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In 1992, The Metropolitan Museum of Art acquired ten drawings by Matthieu Elias (1658–1741), with all but one signed and dated 1706 or 1707. Particular emphasis was placed on their provenance from the collection of Marquis Charles-Philippe de Chennevières-Pointel. Thanks to Chennevières’s writings and to notes on the mats, the drawings were identified as scenes from the life of Jean de La Barrière (1544–1600), an influential sixteenth-century cleric. Though Chennevières mentioned eleven drawings in the series, and eleven featured in his sale in 1900, the whereabouts of the eleventh drawing is unknown. At the Museum, the ten drawings were arranged in arbitrary order and described as scenes “from the Life of the Reverend Jean de La Barrière.” They were not published in-depth and remained largely unknown until the collection was made accessible online in 2010. Thus, when the Musée du Louvre held an
Two more drawings from the same series have been identified at the Albertina in Vienna (figs. 1, 2) and another drawing at the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg (fig. 3), can now be added to this group, making a total of thirteen. The Hermitage drawing was purchased in 1768 by Empress Catherine the Great of Russia from Count Charles Cobenzl. Cobenzl (minister of Maria Theresa of Austria in the Southern Netherlands) had bought the drawing in February 1765 from the Paris dealer Pierre François Basan. Basan, usually so well-informed about works in his hands, named the artist but neglected to identify the subject of the drawing. Yet mid-eighteenth-century guides to Paris repeatedly mentioned the impressive series of windows painted by “Sempi & Michu” after drawings by “Elie” or “Elye” in the cloister of the Couvent des Feuillants (Feuillants Monastery) on the rue Saint-Honoré, near the Tuileries. Antoine-Joseph Dezallier d’Argenville described the windows in 1757 as painted “with much finesse,” and Jean-Baptiste Descamps made particular mention of them in his 1760 biography of Elias, a Flemish artist who had a successful career in Paris. With the total loss of the glass from the Feuillants Monastery, the thirteen drawings are today the best source of information as to the appearance of the painted-glass windows.

**Jean de La Barrière and the Order of Feuillants**

Jean de La Barrière was commendatory abbot of the Order of Feuillants, near Toulouse; initially part of the Cistercian Order, his house later became independent. Adopting the strict rule of Saint Bernard, the order demanded extreme mortification of the flesh—not least, monks were not permitted to wear shoes or cover their heads, and they ate a severely restricted diet. De La Barrière might have remained a relatively minor figure in French clerical history were it not for his stance of tolerance in a period of violence, the thirty years of religious conflict between Catholics and Protestants (Huguenots) known as the French Wars of Religion. A man of extreme piety, de La Barrière opposed the persecution of Protestants. Indeed, he
seems to have become a monk partly in response to the horrors of the Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre of Huguenots in August 1572, choosing to oppose “heresy” through peaceful means.\(^{11}\)

In 1576, the already heightened religious tension was aggravated when Henry I, duke of Guise (1550–1588), set up the Catholic League, opposing the conciliatory attitude to the Huguenots of the reigning king, the childless Henry III (r. 1574–89), and particularly aimed at preventing the succession of the heir presumptive, the Huguenot Henry of Navarre. Even when the latter gave up his Protestant faith in order to become king of France as Henry IV (r. 1589–1610), famously declaring, “Paris is worth a Mass,” the league continued its opposition to him.

Throughout this period, de La Barrière remained firmly loyal to the reigning monarchs, preaching their policy of religious coexistence. As a prominent monk of unquestioned piety, whose Catholicism could not be doubted, he was a thorn in the flesh of the league. Some of the monks of his order, perhaps disagreeing with his tolerance but also unhappy at the strict mortification of the flesh he demanded (which apparently led to a high mortality rate among the malnourished brothers), took advantage of the situation by declaring themselves unable to serve under a near heretic. De La Barrière’s insubordination before the league and his support of the king were presented as betrayals of the Catholic faith. As the order he had created split in two, de La Barrière was forced to flee the house in Paris, suffering arrest and persecution and later removal from office. Nonetheless, he lived to see the eventual collapse of the Catholic League in the 1590s, dying in 1600, the year that Henry IV passed the Edict of Nantes granting religious toleration. While the religious wars had shaken royal powers, those powers were eventually reasserted. More particularly, de la Barrière supported the new reigning house, the Bourbons, and this was not forgotten.

