

Chapter 8

Genealogy as History: From Pupil to Artist as the Dynamics of Genius, Status, and Inventiveness in Art Education in Portugal

*Jorge Ramos do Ó, Catarina S. Martins, and
Ana Luísa Paz*

This chapter identifies the cultural debates, institutional solutions, and practices in the context of arts education and training in Portugal after the end of the eighteenth century. The ways in which the school shaped and mobilized itself to supply the arts student with the cognitive tools and instrumental techniques that would enable him to produce artifacts contrasts to regular education, in which the student traditionally plays the role of a translator of stabilized scientific truths. The text identifies and discusses the meanings of various historical mutations involved in a complex social operation that we still recognize: the transformation of pupil into artist.

Focusing on three related dynamics of the romantic imagery—genius, status, and inventiveness—denaturalization of the place of arts within education of the pupil in contemporaneity is attempted. The growing development of the artist's state as a state of exception historically created an incompatibility with art as a teachable subject within school and a rigid frontier between the artist and the artisan, whereas art education as originally addressing the social margins was forgotten.

Introduction

This text seeks to identify the cultural debates, institutional solutions, and practices in the context of arts education and training in Portugal after the end of the eighteenth century. It will provide a critical approach to the ways in which the institution shaped and mobilized

itself in order to supply the arts student with the cognitive tools and instrumental techniques that would enable him to produce artifacts, thereby constituting himself as an artist capacitated to intervene upon the world—as opposed to regular education, in which the student traditionally plays the role of a translator of stabilized scientific truths. Rather than produce a history of arts education in Portugal since 1780 with the establishment of Casa Pia de Lisboa, we aim to both identify and discuss the meanings of various mutations involved in a complex social operation that we still recognize: the transformation of pupil into artist.

We explore the transformation of pupil into artist through three conceptual territories—genius, status, and inventiveness—which, although transversal in nature, provide an analytical field. We will focus on the visual arts and music, rather than on dance or theater, which must be pointed as rarified practices in Portuguese educational system in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

In the first section, the issue of genius will be explored from a double meaning. Genius is taken as a technology of government within the specialized field of arts education, in which the genius is seen as the exemplum. As a category, genius is an object of scientific inquiry and, at the same time, is a moving target. It means that as we get to know more about the properties of genius, “we will be able to control, to help, to change, or to emulate them better” but the category does not remain static (Hacking 2006, p. 2). Genius as a category of “making up people” is an “actor” and a new way for people to see themselves and others in relation to the state of exception¹ that genius represents.

The second section of the text is concerned with status. We will focus on strains and fractures inscribed in the nature of both the mission and the implementation of “specialized” arts education. An initial genealogy—observable in reformatory political discourse and educational institutions—associated arts education with the function of police as conceptualized in late eighteenth century, that is, as a vehicle for social regeneration. But from the nineteenth century onward, the beliefs on the artist’s interiority as a reality visible through his work gave rise to the artist’s status as a different and original one.

The notion of inventiveness will be explored in the third section and it will regard the analysis of discourses establishing a direct relationship between the learning process and internal modifications of the self. We will tackle the metanarrative of the modern art educational programs, which prescribes that the creative artist is the one who takes care of himself but in a disinterested way. In fact, the idea

of inventiveness articulates itself with the ideas of exception and distinction, but the possibility of originality has to be inscribed within a certain grid of possibilities.

The theoretical and methodological approach demands a rich and diversified documental cluster. It requires from the researcher a particular focus on the rules of discursive formation and on the historical organization that Michel Foucault termed “*enunciative function*,” which we associate with the concept of archive. This term did not refer, for Foucault, to the sum of all texts that any civilization has kept upon as a testimony of its past or of its identity. The Foucaultian notion of archive referred, diversely, to the discursive practice in which a document is taken as an event, as a thing, and even as a monument. The historian has to understand the group of rules that, in a certain historical stage, defined exactly what can be said, preserved, reactivated, and institutionalized (Foucault 1991). In a Foucaultian line, we situate ourselves close to all those historians that no longer worry about the expressive value of the historical source, as we work the source in its interiority and within a relational space. For us, it is to produce an analysis from an undifferentiated “mass of evidence,” that requires to isolate them, and group them in large sets. We understand that only the practice of documentary agglutination can lead the researcher to establish complex historical landscapes. It is, in a word, to establish and to describe forms of legitimacy among different series of events.

It is the objective of this text to enable new conversations about the fabrication of the pupil into artist, from a specific country, Portugal, and a set of themes and problems that still govern us in the present. We intend to add research about arts education and training to the agendas of Contemporary History and Sciences of Education. It will direct an analysis of the educational field and pedagogy toward power/knowledge relations historically involved in the different conceptions of scholar, student, or pupil. Problems related to identity and creative processes give form to our investigation.

