**CITATION SCORES FOR GRECO-ROMAN HISTORIANS IN NORTH AMERICA, 2019**

**© Walter Scheidel (Stanford University)**

**Working paper, Stanford University, September 2019 (Version 1.1, with a January 2021 update*)**

## 1. Introduction

This is the third instalment of my bibliometric survey of scholarly impact in the field of Greco-Roman history. In 2008, I compiled what to the best of my knowledge was then the first-ever list of leading citation scores for Greco-Roman historians working in the United States. Three years later, I provided a shorter and somewhat more limited update.[1] I begin by identifying the data and explaining my approach (2), then present the results (3), and conclude by discussing the findings (4).

## 2. Data and method

I gathered references by two different means.[2] As in 2008 and 2011, I performed manual searches using the "Cited Reference Search" in the "All Databases" function of Clarivate Analytics' (formerly Thomson Reuters') "Web of Science" to track down relevant citations.[3] For the first time, I also used Anne-Wil Harzing's "Publish or Perish" software to harvest citations from "Google Scholar."[4] Thanks to its greater range, the latter produces a much larger number of references. Even so, I continued to use "Web of Science" because of its precision and in order to ensure continuity with my previous surveys.[5] What matters is not the absolute number of citations but the relative ranking of scholars: in this regard, discrepancies between the two databases are fairly minor. (In the following, numbers or percentages in italics refer to findings

---

* For the January 2021 update, see page 9.

[1] Walter Scheidel, "Citation scores for ancient historians in the United States," Version 1.0, Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics, February 2008 (http://www.princeton.edu/~pswpc/pdfs/scheidel/020801.pdf); "Updated citation scores for ancient historians in the United States," Version 1.0, Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics, September 2011 (http://www.princeton.edu/~pswpc/pdfs/scheidel/091102.pdf). These in turn continued my earlier studies of trends in academic publishing and employment in Greco-Roman history and Classics more generally: "Continuity and change in classical scholarship: a quantitative survey, 1924 to 1992," *Ancient Society* 28 (1997), 265-289; "Professional historians of classical antiquity in the English-speaking world: a quantitative survey," *Ancient History Bulletin* 13 (1999), 151-156. For recent surveys from different angles, see now Dan-el Padilla Peralta, "Racial equity and the production of knowledge," January 5, 2019, https://www.dropbox.com/s/0gfxoljbi9nsr8r/Padilla%20Peralta%20SCS%202019%20Future%20of%20Classics%20Equity%20and%20the%20Production%20of%20Knowledge%20ed%20w%20tables.pdf?dl=0 (looking at the racial/ethnic background of contributors to several major Classics journals) and Peter Thonemann, "Gender, subject preference, and editorial bias in Classical Studies, 2001-2019," *Council of University Classical Departments Bulletin* 48 (2019) (https://cucd.blogs.sas.ac.uk/files/2019/09/THONEMANN-Gender-subject-preference-editorial-bias.pdf) (on gender biases in 200 "companion" volumes om Classics topics).

[2] All the data were collected between late August and late September 2019.

[3] https://clarivate.com/webofsciencegroup/solutions/web-of-science/, accessed via Stanford University's library system.

[4] https://harzing.com/resources/publish-or-perish.

[5] In 2008 and 2011 I relied exclusively on "Web of Science." In 2013, Nathan Pilkington, "Google Scholar and the Web of Knowledge: citation scores for ancient historians," (https://www.academia.edu/3420110/Google_Scholar_and_the_Web_of_Knowledge_Citation_Scores_for_Ancient_Historians) was the first to employ "Google Scholar" data for this field. See also, from the same year, his "Ancient historians and departmental affiliations: the value of citation scores?" (https://www.academia.edu/3524452/Ancient_Historians_and_Departmental_Affiliations_The_Value_of_Citation_Scores_). By now, "Google Scholar" has matured into a useful tool for the kind of analysis undertaken here.

obtained from "Web of Science.") I mainly used the "Directory of Ancient Historians in the United States and Canada" to identify promising candidates.[6]

For scholars in active faculty positions, I arranged the data in four different ways: by overall score according to "Google Scholar" and "Web of Science" (Tables 1-2, *N*=40), and by adjusting for academic career length proxied by years from PhD (where applicable), again based on each of the two databases (Table 3, *N*=15).