**PAINTED GLASS IN THE CLOISTER OF THE COUVENT DES FEUILLENTS**

Royal gratitude found physical expression in rich gifts to the order that de La Barrière established. Henry III, last monarch of the house of Valois, had founded the royal monastery known as the Couvent des Feuillants in Paris in 1587.\(^{12}\) The church’s foundation stone was laid by Henry IV. It was consecrated in 1608 and dedicated to Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. Marie de Medici, consort of Henry IV, made generous donations, including the main altarpiece. The facade was built in 1624 by François Mansart, and the cloisters, visible in a drawing of 1707 (fig. 4), were painted with frescoes showing the life of Saint Bernard by Aubin Vouet.\(^{13}\) At this time, an unidentified glass painter also produced about twenty glass panels illustrating the life of Jean de La Barrière for the cloister, but work broke off, leaving almost as many windows empty. Thereafter, there was further, if sporadic, royal support for the monastery. In 1676–77, a large entrance gateway was built, with a bas-relief showing Henry IV presenting the monks with plans of the church. The first life of the Reverend Jean de La Barrière, published by Jean-Baptiste de Sainte-Anne Pradillon in 1699,\(^{14}\) seems to have prompted the completion of the painted-glass scenes from his life in the cloister.

Renaissance architecture generally called for large, light windows, and by the early seventeenth century colored glass had fallen out of fashion in France. There were relatively few commissions for it, and the number of craftsmen declined. Because the rare examples of seventeenth-century glass recalled oil painting, emphasis was placed on the painter-designer and not the craftsman, hence the involvement of Aubin Vouet in the 1620s and, nearly a century later, of the Flemish painter of altarpieces Matthieu Elias.

The main source of biographical information on Elias is Descamps’s biography, which provides key details, such as his birthplace and training in Dunkirk under the landscape painter Philippe de Borbehem, as well as the heartwarming if semi-apocryphal tale of the son of an impoverished widow who entertained himself creating figures and pictures while out minding the family cow at pasture and was noticed by a passing artist, who then took him on as a pupil. Elias is recorded in Paris in 1684. In 1709, he became head of the Académie de Saint-Luc. Nonetheless, most of the work described by Descamps was done in his native region (northern France/Flanders), which is where his paintings are largely found today, in the churches of Dunkirk, Menin, and Ypres.\(^{15}\) Elias worked in what was already an old-fashioned style, his figures somewhat reminiscent of those of his compatriot Philippe de Champaigne, as in the latter’s cycle of scenes from the life of Saint Benedict of Nursia of the 1650s.\(^{16}\) Just why or how Matthieu Elias was chosen to paint the glass for the Feuillants remains unclear, although the most likely reason was his renowned piety, stressed repeatedly by Descamps and illustrated by the predominance of religious commissions in his career. He may well have been recommended by a cleric at one of the institutions he worked for in northern France.
Although Dezallier d’Argenville, Descamps, and others noted the quality of the glass, the first detailed information about it was provided by the glassmaker and historiographer Pierre Le Vieil in *L’art de la peinture sur verre et de la vitrerie*, a book published posthumously in 1774. Le Vieil’s biography of French glass painter Benoît Michu, who became master glass painter in Paris in 1677 and who died in 1730, praises the artist’s skill and describes the layout of the glass in the cloister, with its hagiographical scenes, friezes, and coats of arms.\(^1\) Importantly, Le Vieil interpreted the inscriptions and chronological marks to establish that the glass was made in two campaigns, the first the work of an unknown glass painter between 1624 and 1628, the second between 1701 and 1709, when the glass was painted by Michu and P. A. Sempi, a Flemish glass painter, after Matthieu Elias’s drawings. The original glass does not seem to have been of particular note: Germain Brice’s *Description nouvelle . . . de Paris* of 1687 makes no mention of the glass in the cloisters at all, only of Vouet’s paintings,\(^1\) and eighteenth-century writers mention only Michu, Sempi, and Elias. A guide to Paris of 1785 referred to Vouet’s paintings in passing, asserting that “one looks with greater pleasure on the paintings of the glass windows, which represent the life and miracles of the founder, Dom Jean de La Barrière.”\(^1\)

