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The problem of antiquarianism can no longer be dismissed as of only “antiquarian” interest. It has emerged in the past two decades as lying athwart several key axes of the scholarly interpretation of early modern Europe. Antiquarianism has become important for helping us understand the relationships between philology and history, antiquities and art history, and empiricism and the New Science. The social world of learning in which antiquarian life was performed was the Republic of Letters, and this group, too, has become central to genealogies of modern civil society. Most of all, of course, and building on the classic work of the Italian historian of the ancient world and its modern study, Arnaldo Momigliano, “antiquarianism” mediates between different kinds of historical scholarship. Momigliano, in a seemingly straightforward but actually highly complex way, contrasted the rhetorical mode of the writers of ancient history and structural accounts built on research into aspects of daily life in the ancient world.

Following Momigliano, either explicitly or implicitly, those who have studied early modern antiquaries and antiquarianism have explored the relationship between textual, visual and material evidence. Their sensitive probing has made an enormous contribution to our understanding of historical scholarship and its relationship to the revival of antiquity. In turn, the study of the past no longer appears so distinct from the study of nature or of living peoples elsewhere in the world. A paradox inherent in the study of antiquarianism “in context” is, then, that the more places we find it, the less it has a specific meaning, yet if we narrowly define it in terms of practices such as reading inscriptions we risk missing its broader relevance.
Nicolas Fabri de Peiresc (1580-1637) exemplifies the challenge of studying early modern European antiquarianism. He collected an enormous number of different kinds of ancient artifacts and studied them collaboratively. He read ancient texts and annotated them. He compared texts and artifacts to answer questions either elusive or invisible when approached from within only one field or medium. But Peiresc also applied the methodological principles he used for studying the Classical past—Greece and Rome—to studying the Biblical and post-classical Mediterranean. He drew on this same tool-kit when he studied natural history and distant peoples. From this perspective he exemplifies the “greater” antiquarianism—did Momigliano have this in mind when he pronounced Peiresc “that archetype of all antiquaries”?—and helps us see the connections between a narrower study of the ancient world and the large-scale epistemological revolution of the period 1550-1650.

The most obviously extraordinary aspect of Peiresc’s intellectual practice was his range: from astronomy to zoology and from ancient Greece to modern Yemen. Less obvious but perhaps more significant was his marvelous ability to wring information out of a text or object by asking the right question, or framing the right comparison. We might term this facility the “evidentiary imagination.” It is in his medieval studies that we may see this best, because the range of surviving materials enabled him to work on many registers that were closed when he turned to the ancient or extra-European worlds. From this perspective, too, we can discern connections between Peiresc and later seventeenth-century titans of medieval studies such as Mabillon and Leibniz, and through them to the modern historical auxiliary sciences (historische Hilfswissenschaften) and beyond.

Peiresc wrote constantly. The 60,000-odd pages of surviving manuscript material include reading notes, memoranda, shopping lists, excerpta and thousands upon thousands of letters. Because he rejected publication in print, and because antiquarianism for so long was not a subject of scholarship, these papers and
their structure have remained intact, like some forgotten ancient site awaiting its archaeologist. This long preservation in situ—spared the destructive ravages of well-intentioned but under-informed inquirers of an earlier age—makes the Peiresc archive an extraordinary resource for examining antiquarian scholarship as practiced and lived.

What follows is an attempt to reconstruct Peiresc’s study of medieval Provençal history, which in turn led him to a broader engagement with medieval Mediterranean history. Philological reconstruction of Peiresc’s medieval project, and its implications for the historiographies of the middle ages and the Mediterranean, however important, is only the first layer of meaning that is probed. For telling this story puts into stark relief the principles employed by Peiresc when practicing history, which points us towards the role of archives, material evidence and the middle ages in the world of seventeenth-century antiquaries. This second layer has great value for historians of early modern scholarly practice. Finally, analyzed as practice we can see that what Peiresc was doing belonged to a broad approach which continued on into the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, though carried out by scholars who identified themselves in different ways. This, in turn, enables us to discern, in the broadest possible brushstrokes, the outlines of a very different history of history for the period 1500-2000, one organized around research rather than writing. This third layer raises questions of orientation and descent that all practicing historians might want to consider.

I. Antiquarianism as an archival “science”

One of Peiresc’s four great projects, according to his biographer Pierre Gassendi, was a History of Provence (the others were studies of the Calendar of 354 CE, of the Medicean Planets and of ancient vases). Of them all, it is the one which lets us penetrate most deeply into Peiresc’s practice of historical research.
Peiresc’s close friend, collaborator, and biographer, Pierre Gassendi, described the project this way:

To that end, he took so much care—and what did he not do?—in order to pull out a history from the ashes and dust of our Counts and give light to its most noble families using to this end not bare tradition, slight arguments, uncertain authorities, but authentic records, such as wills, marriage contracts, transactions of business, law-deeds, privileges and also statues, tombs, inscriptions, pictures, scutcheons, coins, seals and other things of this sort. Which, that he might discover and get into his hands, he spared no cost, effort or industry; perusing himself, or causing to be persued, all acts and monuments which could be found in the treasuries and records of the princes, bishops, abbots, chapters, monasteries, nunneries, nobles, gentry, and private persons whomsoever. Also in the statutes of churches, their registers of burials, and calendars. Causing to be sketched whatever thing of great antiquity, was shadowed, portrayed, engraved, or expressed in books, clothing, glass windows, and buildings, whether sacred or profane.¹¹

Gassendi’s description reads like a “perfect,” or “total,” history built from material evidence. And yet, when a finished and long-lost manuscript entitled *Abridged History of Provence* was discovered a few years ago, Peiresc’s practice looked very different.¹² For the *Abridged History* reads like a medieval annal or chronicle, beginning at the beginning and marching forward through time, marking its passage by ruler and regime change—in short, lacking precisely the “interpretative” element which has long been identified with “history.”¹³ The finished product seems to bear no resemblance to the avant-garde project sketched out by Gassendi.¹⁴ The promise of a “new kind of history” vanishes amidst the detritus of yet another antiquarian compilation.¹⁵
Had the *History of Provence* never been published, Gassendi’s few readers could have consoled themselves with the word-portrait of an extraordinary-sounding project. But since it does exist in a finished form, we are confronted with a puzzle: why is Gassendi’s rendering of the project so much more exciting than Peiresc’s?\(^{16}\) It cannot be out of ignorance, as he knew the Peiresc archive as well as anyone could, having spent the two years after Peiresc’s death sitting in Aix and reading through it before writing the *Life*. Indeed, it is in these papers that we find the solution to our puzzle.

What we discover is that every aspect of Peiresc’s study of Provence mentioned by Gassendi is, in fact, found in Peiresc's archive. Across thousands of pages, filling hundreds of dossiers, are the records of Peiresc's close encounter with documents, coins, inscriptions, seals, genealogies and heraldry, whether on paper, stone or glass, and whether preserved in royal, local, noble or monastic archives.

Of course, memoranda, reading notes, excerpts of public instruments, essay-fragments, drafts, and treatise-like letters are not what we generally mean by “history.”\(^{17}\) Nor, it seems did Peiresc.\(^{18}\) Herein lies the challenge posed by his work: an intense historical sensibility, a powerful ability to extract information about the past from surviving materials, and a willingness to entertain potentially fruitful conjectures that is not brought together in an extended narrative. For we see that when he does craft such a narrative, as in the *History of Provence*, it keeps all this intelligence invisible, as if respecting very strict generic conventions.\(^{19}\) What does this tell us?

It is possible to see this practice as a demonstration of a fundamental split between the antiquary who collects and the historian who writes, with all its implied hierarchy.\(^{20}\) Yet, stepping back and viewing Peiresc’s work on medieval Provence from a distance, the two parts look complementary. Turning from the the annalistic *History* to those rich and diverse research materials we might want
to consider them not in Bacon’s categories of “history unfinished” and “history defaced”\textsuperscript{21} but as an example of how to “do” history; of historical scholarship, if not exactly “History.”\textsuperscript{22} If we follow the implications of this, it means evaluating Peiresc the historian not in terms of “histories” written, but of research projects; not, in sum, as an author of books, but of an archive.

Archives, as we have come to understand them since the nineteenth century, are the residue of intention, the often accidental survival, in often accidental shape, of past life preserved in words.\textsuperscript{23} We tend not to view a scholar’s working papers as the goal of his work, but rather as preparatory material for it. But papyrologists, for example, take a different view. They use “archive” in a self-conscious and distinctive way to include private materials, compiled by ordinary people, as well as public documents. It refers explicitly to documentary, rather than literary materials—for these latter the term “library” is reserved-- which can include letters, notes, lists and memoranda.\textsuperscript{24} Peiresc’s “paperware,” similarly, made through excerpting, copying, borrowing and compiling, expresses his intentionality. And though there have been some losses over the years, it is more or less complete as it was at his death in 1637.\textsuperscript{25}

By focusing on Peiresc I want to insist not so much on his uniqueness as a scholar, as on the uniqueness of this archive, and the kinds of questions it enables us to explore. Early modern Europe was awash with antiquaries, and European libraries are today awash with their surviving papers, such as the Dupuy, Cotton and Scaliger manuscripts in Paris, London and Leiden. But the Peiresc papers are both vast and rich. Nor do I refer only to their range from astronomy to zoology. Rather, I am thinking about the revelatory quality of what has survived—Peiresc documenting his thinking—and how the quantity of this has an additive effect, enabling us to “think with” Peiresc as we follow his intellectual trajectory. Through these papers we may, in fact, be able to get closer to Peiresc at work than to any other scholar of his time. Because of his
exemplarity what we learn of Peiresc may help us approach those others, as well.

How did this system work? We can come close to understanding this in Peiresc's own terms by looking at the way Gassendi described Peiresc's archival mechanics in the conclusion of his wonderful biography of 1641. He explains how Peiresc took his notes, organized them and filed them; how he read and annotated; how he wrote and managed his correspondence; and how he collected books and objects and catalogued them. This account corresponds with much of what we have come to know about early modern learned practice, through compilations such as Morhof's *Polyhistor* (1688). And the nature of this practice helped shape the content of Peiresc's scholarship.

But there are aspects of Peiresc's practice that are illuminated most rakingly when viewed not from the perspective of *his* time, but of *ours*. This licensing of an ahistorical approach is, I think, justified in two ways. In the case of antiquaries, it follows Momigliano's own genealogical vision of antiquarianism becoming sociology, which led him even to describe sociologists as “armed antiquaries” (*antiquari armati*). By “sociology” Momigliano was generalizing from the German disciplinary experience of the first half of the twentieth century to broader interdisciplinary approaches to historical understanding. And by the end of the second half of that century, from that broader perspective, many of the antiquaries' questions seemed again especially relevant. Second, there *is* a genetic account that can be reconstructed which connects modern and modernist visions of scholarly practice back to early modern practitioners like Peiresc, though it cannot obviously be given here. Not the least value of this inversion of the typical field of vision is that it can help us see persistent patterns of value and shapes of scholarship that we have missed.

Thinking about Peiresc's archive as “authored,” and the practice that this represents is, in fact, one of those approaches that can be thus clarified by a
backward glance from more recent vantage points. We can begin looking by way of Goethe’s “Materials for a History of Colour Theory” (Part 3 of the Farbenlehre, 1810) and Walter Benjamin’s Arcades Project (Passagenwerk, 1940).\textsuperscript{31} Goethe, in this section of his massive theoretical reconstruction, surveys theories of color from antiquity to his own age. But he stresses the provisional—“materials for”—likening it to the raw materials brought to a building site, but which then had to be adjusted for use. Goethe explained that having incorporated so many extended excerpts “this volume should become like a kind of archive in which would be deposited all that the most remarkable men who had worked on theories of color had said.”\textsuperscript{32} The practical utility of book-as-archive, he wrote, was that it made sources available to those who lived far away from decent libraries.

But there was another reason, too. Goethe observed that it was difficult to do history of scholarship without either including too much detail, and therefore defeating the reader, or including too little, and therefore distorting the source. Moreover, the originality and historicity of an author was always more likely to be conveyed in his own words than in those of a mediator. And Goethe’s example of such a distorting filter is none other than Gassendi’s biography of Epicurus!\textsuperscript{33} Even so, in order not to make the project dauntingly huge, Goethe acknowledged omitting some of his reading notes.\textsuperscript{34}

So, even Goethe’s book-as-archive transcribed less of his researches than Peiresc’s archive-as-book. Benjamin’s Arcades Project (Passagenwerk) is closer to Peiresc than to Goethe. For Benjamin also created an archive out of excerpta, short essays, notes, and collectanea. The absence of a narrative synthesis has, similarly, led scholars to seek a “lost,” or point to a “missing,” narrative masterwork. But Benjamin’s own theoretical reflections suggest that it was his intention from the start to present the “Archive,” with all of its inherent ambiguities, as the historical creation. Indeed, Benjamin, we now know, archived his own life and his own work in just this way; the Passagenwerk, in fact, rather than a one-off exception reflects his basic orientation towards pastness.\textsuperscript{35}
Similarly, Peiresc's general disinclination to narrative closure may not be a sign of "failure" but instead signal an awareness on some level of the gap between existing modes of historical writing and their ability to convey the authentic reality of historical evidence. More than half a century ago, Lewis Namier was roundly criticized by Herbert Butterfield and A.J.P. Taylor because he "persistently refuses to provide sustained narrative." Looking back to the political practice of mid eighteenth-century Britain, Namier saw a landscape as unfamiliar and in need of reconstruction as the Renaissance antiquaries' vision of Rome. And like them he set out "to steep" himself in the details, warning that the reader "must not mind the time spent over details—we distinguish trees by considering their general shape and their characteristic details, for instance, the leaf or the bark; while seemingly more prominent features, such as the circumference, the number of branches, etc. can be safely disregarded, as so many things which lend themselves best to historical narrative." This explicit distinction between what he was doing and "narrative" history is interpreted for us by Momigliano, who identified Namier with precisely the German-style sociology that he saw as the modern descendent of early modern antiquarianism.

