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« On a dit... que mon atelier était une église; eh bien oui! qu'il soit une église, un sanctuaire consacré au culte du beau et du bien et que tous ceux qui y sont entrés et qui en sortent réunis ou dispersés, que tous mes élèves enfin, soient partout et toujours les propagateurs de la vérité. » ¹

Despite gains in our knowledge of nineteenth-century French atelier procedures, the want of a corpus of concrete examples prevents us from glimpsing the specific form the pedagogy assumed in daily practice ². Bits and fragments of studio exercises continually bubble to the surface, but until now no systematic body of material has been disclosed. Recently, however the grandson of Auguste Chavard (fig. 1), a brilliant Ingres pupil, made available to me a series of académies—drawings and paintings after the live model—produced by his grandfather in the master’s atelier. The life studies, dated 1831-1834, reveal a logical progression from early mastery of the pictorial rudiments of line and tone to the advanced expression of delicate nuances of mood. As a bonus, the drawings enable us for the first time to match the celebrated aphorisms recorded by Ingres’ pupils with the actual work created under his supervision. They indicate that Ingres, despite his doctrinaire disposition, sensibly and perceptively guided his students to their full potential. His energetic corrections and brilliant turn of phrase aimed always at freeing them from their fixed visual habits, and making them see and draw without constraint.

¹

²
Ingres opened his studio on what is now Rue Visconti at the end of 1825, following a succession of official honors, including the enthusiastic reception of his work at the Salon of 1824, the award of the Cross of the Legion of Honor, and election to the Academy in June 1825. As was so often the case, an acclaimed master not only felt an obligation to teach, but was indirectly charged with this responsibility by an adoring public. Ingres’ ambition carried him further than most in this regard, since he envisioned himself as the chief of a new school which would draw inspiration from the collaborative ideal of the Renaissance workshop. To this end he set up his art school in rooms contiguous with his own to maximize teacher-student contact. He could thus visit his students at work every day and provide intensive individual instruction—an unusual practice for the period. A rigorous taxmaster, he allowed no vacation period, and his strict routine developed the pupils’ innate capacities while simultaneously leaving the indelible trace of his personal temperament on their studies.

Ingres entered the atelier like a stern father requiring absolute obedience. Patient and dedicated, he taught no “shortcut” methods; each stage in his curriculum had to be thoroughly mastered before he allowed a student to advance to the next. In response to occasional complaints, he would chide his pupils: “Je vous abrège les difficultés de l’avenir, plus tard vous le reconnaîtrez et me remercierez.” No matter how much previous experience a new boy might have had, Ingres started him at the beginning, assigning him to the careful copying of engravings and prints. Once this stage was mastered, the student advanced to the study of the plaster cast, and after practice in rendering light and dark values from the neutral surface, he was permitted to confront the complexities of the live model. Only after a long indoctrination in drawing did Ingres encourage painting.

Unexpectedly, however, he allowed full play of the student’s instincts as to use of technical procedures. While it was traditional to favor hatchings instead of the stump to shade drawings (Ingres personally used both methods but preferred hatchings for life studies), the studies in question clearly indicate the free application of the stump, with only occasional hatchings. Equally surprising, Ingres insisted that his students work all parts of the figure at the same time, model in large planes, and at all times to ignore details in the interest of the whole:

« Il ne faut pas faire un dessin au fini perlé dans une simple étude, cherchez bien les masses d’ombre et de lumière, largement, peu de reflets qui font lanterne, clignez les yeux pour voir les masses... »

His faithful disciple, Raymond Balze, confirmed the master’s approach:

« Nous n’étions pas préoccupés de faire du beau fini qu’il ne réclamait pas, mais bien de chercher la justesse du caractère, du modèle, des masses d’ombre et de lumière largement modelées. »
Chavard’s drawings confirm student accounts that Ingres charted his corrections by gouging the surface with his thumbnail. Only once in these drawings do we find a crayon correction. The master’s ability to score the right contour in this manner profoundly impressed his disciples. Ingres’ corrections further bear out his stated disavowal of polish in these exercises; the coarse thumbnail scratches throb with energy as they adjust a student’s outline. His forceful combination of methodical instruction and spontaneous correction made him the most popular drawing instructor of the time, and when he received his appointment to the École des Beaux-Arts in December 1829 students awaited impatiently his monthly turn in the roster.

