Resumo

Este artigo trata da pintura panorâmica da *Joyeuse Entrée* do rei Filipe III de Espanha (Filipe II de Portugal) em Lisboa no ano 1619 e que o autor descobriu no castelo de Weilburg, Alemanha. O autor compara a informação apresentada no quadro com as informações das fontes escritas da entrada real e outras vistas de Lisboa dos séculos XVI e XVII. Como resultado, o quadro panorâmico parece basear-se numa coreografia imitando a prévia entrada real do rei e que se verifica em todas as fontes da entrada, sejam pintadas, escritas ou gravadas e que foram publicados entre 1619 e 1622.
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Abstract

This article deals with the splendid panoramic painting depicting the *Joyeuse Entrée* of King Philipp III (Filipe II de Portugal) in Lisbon in 1619 which the author discovered at Weilburg castle in Germany. The author places the painting in its historical and pictorial context by comparing it to the written reports of the entry and comparable 16th and 17th century views of Lisbon. Apparently, the painting is based on a strictly planned choreography that largely follows the previous entry of Philipp II, and is identical in the painted, engraved and written descriptions of the event published between 1619 and 1622.
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THE WEILBURG PAINTING SHOWING THE LISBON ENTRY OF 1619 IN ITS HISTORICAL AND PICTORIAL CONTEXT
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This article deals with the splendid panoramic painting depicting the Joyeuse Entrée of King Philipp III of Spain (Filipe II de Portugal) in Lisbon in 1619 (fig. 1), which the author discovered at Weilburg castle in Germany (Gehlert 2008). The large panorama (oil on canvas, approx. 197 × 109 cm) is one of the most important painted views of Lisbon and a key source for the iconography of Lisbon prior to the 1755 earthquake. The present article aims to take a more in-depth look at the painting and places it in its historical and pictorial context by comparing it to the written reports of the entry and other contemporary pictures of Lisbon that should be taken into consideration.

Iconographically, the birds’ eye view of Lisbon as seen from above Almada on the opposite side of the Tejo river is based on earlier models known to us via engravings such as the one published by Georg Braun and Frans Hogenberg in 1572 (no. 28 in Moita 1983, p. 89) as part of the first volume of their six-volume series published in Cologne under the title *Civitates Orbis Terrarum* between 1572 and 1617 (Pereira 2007, S.238). This view became the standard image of Lisbon in print (a typical example would be the engraving by Clemendt de Jonghe, a leading Dutch engraver active in Amsterdam ca. 1647-77, “Lisbona”, 50 × 60cm, BNP no. e-342-4, with a slightly different Alfândega) and formed the basis for engravings for many years to come, as witnessed by a fairly late version of this view published around 1720 in Augsburg by the German engraver Gabriel Bodenehr (1664-1758) with an inscription reading: “LISABONA, Ankunft Königs Caroli des III. in HISPAN: zu Lissabon.”
A°.1704 den 7 Marti” (Lisbon, Arrival of King Charles III at Lisbon in Hispania in the year 1704, March 7). The engraving clearly does not show the architecture of 1704, but still seems to be based on the model by Braun and Hogenberg from the late 16th century. The architecture is a bit removed from reality and important buildings are shown incorrectly (the Paço da Ribeira) or even missing (the palace of the marquis of Castelo Rodrigo) or invented (note the area around S. Vicente de Fora where an additional church of similar size is shown).

Georg Braun also published a bird’s eye view of the center of Lisbon, engraved by Joris Hoefnagel, as part of volume 5 of the series published in 1598, detailing individual buildings and streets identified by 140 numbers in a legend below the view (no. 29 in Moita 1983, p. 89) that is still useful today in identifying buildings on the Weilburg painting. Although there are certain similarities between the Weilburg painting and the engravings, the painting does not seem directly to copy any of the details shown in the engravings. When looking at 17th century city views, one has to keep in mind that none of them would render a “realistic” representation of the city in question in any modern, photographic sense. They are all an amalgamation of fact and fiction to a varying degree (Pereira 2007 provides a good overview of Lisbon’s image in the 16th and 17th centuries).