I limited Tables 1-2 to 40 scholars because distances between scores greatly shrink as one moves down the scale, increasing the likelihood of accidental omissions.[7] For this reason, the reliability of the tabulation diminishes close to the bottom of the list. The career-weighted scores in Table 3 are even more sensitive to the risk of omission because it is relatively easy to overlook early-to-mid career scholars (with lower overall scores but higher annualized scores) if the cut-off point is set too low. In this case, the lowest "Google Scholar" score (71.1) included here was followed by a substantial gap, with renewed clustering from the mid-50s downward; I therefore used it as a threshold, which reduces sample size to 15 but ensures a high level of confidence.

Table 4 lists the top 10 retired ancient historians in terms of gross and annualized scores (relying solely on "Google Scholar" to cast the net as widely as possible), and Table 5 amalgamates active and retired scholars' scores for the overall top 15.

It is a much greater challenge to establish compelling criteria for inclusion. I have amended the category "ancient historians," which I used in my previous surveys, to the more precise "Greco-Roman historians," but definitions are bound to remain contested.[8] Any attempt to draw boundaries raises serious questions: are we to include scholars who specialize in the Jewish or early Christian history of the Greco-Roman world, and how are we to separate the study of "history" from that of literature if the latter is employed in the service of cultural history? After all, the very tradition of "Classics," in which much of the work reviewed here is embedded, seeks to erase such distinctions. At the same time, the more inclusive our approach, the more difficult it becomes to undertake any such survey at all. This would be a loss: unattainable perfection needs to give way to "good enough" for this exercise to become feasible.

In an attempt to accommodate different categorizations, I assembled two sets of rankings. The first of them (in Table 1) defines "Greco-Roman historians" quite and probably exceedingly strictly, as scholars in active academic employment whose faculty positions and/or the bulk of their scholarship have fairly consistently shown a strong emphasis on Greek and Roman history in a conventionally narrow sense.[9] Table 2 takes a somewhat more expansive view by including scholars who either started out by meeting these criteria but have since largely (though not necessarily entirely) moved on to other areas of specialization, as well as literature-focused scholars who have frequently made contributions to what would commonly be recognized as Greco-Roman history.[10] Needless to say, this second list – cautiously labeled "broader" rather

[6] http://associationofancienthistorians.org/directory/, compiled and edited by Greg Andersen and Leanne Bablitz and maintained through crowdsourcing. This database is increasingly in need of updating but still adequate for a general survey. For a different crowdsourced database specifically for "female ancient historians," see http://woah.lib.uiowa.edu/, set up by Sarah Bond.

[7] Thus, the record of runner-up in Table 1, Susan Mattern (Georgia, 771/*260*), is virtually indistinguishable from that of no. 40.

[8] This did not involve a substantive change: the "ancient historians" covered in 2008 and 2011 were also Greco-Roman historians.

[9] For instance, this excludes those with a primary affiliation in Religious Studies.

[10] The first category is represented by Victor Hanson, a Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution (formally a unit of Stanford), with an early record of research in ancient history, who self-identifies as a classicist and military historian and whose citations are primarily derived from his historical scholarship rather than from opinion pieces and the like; Danielle Allen (Harvard), whose first book dealt with ancient Greek history but who now works primarily as a political

than "broad" – may still seem too restrictive, not least by excluding some archaeologists. For practical reasons, a substantively comprehensive – let alone universally satisfying – survey remains beyond the reach of a single author with a day job: I can only hope that disagreement with my parameters will motivate others to try their hand at more inclusive assessments.

I draw boundaries tightly, perhaps overly so, relying on self-identification and thematic emphasis in published scholarship. Moreover, my focus on scholars in active employment may occasion criticism: I adopted it to convey a sense of the relative strength of programs at different academic institutions. This excludes mostly emeriti/ae, who are treated separately but also (albeit more selectively) incorporated into this survey.[11] Independent or more loosely affiliated scholars do not fall into either category. In practice, this matters little with respect to top citation scores, which tend to be associated with (current or former) full-time academic employment.[12] Rankings in terms of sales figures or social media impact are of course a different story, and one that would be very much worth telling.