He continued to teach, both privately and at the École, until 1834 when he left Paris to assume the Directorship of the French Academy at Rome. Consistent with his temperament, he stopped teaching in Paris after the hostile reception of his work, *The Martyrdom of St. Symphorian*. His self-image had been seriously impaired and he no longer felt himself equal to the responsibility.

Auguste Chavard (1810-1885) was born at Lyon, and enrolled in Ingres’ atelier in 1829, just prior to the master’s appointment at the École. Ingres attracted a large contingent of students and followers from Lyon, including the Flandrins, Cornu, Guichard, Lacurie, Janmot, Chenavard and Orsel. The Flandrins, who entered the studio the same year, attest in their correspondence to an intimate relationship with Chavard. Since this group—Hippolyte Flandrin called it “la phalange lyonnaise”—shares a distinct temperamental outlook, its attraction to Ingres is probably not fortuitous. Intelligent, highly industrious, their work reflects an eccentric religious orientation often bordering on the mystical. Formally, it discloses an eclectic style which seems to emanate as much from abivalence and uncertainty as from inner conviction. Ingres must have had a profound appeal to such a group: his identification of art and religion, beauty and morality, could satisfy their mystical yearnings, while his authoritative confidence and doctrinaire attitude could resolve their hesitancies.
The fact that Chavard’s life studies date from 1831 verifies Ingres’ insistence on a long apprenticeship prior to working from the live model. Starting with his first figure, Chavard’s development proceeds along a logical course from realization to idealization. The earliest drawing, a study of Ingres’ favorite model Scévaux (Fig. 2), lacks organic control; while individual lines strive to enclose shape, they are rendered without consideration for their mutual relationships. As a result, the various parts of the body are improperly adjusted to each other, and certain areas, like the legs and right shoulder, function as detached objects. The modeling is flat and shows no sensitiveness to planar divisions, lying over large portions of the body like pasted fragments and making the light areas appear as painted stripes.

A drawing done the same year of the model Koth fils (Fig. 3), indicates somewhat firmer draftsmanship and a more accurate transcription of the empirical data. Chavard is now very much preoccupied with the interior musculature, laboring carefully over the modulation of different planes. He fastidiously renders minor details like the Adam’s apple. His modeling has notably improved, as is evident in the subtle articulation of the clavicles and the series of abdominal muscles; in other places, however, such as the lower left leg and left arm, the shading still has a tendency to lie over the surface like a covering. The foreshortened portion of the left leg is awkwardly swollen, and is made even more conspicuous by the indelicate V-shaped shadow looping around it. Ingres’ corrections in the upper left and upper and middle right margins demonstrate an attempt to provide more stability for the figure and to vary the contour along the left side of the body. At the left, the master indicated that the deltoid muscle of the right arm had to be elevated, and the contour of the triceps tilted outward to emphasize the body’s center of gravity; at the right, he suggested with a marvellous dexterity his idea of the contour for the left side, a somewhat exaggerated...
movement which nevertheless imparts appropriate energy to this area. The model stands with his head raised in accordance with the master’s observation: “Une tête relevée est toujours plus noble et plus fière.”

Another study from this period of a female nude shown from the rear (Fig. 4) attests to Chavard’s rapid progress in grasping organic relationships, and though the modeling continues to lack subtlety the light and dark pattern seems to relate logically to the light source. Marked deficiencies still exist: the left leg is slightly unstable, swinging too far to the right to adequately support the torso, and the point at which the thigh joins the buttocks is a cramped, depressed area, breaking the flow of the bodily contour. Just to the left of this leg Ingres scratched with his trusty thumbnail several parallel curves which swoop outward from the area of the buttocks and intercept one another as they expand outward. Clearly, this is a correction of the faulty connection of the buttocks and left thigh designed to make Chavard see the leg as a rounded and not pinched shape. Ingres told his pupils: “Jamais les contours extérieurs ne creusent, au contraire, ils bombent et font le panier d’osier.”

What he encouraged was a continuous network of curves freely expanding outward, and conversely, he discouraged a constricted, tight outline which hampered the flow of linear movement. Nevertheless, Ingres
complimented Chavard on his progress and told him he had drawn an excellent figure.  

A head sketched that year in charcoal shows increasing mastery of naturalistic detail (Fig. 5). This is indicated not only in the bent nose and heavy chin, but also in the somewhat strained expression on the face. Aside from the hair, the two darkest areas are the eyes and nostrils, perhaps exemplifying Ingres' insight: "Deux masses sont distinctes dans une tête, les yeux et le dessous du nez." Again, however, the modeling is weak and flattens the surface. The startling highlight on the chin is an egregious erasure, and recalls Ingres' warning about "reflets qui font lanterne." Ingres corrected the link between the visible portion of the trapezoid muscle and the neck muscle with his upturned triangular design scratched in at the right.

