CITATION SCORES FOR GRECO-ROMAN HISTORIANS IN NORTH AMERICA, FALL 2022

© Walter Scheidel (Stanford University)

Working paper, Stanford University, October 1, 2022

1. Introduction

This is the fourth instalment of my bibliometric survey of scholarly impact in the field of Greco-Roman history.[1] 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. In 2019, I put together a redesigned survey, which I briefly updated in early 2021.[2]

Once again, I begin by identifying the data and explaining my approach (2), then I present the results (3) and conclude by briefly discussing the findings (4). In the following, I repeatedly draw on my 2019 paper. Readers interested in discussions of the nature, purpose, value and limitations of a bibliometric approach to the study of ancient Greek and Roman history may wish to consult the 2008, 2011 and 2019 versions of my surveys, as well as the exchange between Ramsay MacMullen and Nathan Pilkington in 2020.[3]

2. Data and method

This is the first installment of my survey that relies exclusively on metrics provided by Google Scholar, accessed through Anne-Wil Harzing's "Publish or Perish" software.[4] Whereas in 2008 and 2011 I performed manual searches using the "Cited Reference Search" in the "All Databases" function of Clarivate

---

[1] All data were collected September 6-8, 2022, with one correction on September 30, 2022. I welcome feedback regarding errors or omissions.

[2] Walter Scheidel, "Citation scores for ancient historians in the United States," Version 1.0, Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics, February 2008; "Updated citation scores for ancient historians in the United States," Version 1.0, Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics, September 2011; "Citation scores for Greco-Roman historians in North America," Working Paper, Stanford University September 2019, updated as "Citation scores for Greco-Roman historians in North America," Version 1.1, Working Paper Stanford University January 2022.
These surveys 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 more recent surveys from different angles, see Dan-el Padilla Peralta, "Racial equity and the production of knowledge," January 5, 2019 (looking at the racial/ethnic background of contributors to several major Classics journals); Peter Thonemann, "Gender, subject preference, and editorial bias in Classical Studies, 2001-2019," *Council of University Classical Departments Bulletin* 48 (2019) (on gender biases in 200 "companion" volumes on Classics topics); and Thomas Leibundgut, "Mind the gap: women authors in Anglophone classical scholarship, 1970-2016," *History of Classical Scholarship* in press (on the gender breakdown for articles published in a large number of Classics journals).

[3] Ramsay MacMullen, "Top scholars in classical and late antiquity," *History of Classical Scholarship* 2 (2020), 105-114 (a critique of the 2019 version of this paper – and my earlier work on this topic – as well as of Nathan Pilkington's work on citation scores, referenced below, n.6); Nathan Pilkington "How and why I count(ed): a response to Ramsay MacMullen," *History of Classical Scholarship* 2 (2020), 181-191 (a response to MacMullen, to be read alongside my comments in the 2021 version of my survey (cited above, n.2), 9). For context, see Ludo Waltman, "A review of the literature on citation impact indicators," *Journal of Infometrics* 10 (2016), 365-391.

[4] https://harzing.com/resources/publish-or-perish (Version 8.2).

Analytics' (formerly Thomson Reuters') "Web of Science" to track down relevant citations,[5] in 2019 I first complemented them with the much richer data gathered by Google Scholar.[6] The latter yields a considerably larger number of references, thereby ensuring more comprehensive coverage.[7] Application of the "Publish and Perish" software is essential in fine-tuning the results.[8]

As on previous occasions, I distinguish between scholars in active faculty positions and all living scholars. I have updated my data presentation to feature total citation counts, the *h*-index, and citation counts adjusted for career length, expressed as the average number of citations per year for the period from the earliest citations of a particular scholar's work to the present. The first tally should be self-explanatory. The *h*-index, which represents the largest number *h* where *h* publications have garnered at least *h* citations each, serves as a single hybrid measure of both productivity and impact.[9] Citations per year (imperfectly[10]) control for differences in cumulative citation counts of younger and older scholars.[11]

Due to time constraints, I limit my presentation to the 25 most cited scholars in active faculty positions for cumulative citation counts (Tables 1 and 2), to the 13 scholars in active faculty positions with time-adjusted citation counts in excess of 100 per annum (Table 3), and to the nine most cited retired scholars, a distinct group in terms of citation volume (Table 4),[12] followed by a top ten list for all scholars, ranked according to both cumulative and time-adjusted counts (Table 5).[13]

---

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

[6] In 2013, Nathan Pilkington, "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?".