The working premise of "good enough" also applies to this project as such. Humanities scholars commonly remain resistant to metrics that are routinely employed in other areas of academia. This seems increasingly unjustified: one traditional concern – that citations were once harvested only from journals – no longer applies: "Google Scholar" benefits from Google's voracious appetite in scanning vast amounts of information across a wide range of media, and Thomson-Reuters and now Clarivate Analytics have greatly expanded coverage compared to earlier years, and now seek out citations in books as well.[13] Google's global reach has also reduced the Anglocentric focus that used to bedevil "Web of Science" but would in any case only be an issue if we were to compare scholars on a global scale. For my Anglo-only survey, this problem is non-existent.

theorist; and David Cohen, with a rich record of ancient historical scholarship (which accounts for most of his citations) who now works on human rights and international criminal law but also holds a Classics faculty position at Stanford. Amy Richlin (UCLA), Reviel Netz (Stanford), Kathleen Coleman (Harvard), Giulia Sissa (UCLA), Andrew Riggsby (Texas) and Matthew Roller (Johns Hopkins) are the most prominent members of the second category. Several others who were considered did not clear the threshold.

[11] Compare Scheidel 2008 (n.1), 7, for emeriti/ae scores in 2008. My narrower focus on the top tier serves to keep the workload manageable.

[12] The most notable (and perhaps unique) exception is Stanford research scholar Adrienne Mayor (1,419/*480*), who if included in Table 1 would rank 27th (29th) in terms of gross impact and as the fifth- or eighth-highest scoring woman.

[13] In "Web of Science," the "Book Citation Index – Social Sciences & Humanities" commenced in 2005. For journals, the "Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI)" reaches back to 1900 and the "Arts & Humanities Citation Index (AHCI)" to 1975.

## 3. Results

Table 1 Gross impact: top citation scores for North American Greco-Roman historians in active faculty positions (narrow scope)

| Google Scholar | | | Web of Science | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Person | Institution | Score | Person | Institution | Score |
| Ian Morris | Stanford | 10,098 | Josiah Ober | Stanford | 3,681 |
| Josiah Ober | Stanford | 7,348 | Ian Morris | Stanford | 2,875 |
| Richard Saller | Stanford | 6,622 | Richard Saller | Stanford | 1,909 |
| Walter Scheidel | Stanford | 5,883 | Angelos Chaniotis | IAS | 1,379 |
| Angelos Chaniotis | IAS | 3,807 | Walter Scheidel | Stanford | 1,287 |
| Robert Garland | Colgate | 3,310 | Clifford Ando | Chicago | 1,019 |
| Jonathan Hall | Chicago | 3,223 | Robert Garland | Colgate | 1,017 |
| David Potter | Michigan | 2,733 | Richard Talbert[a] | North Carolina | 998 |
| Richard Talbert[a] | North Carolina | 2,592 | Harriet Flower | Princeton | 802 |
| Clifford Ando | Chicago | 2,415 | Jonathan Hall | Chicago | 761 |
| Harriet Flower | Princeton | 2,283 | Ralph Mathisen | Illinois | 761 |
| Arthur Eckstein | Maryland | 2,155 | Arthur Eckstein | Maryland | 719 |
| James Rives | North Carolina | 1,851 | James Rives | North Carolina | 622 |
| Barry Strauss | Cornell | 1,824 | Barry Strauss | Cornell | 611 |
| John Bodel | Brown | 1,691 | Michele Salzman | Riverside | 610 |
| Thomas Figueira | Rutgers | 1,625 | David Potter | Michigan | 592 |
| John Ma | Columbia | 1,598 | Thomas Figueira | Rutgers | 573 |
| Alain Bresson | Chicago | 1,557 | Susanna Elm | Berkeley | 569 |
| Ralph Mathisen | Illinois | 1,542 | John Bodel | Brown | 565 |
| Elizabeth Carney | Clemson | 1,349 | Elizabeth Carney | Clemson | 517 |
| Michele Salzman | Riverside | 1,318 | Noel Lenski | Yale | 512 |
| Thomas McGinn | Vanderbilt | 1,289 | Jon Lendon | Virginia | 509 |
| Peter Krentz | Davidson | 1,201 | Peter Krentz | Davidson | 485 |
| Jon Lendon | Virginia | 1,188 | John Ma | Columbia | 472 |
| Mary Boatwright | Duke | 1,150 | Alain Bresson | Chicago | 463 |
| Susanna Elm | Berkeley | 1,114 | Hagith Sivan | Kansas | 453 |
| Robert Morstein-Marx | Santa Barbara | 1,102 | Mary Boatwright | Duke | 446 |
| Noel Lenski | Yale | 1,076 | Kyle Harper | Oklahoma | 439 |
| Judith Evans-Grubbs | Emory | 1,074 | Michael Kulikowski | Penn State | 437 |
| Jennifer Roberts | CUNY | 1,051 | Thomas McGinn | Vanderbilt | 373 |
| Dennis Kehoe | Tulane | 1,041 | Dennis Kehoe | Tulane | 366 |
| Emma Dench | Harvard | 1,027 | Christer Bruun | Toronto | 361 |
| Hagith Sivan | Kansas | 1,023 | Joseph Manning | Yale | 353 |
| Michael Kulikowski | Penn State | 1,012 | Emma Dench | Harvard | 328 |
| Joseph Manning | Yale | 968 | Sara Forsdyke | Michigan | 324 |
| Richard Billows | Columbia | 910 | Richard Billows | Columbia | 318 |
| Elizabeth Meyer | Virginia | 858 | Elizabeth Meyer | Virginia | 313 |
| Kyle Harper | Oklahoma | 853 | Robert Morstein-Marx | Santa Barbara | 274 |
| Sara Forsdyke | Michigan | 836 | Jennifer Roberts | CUNY | 266 |
| Christer Bruun | Toronto | 790 | Judith Evans-Grubbs | Emory | 264 |