On Historical Method

The concept of genealogy, also developed by Foucault (2008) after Nietzsche, is essential for interpreting the type of operation we try to accomplish here. As we will observe, the objective is not to go back to the origins, but rather to intersect the emergence of a problem. In its critical vocation, genealogy gives us a history of the present and thus leads the historian to a radical different way of reasoning about

it: what is strange and distant becomes familiar; and, on the contrary, what is a natural today becomes strange after a genealogical analysis. The present starts to be considered within its conditions of possibility and is through this path that we can emphasize the complexity, contingency, and fragility of the analysis of historical events. The genealogical task differs from the traditional historiography undertaken because it avoids both the desire to find the metaphysical essence of an object, the origin or the source that brings it to life, as well as an explanation based on stable shapes or linear and uninterrupted continuities. Instead, genealogy seeks to establish the relations of diverse discursive practices that shape our identity, giving great attention to the local dynamics, the temporal discontinuities, and to the factual accidents. The aim of historical analysis is to show that our objects were historically constructed, piece by piece, compressing very different traditions and that we do not imagine, in the Present, that are associated or even less merged. They are very specific narratives, some of them discontinuous, however with general implications.

The text emerges on the intersection of both sources from the central state—legislation, statistics, reports, reforms, and studies—as on the scientific expertise coming from psychopedagogical studies and pedagogic journals as well as on the artists' own texts relating their work.

Our main interest is to denaturalize what is taken for granted in the placement of arts within contemporary education in Portugal. Through the historical inscription of our current ways of seeing, saying, and addressing arts education as territories of salvation, we start from the platform that art, as a separate and autonomous territory, is an invention of modernity. As such, it is inseparable from the history of the institutions created to naturalize this same idea such as the museums, the academies, or the symphony halls. In parallel with this recent construction of the category of fine art, the growing development of the artist's state as exceptional created an incompatibility with art as a teachable subject within school and a rigid frontier between the artist and the artisan. Even if the academy and the conservatory appeared all around Europe as the best and unique places for the formation of painters, sculptors, musicians, or dancers, this idea of learning what was believed to be innate in each person acquired great legitimacy, reinforced by studies carried out within eugenics (Martins 2011). One could say, even in the present, that for the actors that reflect on art education, the vocational frontier emerges as immanent to the educational system of the arts itself, as

if this was naturally destined only for the few. As we shall demonstrate, all rationality is consolidated on the principle of the superiority of art, the exceptionality of the artist toward social progress and development.

Our analysis inaugurates the application of an analytical frame delineated by the theories and methods of post-structuralism and cultural studies, especially in the latter's field of visual culture. Following the paradigmatic evolutions proposed by the so-called linguistic turn, a renewal of themes and queries in the domains of history, sociology, and art has become indispensable (Grosvenor, Lawn, and Rousmaniere 1999; Heinich 2005; Mietzner 2005; Stanczak 2007). All queries to the documentation are formulated with the intent to establish direct relationships between scientific rationality, practices carried out in public institutions, and the historical actors' production of self-image. We thus hope to contribute to the debate regarding the bases upon which modern practices of subjectivation have been erected. The proposed investigation will allow for the intersection of ethical, political, cultural, and economic domains with that of education, thus illuminating a "micro" domain that situates the individual within himself, and a "macro" domain describing the dynamics of social structures and disclosing a concern for the government of populations as a whole. Our contribution implies the development of concepts that clarify the dynamics of individualization and totalization as a single, inseparable historical process.

Genius and the Government of the Gaze

The debate between the mechanical and the liberal arts, and the establishment within the latter of the fine arts concept, was opened during the eighteenth century all around Europe. However, it was the creation of the first academies in the sixteenth century that gave rise to the separation of painting and sculpture from the other manual arts. This new distribution of the sensible, putting the fine arts close to the arts of the trivium (grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric) and the quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music), implied a shift in the ways of being an artist or an artisan. It is from this separation that the question of genius is problematized.

The genius, considered as a hero, was held up and celebrated within the modern Western history of art. But our argument is to explore the ways genius is mobilized not only as the exemplum to be venerated or copied but also as the barometer of normality. The constitution and maintenance of a gallery of Western geniality would live, until today,

from the effect of exceptionality and rarity regarding the works created. This implied that the artistic practice from the perspective of its production would remain, governed by the technology of the genius, and as such an essentially rarefied practice.

The paradigm that covers the evolution of the teaching of visual arts in Portugal varies according to the institutional context. However, it is, first, the art as a craft and then, assuming more emphasis by the late nineteenth century, the art as fine art. This occurred simultaneously with the autonomy of the art field and the fight against an art with an academic weight. It is within this moment that the artist acquired a state of exception that separated him from other social spheres. This distinction allows us to attend to the inscription of a psychological mark on the ways of considering the artist as a certain kind of subject. That is, the question of the artistic practice as a vocational and authorial practice is related with assumptions about the *a priori* human subject as a person with an inner domain that the psychological sciences stated as a truth and from which all creative power was believed to emerge.

In 1875, the professor of sculpture at the Lisbon Fine Arts Academy, Francisco de Assis Rodrigues, established the distinction between the artist and the artisan in his *Technical and Historical Dictionary of Painting, Sculpture, Architecture and Engraving*. The artist was

the one who professes and exercises some art for which competes most genius and talent than the hands; The one who cultivates the liberal arts, like the painter, the sculptor, the architect, the engraving, etc. Our classic, still the best reputation, confused this term with a craftsman, applying it indiscriminately to the liberal arts as well as to the mechanical and manufacturing. (Rodrigues 1875, p. 61)

The noun “artist” unfolded into adjectives as a way of establishing the opposite of what was not to be an artist. An artifice was not an artist and thereby the production of those craftsmen could never be included in the art world. Genius and talent were considered as synonymous and the hands were related to an excess that did not belong to the sublime and ineffable world of art. The figure of the genius appeared to establish a line of distinction between what was a work of art, which would be appreciated by critics and the art lovers, and what would be an industrial product directed to the masses. Under the rules of fine arts, there seemed to be particular ways to be an artist and artistic. The frontier was drawn, even if the ways in which the genius could be achieved were not objectively defined.

