study of its curriculum will therefore shed light on the Academic system and perhaps on its contribution to the general artistic developments of the nineteenth century. The organization of instruction in the private studios consisted of four major divisions: elementary drawing lessons, drawing and painting after the live model, compositional study in the form of sketches and copying.

DRAWING INSTRUCTION

As the *concours des places* was the criterion for admission to the Ecole, drawing instruction was the primary consideration in the atelier. The master was preoccupied with a pupil's ability to make an *académie*, that is, to draw the live model. Upon being presented to a master, the young art student was required to show samples of his work. On the basis of these samples the master assigned the student to a particular rank within the atelier. At the elementary level the pupil was required to copy engravings, called *modèles de dessin*, as well as plaster casts of individual parts of the body.

Although this form of instruction had been practised since the seventeenth century, at no time was it adopted in the Ecole des Beaux-Arts during the nineteenth century. It was employed only in the private ateliers, in the industrial art schools and in the drawing programme of the State school system.[8] The drawing models were mostly engraved and sometimes lithographed. The objects represented were sharply delineated with accentuated contours. Shaded areas were composed of individual lines and cross-hatching to facilitate the student's grasp of the illustration (Fig. 6).[9] As every line of the model was clearly visible, a student was able to reproduce the entire engraving meticulously. It was a slow and painful procedure, requiring the kind of effort admired by the nineteenth-century Academicians. This trial by ordeal, which will be discussed later in more detail, was a hallmark of nineteenth-century Academic instruction.

A traditional academic emphasis on patient and diligent labour dates back to the medieval guild system, and generally implied a moral commitment to the virtues of labour and industry. During the Renaissance and Baroque periods, patience and hard work were elevated as superior qualities by the academic instructors to convince pupils that conscientious effort could replace what nature failed to provide.[10] But the nineteenth-century Academy stood alone in dogmatically asserting not only the moral and didactic basis for hard work, but also the pictorial display of laborious and diligent application. If a pupil demonstrated a certain facility in his drawing execution, the master often requested that he practise copying complicated shaded models, to force him to develop a more careful and tighter technique.[11]

Drawing models generally consisted of two types, one exhibiting only contours, the *dessin au trait*, and the other combining contours with shaded areas, the *dessin ombré*. The student was first required to master the rudimentary models before proceeding to the second types, which exhibited relief through tiny parallel lines closely juxtaposed. A deep relief was obtained by crossing the *hachures*. The uses of cross-hatching

was a controversial problem during the nineteenth century, and critics opposed to it used the alternative method of the *estompe* to give relief to contour drawings. The stump was a small cylindrically shaped roll of paper or parchment pointed at one end: with this tip the artist smudged his pencil and charcoal lines for modelling effects. However, the stump was not regarded favourably by the Academicians in this early period, although it gradually became the dominant method of rendering relief after the mid-century. In the ateliers of the July Monarchy the *hachure* technique was the conventional form of modelling. Paillot de Montabert describes the procedure in the following way:

> The *hachure* is not a device invented to enhance the beauty or expressiveness of a pictorial work, but a necessity imposed by the nature of the imitating process: a method to which one resorts in suitable cases to make up for the faint lines produced by a pencil or brush.[12]

The *hachure* was a practical necessity for use in achieving effects of light and shade inaccessible to the single thin stroke of brush or pencil.

Paillot also observed that the effects of this method often led to 'wretched mechanical studies', and that its practice brought to mind the 'somewhat absurd patience of those individuals who, when copying from prints, use a pen in order to imitate exactly the work of the engraving tool'.[13] It should be noted that Paillot was not criticizing the elementary pedagogical procedures, but pointing out the pernicious results that the method encouraged when unchecked. A pupil so trained (and all art students received this instruction either in a drawing school or the atelier) was inculcated with a vision of nature translatable into well-defined contours and *hachure* marks. Even when confronted with a live model (Figs. 2, 3, 4, 5) or a landscape (Fig. 1), his natural tendency was to execute the drawing in this manner. His basic instruction, derived from copying engravings, established a fixed mode of seeing and rendering nature. As shall be shown, the elementary drawing instruction encouraged stylistic tendencies that would affect painting techniques as well.