[a] In phased retirement for 2020

Table 2 Gross impact: top citation scores for North American Greco-Roman historians in active faculty positions (broader scope)

| Google Scholar | | | Web of Science | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Person | Institution | Score | Person | Institution | Score |
| Ian Morris | Stanford | 10,098 | Josiah Ober | Stanford | 3,681 |
| Josiah Ober | Stanford | 7,348 | Ian Morris | Stanford | 2,875 |
| Richard Saller | Stanford | 6,622 | Richard Saller | Stanford | 1,909 |
| Walter Scheidel | Stanford | 5,883 | Victor Hanson | Stanford (Hoover) | 1,513 |
| Victor Hanson | Stanford (Hoover) | 4,873 | Angelos Chaniotis | IAS | 1,379 |
| Angelos Chaniotis | IAS | 3,807 | Amy Richlin | UCLA | 1,297 |
| Amy Richlin | UCLA | 3,352 | Walter Scheidel | Stanford | 1,287 |
| Robert Garland | Colgate | 3,310 | Clifford Ando | Chicago | 1,019 |
| Jonathan Hall | Chicago | 3,223 | Robert Garland | Colgate | 1,017 |
| David Potter | Michigan | 2,733 | Richard Talbert[a] | North Carolina | 998 |
| Richard Talbert[a] | North Carolina | 2,592 | David Cohen | Stanford | 932 |
| Clifford Ando | Chicago | 2,415 | Reviel Netz | Stanford | 897 |
| Harriet Flower | Princeton | 2,283 | Harriet Flower | Princeton | 802 |
| Danielle Allen | Harvard | 2,236 | Jonathan Hall | Chicago | 761 |
| Arthur Eckstein | Maryland | 2,155 | Ralph Mathisen | Illinois | 761 |
| Reviel Netz | Stanford | 2,101 | Arthur Eckstein | Maryland | 719 |
| James Rives | North Carolina | 1,851 | Danielle Allen | Harvard | 693 |
| David Cohen | Stanford | 1,836 | Kathleen Coleman | Harvard | 674 |
| Barry Strauss | Cornell | 1,824 | James Rives | North Carolina | 622 |
| John Bodel | Brown | 1,691 | Barry Strauss | Cornell | 611 |
| Kathleen Coleman | Harvard | 1,682 | Michele Salzman | Riverside | 610 |
| Giulia Sissa | UCLA | 1,673 | David Potter | Michigan | 592 |
| Thomas Figueira | Rutgers | 1,625 | Thomas Figueira | Rutgers | 573 |
| John Ma | Columbia | 1,598 | Susanna Elm | Berkeley | 569 |
| Alain Bresson | Chicago | 1,557 | John Bodel | Brown | 565 |
| Ralph Mathisen | Illinois | 1,542 | Elizabeth Carney | Clemson | 517 |
| Elizabeth Carney | Clemson | 1,349 | Noel Lenski | Yale | 512 |
| Michele Salzman | Riverside | 1,318 | Jon Lendon | Virginia | 509 |
| Thomas McGinn | Vanderbilt | 1,289 | Peter Krentz | Davidson | 485 |
| Andrew Riggsby | Texas | 1,209 | John Ma | Columbia | 472 |
| Peter Krentz | Davidson | 1,201 | Alain Bresson | Chicago | 463 |
| Matthew Roller | Johns Hopkins | 1,201 | Hagith Sivan | Kansas | 453 |
| Jon Lendon | Virginia | 1,188 | Mary Boatwright | Duke | 446 |
| Mary Boatwright | Duke | 1,150 | Kyle Harper | Oklahoma | 439 |
| Susanna Elm | Berkeley | 1,114 | Michael Kulikowski | Penn State | 437 |
| Robert Morstein-Marx | Santa Barbara | 1,102 | Matthew Roller | Johns Hopkins | 423 |
| Noel Lenski | Yale | 1,076 | Giulia Sissa | UCLA | 395 |
| Judith Evans-Grubbs | Emory | 1,074 | Thomas McGinn | Vanderbilt | 373 |
| Jennifer Roberts | CUNY | 1,051 | Dennis Kehoe | Tulane | 366 |
| Dennis Kehoe | Tulane | 1,041 | Andrew Riggsby | Texas | 365 |