It became necessary, first, to enter into the disciplinary and academic ways of doing art based on the copy of the masters. This is the work done by the first Portuguese student fellows in Rome by the end of the eighteenth century, at the expense of Casa Pia de Lisboa. It is of particular importance because it gives us a picture of the place of the masters in the formation of the artist and its implications at the level of the fabrication and government of the gaze. João Gerardo Rossi, then the director of the Portuguese Academy of Fine Arts in Rome, established in the halls of the palace a “Cabinet of original Paintings” that somehow “authorized” the academy. Giving legitimacy to the task of training the future Portuguese artists, this gallery of geniuses was presented as the model to follow. In addition to the gallery, Rossi lectured to the students three times per week in a library he also established. The library contained not only books on fine arts in general, but also books on history, mythology, allegory, and lives of artists. Available for the students, those books would be a source of “excellent instruction” and a “useful way to escape from idleness” (quoted in Martins n.d, p. 399).

Casa Pia also bought casts of classic statues. More than ornamentation, they were to be the essential basis of study. Both the academic and the vocational regime of the arts are dependent upon the image of exceptional works that have to be copied.

The figure of the genius as the author of exemplar works governs the ways of seeing, saying, and doing within the modern regime of the arts. The art student had to draw from other drawings, lithographs, from plaster casts, antique sculptures, and live models. A good example comes from Vieira Portuense, an artist and drawing professor in the Public Lesson of Drawing of Oporto at the beginning of the nineteenth century. He referred to the collection of “the most complete” and “special” works in geometry, perspective, and architecture, as well as the most singular ornaments and prints, with the statues of the most celebrated Greeks that made up part of the library of the teacher’s lesson and that could “insinuate,” “dispose,” and “guide the beginners until” these achieved “sublimeness” (Júnior 1803, pp. 8, 9). Contradicting the myth according to which the artist is born, and not made, Vieira stated that the process to form the artist corresponded to a period of learning. The shift from pupil to artist was imagined to emerge by delving into a gallery of great samples, visual and theoretical, based on which all inventiveness would be forged.

What is put in question is the distinction between talents as gifts of nature or as products of education. The academic regime of arts

shows us that everyone could make proportionate figures if trained to do so. At the same time there seemed to exist a natural aristocracy that stated that not everyone could enter the sacred temple of art. By the end of the nineteenth century, the vice inspector of the Oporto Academy of Fine Arts calibrated the level of expectations with the natural abilities of each student:

Those who appear, who compete, who announce themselves do not have aspirations to immediately enter this place reserved for the sacerdotal... Upon the displays being subject to the fundamental rules of art, they may feel constrained, anxiety, anguish, deprived of air, but they have to submit themselves to this process in order not to make false moves and to securely enter into the naves of the monument. (Samodães 1893, p. vi)

Freedom was taken as a counterpoint to an epistemology of painting. The latter began to be felt like a negative power. However, the complexity of the power is more all encompassing than this consideration toward coercion and freedom/power. The two distinctions cannot be viewed separately. Both aspects are constituted, reinforced, and provoked permanently in a relationship of “agonism”:

This apprenticeship is indispensable. This subjection is useful; freedom would be dangerous before reaching the age of using it without doing harm. It is laborious copying, imitating, repeating what others have composed or imagined; but without the apprentice there is no school, and without school there are no artists. (Samodães 1893, p. vi)

“The impatience,” continued Samodães, would be moderate in the school because it was there where one would learn the traditions and the “methods taught by the masters.” The young artist would be appreciated “due to the correctness with which he copies, imitates and executes the rules that are imparted to him by those who have the prestige of experience” (Samodães 1893, p. vi). Meanwhile, the idea was clearly formed that school and learning were incompatible with the idea of being an artist.

Even with revolts against a way of teaching the arts within academies, the modern artists went to the museums to learn and to copy the great Western masters, and functioned within the same system of rationality according to an idea of genius. The great difference is visible in the ways geniality was unfolded within the body. It was not anymore a question of training to acquire a certain *ingenium*, but

rather a state that, born through all his life, marked the body and the soul of the artist as a stigma in the Greek sense of it. The “free” status of the modern artist was closer to the myth of the eccentric genius. Genius had no rule, talent was seen as a gift, and the precocity was the myth of the genius.

The history of genius often considers child prodigies. The idea of having a biography and a past that explains and justifies both the errors and the glories of the future was a major argument to the theory of innate genius. Legal, criminal, medical, or pedagogical sciences made use of time, growth, and development in the ordering of certain human kinds, be it the artist genius, the criminal, the mad person, or the abnormal child. The argument of childhood as the place of genius is a discourse still alive today. The biographical path of artists is constantly punctuated with instances of situating in childhood the failure to adapt to a set of specific rules—the genius, according to Kant (1790/2008), did not obey any rule outside his own; he himself made the rules. Simultaneously, behaviors and performances are taken as exceptional when seen in the light of a certain idea of childhood. In Western history we find that the consecrated geniuses typically began as child prodigies, which means they were able to rebut time and conciliate extraordinary undertakings (Howe 1999).