Although we may criticize this training, it at least had the virtue of instilling in the pupil an unshakable confidence in his drawing ability, and enabled him to tackle the most complicated objects with ease. Cézanne's reference to Bouguereau as an artist who 'realized' on canvas his pictorial vision, is evidently related to the Academic confidence of execution. The superiority of the Academic drawing technique surely is a result of this training; but the initiation into the careful reproduction of the drawing models inhibited the artist from the more expressive use of contour and *hachure* which characterizes the work of outstanding nineteenth-century artists. The technique fostered the cold and lifeless appearance which the Academy itself criticized while never fully understanding its origins. It could not grasp the fact that the patient delineation of cross-hatched drawings contributed to producing an aesthetic vision which governed an artist's entire production.

Copying of engravings was so deeply rooted in the French drawing tradition that all

artists accepted it without reservation. Since it had produced draughtsmen of great power during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Academy certainly cannot be blamed for promulgating this system in the later period. As it emphasized laborious execution as a positive merit, the Academy encouraged concentration on the reproduction of an object rather than on its pictorial possibilities. It was mentioned earlier that the entire nineteenth-century Academic outlook was imbued with the moralizing standard of a carefully 'correct' and painstaking execution. But while the Academic partisans continued copying engravings well into the century, the impact of Romanticism and the development of lithography led to a heightened appreciation of the spontaneous qualities of creation more in common with the rococo viewpoint than with the Davidian. Independents thus abandoned the Academic method of drawing under the influence of lithography and the qualities of the improvised sketch.[14]

In keeping with the belief that art should be systematic and disciplined, drawing instruction in the ateliers and drawing schools was divided into logical categories and a hierarchy of modes. On the elementary level, these generally comprised a sequence of engraving-models of individual facial and bodily features following this pattern: a first series, including eyes, nose and lips; a combination of all three features, followed by a profile and front view of this combination; a sequence first of chin studies, a second series of ear models, and a third series combining all of the above features and culminating with models of the head. After the head was mastered, the pupil copied hands, feet, legs and finally the full figure.[15]

All of the individual features of the face, as well as the ensembles of head and figure, were oriented by the copyist on horizontal and vertical axes which he indicated in the form of reference lines. The student was then taught to render a *mise en trait*, a lightly indicated sketch of the feature to be executed, upon which he added the hachures and carefully fixed the contours (Figs. 7, 8).[16] It is essential to emphasize that the *mise en trait* was a form of rough sketch aimed at providing a base for a careful finish. The copying exercise, then, consisted of a two-part division of the prompt layout and of the tightly rendered finished work. As Couture summed up his approach to elementary drawing instruction:

> To establish, either in imagination or in reality, a horizontal and a vertical line in front of the objects one is reproducing – this is an excellent maxim to which one should always adhere. When with the aid of light indications, you have decided upon the layout, you then screw up your eyes and look at the natural object. By so doing, you simplify it and eliminate detail, so that you see only the basic contrasts of light and shadow. Having thus established and made sure of the basic outline, you open . . . your eyes and fill in the details within the design you have set yourself.[17]

Here it seems apparent that the method used in the copying of engraving was carried over into the realm of natural objects as well.

When the teacher decided that the student had mastered the *modèles de dessin*, he assigned him to copying plaster casts, which were also arranged in sequence as drawing models (Fig. 9). The masters owned a large selection of these casts, ranging from individual facial and bodily elements to full-length figures like the Belvedere Torso and the Discobolus.

The transition from copying engravings to copying casts was known as passing *à la bosse*, the *bosse* being the term for plaster casts during the nineteenth century. In the ateliers the *bosse* was understood as the proper intermediary between drawing after engravings and drawing after the live model. A student never began drawing the live model before mastering the *bosse*, and he never began the *bosse* before mastering the *dessin ombré*. Copying the cast was an exercise principally designed to heighten the student's awareness of the effects of light and shade. 'It is the distribution of light and shade which determines the modelling, that is to say, the relief; the model of a figure from the bosse should always be studied from this point of view.'[18] As in the case of the engraving-copies, the pupil used the crosshatch technique to render his relief (Figs. 10, 11, 12).

On this level of study the cast presented fewer difficulties than the live model because of its immobility and constant effects of light. The cast could also be conveniently shifted at varying intervals to manipulate the disposition of these effects. The student was advised to observe salient points of luminosity and abrupt passages from light to dark, and never to forget to place them properly, 'to give full value to half-tones and shadows'.[19] In addition to its practical advantages on the elementary level, the *bosse* assumed a crucial role in the atelier curriculum for two reasons.