[a] In phased retirement for 2020

Table 3 Impact adjusted for career length: top mean annual citation scores since completion of doctoral degree for North American Greco-Roman historians in active faculty positions

| Google Scholar | | | Web of Science | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Person | Institution | Score | Person | Institution | Score |
| Ian Morris | Stanford | 297.0 | Josiah Ober | Stanford | 94.4 |
| Walter Scheidel | Stanford | 226.3 | Ian Morris | Stanford | 84.6 |
| Josiah Ober | Stanford | 188.4 | Walter Scheidel | Stanford | 49.5 |
| Richard Saller | Stanford | 161.5 | Richard Saller | Stanford | 46.6 |
| Victor Hanson[a] | Stanford (Hoover) | 124.9 | Clifford Ando | Chicago | 44.3 |
| Jonathan Hall | Chicago | 124.0 | Angelos Chaniotis | IAS | 39.4 |
| Angelos Chaniotis | IAS | 108.8 | Victor Hanson[a] | Stanford (Hoover) | 38.8 |
| Clifford Ando | Chicago | 105.0 | Reviel Netz[a] | Stanford | 37.4 |
| Danielle Allen[ab] | Harvard | 97.2 | Kyle Harper | Oklahoma | 36.6 |
| Harriet Flower | Princeton | 87.8 | Amy Richlin[a] | UCLA | 31.6 |
| Reviel Netz[a] | Stanford | 87.5 | Harriet Flower | Princeton | 30.8 |
| Robert Garland | Colgate | 87.1 | Danielle Allen[ab] | Harvard | 30.1 |
| Amy Richlin[a] | UCLA | 81.8 | Jonathan Hall | Chicago | 29.3 |
| David Potter | Michigan | 78.1 | Robert Garland | Colgate | 26.8 |
| Kyle Harper | Oklahoma | 71.1 | David Cohen[ac] | Stanford | 24.7 |

[a] Scholars in the "broader scope" category (see Table 2)

[b] Measured from first PhD

[c] Measured from PhD (rather than previous JD)