The demarcation between the figure of the “artist” and the “art lover” is another partition of the sensible that organizes, orders, and makes reasonable the idea of a set of gifts or innate skills, which only exceptionally are found among the common people. For their complete separation, in the population as a whole, it was admitted that the sensitivity to art was present in all individuals, at least in potency, but it was necessary to distinguish between those who were gifted with a passionate love of art, and those who could only be endowed with true aesthetic pleasure through education. This argument, which separates and objectively orders aesthetic training and education of sensibility into a hierarchy based on the criterion of one’s professional destiny, is particularly hegemonic with regard to the vocational education of music. The principle of specificity is corroborated in precociousness and selection: the whole of the artist’s future should be closely monitored from an early age and a selection process or entry exam should take place for the various schools of vocational music education, which will allow the measurement and hierarchy to be set for any kind of special artistic aptitude.

In what follows, we will try to explain how the notion of talent began to appear a long way from being recognized as an exception or statistical rarity. It starts from historicizing the presence of the arts as

an essential aspect for the integral education of the pupil. Related to the *Casa Pia de Lisboa*, from the end of the eighteenth century, in a context apparently opposed to the entire modern system of the arts, there emerges a social prophylactic institution for orphaned, destitute, and abnormal children, seen merely as professional training and a way of social integration.

Status: Art Lovers and Professionals

Under status, we will focus on the line that separates the artist from the craftsman through the exception and distinction that arts could promote. From the nineteenth century onward, the beliefs on the artist's interiority and the emergence of the self as a psychological category made reasonable the idea of originality and authenticity (in terms of personality) of the work of art, be it a romance, a painting, or a musical composition. However, if one considers the notion of creativity before the eighteenth century, one perceives that it was considered a blasphemy to empower man with the powers of God. In fact, an initial genealogy associated arts education in Portugal with the function of police as conceptualized in late eighteenth century, that is, as a vehicle for social regeneration. The learning of the arts was connected to craftsmanship, marking a specific destiny for the orphan or state-protected minor.

Historical evidence starts by showing us a map of institutions where liberal policy and arts education come together. In the wake of the policy of suppression of the religious orders, in the mid-1830s, and after the extinction of the Seminary of the Patriarchal Convent of Santa Catarina, in 1835, the liberal government began the reorganization of this education, transporting the Music Lesson, with its teachers and instruments, to the *Casa Pia de Lisboa*. The romantic writer Almeida Garrett was given the task of founding this *Conservatório Geral* in 1836, composed by Drama, Music, and Dance Schools, and later on called "Royal Conservatory." Music, theater, and dance instruction were mainly professional training geared toward what we today call "children at risk." The same situation happened for the visual arts.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the teaching of the visual arts in Portugal remained linked to sporadic experiments until the foundation of the Academy of Fine Arts in Lisbon and Oporto in 1836. In Lisbon, the Fortification and Military Architecture Lesson (1647), the Sculpture Lesson and Laboratory linked to the Mafra works (1750), the *Casa do Risco* (1755), the

Drawing Lesson of the *Colégio dos Nobres* (1761), the Stucco Production design and *Real Fábrica das Sedas* (Royal Factory of Silks) lessons (1763), as well as the Engraving Lesson of the *Imprensa Régia* (Royal Print) (1768), and the Public Drawing and Drawing Lesson in Oporto (1780), completed, alongside the Royal Lesson of Figure Drawing and Civil Architecture (1781), the scenario of training possibilities. Also in the eighteenth century, the difference was marked by the creation of the Drawing Lesson of the *Casa Pia de Lisboa*, in 1781. In line with this aim to endow youths with a profession, King João V had founded the Portuguese Academy of Arts, in Rome, to which, from 1785 onward, the most talented pupils began to be sent. The drawing was considered as the technological sublime of the nineteenth century. It was obvious for those who defended this art that it was not related to the formation of artist but it was, rather, the language of industry and the basis for the citizen of the world (Martins 2011).

The development of art education programs for children and youths who are “at risk,” “problematic,” or who “fail academically” is directly linked to this concept of orphans and destitute children as potential threat to stable social development. The artistic activities were a way of permitting individuals “to effect by their own means or with the help of others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts, conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state,” from happiness to immortality (Foucault 1988, p. 18). The arts, considered as an aesthetico-ethical practice of minority groups, acquired amplitude within the new disciplinary institutions operative at the level of a populational reasoning. A disciplined body, on the one hand, a soul that is rational, on the other, are all part of an effort to “eliminate errors,” “reduce imaginations,” and “dominate the bodily desires” of the citizen of the future (Foucault 1994, p. 155; Ó 2003).

Within music education the argument becomes clearer, since the public authorities believed that the music profession would be an entirely plausible, reasonable, and even desirable destination for orphans or any other children who were under the care of the state. Within the scope of the new police-rehabilitation power carried out under the stewardship of Pina Manique from the end of the eighteenth century, it would be an occupation among other possible ones that the institute provided for, such as watchmakers, tailors, shoemakers, or stonemasons. As such, we have an initial image of the musician, for instance, as somebody who learns to master a manual technique, and whose individuality is lost in the collective context symbolized by the

orchestra of an institution, which began to perform in entertainment, religious, and military events. It has to be emphasized that in the subsequent years the *Casa Pia* acquired a reputation as the “breeding ground for the military bands.”