First, it introduced the student to works of antiquity (casts were moulded on classical statuary) and it introduced him to the concept of the *effet* – the unified relations of planes of light and dark values. The pedagogical system of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts centred around rotating studies of the antique and of nature.[20] Even the competition for places was based on drawing alternatively after an antique copy and after the live model.[21] Studies of the cast represented the antique part of the Ecole's training. Plaster casts of classical sculpture were collected in the Cour vitrée on the ground floor of the Palais des Etudes to serve as models for art students of the nineteenth century, just as they serve students of our own time. In this way the *bosse* became identified with the antique and played a fundamental role in training the Academic art student.[22]

Above all, however, the *bosse* was employed to familiarize the pupil with the qualities comprising the *effet*, a trait considered essential to a successful work of art. Although we generally conceive of the effect as a partially undefinable and abstract quality, in the academic pedagogy of the nineteenth century it was specifically identified with modelling in terms of light and dark values.

> Light and shade being the essential divisions of the effect, half-tones serve as the intermediaries linking them. Reflections must also contribute to harmonize

> masses of shadow; they pick out forms lying in chiaroscuro by the effect of contiguous bodies.[23]

The study of light and dark values, and especially the intermediary tones between the brightest light and darkest shadow, was based upon observation of the plaster cast. Amaury-Duval tells us that when he passed *à la bosse*, Ingres repeated constantly the term *demi-teinte*. He further recalled his difficulty in grasping this concept within the framework of plaster study:

> To me, a plaster cast looked white when in the light and dark when in shadow; and it is a curious thing that the unpractised eye does not perceive what we call 'modelling', that is, the transition from light to shade by means of half-tones.[24]

In copying the cast, emphasis on the *demi-teintes* could result in a subtle gradation of tonal values that modelled the drawing and achieved the effect.[25] At the same time, these tones attenuated the contrasts between the dominant light and dark areas, and reduced the intensity of effect through the play and juxtaposition of these areas. The more intermediary tones rendered, the less sharp the effect.

Academic pedagogy stressed both a carefully graduated relief through a succession of *demi-teintes* and a vigorous effect. But as this relief took the form of anatomical exactitude, achievement of a heightened effect was diminished by the scrupulous details. One handbook of the July Monarchy warned:

> you should pay no attention to half-tones or details until you have dealt with the principal masses. If, after drawing the outline, you were to finish the work by starting on details and half-tones surrounding the light area, you would fall into the characteristic error of making the details appear dark and hard, whereas they should be bright and enveloped in silvery rays.[26]

The simplification of the light and dark masses in favour of the effect was a basic goal of independent artists during the nineteenth century. Through elimination of unwanted *demi-teintes* a sharper effect was realized. Although this often resulted in a flat appearance with respect to interior modelling, a greater sense of relief was achieved in terms of the optical relationship between the principal motif and the background. Thus the independents tended to simplify the academic procedure, which required a belaboured technique with respect to interior modelling.

The problem of the *demi-teintes* also arose in painting, for which the plaster cast study played a preliminary role.[27] Couture stressed the conventional method of drawing and painting dependent on this subtle modelling:

> You must establish what I call 'dominants' for light and shade effects. Look carefully at your model, decide which is its brightest light, and situate the light in your drawing at the place it occupies in real life. Having made this your dominant, you will of course make sure that all other lights are subordinate to it.

> The same applies to shadow: find your strongest and deepest black and use it as a guide or tuning-fork to establish the values of your other shadows and half-tones.[28]

The Academic practitioners in general emphasized careful gradation of light and shadow, and the rendering of *demi-teintes* was intimately linked to what they considered intelligent presentations of a theme. And although it was recognized that the effect was conditioned by touch and colour, it was essentially understood as dependent on the disposition of light and dark:

> It is chiefly to combinations of light and dark that the effect owes its energy, sweetness and charm: this is shown by prints, which achieve a strong effect despite their lack of colour. Colour of course produces an effect of its own, but it is optically subordinate to those obtained by masses of light and dark half-lights and half-darks.[29]

Like most of the technical concepts of the nineteenth century, that of the effect underwent a terminological evolution, and acquired a more comprehensive application after mid-century.[30] The relationship of the effect to modelling, however, remained constant. As the Academician Jules Breton wrote with respect to modelling:

> Artists' manuals tell us that modelling is the art of grading tints from the lightest to the darkest so as to express physical relief. . . . But that is not all it does, and its further consequences are of the greatest importance in painting. . . . It must, above all, express the intimate appearance of objects, their essential or accidental being . . . the links which join and harmonize them. . . . In landscape it conveys the roughness, smoothness, solidity and fluidity of elements, the shimmering of light and the mystery of atmosphere. It adapts itself to the feelings of every artist, or rather it is the chief carrier of his feelings. . . . *Modelling, combined with proportion,* is *the whole drawing*; *and, combined with the relationship of values, it forms the whole splendid orchestration of the effect which is improperly called chiaroscuro.*[31]

Although the concept of effect now comprehends more than qualities of chiaroscuro, Breton affirms the unchanging relationship of modelling to the effect.

Significantly, Academicians often appreciated effects achieved by independent painters who used a scheme of abrupt value relations, but they qualified this admiration by observing that these effects were obtained only at great sacrifice – through elimination of the painstaking gradation of light to dark which alone demonstrated an artist's science. Proust tells us that, as a student of Couture's, Manet persistently sought ways of eliminating *demi-teintes*, and achieving an immediate transition from dark to light. Once when the master asked his pupil's opinion on a recently painted portrait, Manet answered that its colour-scheme seemed to him too heavy, too much encumbered by half-tones. Couture in turn replied: 'Aha! I know why you say that.

You refuse to see the succession of intermediate tones between dark and light.' But Manet insisted that:

> light appeared to the human eye with a unity such that a single tone was sufficient to render it; moreover it was preferable, crude though it might seem, to pass suddenly from light to darkness rather than accumulate features that the eye does not see and which not only weaken the force of light but attenuate the colouring of shadows which it is important to emphasize. For the colouring of dark areas is not uniform, but extremely varied.[32]

For Manet, the effect was intimately related to the intensity of light, and the *demi-teintes* only served to attenuate this intensity. Light alone was the unifying factor, requiring only a single tone for its execution. In a sense, Manet took the intellectual content out of the Academic method by insisting on the elimination of tones that escape the vision in a drawing or painting session. This would have significant implications for later independents, and especially the Impressionists.

It is essential to understand that Manet accepted the Academic requirement of an intense effect with respect to light and dark qualities; but he wished first to dissociate this concept from that of the *demi-teinte, qua modelé*. He did not quarrel with the aesthetic ends of the Academy, but with the means of achieving the desired result. Courbet, perhaps more involved in the Academic tradition than Manet, misunderstood the latter's intention, and compared his work with playing cards. However, as we shall see, Manet's discovery proceeded directly from the instruction of Couture.

Thus the concept of the *demi-teinte* was inculcated during the atelier phase of drawing after the plaster cast, and continued into the subsequent phases of drawing and painting from the model. As previously suggested, the cast was ideal for introducing this notion because of its uniform surface colouring. The cast presented to the neophyte a strictly 'white' appearance, and the master then stressed the existence of light-to-dark gradation even on a colourless surface. Indoctrinated in this way, the pupil continued to grade his tones intellectually later in his career, even when certain of these tones were not immediately apparent to the eye.

When the pupil had mastered drawing the cast and demonstrated a thorough understanding of the *demi-teintes*, he was then assigned to a place before the live model. This step was known as passing *à la nature*, and represented the most significant advance preceding painting instruction. At the same time it meant a rise on the social level within the atelier; no longer considered a *rapin*, the pupil now participated in the activities of the senior group and himself made sport of newcomers.

Confronted with the live model, the inexperienced artist had often to overcome technical as well as psychological obstacles; he missed the unity of tone and immobility of the cast, and the female nude embarrassed him. In order to aid the pupil in adjusting to the new situation, the master required that he draw several ensembles without detail to practise seizing a pose quickly.[33] Ingres admonished his pupils at this stage to concentrate on:

> *line* and *mass*. The model's movement should be dashed off in a few lines and there should be no detail in the light and dark patches, or if there is, it should be subordinated to the two essential masses of light and dark.[34]

As a practical guide, the master advised the pupil to squint in observing the model – forcing him to concentrate on the essential elements of the model.

At this point in his training, the student was also advised to recall his experience with the antique casts, and to apply their classical proportions to the live model, which would always be 'defective' in this respect. This usually was not difficult for the pupil, because of his long practice in copying engravings and casts. By the time he arrived at drawing the live model, he had been conditioned to see it in terms of the drawing and plaster models. The poses of the live model generally resembled those of antique statues, and to the neophyte the live model appeared as a kind of living statue.