At the upper end of the painting we see to the left the coat of arms of Portugal, in the middle section a cartouche with an inscription detailing that this work shows the entry of king Philipp III in Lisbon 1619, and to the right the coat of arms of Lisbon (a ship with two ravens). The inscription reads ENTRADA D[E] [S]V MC[G?] DON
PHELIPE III EN LISBOA EN 1613. The inscription has been restored imperfectly (see Gehlert 2008, p. 213) and should be understood as “Entrada de Su Magestad Don Felipe en Lisboa 1619”, which was the year of the royal visit. The catalog files available at Staatliche Schlösser und Gärten Hessen, the keeper of the painting, reveal that the painting in fact had been catalogued as showing Lisbon in 1619 (with a question mark) in 1981:

“Seeschlacht (sic) bei Lissabon, Öl/Leinwand, 110/197 cm, 1619 (?), Inv. Nr. Alte Bezeichnung Weilburg 80/20 Thronsaal (aus Rauschholzhausen)”

The files also contain several quotes submitted for a new restoration of the painting that had been intended in 1981 but apparently was never executed; there are bills for restoration dating from 1963 and 1969. The overall condition of the painting remains very poor and it is still in dire need of further restoration. The current inscription seems to have been applied over an older layer of inscription (Gehlert 2008), traces of which are still visible. It might be possible that the initial inscription did bear a different date or no date at all. Technical analysis would help resolve this question, but it has not been performed to date.

The canvas possibly formed part of the Spanish royal collection in the early 17th century. A picture of the same content was described in detail by the Italian connoisseur Cassiano dal Pozzo in 1626, who saw it hanging in the newly decorated Salón de los Espejos of the Alcázar amidst paintings by Titian and Rubens. In his travel diary, he devotes considerable space to this painting, and he points out the very beautiful view of the harbour with large and small boats with festive banners. He also mentions that the painting showed the entry, starting from the wooden pier and from there through the arches of the various nations:

“L’altro era l’entrata di Filippo 3° in Lisbona, che fa bellissima uista per il Porto pieno di Naui si grosse, che piccoli parati, e come si dice di gala e per il Ponte di Legno per lo sbarco, L’ord. Dell’ entrata, e gli Archi delle Nationi che ui si uedeuano…” (Pozzo 1626)

The painting at Weilburg seems to fit this description rather well. A similar impression is given by an inventory of the Alcázar of 1636, Quadros y otras cosas que tiene Su Majestad Felipe IV en este Alcázar de Madrid. Año de 1636:

“Entrada del Rei nuestro Señor Phelipe 3º en Portugal por el rio Tajo, en que se demuestran las galeras en que fue y delante muchos barcos con damas y figuras de monstruos marinos y mucha cantidad de barcas y la puente por donde entró y lados con los arcos de su entrada” (Rebollo 2007, p. 76)

The inventory mentions the work as hanging in the Pieça quarta donde está la fuente. In the Weilburg painting, however, it is not possible to identify “barcos con
damas” (boats with women) although some of the “monstruos marinos” are clearly visible (a giant lobster, a whale etc.) In addition, Vicente Carducho mentioned a painting showing the Lisbon entry as hanging in the Salón de los espejos in 1633:


It is known that the decoration of the Salón de los Espejos was re-arranged around the 1930s and it would be conceivable that the painting was moved to another location in the palace such as the pieza quarta. At any rate, there seem to have been in existence several views of Lisbon with the royal entry, as pictures with this title show up in contemporary documents and inventories. Vítor Serrão mentions that the Portuguese painter Domingos Vieira Serrão brought two paintings of the royal entry to Madrid:

No âmbito das suas actividades de pintor régio, sabe-se que, [Domingos Vieira Serrão] em Fevereiro de 1623, se deslocou a Madrid para entregar a Filipe IV (…) dos lienzos de la entrada de Lisboa com marcos de palo santo (…) (Serrão 2006)