[7] Google Scholar is better at harvesting citations in Humanities fields than more restrictive databases: Ann-Wil Harzing and Satu Alakangas, "Google Scholar, Scopus and the Web of Science: a longitudinal and cross-disciplinary comparison," *Scientometrics* 106 (2016), 787-804. Nevertheless, much work remains to be done: e.g., Giovanni Colavizza, Silvio Peroni and Matteo Romanello, "The case for the Humanities Citation Index (HuCI): a citation index by the Humanities, for the Humanities," *International Journal on Digital Libraries* June 30, 2022.

[8] There are several reasons for this. (1) Scholars in this field rarely maintain Google Scholar author pages that display citation counts and related metrics. (2) Google Scholar author pages need to be carefully curated to eliminate spurious references that can inflate total tallies, but that care is not always taken. (3) "Publish and Perish" (PoP) makes it possible to establish more accurate cumulative tallies than Google Scholar author pages that sometimes (and rather inexplicably) omit some publication/citation years (as I have observed on my own page and on several others), which inaccurately depresses overall tallies. Using PoP, automatically generated totals can be checked by exporting the results into Excel and performing independent additions. That said, in very rare cases even PoP's coverage may be incomplete: I noticed that it omits citations of one of my articles (in a case where my surname was garbled by the publisher during subsequent digitization) whereas my Google Scholar author page recognizes and includes those references.

[9] The *h*-index was first proposed by Jorge E. Hirsch, "An index to quantify an individual's scientific research output," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 102 (2005), 16569-16572, and is now a standard feature of Google Scholar author pages and the "Publish or Perish" software. In three cases (Peter Brown, David Cohen and Robert Morstein-Marx) the complexities of the search process (due to the authors' names) made it impossible to provide an *h*-index result.

[10] I say "imperfectly" because the citation counts of very senior scholars are constrained by the smaller number of both scholars and publications several decades ago, which reduced the opportunities of being cited relative to those more recently enjoyed by less senior peers; moreover, citation frequency tends to decline as publications age. For these reasons, my comparative evaluations of actively employed scholars carry somewhat greater weight than those that include retired scholars.

[11] In the present survey, I have replaced years since PhD (which I used in earlier versions) with years of publishing, which reflects usage in "Publish or Perish" and provides a more consistent divisor of cumulative citation counts.

[12] I exclude University of Toronto emeritus Timothy Barnes (9,946; *h*-index: 44; c/y: 181) who has long been affiliated with the University of Edinburgh,

[13] My earlier surveys offer more expansive rankings.

As I explained in my 2019 survey, it is quite a challenge to establish compelling criteria for inclusion (or rather, exclusion). Instead of repeating myself here, I refer readers to that earlier discussion.[14] As in the 2019 version, I present two sets of rankings. The first one 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 conventional sense. The other one adopts 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 more literature-focused scholars who have frequently made contributions to what would commonly be recognized as Greco-Roman history. Needless to say, even this second list – cautiously labeled "broader" rather than "broad" – may still seem too restrictive, most notably by failing to accommodate archaeologists.

As I already pointed out on previous occasions, I draw boundaries tightly, perhaps overly so, relying on job descriptions, self-identification and thematic emphasis in published scholarship. Moreover, my focus on scholars in active employment may prompt criticism: I adopt 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 are also (albeit more selectively) incorporated into this survey. 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 very closely associated with (current or former) full-time academic employment.[15]

3. Results

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

Person	Institution	Score	*h*-index	Citations/year (rounded)
Ian Morris	Stanford	12,794	47	355
Josiah Ober	Stanford	12,537	40	285
Walter Scheidel	Stanford	10,296	53	298
Richard Saller	Stanford	7,935	33	180
Greg Woolf	UCLA	7,667	41	219
Angelos Chaniotis	IAS	6,601	42	178
Jonathan Hall	Chicago	4,632	21	145
Clifford Ando	Chicago	4,122	28	147
Richard Talbert*	North Carolina	3,775	24	74
Harriet Flower	Princeton	3,578	22	115
David Potter	Michigan	3,490	26	92
James Rives	North Carolina	2,851	24	73
Ralph Mathisen	Illinois	2,618	26	61
John Bodel	Brown	2,606	25	59
John Ma	Columbia	2,539	21	67

[14] Scheidel 2019, 2-3 (cited above, n.2).