Table 4 Top citation scores for retired North American Greco-Roman historians (Google Scholar)

| Gross scores | | | Annualized scores | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Person | Institution | Score | Person | Institution | Score |
| Peter Brown | Princeton | 20,229 | Peter Brown | Princeton | n/a |
| Ramsay MacMullen | Yale | 8,036 | Brent Shaw | Princeton | 149.0 |
| Glen Bowersock | IAS | 7,682 | Roger Bagnall | NYU | 137.4 |
| William Harris | Columbia | 6,846 | Glen Bowersock | IAS | 134.8 |
| Erich Gruen | Berkeley | 6,831 | William Harris | Columbia | 134.2 |
| Roger Bagnall | NYU | 6,459 | Ramsay MacMullen | Yale | 129.6 |
| Brent Shaw | Princeton | 6,108 | Erich Gruen | Berkeley | 124.2 |
| Sarah Pomeroy | CUNY | 5,582 | Kurt Raaflaub | Brown | 108.7 |
| Kurt Raaflaub | Brown | 5,326 | Sarah Pomeroy | CUNY | 96.2 |
| Christopher Jones | Harvard | 4,560 | Christopher Jones | Harvard | 84.4 |

Table 5 Top citation scores for North American Greco-Roman historians (Google Scholar)

| Gross scores | | | Annualized scores | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Person | Institution | Score | Person | Institution | Score |
| Peter Brown | Princeton | 20,229 | Peter Brown | Princeton | n/a |
| Ian Morris | Stanford | 10,098 | Ian Morris | Stanford | 297.0 |
| Ramsay MacMullen | Yale | 8,036 | Walter Scheidel | Stanford | 226.3 |
| Glen Bowersock | IAS | 7,682 | Josiah Ober | Stanford | 188.4 |
| Josiah Ober | Stanford | 7,348 | Richard Saller | Stanford | 161.5 |
| William Harris | Columbia | 6,846 | Brent Shaw | Princeton | 149.0 |
| Erich Gruen | Berkeley | 6,831 | Roger Bagnall | NYU | 137.4 |
| Richard Saller | Stanford | 6,622 | Glen Bowersock | IAS | 134.8 |
| Roger Bagnall | NYU | 6,459 | William Harris | Columbia | 134.2 |
| Brent Shaw | Princeton | 6,108 | Ramsay MacMullen | Yale | 129.6 |
| Walter Scheidel | Stanford | 5,883 | Victor Hanson | Stanford (Hoover) | 124.9 |
| Sarah Pomeroy | CUNY | 5,582 | Erich Gruen | Berkeley | 124.2 |
| Kurt Raaflaub | Brown | 5,326 | Jonathan Hall | Chicago | 124.0 |
| Victor Hanson | Stanford (Hoover) | 4,873 | Kurt Raaflaub | Brown | 108.7 |
| Christopher Jones | Harvard | 4,560 | Clifford Ando | Chicago | 105.0 |

## 4. Discussion

These are fairly male lists. 10 (*10*) of the 40 scholars in Table 1 are women, or 25%, as are 11 (*10*) in Table 2, which shows that the "broader" definition of Greco-Roman historians does not affect the gender ratio. These numbers conceal greater imbalances at the top: 0 (*1*) women are in the top ten in Table 1 and 1 (*1*) in Table 2, which measure total scores. Greater inclusiveness does make a difference in Table 3, with only 1 (*1*) woman placing in the top 15 based on the "narrow" scope, or 6.7%, as opposed to 3 (*3*) following the "broader" definition, or 20%.

Most importantly, we see change over time. In 2008, *5* of the *38* most-cited active scholars were women (*13.2%*), and in my smaller survey from 2011, *3* of *30* were (*10%*), compared to 7 (*5*) in the top 30 in Table 1 and 7 (*7*) in the top 30 in Table 2 right now, or mostly close to one-quarter. This points to roughly a doubling over the last decade, driven in the first instance by male retirements that allowed women to move up the rankings.[14]