According to Le Vieil, at the start of the eighteenth century, nineteen scenes had still to be produced, the marks he read indicating that Michu painted eleven of them (as well as the friezes and coats of arms of nine), with Sempi responsible for the rest. He proclaimed the superiority of Michu’s paintings over those of Sempi.\(^2\) Le Vieil does not seem to be infallible and some later sources provide contradictory information, but it must be borne in mind that Le Vieil was the son of Michu’s contemporary and collaborator Guillaume Le Vieil and should probably be seen as more reliable.\(^2\)
In the wake of the French Revolution, the glass was among many works cited by those concerned for the fate of Paris’s cultural monuments. By this time, Aubin Vouet’s paintings had been almost entirely destroyed, but when the antiquarian Aubin Louis Millin saw the monastery in 1790, he reported: “The windows in this cloister are famous and worthy of interest from art lovers” and went on to provide a detailed description. There had been forty glass panels on small squared pieces of glass, each set into a larger piece of plain glass with an inscription below, inscriptions he scrupulously recorded. The remaining monks claimed to have been offered 90,000 livres for the glass.

If damage to the glass meant that Millin could see and record only thirty-six subjects out of forty (reproduced by him in five plates; see one in fig. 5), there was good reason to fear further losses. Secularized in 1790, the monastery was taken over by soldiers. It was in the nave of the church that Jacques Louis David worked on his celebrated painting The Tennis Court Oath of 1791, and it was here that the political moderates who came together in the wake of the Revolution as the Société des Amis de la Constitution gathered, becoming known as the Club des Feuillants. The monastery was partly demolished between 1801 and 1804 to make way for the rue de Rivoli, although witnesses recorded seeing some parts, including the cloister, still standing in 1830. But by this time the glass had been removed and taken to the Musée des Monuments Français, set up in 1795 by Alexandre Lenoir. It featured in the second edition of the museum catalogue, in which he stated that the scenes by Michu were of interest, while the others were “as mediocre in execution as in invention.” The third edition, meanwhile, describes three of the scenes and explains that they were displayed in the seventeenth-century room.

In 1802, Lenoir reported to the Minister of the Interior that the glass had been restored by a master glazier, one “citoyen Tailleur.” The same document reports that the museum had thirty pieces of glass.
from the Feuillants monastery. We learn that the scenes each measured “2 pieds × 20 pouces” (65 × 54 cm). Lenoir praised Michu’s achievements in a history of painting on glass in 1803, but was somewhat disparaging in a more extensive text of 1809: “those by Benoît Michu after Elye (the Belgian) are interesting; yet some are but the exact imitation of a drawing in brown wash and I see in the others nothing but a tasteless copy of a Flemish gouache.” Charles Paul Landon reproduced three scenes in different volumes of his Annales du Musée in 1807. Although he stated that there were only fourteen glass scenes in the museum, we should probably give greater credence to Lenoir’s reference to thirty.

THE GLASS MISLAID
The last description of the Musée des Monuments Français appeared in 1816, and it too mentioned the glass from the Feuillants monastery, but Lenoir’s museum was to close that same year. A recent research project devoted to the Musée led by the Institut National de l’Histoire de l’Art in Paris has shown that some of the glass disappeared when the museum was broken up, while some was sold through the Dutch art market and apparently made its way to Britain. None of the Feuillants glass has been located. Thus, it is the drawings in the Metropolitan Museum, the Albertina, and the Hermitage that allow us to judge the lost glass. We cannot see the color so admired by authors from Le Vieux to Landon, but with the help of Millin’s plates we can identify the subjects and arrange the scenes in correct order.

THE DRAWINGS
If nineteen scenes were missing from the first campaign, we would expect nineteen drawings by Elias. At present, we know of thirteen, all relating to the later part of Jean de La Barrière’s life. Executed in a similar technique, with red chalk, red or reddish-brown wash, heightened with white, they each measure about 53 × 44 centimeters. Since each scene was set into a larger panel of plain glass and the full panels in the Musée des Monuments Français measured 65 × 54 centimeters, we can hypothesize that the drawings were full-size models for the painted section.