Benjamin, it is clear, looked to the material remains of the past for inspiration when he wanted to explode the "once upon a time"—and implied "happily ever after"—that underpinned the nineteenth-century historicist project against which he rebelled. Benjamin's emphasis on the constructedness of all historical accounts ironically repolarizes Theodor Mommsen's mockery of the "antiquarische Bauplatz." In the 1970s, Michel de Certeau reclaimed this same vision of historical research as an "immense work site," identifying the "historiographical operation" with the practice of turning the world as given into evidence. "This new cultural distribution is the first task. In reality it consists in producing such documents by dint of copying, transcribing, or photographing these objects, simultaneously changing their locus and their status...It forms the 'collection' of documents." Indeed, de Certeau continued, "'Collecting' for a long
time actually means manufacturing objects: copying or printing, binding, classifying.” The act of collecting, understood in this way, constituted a “gigantic machine,” in Pierre Chaunu’s words.  

Peiresc the author of his archive, then, is none other than Peiresc the collector—the “gigantic machine” now mostly in the municipal library of Carpentras, France. And de Certeau actually pinpointed the period “from Peiresc to Leibniz” as the threshold separating “curiosity” or research—the endless process of scholars tranforming particularity into sources—from the production of self-contained narrativizing texts. But this new kind of writing nevertheless could not comprehensively obscure its genealogy. “Biographical detail, an aberrant toponymy, a local drop in salary, and so forth: all these forms of exception, symbolized in history by the importance of the proper name, renew the tension between systems of explanation and the always unexplained ‘that’.”

Peiresc clearly preferred the open-endedness of research to “finished” narrative. And his “collection”—his archive—is, in fact, full of names, just as de Certeau envisioned. Peiresc even acknowledged this practice and tried to explain why names mattered so much to him. He was a keen practitioner of what contemporaries called “genealogy,” the history of family descent and relationships,—it was, according to Gassendi, the backbone of his History of Provence. Peiresc also applied this collective approach to the study of biologically-unrelated individuals, which wasn’t what contemporaries understood by “genealogy” and which we now term “prosopography.”

But the ubiquity of names and naming in Peiresc’s historiographical operation—capturing the fact that the Greek prosopos means “face”?—suggests that we cannot identify him exclusively with either of these social contextualizations of the individual. If genealogy embodies many of the distinctive attributes of antiquarian scholarship, namely, that it is intensely source-based and comparative, ranging across varied forms of textual and material evidence in order to reconstruct a
pre-existing reality, it also reveals many of its paradoxes. For closer inspection of Peiresc’s handling of this information shows that the study of individuals in their social context is no static “auxiliary science,” but something which points towards a practice more like Namier’s “social history.”

When, for example, Peiresc looked into the episcopal records of Marseille he saw a history of how people lived.

I saw in this register of Marseille proof of the wealth of many families acquired by the trade in pelts; that’s to say, tanning and furring, in the twelfth, thirteenth centuries and beyond. So that among the aldermen or syndics of Marseille there was always one who was a merchant in tanning. They themselves prepared the skins and sold them far away. Drugs were also in the same centuries a source of great wealth. Drugs and aromatics were sold and made by the same people, and we find in lawyers’ notebooks in big cases whose consultations were entitled “for the noble aromatorier”. All these opulent merchants established rich foundations of which mention is made in this register of the [cathedral] Chapter of Marseille.

This same talent for seeing social reality in lists of names is on view in Peiresc’s treatment of his own family’s history. Gassendi, right at the very beginning of his Life, notes that a Fabri came from Pisa, went to the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and returned to Provence in the retinue of St Louis, in 1254, whose patronage he later secured. This “Hugo” married a local woman and was made governor of Hyeres by Charles I. A son was made magistrate of Marseille by Charles II. Another, who had travelled to the Holy Land, built a hostel for fellow pilgrims. On the annotated family chart drawn up by Peiresc himself we can trace five generations of a family’s involvement with St Louis, Outremer, the Crusades, the Angevin Empire and Marseille. (fig.1)
Peiresc’s practice of genealogical research seems to confirm the recent judgment that

Genealogy, consequently requires patience and a knowledge of details and it depends on a vast accumulation of source material. Its ‘cyclopean monuments’ are constructed from ‘discreet and apparently insignificant truths and according to a rigorous method’; they cannot be the product of ‘large and well-meaning errors.’ In short, genealogy demands relentless erudition.

The judgment is Michel Foucault’s and it is wielded, like de Certeau’s, though by way of an analysis of Nietzsche’s concept of “genealogy,” to ground a new theory of historical practice.51 As if adrift in the Peiresc archive, Foucault insisted that the “true historical sense”—and like Nietzsche he is attacking “high” narrative history—only “confirms our existence among countless lost events, without a landmark or a point of reference.”52

The complexity of just such a social, human-scaled vision of the past is reflected in the unique graphical form Peiresc developed for presenting family relations. While contemporaries digested genealogical information visually, always seeking simplification, his charts stressed complexity: not the top-down arborial model that clarified descent, but a side-to-side development that mimicked the messiness of social reality.53 Compared to Peiresc’s organic-looking charts, full with the twists of fate, the work of his colleagues appears utterly lifeless.54 (figs. 2a, 2b). What Foucault described by way of metaphor—genealogy studying events “not in order to trace the gradual curve of their evolution, but to isolate the different scenes where they engaged in different roles”55—Peiresc drew on paper. What Proust saw unfolding in experience—“Thus the empty spaces of my memory were covered by degrees with names which in arranging, composing themselves in relation to one another, in linking themselves to one another by increasingly numerous connexions, resembled those finished works of art in which there is not one touch that is isolated”—Peiresc practiced as a program.56
Moreover, Peiresc packed biographical information into his charts, turning what for others was an end-point, or set of answers, into a research tool that opened up new questions.57

But other forms which captured individual identity while still relating it to a larger family, such as seals, were also intensively studied by Peiresc. We possess an entire volume containing paintings of the seals of Provençal families (Carpentras MS 1784). These were produced to a high aesthetic standard but also with a remarkable aspiration to verisimilitude. Many of these illustrations depict broken and mangled seals.(fig.3) Clearly, the charge to the artist was to show things as they are, with the idea that even the slightest bit of material should be salvaged and preserved because it could be—or become one day—evidence. Peiresc’s commitment to evidence trumped obvious preferences for pretty things, but the quality of artistic representation of these seals reminds us of the somewhat later project of Cassiano dal Pozzo to create a “paper museum.”58

This problem of nomenclature—how exactly do we call what Peiresc was doing?—has, as Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg have recently pointed out, only become more complicated with our richer our understanding of the erudite landscape of early modern Europe, making Momigliano’ distinction between the ancient “historian” and the “antiquary” but a special case of a general conundrum.59 Nevertheless, even posing the question “what kind of history is a history of names?” may help correct two general misapprehensions about the antiquaries’ historical practice, and one about our own.60 First, that antiquarianism, unlike narrative history, was not about people.61 Second, that what antiquaries produced was synchronic and structural in form, as opposed to narrative history with its relentless diachronicity.62 Finally, working through Peiresc’s genealogical research is to be shown that what we now call “social history” does not have to be a history of collectives, and that at bottom there is always a human voice, a human face; in short, a name.63
II. Researching the History of Provence

Turning now to Peiresc’s history of medieval Provence, it is not surprising that he would see it as a family history—or a history of families. That he also framed it as a Mediterranean history can show us how he envisioned the different strata of his archive coming together to tell a story.

In Carpentras, 10 volumes survive which are devoted specifically to different families (as many, in fact, as are devoted to his correspondence). They contain a variety of information, ranging from excerpts of birth, baptismal, marriage and death documents, many of which bear notarial attestations of accuracy, to criminal proceedings, and royal declarations. Family charts in one or another state of completion are typical. So are depictions and descriptions of seals and iconography of funerary monuments. Peiresc sought out the same kinds of information for the ruled as for the rulers. Nevertheless, that there was so much more material available for documenting the Counts of Barcelona-Provence or the Angevin kings meant that Peiresc could range widely and deeply in his pursuit of their pasts.

Establishing an accurate history of Provence meant, so it might seem to a reader of Peiresc’s History, clarifying basic facts of rulers, reigns and events. This was complicated terrain. Peiresc’s tangled genealogical charts were the equal of this history (figs. 4a,b,c). But reading through the archival material assembled by Peiresc shows him alert to, and inquiring deeply into, the Mediterranean dimensions of this medieval history. For the advent of the Berenguer Lords of Barcelona in 1112 created a new reality in the Western Mediterranean, while the ambitions of their Angevin successors after 1263 turned to the East, and an empire that connected Aix with Naples, Palermo, Albania, Cyprus, Jerusalem and—almost—Constantinople. The Peiresc archive, with its assiduous excerpting
of legal documents enables us to track Angevin aspirations as well as subsequent French pretentions.\(^6^6\)

Jacques Rancière has brilliantly shown how Braudel’s presentation of the death of Philip II stages the conflict between the historical reality as it would have been experienced and its subsequent analysis by scholars who deploy categories and sources unavailable to the historical actors. For him, the extreme tension in this act brought to a close the “age of history” which began with Michelet and in which historians could “rewrite the scene of the king’s death in the equilibrium of narrative and science.” No longer could “narrative and science” be reconciled, nor “narrative and truth,” and certainly not “the great popular epic that is like a dream in its telling, [and] the disenchanted rigors of number or even the discouraging minutiae of real, everyday and domestic, life.”\(^6^7\) Translated into Momigliano’s terms, we might hear an opposition between diachronic and synchronic, narrative and structure, or, of course, ancient history and the antiquarian. Rancière, despite recognizing that Braudel’s was the contrast between historical narrative and social science, seems not to have been aware of the dovetailing of his and Momigliano’s histories of scholarship.\(^6^8\) But if Rancière was perceptive in picking out from Braudel’s 1237 pages a single telling sentence, it was the statement that Philip II himself would not have recognized the Mediterranean that Braudel was building on and around him.

I do not believe that the word Mediterranean itself ever floated in his consciousness with the meaning we now give it, nor that it conjured up for him the images of light and blue water it has for us; nor even that it signified a precise area of major problems or the setting for a clearly conceived policy.\(^6^9\)

Living by the sea and in close working relations with the merchants of Marseille, Peiresc himself came to view the sea as a subject of scholarship. We can know what it meant to him, we can use it to reconstruct his world, and we can do this without imposing our categories upon him. For as a student of its natural history
he wrote about its currents, winds, circumambient mountain ranges, and
volcanology. He was instrumental in establishing the correct distance and
orientation of the Mediterranean. As a student of its culture, he paid attention to
its weights and measures, foodways, mythology and trade routes. And as a
Mediterranean man whose material fortune was invested in the intellectual cargo
carried upon its waves by merchants and their captains, he was as well-informed
as anyone of the daily life of the sea. Peiresc's historical study of the medieval
Mediterranean was where his approach to studying the history of families met his
understanding that the sea both shaped and was shaped by the acts of men. The
survival of his archive enables us to follow Peiresc's exploration of the medieval
Mediterranean by looking over his shoulder as he set out to study the twelfth-
century rulers of Barcelona and the code of maritime law that was first
promulgated there. Philip II's silence enabled others to push him to the side, and
to put words in his mouth. Peiresc's words keep him at the center, and enable us
to work with him.

In 1630, while trapped in Belgentier by a combination of Plague and civil unrest
(the "Revolt of the Cascaveau") Peiresc had his bookbinder, Simon Corberan,
who remained in Aix, send him some of his manuscript books. Near the head of
the list we find "Customs of Barcelona's constitution Peace, Treaties &
Privileges." Near the middle there is a listing for "marine Consulat routier"
[emphases in the original]. These both point to Peiresc's research into the
"Llibre del Consolat de Mar", the first post-classical maritime law. He seems to
have been its first modern researcher.

This project, in turn, seems to have been driven by a very contemporary need.
Responding to an intensified Spanish threat to French coasts, and dissatisfied
with existing French maritime strategy, in the late 1620s Cardinal Richelieu
began to mobilize a research team. Echoes of this filter into the Peiresc
correspondence as early as Spring 1627. By that summer, Peiresc had been
brought into the project, perhaps through his friend and correspondent, the
Secretary of State Lomenie. Looking through some of his materials for historical comparanda, he noted that “there was a book commonly found among men concerned with navigation entitled the book of the Consulat de la mer, which is found in French and Italian” and might contain material worth pursuing. Peiresc promised to make “a little tour” in Marseille and explore the archives of the Hotel de Ville, making “the most exact research that I could.”