Paintings with a similar title or description even show up in far-away locations connected to Hapsburg rule, such as the chateau of Ernst von Mansfeld near Luxembourg (Mousset 2007). If some of those views were copies of an original painting, it would have to be assumed the original was held at either Lisbon or Madrid. In addition to the total view of the entry, certain documents mention one or more
paintings in the Alcázar as showing a complete set of the highly intricate triumphal arches, possibly painted in great detail. The 1636 inventory mentions two large canvases with images of all the arches of the 1619 entry (Rebollo 2007, p. 77). As the inventory mentions two paintings, this might point towards the two paintings delivered by Domingos Vieira Serrão. The paintings of the arches are also mentioned by Pozzo already in 1626, although he mentions only a single painting:

…gli Archi delle Nationi, che ui si uedeuano, de quali tutti ue n’era ritratto in un quadro nella medesima sala (d)u’era il Tavolino…” (Pozzo 1626)

No engravings of the entire painting have become known, but some of the details have found their way into an engraving that we will study later. The first impression that this work gives is an idea of splendor. Large areas are painted in blue, red, gold and magenta, all of these very expensive colors at the time, giving it an extremely sumptuous and festive character that is unique for such a city view and makes the painting stand out among any paintings. This first impression alone would be enough to suggest a commission at the level of the court, an idea that is supported by the prominent role played by the huge royal galley (the present reconstruction of the galley at the Museu Maritim at Barcelona is very similar, but less splendidly decorated) that forms the largest single element on the canvas. No other painting of that time presents a similarly broad and comprehensive panorama of Lisbon. In doing so, the painting confirms written descriptions of the city from the early 17th century such as the following one by Frei Nicolau de Oliveira, who in his Livro das Grandezas de Lisboa describes the Portuguese capital thus:

“Falando de Lisboa, que é a principal, cabeça do Reino, e mais populosa que todas da Europa (se não parece a alguém que exagero, dizendo todas do mundo), tem ares suavíssimos, saudáveis, temperados … Esta cidade ocupa agora, em comprimento, de Belém até S.Bento de Xabregas, que sao quase duas léguas; há continuamente casas e quintas.” (Oliveira 1620, 524)

Frei Nicolau points out that Lisbon reaches from Belém to Xabregas, and we can confirm this on the Weilburg painting. The uninterrupted rows of houses and estates can not fully be confirmed, however: We do see a string of houses and quintas but there is still ample room between them once we have left the city wall to the East and the area of S. Bento to and the new quarter of Lapa to the West behind us. This may indicate that when the painting was made there was still less development than at the time Frei Nicolau published his book in 1620.

Most of the buildings that are identifiable at first glance date from Philippian rule, such as the great quadrangular tower, the Torreão (fig. 3), on the waterfront designed by Filippo Terzi as the most prominent addition to the royal palace and to Lisbon architecture erected under Philipp II. The tower probably was finished before the death of Philipp II in 1598 (Kubler 2005, 103). This edifice forms the absolute
center of the painting, as befits the central position of the king in the social order of the time. Philipp II also ordered the rebuilding of the convent of S. Vicente de Fora (fig. 4). The church is shown with twin towers and a cupola reminiscent of St. Peter’s in Rome on top of a dome with a classical pediment very similar to the Pantheon in Rome, alluding to its character as the Panteão Real, or burial place of the Portuguese kings. The circular construction shown on the painting was never realized. When Philipp II signed the plans by Filippo Terzi in 1590, the church was intended as a rectangular building with a cupola modelled on Il Gesù in Rome (as can be seen on an old painting from Villa Mombello, Imbersago, Italy showing the design of the nave and the dome. See Varela 2001, 360). The nave and façade were finished only in 1629 (Kubler 2005, 105).

Some of the buildings also underline the importance of the role of Cristóvão de Moura (1538-1613), the first Marquês of Castelo Rodrigo, the Portuguese mastermind behind the Iberian Union of 1580, such as the Palácio Corte Real (fig. 3) next to the Torreão on the Ribeira das Naus. This giant palace of the Marquês de Castelo Rodrigo, the valido of Philipp II, who served as Portuguese vice-roy in the years 1600-3 and 1608-12, was built in typical Spanish style with four corner towers and steep roofs. Work on the palace begun around 1585 based on a project attributed to Juan de Herrera (García 2008, 23), but it was not yet finished when Cristóvão de Moura died in 1613 (Varela 2001, 360). On the Weilburg painting, the building has a very prominent position immediately next to the royal tower in the center of the picture. Both the royal tower, and the Corte Real palace were destroyed by the earthquake in 1755.

