

Miguel Figueira de Faria Political and Aesthetic Ideas in the Correspondence Related to Domingos Sequeira and Vieira Portuense¹

“On this occasion I would like to inform you of a letter Sir João de Almeida sent me in which [...] he tells me that I should think about returning to Lisbon [...] in order to set up a Portuguese school there.”

Letter from Domingos Sequeira to João Pinto da Silva²

“I must tell you that here in Lisbon you will have little to do as there is no taste for painting, and consequently painters here do things of little merit, such as painting walls and ceiling frescos [...] and besides only a few portraits are made, a style which I am unsure you will be up to.”³

Reply letter from João Pinto da Silva to Domingos Sequeira³

This paper is based on the correspondence of artists Domingos António de Sequeira (1768–1837) and Francisco Vieira Portuense (1765–1805) and other epistolographic documents concerning them. In those days correspondence between Portuguese artists was scarce. The set of documents under study refers to the active and passive letters exchanged between artists and their respective patrons or liaison officers during their training period in Rome. In Sequeira’s case, I have included letters to and from his family exchanged at the end of his career.

The main participants in the correspondence were as follows: Portugal’s ambassadors to Rome, João de Almeida de Melo e Castro (1756–1814) and his successor, Alexandre de Sousa Holstein (1751–1803), the Jewels Keeper of Queen Maria I, João António Pinto da Silva, the consul in Genoa, John Piaggio, and officials from Portuguese legations, José Pereira Santiago,⁴ Luís Álvares da Cunha, Augusto Molloy, and Abbot Gaetano Ceni, besides other actors in this range of influence, like Secretary of State Luis Pinto de Sousa Coutinho and the Bishop of Macau – the recipients of works sent to Lisbon by the artists – and even official Manuel de Figueiredo. The close relationship between Domingos Sequeira and João Pinto da Silva and between the former and Vieira Portuense and João de Almeida de Melo e Castro, even after he left the legation, is particular evident.

The Ancien Régime’s personal ties system is reflected in the hierarchical relationships between artists and patrons, much more important than the correspondence among peers, usually constrained by competitive rivalry.⁵ The two artists were no exception to this. Living in Rome at the same time, their correspondence denotes a vigilant courtesy, illustrated by several examples. Vieira wished to conduct his studies quickly “so not to be surpassed by Sequeira,”⁶ informing João de Almeida how his rival was required to acknowledge the value of his work: “The copies that I am sending you are of Herodiade [Guido Reni] of which Sequeira was forced to say in public that I had copied them well”⁷ whereas Sequeira told the same interlocutor: “Vieira is curious about what we are doing but so far he knows nothing.”⁸ In his letters to João Pinto da Silva, João

de Almeida analysed Sequeira's attitude towards Vieira "whose rivalry has no limits," adding that "the emulation between the two rivals has triggered their amazing progress."⁹

Their careers ran in parallel and in 1802, back in Portugal, they were simultaneously appointed as royal painters. As they became renowned artists, their correspondence was repeatedly scrutinized in the specialized literature. Thus, given the scarcity of letters exchanged *between artists* for the period under review and the fact that most of the sources used were published extensively in the first half of the last century, this article used transversal methodology and compared the available information with international data, which permitted reordering ideas and analysing the information in a new light. In fact, the personal experiences of Domingos Sequeira and Vieira Portuense complemented each other, gaining new importance when subject to a comprehensive analysis, particularly during their stay in Rome in the late eighteenth century. Comparing these experiences with those of other nations will allow a better understanding of the situation in Portugal, putting it in context and providing new data that will help consolidate the dominant views and/or illustrate the differences when comparing them with Rome's cosmopolitanism in that period.

Music first

The first surprising note is the hierarchy of values shown in the diplomatic correspondence. Hiring Italian musicians and singers for the Patriarchate and the royal theatres was a priority, whereas news concerning would-be painters was secondary.¹⁰ Sopranos, contraltos, and tenors were the main topic in most of the correspondence, overshadowing those devoted to the visual arts. This became a major topic in the letters exchanged between Domingos Sequeira and his main patron João Pinto da Silva, as the epigraph introducing this paper attests reflecting a national specificity. Joaquim Machado de Castro, the founder and head of the Lisbon School of Sculpture (1770), noted: "In Portugal, the influence of a malign and destructive star reigns over Fine Arts!"¹¹

Not wishing to expand on the Portuguese arts situation, it is worth mentioning the role of drawing in the hierarchy of the national élites' preferences, including the royal household. Taking this into account, this paper examines the training and affirmation periods of Domingos Sequeira and Vieira Portuense and the progressive secularization of their artistic creations, expressed in their approach to new pictorial genres,¹² while referring to a less studied topic, which is their ideological stances as they supported new ideas, from Nationalism to Liberalism.