At the end of 1627, Peiresc informed the Dupuy brothers in Paris that his Roman friends, knowing “of the research that I am making of the nautical customs of the coasts of Italy,” had informed him that Lucas Holstenius had seen in Robert Cotton’s library in London a book made in Pisa four or five hundred years ago “that described all the coasts of the Mediterranean Sea” and indicated the reach of the local sovereign powers. The particular difficulty of working with Cotton, whose good will Peiresc had strained by keeping his late antique illuminated Genesis for years, and the general hostilities between France and England, made it unlikely that the whole book would ever pass over the water, but Peiresc hoped that at least the section on the coast of Provence could be copied. In the first half of 1628 Peiresc wrote to, and obtained from, Holstenius, a copy of his excerpta of the the first few pages of the manuscript known to scholars today as the “Pisan Portulan.” It is the oldest surviving portulan text and perfectly complemented Peiresc’s simultaneous pursuit of a Mediterranean maritime code.

By January 1628 it was clear to Peiresc that Richelieu’s historical interest had a direct practical implication: suppression of the old office of Admiral of the Levant. Indeed, this was the beginning of the trajectory that led to the Règlement du Roi sur le fait de la Marine of 21 March 1631 and Richelieu’s assumption of the title grand maître et surintendant de la navigation. In this redistribution of power, it must be remembered, Peiresc’s own brother-in-law, Henri de Seguiran, became the Cardinal-Duke’s “lieutenant général en l’intendance de la Marine,” leading to the Seguiran report on the defense of the coasts of Provence of 1633.
In 1629 Peiresc formulated a program for capturing the earliest edition of the *Llibre del Consolat de Mar*: “Memoires and instructions for one doing research on old manuscript books of the *Consulat de la Mer* which could be done in Barcelona.”

Peiresc began by identifying the content of the book as “concerning the judgment of mercantile affairs and naval warfare.” The text had been written in Catalan but then translated into Italian and French. The earliest editions were, however, in Catalan and the oldest was produced in Barcelona in a small quarto in 1523. The book included information on consuls, judges, scriveners, and the making of boats and maritime negotiation. But it was the “privileges and ordinances,” which Peiresc termed “possibly the most curious of the whole volume and likely the most ancient, for many reasons that are too long to spell out here.”

Peiresc seems to have zeroed in on this section because its seventeen articles spelled out the time and place of the laws’ ratification, mapping a new *koiné*, a Mediterranean united by law, but also by the practices and passions of merchants, mostly, that the spread of this legal code mirrored darkly. Over the years, copyists’ sloppiness had led to some passages being omitted or transposed and dates corrupted. This was what Peiresc most wanted clarified.

Because the history of this book was so complex Peiresc decided that someone had to go to Barcelona. Peiresc drew up one of his typical memoranda outlining the shape of the project he hoped would be undertaken. He specified that whoever was to do it had

- to inform himself in particular of the officers of the marine in the city of Barcelona, or other persons curious about old books, if there could be found one or more books written by hand, whether on parchment or paper. Or any registers of the said court of the consuls of the sea, or of other tribunals of justice, or indeed in the Archives of the town hall
of Barcelona, in whose registers, or manuscript books, were inserted said laws or customs of the sea.\(^{86}\)

If his agent were to find the book, he was to identify, first, its order. But “above all it is necessary to search there” ("Sur tout il y fault chercher") to see if the dates of ratification of the seventeen articles were found or not. Peiresc was especially keen to know if the fifth article, concerning its ratification in Marseille, could be found. And if it were found, Peiresc wanted an exact transcription made, sparing no detail of its presentation: “It is necessary to collate them exactly, word for word and letter for letter, and to mark in the margin of the enclosed copy all the diverse readings and differences that are recognized there, whether of letters and numbers or of proper names, or of the other words of the said articles when it would even seem that there was some inexactness, in order to give a foundation to those conjectures that could resolve them.”\(^{87}\) If a printed edition of the \textit{Llibre del Consolat} older than 1523, or a manuscript version, could be found at a decent price, and with those 17 articles intact—all the better.\(^{88}\) Peiresc even arranged for a line of credit, to insure that his agent would be able to stay as long as would be necessary to achieve these goals.\(^{89}\)

Peiresc found someone going to Barcelona, the Provincial of the Minims in Provence, P. Jean François, who was off to visit the local Chapter in the late spring of 1629.\(^{90}\) Peiresc seized the occasion, equipping him with a detailed set of instructions that extended beyond the \textit{Consolat de Mar} to other problems in Provençal-Catalan history.\(^{91}\) In this memo Peiresc spelled out something close to the “theory” of material culture that Gassendi attributed to him for the \textit{History of Provence}.

Peiresc indicated who he was most interested in—Alfonso the Chaste (1157-96) and his wife, his father Raimon Berenguer IV (1113-62), his mother Queen Petronilla (1135-74), his grandfather Ramon Berenguer III (1082-1131) and, above all, his grandmother the Countess Dulcia (1095-1190)—but also what. He
was quite specific about his desire for material and iconographic traces. First of all, he spoke of seals. He wanted charters “where the old seals were attached, to take down the most exact possible description of them...And if one could make a mold of them and take the impressions, at least of the face, that would be very curious.”

Peiresc’s evidentiary imagination is on fully on display here, just as Gassendi had asserted in his biography. For, Peiresc continued, turning from seals to other kinds of material culture, “If there are statues or paintings of those princes, on the gates, in the windows, on the altars or reliquaries, chalices, cross and other instruments of the church, one could also remark on them.”

After doing this at the Benedictine monastery of S. Maria de Ripoll—an ancient dependent of St Victor of Marseille—Peiresc suggested the Minim do the same at the Cistercian monastery of Poblet, which he estimated as no more distant from Barcelona.

While Peiresc’s research into medieval maritime law may have been driven by some present need, his other focus, on the Counts of Barcelona-Provence was a much older concern. Indeed, the attention to iconographical clarity here reprises the import of a set of instructions Peiresc had fashioned for his factotum, Denis Guillemin, in June 1609, when sending him to Angers to discover and describe in writing whatever tombs could be located of the Counts of Provence and Dukes of Anjou. Peiresc had asked him “to make in color, or in pencil on paper of the same size as this leaf, the figures of the said counts or countesses, except for King René, who is well-known to us. And that the figures should all be in full, with the true way of their clothes, just as one finds them.” While in the area, he was to examine nearby monasteries for new material and “to mark well the places where they are found.”

In 1626, only three years earlier, when Cardinal Francesco Barberini passed from Provence to Spain as Papal Legate, Peiresc charged him with a range of archival tasks. We know this because Peiresc’s letter thanking the Cardinal for three inscriptions mentions also that in the archives of the monastery of Pobleto
he hoped to find cartularies “in which, I have no doubt there won’t be found seals where their figures are represented, with the clothing or weapons used in those times.”

In the city of Barcelona, Peiresc directed his agent to the paintings of the Counts and Kings of Aragon in the House of the Deputation (Diputació) but warned “that these were made at whim, without any relationship to their true portraits, nor to the costume of their time.” There were similarly ahistorical depictions in the tomb sculptures of the cathedral. But if there were any authentic portraits of Alfonso the Chaste or of his grandmother Dulcia, Peiresc wanted a sketch. Peiresc recalled that he had tried to program Cardinal Francesco Barberini “to do a little bit of research on these portraits” during his legation in 1626, but that he had fallen ill and those whom he employed simply went to the Deputation and fell for the fakes.

But how to insure that the Minim did not make the same mistake as Francesco Barberini’s helpers? Peiresc is here trying to remotely pilot the connoisseurship of portrait styles in medieval Provence-Catalonia—not an area where he could naturally count on his agent’s skill. So, as was the case with his memoires to Levant-bound travellers, Peiresc spelled out as much as possible the thinking behind his criteria of judgment. And the really interesting thing here, suggesting that the study of antiquities was the foundation for his medieval studies, is the role of numismatic portraiture as the baseline of veracity. “In order to really recognize if the manner of the portraits that one will find there will correspond to the antique manner, of the time of that prince, there is added to this memoire a couple of small silver monies struck in Provence on the authority of that King Alfonso the Chaste, while he possessed the sovereignty.” It is also important here to note Peiresc’s clear and very precise use of the term “sovereignty” to denote “supreme and final authority” and as a “thing” that a ruler possessed, almost like a scepter.
Nevertheless, coins alone could not suffice. For while they were precise indicators of material culture—they permitted clothes, hair style, crowns, beards to be dated—their small size limited their utility for identifying their subjects:

And for judging if there is a relationship of the ones to the others, it is expected that it does not lie there. It is an incontrovertible point that the portraits are not faithful, since the money of the times can not be thrown in doubt for the manner of the clothing or crowns and of wearing a beard or not. But as for the resemblance of the face, the smallness of the monies does not allow for them to be exactly observed by the crude workers such as those of that time. 98

Therefore, Peiresc, continued, it was necessary to pursue this comparison across the range of material culture: “in order to compare the portrait of that Prince (who is there represented clean-shaven, having a simple and large crown) with the portraits or statues on tombs or church porches, or on altars, windows, reliquaries, chalices and other church vessels, and other places where such portraits could have been conserved.” 99

If Pere François had the time, Peiresc suggested that he undertake the same comprehensive trawl for evidence through the archives of the Cathedral of Barcelona as he would have at Ripoll and Poblet. But just to make sure he was understood, Peiresc used this as an occasion to repeat his list of possible sources. Again, it is the richness of the evidentiary imagination that is so striking:

...for the tombs, epitaphs, sculpted armoiries or portraits of those princes and princesses, made on the doors of churches and chapels, altars, windows, reliquaries, cross, chalices and other vessels and utensils of the Church. And especially, for the manuscript chronicles, anniversaries, charters and ancient documents, of the seals of King Alfonso the Chaste and of his grandfather and grandmother. 100
Finally, if the Minim could find some lettered cleric to help him, Peiresc offered to render reciprocal services in Provence, furnishing books and other things “that could serve for the knowledge of their history, just as theirs serve for ours”---Peiresc leaving no doubt that what he was aiming at was “history.”¹⁰¹ Jean François, however, reported great difficulty in finding either a book or a person who could help. He blamed the southern European ways. “Matters go in such slowness in this city, that we were 8 or 10 whole days to find the opening to see the ancient archives and those of the [cathedral] chapter of Barcelona.”¹⁰² (Five full years later Peiresc received a “Memoire du Sr Rafael Dominique extrait des archives de Barcellone 25 October 1634.” This Dominican described himself as archivist---“arxivier”—of the “real arxive de barcelona.”¹⁰³ He responded to Peiresc’s interest in the Countess Dulcia who married the Count of Barcelona and so made him and his heirs into Counts of Provence.¹⁰⁴)

Jean François proved more successful with the other part of his charge: locating a copy the Llibre del Consolat de Mar. In the Peiresc archive we find an extract referring to precisely the passage in the third part of the book signalled by Peiresc in his instructions.¹⁰⁵ From it we learn that the maritime law was accepted in Rome, 1076 (article 1), in Acre in September 1102, while King and the Count of Toulouse were en route to Jerusalem (article 2).¹⁰⁶ They were adopted by the Pisans in Mallorca in 1102 (article 3) and in Pisa itself in 1118 (article 4). Article 5, which Peiresc had explicitly wanted documentation for, indicated that the “consulat de la mer” was signed in Marseille in the house of the Hospital during the rule of Sr “Jauifie antox” (Geoffroy Autax) as podestà. In 1175 the laws were adopted in Almeira by the Count of Barcelona and by the Genoese (article 6), in 1186 in Genoa itself (article 7), in February 1187 it was signed into law by King William in Brindisi (article 8), in 1190 in Rhodes (article 9), in 1200 by the prince of Morea (article 10), in 1225 by the Venetians in Constantinople in the Hagia Sofia (article 11), and in 1225 by the Count of Germany [sic](article 12). The laws were adopted in Messina in 1225 (article 13), in France, in the presence of the Templars, Hospitallers and Admiral of the Levant in 1250 (article
This chronology maps Peiresc’s Mediterranean—and the inference from commerce to civilization is Peiresc’s. In 1627, at the very beginning of this project, he wrote to the Dupuy brothers expressing his pleasure at Cardinal Richelieu’s recognition of their mutual friend Théodore Godefroy’s talents, but “especially the work he undertook touching on the treaties made with foreigners concerning commerce.” Peiresc hoped that Godefroy, and their other friend, André du Chesne, would come down and tour the archives in cities such as Montpellier where “they would find treaties made between the consuls of Montpellier and all the greatest powers of the inhabitable lands of 2 or 300 years ago, such as the Emperors of Constantinople, the Venetians, the kings of Naples, Sicily, Cyprus, Spain, England, Scotland, and if I am not mistaken, even the Barbarians. All had no other foundation than commerce.”

