FIRST EDITION / RESEARCHED 17 NOVEMBER 2026

Midjourney Creative Studio

Part I

Prompting and Creative Control



A 200-page illustrated tutorial workbook with six teaching units, 24 applied cases, prompt drafts, visual critique, iteration records, and guided practice.

START HERE

How to use this volume

Read one case at a time. Each eight-page case moves through a lesson and brief, prompt lab, visual critique, controlled iteration, assistant-assisted revision, diagnosis, workflow, and portfolio handoff. The four cases in each unit apply the same concept to different fictional briefs.

This is a written workbook with substantial planning and writing space. Prompt variants are proposed exercises, not tested Midjourney outputs. The artwork is original AI-generated teaching illustration made with a separate image-generation tool. It is not a Midjourney screenshot, a parameter benchmark, a verified edit sequence, or an extracted video frame.

You need your own Midjourney access and any required plan or generation resources. Buying the workbook does not include a subscription, credits, account access, or live generation service. No Midjourney jobs were executed for this release.

Prompt templates containing YOUR_REFERENCE_IMAGE_URL or YOUR_STYLE_IMAGE_URL require replacement with your own usable reference URL, or use the described website upload role instead. Do not submit placeholder text as if it were an actual image.

The books are independent learning material and are not affiliated with or endorsed by Midjourney. Check current official documentation when your interface or model differs.

MODEL AND FEATURE MAP

Choose the matching workflow

Current image baseline

The official Version guide listed V8.2 as the default when checked. Prompts that use a model parameter make the intended image model explicit. Your account settings and future defaults may differ.

V8 subject references and edits

Use the current Edit Model route for the V8 reference/edit exercises. Keep --tile image generation separate from Edit Model work. Use the website role instructions when a reference is not already hosted.

Labeled V7 comparison

Only the explicitly labeled legacy lesson uses a V7 Omni Reference template. It is not a V8 recipe. Do not mix --oref or --ow into the V8 examples.

Image versus video

The Animate route uses a starting image and video-specific controls. Image prompt parameters such as --ar, --v, and --sref are not carried into the video prompt examples.

Record before comparing

Save the workflow type, selected model, prompt, active references, settings, source/result identity, and review question. Avoid carrying an undocumented setting into the next experiment.

ORIGINAL ILLUSTRATION / NOT A MIDJOURNEY RESULT

Read the teaching plate



Wide and close framing

Compare the mug scale, the empty space, and the amount of material detail. Then compare the two lower lighting treatments. These panels illustrate visual questions; they are not a controlled parameter A/B experiment.

The plate is reused as a visual vocabulary exercise throughout this volume. It does not depict every case prompt and does not establish that a particular parameter caused a particular look.

UNIT 1 / CASE 1 / AMBER LANTERN / LEARN

Set up a repeatable first session / Amber Lantern

Begin on the Midjourney website with an account and the service access required by your plan. Locate the Imagine bar, settings, creation feed, and the controls for opening an individual result. Before generating, record the selected image model, aspect ratio, active personalization or references, and a small session limit. A saved prompt without its surrounding settings is an incomplete experiment. Use one fictional brief rather than exploring several unrelated ideas at once.

Fictional brief

A quiet product study for a fictional homewares collection. Subject: an unbranded amber glass lantern on a dark stone plinth.

Acceptance criteria

Clear lantern silhouette, visible glass texture, one dominant light direction.

Predict the first visible issue you would inspect.

UNIT 1 / CASE 1 / AMBER LANTERN / PROMPT LAB

Draft and compare the prompts

Proposed image prompt or labeled template

```
an unbranded amber glass lantern on a dark stone plinth, center-left subject with breathing space, soft side light, palette of amber, slate, cream, original editorial art direction --ar 3:2 --v 8.2
```

Variant or revision brief

an unbranded amber glass lantern on a dark stone plinth, a simplified composition with one dominant focal point, soft side light, palette of amber, slate, cream, original editorial art direction --ar 3:2 --v 8.2

One comparison question

Keep the same subject and framing while comparing the first candidate set with one deliberate revision.

These are proposed drafts. Record your actual workflow and inspect the result rather than assuming the text guarantees the requested outcome. A reference placeholder must be replaced before use. A plain-language revision brief can guide a new prompt or edit; it is not itself a universal parameter recipe.

Record the exact prompt and active workflow you actually use.

UNIT 1 / CASE 1 / AMBER LANTERN / VISUAL CRITIQUE

Look before you revise



Teaching illustration generated separately from Midjourney. Not this case's output, not a verified before/after sequence, and not a controlled parameter comparison.