1. Francesco Bartolozzi, *Portrait of Domingos Vieira o Portuense*, 1801, engraving. Porto, Biblioteca Geral da Faculdade de Ciências da Universidade do Porto



2. Domingos António de Sequeira, *Self-portrait*, c. 1785, drawing. Lisbon, Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga

Rome 1790

During their training period, one notes the repetitive use of supplication and gratitude formulas in the letters sent to their interlocutors, in accordance with the protocol praxis of the ties system dominant at the end of the *Ancien Régime*. The letters denote the artists' strategy to establish a good relationship with the court and its representatives, particularly with government officials on whom they depended, ambassadors accredited to Rome, their administrative *entourages* and other officials in a position to influence their routine as students. They made continuous demands for financial and logistic support, provision of pensions or their increase, allowances, bonuses, etc., together with protection requests and testimonies of veneration and gratitude, which reflect the courtesy in use at the time. The content of the letters varied little, whereas their interlocutors'

answers combined reprimands and recommendations in a patronizing manner, illustrating their legitimate authority in return for the protection granted. It is important to forsake this *mise en scène* and extract the information that is important for this study. These exchanges illustrate two clear aspects. Firstly, *patronage* had obvious advantages materialized in the offer of works, such as copies of specific paintings kept in Rome's galleries; secondly, the well-known and much requested involvement of patrons in selecting themes for the works of invention, a subject that will be addressed further on.

Artistic training

Domingos Sequeira and Vieira Portuense coexisted in Rome between 1789 and 1795,¹³ the latter extending his stay in Italy until 1796, with long sojourns in other cities, namely Parma. Both artists underwent similar training. They had an initial education at the Royal School of Drawing (*Aula Pública de Desenho*), created in 1781, and practiced under the guidance of local master painters, in accordance with the usual workshop training practices.¹⁴

In Rome, the first stage involved choosing a master who would provide guidance and supervise progress. Portuense became a pupil of Domenico Corvi,¹⁵ and Sequeira studied with Cavallucci and Nicola La Piccola,¹⁶ also attending Corvi's life drawing classes. Accordingly, the early correspondence of the young students illustrates their practice of observing the work of the great *ancient* and *modern* masters. Direct contact with these works allowed artistic training that was not available in Lisbon and motivated them to attain a goal that alone justified the trip to Italy. Just after arriving they made study visits to the collections. The letters reveal a comprehensive dedication to those practices, which included making copies *in loco*, which was mandatory and a first step

to assess candidates for their dexterity and quickness in performing the exercises. To enable this it was necessary to ensure access to the main collections in the galleries, which presupposed tipping the guards watching them during their work. Vieira even denounced the excessive zeal of the custodians who forbade taking any drawing compass measurements.¹⁷ These works were normally sent to the artists' protectors, a procedure repeatedly mentioned in the correspondence between Vieira and João de Almeida.¹⁸

The correspondence described the visits to the Colonna and Corsini galleries and allows identifying some of the copied works, and the aesthetic guidelines of the artists and of their patrons. The copied painters were Guido Reni, Guercino, Domenichino, Gerardo de la Notte, Correggio, Schiavone, and even Raphael, namely through a copy made by Sassoferrato.¹⁹

Besides these exercises in Rome's galleries, the two artists also reported visiting other Italian regions, initially on the outskirts of Rome, where they practiced other genres, from topographical notes to landscape painting, followed by excursions to more remote areas "to draw the most exquisite things,"²⁰ or "to watch the art galleries and ancient monuments for [...] better education."²¹

They also undertook live drawing classes,²² as this part of the training was difficult to obtain in Portugal due to the lack of local regular model classes.²³ It was a core academic exercise in the training path of young artists to enable them to proceed to the next level, which was to create original works and not just copies, a pre-requisite stressed by their masters and also transmitted to Lisbon by legation officials.

Regarding the grant of a hundred escudos given to Domingos Sequeira "for studies of the two large paintings that he would paint on the service of Her Majesty," Pereira Santiago informs Pinto da Silva of the need to increase support to the artist, owing to the fact he had changed from copying works in galleries to making pieces of his own:

The orders I received from Your Excellency, which I have followed, [...] did not belong to this class, as they referred to copies from art galleries, and not to original paintings, which require specific studies, as I was told by the teachers.²⁴

Participation in painting contests was a particularly sensitive point in assessing the students' learning progress. Prize winning played a major role in the correspondence, and being granted *academic status*,²⁵ a logical result of the recognition gained within Rome's artistic circles, was also celebrated. Sequeira described his experience extensively in his letters to the Jewels Keeper, including the picturesque procedures of the competitions, the prize awarding ceremony, the ceremonial after election at the Academy, etc., offering an interesting picture of artistic everyday life in Rome.

From artistic training to artistic performance

In this learning process, choosing the most appropriate logistics was equally necessary. Portuguese rented a "*painter's studio*" near St. Anthony's Church of the Portuguese²⁶ to devote himself to "original pieces [...], which is what Corvi wanted, and fewer copies."²⁷ Having a personal workspace was a step forward in the artist's autonomy from the galleries and the master's workshop. It also marked the beginning of an activity that combined the fulfilment of orders and offers to patrons with the opportunity to create pieces for the local market. In Sequeira's case, Pinto da Silva considered this progress premature and earned him a severe rebuke:

I believe that you intend to sell, at a good price, the panels that you are painting there and at the same time, you ought to Remember the great Alms and respect that you owe to Her Majesty who wishes you to improve in an Art that might be useful to you and your Family, with which you might honour the Nation. As your friend I advise you to exempt yourself from greed or any other Roman ambition and to take from that Court only what may be useful for your advancement and no other things usually attributed to Italians.²⁸