Peiresc’s interest in the fourteenth-century law code, “Assises & bons usages du Roiaume de Hierusalem,” shows us where these questions lead, and how this legal vision of a Mediterranean unity could lead from the west to east, from Barcelona to Jerusalem, and always back to individual names and fates. The code is first mentioned by Peiresc in 1617. The importance of legal authority required the Assises to list precisely the Barons and Knights in their different jurisdictions, such as Jerusalem, Naples, Acre, Tyre etc. Exactly ten years later, at the very same time that Peiresc began thinking hard about the Consolat de Mar, Peiresc received from Pierre and Jacques Dupuy an extract from the Assises which, he wrote, he “had heard much spoken of, but which I have never ever seen.” It “grabbed me by the nose like mustard,” he wrote, and he resolved then and there to seek out the full text. “I assure you that I will excavate so much,” he wrote, “that I will disinter something.” Peiresc laid out a plan: he would write not only to Venice, but also to Cardinal Barberini in Rome to see if there
were not a copy in the Vatican of the old French version. He would write to Naples and Sicily—maritime extensions of France, after all, under the Angevins. And he would write directly to Cyprus, Jerusalem and Constantinople.”

In a letter of May 1627 to the Dupuy brothers, Peiresc said that he had written to Marseille, Cyprus and Jerusalem in search of a manuscript copy. In June, Peiresc wrote to Viguier, the Marseille-based French Consul to Syria, and asked if the vice-consul actually resident in Cyprus, Jean-Antoine Spanet (sometimes written Espannet), could be approached to seek out things on his behalf. He added that he had sent the specific request (“memoire”) to one of Espannet’s close friends, the Marseille merchant Leonard Danmartin. In the middle of July, Peiresc had heard back from Rome that Lucas Holstenius had promised to transcribe the French copy of the Assises that was in the Vatican Library, and that he and Jean-Marie Suares, Peiresc’s creature and the Bishop of Vaison-la-Romaine, and no mean scholar himself, would seek out an able copyist able to cope with its difficult scrawl. The index of chapters arrived from Suares in early September.

In November 1627, Gerolamo Aleandro in Rome weighed in on both the Assises and Consulat de Mar, which as noted above, Peiresc was just then seeking out. Later that month Peiresc could write that he had received good news from Cyprus. Peiresc asked Danmartin to write to Espannet for more information about pricing. In his register of outgoing correspondence Peiresc wrote “CYPRE au Sr Spannet vice consul, pour les Assises & autres MSS.” So we know very clearly what it was he was looking for.

What he got, a month later—the letter of November obviously crossing—was something else. In his register he wrote, simply, “Arrivee DES MSS DE CYPRE.” But in a thank you note written to Espannet on 13 December 1627 Peiresc spelled out the objects of his continuing interest—indicating that these were not among the three books brought him by Danmartin the previous day.
In addition to “all sorts of books dealing with laws and history,” Peiresc was especially keen on “the maritime laws of the Consulat de mer [sic], or more precisely, of the merchants in everything that concerns maritime navigation, and warfare, whether the book is printed in any language, Catalan, French or Italian.” At the same time that he tried to launch this line of inquiry he charged Espannet not to neglect in his research “the book of the High Court or Asisses and customs of the Kingdom of Jerusalem.” He would take a manuscript copy or the Italian translation printed in Venice in 1535 with the title “L’alta corte.”

Just a few days later, however, Peiresc wrote in his register of outgoing mail “Arrivee de livre des lignages d’oultre mer.” This text was produced in the same Cypriot circle as the fourteenth-century version of the Assises, and came from Rome along with a copy of the first three chapters of the Assises. On 26 May 1628 Peiresc noted the arrival in Aix of a copy of the complete Vatican version of the Assises of Jerusalem, sent to him by Aubery from Rome. Even though Peiresc had succeeded in getting a copy of the Assises, and an excerpt from Cotton’s Portulan from London via Rome, and, eventually, a copy of the Llibre del Consolat de Mar from Barcelona a couple of years later, he did not cease seeking variant manuscript versions of each of these from Cyprus.

It so happens that the copy of the Assises which Peiresc obtained from Rome included a longer version of the “Libvre des Lignages d’Outremer” than was found in other copies of the Assises. Even a brief perusal showed him that his genealogically-inclined colleagues Godefroy, du Chense and the brothers de Ste Marthe would “find there much pasture for their taste.” Peiresc was intrigued enough to tell a new correspondent in Sidon that he had just recovered a genealogy of the families of the Kingdom of Jerusalem but was looking for any additional proofs that could be found in the East. The text begins with a defense of naming as a bulwark against the oblivion of eating time, and then proceeds to narrate successive lineages which together make a thick prosopographical web. Indeed, one could argue that the texture of this
document was entirely woven of names. It is, in short, a genealogical view of the inhabitants of the Kingdom of Jerusalem at a moment in time.

In 1635, in Aix, the printer Estienne David brought out a French translation of the Consolat, explaining that the book “fell into his hands these past years.” One suspects that Peiresc was the one who put it there. Even afterwards, Peiresc remained engaged by the chase, asking the Observant Father and famed manuscript hunter, Constantino Gaetano (1568-1650), if he had ever come across a manuscript of the “Consulato di Mare” in either French, Catalan or Provençal. And while he was asking, Peiresc also wondered if there existed any documentation in Rome of ancient, or just old, maritime laws. Peiresc presented Pisa as “the first among the Christians to make a dent in the maritime empire held by the Sarracens for many years, and to seize a good part of it.” Gaetano, in turn, cited this part of Peiresc’s letter as his sole authority that the maritime law was invented by the Pisans. That modern scholars, beginning with Capmany in 1779, have denied the authenticity of the ratification dates found in Peiresc’s document takes nothing away from Peiresc’s sense of how dates of ratification could themselves have defined both a space and a time. Nor does it challenge Peiresc’s strategies of authentication—he asked all the right questions.

The Lignages d’Outremer, like the Consolat, was a book that had a murky post-Peireskian afterlife. Charles du Fresne, the Sieur du Cange, had wanted to prepare an edition of it for publication based on the copy that Peiresc made from his manuscript for Pierre and Jacques Dupuy (Dupuy MS. 652). Since du Cange used archival sources to corroborate information in the text, had he succeeded in publishing the work before his death he might have been known as the first historian of the Crusades. The prosopography of Crusader families, as it has been studied by the best modern scholars, seems to have followed in the path of Peiresc and du Cange. Steven Runciman, for example, in The Families of Outremer (1959), commented that in the heavily Provençal County of Tripoli,
“most of the lords have surnames, such as Dorel, Porcelet or Mazoir, which are not derived from lordships but suggest a more bourgeois origin.” Jean Richard, in turn, also emphasized the Provençal demography of the County of Tripoli—mentioning among the landowners a family named Porcellet.

The Porcellet were among those many Provençal families who sought success in the Holy Land. Though no longer important, and though unrelated to his own family, Peiresc devoted more attention to the Porcellet—2 volumes of documents and excerpts—than to any other family history, including that of the Lords of Baux, for example, or the Villeneuve of Les Arcs. Peiresc’s excerpts reveal Porcellet’s getting, spending and laying waste their days. It also reveals that Peiresc thought these mundane facts of social life were worth excerpting.

The cartularies of the Knights of St John of the Hospital, located in Arles (for the Ferme de St Gilles), documented their land ownership and family relations in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. The excerpta from the papers of the Hospitallers (and some from the Templars, as well) show members of many of the same crusading families back in Provence and living their lives—until caught in some moment of legal activity, and then frozen for all time. In the Hospitaller archive Peiresc followed crusading Porcellets to their villages in the Galilee and Syria and then back to Provence. As Jean Richard has noted, these Porcellet documents show us family relations, village life, agrarian ways and feudal institutions. Peiresc had the authenticity of these purchases, land swaps, donations, confirmations of privilege, marriage contracts, and wills attested by the Arlesian notary Elzias Arfeuille, with finding aids.

What Peiresc’s field survey permits—or, at least, points towards—is the reconstruction of a family’s history. And almost four hundred years later this is exactly what Martin Aurell has done, going over this same ground in order to write a history of the Porcellet family. In this case, the modern familiar practice
helps us understand more clearly what was at stake in a pre-modern, distant one.  

A distinctive feature of Peiresc's field of vision was its regional lens. The Porcellet was a Mediterranean family, and its history, done properly, could not but be a Mediterranean history. By the year 1000 there were Porcellets in Provence, by the early twelfth century in Genoa, the mid-thirteenth in Lorraine, and the late thirteenth in Naples and Sicily. Peiresc tracked the Porcellet through the Provençal archives, and organized and collected the help of others in Genoa, Spain and Naples. The Porcellet seem to have been especially active in the service of King Charles I of Anjou.

The lasting monument to the Porcellet was created by Jacques Callot, and long thought unique: his early (c.1616) engraving of the history of the Porcellets. Working within the convention of a Church facade whose doors were covered by the Porcellet family tree and whose walls were screens on which scenes from family history were projected, Callot produced an astounding “as if” multi-media presentation. We can follow the family's movements across time and space, from ninth-century Spain to Provence, Outremer and Southern Italy, and finally Lorraine. We can see them in the scenes that helped determine the family's history. And we can read about what they were doing in the long captions beneath the pictures.

For this is a tour de force of verbal, as well as visual, description. If we look closely at those captions we see something very unusual: there are actual citations by year from archival sources. Some of these are from Provence and preserved only in Peiresc's archive in his own hand, such as “the catalogue of the Bishops of Digne” or “Monastery of Silvacane.” The program of sources was obviously the work of a serious scholar—the broadside itself identifies only an “L.P.M.L.M. Collector” alongside of “Jac. Callot sculptor.”
The print was long thought unique, but the Peiresc archive preserves a second copy, now much battered.\(^{154}\) (fig. 4a, 4b) Its presence alerts us to a possible relationship between Peiresc’s research project and the commissioning of the Callot print. We know from Callot’s biography that this print could have been executed as early as 1612 and as late as 1616. Callot was himself a Lorrainer and it is suggested that when he was in Florence in 1612 he could have met up with the Bishop of Toul, Jean Porcellet de Maillane. We do know that in 1616 Callot produced an engraving of a historical scene depicting the Bishop in the miracle of St Mansuit—after whom his Abbey was named.\(^{155}\) Peiresc seems to have been in regular contact with the Bishop of Toul between 1605 and 1620 asking and answering questions about the Porcellet in Provence.\(^{156}\) Was Peiresc responsible for any of the learning assembled by that “Collector”? 

Callot’s magnificent and rare print, as much as Peiresc’s two volumes of notes, opens out on to a medieval Mediterranean stage peopled by individuals in motion, in which Provence played a central role: the rise of the House of Barcelona, the Angevin expansion and the Crusades.

iii. Discovering the Medieval Mediterranean

Peiresc’s archival approach to the world of the Crusades bears comparison with editions of classics like Joinville or contemporary collections of crusade narratives such as Bongars’ *Gesta dei per Francos* (1611). What we find is that his eye is turned away from narrative and towards the sources of these narratives. This is especially clear when we see him in action reading just these texts for their usefulness in corroborating archival evidence.\(^{157}\) In the second or third decade of the seventeenth century it was Bongars who was making a recognizable and much appreciated contribution to scholarship by collecting and publishing crusade narratives. What Peiresc was doing, stripmining whole
archives for scraps of information about crusaders and their families—which he reconstituted in his own vision as his own archive—, many of which told of obscure figures doing ordinary deeds like buying and selling, and each of which in turn suggested a whole story onto which it opened only the smallest window—this went well beyond what most anyone else imagined “History” then to mean.\textsuperscript{158}

Peiresc knew what he was doing, knew that this was a different kind of historical scholarship. Contrasting, for the benefit of Cardinal Francesco Barberini, Nostradamus’s unreliable history of Provence with his own project, Peiresc emphasized both the importance of its archival basis and that this was history, not some \textit{Hilfswissenschaft}. In the archive, in this case of Provence, “one could learn the history of those times much more securely than all this that is said and written by badly informed people who have introduced a thousand lies and blunders, unworthy of memory. On the contrary, true history is buried and the memory of many things important and worthy of faith is wiped out. And it will be possible, without much difficulty, to pass it on to posterity from there.”\textsuperscript{159}

Peiresc may have come to the Crusades by following individual Provencaux as they moved across the Mediterranean, but it was the larger phenomenon which seems to have fired Peiresc’s imagination. For it was this very subject, according to Gassendi, that led Peiresc to recognize the importance of cross-cultural comparison. It was not enough to study Western Crusade texts, as Bongars proposed. Peiresc believed that one had also to read the Arab writers on the Crusades. “With what ardency,” Gassendi writes, “did he seek to get a translation and edition of those Arabic books which the most excellent Golius recently brought with him out of the East, containing a history of the expeditions and wars of our kings in Syria? For he thought it possible that writers of that nation might relate many things differently than ours, which would be worthwhile to know. So that, at the least, from comparing them together a more probable narration might be framed.”\textsuperscript{160}
And, moreover, comparative history could not be done from self-conscious narratives alone. Gassendi continued, turning now to the kind of archival research we have been analyzing.