Of special importance to the Castelo Rodrigo family was the convent of S. Bento da Saúde (fig. 5), where Cristóvão de Moura and his son Manuel, Spanish ambassador to Rome, had planned a family pantheon and imported expensive Roman marble artwork for the crypt (a marble plinth survives at the Museu Nacional da Arte Antiga). Work on this immense convent began in 1598 and it was inaugurated in 1615 (Varela 2001, 359-360). Following many conversions, the edifice today houses the Portuguese parliament. On the painting, the monastery is shown to be of a scope resembling the Escorial (Varela 2001, 359).

In addition to the cathedral and the castle of S. Jorge, the two waterfront palaces of the king and the Marquês de Castelo Rodrigo, and the two hill-top monasteries of S. Vicente and S. Bento are the most prominent buildings to be identified on the painting. All of those four were initiated under Philipp II, and most probably, only the Torreão was completely finished at the time the canvas was painted. The other three buildings would then have been presented as if finished, in order to idealize both the rule and architectural accomplishments of Philipp II and the qualities and attractions of Lisbon.

In addition to the architectonic details, the painting is also an extremely important source for the royal entry of Philipp III in 1619. When looking at the triumphal arches and other details of this entry, it is important to be aware of the fact that the entry of Philipp III in 1619 was closely modelled on the earlier entry of Philipp
II in 1581 (Soromenho 2000, 23). There are numerous parallels between the two entries of 1581 and 1619. The Memorial published by Pero Ruíz Soares in 1629 offers a good overview of both entries. Parallel events include the exact day and hour – June 29, 15:00h – of both entries (“dia de sam pedro que foi os mesmo dia em que seu pay entrou partindo de bellem as tres depois do m° dia na sua gale Real.” Soares 1629, 423; “a .29 de Junho da dita era de .1581. as tres oras depois do m° die sembarcou elRey em Almada pera cidade núa gale” Soares 1629, 423), and almost the same number of the galleys in 1581 (“…e uinha na galle Real e onze gales mais.” Soares 1629, 194) and in 1619 (“neste tempo não estaua neste porto de lix nhuã galee e pera a entrada mando elRey uir de calis [Cádiz] treze gales entre as quais uinha huã Real delRey m° custossa de Ricos feitios por dentro com as paas dos Remos todas douradas.” Soares 1629, 422).

In addition to the use of similar triumphal arches in both entries (many of the 28 triumphal arches used in 1619 had in fact been modelled on the 15 arches used in the earlier entry of Philipp II in 1581, see Soromenho 2000), these parallels would suggest that the choreography for the Joyeuse Entrée of Philipp III had been planned more or less immediately after the death of Philipp II in 1598. This would have made good sense, as the capital of the Spanish crown at that time wasn’t settled as Madrid yet (Madrid was declared capital only in 1606 and by no means fully developed for that task), and there was a large interest in Lisbon to convince the king to make it the capital of the combined crowns of Spain and Portugal (Garcia 2008, 87 et seqq.). The Portuguese capital would certainly have been much more accessible than Madrid and would have offered a much larger harbor than Sevilla. In addition, Lisbon’s position at the center between old world and new world would have made it an ideal location for trade and government of a world empire, as laid out here by Luís Mendes de Vasconcelos, comendador of the Portuguese Order of Christ in 1608:

“...pareceu-me que seria coisa utilíssima mostrar como a cidade de Lisboa é mais apta para as coisas do mar, a respeito desta monarquia, que outra alguma, e que nela terá abundantemente a corte de sua majestade não só tudo o que para sustento comum é necessário, mas as mais preciosas coisas do mundo, e el-rei as melhores recreações que se podem desejar: para que por todas estas razões se reconheça que esta cidade é mais digna que todas, da sua assistência.” (Vasconcelos 1608, 87)

