" (see note 119), pp. 302f.

¹³² Quoted from Ibid., p. 304.

¹³³ Ibid., pp. 309ff.; Jozef WOUTERS, "Pedro de Alcantara Jiménez: a representative case of the election of bishops in Latin America during the XIXth century", AnPraem 66 (1990), pp. 254-257.

(Old Castile). In the same year he experienced not only the suppression of the masculine branch of the Premonstratensian Order in Spain by politicians of a similar persuasion as had led the revolution in the Río de la Plata but also the interruption of relations between his country and the Holy See. Since the cathedral chapter had only elected him as “ecclesiastical governor”, his status remained in question, and his rule of six years is considered to have been flawed.

While Argentinian pro-republican authors have often seen Orellana as simply one of their enemies, historiography has recently adopted a more nuanced position. The bishop is increasingly admired for his principled position in the struggle over sovereignty and independence. Questions of loyalty were by no means clear in the decade after the May Revolution of 1810, and parts of the Church continued to resist the new régime even much later. Some scholars and commentators have voiced respect for Bishop Orellana’s steadfastness, particularly for his “unshakable fidelity to healthy orthodoxy and spiritual values”¹³⁴.

The attitudes and actions of the three missionaries who had left Valladolid for Spanish America were consistent. They were concerned about legitimacy in Church and state and deeply committed to a traditional Catholicism. In this sense, Orellana’s religious mindset may to some extent claim more general validity for the Spanish Congregation at his time. But it surprises that neither in the writings, documents, and sermons left by the three Premonstratensians nor in the references by contemporaries to their thought and works were they ever addressed as regular canons. The Spanish Congregation had by then already become so weak that these missionary priests and bishops identified themselves not as sons of St. Norbert but of the Church. Any feeling for a *proprium Praemonstratense* as it had existed at least since the canonization of St. Norbert had vanished. All the easier it was for a liberal government in 1835 to extinguish the masculine branch of the Order in Spain.

Resumen

Rodrigo Antonio de Orellana (1755-1822) fue un canónigo y posteriormente un abad del monasterio premonstratense de San Norberto en Valladolid, profesor de teología en la Universidad de la misma ciudad, y después de una larga carrera académica en 1805 fue nombrado obispo de Córdoba del Tucumán. Este artículo

¹³⁴ CUENCA TORIBIO, “Iglesia y estado” (see note 11), p. 119, n. 17.

presenta la primera descripción en inglés de la vida de Orellana y de su pensamiento en el contexto de la política y teología de la época. La oposición marcada del obispo, desde la Revolución de Mayo hasta el movimiento que más tarde llevaría a la independencia de Argentina, se muestra derivar de una visión fuertemente agustiniana de la sociedad y de la política que era típica de su orden. La actitud contrarrevolucionaria de Orellana se desprendió de un regalismo conservador y una inclinación jansenista que eran típicos de la ilustración católica española y que no le permitieron aceptar la legitimidad del gobierno popular.

St. Norbert College
De Pere, WI 54115
U.S.A.

Wolfgang GRASSL