This essentially sums up the first year's work after the live model; beginning with real handicaps, Chavard gradually improved his capacity to render the human form. While his modelling still lacked understanding, it too had measurably progressed. Ingres' corrections in this phase emphasized relationships between the parts and the plotting of the right contour. The next stage is interlocked with the first, but most of its drawings are more poised, and bear a distinctly analytic stamp. As Chavard masters the

![Fig. 6. Chavard, Study of a Live Model, 1832.](image1)

There is an unmistakable affinity with the figure of Theseus' father in Flandrin's Prix de Rome of that year (Fig. 7). Paris, coll. part.

![Fig. 7. Hippolyte Flandrin, Theseus Recognizes His Father, 1832.](image2)

construction of lights and darks, his drawings become idealized; he communicates a deeper response to the model’s moods, catching them in their brooding and pensive states.

A study of Koth Père (Fig. 6) 30, which I date 1832 on the basis of internal evidence and its unmistakable affinity with the figure of Theseus’s father in Flandrin’s Prix de Rome of that year (Fig. 7) 31, traces this new development. The hesitant contours are gone and in their place we find soft, fluid lines gliding effortlessly around the forms. Chavard now analyzes relationships in geometric patterns, a direction especially visible in the cycloidal buttocks and protruding stomach, and in pectoral and dorsal muscles. Indeed, most of the figure seems to have a substructure of diverging, cresting arcs: even the pugilistic nose reflects in its curves the rhythms of the bodily contours. Ingres made one slight correction in the curvature of the back; he wanted Chavard to indent it more in the lower section, and this would have brought the entire dorsal region into geometric harmony with the abdomen and buttocks. The master at this point is correcting in terms of his personal ideal, and it is not fortuitous that the rectification modifies the study in the image of Ingres’ allegorical figure Samedi, in the 1813 series of illustrations for La Semaine 32. Chavard’s modeling has dramatically improved; he has learned to accumulate his darks judiciously to define an edge or to separate muscular planes, and he delicately picks out features like sunken cheek bones, heavy thigh muscles, sinews and protruding bones in the arm. The right arm is a masterpiece of subtle shading and graceful outlines. Chavard’s study thus attempts to resolve Ingres’ paradoxical and often contradictory statements on the real and the ideal. While the pupil has unflinchingly rendered the spareness of the figure, the unclassic physiognomy and folds of the flesh, his deliberate harmonizing of the parts with sinuous contours and geometric patterns conveys an aura of antique calm and repose.

FIG. 8.—CHAVARD, Study of the Live Model, ca. 1832.
In accordance with Ingres dictum:
« D’un homme fort... saisissez bien le caractère herculeen. » Paris, coll. part.
A drawing of a robust model from the same period amplifies this approach (Fig. 8)\(^\text{35}\). The neck and shoulders are accentuated in accordance with the master's dictum, "D'un homme fort n'en faites pas une demi ressemblance; saisissez bien le caractère herculéen"\(^\text{34}\). This relates further to his declaration: "Dans tout il y a une caricature qu'il faut saisir. Saisissez la physionomie d'un modèle, s'il est large ou étroit, le faible ou le fort; le peintre doit être physionomiste, chercher la caricature"\(^\text{35}\). Although the point of departure was the empirical world, the artist had the obligation to seize the essential character of the model and to adjust its contours in conformity with a preconceived notion of harmony. Ingres here departed from rigid neo-classic dogma: his "correction" did not aim at eliminating accidental or imperfect features of the model, but on the contrary, at finding a design which could both harmonize these features and reveal their singularity. The "caricature" of the model would in fact become the leitmotiv of the design. Ingres' three thumbnail adjustments on the drawing are slight but crucial in this context: one rounds out the curve of the deltoid muscle of the left arm and harmonizes it with the swelling of the lower arm; another raises the angle of the lower right arm, making it parallel with the right thigh; the last smooths out the curve of the right thigh to make it accord effectively with that of the lower leg. Rather than rectify specific anatomical "defects", Ingres' present corrections seek to bring into a deeper union the figural contours.