The merchant community in Lisbon must have been convinced that there were so many good reasons advocating a shift to Lisbon (climate, trade, location etc.) that this simply should have been happening eventually. Correspondence from the beginning of the 17th century between the court at Madrid and Lisbon (Oliveira 1882) shows that the visit of the king had been imminent a number of times from at least as early as 1605 and that wooden models of the triumphal arches were ready by 1612, the last year of Cristovão de Moura’s service as vice-roy (Gehlert 2008,
Vasconcelo’s eulogy of Lisbon thus falls into this area of time. It would be safe to assume that Moura (comendador-mor da ordem de Alcântara), Vasconcelos (comendador da ordem de Cristo), Lavanha (cronista-mor) and other influential Portuguese people at the court of Philipp III were very much intent on establishing the court at Lisbon rather than Madrid, and the periods with Moura as vice-roy (January 29, 1600 to 1603, again in 1603, and again from February 1608 to 1612) would have seen much renewed interest in this venture (for a general discussion of the intended shift of capital, see Bouza Álvarez 2000, chapter 6, Lisboa Sozinha, quase viúva. A Cidade e a mudança da corte no Portugal dos Filipes, pp. 159-184). There were more than 30 written reports and poems published on the entry of 1619 (Kubler 2005, 135). Although the amount of details varies between almost none (Vasco Mausino de Quevedo, 1619, published six cantos full of mythological examples, but no facts) and absolute detail (Lavanha, 1622, features 12 full-page engraved plates by Schorkens of the triumphal arches; his book is considered the official account of the entry, published by him in his quality as Cronista-mor do Reino, which he became 1618), none of those reports offers a description of the entry that would contradict what we see happening on the Weilburg painting. The most detailed and readable account is the one published by Francisco Rodríguez Lobo in 1623, which confirms the choreography presented in our painting. Many of the details mentioned hark back to the entry of 1581 and can also be observed on our painting. We will see this in an example drawn from a typical epic poem on the entry of Philipp II in 1581 by the Portuguese author, André Falcão de Resende:

“Luego que su Magestad / en la galera vuo entrado / los truenos del artillaría / horrisona salva háo dado. / … / las belicozas galleras / que en escadrón ordenado / a la real como sennora / patrona en medio háo tomado.” (Resende 1581, 96)

As the royal galley arrived, all of the city and ships fired in salute (fig. 6); this is mentioned in nearly all of the sources of the entry of 1619, and it was identical in 1581. The same is true of the fact that the royal galley was taken in the middle, as is neatly confirmed by the Weilburg painting.

“Los ilustros vereadores / que tienen el consulado / de la muy nobre cidad / y su gobierno ordenando / en el caiz de la marina / y ribera se an ajuntado, / en el caez que capaz y largo / de mil figuras ordenado / y de triunphales arcos / tiene lustroso y gallardo…” (Resende 1581, 97)

As described by Resende, the nobility awaited the king at the wooden pier where triumphal arches and thousands of visitors awaited the king (fig. 7). The parallels are obvious. It is as though no time had passed between 1581 and 1619. The question is: Why do the authors use so many parallels? One motivation might be to position Philipp III closer to the image of his father, the “great” king Philipp II (Philippus Prudens). The other might be a lack of time for preparation
and a sense of urgency to get the new king quickly to Lisbon in order to change the capital. A third possibility might be the rigidness of Hapsburg state protocol. Most probably, it was a combination of all three factors. What is clear though is that in a case of more than 30 reports with hardly any serious deviance, we need to assume that there had been in fact a kind of censure at work in order to ensure that one official version would get published and supported by the other publications. In this sense it is telling that the only early source, Mausino de Quevedo of 1619 doesn’t relate any factual details of the entry. The best source, Lobo, is published 1623, and another useful factual source, Gregorio San Martín, in 1624 – significantly after publication of the account by Lavanha (for an overview of the contempory literary sources, see Garcia 2008, chapter 3, Livros do século xvii sobre Lisboa, p. 87).