The analysis of the correspondence concerning the two artists allows concluding that Portuguese students going to Rome did not have to meet certain requirements – there was no sort of *prix de Rome* like in France – nor were there any regulated work plans, as established in 1758 by the Academy of San Fernando in Madrid for Spanish students.²⁹ The granting of scholarships was based on the assessment of the artists' merit by their patrons, originating the personal ties typical of the end of the *Ancient Regime*. However, the activities described indicate that the artists came to Rome with a basic training that enabled them to evolve from making copies in the galleries to producing original pieces just a year later, while attaining acclaim in the academic competitions. The letters also tell us who their masters were, the usual forms of payment ("*mexas*"),³⁰ and the interference in their training, suggesting substantial freedom of action and choice. Conversely, the correspondence exposes the close supervision to which they were subject by court stewards who were in touch with the masters and observed the works produced, releasing regular information on the artists' behaviour, academic progress and on the teachers' expectations of their evolution.

"Divine or profane?"

The creative process also reveals another form of interaction between the students and their promoters over the choice of works. Who defined the *subjects*? The language used discloses the artists' flexibility and careful research of their patrons' preferences, which, ultimately, constituted a substantial sample of the domestic market, probably the main destination of their future production.

The letters show a decrease in the hegemony of sacred themes and a progressive experimentation with new genres. Sequeira, proposing to do a painting for prince D. João, writes that he will await court suggestions for “something that would be of his liking”, indicating “whether it should be Divine or profane.”³¹ He paid attention to the receptivity to his work, seeking to find out the “feeling” it caused in court so that he could ‘adapt’ his next creations.³² Examples of this include:

I’m waiting for the response to my question to you about the next painting [...] in order to do something that might please you. [...] Will Your Excellency please let me know the kind of painting you wish so I can better comply with my duty.³³

Portuense seemed more inclined to expand the themes of the covered genres. In a letter to João de Almeida he proposed sending “an original panel representing an amorous subject”³⁴ and, another time, “some joyful composition of mine which might have more acceptance.”³⁵ On a different occasion he mentioned sending two landscape paintings to the bishop of Macau, adding: “And if you wish something of this genre all you need to do is ask.”³⁶ His will to please his patrons is evident and in some cases he required written instructions to better comply with the orders:

I would also wish to start the allegorical panel Abbot Ceni has mentioned [...] however, I would need an accurate written description of the order, clearer than the one that was sent to me, which was quite confusing.³⁷

It is in this context that João de Almeida, in a letter to Pinto da Silva, mentions he requested a new work from Sequeira to be sent to the court “for which I provided the theme, a representation of [...] Jesus Christ ordering that tribute be paid to Caesar, and God be given what is God’s,”³⁸ a subject that he considered to be “more in accordance with Her Majesty’s high dignity.”³⁹ João de Almeida’s choice reinforces this more secular approach, even in the context of religious painting.

Apart from the students’ concern to follow the suggestions received and to adapt to the tastes of their patrons, the meaning of the words exchanged is important: *Divine or profane? To God and to Caesar...* the language illustrates the openness between patrons and artists and the dynamics for change in the monotonous national market. This transition was supported by the better informed nobility connected to diplomacy and reflects the evolution of the Portuguese students while in Rome. Although religious themes still predominated, there was openness

3. Angelika Kauffmann, *Portrait of Domingos Vieira o Portuense*, c. 1790, oil on canvas. Bregenz, Voralberg Landesmuseum



4. Domingos António de Sequeira, *Self-portrait*, c. 1827, drawing. Lisbon, Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga



to secular topics like landscapes, gallant scenes, allegories, and historical paintings. This had already been done by the previous generation of students in Rome, led by Francisco Vieira Lusitano (1699–1783),⁴⁰ although with little public acceptance. This support was only actually achieved in the enlightened environment of the last quarter of the century through people like João de Almeida and Alexandre de Sousa Holstein.

The scrutiny of themes of the national painting production is a clear rebuttal of this development and applies equally to Portuguese sculpture students in Rome, as attested when comparing José de Almeida’s solely sacred productions (around 1708–1770) in the reign of King João V, with the almost exclusively profane of João José de Aguiar (1771?–1841), a contemporary of Vieira and Sequeira in Italy.

The seventeenth-century tradition,⁴¹ which prolonged the orthodoxy of the Tridentine Catholicism during much of the eighteenth century,⁴² helps understand Portugal’s situation within the international context. The attempt to reconcile Portugal’s backwardness with Rome’s artistic cosmopolitanism is evident between the lines of the correspondence.