For he [Peiresc] was likewise of the opinion that many things omitted by our historians might be supplemented from those of that region, the various councils of the time, the charters, letters, seals, coats of arms, inscriptions, coins and other things of that sort. Now, he was extremely curious about such things as these above all others, because he said they were incorrupted witnesses of antiquity, & that such things might be learned from them, which a man should seek in vain among all Historians extant.¹⁶¹

This is a spectacular statement not of a prolegomenon to some future historical practice, but of one just undertaken. Like Gassendi’s magnificent summary of Peiresc’s research for the *History of Provence*, we know that each of Gassendi’s sentences reflects the reality of Peiresc’s archive.

The history of Peiresc’s “reception,” as I have suggested elsewhere, is bound up with wider cultural changes.¹⁶² Nevertheless, even a brief look at how the Crusades were studied in the immediate centuries after Peiresc can help us more clearly perceive his contribution. Du Chesne, as we have seen already, recognized the interest of the *Lignages d’Outremer*. When Antoine Galland published his friend Barthélemy d’Herbelot’s *Bibliothèque Orientale* (1697) he suggested in the preface that sources, in particular the study of Arabic sources, might shed additional light on the history of the Crusades.¹⁶³ In the middle of the eighteenth century, the Benedictines formulated a plan to publish Crusade monuments, not only texts but also documentation. And, moreover, they, too, realized the need to have the Arab sources as well as the Western. The Academy of Inscriptions in turn took up the project and part of it fell, ultimately, to Michaud, who brought Peiresc’s comparative vision to some kind of fruition two
centuries later—though a compendium of specifically *Arab* historians of the Crusades would not be published until 1969.¹⁶⁴

But what we find neither in Michaud, nor in Friedrich Willken’s nearly contemporary *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (7 vols., 1807–32), nor in Heinrich von Sybel’s cutting-edge *Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs* (1841), is a picture of the Crusades reconstructed from the ground up by way of archival documents. Von Sybel, like Droysen heir to Ranke’s revolution, may have begun with an entire section devoted to “Kritik der Quellen und der Literatur” but that it was entirely constituted by narratives suggests that up through this point archival, administrative documents were still not being utilized for crusade history.¹⁶⁵ What Peiresc had done would not be done again until the great historical revolution of the twentieth century. And even Braudel was given to wonder when “it will become possible to write general history from original documents and not from more or less secondary works.”¹⁶⁶

If, for the near sixty years since Momigliano’s classic article of 1950 we have associated antiquaries with the beginnings of modern historiography, we need now to look in the other direction, to a “Medieval History and the Antiquarian.”¹⁶⁷ Indeed, Momigliano himself flagged this story in his typical lapidary fashion, nodding in the direction of Mabillon “and his Italian disciples.”¹⁶⁸ The importance increasingly attached to “historia sacra” for developing “modern” scientific history is fast filling in our knowledge of the antiquarian study of post-classical times.¹⁶⁹ There remains, nevertheless, a huge gap in our historiographical understanding, omitting the work of Peiresc, but also undervaluing the contributions of colleagues such as Andre Duchesne and Henry Spelman, and followers like William Dugdale.¹⁷⁰ If we want to understand why, we might need to think in terms of literary, rather than forensic, expectations.

Peiresc’s *History of Provence* bears so little relationship to the brilliant research program that underpins it because when Peiresc chose to write a “History” he
accepted certain generic conditions—and expectations—that left no space for his multi-layered, multi-directional investigation. In the see-saw dialogue between research and writing, the seventeenth century saw the research side surge ahead. Even Leibniz, nearly a century later, could do no better: his research for the *History of the House of Brunswick*, like Peiresc’s for *Provence*, glistens with brilliance, but his written *History* is flat and dull. Conventions of genre were powerful while the as yet uncanonized norms of research allowed for greater experimentation but lacked a form of literary exposition.¹⁷¹ It is only by putting the finished prose alongside the inevitably unfinished archive that we catch a glimpse of the historical whole that belies any comprehensive distinction between antiquaries and historians.

This gap between the writing of history and the researching of history, as de Certeau observed, first made itself evident in the era from Peiresc to Leibniz (we might want to extend it forward, beyond even Caylus, to Goethe). It poses a problem different from the one that Momigliano answered for us. He named Gibbon and Winckelmann as those who successfully, and finally, married the tools of the antiquary to the style of the rhetorically-trained ancient historian. But de Certeau challenges us to reflect instead on the cost of creating that successful narrative. He frames this in terms of eliding the constructedness of historical knowledge; we might instead describe it in terms of a shift in emphasis away from a kind of curatorial intelligence that spins worlds from individual monuments towards an interpretative one that converts individual moments into longer narratives.

The literary dimension of research is uncharted terrain for historians of historiography but not, of course for historians and theorists of fictional storytelling. The relationship between what we might term presentational and argumentational modes has been very carefully analyzed by Paul Ricoeur in the second part of the first volume of *Time and Narrative*. He argues that there can be a ‘plot’—or expectation of a story—even in non-human centered narratives,
and he, too, takes Braudel’s *Mediterranean* as the most extreme example of this kind of unconventional narrative. “To be totally convincing, however,” Ricoeur writes, “it is necessary to explain how history can still be a narrative when it stops being about events, whether it becomes structural, or comparative, or if it regroups into series items drawn from an atemporal continuum.”¹⁷² This is exactly our question about Peiresc and the writing of antiquarian scholarship. And, we might ask, with Momigliano’s challenge in mind, when did this happen?

Ricoeur never answers the question. Like Rancière, his Braudel remains part of the grand tradition of narrative, though at its limit, where “what distinguishes the historian’s concept of structure from that of the sociologist or the economist” is tested.¹⁷³ But Robert Alter, examining the history of the novel, did try to trace this line. He focused on precisely the period highlighted by de Certeau, arguing that the novel from Cervantes to Sterne to Diderot exposed its conventions and structure, unwilling to hide them behind the scrim of narrative. In this it resembles the writing of historical research by antiquaries in this same period from Pasquier to Peiresc to Leibniz to Caylus.¹⁷⁴ It was in the nineteenth century, according to Alter, that the novel pretended to a mirror of reality and so buried its working parts. Hayden White’s powerful presentation of Ranke, Michelet, Tocqueville and Burckhardt as representations of different dimensions of realism in historical writing exactly corresponds to Alter’s claim for the pretensions of the nineteenth-century novel—though these giants now appear transformed (ironically) from canonical to exceptional.¹⁷⁵

If the nineteenth-century realist novel has come to define the genre, it has done so at a high price: both ignoring what came before, and also missing the link between the self-consciously experimental novels of the twentieth century that came after and those of the seventeenth and eighteenth that came before. So, too, as the form of history written from Gibbon to Burckhardt and in some way on to Braudel asserted itself as the standard it has obscured for us the achievements and ongoing influence of the early modern Peirescs and obscured
the genetic account that can link them to modernist historical experiments such as Benjamin’s *Passagenwerk*.\(^{176}\)

But this leads us to a momentous question: if the nineteenth-century form of history is not inevitable but exceptional, then could the antiquarian impulse—early modern *historia* with its inclination to research and description—actually constitute a norm for the period 1500-2000? This would be no less than a Copernican Revolution in the history of historiography. It would suggest the need for a new morphology of antiquarianism that could account for its transformations over the arc of five centuries. This would need to be articulated in terms of practices but also presentation. And it would, in turn, make the nineteenth century into the “problem,” the thing needing to be explained, rather than the standard against which early modern and modern deviations from the norm are to be measured.

Though once upon a time academic history may have successfully squeezed antiquarianism out of the university’s precincts, the monograph of the twentieth century, in its evidentiary focus and narrow address, may have more in common with the research-mindedness of early moderns like Peiresc than with storytellers like Macaulay or Michelet. And all this leaves aside the uncontested dominance of the “antiquarian” in amateur and local history and the para-historical genres of biography, memoire and historical fiction, as well as in successor disciplines such as archaeology and anthropology. Finally, Peiresc’s refusal of story-telling for archiving, which may once have seemed like a radically distant form of writing, now seems more familiar and much less radical in a scholarly age increasingly shaped by the curating and aggregating of information in searchable and linkable databases. The implications of this external transformation for future internalist histories of history can today only be guessed at.
An earlier version of this paper was delivered to the BGC/ Columbia Medieval-Renaissance Seminar in May 2008; later versions were presented to the Early Modern History workshop at Princeton University in April 2010, and at the Whitney Humanities Center, Yale University, in May 2010. The author wishes to thank Brigitte Bedos-Rezak, Adam J. Kosto, Jacob Soll and Orest Ranum for their careful reading and thoughtful comments on later versions of the argument, and the work of two anonymous referees.
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9 Momigliano, Classical Foundations, 54. Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg describe him as “the brilliant young dean of antiquaries in his own time” (‘I have always loved the Holy Tongue’. Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship (Cambridge, MA, 2010), 16).

10 This extended story is the subject of a work in progress, entitled Foundations of Material Culture: Cultural History Before Burckhardt.

11 Gassendi, Viri Illustriis Nicolai Claudii Fabricii de Peiresc Senatoris Aquisextiensis Vita in Opera Omnia, 6 vols (Lyon, 1658), V, 337; Gassendi, The Mirror of True Nobility and Gentility (Haverford, PA, 2003 [1657]), bk.6, 277. (I have lightly modernized Rand’s 1657 translation throughout). I do not intend here a more general statement about Peiresc’s medieval studies. Nor is this to be found in E.S. Peck, Peiresc Manuscripts Aiding the Reconstruction of Lost Medieval Monuments, Harvard University unpubd Ph.D (1963) or Jürgen Voss, Das Mittelalter im historischen Denkens Frankreich. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalterbegriffes und der Mittelalterbewertung von der zweiten Hälfte des 16. bis zur Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts (Munich, 1972), in which Peiresc is mentioned only a handful of times.

12 Peiresc, Histoire Abrégée de Provence & Autres Textes, ed. Jacques Ferrier & Michel Ceuillas (Avignon, 1982). The manuscrit of the “Histoire Abrégée” found its way into the collection of Peiresc’s friend, Pierre d’Hozier, and thence into that of his son, Charles d’Hozier. When his papers entered the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1902 Peiresc’s text was included in MS. Fonds français 32605.

13 Dionigi Atanagis, Ragionamento della istoria (1559), collected in the Ars Historica volume, distinguishes between the narration of events day after day, as in a diary, and history, which “alla narration delle cose fatte aggiunge i consigli & la cagione, perche fur


15 Nor should we assume that there is an *Unabridged History of Provence* out there somewhere. While this possibility cannot be dismissed out of hand, the re is no trace of any such lost text in Peiresc’s 60,000 page Nachlaß.

16 Lest we rush to the easiest of quick conclusions and charge Gassendi with either hagiography or invention, we should remember that he was an extraordinary biographer. One could argue that when Gassendi thought historically he thought biographically, viz. his *Lives* of Tyco Brahe, Peiresc and, especially, Epicurus. Daniel Morhof went so far as to proclaim the *Vita Peireskii* the best biography of a scholar written up to that point (*Polyhistor* (Lübeck, 1708 [1688]), 239-40).

17 Eduard Fueter’s massive and seemingly comprehensive history of historical writing had nothing to say about antiquaries as on principle he did not consider erudition (“der gelehrten historischen Forschung”) a part of history (*Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* (Munich, 1911), v).

18 That Peiresc’s materials were unpublished is only partly relevant, as he rarely thought in terms of publication. Moreover, published antiquarian scholarship was often organized to include just such instruments and was focused around the study of particular objects, whether material or textual. See the titles collected in J.A. Fabricius *Bibliotheca antiquaria* (1713).

19 Even the one exception to this rule is instructive. Peiresc’s only published tract, *Origines Murensis Monasterii* (Spirenberg [Paris], 1618), is an anonymous compilation of archival material with slim textual surround. See Miller, “The Ancient Constitution and the
Genealogist: Momigliano, Pocock, and Peiresc’s *Origines Murensis Monasterii* (1618),”


21 Bacon calls “Memorials” “preparatory history” and divides these into two categories, “commentaries” which are narratives of events, and registers, which “are collections of public acts, as decrees of council, judicial proceedings, declarations and letters of estate, orations, and the like, without a perfect continuance or contexture of the thread of the narration.” Antiquities, or “history defaced” or “remanants of history” was gathered “out of monuments, names, words, proverbs, traditions, private records and evidences, fragments of stories, passages of books that concern not story, and the like.” Francis Bacon, *Advancement of Learning* (London, 1605), II[.2], 10-11.


23 See, for instance, the special issue of *Archival Science* edited by Ann Blair and Jennifer S. Milligan devoted to the history of archives (7, 2007), but note that none of the cases examined is adequate to the example of Peiresc whose archive more resembled a collection than a repository, and whose notion of “utility” was very different from that underpinning institutional archives.


28 See, for example, “**Description Terminable and Interminable: Looking at the Past, Nature and Peoples in Peiresc’s Archive**,” “**Historia**: Empiricism and Erudition in Early Modern Europe,” eds. Gianna Pomata and Nancy Siraisi (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2005), 355-97.