The plans for the Joyeuse Entrée were prepared early on and probably with certain haste, as Lisbon was eager to welcome the new king and convince him of the apparent natural and strategic advantages of Lisbon. A similar haste seems to be observable in parts of the Weilburg canvas, as suggested by the rather clumsily painted houses that have apparently been painted onto the canvas with great speed. This becomes apparent in the upper half of the image of the Terreiro do Paço (fig. 8) and in many other details of the city. Some buildings, such as the Hospital de Todos-os-Santos are only hinted at with a recognizable façade, but no edifice of any real depth is shown. All of the elements in this painting have to be understood as signs in a semiotic understanding, rather than as ‘realistic’ or ‘naturalist’ renderings of what could have been observed in 1619 on the spot in Lisbon. This painting, like other 17th century paintings, seeks to create an illusion that will have a desired effect on the viewer. It should never be mistaken for a faithful historic report, if such a thing could even exist. In unique fashion, the Weilburg
picture offers an amazing amount of detail e.g. in the figures of the saints on the banners flown by the ships, and, at the same time, a stunning carelessness when it comes to segments carrying less meaning or relevance. In the context of royal commissions this approach seems quite daring and there are hardly any parallels to this manner of painting; only Greco or Velazquez would come to mind in terms of sketchiness. Specialist city views by Wijngaerde, Merian etc. never show any kind of sketchiness, though this may be due to their medium, the engraving. All houses and windows are rectangular in their views. But this would also hold true for painted views of the royal palaces in Madrid, for instance by Jusepe Leonardo or others. So in terms of style, this co-existence of meticulous detail and generous non-chalance seems unique.

We should now compare the painting to the engraving (fig. 9) of the Joyeuse Entrée published by Lavanha in 1622, which up to the discovery of the Weilburg painting had been the only source of pictorial information on the 1619 entry in Lisbon. Hans Schorkens (sometimes spelled Schorquens), a Flemish engraver active in Madrid, created this print (19.9 × 29.4 cm) based on a model by court painter Domingues Vieira Serrão (ca. 1570-1632), as indicated in the inscription: “Debuxada por Domingo Vieira Pintor del Rey i cortado por Ioan Schorquens”. The print was published as part of the detailed account of the entry published by João Baptista Lavanha in Madrid and Lisbon (Lavanha 1622). It combines a skyline of Lisbon similar to the one painted or drawn by Serrão with the relevant information on the choreography and decoration of the entry strictly as given on our painting. The large canvas which served as the the model for the engraving has been dated around 1620 by Vitor Serrão and has been kept in the church of S. Luís dos Franceses at Lisbon to this day (fig. 10). The painting, dedicated to Nossa Senhora do Porto Seguro, probably had been commissioned by a French merchant (Serrão 2009, 70). In Schorken’s
print, the skyline is taken over almost exactly from this painting (although the cathedral does stand out from the houses on the print significantly more – two stories – than on the canvas, and the front section of the print showing the Terreiro do Paço seems to have a slightly higher viewpoint), while the details of the entry such as the triumphal arches are taken over from the information stated on the Weilburg painting. Despite several differences such as the one concerning the cathedral, the print on the whole is so close to the painting that a common source or a direct connection have to be assumed.

This would establish the following chronological order:
1. The Weilburg painting defines the choreography and basic decorative elements of the royal entry after 1598, possibly under the influence of Lavanha
2. Vieira Serrão draws or paints a different view of Lisbon
3. Schorkens combines both the view of Lisbon by Vieira Serrão and the basic elements of the entry from the Weilburg painting in his engraving of the scene published by Lavanha in 1622.

It is interesting in this regard to take a look at some of the ephemeral architectural elements of the entry in Lavanha’s prints and compare them to our painting. Lavanha’s single-page print (fig. 11) of the German arch features a mystical marriage of Habsburg and Spain/Portugal crowned by the double-headed Hapsburg
The Weilburg painting showing the Lisbon entry of 1619 in its historical and pictorial context

eagle, which is flanked by a soldier and a representation of faith. The arch closely follows the model used in 1581 (double columns on plinths that were topped with pyramid-shaped pinnacles crowned with silver balls, see Soromenho 2000). Note that the figures bearing the crown are freely standing and there is no support structure for the crown as the top element of the arch. In Lavanha’s engraving of the total view of the entry, however, the German arch is presented somewhat differently (fig. 12): here, it fully conforms to the version given on our painting, notably including the top needle and the supporting sub-structure missing in the more detailed single-page print.