Chavard received compliments from the master for a life study drawn at the Ecole when Ingres served his turn in the rota (Fig. 9)\(^\text{36}\). Its subtle interplay of lights and darks, combined with the sensitive organization of form, yields a poetic calm despite notable anatomical errors. The cavity at the joint between upper and lower leg is too highly placed in relationship to the kneecap and thigh, and the entire left leg appears distorted in its twist toward the right. These distortions, however, are assimilated in the general linear rhythms and the deft handling of tonal values. Chavard skillfully links the curve of the cheek with the line of the vertebrae, which in turn is taken up by the inside contour of the left leg. The left arm echoes the sinuous arcs of the hip and thigh, while the right heraldically reverses the position of the left leg, firmly anchoring the figure in place. The delicate manipulation of light

\[\text{FIG. 9.—CHAVARD. Study of the Live Model, ca. 1832. Chavard received compliments from Ingres for this life study. Paris, coll. part.}\]
and shade picks out the interior musculature and accents the flowing rhythms.

A head from 1832 seems less idealized, conveying a startling vigor and boldness (Fig. 10)\(^{37}\). The modeling is freer than in the first head examined, yet more effectively disposed. Chavard is brutally frank in his treatment of the physiognomy: the large nose, intense eyes, pursed lips and unruly hair yield an almost caricatural effect. At the same time, the head is geometrically simplified by a pattern of bow-like trajectories. The arc of the nose is repeated in the cheek, forehead, right eye, curls of the hair, mustache, chin, and in the shadow on the left cheek and shoulder. While the springing rhythms of the head

convey an animal vitality, they are so compactly structured that they remove the model from the everyday world and project him into a realm of Olympian grandeur.

Two studies from approximately the same period relate indirectly to Ingres’ painting, The Martyrdom of Saint Symphorian (Fig. 11)\(^{38}\), a work which preoccupied the master during Chavard’s apprenticeship, and whose severe critical reception at the Salon of 1834 was largely responsible for Ingres’ decision to assume the directorship of the French Academy at Rome. Both drawings are of Scévaux, the model who served as the muscular ictor in the foreground of the Saint-Symphorian\(^ {39} \). During this epoch, Ingres was engrossed in an analysis of the energetic traits he perceived in Michelangelo, and especially

FIG. 10.—CHAVARD. Study of a Head, 1832.
The modeling is freer than in the first head examined (fig. 5).

admired this robust studio model who evoked for him the figures of the Renaissance master: "Voyez le rapport intime de ce modèle (Scévaux) avec les hommes de Michel-Ange. Mais ! c'est juste la même chose, et tous les jours les modèles de Phidias viennent se poser devant vous". In another reference to Scévaux, Ingres affirmed the artist's capacity to find in nature an esthetically satisfying ensemble, without needing to rely on the "selective" process in vogue since the Renaissance:

« Regardez cela (le modèle vivant): c'est comme les anciens et les anciens sont comme cela... Les anciens, eux, n'ont pas corrigé leurs modèles, j'entends par là qu'ils ne les ont pas dénaturés. Si vous traduisez sincèrement ce qui est là, vous procéderez comme eux, et, comme eux, vous arriverez au beau. Si vous suivez une autre marche, si vous prétendez corriger ce que vous voyez, vous n'arriverez qu'au faux, au louche ou au ridicule. »

Thus the singularity of Ingres' outlook lay in his conviction that the artist's personal sensibility enabled him to discover perfection in an individual model. But in Ingres' attempt to contrast the lictor's physicality with Symphorian's spirituality, he over-exaggerated Scévaux's anatomy to the point of astonishing even his most faithful disciples. They had worked closely with him during the evolution of the picture, and, as Ingres' preliminary studies for it reveal, the poses sketched by Chavard correspond to those of the striding lictor. The oil study in Montauban shows the lictor with his right arm bent, his hand against his hip, remarkably akin to Chavard's drawing of Scévaux facing left. That the students experienced surprise—even disappointment—over the Saint Symphorien demonstrates that, although Ingres was guiding them toward his own abstract ideal, he first required that it rest on a sound knowledge of the intricacies of natural form. Before they could make the leap to work of a higher order—the "Ingriste" ideal—they needed to develop a sense of naturalism, and it was apparently in this developing state that they experienced the Saint Symphorien.