30 This is in part the goal of my forthcoming *Cultural History before Burckhardt: Foundations of Material Culture*.

31 Goethe is regularly described as a polymath, but rarely is his practice viewed from the perspective of early modern polymathy and its various intellectual commitments; sustaining this argument is of course outside the scope of this essay. For Benjamin’s particular relationship to “antiquarianism” see Miller, “**Momigliano, Benjamin and Antiquarianism After the Crisis of Historicism**,” *Momigliano and Antiquarianism*, 348-62.


33 “Der Schriftsteller neigt sich zu dieser oder jener Gesinnung; sie wird aber durch seine Individualität, ja oft nur durch den Vortrag, durch die Eigentümlichkeit des Idioms, in welchem er spricht und schreibt, durch die Wendung der Zeit, durch mancherlei Rücksichten modifiziert. Wie wunderbar verhält sich nicht Gassendi zu Epicur!” Goethe, *Zur Farbenlehre*, 476.


36 Quoted in Siegfried Kracauer, *History. The Last Things Before the Last.* Completed after the author’s death by Paul Oskar Kristeller (Markus Wiener, Princeton, 1995 [1st edn] 1969), 186. While we might not immediately associate Namier with modernist historiography, the fact is that his “refusal” of narrativity reflects a similar rejection of the implied intelligibility of subjects that can be reduced to narrative form.


41 De Certeau. *The Writing of History*, 74, 86.

42 De Certeau. *The Writing of History*, 84.


44 “So that it is lesse to be wondered at if no gentleman in Provence was better acquainted with his own noble ancestors than Peireskius was, seeing he examined all their Genealogies, and tryed them by their Records and Coats of Arms, whose variations he exposed, according to the several Houses to which they did belong.” Gassendi, *Mirrour*, bk.6, 277-8; Gassendi, *Opera Omnia*, V, 337. Genealogy of course was in high

45 This point is missed even in studies explicitly directed at genealogy and history in seventeenth-century France, viz Chantal Grell and Mathieu Da Vinha, “Les Généalogistes, le roi et la cour en France, XVIIe-XVIIIe siècles,” Historiographie an europäischen Höfen (16.-18. Jahrhundert), eds. Markus Völkel and Arno Stromeyer (Berlin, 2009), 255-74. However, from a theoretical, rather than historical perspective K.F. Werner has linked modern social science history, under the term Landesgeschichte, with medieval prosopography (“L’apport de la prosopographie à l’histoire sociale des élites,” Family Trees and the Roots of Politics: The prosopography of Britain and France from the tenth to the twelfth centuries, ed. K.S.B. Keats-Rohan (Woodbridge, 1997), 3). For the definition of prosopography employed here, see Claude Nicolet in Annuaire de l’École pratique des Hautes Études (1970/71), 297.


47 “J’ay veu dans ce registre de Marseille la preuve de la richesse de plusieurs familles acquise par le commerce des peaux, c’est a dire de la tannerie et des fourrures dans les XIle, XIIle siecles et suivants. De sorte que parmi les Echevins ou syndics de Marseille y en avoir toujours un qui estoit commerçant en tannerie. Ilz preparoient eux mesmes les peaux et les vendoient au loin. La droguerie a esté encore dans les mesmes siecles une source de grandes richesses. Les drogues et aromates se vendoient et fabriquoient par les mesmes personnes, et nous trouvons dans les livres manuscrits des jurisconsultes de grands procez dont les consultations estoient ainsi intitulées pro nobili aromatorio. Touts ces negociants si opulents faiosont des riches fondations dont est faict mention dans le susdict registre du chapitre de Marseille.” Peiresc to Pierre d’Antelmi, 23 February 1632, Lettres de Peiresc, ed. Philippe Tamizey de Larroque, 7 vols. (Paris, 1888-1898), VII, 74; Aix, Bibliothèque Méjanes [henceforth Aix, Bib.Méjanes], MS. 201
Peiresc’s knowledge of Marseille made him a source for Antoine Ruffi, future historian of Marseille, who in turn acknowledged Peiresc’s contributions (Aix, Bib. Méjanes, 211 (1029) Ruffi to Peiresc 17 January 1637, 21 March 1637, 24 March 1637, 161-163.)

This explains his close attention to Pisan and Genoese genealogies. On Pisa see, for example, Peiresc to Gaetano, 6 March 1637, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1873, fol.172v. On Genoa, for example, Peiresc to Boerio, 6 December 1633, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., 1872, fol. 384bis r; R.P. Agostino Schiaffino to Peiresc, 4 January 1634, Paris, B.N., MS. F.fr. 9540, fol.106r-108v—a fascinating account of histories and chronicles of Genoa—and Peiresc to R.P. Agostino Schiaffino, 31 May 1634, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., 1872, fol. 386r. For the Grimaldi/Grimaud family, see Peiresc to Luca de’ Grimaldi, 18 November 1632, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1873, fol.598r.

Gassendi, Mirrour, year 1, p.13; Gassendi, Opera Omnia, V, 243.

Generation I: Hugh Fabry, a Pisan, had three sons. Generation II: Jean Fabry, “dit le Pisan oncle de Hugues avec qui il passa outremer avec le comandement de quelque navire” (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1882, fol.389); Generation III: Geoffroy “filz de Pierre Fabry, nommé devant Gentilhomme Chancellier entre les citoyens d’Ieres de l’adveu desquelz les Citoiens de Marseille aechterent Ieres d’Amiel de Fos et de ses enfans avec le Chateau de Breganson Au moyen de quoy ceux d’Ieres estoient agregez aux privileges maritimes des Marseillois & en la faculté de la pesche depuis Breganson jusqu’a l’Isle de la Corrente qui est la Tour de Bouq” (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1882, fol.389); Generation IV: “Hugues Fabry conseiller par la mesme traditione fut au passage du Roy St Louis en terre Ste soubz le comte Charles Ier de Provence avec Jean son frere et Marie de Soleriis sa femme avec son fiz Aycard lors bien Jeane. Et au retour d’oultre mer eu le commandemnt du Chateau d’Ieres & l’intendance des nouvelles....” (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1882, fol.389); Generation V: his son Aycard Fabry “S’il estoit loisible d’alleguer une simple traditive domestique cet Aycard fit le voyiage de Tunis soubs le Roy Charles Ier ou mourut le Roy St Louis l’an 1270 en Aout & avoir succedé a Huges son pere tant au commandement du Chateau qu’en l’intendance des fortifications de toute la ville aprez avoir fait on autre voyage d’Oultremer en fort bas age” (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1882, fol.389); Generation VI: Aycard’s nephew Guillaume Fabry de Soleriis “fondateur avec patronnage d’un nouvel hospital a Ieres pour les pelerins du St passage d’Outremer...Il estoit homme de lettres fort versé en la philosophie naturelle &
avoit faict de grans pelerinages aux guerres d’Oultremer y exerciant les offices de pieté & de charité avec un tel goust qu’il ne voulu pas espargner à l’usage & dotation desdits fondations sa propre maison avec son jardin de toute sa librairie ou le prix d’icelle” (Carp., Bib. Ingouimb., MS. 1882, fol.389). A concise summary said to be prepared by Peiresc but in a different hand is in Paris, B.N., MS. F.fr. 20262, fol.1.


52 Michel Foucault, “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History,” in Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews, ed. D.F. Bouchard (Ithaca, 1977), 140, 155. Foucault’s careful analysis of Nietzsche’s changing assessment of antiquarianism (from negative in The Untimely Meditations to positive in Human All too Human once reinterpreted as genealogical) is at 162, 164. This obviously builds on his notion of the “archive” as not an inert repository but a system of multiple possibilities (Michel Foucault, The Archaeology of Knowledge (New York, 1972), 7,76,129.

53 It is worth noting that graphical forms of genealogical representation are very little studied. Christiane Klapisch-Zuber’s outstanding L’ombre des Ancestres. Essai sur l’imaginaire médiéval de la parenté (Paris: Fayard, 2000) focuses on vertical arborial schemes. Horst Bredekamp’s brilliant treatment of Darwin’s preference for a coraline over arborial representation of evolution is couched precisely in terms of the former’s ability to represent better the inherent instability of life courses over time (Darwins Korallen. Die frühen Evolutionsdiagramme und die Tradition der Naturgeschichte (Berlin, 2005), ch.2: “Vom Baum zur Koralle, 1837.” Mary Bouquet delves into the ontology underpinning the arborial model but pays no attention to the vine (“Family Trees and their Affinities: The Visual Imperative of the Genealogical Diagram,” The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute, 2 (1996), 60). Daniel Rosenberg and Anthony Grafton do present a few left-to-right “stream of time” charts but do not comment on the different underlying ontologies. (Cartographies of Time: A History of the Timeline (Princeton, 2010), 123, 147). Perhaps Carlo Ginzburg comes closest to evoking the implications of Peiresc’s “messiness” in his fusion of visual resemblance and family tree (“Family Resemblances and Family Trees: Two Cognitive Metaphors,” Critical Inquiry, 30 (2004), 555). Umberto Eco would identify Peiresc’s type of genealogical chart, with its rejection of “the rigid form of the tree,” as characteristic of a “Baroque mentality” (Umberto Eco, The Infinity of Lists (New York, 2009), 231-33). For a bald enumeration of 7 distinct
types of genealogical charts—none of which is exactly Peiresc’s—see Johann Georg Fessmaier, *Grundriss der historischen Hilfswissenschaften vorzüglich nach Gatterers Schriften zum akademischen Gebrauche bearbeitet* (Landeshut, 1802), 42-9.

54 For example, Pierre d’Hozier’s genealogy of the Dukes of Brege & Lignitz and Brege & Glogovie (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1801, fols. 75r-76v). D’Hozier’s printed broadside “Table Genealogique pour montrer la parenté qu’il y a entre Mr le Duc de Lorraine & Mr. le Marquis de Breval” is even more limited, vertical and abstract (Carp., Bib. Inguimb, MS. 1801, fol.215v, author’s signed presentation copy to “Messieurs Du Puy par l’autheur”).

55 Foucault, “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History,” 140.


57 Malinowski assesses the genealogical chart in exactly this way: “Its value as an instrument of research consists in that it allows the investigator to put questions which he formulates to himself in abstracto, but can put concretely to the native informant. As a document, its value consists in that it gives a number of authenticated data, presented in their natural grouping....” (Bronislaw Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (Prospect Heights, IL, 1984 [1st edn 1922], 15.


60 The question is not posed, for instance, in Gregor Rohamnn, ‘Eines Erbaren Raths gehorsamer amptman’. *Clemens Jäger und die Geschichtsschreibung des 16.*
Jahrhunderts (Augsburg, 2001), despite its deep engagement with Jäger as historian and genealogist.

61 For example, in Peiresc’s dossier on Marseille we come across an excerpt documenting a Pierre de Cerveris buying half a windmill from Jean, Jehannet and Samsette Pascal in 1390, a Bertrand d’Agout of Marseille conveying the Chateau of Cabries to Olivier d’Agout his brother, and to Bertrand his nephew a house in the part of Marseille “long called” Jerusalem, and the comune of Sixfours purchasing the right to make olive oil on property of the abbey of St Victor. Carp., Bib. Inguimb. MS. 1853, fols. 123r; 125r; 124r. These examples could be multiplied many times over. While students of early modern epigraphy from Momigliano onwards have made the connection between inscriptions and the history of institutions, careful reading of the Smetius-Lipsius or Scaliger-Gruter syllogae shows that names were everywhere. (See William Stenhouse, Reading Inscriptions & Writing Ancient History. Historical Scholarship in the Late Renaissance (London, 2005), esp. 149-60.)

62 Peiresc’s genealogical “focus” made him especially attentive to the power of lists, which mimicked continuity over time. This is where chronology could blur into genealogy, as in lists of the bishops of Marseille and Aix from late antiquity to the sixteenth century (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1855, fol.355r; MS. 1857, fols.1-8; MS. 1859, fols. 10-13). This same approach could also underpin the study of political units: viz. for Aquitaine ((Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1792, fol. 178bis), Rome (fol. 180), Provence (fol. 182), Norsemen (fol. 184-85), Saxons (fol. 190), “Alamannorum” (fol. 192).

63 It has long been noted that early modern antiquaries devoted a great deal of attention to etymology. This suggests an awareness of the singularity of names and naming that could spill over into non-etymological pursuits. See for example, Linda Van Norden, “Peiresc and the English Scholars,” Huntington Library Quarterly, 12 (1949), 377-8.

Mondragon, Sceytres, Boucicault, Spinola d’Aix, Clémens, Brancas, Oraison, du Blanc, Laudun, Candolle, Portanier, et leurs preuves”; 1853: “Généalogies diverses antiques des princes qui ont regne en Provence...Généalogies et titres pour les maisons de Bulbone, Requiston, Simonas, Carnuti, Grimault, Flota, de Medullione, de la Garde, Melna, Signa, Revigliase, Jarente, Cossa. Registre de Caradet”; 1854: [Recueil de pièces concernant les familles nobles de Provence];

Counts of Provence and Toulouse, and the Vicounts of Marseille (Paris, B.N. MS. N.a.f. 5174, fols. 52v-53r); Counts of Provence before the advent of the House of Barcelona (fols. 53v-54r); fol. 55r; Counts and Toulouse and Provence (fols.58v-59r). Carp., Bib. Inguimb. MS. 1801, fols. 109v-110r; Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1811, fols. 12r-13v, fol. 13v.