This would support the theory that the triumphal arches presented on the engraving of the total view were in fact based on, or taken directly from, the Weilburg painting, while the single-page engravings of the arches would have been based on another, more detailed source such as the plans and models kept by Teodósio de Frías, which wouldn’t have been ready at the early time the Weilburg painting presumably came into being. There is no other reasonable explanation as to why Lavanha would go back to the details on the Weilburg painting if he had better material available. Apparently, the large view of Lisbon with the entry of Philipp III published by Lavanha was, in fact, and as stated on the print, based on a drawing by Domingos Vieira Serrão plus on the entry details given on the Weilburg view. The most important deviation between the engravings and our painting, however, can be found in the stage set next to the arch of the Portuguese nation (fig. 13), which seems to have been misunderstood by the engraver. In the 1619 entry, the frontal section of the Alfândega is decorated with a façade of 12 round arches crowned with paintings and a golden balustrade, all of which are ephemeral architecture. Between that part and the triumphal arch of the Portuguese nation, there is huge a stage set alluding to Philipp III’s expulsion of the mouriscos, decreed in 1609, which he regarded as a triumph of faith and a primary achievement of his reign.

Fig. 10 – View of Lisbon painted by Domingues Vieira Serrão, kept at S. Luís dos Francheses, Lisbon. The large picture is dedicated to Nossa Senhora do Porto Seguro and seems to be the model for the view shown on Lavanha’s print.
The Weilburg painting shows the monarch presiding, on a high throne held up by giants, over the expulsion of the *mouriscos*, typified here by a single moor being driven out by a general wielding a club, as two friars personifying the Catholic faith look on. In contrast, the Lavanha print shows four half-naked figures that do not perform any clear kind of action while the king on the throne is misrepresented as a putto (fig. 14). George Kubler had interpreted this as the “Titans threatening the Spanish Jupiter,” a theme he had encountered in other royal entries, and understood this scene as a kind of critique of Philipp’s rule, but the problem seems to be the erroneous engraving. Soares, who published his Memorial in 1629, would have based his information on Lavanha 1622, as he didn’t know the painting, which by that time probably was already in the Alcazar at Madrid, as the primary source:

“fez mais o prouedor dalfandega hu frontespiçio nalfandega da banda do mar mui bem ornado e da banda da terra as portas dalfandega hu teatro mto bem ornado no qual estaua a istoria dos gigantes que quizerão conquistar o çeo tudo de uulto e de mto grande grandeza”. (Soares 1629, 420).

Could the Weilburg painting have been based on the Lavanha print? Probably not, as it would seem strange to replace Serrão’s well drawn cityscape with the more mannerist version of Weilburg. In addition, why would anybody transform the “Ti-

---

**Fig. 11** – The arch of the German nation as published in Lavanha’s book. The imperial crown is supported by a figure of Santa Fé and a Miles Christianus, flanking the Hapsburg double-headed eagle. The theme is a marriage of Portugal and Hapsburg.

**Fig. 12** – Detail of the Arch of the German nation as shown on the Weilburg painting, and on Lavanha’s view of Lisbon. Lavanha follows Weilburg here, but not in the full-page version of the arch.
tans threatening Jupiter” into the “Expulsion of the Moriscos”? It makes much more sense if we read it from Weilburg (original painting) to Lisbon (misunderstood engraving). Taken together, all of the relevant information presented on the painting seems to point to an early date around 1600 shortly after the death of Philipp II. This would confirm an observation made by George Kubler in his study of the Joyeuse Entrée of 1619, where he writes that Lavanya began to conceive the Lisbon entry already before 1600 as a tool to present Lisbon as the ideal candidate for the capital of the united empires of Spain and Portugal (Kubler 2005, 144). He assumes that Lavanya’s plans were devised with the help of powerful persons at court such as Cristóvão de Moura. This seems to have been the case. Accordingly, the panoramic and yet highly detailed canvas, which defines the entire script for the entry in painted form, might well have been commissioned by the Marquês de Castelo Rodrigo, Cristóbal de Moura, or his circle, after 1598, maybe during his first service as Portuguese vice-roy from 1600-1603, with a view to attract the young king Philipp III to Lisbon in order to convince him of the natural, political, and commercial advantages of Lisbon and to make him establish his residence there. Several sources (Soares etc.) report that Philipp III enjoyed the summer (from June to October) in Lisbon, and there is reason to believe that the grand project might even have had a chance to succeed as there were many arguments in favor of such a move (see Garcia 2008 for more background on those arguments). The 1622 publication of Lavanya’s book celebrating the event of 1619 happened a year after the death of Philipp III in 1621. The book may well have sought a new impetus for a change of capital under the new king Philipp IV, who was only 16 years old at the time. The arguments in favor of Lisbon were very strong, and it is astonishing to see that the project failed again and again. It certainly wasn’t due to a lack of effort on the Portuguese part.