Nationalism and Liberalism: Heroes and Ideas

The correspondence also allows learning about the artists’ personal initiatives, despite the chosen themes not deviating from the strategy to please their patrons. It is in this context that Sequeira’s work *The Miracle of Ourique* was created. In a letter to António Pinto da Silva dated 3 August 1791, he described the theme he was developing:

A broad composition of figures in a painting that I am determined to do for Her Majesty, representing King Afonso Henriques, the first king of Portugal, listening to the voice of Jesus Christ and viewing a group of angels before giving battle against the five kings in *Campo de Ourique*.⁴³

There was no mention to instructions on the theme and the guidance that Sequeira requests from the Jewels Keeper refers just to the size of the painting, asking whether the prince would like the painting to be ‘large or small,’ and suggesting the first option “a big composition painting would look better in a larger proportion.”⁴⁴

This work has multiple meanings.⁴⁵ It marks the artist’s emancipation from making copies, representing his first creation of *historical paintings*, and introduces a nationalist slant in this genre, anticipating his rival Portuense⁴⁶. The theme also places us at the ongoing ideological transition. As a first step in historical painting of a Portuguese theme, it has

a careful religious tone, embracing innovation amidst the prevalent orthodoxy of religious art.⁴⁷ The painting is about the *miracle* and not about the battle of *Ourique*, depicting the mythic moment before the fight. In the light of the very conservative reign of D. Maria I, the emergence of a providential nationalism combining patriotic feelings and religious obedience, transferring into art the most orthodox component of the birth of the nation, is thus understandable. The cult of the first king of Portugal was not new and repeatedly practiced over centuries, especially during the Restoration of Independence in 1640, alongside successive efforts for his canonization, an old idea that still echoed in the eighteenth century.⁴⁸ There were multiple initiatives proximal to Sequeira's work, from the erection of a commemorative obelisk at the alleged site of the Battle of Ourique (1785)⁴⁹ to the publication by the Oratorian Father António Pereira de Figueiredo: *New Testimonies of the miraculous apparition of Christ our Lord to D. Afonso Henriques before the famous Battle of Ourique ... (1786)*,⁵⁰ whose chronological proximity to the painting attest the updatedness of the topic.

It is worth examining the factors behind Sequeira's start of historical painting in the context of the productions of his contemporaries in Rome, in an academic environment that may also explain his choice of genre and the nationalist theme of King Afonso's heroism, ideals not disclosed in the correspondence of ambassadors and their officials. His relationship with other interlocutors, such as Manuel de Figueiredo (1725–1801), an official of the Secretariat of State and a representative playwright of the Portuguese neoclassical theatre and researcher of patriotic myths, should also be considered as an inspiring element in the progression of nationalism as a pictorial subject.⁵¹

Portuense, by then living in London, also confirmed this trend, and his production followed Sequeira's choice. His intention had lain dormant at least since 1798, when he tried to get Sousa Coutinho's support for an illustrated edition of Camões's *Lusíadas*.⁵² He justified it with a patriotic manifesto, proposing "to make a worthy artwork that will honour both me and my country [...] a magnificent edition comprising the Nation's most celebrated and honourable events in all 10 *cantos*."

Portuense's wish translated into a historical painting and in 1799 he presented *The Oath of Viriato* at an exhibition at the London Royal Academy of Arts, which Francesco Bartolozzi engraved a year later. The painter mentioned the print in his correspondence "representing Viriato when he takes the oath to stand against the Romans," claiming that it is "the first print about a Portuguese historical fact."⁵³ In the exhibition catalogue, *The Oath of Viriato* comes with an unusually long text explaining the moment:

Viriato, chief of the Lusitanian, exhorts his companions to take vengeance on the perfidy of Galba [...] and at the sight of the dead bodies of the men, women, and children swears, by putting his hand, and those of his companions, in the wounds of the virgins yet palpitating, that they will

not lay down their arms until they are revenged on the cruel invaders of their country, and on the perfidious enemy of the human race.⁵⁴

The painting attests Portuense's adoption of the nationalist trend. However, it had been preceded by other historical paintings depicting English themes, indicating that he adapted his patriotic sentiment to the art market of the host nation, which demonstrates his cosmopolitan flexibility.

Although its anti-Napoleonic connotation has been mentioned before,⁵⁵ *The Oath of Viriato* surpasses Sequeira's *Miracle of Ourique* by leaving out the religious content and expressing secular nationalism, a trend confirmed in his studies for the engravings of the planned edition of *Os Lusíadas*.

The works of the two artists after returning to Lisbon consolidate this *nationalization* of themes in historical painting. Sequeira insisted, among other patriotic themes, in painting topics related to King Afonso Henriques. There are known studies for two works, *Legend of the Birth of D. Afonso Henriques* and *Baptism of D. Afonso Henriques*,⁵⁶ respectively, for the new Ajuda Royal Palace. Vieira Portuense, in turn, produced other works of strong patriotic sentiment such as *D. Filipa de Villhena arming her sons as knights*, an episode of the Restoration of Independence after the Iberian Union period (1580–1640).

The turbulent environment and the threat of war following the Napoleonic expansion explain the rapid progress of nationalist ideas in the arts. This discourse was also present within the Portuguese royal household, as attested by the images used to decorate the royal palaces, from Mafra to Ajuda, inspired by the great deeds of the sixteenth-century maritime discoveries and dramatic moments of mediaeval history.