By the middle of the nineteenth century, the major questions in the documents framing the organizational solutions for the music schools were in diametric opposition to conceiving of musical education as an individualized practice. The accepted assumption was to provide musical education for many and with scarce resources. It was in this background that Almeida Garrett would advocate the adoption of the technique of mutual teaching, a pedagogical method that emerged in England at the end of the eighteenth century, and which would be introduced in Portugal by the military schools for initial education in 1815. It was also adopted in the *Casa Pia*, in an attempt to respond to the need that the army and the institution founded by Pina Manique felt for producing children who could read and write at a low cost. This would appear to indicate that the social demand was increasing and that the teacher-pupil ratio was now unsuitable. The decree of December 29, 1839, talked of a flourishing state of the music school: from year to year, its attendance was growing, to such an extent that one teacher was not enough to teach all the students. The figures available from 1840 to 1842 show that for a total of 152 pupils there were only 7 teachers. This explains the option for mutual teaching, based on continuous activities specially designed for large numbers of pupils at different levels of instruction, who taught one another under the general supervision of a single teacher.

The conservatory would also discover here a safe path to train and recruit teachers who were a scarce commodity. To make the mechanisms more efficient, an award was also organized, a practice that would later become commonplace in the field of art education and also in the whole of the public education system, under the influence of the modern educators. However, for the time being, the acknowledgment of excellence was concerned only with improving the conditions for the immediate survival of the award-winning individual or his/her professional practice. In a decree of March 1839, which contained Special Regulations for the Music School, it was clearly defined that the pupils would be trained in the Study of Art and Science of Music, in order to propagate its practice. It became evident that the institution was essentially destined to facilitate their progress in general, aimed at transforming them into composers, teachers, and artists at the service of the cathedrals, orchestras, and army’s military bands.

The time had not yet arrived in which the awards symbolically rewarded the virtuosity as a gift of nature, expressing the notion of a guaranteed promise and career, and so, the problematic of artistic status was not yet established as the place of exception and distinction. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the population that attended the conservatory still mostly comprised youths from the popular classes, which meant that the accumulation of cultural capital remained far from being guaranteed by this kind of student body. The director of the Music Conservatory, Luís Augusto Palmeirim, was concerned about this issue, as he listed the occupations of the pupils' parents and concluded that they were essentially workers, artists, and public sector subordinates, and that the institution's statistics showed that most of the pupils were orphans (Palmeirim 1883, p. 21). Another characteristic set this population apart from the pupils attending other public education establishments of the epoch. "The Conservatory is attended," the same source informs us, "in the vast majority by female pupils." Capturing the large categories at the edge—the *poor*, the *orphaned*, and *women*—the institution felt meaning was attached to its action. The liberals believed that specialized art education could indeed qualify the underprivileged to "acquire a means for their decent sustenance," living their own "material emancipation" (Palmeirim 1883, p. 21).

Music education as an "ornate and gentile perfecting of noble education, but not as its basis," in the oft-cited expression of Almeida Garrett, had no room in a public education. In political circles there was no talk of art training as a "gift," means of "consolation and relief," a way of socially "pleasing," or a "pastime" (Garrett 1829, pp. 42, 226). This cause was fought for with increasingly less energy throughout the twentieth century, given that this perspective clearly aimed at producing professionals would be superseded by one going in the reverse direction, that is, which began to view the mission of the conservatory as an institution to train lovers of art. This dynamic sheds light on the movement of affirmation of the individual genius articulated with the magical capacity of the artist to impose as legitimate and universal his particular perceptions and appreciations about the world, the art, and the act of creation. Like in the visual arts, in music education, the argument regarding the immanent geniality of the artist and the refusal to accept the idea of training the learner to be a professional would gain more weight—prosthesis or ornamental would perhaps best describe the debate that would follow.

Henceforth, a coexistence of two ways to view education in the conservatory was established. The first one refers to all those aiming

at a professional qualification, and its small presence demonstrates itself through the eloquence of numbers. The other considers amateurs, and although their presence was borne out in the letter of the law only once, its effects were felt in a lasting fashion with the firm desire to demarcate the conservatory from the model in place since 1835. By the middle of the century, it was already clear for some that there were two paths:

These pupils can be split into two categories: one is comprised of individuals who only go to the lessons in order to learn an art free of charge, for their own entertainment; the other is comprised of those who attend so as to obtain, through the qualifications that can be gained, an honest means of living. The former group only acquires a superficial level of knowledge, up to the point at which they deem themselves adept for their intended purpose, which is merely recreational. Having reached this point, they leave the conservatory imperfect and only initiated in the art they have dedicated themselves to. The same thing happens to the other group, albeit for different reasons; either because they belong to the needy classes, and for this reason only by their families making a big sacrifice can they dedicate themselves to the study of an art, the long duration of which is both burdensome for them and propitious of an unhappy time in the capital, given that they cannot remain stagnated without serious detriment; they abandon their studies as soon as, with the little knowledge they have acquired, they can earn a meager living. (Farrobo 1850, p. 9)

We therefore have, on the one hand, what several authors call “bourgeoisie education,” to a large extent destined to conform to what was then the prevailing imaginary about women’s education in society, which put the piano in the hall as the scenario and ideal destination for a performance of *elegance*, *nobility*, and *decorum*. On the other hand, a path of representation of the culture that involved the affirmation of the artist predestined for that function and for whom, naturally, the honing of technique—which, in the historical context of the second quarter of the nineteenth century, was in fact the only synonym of art education—should be less and less of a concern in relation to the new pressure to acquire cultural capital, above all, in order to make the artist *an aesthete, a virtuoso of good taste*.