Postscriptum

There is a widespread belief that a city view of a historic event such as the entry of Philipp III in 1619 would have to have been painted after the event, fresh from memory, similar to the way it is spelled below out on the occasion of the earlier entry of Archduke Ernst of Austria in Antwerp in 1595:

“Description of the Public Thanksgiving, of the Spectacles and the Games at the Entry of the Most Serene Prince Ernst Archduke of Austria, Knight of the Golden Fleece, Prefect of the Belgian Province to His Royal Catholic Majesty on 14 June 1594, published at Antwerp some days later.” (Mulryne 2004)

A quick glance at even one of the highly elaborated triumphal arches shown in that publication, such as the Arcus Lusitanorum, makes it clear that if this account was
indeed published ‘a few days’ after the visit it must have been in the making for at least a year or longer. That confirms the idea that such demanding descriptions are to be understood as a kind of written state protocol that would be prepared in advance of the visit, and published after the visit.

In the Lisbon entry 1619 this was no different. It would not only have been very difficult, but virtually impossible for any painter to observe the manifold details of this state visit, which surely must have been based on a strictly planned choreography in accordance with Hapsburg protocol, similar to the Antwerp entry of 1595 (which Lavanha had carefully studied, see Kubler 2005). The painter could not have been in all places at once and would have had to rely on reports and descriptions, mostly verbal, by others. There would have been deviations between the individual records of the event. The amazing fact, however, is that all published written and pictorial records in unisono agree on the events of the entry; and those descriptions also are perfectly in line with the scene presented in the Weilburg painting and the Lavanha print, and even in personal testimonies by witnesses to the scene, such as the letter sent to the Conde de Gondomar by Santiago de Monzón:

“Su Magestad llegó (a) Almada, qu’es media legua de Lisboa, de la otra parte del río, a 26 del pasado. Ubo muy gran fiesta aquella noch en la ciudá, de luminarias, y en el río los nabíos dispararon gran cantidá de piezas.” (Monzón 1619)

That means virtually all sources declare the same facts. This would have been impossible without prior detailed planning of the event and strict supervision of the sources that were to be published. This would have to have included the painter, as his work is considered a publication too. Under the circumstances of the royal entry with its masses of people, even the task of painting a single triumphal arch properly would have been all but impossible, given the problems to move freely among the multitude and with restricted access due to the security measures associated with the entry, the extreme height of the arches, and other problems more. For a legible rendition of the arches he would have needed recourse to the models and sketches of those arches. The same holds true for the details presented in the galleys or in the architecture. None of what we see did happen spontaneously, and none of this is in any way a picture of reality. It is a carefully arranged illusion, just like so many works in the siglo de oro. The official public chronicle of this event is the book published by Lavanha in 1622; the Weilburg painting may have been the unofficial court chronicle ex ante defining the main events of this royal visit in painted form as a kind of master plan of the entry with the purpose of rallying support for the idea of the royal entry which would have been a key argument used for the intended shift of capital from Valladolid or, after 1606, Madrid, to Lisbon.

Fig. 13 – The teatro, a huge stage set placed next to the arch of the Portuguese nation, alluding to Philipp III’s expulsion of the mouriscos.

Fig. 14 – The same scene as shown on Lavanha’s view. The figure of Philipp III on a high throne held up by giants has been misunderstood as a putto; the drama of the scene is missing entirely.
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