Negotiations with sculptor Antonio Canova to carve a monument representing the *Genius of National Independence*, carried out before the departure of the Portuguese Court to Brazil as a result of the first French invasion in late 1807,⁵⁷ confirm the atmosphere in Lisbon at the beginning of the nineteenth century. In the (re)construction of a national feeling, compelling speeches seeking to establish an inspiring pantheon of heroes and ideals came to the fore. Afonso Henriques, Viriato, or the protagonists of the maritime deeds, like Vasco da Gama, were a source of inspiration. In general, the evocations recalled the creativity of the epic poem *Os Lusíadas* by Camões, a poet who became a main reference as a symbol of the nation in the Romantic period.⁵⁸

Vieira did not witness the peninsular wars or the outbreak of Liberalism, dying prematurely (Funchal, 1805). Sequeira, on the contrary, lived those moments with intensity, exposing himself to the ideological turbulence of the period.⁵⁹ After portraying Napoleon's general *Junot protecting Lisbon* during the French occupation (1807–1808), he was accused of Jacobinism and imprisoned for nine months. After his liberation he decided to come clean, becoming the most active artist in

the acclamation of the Anglo-Portuguese-Spanish alliance. In 1820 he joined the liberal revolution enthusiastically. His production since, with some works denoting strong ideological content, such as the paintings *Allegory of the Constitution* and the collective portrait of the members of parliament, makes him *the artist of the regime*. In the first work he exalts:

The Lusitanian greatness tearing the mask of despotism, hypocrisy, ignorance, and atrocity, etc., that oppressed the Nation [...] and which fell in the same abyss where despotism had shackled and oppressed virtue, the sciences, the arts, merit, and industry.⁶⁰

Paris

During the 1823 counterrevolution, he emigrated, living in London and Paris and returning to Rome, where he died in 1837. In his family correspondence over this period, Sequeira assumed his ideological positioning permanently. Writing from Paris to his brother-in-law João Baptista Verde, he tried to convince him to leave the country, criticizing the situation:

My dear brother, see in which hands our dear country has fallen, In Barbarian and most savage countries such bold procedures are not to be found [...], poor Portuguese and poor, poor slaves and the humblest of you who suffer although you can escape the clutches of such monsters, blessed be those who are free to live away from such sad life.⁶¹

The letter sent after the death of King João VI shows his enthusiasm with the end of censorship,⁶² and depicts the new political situation: “Now one is free to write, the bogeyman that scared even the more courageous is gone. Long live the Great Emperor and King of Portugal and the New Constitution and hail to the honourable Portuguese.”⁶³

The correspondence of the two artists presents a clear picture of the ideological evolution underway in Portugal, the progressive secularization of artistic production and the birth of a renewed patriotism and constitutional freedom. This situation is better understood if we consider the additional information that the letters offer, particularly the context of their education in Rome and their relationship with patrons as part of the *Ancien Régime*’s traditional ties. The apparent contradiction of these two overlapping realities – the expression of the artist’s freedom and his submission to his patron – illustrates the transitional atmosphere of the period.

1 In this study, I have mainly used the documentation published by J. M. Teixeira de Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira em Itália*, Imprensa da Universidade, Coimbra 1922; L. Xavier da Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal foram para o estrangeiro estudar Belas-Artes e Cirurgia com protecção oficial, nos decénios finais do século XVIII*, Academia Nacional de Belas-Artes, Lisbon 1938 and *Idem*, *Cartas do pintor Sequeira, da filha e do genro, depois da emigração de 1823*, Academia Nacional de Belas-Artes, Lisbon 1940. The basic bibliography on Domingos António de Sequeira and Vieira Portuense was revised in the two last major exhibitions dedicated to these painters. See the respective catalogues and essays in M. A. Beaumont *et al.*, *Sequeira: um português na mudança dos tempos*, Museu Nacional de Arte Antiga, Lisbon 1997; J. S. Carvalho *et al.*, *Francisco Vieira, O Portuense*, Museu Nacional de Soares dos Reis, Porto 2001. Also of particular interest for this study see also V. Correia, *Sequeira em Roma, duas épocas*, Imprensa da Universidade, Coimbra 1923, and, especially with regard to Sequeira, A. G. Markl, *A obra gráfica de Domingos António de Sequeira no contexto da produção europeia do seu tempo*, PhD in Fine Arts, Lisbon, FBAUL, 2013.

2 Cfr. Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., doc. CX, letter sent from Rome to Lisbon on 3 January 1794.

3 *Ivi*, doc. CXVI, Lisbon-Rome, 9 April 1794.

4 On José Pereira Santiago and his relationship with Sequeira, see Correia, *Sequeira em Roma* cit., pp. 6–15.

5 According to some authors, this rivalry resulted in a certain *odium artisticum*. See Raczyński, *Les Arts en Portugal*, Jules Renouard et Cie., Paris 1846, p. 285: “Sequeira, à ce qu’on m’a dit, portait à Vieira une haine très grande et cherchait à lui nuire. Il a rempli sa vie d’amertume.”

6 Cfr., Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc. XXVI.

7 *Ibid.*, doc. XXX.

8 *Ibid.*, doc. LIV.

9 Cfr. Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., doc. XXIX.

10 Especially see the documentation published by Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit.

11 Cfr. H. F. Lima, *Joaquim Machado de Castro, Escultor Conimbricense. Notícia Biográfica e compilação dos seus Escritos Dispersos*, Imprensa da Universidade, Coimbra 1925, p. 322.