Peiresc made a copy of the treaty of Viterbo (1267) which he indexed as “Constantinople, Achaye, Moree” and in the margins referred to the regions under discussion, viz. “Tiers de l’Empire”, “Royaulme d’Albanie et de Servie,” “Royaulme de Salenique” (Carp., Bib. Inguimb. MS. 1798, fols. 647-649). Peiresc also had copied out the confirmation of this treaty seven years later at Foggia (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1798, fol. 655r) and the subsequent agreement of 1281 between Charles of Anjou, Emperor Philippe de Courtenay and Venice securing transport (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1798, fol.658r). Peiresc had a whole cycle of documents from the Latin Kingdom of Constantinople copied out for him (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1798, fols. 643r-645v), including copies of imperial signatures (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1823, fols.224r, 225r, 228r). The register of Philip the Fair for the year 1313 tracks Peiresc’s detailed probing of this would-be empire’s limits (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1837, fols. 46r-47v). A rough count shows that 16 of the 42 excerpta concern the Eastern Mediterranean or the Angevins. The revolt of the “Sicilian Vespers” was also documented by Peiresc (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1843, fols. 3r-8r; Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1837, fol.186r-v).


71 See the essays collected in Miller, Peiresc’s Orient: Antiquarianism as Cultural History in the Seventeenth Century (Ashgate/Variorum, forthcoming).

72 This is the subject of Peiresc and the Mediterranean: Historical Research in the Seventeenth Century (forthcoming).

73 By contrast: “The historian who takes a seat in Philip II’s chair and reads his papers finds himself transported into a strange one-dimensional world, a world of strong passions certainly, blind like any other living world, our own included, and unconscious of the deeper realities of history, of the running waters on which our frail barks are tossed like cockle-shells.” Braudel, The Mediterranean, I, 21.


75 Others may have noted its existence, such as Hugo Grotius, who mentions it in De Jure Belli (1623) Ill.1.v, but the more substantial discussions are all substantially later: viz. Arnold Vinnius, Petri Peckii in titt. Dig. & Cod. ad rem nauticam pertinentes, commentarii, (Leiden, 1647); Étienne Cleirac (1583-1657) Les us et coutumes maritimes (Bordeaux, 1661); Ducange in his Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Latinitatis (1678) entry, “Consules.” See D.A. Azuni, Droit Maritime de l’Europe, 2 vols. (Paris, 1805), and most recently Julia Schweitzer, Schiffer und Schiffsmann in den Rôles d’Oléron und im Llibre del Consolat de Mar (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2006) esp. 19-22, 28-30.

76 See Peiresc to Dupuy, 8 April 1627, Lettres de Peiresc, I, 196; [?] May 1627, I, 233.


78 Peiresc to Dupuy, 18 December 1627, Lettres de Peiresc, I, 454.

79 Holstenius had himself informed Peiresc of his discovery in Cotton’s Library of a text on Mediterranean navigation and nautica. But the accompanying chart was missing and it makes sense that Peiresc would seek it out through his maritime contacts. See Miller, “Mapping Peiresc’s Mediterranean: Geography and Astronomy, 1610-1636,” Observation in Early Modern Letters (1500-1650), ed. Dirk van Miert (London-Oxford, 2010); Patrick Gautier Dalché, Carte Marine et portulan au XIIle siècle. Le Liber de Existencia
Riveriarum et forma maris nostri Mediterranei (Pise, circa 1200), (Rome, 1995), 1-3, 102.


81 Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1775, fol. 3r. “Memoires et Instructions pour ce qui est des recherches des vieux livres MSS du Consulat de la Mer qui se peuvent faire a Barcellone.”

82 Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1775, fol. 3r ; Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1769, fol.577r.

83 Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1775, fol. 4r.

84 Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1775, fols. 4v-5r.

85 Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1775, fol.5r.

86 Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1775, fol.5r: “De s’inhonmer particulierement des officiers de la marine en ladit ville de Barcelonne, ou autres personnes curieuses de vieulx livres, s’il se trouveroit un ou plusieurs libvres escriptes à la main, soit en parchemin ou en papier, ou aulcuns registres de ladit cour des consuls de mer, ou d’autres tribunaux de justice, ou bien dans les Archives de l’Hostel de Ville de Barcellone. Dans lesquels registres, ou livres MSS fussent inserees lesdits loix ou coutumes de la mer.”

87 “Particulierement aux cinq premiers articles, and principalement au cinquiesme concernant l’approbation qu’on presuppose avoir esté faicte à Marseille. Et s’il s’en trouve ou lesdits articles soient inserez, il les fault collationner exactement, <mot par mot et> lettre par lettre, et marquer au marge de ladit coppie cy joincte toutes les diverses leçons et differances qui s’y recongoostront, soit aux chiffres & nombres, ou aux noms props, ou au restant des paroles desdit articles quand mesmes il sembleroit qu’il y eust de l’incongruité, afin d’y pouvoir fonder telles conjectures qui y pourront eschoier.”

88 Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1775, fols. 5r—v ; Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1792, fol. 578v.

89 Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1775, fols. 5v.

90 Peiresc seems first to have come into contact with him as the Superior whose permission was required for Father Théophile Minuti’s voyage to the Levant as Peiresc’s agent in 1629. Peiresc’s first surviving letter to Father François is a thank you note for granting said permission, dated to 14 February 1629 (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1876,
Jean François arrived in Barcelona at the end of April 1629 (Jean François to Peiresc, 8 May 1629, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1816, fol.243r).

Whereas the other memo was not located in time or space, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1816, fol.229-31 is indexed as "SCHEDAE/ RUIPOLLENSES/ & BARCINONAE/ par le P. Jean François Provincial des Miimes allant au Chapitre à Barcellone. 1629".

Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1816, fol. 230r: "ou fussent attachez les vieux seaulx, prendre la description d'iceulx la plus exacte que faire se pourrà... Et si on les pourroit faire mouller et en prendre des empreintes au moins du visage ce la seroit bien curieux."


Paris, B.N., MS. N.a.f. 5171, Peiresc to Roumolles, 1 June, 1609, fol.708, published in Lettres de Peiresc, V, 231-33. At least some of this iconographic research project was completed, and survives (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1784, fols. 119-31). The titlepage at fol. 119 reads "PORTRAITS DES PRINCES ET PRINCESSES DE LA MAISON D'ANIOU apportez d'Angers par le Prieur de Roumoules.") These include a fine pencil sketch of Marie of Provence, sister of René of Anjou and wife of Charles VII, and beautiful miniature paintings of Louis II and his wife Yolande of Aragon (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1784, fols. 122r and 125v-126r. There is also the drawing of an unidentified female tomb sculpture (fol. 124r).

"...ne'quali non dubito che non si trovassero, sigili dove siamo rappresentate le lor figure, con gli habiti ô arme usate in que' secoli." Peiresc to Barberini, undated [late 1625?], Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS. Barberini-Latina 6503, fol.1r.

Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1816, fol.230v. Louis Aubery, one of Peiresc's helpers in the Barberini famiglia, for his part, explained to Peiresc that the Cardinal prevented him from leaving the legation in Madrid and going to Barcelona to do this research (Aubery to Peiresc, 17 October 1626, Paris, B.N., F.fr. 9542, fol.218v).

Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1816, fol.231r: "Pour bien reconoistre si la maniere des portraits qu'on trouvera là, aura de la correspondance <à la maniere> a l'antique [sic] du temps de ce prince, on a joinct à ce memoire une couple de petits monnoyes d'argent battue en Provence de l'authorité dudit Roy Aldefons [sic] le Chaste, lors qu'il en possedoit la souveraineté."
Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1816, fol. 231r: “& pour juger s’il y a du rapport des uns aux autres attendue que s’il ne s’y en trouve, c’est une marque infaillible que les portraits ne seroit pas fidelles, attendu que ceux de la monoye du temps ne peuvent pas estre revocquez en doubte, pour la façon des habillements, ou couronnes, & de porter barbe ou non. Car pour la ressemblance du visage, la pettitesse des monoyes ne souffroit pas d’y pouvoir estre exactement observee par des ouvriers si grossiers que ceux de ce temps là.”

Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1816, fol. 231r: “a fin de comparer le portrait dudit Prince (qui y est representé rasé ayant une couronne fort simple et grossiere), avec les portraits ou statües des tombeaux ou des frontispieces d’eglises, ou des autels, vitres, reliquaires, calices & autres vases de l’église Et autres lieux, ou tels portraits pourroient avoir esté conservez.”


Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1816, fol. 231r. The Minim’s father’s researches—on the abbots of Ripoll from 888 (fols. 233-234r) or the epitaphs of Raymond Berenger (fol. 235r) and his donations to the monastery (fols. 236-237), including inscriptions and monograms (fol. 238)—were sent to Peiresc.

P. Jean François to Peiresc, 16 May 1629, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1816, fol. 245r. Underlining is Peiresc’s.

Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1881, fol. 70r, 71r.

Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1881, fol. 71r.


But note that Philip I was King in 1102, that the future Louis VI was not in Acre in 1102, and that Acre was itself not captured from the Muslims until 1104.

Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1775, fols. 9r-10

Peiresc to Dupuy, 16 May 1627, Lettres de Peiresc, I, 230.

In April 1617 Peiresc wrote from Paris to a friend from his law school days in Padua, Lorenzo Pignoria. “Ho veduto mentione di un certo libro stampato in Cypro gia lungo tempo in folgio piccolo intitolato le Assise di Gierusalem, tradotto dalla lengua Francese vecchia in volgare Italiana ove si contengono le leggi editti pragmatiche & altre ordinationi fatte in oriente da’ prncipi Francesi. Et ho inteso che nella libraria di San Marco ce ne un essemplare MS in lengua Francese di que tempi, sarebbe cosa molto meritevole di trovare un essemplare di detta editione & farlo ristampare ò vero se si potesse haver copia dell’original Francese, Io facessimo stampare qui prout iacet nell’originale con una version appresso, come si fece gia del Villardoin.” Peiresc to Pignoria, 12 April 1617, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1875, fol. 338v. There was a Venetian copy of the Assises, and also an earlier printing (see Grandeclaude, “Classement sommaire”).


Peiresc to Dupuy, 16 May 1627, *Lettres de Peiresc*, I, 221. He repeated this in his letter of 5 June 1627, *Lettres de Peiresc*, I, 265. Peiresc’s own archive shows that these letters were actually written a month later.

The cover letter to Danmartin mentioned a request for a book, but the letter to Espannet himself referred to an enclosed list of books to buy, now missing, mentioning in passing that he expected these might be found “in the hands of Christian priests or other inhabitants of the Kingdom of Cyprus.” Peiresc to Danmartin, 24 June 1627, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1876, fol. 615r; Peiresc to Espanet, 24 June 1627, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1876, fol. 615v.


Paris, B.N., MS. N.a.f. 5169, fol. 29r, for 28 November 1627.

To Dupuy, on 8 December 1627, Peiresc noted that there were three manuscripts sitting in quarantine in the bay of Marseille, and that he also expected to receive a copy of the 1535 Venice edition of the *Assises* within a few days. *Lettres de Peiresc*, I, 436. The copy was in his hand a day later (Peiresc to Dupuy, 9 December 1627, *Lettres de Peiresc*, I, 441-2.

Paris, B.N., MS. N.a.f. 5169, fol. 29v, for 13 December 1627.

In fact, it was the December shipment which bagged one of Peiresc’s greatest catches, the *Eclogues* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. See Peiresc to Dupuy, 18-25 December 1627, *Lettres de Peiresc*, I, 444-50. The manuscript was published by Henri de Valois—dedicatee of Gassendi’s *Vita Peireskii*—in 1638.

Peiresc to Espannet, 13 December 1627, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1873, fols. 122v-123r. “...des loix maritimes du Consulat de mer ou pour mieux dire des negotiantz, au long de la marine & des armementz de mer, encore que ce livre se soit imprimé soient en diverse langues, Catalane, Francoise, ou Italien...ne vous lassez point en la recherche du livre de LA HAULTE COURT ou des ASSISES & bonne usage du ROYALME DE IERUSALEM. Et en celluy de la BASSE COURT, ou de la Cour du Vicomte de duc [sic] Bourgoine que se trouvent communement jointz ensemble et quand mesme vous rencontrerez de ceux qui furent traduictz en Italien et imprimez a Venizé l’an 1535 soubz le tiltre de LALTA CORTE” (fol.123r).