The baseline is of critical importance: are men overrepresented in this survey relative to their overall presence among senior faculty? This does not seem to be the case. In 1999, I found that 21.4% of 504 Greco-Roman historians employed full-time at US academic institutions were women: they accounted for 11.3% of full professors, 25.1% of associate professors, and 40% percent of assistant professors. Canadian rates were similar for full and associate professors but lower for junior faculty.[15] According to the "Committee on the Status of Women and Minority Groups Department Census Report 2006-2007" of the (then) American Philological Association (now Society for Classical Studies), 12 years ago women accounted for 28% of full professors of Classics at US institutions, an imperfect proxy for ancient historians but nonetheless instructive.[16] A more recent survey of Classical Studies at four-year institutions in the US

[14] The highest-scoring woman in my earlier surveys, Sabine MacCormack, passed away in 2012.
[15] Scheidel 1999 (n.1), 152-3. Judging by the 1992 issue of *L'Année Philologique*, about 20% of publications in Greco-Roman history were produced by women: Scheidel 1997 (n.1), 286-7. These metrics are all much in need of updating.
[16] "CSWMG Report on 2006-2007 Department Survey" ((https://classicalstudies.org/sites/default/files/documents/2006_2007DepartmentSurveyReport.pdf).

showed that about 40% of faculty were women in the fall of 2012, and their share in primarily research-oriented institutions and those that offer relevant doctoral programs was effectively the same. While this report does not offer a breakdown by rank, comparison with my 1999 data suggests that a doubling of the share of full professors between 1999 and 2012 is a plausible conjecture.[17] Finally, my own rough-and-ready review of full professors currently specializing in Greco-Roman history at thirteen high-end institutions in North America – prime candidates for inclusion in this survey – points to a similar share, with a little less than a quarter of them women.[18] Taken together, these statistics speak against a significant mismatch between the representation of women in this survey and in the field at large. In view of legitimate concerns that female scholars tend to get less cited than men, this is an encouraging finding. So is the trend toward a stronger presence of women among the most frequently cited scholars, even if we are still a long way from anything like a balanced distribution.[19]

My lists are even more white than they are male, but once again there is reason for hope. We observe an improvement from *1* non-white scholar out of *44* and *30* scholars in 2008 and 2011, respectively (*2.2%* and *3.3%*) to 3 (*3*) out of 40 in 2019, or 7.5%, in Table 1, and to 4 (*4*) out of 40, or 10%, in Table 2. Once again, these rates are not obviously inconsistent with the overall makeup of the field at senior levels.

On a rough and inevitably simplifying count, Roman historians, broadly defined, outnumber Greco-Hellenistic ones 5 to 3. This is comparable to a 6 to 4 skew in employment I observed 20 years ago.[20] In this regard, the current top ten (in Tables 1-2) are an outlier by showing no bias, whereas top-scoring emeriti/ae skew much more strongly in favor of Roman history.[21] Time will tell if this reflects a long-term trend.

Institutional affiliation is highly unevenly distributed.[22] Stanford's showing is particularly strong, continuing a trend that was already visible in the 2008 and 2011 surveys. 4 (*4*) of the top 5 scholars scholars in Table 1 are based at Stanford, as are 5 (*4*) of the top 5 and 7 (*7*) of the top 20 in Table 2. 5 (*4*) of the top 5 and 5 (*6*) of the top 10 in Table 3 are as well. The contrast to the affiliation of the top emeriti/ae in Table 4 is striking, a roster that is dominated by Ivy League institutions. The Stanford scholars' commitment to scholarship that appeals to multiple academic constituencies seems to play a major role in this. The same applies to Peter Brown, who in my 2008 survey already towered above everybody else and continues to do so, and, among deceased luminaries, to Moses Finley and Arnaldo Momigliano.[23]

[17] Susan White, Raymond Chu and Roman Czujko, "The 2012-13 survey of Humanities departments at four-year institutions," College Park, MD: Statistical Research Center, American Institute of Physics, 2014, 176.

[18] 6 out of 27 at Berkeley, Brown, Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Michigan, Penn, Princeton, Stanford, Texas, Toronto, UCLA, and Yale (applying the "narrow" criteria).

[19] E.g., Molly M. King et al., "Men set their own cites high: gender and self-citation across fields and over time," *Socius* 3 (2017), https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2378023117738903; Rachael Pells, "Understanding the extent of gender gap in citations," *Inside Higher Ed*, August 16, 2018, https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/08/16/new-research-shows-extent-gender-gap-citations.