The Academic master, however, not only thought in terms of figural beauty, but preferred the antique models for their simplicity of line and mass. He emphasized the need to generalize the major divisions of the human body, rather than attention to unessential detail, and for this stage the antique examples were especially suited. When a pupil arrived at this level, the master always placed great emphasis on the notion of the ensemble, and drawing the live model was meant to provide the elements of this concept. Whereas the preliminary drawing instruction was concerned with individual parts of the body, the drawing of the live model was taught with a view to inculcating the idea of the whole.

Yet the pupil often had great difficulty in carrying out this part of the training; accustomed to copying fragmented elements, he did not learn the concept of the ensemble easily. Concerning the work of pupils raised in this system, Breton observed that:

> the great error of most pupils was to go out of their way to include in their figure-drawings details which bore little relationship to one another, such as noses and mouths that did not match. In drawing from models they would show muscles that did not fit the construction as a whole, or they would introduce half-tones that gave the effect of a void or exaggerated angles, in the former case because they were too dark in the vicinity of a light area, and in the latter case for the opposite reason.[35]

The director of the art school visited by Breton[36] agreed with this observation, and said he often exhorted his pupils to 'work in masses and see things on a big scale' but they refused to understand this.

These remarks illuminate the Academic method and its results; while stressing the importance of the ensemble and seeing 'in the mass', it checked its own ambitions by a self-defeating methodology. Neither Academic partisan nor independent critic considered investigating the pedagogy as a source of what they felt to be a decline in

French art, mainly because it had served French tradition since the seventeenth century and enjoyed the prestige of a national institution. Meissonier reflected the ambiguous attitude towards the system when he reproached himself for finding it difficult to teach others drawing, and offered as an explanation: 'I have lost the habit of drawing outlines myself, for in painting I always block out the relief at once.'[37]

In other words, the mature artist still associates drawing instruction with the traditional approach, even though his personal evolution has taken the form of a more direct technique with respect to the basic goals of ensemble and effect. But Meissonier's development must be understood in light of the more general evolution of nineteenth-century techniques which transformed the conceptual framework of Academic ideals. The self-consciously achieved effect was considered antithetical to the free and spontaneous expression of the artist. Paradoxically, however, the solution to this dilemma posed by universal acceptance of Academic criteria was still to be found in the Academy's curriculum. We shall take up this problem in the next chapter.

During the period of the July Monarchy, the pencil was the preferred instrument for rendering life drawings because it forced a tight and controlled execution. In order to facilitate the pupil's grasp of the ensemble, the master would sometimes prescribe charcoal in place of the pencil. Charcoal, or *fusain*, permitted a freer and prompter rendering: after 1863 it would become the habitual instrument for drawing both the model and the cast.[38] But charcoal did not work well in rendering *hachures*, and it encouraged smudging, either with the stump or finger, in the interests of relief. The informal result was frowned upon by the Academicians, and the superiority of the pencil was upheld during the early period. The tools themselves thus became identified with Academic principles, and subject to controversy under the influence of independent tendencies.

As in his previous stages of instruction, the pupil was taught to begin his life drawing with a light sketch:

> One must get into the way of quickly perceiving the figure's action and the chief movements of the muscles, for it is during the first few moments after the model has taken up a pose that all parts of the body are most effectively in play. . . . To render this, he should first lightly sketch in the whole drawing, though he need not thereafter adhere too slavishly to his own lines.[39]

A light preliminary sketch further permitted the pupil to make changes and modifications before adding the final touches.[40] As in his previous training, he began with a *mise en place*, and centred his sketch with horizontal and vertical guide lines formed with the aid of a plumb line.[41] The student was specifically required to apply the sketch-finish method in rendering the figure; he was not to attempt a drawing all at once:

> A drawing, like a painting, cannot be done straight off. A notebook sketch is done in this way, and the skilful artist may put a great deal into a drawing tossed

> off in this manner. But the pupil must go to work more humbly, starting with simple elements and working up to more complex, keeping the main aim in view and achieving delicacy by degrees without losing sight of the mass.[42]

Throughout his drawing instruction the pupil was taught to build up a work in two major phases – the *mise en place* and the finished execution. The aim of the sketch was to indicate the ensemble, which in turn was the quintessential purpose of the life drawing programme:

> Pupils should be accustomed to take account of mass before they are allowed to finish the details. Too often they treat these over-elaborately with the pencil, forgetting that they function as accessories and that the effect depends above all on the general composition.[43]

Since the sketch emphasized the ensemble at the expense of extraneous detail, it was perhaps more significant in this respect than the finished drawing. This conclusion had profound implications for independent trends.