Paris, B.N., MS. N.a.f. 5169, fol. 33r, 26 May 1628. The copy of the “Assises de Jerusalem” that Peiresc obtained from Cardinal Francesco Barberini in May 1628 was
made from an early fifteenth-century copy of a version produced on Cyprus in 1369. On its first page Peiresc wrote “Ce manuscrit est un des plus rares et des plus curieux de la bibliotheque vaticane, Monsig.’ le Cardinal Barberin me le fit transcrire non sans grand soin et peine” (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1786, fol.1r). We now know that the Roman copy was the sole exemplar of a second recension of the Assises and Peiresc’s endeavor to obtain a copy brought it to France, where he had it copied for the Dupuy—(now Paris, B.N., MS. Dupuy 652). It was the progenitor of 6 manuscript copies, as well as the first printed edition, edited by G. Thaumas de La Taumassière, *Coutumes de Beauvoisies, par Messire Philippes de Beaumanoir Bailly de Clermont en Beauvoisisis.*

Assises et bons usages du royaume de Jerusalem, par Messire Jean d’Ibelin comte de Japhe et d’Ascalan, sire de Rames et de Baruth. Et autres anciennes coutumes le tout tiré des Manuscripts (Bourges, 1690).

127 In 1631 Peiresc drew up a shopping list for Espannet (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1769, fol.242r-v).


129 Peiresc to Dupuy, 18 December 1627, *Lettres de Peiresc,* I, 452.

130 Peiresc to [De Loches], 14 December 1628, Carp. Bib., Inguimb., MS. 1876, fol. 374r. In Peiresc’s register of outgoing correspondence this letter is listed as sent to a “P._____ Cappucin de Seyde” (Paris, B.N. MS. N.a.f. 5169, fol.37v). We know that de Loches arrived there in 1626 but that it was only F.A. de Thou’s visit which brought him into Peiresc’s network.

131 “Pour ce que memoire d’houme est desfaillant, car l’home faut que a mourir luy convient, pour ce convient a mettre en escript our savoir les choses passées, car se escrire n’en fust nous ne savons rien les fais, ne les dis des anciens, qui sont trespasses grant tans a de ce siecle. Et pour ce avons vouleu faire cette remembrance de partie de la gent de sa mer, cest a savoir du Royaume de Jerusalem & de Chipre, d’Antioche et
de Ermenie & de Triple pour savoir dont il sont estraict & venu & pour ce que li Roy ont estes & sont chef des autres nous commencerons premierent d'eau … Ci dit des Roys de Jerusalem....” Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1786, fol. 403r (orthography is corrected in the edition of Rome, B.A.V., MS. Vaticana-Latina 4789 printed in Lignages d’Outremer, 85). Peiresc would have found this sentiment especially congenial; see Miller, Peiresc’s Europe, ch.5.

132 A sample of this texture is an account of the heirs of Gui de Milli of Bessan (the modern Beit She’an): “The first Lord of Bessan was the brother of Lavene of Bessan, and married Betune and had a son Adam, who was Lord of Bessan, and married a wife and had a son Gremont who was Lord of Bessan, and married Agnes the daughter of Hugh Lord of Giblet, and had four sons and three daughters: Ades, Gautier and Amauri, and Philippe, Richet, Isabeau & Estefemie. Amauri and Philippe dying, Richent married Baudian of Ibelin, as was said. Isabeau married the Constable of Tabarie. Estefemie married Philippe le Rous and had Isabeau who was the mother of Emeri, Barlais. Ades married Helius the daughter of Henri the Buffalo.” (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1786, fols. 415v-416v). In later generations of this family we also find Porcellets (viz. Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1786, fols. 417r, 419r).

133 “L’imprimeur au lecteur,” Le Consulat, contenant les Loix, Statuts, Costumes touchant les Contracts, marchandises, & negociation Maritime (Aix, 1635).

134 Peiresc to Gaetano, 6 March 1637, Carp. MS. 1873, fol.172v (post-script): “Saprei volintiere ancora se le ha mai passato per le mani alcun MSS.° del libro ord.° del Consulato di Mare, in lengua volgare Francese ò Catalana, ò Provenzale, che se ne caverrebbe forzi qualche frutto, principalmente della sottoscrittione de prencipi et Republiche della Christianità che concorsero à fame l’approbation fra le quali quella di Pisa fu deli prime, che diedero il moto all’altri. Et se in Roma si trovarebbe alcuna memoria nelli registri publici del Campidoglio, ò d’altrove dove si facesse mentione delle leggi maritime antique & deli consoli stabiliti per eseguirle.” A second, and final, letter from Peiresc to Gaetano, written only a few weeks before his death, shows Peiresc still hunting for sources, thanking him for the news “che nell’Archivio della Reformassioni [Reformed Franciscans?] di Firenze si conservano ancora gli stromenti & privileggi antiqui della Repub. di Pisa.” Peiresc to Gaetano, 3 June 1637, Paris, B.N. MS. Naf. 5172, f.81r [= Carp. Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1873, f.177r]. For more on Gaetano, see José Ruysschaert, “Constantino Gaetano, OSB, Chasseur de manuscrits. Contribution a

135 Peiresc to Gaetano, 6 March 1637, Carp. MS. 1873, fol.172v: “i primi da Christiani a dar intaccio all’imperio maritimo che da tanti anni prima possederano li Saraceni & di acquistar una buona parte.”

136 This passage, in which he refers to “vir sane eruditissimus clarissimusque Claudius Nicolaus Fabricius Peyrescius Gallus, de litteris deque litteratis bene merentissimus” is in notes on Pandolpho’s life of Pope Gelasius II, printed in Ludovico Muratori, Rerum Italicarum scriptores (vol. 3, part I, 402ff) and quoted in Jean-Marie Pardessus, Collection de lois maritimes antérieures au XVIIIe siècle, 6 vols (Paris, 1828-45), 12. Pardessus shows that Gaetano’s patriotic history was false (14-15).

137 Capmany was the first person to question the authenticity of this document in his Memorias historicas sobre la marina, &c., de Barcelona according to Pardessus, Collection de lois maritimes antérieures, 5. Pardessus’ demolition of the ratification dates by source critique is most thorough (7-11).

138 The Lignages d’Outremer would only be published in the later nineteenth century amidst French enthusiasm for Outremer. Might du Cange have known anything about Peiresc’s researches? This is likely, but it is a question no one has asked. The new edition of the Lignages d’outremer does not even indicate Peiresc’s ownership of the paradigmatic manuscript.


140 Jean Richard, in Le Comté de Tripoli sous la dynastie toulousaine (1102-1187) (Paris, 1945), 90. I follow Peiresc’s spelling, though the current convention is “Porcelet.”

141 Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, 1845. The scale of this dwarfs the scope of Peiresc’s study of other families, even substantial studies, such as that devoted to the Villeneuve
family of Les Arcs and later Vence, see Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1848, fols. 109-209; MS. 1881, fols. 304r-330v.

142 For example, Carp., Bibl. Inguimb., MS. 1844, fol. 11r, fol. 21r; Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1845, fols. 43-47.


145 Jean Richard, “Le comté de Tripoli dans les chartes du fonds des Porcellet,” Bibliothèque de l’École des chartes, 130 (1972), 339-382, at 366. I thank Brigitte Bedos-Rezak for bringing this to my attention. Martin Aurell has linked the rise in surviving
documentation on the Porcellet family with the installation of the Military Orders in the Camargue and Rhone regions (Actes de la famille Porcellet d'Arles (972-1320).


146 Carp., Bib. Inguimb. MS. 1844, fol. 21v.

147 Aurell identifies the themes of these documents with the “multiples facettes de la société, les pouvoirs, la religion ou l'économie en Méditerranée occidentale” (Actes de la famille Porcellet d'Arles (972-1320), xii). Aurell notes the existence of Peiresc’s two volumes in Carpentras but seems not to have viewed them. Moreover, he assimilates Peiresc’s purpose to Pierre d’Hozier’s interest in verifying proofs of nobility (xix-xx).


148 One document (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, fols.292r-95), unlike many of the others, was created as a digest and was arranged chronologically, rather than by a given document’s foliation. We also find sub-sections devoted to specific locations (Fos and Maillane: Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, fol. 293v; Provence: Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, fol.295r-v). A fair copy of this is found in Avignon, Bibl. Municipale, MS. 4880, fols. 56-77.


150 Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, fols. 298, fol.342r. This was found in “Reg. re Regis Caroli I signato 1271, Ira B. fol.87.” A first passage is marked “In registro Regis Caroli Primi signato 1276 Ira A fol. 114” and others follow for the years 1276,1269, 1271,
1275, 1270, 1277, 1274, each given with its precise reference to volume and page
(Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, fols. 342-346.)


The Callot texts resemble the digest in Peiresc’s archive discussed above n118 (Carp. MS. 1845, fols.2-11).

See above, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, fol.421r. Peiresc’s long autograph excerpt from Digne (in an early Latin hand) referring to Guillelmus Porcellet for the year 1324 is followed, condensed, by Callot (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, fol.454r). The excerpt from Sylvacane is not in Peiresc’s hand, and Callot spends less time on it (fol. 452r).

Mention of Peiresc’s battered print was omitted from the earlier twentieth-century printed catalogue of Peiresc’s papers at Carpentras and as a result seems to have escaped the attention of prior researchers (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, fol. 420ter).


Several items in Peiresc’s archive, both manuscript (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, fol. 392v) and printed (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1845, fols. 126bis-131r, fols. 212-216r, 221r-230r, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, MS. 404-12, 413-20), seem to have derived from the Bishop of Toul. Peiresc marked up documents he received from the Bishop (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1844, fol. 421ter-425v; Carp., Bib. Inguimb. MS. 1845, fols. 23-25). An important letter from the Bishop of Toul to Peiresc is dated 16 June 1614 (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1845, fol. 231r). Peiresc documented “shipments” of archival sources to the Bishop of Toul, the last of which was sent in 1616 (Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1845, fol. 247). In 1620 the Bishop of Toul wrote a reply to Peiresc’s request for information on behalf of André Du Chesne for his *Histoire de Montmorancy*. Jean Porcellet de Maillane to Peiresc, 6 June 1620, Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1814, fol.141r.

Peiresc is reading Bongars against an archival document in Carp., Bib. Inguimb., MS. 1811, fol.26r.
For a comprehensive treatment of this theme, see the essays in “Historia”: Empiricism and Erudition in Early Modern Europe, eds. Gianna Pomata and Nancy Siraisi (Cambridge, MA, 2005).

“...detti commissioni, et deposto nell’archivio del Venaisiino dov’erano registrate le commissioni d’ambi le parte, così delle maestri Regii, come delli Apostolica, et altri instrumenti dalli quali si potrebbe imparare la historia di que’ tempi molto più sicura, di tutto questo se n’è poi detto e scritto da persone mal informati, che hanno introdotto mille buggie et sproposti, indigni di memoria. Sendosi al contrario sepolta la vera Historia, et quasi abolita la memoria di cose molte importanti et degna di fede, et di passare alla posterita se da costi sarà permesso, come parere che non vi possa occorrere difficoltà.” Peiresc to Barberini, 31 October 1635, Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS. Barb.-Lat. 6503, fol. 159v.

Gassendi, Mirrour of True Nobility and Gentility, bk.6, 291. Generally on Peiresc and comparison see Miller, “The Antiquary’s Art of Comparison,” 57-94.

Miller, Peiresc’s Europe, 157-8.

Robert Irwin, For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies (London, 2006), 115. For a recent discussion of d’Herbelot, see Nicholas Dew, Orientalism in Louis XIV’s France (Oxford, 2009), chs. 1, 4 and the bibliography there.


Heinrich von Sybel, Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzugs (Leipzig, 1881), 1 edn 1841.


centuries, see Blandine Barret-Kriegel, Jean Mabillon; La défaite de l’érudition; Les Académies de l’histoire (Paris, 1988); Lionel Gossman, Medievalism and the Ideologies of the Enlightenment. The World and Work of La Cure de Sainte-Palaye (Baltimore, 1968) and R. Howard Bloch, God’s plagiarist : being an account of the fabulous industry and irregular commerce of the Abbé Migne (Chicago, 1994).


170 These key figures remain woefully understudied; for Spelman and Dugdale, for example, the best work remains that in English historical scholarship in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries ed. Levi Fox (London, New York, Oxford University Press, 1956); for Duchesne, Emmanuel Bury, “Le ‘Pere de l’Histoire de France’. André Duchesne (1584-1640),” Littératures Classiques 30 (1997), 121-31. Though medievalists are aware of the role of nineteenth-century editors of medieval public documents in shaping these sources, and for material awareness by contemporary practitioners (see the rules formulated by Olivier Guyotjeannin, et al., Diplomatique Médiévale (Brussels, 2006) 3rd edn, 17-21, 397-417), the practice of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century antiquarian editing of medieval documents has up to now been largely unexamined. But see for instance, Sawilla, Antiquarianismus, 244n78, 315-6.

171 Even the cursory reader of the materials collected in Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Schriften und Briefe zur Geschichte, eds. Malte-Ludolf Babin and Gerd van den Heuvel (Hannover, 2004) would be stunned by the brilliance of Leibniz’s evidentiary imagination. Nor, pace Sawilla (Antiquarianismus, 255), does Mabillon the narrative historian sparkle
with anything like the intensity of Mabillon the connoisseur of medieval ink, paper, seals, cursive and formularies.


176 Foucault, whose reinterpretation of Nietzsche by way of Benjamin actually approximates the practice of scholars such as Peiresc was not himself interested in establishing such a genetic account.