Although we cannot compare Elias’s drawings with the finished glass, there is further reason to think that the glass copied the models closely. Comparison between Millin’s prints and nine of the surviving drawings reveals only small differences in most scenes, which can largely be explained by the small scale and summary nature of Millin’s reproductions. This is confirmed in two instances where we have not only Millin’s sketch and Elias’s drawing but also the outline print made for Landon, revealing the latter to be far closer to the drawings than to Millin.

Four drawings, however, are not the same as any of the scenes depicted by Millin. One may perhaps be a (rejected?) variation of a recorded scene, while three have no parallel whatsoever. A drawing in the Albertina (see fig. 2) is similar in spirit but not in detail to Millin’s scene 26, The Blessed Jean de La Barrière pronounces the funeral oration for Henry III before the parliament of Bordeaux. It may well be that the secular figures seated in the church in the drawing are the members of the Bordeaux parliament, but the building shown seems very like the Basilica of Saint-Denis, on the edge of Paris, where the kings of France were traditionally buried. Yet it was only in 1610, a decade after the death of de La Barrière, that the remains of Henry III were buried in Saint-Denis. It is
possible, therefore, that this drawing was a preliminary version that was rejected because it was not historically accurate.

The three drawings of scenes for which nothing similar is found in Millin’s prints, all in the Metropolitan Museum, may relate to lost scenes, but only four lost pieces of glass are mentioned, of which two (between Millin’s 17 and 18, and 19 and 20) depict events early in Jean de La Barrière’s life, the inscription beneath the second precluding identification with any of the drawings. Another missing piece fell between Millin’s scenes 34 and 35, and this might be a logical place for the scene showing monks carrying the bier with Jean de La Barrière’s body from a church into a side chapel or cloister (fig. 6). Millin does not say where the last missing scene should have been. Thus, for the two other drawings, showing the arrest of Jean de La Barrière under the league (fig. 7) and (apparently) an emaciated Jean de La Barrière blessing a cardinal (fig. 8), no place can be identified in Millin’s program.

Two points should be noted. First, the drawing of monks carrying the bier is less finished than the rest and the signature seems to be a rather formal imitation of Elias’s signatures on his other drawings (not only those in this series). Secondly, the dated drawings are signed 1706 or 1707, whereas Le Vieil tells us that the dates on the glass indicate that the panels of the second campaign were executed in 1701–9. Although Chennevières said that his drawings were dated 1704–7, none of the known sheets bears the date 1704 (it may appear on the missing eleventh Chennevières drawing). It is possible that the drawings for other scenes in the series were produced earlier, but we can be sure that Elias did not execute the drawings in chronological order, since some of the scenes in de La Barrière’s later life are dated 1706, while earlier scenes are dated 1707.
drawings by Elias out of a total of seventy-eight, of which perhaps eight may in fact be his work. 37 But any dissimilarity in style and manner can be explained by the very different purposes of the drawings: those in the Louvre were designs for prints for Jean Mariette, which dictated the linear manner, the use of pen and ink with flat applications of gray wash, in contrast to the painterly effect of the red chalk and red wash drawings produced as models for painted glass.

One more drawing has been tentatively but mistakenly attributed to Matthieu Elias. While *King Henry III showing Jean de La Barrière the plan of the Monastery being built for him in Paris* (Appendix no. R1) is the same size as the drawings described here, its use of angular lines in pen and brown ink, tinted with brown and colored washes, has no parallel in technique or style among Elias’s known drawings. 38 It relates to an early period in de La Barrière’s life and we know that Elias designed later subjects. Nor does the iconography coincide with Millin’s print after the glass (Millin scene 20); rather, it represents a combination between that scene and the bas-relief on the monastery gates (reproduced by Millin at the end of the thirty-six glass scenes). Its function and authorship thus remain uncertain.

Whether Elias’s drawings are those created for use by Michu and Sempi or finished presentation sheets made in the wake of the glass’s success, they are undoubtedly the best record we have today of the lost painted glass of the Couvent des Feuillants in Paris.
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APPENDIX

Drawings by Matthieu Elias for the Life of the Reverend Jean de La Barrière

Note to the Reader: The drawings are ordered here according to the chronology of the life of Jean de La Barrière. Their descriptive titles are translated from the original inscriptions beneath the painted-glass scenes, as recorded in a volume of 1790 by antiquarian Aubin Louis Millin. The "scene numbers" reflect the order of the painted-glass scenes in the cloister. The "R" in "R1" stands for "rejected," indicating that the work is not accepted as by Matthieu Elias. The drawings listed below that are in the Metropolitan Museum may be viewed at www.metmuseum.org/art/collection.