The importance of the life drawing programme in the Academic curriculum is also seen in the stress on this programme as the basis for success in all genres. The young Impressionists studied with Gleyre because they felt knowledge of the figure would help them draw landscapes. The forerunners in the Academic ateliers took it for granted that it was the base of all specialties:

> The study of nature is the best way to perfect oneself in drawing. We must learn from nature herself the various movements she produces in limbs by means of muscles; this study is done with the help of a nude human being known as the 'model', who is made to pose in any desired attitude.[44]

The study of the live model was understood as indispensable to those who desired skilled draughtsmanship,

> and at the same time so difficult, that a young man who already knows how to draw fairly well . . . must sometimes begin all over again from scratch . . . when it comes to drawing the live model and putting the various parts of the figure together. . . .[45]

As we mentioned previously, when the master visited his atelier he primarily directed his attention to the figure drawings. He would stop at each artist's place and examine individual essays for faulty draughtsmanship. These visits were therefore known as *séances de correction*, and were identical with those exercised at the Ecole. Sometimes the master would mark with pencil on the student's effort to indicate an error in proportion, or simply indicate by gesture the proper contour (Fig. 13).[46] Ingres corrected his pupils' work by scratching on the paper with his fingernail.[47]

– Corrections almost always dealt with proportional or anatomical defects, and these sessions represented the principal means of instruction both in the private ateliers and in the Ecole des Beaux-Arts.[48] Conceptually, the correction was linked to the notion

of perfection rooted in the admiration of antiquity. Correcting a drawing meant more than the adjustment to the lines to the model; it implied the adherence to classical proportions. Correction therefore denoted perfection – a criterion in drawing analogous conceptually to the *fini*, and therefore an intellectual preoccupation.

Just as the *fini* served to demonstrate an artist's knowledge of archaeological details, so the 'correct' drawing demonstrated the draughtsman's knowledge of classical works. This explains the Academic horror of strict observation of the model; when a pupil copied a figure's 'defects' he committed a double sin in terms of Academic criteria: admitting ignorance of antiquity and rejecting the concept of correction.

This discussion basically sums up the drawing programme in the atelier curriculum.[49] Mention must be made, however, of exercises that were included in both the drawing and painting stages. Prior to graduating into the painting class, the students were assigned compositional problems as well as executing copies in the Louvre. These were drawing exercises in keeping with the pupil's degree of experience in the atelier. Only the most advanced pupils in figure drawing were assigned these problems, which they shared with more experienced pupils who painted their compositions and copies. These exercises served as a transitional link between the two halves of the Academic curriculum.

The master further advised an extra-curricular drawing activity in which all the pupils were invited to participate: this was the sketching in a pocket notebook of daily events.[50] This was not simply a formal exercise, but was considered a practice crucial to the development of an artist's personal viewpoint, his originality. The master consciously recommended this practice as a relief from the more disciplined techniques of the atelier.[51]

These thumbnail jottings were different from the light sketches which served as under-drawings for the finished work; they did not represent the preliminary stages of a drawing, but were themselves compositional sketches to inform the definitive work. They were not known as *esquisses*, but as *croquis* – rapidly rendered drawings composed of few lines and marks. As Couture advised in this respect:

> If you use models, take them by surprise: do not let them realize that you are looking at them. A few rapid strokes, your own observations and notes made under the heat of your impressions will guide you far better than those dreadful models which lead you astray.[52]

As notes for future reference, these sketches could be reworked in the studio:

> After having captured a good movement or a natural pose you can always arrange a session with the model; . . . but be careful to look at the model only to render your first impression.