12 Concerning Vieira Portuense, the interesting correspondence exchanged with printer Giambattista Bodoni (1740–1813) and with engraver Francesco Rosaspina (1762–1841) is not included, as it was recently examined by A. Araújo, *Experiência da natureza e sensibilidade pré-romântica em Portugal: temas de pintura e seu consumo (1780–1825)*, 2 vol., PhD in Art History, Porto, 1991, appendix 8, pp. 103–201, and by G. Raggi, “Vieira, Rosaspina, Bodoni: Uma relação ininterrupta entre a Emília Italiana e Portugal,” in J. S. Carvalho *et al.*, *Francisco Vieira, O Portuense* cit., pp. 36–70.

13 Sequeira arrived in Rome on 29 June 1788. The date of Portuense’s arrival is not well documented, but he was already there on 19 August 1789.

14 Vieira Portuense studied in a family atmosphere, as his father was also a painter, Domingos Francisco Vieira (?–1804), and later with João Glama Stöberle (1708–1792) and Jean Pillement (1728–1808); Sequeira studied with Francisco de Setúbal (c.1747–1792) after five years at the Royal School of Drawing where he obtained two first prizes in two contests: 1784 and 1786.

15 Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc. XXXIII.

16 Sequeira’s masters in Rome were identified by C. V. Machado, *Collecção de Memórias relativas às vidas dos pintores, e escultores, arquitetos, e gravadores portugueses...*, Imp. de Victorino Henriques da Silva, Lisbon 1823, p. 149. He received a pension of 300\$ rs. to study in Rome, paid through the ‘bolcinho’ (The Queen’s petty cash fund). He arrived in Rome in 1788, and chose Cavallucci and La Piccola as masters. In his correspondence, Sequeira (Costa [1938], doc. XXXII–XXXIII) – referred specifically to Nicola La Piccola as “my Master.” Concerning Cavallucci, I found references of his idea of a work to be sent to Lisbon, *Marco António nos braços de Cleopatra*, having been approved, when he wrote “as it was so well accepted by Cavaluxe [sic] [...] as well as by other teachers” (Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc. LXX) and also with regard to the *mise en scene* of Sequeira’s nomination as an academician, a ceremony where Cavallucci played a predominant role (Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., doc. CII). Sequeira also revealed that he attended Corvi’s Academy, regretting to have missed the training sessions: “Thanks God I am feeling a little bit better but it cost me much the fact that I couldn’t attend Corve’s Academy training sessions in the last few evenings” (Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc. LXV). Both Cyrillo’s traditionally accepted information and the correspondence indicate that the relationship between Nicola La Piccola and Sequeira was flexible and open to multiple influences and that the former’s supervision of the latter was somehow informal.

17 Cfr. Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc. XXII: “At the Galleria Corsini where I am starting Guido’s *Herodiade*. With a great zeal on the part of the Guard who does not leave me for a single minute, fearing that I use the drawing compass to take measures from the Original.” Visiting the galleries and making copies of the works *in loco* was common praxis in the training plans of other international artists. For Spanish students in the same period, see C. Brook, “Regolamenti delle Pensioni per Roma dell’Accademia di San Fernando (1758–1830),” in L. S. Ruiz, F. Jiménez (eds.), *El Arte Español entre Roma y París (Siglos XVIII y XIX): Intercambios Artísticos y Circulación de Modelos*, Casa de Velázquez, Madrid 2014, p. 90, and P. D. Corral, “The Beginnings of the Real Academy de España in Rome: Felipe de Castro and Other Eighteenth-Century Pioneers,” in *The Burlington Magazine*, CLVI, 2014, 1341, December, p. 808.

18 Cfr. Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc. XXXIII: “Your Excellency must have

seen my copies, and please forgive me if they are not to your taste; and if you wish me to copy another original, you just have to let me know.”

19 Ibid., doc. XXX: “Now I am finishing the copy for Mr Luis Pinto, which is from Sasso Ferrata after a drawing by Raphael.” On this see Teresa Viana’s work in *Francisco Vieira, o Portuense*, no. 7, p. 108.

20 Ibid., doc. XXXVIII. Portuense on his trip to Marca and Umbria.

21 Cfr. Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., doc. CXXIII. Sequeira announcing his trip around Italy to Pinto da Silva. On the graphical testimonies of the artists in Italy, see T. Viana, “Os álbuns de viagem de Vieira Portuense,” in J. S. Carvalho et al., *Francisco Vieira, O Portuense* cit., pp. 84–93, M. A. Beaumont, *Domingos António Sequeira, Desenhos*, Instituto de Alta Cultura, Lisbon 1972/75, pp. 14–15 and A. Markl, *A Obra Gráfica de Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., pp. 27–28, 34.

22 Cfr., Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc. LIV.

23 In 1780 painter Cyrillo Volkmar Machado set up a private academy which lasted intermittently until the following year. Other initiatives arose from 1785 onwards, like the one sponsored by Intendant Pina Manique to create a Fine Arts project in the recently founded Casa Pia de Lisboa, a royal institution that assisted orphans. However, there is no information about these artists attending these classes. On these experiences in the late eighteenth century see J. M. Lopes, *O desenho do corpo em Portugal no século XVIII. Os actos do desenho / Os desenhos dos actos*, PhD thesis submitted to the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Porto, Porto 2009, pp.102–106.