Chavard's study of Scévaux facing left was "trouvé bien" by the patron, undoubtedly for the vigorous massing of lights and darks which help establish the sense of bulk. Scévaux was nicknamed the "beau denteâle" for the rippling muscles on his side, and Chavard's modeling emphasized the model's brawny physique. The artist's range has considerably broadened: he passes easily from the delicate treatment of the nipple to the massive accumulation of shadow under the arm. Ingres's insistence on subordinating detail to masses and silhouetting the shadows is here exemplified by the conspicuous patterning. The heaviest modeling is concentrated in the arm and is softly modulated around the edges with translucent greys; the shadows no longer appear as stripes but carefully articulate the surface. The figure rests firmly planted on his powerful legs which buttress the trunk like supporting columns; the sense of weight is emphasized by the curvilinear axis formed by the head, the contour of the shadow
in the torso and the contour of the left leg. Chavard dramatically counterbalances this movement with the energetic diagonal thrust of the arms.

His second study of Scévaux also exhibits extraordinary control of the modeling, which comes through in such details as the elbow and the denticulated muscles on the side that earned the model his sobriquet. The artist’s progress may be further measured by the way he geometricizes his light and dark patterns while managing to avoid the artificiality of his earlier modeling. The dark triangular shadow of the armpit and the adjacent elliptical light area combine to create an arresting visual shape which also defines the robust musculature. Ingres evidently disapproved of the left leg, since his corrections to the left and right of the figure attempt to straighten this leg for better visible support. The thumbnail imprints on the right correct the inside contour, that on the left, the outside. Curiously, here again the original legs of Chavard’s figures resemble those of the lictor in Saint Symphorian, but Ingres would not permit students to advance to his level of abstraction without having attained it by degrees through the various stages of his instruction.

During Chavard’s last two years in the studio, however, the life studies search increasingly for geometric harmonies and abstract rhythms. In his drawing of Koth fils dated 1833, the clavicles are united by a single horizontal line stroked across the figure, the head is formed from a neat oval, and the shadows of the neck, shoulder and upper left arm are treated in a denteform shape (Fig. 12) 46. Even the smooth hair fits the scalp so as not to disturb its geometric purity. The abdominal muscles also assume a denteform configuration partly defined by the zig-zag highlight which runs the length of the torso and incorporates the penis. The strong outline contributes to the idealization of the figure. Two pentimenti around the legs show the artist’s ability to adjust the figural parts to maximize movement while nevertheless guaranteeing stability. The body follows an axis shaped like a bow which gives the impression of a taut spring coiled for action.

The last works in the series presented here are undated, but they convey the classical qualities of trancelike immobility and sensual clarity we associate with the master

---

**FIG. 12.—CHAVARD. Study of the Live Model, 1833.**
The artist is now searching increasingly for geometric harmonies. Paris, coll. part.
(Figs. 13-15). The reclining figure after the model Lalande (Fig. 13) received “compliments du maître” 47, and we need only compare it with Chavard’s first life study, also a reclining figure, to recognize the artist’s total transformation. Not only is he now complete master of the elements of line, tone and foreshortening, but he is capable of penetrating the model’s mood to give the banal pose poetic warmth. The notion of the académie as a stereotypical product is emphatically contradicted by this example. A firm, unbroken outline unites the cavities and convexities of the body, the swelling and contracting shapes, the rising and falling rhythms in a subtle interplay of sculptural mass and linear surface design. Lights and darks are subordinated to abstract formal patterns: the cresting shadow linking the chest and the deltoid recurs in the abdominal cavity, the left arm, the inside contours of the left thigh and leg muscle. Like an antique hero, the figure exudes a combination of grace and power. More specifically, it recalls Ingres’ preliminary studies for the figure of Acron in his picture Romulus, Conqueror of Acron 48.

The standing figure of Melon is rendered with gentle curvilinear rhythms appropriate to the model’s pensive expression 49. As in some previous studies, the body follows a bow-like trajectory, but one that falls in slow tempo. The model’s left hand and upper left arm are reduced to geometric shapes; the deltoid intersects the biceps like Cubist faceting with each of the planes modulated in a different tone. The rhythmic descent of the abdominal muscles conforms to the slow curve of the bodily axis. The modeling in the legs is heavy but it has been polished to a marmoreal smoothness befitting the figure’s contemplative attitude. Ingres’ corrections at the right indicate he wished the upper left arm to tilt outward parallel to the direction of the left thigh, thus harmonizing the upper and lower portions of the body.