These notes embody a characteristic quality that no amount of reworking could basically alter, and which could even prove injurious to their vitality. The daily nota-

tions recorded immediate impressions which could not always be sustained in the studio productions. Knowing the importance of this practice, Delacroix observed that:

> if you are not skilful enough to sketch a man falling out of a window during the time it takes him to get from the fifth storey to the ground, you will never be able to produce monumental work.[53]

The *patron* not only stressed the need for immediacy and spontaneity in the notebook sketches, but also recommended the practice for learning to compose and capture a scene's effect. Etex advised his students to carry continually:

> a notebook, a sheet of paper, so as to catch the varied compositional lines of nature by observation of real life, on the street or the road, in the fields or when passing along a river.[54]

And further on he writes:

> A few lines put down in your album will remind you of the effect you did not have time to seize and fix in your own mind.

On the basis of his notes, Etex claimed that he was always able to paint 'an impressive effect in the same way as it struck me'. As opposed to the dutiful works of the atelier, the notebook study emphasized the immediate impression and its spontaneous execution.

We must be careful not to underestimate the importance of this practice that is still very much a part of an artist's daily routine. If we could assemble the notebooks of both Academic and independent artists, we would find many stylistic traits in common. Furthermore, the possibilities this exercise offered to independent artists must also be considered. The *croquis*, jotted in a notebook, covering a wide range of subject matter, from street scenes and landscapes to copies in the Louvre, provided for the pupil an opportunity to appreciate the common objects and immediate events in his visual environment. Certainly this practice had been in vogue since the Renaissance, but it assumed a greater dimension in the nineteenth century, when the depiction of contemporary events could represent a means of liberation from conventional and stereotyped themes.

By the end of the nineteenth century, the *carnet en poche* practice had become so institutionalized that an artist could write a manual, *The Art of Jotting Down and Using Sketches*.[55] He described it as an art 'recording, with a few strokes of the pen or pencil, something seen or imagined'. Furthermore:

> in drawing from nature one should try to render as simply as possible what is before one's eyes, having in view only the design and the general effect. The manner of treatment is secondary: if your effect is successful and your drawing correct, the way you make your strokes and hatchings will not matter much . . . in addition you should try to achieve an amusing and above all personal manner of sketching.[56]

Before proceeding to the painting programme one must concede that it may be argued that the curriculum did not basically differ from that of the previous two centuries, and that the sequence of drawings, from casts, and from the live model had been the foundation of the Academic curriculum since the seventeenth century. What then, if any, are the distinguishing features of the nineteenth-century programme?

One of the most notable perhaps was the intensive life drawing session which consumed almost the entire daily schedule in the atelier. This was a legacy of David's influence.[57] A second was the emphasis on the *demi-teintes* in the interest of strong relief, also in part due to the Davidian point of view. In the earlier period, the cast was considered significant primarily because of its associations with antiquity. It was used more specifically as a transitional device to ease the step between the flat surface of an engraving model and the complexity of the live model.[58] Here, of course, it was also employed for the study of light effects, but nowhere in the earlier period do we find a clear formulation of the concept of the *demi-teintes*.[59] A third feature absent from the previous period, and closely tied to the second, was the emphasis on the effect. Earlier writers were far more preoccupied with the part-to-part ensemble of a work than with the narrower concern for the effect.

It may be noted, however, that these are not so much changes in the curriculum as they are shifts of emphasis on individual concepts within the Academic ideology. Both the effect and the *demi-teintes* were discussed and taught in the early Academy, although lacking the stress given to them in the later period. And as will be seen, this shift of emphasis was crucial for the later developments of art in the nineteenth century. But of all the changes in the nineteenth-century atelier curriculum, the most significant occurred in the painting programme.

PAINTING INSTRUCTION

Painting was taught only after the pupil demonstrated a thorough grasp of the Academic drawing style. Couture, who emphasized his painting methods, always insisted that a pupil draw expertly before touching a brush. Amaury-Duval tells us that long after he and his fellow pupils became proficient in life drawing, it worried them that Ingres still had not mentioned painting. But Ingres was not exceptional; all the masters prohibited painting until the pupil mastered drawing.[60] The natural criterion for advancing a pupil to this stage was his success in the *concours des places* at the Ecole.

After brief instruction on the care and use of tools, the master assigned as a first lesson the copy of a head, either painted by an old master or one specifically executed for this purpose by the *patron*. The old-master model was usually presented in the form of a previous copy, but occasionally the pupil would carry out this exercise in the Louvre. Examples were generally chosen from Flemish or Venetian models, that is, works exhibiting vivid colouring and a pronounced brush technique.[61]

Following this practice, he would be assigned to study the head of a live model.