24 Cfr. Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., doc. LXVI.

25 Sequeira reported his appointment to Pinto da Silva on 8 October 1793. Cfr. Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., doc. CII.

26 Cfr. Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc. XXXII/XXXIII.

27 *Ivi*, doc. XXXIII. The correspondence reflects this transition stage, whereby the painter repeatedly requests support to be able to change from making copies to creating originals: “The reason for all this is the fact that my expenses are always increasing and even more now that I’ve started a study to paint originals, as it is what Corvi wants me to do, and less copies and that is what you can give me, a subject of the Expression of your Genius and which I will carry out. And this you can explain to Mr Luis Pinto, that one requires large expenses to be able to study what is natural and this necessarily requires more Escudos.”

28 Cfr. Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., doc. LXXXIV, LX-Roma, 4 April 1792.

29 Cfr. Brook, *Regolamenti delle Pensioni per Roma* cit., p. 89 and following.

30 Word that appears often in the correspondence, adapted to Portuguese from the Italian *mancia* (tip), cfr. Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc. LVII.

31 Cfr. Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., doc. LIV.

32 Ibid., doc. XXXIII: “Dear Sir, I would be very happy if you honoured me by telling me Her Majesty’s feeling about my painting, as well as yours so that I can adjust other works that I will send you.”

33 Ibid., doc. XXXVI.

34 Cfr. Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc. XXXIV.

35 Ibid., doc. XXXV.

36 Ibid., doc. XXXIII.

37 Ibid., doc. XXXIX.

38 Obvious reference to the Gospel of Saint Matthew (22, 21).

39 Cfr. Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., doc. XXIX.

40 On the long bibliography about Vieira Lusitano and his period in Rome see *Vieira Lusitano 1699–1783: O desenho*, edited by L. Arruda, J. S. Carvalho, exhibition catalogue, Lisbon, MNAA/IPM 2000; *Giovanni V di Portogallo (1707–1750) e la cultura romana nel suo tempo*, edited by G. Borghini, S. Vasco, S. Rocca, De Luca, Rome 1994; P. Quieto, *D. João V de Portugal: A sua influência na arte italiana do século XVIII*, Elo, Lisbon–Mafra 1990; T. L. Vale, *Um português em Roma – Um italiano em Lisboa: Os escultores setecentistas José de Almeida, João António Bellini*, Livros Horizonte, Lisbon 2007, pp. 16–21 and J. M. Lopes, *O desenho do corpo em Portugal* cit., pp. 117–120.

41 In the context of this supremacy of religious paintings, there are, however, some noticeable experiences in other genres, exceptions that prove the rule. Examples include the still lifes painted at the *escola de Óbidos* (Obidos School) by Baltazar Gomes Figueira (1604–1674) and his daughter Josefa d’Ayala (1630–1684), the fires of Diogo Pereira (active between 1630–1658) inspired on Troy, or a few mythological themes by Bento Coelho da Silveira (1620–1708). See a synthesis by V. Serrão, “Le Monde de la peinture baroque portugaise: naturalisme et ténèbres,” in *Rouge et Or, Trésors du Portugal baroque*, V. Serrão, N. Garnot (eds.), exhibition catalogue (Paris, Musée Jacquemart-André), 2002, and L. M. Sobral, *Pintura e poesia na época barroca*, Editorial Estampa, Lisbon 1994.

42 Note the contradiction between the graphic and pictorial work of Vieira Lusitano. In the former there is visible familiarity with classical mythology themes and in the latter religious painting predominates. On this, see, respectively, L. Arruda and J. S. Carvalho, *Vieira Lusitano 1699–1783* cit., in particular Arruda’s study, *Vieira Lusitano. O Desenho* cit., pp. 56–67, and pp. 179–190. See also N. Saldanha (ed.), *Joanni V Magnifico, A pintura em Portugal ao tempo de D. João V*, IPPAR, Lisbon, December 1994, exhibition catalogue, which shows only one mythological painting attributed to Vieira Lusitano (*Vénus ao espelho*, pp. 210–211). Apart from doing portraits, only a few exceptions deserve to be mentioned, namely the *gallant scenes* by French painter Pierre-Antoine Quillard (1704–1733) described in the catalogue by Agostinho Araujo, pp. 278–287, which were brief deviations from

the rule, otherwise marked by the hegemonic presence of religious art.

43 Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., doc. LXXVII.

44 Ibid.

45 José-Augusto França rediscovered the work long been reported missing. It is now in the Musée Louis-Philippe in the French city of Eu. On this see J.-A. França, “O milagre de Ourique de D. A. Sequeira,” in *Boletim Cultural da Póvoa de Varzim*, XXVI, 1989, 2, pp. 711–715.

46 On the hypothetical precedence of Portuense concerning this subject see the stimulating work by Foteini Vlachou, “Patriotism, Painting and the Portuguese Empire during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars,” in R. Bessel, N. Guyatt, J. Rendall (eds.), *War, Empire and Slavery, 1770–1830*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke 2010, p. 259.