Inventiveness: Between Grids and Freedom

The modern notion of invention as related to originality, subjectivity, and creation differs from its previous meaning in the sixteenth

and seventeenth centuries as making visible something that already existed in nature. Invention was considered as an ability to imagine other possibilities for a real situation, but having the imagination as a storehouse of previous traces or perceptions. The invention of a whole composition of figures without having models was a usual exercise in the visual arts that respected a number of rules and ways of representation. We will take the visual arts grammars to problematize the paradoxical possibility of nature against the impossibility of nurturing who was believed to be born a genius.

The notion that a cultured nature would preexist education or that experience of aesthetic grace would be perfectly free from the restrictions of culture, and as such not influenced by the long patience of learning supplied by the school, governed the Portuguese *intelligentsia*. A second accumulation that derives from the myth of innate taste and accepts the individualism of *genius*, would be played out in Portugal by neglecting the study technique in favor of a spiritual type of training of the pupil, through the transmission of content that is almost always taken from artistic heritage and destined to guarantee the cultural *nobility* of the apprentice artist (Bourdieu and Darbel 1969, pp. 161–166). One can see the origin of the future debates, based on different denials around the relationship between the school world and the art field.

The debate about the teaching of the arts in Portugal from the nineteenth to the twentieth centuries shows how the discourses became closer to the romantic and profoundly elitist illusions, and essentially unable to conceive a critical and exterior position to what the first promoters of Portuguese art education had imagined this branch of teaching would entail. Soon, the learning of art was considered not fit for school culture. In this section, we will focus on the question of inventiveness as it addresses a still contemporaneous question: Could art be taught? We will take this question through the logic of disinterestedness and divine furor that the modern artist entails.

The modern system of visual arts, establishes itself as execution, grounded on the analysis of past masterpieces and evaluated through the barometer of technique and historical moral contents. The correct way to draw, paint, or sculpt was to observe a set of rules. “The best way to learn is to see examples, rather than listen to rules.” The prescriptive “rules” were formulated on the “models of the Arts themselves” (Júnior 1803, p. 6). The invention of the gaze and the fabrication of the hand contained in themselves the production of the observer. Both regard a gallery of notable examples and models

that organized and ordered knowledge, and the slow self-disciplined confection of an efficient eye and hand.

The outlines should be “grandiose,” that is, “ordering” and never “dry” and “cutouts.” The figures should be presented with “just” and “natural movement,” “natural attitudes,” “untethered,” and “balanced on the canvas.” Solidity was preferable to passing vogues and this reason led to preference being given to “attitudes, which at any time, and in any place, were always the same.” The spherical effect was a universal rule of composition, but with the warning that “the painters, as well as the poets, enraptured with taste and genius, very often employ a degree of license to give more emphasis to their compositions.” Thus, even though “Macedonian Alexander was small in stature, Agesilaus had a defective body,” the deformity was not the object of the representation. The painter, like the executor of micro-codes would know how to “lend him that elegant figure, and physiognomy of greatness, which constitutes the character of majestic men” (Taborda 1815, pp. 11–18).

The disciplined *grid* of the space of the picture was obtained not only through the location of the presentation of the figures, but also through the colors applied. The “purest and most brilliant colors should be used in the noblest parts of the picture” (Taborda 1815, p. 18). This microphysics of the positioning establishes an order in the reading that is much more than the eye physically sees. The construction of the vision and the observer as cultural practices imply the production and intelligibility of the sensorial process that is triggered in the observer, in the play of relations, in the system of thinking, of equivalents and meanings translated into the artistic object. Depending on the subject, for example, the coloring varies. The regimes of perception became inseparable from the emergence of models of subjective vision, which can be seen in color sensation (Crary 2000). The gaze was established:

The blue color, is therefore composed of the purest, and the most tenebrous, tends to produce a sensation of gloom; and green, as a mixture of the lighter color, and darker will be more gracious for the movement of the organs of the eye without in the least tiring them. (Taborda 1815, p. 18)

An analysis of the collection that today comprises the museums of the two Portuguese Faculties of Fine Arts enables one to perceive the path of productivity of the artistic practice based on the copy. It became consensual that the artist’s eye was constructed through

reference to an archive already seen. However, no questions regarding how the gallery of geniuses governed the (im)possibilities of the discourse were raised. This gallery gathers meaning as a model in the process of inscribing tradition as an integral part of a grandiose past and, simultaneously, and somehow contradictory, the (im)possibility of the artist genius to enter the gallery through the unknown. At the end of the nineteenth century, the vice inspector of the Academy of Fine Arts of Oporto stated that in order to definitively enter the “sanctuary” of art, the artists would have to go through “lengthy preparation” discarding “many illusions” and experiencing, at times, “the anguish of disappointment,” and would become discontent with themselves. When, finally, the artists were able to interpret an action read in a book, launch on the canvas “a concept of their thinking,” reproduce a scene of nature, and everything “without exaggeration or folly, maintaining the correctness of the drawing, the harmony of the composition and the color,” then there would be no doubt that they are in the zone of truth in painting, “reaching the creative faculties and definitively entering the sanctuary of art” (Samodães 1893, p. viii). It was a question of defending the place of school and learning but the argument was drawn through the exceptionality of art and the fear of its vulgarization as we have seen.