[20] Scheidel 1999 (n.1), 156, for the entire Anglosphere.

[21] In my 2008 survey, Ernst Badian (Harvard), Ramsay MacMullen (Yale), Glen Bowersock (IAS) and Erich Gruen (Berkeley) emerged as the leaders of the emeritus pack. By now, absent Badian, this list is headed by the then still active and now retired Peter Brown (Princeton).

[22] Canada is severely underrepresented relative to its overall demographic weight.

[23] Scheidel 2008 (n.1), 5-6, 8 (Brown), and Walter Scheidel, "Measuring Finley's impact," in Daniel Jew, Robin Osborne and Michael Scott (eds.), *M. I. Finley: an ancient historian and his impact*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016, 288-297, at 294 table 1 (Brown, Finley and Momigliano).

Holders of doctoral degrees from outside the US are strongly represented: 10 (*9*) of the top 22 in Table 1 and 12 (*12*) in Table 2 earned them in Europe. This shows a decline from *15* out of *22* in 2008 that reflects the strength of overseas connections among the current top-ranked emeriti/ae.[24]

Finally, North American historians are holding their own against their colleagues from the UK: with no claim to completeness, a spot check of some of the most likely contenders yields Robin Osborne (Cambridge, 8,381/*2,586*), Mary Beard (Cambridge, 8,094/*2,787*), Greg Woolf (London, 5,525/*1,591*), and Nicholas Purcell (Oxford, 3,346/*2,039*). This strongly suggests that Mary Beard is now the highest-scoring woman in the field anywhere in the world. Overall, the US enjoys a slight edge thanks to Peter Brown's unparalleled stature and two Greek historians at Stanford who have branched out into world history and Political Science, respectively. If any lesson is to be drawn from this, it is that breadth matters. The field would benefit from taking it to heart.

**Update from January 4, 2021**

Ramsay MacMullen, "Top scholars in classical and late antiquity," *History of Classical Scholarship* 2 (2020), 105-114, critiques the 2019 version of this paper (and my earlier work on this topic) as well as Nathan Pilkington's work on citation scores (see above, n.5). Pilkington has published a response, "How and why I count(ed): a response to Ramsay MacMullen," *History of Classical Scholarship* 2 (2020), 181-191. As he points out (185), MacMullen misrepresents the objective of our studies by superimposing his own definition of impact – "whatever shapes people's ideas, values, and behavior" (105) – on our own work. Neither Pilkington nor I have endeavored – or could hope to endeavor – to assess the relative influence of particular scholars of Greco-Roman history. MacMullen's taking us to task for failing to conduct such an assessment on an appropriately comprehensive (and global) scale therefore completely misses the point of our exercise, which is much more modest – namely, the quantification of citation distributions for specified academic populations. Citation scores measure impact in the narrow sense of formal acknowledgment of the work of individual scholars by other scholars, not in the broader sense of scholar's overall intellectual influence on others.

I take this opportunity to update the top four rankings in Tables 2 and 3 (based on Google Scholar accessed on January 3, 2021). These rankings have been fairly stable, which suggests that a couple of updates per decade would be sufficient for keeping track of the overall distribution.[25]

Update of Tables 2 and 3 — Top citation scores (columns 1-3) and top mean annual citation scores since completion of doctoral degree (columns 4-6) for North American Greco-Roman historians in active faculty positions ("broader scope;" Google Scholar)

| | Gross | | | Annualized | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ian Morris | Stanford | 10,657 | Ian Morris | Stanford | 304.5 |
| Josiah Ober | Stanford | 10,340 | Walter Scheidel | Stanford | 268.5 |
| Walter Scheidel | Stanford | 7,519 | Josiah Ober | Stanford | 252.2 |
| Richard Saller | Stanford | 7,480 | Richard Saller | Stanford | 174.0 |

[24] For discussion of the situation in 2008, see Scheidel 2008 (n.1), 4.

[25] The discrepancy between Ober's scores for 2019 and 2021 results from the accidental omission of a high-impact item from the 2019 version. This also resolves the tension between the Google Scholar and Web of Science scores for Morris and Ober in Tables 1-3.