The soft shading and sinuous curves of the adolescent model (Fig. 14) project the sensual character of the pubescent stage, while the attenuated sleekness evokes the qualities of ancient statuary. The pose is reminiscent of the figure of Patroclus in Ingres’s Prix de
Rome of 1801, as well as an académie
Ingres himself executed as a student. This time Ingres made corrections on Chavard’s drawing with black crayon, improving the nostril, lengthening the neck and showing how it attaches to the body. The master was intent on harmonizing the neck with the elongated proportions of the figure. Ingres’ diagram of the “T” for the neck illustrates an observation he made on the relationship of the neck to the head: “Jamais le col et la tête ne s’enfilent, ils forment toujours deux lignes qui se contredisent.” The standing female (Fig. 15) was awarded “grands compliments” from Ingres, undoubtedly because its simple masses and languorous rhythms recalled his

own work. The serene pose establishes an atmosphere of tranquility similar to the Bather of Valpinçon. Ingres once told his students: “Dans les images de l’homme par l’art, le calme est la première beauté du corps.”

As Chavard’s drawing perfected itself in the period 1833-1834, Ingres finally permitted him to paint. Amaury-Duval noted the master’s insistence on a long apprenticeship in drawing as a prelude to any attempts at painting. As far as Ingres was concerned, once this stage had been reached painting literally became only a gloss on the surface. Yet surprisingly, just as he encouraged full freedom in the drawing exercises, so he permitted experimen-
mental attempts in pigment. Chavard’s painted académie of 1833 portrays Sévè-
vaux, and the artist’s compressed treatment of the reclining pose emphasizes the
model’s ample bulk (Fig. 16). The sense of vigorous force is communicated as well
through the brush technique: broad, aggressive strokes pick out the left leg, while a
thick mosaic-like pattern of earth colors has been applied in the head and torso. The
planes of the head were subordinated to a “blocky” geometric scheme reminiscent of
a three-dimensional puzzle. Shadow areas again have a visual autonomy but are an
integral part of the design: the one in the region of the left shoulder recurs in the
genital section, under the left arm and between the joint of the right leg. The undu-
ulating contours of the right side provide a counterpoint to the angular left side, result-
ing in a simultaneous effect of repose and coiled energy. Like a reclining version of
Ingres’ Jupiter, Sévèvaux radiates the omnipotence of an antique deity.

Although they tend naturally to overlap, there are three observable stages in Cha-
vard’s development: the first shows his attempt to master line and modeling; the
second, accurate reproduction of the model, and finally, the process of idealization.
For the most part, Ingres’ corrections correspond to this progression, except that
here it is difficult to distinguish a rectification of the naturalistic form from a correc-
tion tending to idealize that form, especially in the case of a contour. In the final pro-
cess, Chavard became increasingly responsive to the moods of the model, disclosing
a capacity to find poetry in the conventional studio poses. But his advance to this stage
depended upon complete mastery of the empirical data. It is often suggested that
Ingres loathed the study of anatomy, but Chavard’s studies provide evidence to the
contrary.

Indeed, Ingres’ remarks are often spiced with his knowledge of anatomy, and once
he jokingly said: “Ils sont tous mes amis, ces muscles : mais je ne sais aucun d’eux
par son nom.” And elsewhere: “Je tiens à ce que l’on connaisse bien le squelette,
parme que les os forment la charpente même du corps...” Whatever distortions he
permitted his students came generally after demonstrable mastery of the real world.

**

Ingres’ regular, intense instruction seems to be unparalleled in the history of the

FIG. 16.—CHAVARD. Study of the Live Model, oil on canvas, 1833.
As Chavard’s drawing perfected itself in the period 1833-1834,
Ingres finally permitted him to paint. The master insisted on a
long apprenticeship in drawing as a prelude to any attempts at
nineteenth-century French atelier. He left his mark on nearly every life study by Chavard, attentive to even the most apparently trivial of details. Because of his austere pedagogical approach he is often accused of having had a pernicious influence on his pupils—his strong temperament and sustained observation overwhelming their personality.

Chavard's work certainly reveals the impress of the master, but his progress attests not only to an assimilation of stylistic peculiarities but to an intuitive understanding as well. Ingres gradually disclosed his personal vision to his pupils, allowing them to be privy to his innermost thought; and this intimate participation in the mental life of the master instilled in them a sense of confidence and conviction which they had not experienced previously nor would ever know again.

Students felt themselves privileged to be associated with Ingres, and he became in turn a surrogate father. His authoritarianism was founded in part on his paternalism, and like a good father he wished to develop the individual aptitudes of his students. Ingres especially attracted ambivalent temperaments, and it was the force of his inner vision which catalyzed their own.