The articulation of the idea of vocation, as an innate force, and the choice of a professional destination took on a parallelism with a “calling” in the religious sense (Weber 2001). The valuing of individuality and genius imposed another model that translated into the disqualification of the school learning as a form of not corrupting the “artisticity” of the artist. Nathalie Heinich (1993, p. 208) argues that the vocational regime is established in this space between the academic quality and the need to be original as a way of achieving the singularization that the author function presupposes (Foucault 2002). The problem was formulated based on the theories of genius and innate gifts. The sense in copying the entire Greco-Latin culture, a central reference point of the whole academic process of the formation of the artist, began to be questioned at the end of the nineteenth century:

The Lisbon Academy of Fine Arts, in the way it is organized, can present us with disciples who know how to copy the Greek Gladiator and Antino; who memories the beautiful forms of the Apollo Belvedere; who reproduce the provocative voluptuousness of Venus de Milo; who give us an idea of that supreme and exasperated agony of Laocoön and His Sons, because all these classic models, which are Apocryphal to a

greater or lesser extent, maimed to a greater or lesser extent, fallen to a greater or lesser extent, are over there. (Ferreira 1860, p. 28)

This fight against school marks the shift to a vocational model. Unsurprisingly, what we observe from here onward is an imprinting of the psychological character within the figure of the artist that paves the way to view artistic practice as a vocational practice. The psychological sciences draw up an entire grammar of the body and soul and it was the artist becoming wrapped up in the work he was producing that led to the interiority and the personality as conceptual places from which all inventiveness was derived. Concepts as motivation, cognition, emotion, and personality had acquired a psychological meaning during the period between wars (Danziger 1997, p. 111) when the art, as way of expressing feelings and emotions, gains projection. It was not by chance that the colors, for instance, lost their hierarchical position within an ordered schema of symbolical profiles to represent the secret sentiments of the artist.

However, continuity would define the methods of learning the arts in the modern Portuguese Faculties of Fine Arts. The academy's archive, and here archive is understood to mean a set of rules that order the (im)possibilities of discourse and situates it in the field of "truth," did not start from identifying what we call "creativity" or "originality" as prescriptive principles. The copy of the great masters was, and still is, part of the process of the pupil becoming an artist. The fracture settles on the formula of the impossibility of learning something that is believed to be unteachable. The vocational artist and autonomy in the field of art will live, from the twentieth century onward, in the rejection of the academy. Fialho de Almeida, a Portuguese journalist, wrote that "up to a certain phase, the masters serve a purpose: they are of no use however when age has settled one's moral attributes and aptitudes." There are artistic geniuses, he continued, "for whom the influence of the masters was an authentic assassination" (Almeida 1892, p. 241).

Final Comments

This chapter sought to question three related dynamics, the romantic imagery that the twentieth century turned hegemonic—about the artist and the origin of his production. In this imaginary, the classic themes of the gift, of grace, and of precocity constitute the manifestation of skills generally interpreted more as virtues of the person rather than the

product of education or acquired during a long institutionalization due to the need of technical learning. What we observed is that there is a strong historical association between the production of the genius and the task of normalization that an educational relationship implies. The fabrication of the young artist—even when presented on the opposite of the artisan—invariably starts with the copy of masterpieces and follows through systematic repetition. The links between discipline and creativity, as well as between heritage and individual artistic discourses become very evident. The authenticity and originality are inscribed from a psychological work through the soul triggered by concerns of social integration. The artistic self is constructed always in reference to inheritance, to archive. The constant representation about entering the sanctuary of art tends to value the anguish and the illusions of those that aspire to be artists—what justifies the permanent rarefaction of the chosen—but reveals no concern with the kind of mortification correction enforced by mimesis. When seen at the historical stage of its emergence and consolidation, vocation is less an innate strength than the result of a slow conversion, even if referred from the late nineteenth century onward to psychological characteristics of the pupil. The archive remains as the place of a whole worldview.

Our research has also established direct connections between arts education and the need for changing the moral qualities of deviant populational groups, which questions other current scenarios: the one that takes arts education for the elites as its prime target in order to make the artist an *aesthete*, a *virtuoso* of *good taste*. Where one often reads *elegance*, *nobility*, and *decorum*, we started by finding a destination-artist for the unfortunate and marginalized, always within a space for the development of collective practices of labor specifically from the orphanages as if the image of “orchestration” overlapped the one of individualization. And in our perspective, it is important to understand that, under the advent of the liberalism in Portugal, the device mounted to the regeneration of the state-protected minor through an artistic profession has passed to the universe of children and youth of the urban bourgeoisie, especially women. It is there that the space of art education resides. Another key issue to educational modernity is the one that supposes that the production of young artists and art lovers can occur within the same institutions and under the same curriculum. In the history of arts education, and in terms of school authorities, the type of formation that is given to those that will produce to a public is indistinguishable from the one given to the amateur that will produce for himself. The same regime of rules and

cognitive procedures historically governs both the hand of the executant and the gaze of the cultivated viewer.