47 It is worth mentioning the news by José da Cunha Taborda, a student in Rome contemporary of both Vieira and Sequeira, on the existence of a work by Vieira Lusitano for the ceiling of Igreja dos Mártires in Lisbon evocative of the *Lisbon’s conquest from the Moors by King Afonso Henriques*, which had disappeared in the earthquake that destroyed the city of Lisbon in 1755. Cfr. J. Taborda, *Regras da Arte da Pintura*, Impressão Régia, Lisbon 1815, p. 254. Although it is an historical theme, the way it was treated turns it into one of religious inspiration, as seen in the preparatory study preserved in the Évora Museum collections. See its description in L. Arruda, J. S. Carvalho, *Vieira Lusitano 1699–1783* cit., pp. 140–141.

48 The Battle of Ourique (25 July 1139) and the legend of the miracle that preceded it were core moments in the birth of Portugal. Medieval narratives recorded the victory of D. Afonso Henriques over the five Moor kings, highlighting the disproportion of the armies on the battlefield and the hand of God in the battle’s result, which was fought during the *Christian Reconquista* of the Iberian Peninsula. The historical veracity of this episode was only questioned later by the Portuguese romantic historiography. On the numerous bibliography on this subject see, for instance, A. Buescu, *O milagre de Ourique e a História de Portugal de Alexandre Herculano, uma polémica oitocentista*, INIC, Lisboa 1987, pp. 123–137.

49 See the news published in *Gazeta de Lisboa*, no. XLIII, (supplement), of 28 October 1785.

50 Work with impact at that time and reprinted at the Royal press in 1809. Cfr. Buescu, *O milagre de Ourique* cit., pp. 127–128.

51 There is no reference to direct correspondence between Sequeira and Manuel de Figueiredo, but their relationship is documented in the letters exchanged while the painter was in Rome. The playwright was given a painting by the artist, which suggests their close relationship. Cfr. Carvalho, *Domingos António de Sequeira* cit., doc. XXX.

52 Lisbon, Arquivo Nacional da Torre do Tombo, *Casa de Linhares collection*, 101. doc. 37 (London, 17 July 1798), partially transcribed in M. L. Cabral, *A Real Biblioteca e*

os seus criadores, Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon 2014, p. 317. Since 1796, there are references in Bodoni’s correspondence to Rodrigo de Sousa Coutinho’s interest in a luxurious edition of *Os Lusíadas*, an idea that Sequeira seems interested in upgrading by adding illustrations. Cfr. Costa (1938), doc. XLVII and Raggi, *Vieira, Rosaspina, Bodoni* cit., p. 68.

53 Cfr. Arquivo Histórico Biblioteca Nacional, *Reservados*, Ms. 63, n. 4, doc. 26. Letter from Vieira Portuense to António R. Santos, chief librarian of the royal library, transcribed by Cabral, *A Real Biblioteca e os seus criadores* cit., pp. 351–316. I believe that Vieira Portuense’s testimony made some authors give him credit for introducing nationalism in Portuguese historical paintings of that period. Cfr. Vlachou, *Patriotism, Painting and the Portuguese Empire* cit., p. 259.

54 On this, see P. V. Gomes, *Vieira Portuense*, Edições Inapa, Lisbon 2001, pp. 24 e 72–73 and Vlachou, *Patriotism, Painting and the Portuguese Empire* cit., pp. 259–263.

55 Varela Gomes, *Vieira Portuense* cit., p. 72 and Vlachou, *Patriotism, Painting and the Portuguese Empire* cit., pp. 259–260.

56 See the contribution of A. Markl, in Maria Alice Beaumont et al., *Sequeira: Um Português na mudança dos tempos* cit., pp. 218–223.

57 On Canova’s abovementioned project, see R. Mendonça, *Recepção de escultura clássica na Academia de Belas Artes de Lisboa*, PhD thesis presented to the Fine Arts College of the University of Lisbon, 2014, pp. 56–57 and corresponding documentation, pp. 413–422. See also M. J. Neto, ““O Génio da Independência”: a estátua encomendada a Antonio Canova para Lisboa em 1807,” in *Artis*, 2014, 2, pp.198–199.

58 On the (re)surgence of nationalism in Portugal see, for instance, J. M. Sobral, “A formação das nações e o nacionalismo: os paradigmas explicativos e o caso português,” in *Análise Social*, XXXVII, 2003, 165, pp. 1093–1126.

59 On Sequeira’s adherence to liberal ideas and on the evolution of his ideological manifestos, see M. F. Faria, “Machado de Castro e Domingos Sequeira... ‘Das Luzes à revolução,’” in M. F. Faria (ed), *Machado de Castro: da Utilidade da escultura*, Caleidoscópio, Lisbon 2014, pp. 85–105.

60 Beaumont, *Domingos António Sequeira, Desenhos* cit., pp. 44–46 and J. A. França, *A arte em Portugal no século XIX*, Bertrand, Lisbon 1966, p. 152.

61 Cfr. Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc.V, Paris, 27 September 1824.

62 With regard to the chosen topic and as this paper was being written, I have realized the need to understand the censorship mechanisms used in the correspondence. One notes that the literature on censorship focuses mainly on the history of the book and does encompass epistolography. Accordingly, there is a need to go deeper into this question, which permeates this study.

63 Cfr. Costa, *Documentos relativos aos alunos que de Portugal* cit., doc. XI, Paris, 26 July 1826.