One of Flandrin's most delicate works was painted under the influence of his master at Rome (Fig. 17), a work which for sheer poetry he never surpassed during his independent career. The type of pupil Ingres attracted gained by this contact and developed rapidly: but as soon as this contact was broken the student suffered a distinct loss of direction. Student correspondence reveals that after Ingres left for Rome his disciples found it difficult organizing their creative energies productively. The Flandrins and Balzes profited from continued liaison with Ingres in Rome, but events show that they—and Hippolyte especially—sacrificed much of their own individuality out of deference to the master. In Hippolyte's case, the initial oedipal projection degenerated into a lifelong sense of obligation and guilt.

Chavard himself reflects this loss of direction in his independent work. In the period immediately following his emancipation he discloses the master's impact in such
works as the portrait of Liszt ⁶⁵ and Paolo and Francesca (Fig. 18), but he eventually lapsed into a plethora of stylistic tendencies embracing Monticelli and Millet (Figs. 19-20), although occasionally producing a work of deep conviction (Fig. 21). As for his drawings of this later period, of which I have examined hundreds, he never again achieved the level of certainty expressed in the student work.

In a more general sense, Ingres’ appeal to his students in the late 1820s had to do with his authoritative assurance in a time when established conventions were being challenged by romanticism. He offered a rigorous system when everyone else was experiencing self-doubt; a system, however, not so much founded on a set of dogmatic rules as it was on the character of his own assertive will. This temperament was rooted in the unusual circumstances of his childhood, for as the result of paternal pressures his rigid personality crystallized at an early age. It may be said that Ingres sprang fully grown from the head of his father, a frustrated jack-of-all-trades who never mastered one sufficiently to satisfy his ambition. Joseph was a draftsman, decorator, sculptor, architect, miniaturist and musician and indulged himself in the free development of his gifts ⁶⁶. Restless and endowed with a sensual nature, he strayed often from the family household, and his sexual conduct was such that it eventually forced his wife to leave him ⁶⁷. In this unhappy and irregular household, Ingres was the sole hope of his father to achieve family success. Ingres père deliberately neglected all the other members to concentrate on his son Jean, and he never let Jean forget the constant sacrifices he made in his behalf ⁶⁸. Ingres grew up with the awesome responsibility of having to satisfy his father’s ambition, an ambition Ingres ultimately internalized as an all-consuming force. As opposed to his father’s penchant for multifarious pursuits, Ingres concentrated his energy on a single objective; as opposed to his father’s intemperance and excessive indulgence, he lived a life of utmost sobriety and regularity. If his painting exhibits this concentration and control, it also projects the unchanging character of a man whose personality has been permanently fixed early in life under tremendous pressures ⁶⁹. From this followed his inflexible and dogmatic positions.

Ingres’ stubbornness and intractable behavior find its esthetic parallel in the

---

FIG. 18.—CHAVARD, Paolo and Francesca, oil on canvas, ca. 1835. Painted in the period immediately following his emancipation from Ingres authority; the picture still discloses the master’s impact. Paris, coll. part.
constancy of his pictorial vision. Only an unyielding view of the universe could preserve his ego intact, and understandably he could tolerate little contradiction. This view he preserved on canvas. Art was for his a source of power and control, and he functioned optimally only at work where he drove himself relentlessly. He lived according to an immutable ideal: he refused to recognize the ephemeral, the ugly, the transient and the imperfect. He literally "corrected" the natural world in his mind's eye. The skeleton did not disturb his notion of anatomy, it interfered with his conception of perfection, or immutability. Genius, according to him, was the capacity to "discerner le beau d'avec le laid", and elsewhere he declared: "Le laid : on le pratique parce qu'on ne voit pas assez le beau". Ingres' outlook is perhaps nowhere better expressed than in this statement:

"Comme vous, nous voulons Adam et Eve, mais avant le péché, dans toute leur beauté morale et physique, ne connaissant que le bien, conversant avec les puissances célestes aimées de Dieu, des Anges, heureux et s'animant sans soupçons et sans malice, et sachant tout ce qu'il est bon de savoir, sans orgueil et sans envie et n'ayant pas encore reçu l'infénel conseil qui

FIG. 19.—CHAVARD. Evening in a Park, oil on canvas, 1850s. After he had left Ingres, Chavard, as other students, suffered a loss of direction in his independent work, and soon lapsed into different stylistic tendencies: this painting is under Monticelli's influence. Paris, coll. part.