Among other possibilities, these are the genealogical lines that, in our opinion, allow new discussions around art training of children and the young. Our narrative assumes the historicity—full of ambiguities, paradoxes, and even discontinuities—of particular ideas but which circulate in today's educational arena as timeless postulates. We aimed to focus only on the systems of rationality activated by the vocabularies of art and the artist, but above all on the consequences of their social use, with regard to the devaluing of the art learning and the organization of a significant consensus that leans toward rarefying, or even blocking in the present—systematically and even perhaps violently—the democratization of the processes that lead to creation. With the hypothesis of obstructing the multiplication of the creators, we believe that we can surprise the present in the least accessible regions and thus augment the conditions of possibility that allow us to understand the subjects that today we are and we may want to be.

Note

1. The state of exception of geniality relates not only to the discursive fabrication of the category within eugenics discourse in which the genius is placed at the top of the human race, but also to the social construction of the artist as a genius, as a child prodigy, that differentiate himself from the others through great originality. The biographical formula of genius tends to the heroization of the man (see, e.g., Martins 2011).

References

- Almeida, Fialho de. 1892. *Vida irónica, Jornal d'um vagabundo*. Lisbon: Livraria Clássica Editora.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Alain Darbel. 1969. *L'amour de l'art: Les musées d'art européens et leur public*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Crary, Jonathan. 2000. *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle and Modern Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Danziger, Kurt. 1997. *Naming the Mind. How Psychology Found Its Language*. London: Sage Publications.
- Farrobo, Conde do. 1850. *Relatório do Conservatório Real de Lisboa e Inspeção Real dos Teatros*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional.
- Ferreira, José Maria de Andrade. 1860. *A reforma da Academia das Belas-Artes de Lisboa*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional.

- Foucault, Michel. 1988. *Technologies of the Self. A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- . 1991. Politics and the study of discourse. In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. London: Harvester, pp. 53–72.
- . 1994. *História da sexualidade III. O cuidado de si*. Lisboa: Relógio d'Água.
- . 2002. *O que é um autor?* Lisbon: Vega.
- . 2008. Nietzsche, Freud, Marx. In *Arqueologia das ciências e história dos sistemas de pensamento*, edited by Manoel Barros da Motta. Rio de Janeiro, Forense Universitária, pp. 40–55.
- Garrett, J. B. de Almeida. 1829. *Da educação*. Londres: Casa de Sustenance and Strech. Available (October 15, 2011) at <http://purl.pt/2>
- Grosvenor, Ian, Martin Lawn, and Kate Rousmaniere. 1999. *Silences and Images: The Social History of the Classroom*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Hacking, Ian. 2006. *Kinds of People: Moving Targets*. British Academy Lecture, April 11, 2006. Available (October 15, 2012) at <http://philpapers.org/rec/HACKOP>.
- Heinich, Nathalie. 1993. *Du peintre a l'artiste. Artisans et académiciens à l'age classique*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- . 2005. *L'élite artiste. Excellence et singularité en régime démocratique*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Howe, Michael J. A. 1999. *Genius Explained*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Júnior, Francisco Vieira. 1803. *Discurso feito na abertura da Academia de Desenho, e Pintura na cidade do Porto*. Lisboa: Régia Oficina Tipográfica.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1790/2008. The critique of judgement. Available (October 11, 2011) at www.forgottenbooks.org.
- Martins, Catarina S. 2011. *Narrativas do génio e da salvação: a invenção do olhar e a fabricação da mão na Educação e no Ensino das Arte visuais em Portugal (de finais de XVIII à primeira metade do século XX)*. Lisboa: Instituto de Educação.
- Martins, F. A. Oliveira. n.d. A Academia Portuguesa de Belas Artes em Roma. *Ocidente* 18: 375–400.
- Mietzner, Ulrike. 2005. *Visual History. Images of Education*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Ó, Jorge Ramos do. 2003. *O Governo de si mesmo: modernidade pedagógica e encenações disciplinares do aluno liceal (último quartel do século XIX—meados do século XX)*. Lisbon: Educa.
- Palmeirim, Luís Augusto. 1883. *Memória histórico-estatística acerca do ensino das artes cénicas e com especialidade da música*. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional.
- Rodrigues, Francisco de Assis. 1875. *Dicionário Técnico e Histórico de Pintura, Escultura, Architectura e Gravura*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional.

- Samodães, Conde. 1893. Discurso. In *Catálogo da Exposição dos trabalhos escolares dos alunos da*, edited by Academia Portuense de Belas Artes no ano de 1892. Porto: Tipografia de A. J. da Silva Teixeira: v–xi.
- Stanczak, Gregory. 2007. *Visual Research Methods: Image, Society, and Representation*. London: Sage Publications.
- Taborda, José da Cunha. 1815. *Regras da Arte da Pintura*. Lisbon: Na Imprensa Régia.
- Weber, Max. 2001. *A ética protestante e o espírito do capitalismo*. Lisbon: Editorial Presença.