For all drawings in The Metropolitan Museum of Art:
By Matthieu Elias (born Flanders, 1658–1741)
Red chalk, heightened with white, pen and black ink, with red and orange washes, each about 21 × 17 1/2 in. (53.3 × 44.5 cm)
Credit line: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Harry G. Sperling Fund, 1992
Publication: Metropolitan Museum 1992, p. 30

1. Scene 25. Fatally wounded, King Henry III informs the Blessed Abbot of his condition and recommends himself to his prayers
Signature in gray ink: Matthaeus Elyas Belgo vulgo Elye inv. et fecit 1707[?]
The Metropolitan Museum of Art (1992.246.10)

2. Scene 28. The Blessed Abbot having retired to the Château de Montaiguu, soldiers of the league arrive to capture him as he leaves. A piece of wood falls from on high and scatters the soldiers and wounds the Holy Abbot, whom they leave for dead; he is miraculously cured and escapes
Signature in gray ink: Matthaeus Elyas Belga vulgo Elye. ln et fecit 1706
The Metropolitan Museum of Art (1992.246.6)

3. Scene 30. The Blessed Jean de la Barrière is in Rome in 1590, where he receives all possible marks of consideration from Pope Clement VIII, the cardinals and the most important people of the city
Red chalk, pen and brown ink, orange and reddish-brown wash, heightened with white, over graphite, 20 7/8 × 17 1/4 in. (53.4 × 43.9 cm)
State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg (OR 3028)
Provenance: Pierre-François Basan, Paris; 1765 acquired from him for 18 florins de change by Count Charles Cobenzl, Brussels; 1768 purchased with the Cobenzl collection by Catherine the Great
Signature in gray ink: Matthaeus Elyas Belga vulgo Elye inven. et fecit 1706
Publication: Dobroklonsky 1955, no. 790

4. Scene 31. Foundation of a second Feuillant monastery in Rome, dedicated to St. Bernard, in 1594, thanks to the generosity of Caterina de’ Nobili, niece of Pope Julius III and widow of Count Sforza Sforza di Santa Fiora
Signature in gray ink: Matheus Elyas. Belga vulgo Elye In et fecit 1707
The Metropolitan Museum of Art (1992.246.2)

5. Scene 32. Supporters of the league pursue the Blessed Abbot to Rome; despite their calumnies his innocence is recognized by the pope himself, who orders Cardinal Bellarmine to restore all his posts and honors
Signature in gray ink: Matheus Elyas. Belga vulgo Elye In et fecit 1707
The Metropolitan Museum of Art (1992.246.8)

6. Scene 33: The Blessed Abbot, near death, receives the blessing of the pope, who sends for this purpose Cardinal d’Ossat, a close friend of the saint, whose teacher he had been; he dies in the odor of sanctity on 25 April 1600
Signature in gray ink: Matthaeus Elyas Belga vulgo Elye Inve. et fecit 1706
The Metropolitan Museum of Art (1992.246.4)

7. Scene 34. To satisfy the devotion of the people, they are forced to leave the Blessed Abbot’s body on display for three days; many miracles are performed
The Metropolitan Museum of Art (1992.246.6)

8. Scene 35: Because of the tales of miracles performed at the Holy Abbot’s tomb, Pope Clement VIII goes to the Monastery of St. Bernard to commence his beatification; the monks, in a sentiment of humility, beg him humbly to suspend the process
Red chalk, brown wash, heightened with white, over graphite, on yellow-tinted paper, 21 × 17 1/4 in. (53.4 × 43.9 cm)
Albertina, Vienna (51561)
Provenance: Gottfried Winckler, Leipzig; Albert, duke of Sachsen-Teschen, Vienna

9. Scene 36: Reception of the heart and head of the Blessed Father Dom Jean de la Barrière, brought from Rome to his Abbey of Feuillants in 1626, where they are carefully preserved along with other relics of the Holy Abbot
Signature in gray ink: Matthaeus Elyas Belga vulgo Elye [?] et fecit 1707
The Metropolitan Museum of Art (1992.246.3)