FIG. 20.—CHAVARD. Interior with Woman Sewing, oil on canvas, 1850s. Influenced by Millet (cf. fig. 19). Paris, coll. part.
devait rendre esclaves, pour avoir voulu l'indépendance absolue, et la liberté de tout prendre 74. »

Paranoidal, anti-social, Ingres created for himself a personal Garden of Eden which he realized in fact through his esthetic sensibility: “Si vous voulez voir cette jambe laide, je sais qu'il y aura matière, mais je vous dirai comme cet autre : prenez mes yeux et vous la trouverez belle” 75. His warning to students to pass by Rubens' work as if they wore blinders is typical: it was necessary to avoid all contact with contradictions of Ingres' projected dream world. He thought of himself as the Good Shepherd, Delacroix as Evil incarnate: “Voilà le loup dans la bergerie”; or again, after the romantic painter passed by in the Louvre: “Ouvez toutes les fenêtres, ça sent le soufre ici.” His outlook enabled him to locate each experience in the framework of his peculiar vision, and this is implied in a statement to his students: “Avez tout entière dans les yeux, dans l'esprit, la figure que vous voulez représenter, et que l'exécution ne soit que l'accomplissement de cette image possédée déjà et préconçue” 76.

Yet his relationship with disciples differed from his relationship with peers: in the presence of the former he became the self-sacrificing parent like his own father. Ordinarily, a teacher with a strong temperament contributes to his students' emancipation, since they must continually affirm their own identity to keep from feeling submerged, and sometimes this erupts into a severe falling out. This was true of Manet's relationship to Couture, Redon's relationship to Gérôme. But this kind of reaction did not occur in the studio of Ingres 77: he drew to him individuals requiring a paternal relationship and who completely identified their aspiration with his own. He enacted the role of an omnipotent deity and addressed himself to his disciples in a theological sense:

« Ayez de la religion pour votre art. Ne croyez pas qu'on produise rien de bon... sans élévation dans l'âme. Pour vous former au beau, ne voyez que le sublime 78. »

And Silvestre wrote about Ingres:

« Pour lui, l'art est un sacerdoce. Infaillible, il ne discute pas. Un grand homme vit en simple mortel; M. Ingres fait le Pape, le Vice-Dieu 79. »
This, however, is precisely what his pupils were looking for: Ingres promised them heaven and earth, and they trusted in his power to deliver.

A touching calque Ingres made of Giotto’s Lamentation a week before he died further exemplifies his attitude: he seems to have identified with the Christ, and imagined his own corpse to be surrounded by the weeping faithful. In his dream projection he inhabited the Giotto-like ambience, an esthetic universe not compounded of empirical substances. For a brief moment in their lives, the students were allowed entrance to this celestial realm, and it is certain that they never regretted the experience. Ingres’ vision was always distinct, never undefined or fuzzy, and he managed to lay it bare to them. Whatever judgment critics and historians make on the students’ independent achievements, this is irrelevant to their own self-interests. They simply would not have had it any other way.

A. B.

RéSUMÉ: Ingress et Egress chez Ingres.

L’une des lacunes les plus fâcheuses qui existe dans l’étude de l’art du xixe siècle, est l’absence de toute connaissance sérieuse sur les pratiques d’ateliers. Comme, à cette époque, un grand nombre d’artistes éminents formèrent des jeunes, une telle information nous permettrait de comprendre le processus concret par lequel leurs œuvres virent le jour. C’est pourquoi nous sommes reconnaissant à M. André Gottraux, le petit-fils d’Auguste Chavard, d’avoir mis à notre disposition les études d’après le modèle vivant que son grand-père exécuta quand il était étudiant dans l’atelier d’Ingres. Le maître faisait la critique des dessins, et les corrigeait en y marquant des traits avec l’ongle de son pouce. Ces corrections, ainsi que les commentaires d’Ingres notés par Chavard sur les dessins, nous renseignent ainsi sur sa façon d’agir, et sur la manière qu’il employait pour développer les aptitudes et la personnalité de chaque étudiant.
NOTES

* I wish to express my deepest gratitude to M. André Gottraux who made available to me his grandfather's collection and showed me such gracious hospitality during our meetings. I also wish to thank Professor Jacques Guilmain, Chairman of the Department of Art, SUNY at Stony Brook, for his beneficial advice and encouragement, and Irene Falkenstein for her help in research.
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