Compare the mug scale, the empty space, and the amount of material detail. Then compare the two lower lighting treatments. These panels illustrate visual questions; they are not a controlled parameter A/B experiment.

Identify one useful visual decision and one issue to inspect in your own result.

UNIT 1 / CASE 1 / AMBER LANTERN / COMPARISON RECORD

Run a controlled iteration

Decision to make

Keep the same subject and framing while comparing the first candidate set with one deliberate revision.

Record A and B as actual observations when you run the exercise. Keep the subject facts and other known settings fixed where possible. If a reference, model, or workflow changes, record that change instead of calling the comparison fully controlled.

Criterion	A / observation	B / observation
Brief compliance		
Subject / structural clarity		
Style / palette coherence		
Delivery suitability		

Illustrative diagnosis, not an observed result

The first result is attractive, so its undocumented settings become the accidental foundation of the project.

A useful comparison ends with a reasoned decision: keep A, keep B, revise one issue, or gather more evidence. Do not score an ungenerated result as if it were observed.

What changed, what stayed stable, and what decision follows?

UNIT 1 / CASE 1 / AMBER LANTERN / PROMPT EDITING

Use an assistant without losing the brief

This portable instruction can be used with a text assistant such as ChatGPT, Gemini, or Claude. Interfaces and capabilities vary; the task here is structured brief editing rather than a claim about a specific product feature.

```
Act as a visual brief editor. Project: Amber Lantern. Subject: an unbranded amber glass lantern on a dark stone plinth. Purpose: a quiet product study for a fictional homewares collection. Preserve these criteria: clear lantern silhouette, visible glass texture, one dominant light direction. Lesson focus: Set up a repeatable first session. Suggest three concise plain-language revisions and explain each change. Do not invent Midjourney parameters, claim a generation was run, or promise exact consistency. Use only controls verified in my current workflow notes.
```

Ask for a reviewable response

Request a table with the original requirement, proposed phrase, reason for change, and uncertainty. Keep the model/tool compatibility notes in your own verified source record.

If the assistant has not seen your actual image, describe the visible problem precisely or provide an image through an interface that supports it. Ask it to distinguish observed features from guesses. You choose the revision; the assistant does not validate an unseen generation.

Which suggested change directly addresses the brief?

UNIT 1 / CASE 1 / AMBER LANTERN / REPAIR

Diagnose one failure mode

Hypothetical failure

The first result is attractive, so its undocumented settings become the accidental foundation of the project.

Repair direction

Reopen the job details, record the settings you can confirm, and mark unknown fields as unknown. Start a documented baseline if the original state cannot be recovered.

Start from the smallest relevant difference. Keep the original candidate and the revised candidate separate. Inspect the affected region and the whole composition after a change; a local improvement can introduce a new mismatch elsewhere.

Useful review questions

What is visibly wrong? Which requirement does it violate? Which input or workflow change is most likely to address it? What must remain unchanged? What result would make you stop revising?

Write a repair plan and the evidence that would confirm it.

UNIT 1 / CASE 1 / AMBER LANTERN / WORKFLOW

Follow the production sequence

1. Write the intended deliverable and audience.

2. Select the image model and record active settings.

3. Submit one simple text prompt.

4. Open individual candidates and inspect the actual content.

5. Save the chosen prompt, result identity, and settings.

6. Choose one next question before spending another job.

Current source to verify

Version and compatibility /
https://docs.midjourney.com/hc/en-us/articles/32199405667853-Version

Record unavailable controls or compatibility differences before changing the brief. A missing feature may indicate the wrong model or workflow, not a weak descriptive prompt.

Record the actual route, source/result identity, and next action.

UNIT 1 / CASE 1 / AMBER LANTERN / HANDOFF

Turn the case into portfolio evidence

Required evidence

A baseline record that identifies model, prompt, aspect ratio, references, and the first visible issue.

Case note / Amber Lantern. Purpose: a quiet product study for a fictional homewares collection. Acceptance: clear lantern silhouette, visible glass texture, one dominant light direction. State whether the work is a fictional exercise, a concept alternative, or an actual commissioned deliverable.

Keep the selected file, the relevant prompts, reference roles, dated workflow notes, and a short explanation of your contribution. Identify dimensions and intended placement. For a pattern, review the final repeat. For motion, review playback and any loop seam.

Only describe results you actually observed. The workbook's teaching plate and hypothetical diagnoses are not evidence that your Midjourney run succeeded. Keep unresolved issues visible in the handoff note.

Summarize the decision, the approved file, and one limitation.