10. Jean de La Barrière pronouncing the funeral oration for Henry III in the Basilica of Saint-Denis[?]
Red chalk, brown wash, heightened with white, over graphite, on yellow-tinted paper, 21 × 17 1/2 in. (53.3 × 44.5 cm)
Signature in gray ink: Matthaeus Elyas Belga vulgo Elye Inve. et fecit 1707
Albertina, Vienna (51560)
Provenance: Gottfried Winckler, Leipzig; Albert, duke of Sachsen-Teschen, Vienna
Possibly a rejected version of scene 26, in which “The Blessed Jean de La Barrière pronounces the funeral oration for Henry III
before the parliament of Bordeaux." The body of Henry III was moved to Saint-Denis only in 1610.

11. *The arrest of Jean de La Barrière by the League at Lombez*  
Signature in gray ink: . . . Elye . . . in. et fecit  
The Metropolitan Museum of Art (1992.246.1)  
According to biographies of Jean de La Barrière, this event took place shortly before the accident at the Château de Montaigu (scene 28).

12. *Jean de La Barrière blessing a cardinal*  
Signature in gray ink: Matheus Elyas Belgo vulgo Elye inve. et fecit 1706  
The Metropolitan Museum of Art (1992.246.9)  
Possibly, bearing in mind de La Barrière's physical state and the weeping of the onlookers, Cardinal Ossat being received on the eve of the abbot's death, throwing himself at his feet to receive his blessing.

13. *Feuillant monks carry the bier with the body of Jean de la Barrière*  
Signature (probably not original), in gray ink: M. Elye. Inve. et fecit  
The Metropolitan Museum of Art (1992.246.5)  
Perhaps the missing scene mentioned by Millin between scenes 34 and 35.

R1. Unknown French(?) artist  
*King Henry III showing Jean de La Barrière the plan of the monastery being built for him in Paris*  
Pen and brown ink, gray and colored washes, 21 × 17 1/4 in.  
(53.3 × 43.7 cm)  
Musée Carnavalet, Paris (D.6205)  
Provenance: Galerie Paul Prouté, purchased for the Musée Carnavalet, 1944
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10 On de La Barrière and the Feuillants, see Pierre 2006.  
11 Ibid., p. 34.  
12 On the history of the Couvent des Feuillants complex, see Ciprut 1957.  
14 Pradillon 1699.  
15 A small exhibition devoted to his paintings was held in the town of Bergues in 1982; see Guillemin 1982.  
17 Le Vieil 1774, p. 76.  
20 Le Vieil 1774, p. 76.  
21 Ibid., pp. 76–79.  
22 “Les vitraux de ce cloître sont célèbres, et dignes de la curiosité des amateurs des arts.” Millin 1790 [1799], p. 82, quotation on p. 46. On Millin’s project, see Hurley 2013. Millin contradicts Le Vieil, stating that those by “Pempi [sic]” are greatest in number and far superior to the others. Comparison with other sources makes clear that Le Vieil is the more reliable on this point.  
23 Millin 1790 [1799], p. 63.  
24 Millin listed thirty-six and specifically mentioned three damaged pieces (one of them with its inscription intact, the others totally destroyed). No mention is made of the fortieth piece.  
26 The scene of the demolition was captured in a number of drawings and paintings, such as a picture of 1806–7 by Hubert Robert (Musée Carnavalet, Paris, P.364). M. F. de Guilhermy (in Guillermyn and Fichot 1855, p. 251) recalled seeing some remaining parts of the monastery in 1830.  
“No. 12. Dom Jean de la Barrière, fondateur du couvent des Feuillans, rue Saint-Honoré, tenant chapitre; par Sempy, d’après Elye. No. 13 . . . L’exposition d’une Relique aux fidèles; par les mêmes. No. 14 . . . L’emprisonnement de dom Jean de la Barrière; par les mêmes.” Lenoir (Alex.) [1797], pp. 217, 237. It is interesting that despite Alexandre Lenoir’s praise for Michu, the author of the three scenes on display was given as Sempi.

“Restauration des vitraux recueillis au Musée des Monuments français,” February 18, 1802, in Lenoir (Albert) 1883–97, vol. 1, p. 275, doc. CCXLIV.

Lenoir (Alex.) 1803, p. 51, in which he seems largely to have been repriming Le Viel.

“celles de Benoît Michu, d’après Elye (le belge), sont d’un effet piquant; mais les unes ne sont que l’imitation exacte d’un dessin au bistre, et ne je vois dans les autres que la copie sans goût d’une gouache flamande.” Lenoir (Alex.) 1809, p. 24.


Béatrice de Chancel-Bardelot, email message to author, September 6, 2017. The program ran from 2010 to 2015 and culminated in an exhibition in 2016; see Bresc-Bautier and Chancel-Bardelot 2016.

The inscription reads: “Le 3 juillet 1587 le roi Henri III, accompagné du légat et de toute sa cour, reçoit le bienheureux dom Jean de la Barrière et ses religieux en son château de Vincennes, où il leur donne un appartement en attendant que le monastère qu’il leur faisait bâtir à Paris fût en état de les recevoir.”

Although the darker ink of the signatures on the drawings might be seen as indicating that the inscriptions were added later, when the drawings were no longer needed for the making of the painted glass, it must be stressed that other drawings by Elias show similar signatures in ink that contrast with the technique of the drawing. See, e.g., Louvre, 26540.

Brejon de Lavergnée and Cugy 2013.

The note on the back of the drawing includes several errors, suggesting it is Jean de La Barrière presenting the plans to the monarch and identifying the monarch as Charles IX. Musée Carnavalet, Paris, D.6205.
Dulaure, Jacques Antoine
de Guilhermy, M. F., and Charles Fichot
Guillemin, Jean-Claude
Hébert
Hurley, Cecilia
Kuznetsov, Yury
Landon, Charles Paul
Le Viel, Pierre
1774 L’art de la peinture sur verre et de la vitrerie. [Paris]: De l’Imprimerie de L. F. Delatour.
Lenoir, Albert, comp. and ed.
Lenoir, Alexandre
[1795–96] Notice historique des monumans des arts, réunis au dépôt national, rue des Petits Augustins, suivis d’un traité de la peinture sur verre. 2nd ed. Paris: Cussac, an IV”.
[1797] Description historique et chronologique des monumans de sculpture, réunis au Musée des Monumens Français; . . . suivie d’un traité historique de la peinture sur verre. 3rd ed. Paris: Au Musée, an V.
1803 Musée des Monumens Français: Histoire de la peinture sur verre, et description des vitraux anciens et modernes, pour servir à l’histoire de l’art, relativement à la France; ornée de gravures, et notamment de celles de la fable de Cupidon et Psyché, d’après les dessins de Raphael. . . . Paris: Guilleminet, an XII.
Metropolitan Museum
Millin, Aubin-Louis
Phillips, Catherine
Picart, Yves
Pierre, Benoist
Pradillon, Jean-Baptiste de Sainte-Anne
Prat, Louis-Antoine, and Laurence Lhinares
Raunié, Emile
ILLUSTRATION CREDITS

Coloring the Temple of Dendur: figs. 1, 2: Image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art; fig. 3: from Blackman 1911, pl. 120; figs. 4, 6, 8, 14, 16: photograph by Erin Peters, 2013; figs. 5, 7, 11: photograph © 2018 Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; figs. 9, 12, 13: photograph by Erin Peters, 2014; figs. 10, 15: courtesy M. P. Saba and M. Felsen, 2013

Inscriptions on Architecture in Early Safavid Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum: figs. 1–3, 5–16: image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art; fig. 4: image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, photograph by Katherine Dahab

The Significance of Azurite Blue in Two Ming Dynasty Birthday Portraits: figs. 1, 2, 7, 9: image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art; fig. 3: from Li Dongyang et al., Da Ming huidian (1964 ed.), p. 1065; fig. 4: from Wang Yan 1995, p. 160; figs. 6, 7, 10: Photography © Asian Art Museum of San Francisco; fig. 8: from Wang Yan 1995, p. 92; fig. 10: from Little and Eichman 2000, p. 329; fig. 12: Image Archives/DNPartcom

Manet’s Boucher: figs. 1, 7, 9: © RMN–Grand Palais/Art Resource, New York; fig. 2: Museo Nacional de Bellas Artes de Buenos Aires/HIP/Art Resource, New York; figs. 3, 11: image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art; fig. 4: Department of Paintings Conservation, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; fig. 5: Courtesy Bibliothèque Nationale de France; fig. 6: Courtesy Franco Cosimo Panini, photograph by Ghigo Roli; fig. 8: Scala/Ministero per i Beni e le Attività culturali/Art Resource, New York; fig. 10: from Stéphane Guégan, ed., Manet: Ritorno a Venezia (Venice: Fondazione Musei Civici, 2013), p. 33. Image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, photograph by Heather Johnson; fig. 13: from Pennell and Pennell 1908, p. 73. Image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, photograph by Heather Johnson; fig. 14: Courtesy of the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

The Wet Nurse in Daumier’s Third-Class Carriage: figs. 1, 4, 10: image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art; fig. 3: Photograph by NGC; fig. 5: Finnish National Gallery/Kansallisgalleria/Hannu Aaltonen; fig. 6: © Musée de l’Assistance Publique–Hôpitaux de Paris; figs. 7, 8: © www.daumier-register.org; fig. 9: Courtesy General Research Division, New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox and Tilden Foundations; fig. 11: Courtesy University of Toronto Libraries

Inscribed Kassite Cylinder Seals in the Metropolitan Museum: figs. 1–14 (line drawing): Gina Konstantopoulos; figs. 2, 11 (seal); 2, 11 (impression); 15: image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art; figs. 1, 3–10, 12–14 (seal); 1, 3–10, 12–14 (impression): image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, photograph by Paul Lachenauer


An Illuminated Fragment of the Postil on the Lenten Gospels by Albert of Padua: fig. 1: Image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, photograph by Hyla Skopitz; fig. 2: Image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art; fig. 3: Archivio Fotografico Musei Civici d’Arte Antica dell’Istituzione Bologna Musei; fig. 4: Thüringer Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Jena


Scenes from the Life of Jean de La Barrière by Matthieu Elias: figs. 1, 2: © The Albertina Museum, Vienna; fig. 3: © The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg; figs. 4, 5: Courtesy of the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; figs. 6–8: image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Eighteenth-Century Ironwork from Great George Street, London: fig. 1: © Albertina Museum, Vienna; fig. 3: © City of London Corporation

A Hidden Photograph by Julia Margaret Cameron: fig. 1: image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art; fig. 2: Department of Photograph Conservation, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; fig. 4: Department of Scientific Research, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; figs. 5, 6: Department of Paper Conservation, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; fig. 7: © Victoria and Albert Museum, London

John Singer Sargent’s Mrs. Hugh Hammersley: Colorants and Technical Choices to Depict an Evening Gown: figs. 1, 3, 6: image © The Metropolitan Museum of Art, photograph by Juan Trujillo; figs. 2, 4: Department of Paintings Conservation, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; fig. 5: Royal Collection Trust/© Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2018
ARTICLES
Coloring the Temple of Dendur
Erin A. Peters

Inscriptions on Architecture in
Early Safavid Paintings in the
Metropolitan Museum
Barry Wood

The Significance of Azurite Blue in
Two Ming Dynasty Birthday Portraits
Quincy Ngan

Manet’s Boucher
Emily A. Beeny

The Wet Nurse in Daumier’s
Third-Class Carriage
George D. Sussman

RESEARCH NOTES
Inscribed Kassite Cylinder Seals in
the Metropolitan Museum
Gina Konstantopoulos

The Silver Stag Vessel: A Royal Gift
Theo van den Hout

An Illuminated Fragment of the Postil on
the Lenten Gospels by Albert of Padua
Krisztina Ilko

Two Embroideries Used as
Liturgical Cuffs
Alice Isabella Sullivan

Scenes from the Life of Jean de
La Barrière by Matthieu Elias
Catherine Phillips

Eighteenth-Century Ironwork from
Great George Street, London
Max Bryant

A Hidden Photograph by
Julia Margaret Cameron
Nora W. Kennedy, Louisa Smieska,
Silvia A. Centeno, and Marina Ruiz Molina

John Singer Sargent’s Mrs. Hugh
Hammersley: Colorants and Technical
Choices to Depict an Evening Gown
Nobuko Shibayama, Dorothy Mahon,
Silvia A. Centeno, and Federico Carò