[15] The most notable exception is Stanford research scholar Adrienne Mayor (2,572; *h*-index: 19; c/y: 70), who if included in Table 2 would rank 18th in terms of gross impact and as the third-highest scoring woman.

Barry Strauss	Cornell	2,467	22	49
Kyle Harper	Oklahoma	2,396	18	160
Thomas Figueira	Rutgers	2,302	25	51
Joseph Manning	Yale	2,189	23	61
Noel Lenski	Yale	2,028	24	72
Robert Morstein-Marx	Santa Barbara	1,947		53
Michele Salzman	Riverside	1,942	20	47
Jon Lendon	Virginia	1,859	13	56
Susanna Elm	Berkeley	1,680	16	47
Peter Krentz	Davidson	1,669	19	39

* in phased retirement

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

Person	Institution	Score	*h*-index	Citations/year (rounded)
Ian Morris	Stanford	12,794	47	355
Josiah Ober	Stanford	12,537	40	285
Walter Scheidel	Stanford	10,296	53	298
Richard Saller	Stanford	7,935	33	180
Greg Woolf	UCLA	7,667	41	219
Angelos Chaniotis	IAS	6,601	42	178
Victor Hanson	Stanford (Hoover)	6,507	30	141
Jonathan Hall	Chicago	4,632	21	145
Danielle Allen	Harvard	4,158	24	130
Clifford Ando	Chicago	4,122	28	147
Richard Talbert*	North Carolina	3,775	24	74
Harriet Flower	Princeton	3,578	22	115
David Potter	Michigan	3,490	26	92
Reviel Netz	Stanford	3,016	21	112
James Rives	North Carolina	2,851	24	73
Ralph Mathisen	Illinois	2,618	26	61
John Bodel	Brown	2,606	25	59
John Ma	Columbia	2,539	21	67
David Cohen	Stanford	2,536		65
Barry Strauss	Cornell	2,467	22	49
Kathleen Coleman	Harvard	2,407	20	50
Kyle Harper	Oklahoma	2,396	18	160
Thomas Figueira	Rutgers	2,302	25	51
Giulia Sissa	UCLA	2,245	25	58
Joseph Manning	Yale	2,189	23	61

* in phased retirement

Table 3 Impact adjusted for career length: top mean annual citation scores for North American Greco-Roman historians in active faculty positions (broader scope)

Person	Institution	Citations/year (rounded)
Ian Morris	Stanford	355
Walter Scheidel	Stanford	298
Josiah Ober	Stanford	285
Greg Woolf	UCLA	219
Richard Saller	Stanford	180
Angelos Chaniotis	IAS	178
Kyle Harper	Oklahoma	160
Clifford Ando	Chicago	147
Jonathan Hall	Chicago	145
Victor Hanson	Stanford (Hoover)	141
Danielle Allen	Harvard	130
Harriet Flower	Princeton	115
Reviel Netz	Stanford	112

Table 4 Top citation scores for retired North American Greco-Roman historians

Person	Institution	Score	*h*-index	Citations/year (rounded)
Peter Brown	Princeton	25,627		400
Ramsay MacMullen	Yale	10,384	41	144
Glen Bowersock	IAS	10,193	42	167
William Harris	Columbia	10,012	38	170
Erich Gruen	Berkeley	9,809	41	169
Roger Bagnall	NYU	9,240	42	171
Brent Shaw	Princeton	8,139	41	160
Kurt Raaflaub	Brown	7,500	46	156
Sarah Pomeroy	CUNY	7,485	28	141

Table 5 Top citation scores for North American Greco-Roman historians

Gross scores			Annualized scores		
Person	Institution	Score	Person	Institution	Cits/yr
Peter Brown	Princeton	25,627	Peter Brown	Princeton	400
Ian Morris	Stanford	12,794	Ian Morris	Stanford	355
Josiah Ober	Stanford	12,537	Walter Scheidel	Stanford	298
Ramsay MacMullen	Yale	10,384	Josiah Ober	Stanford	285
Walter Scheidel	Stanford	10,296	Greg Woolf	UCLA	219
Glen Bowersock	IAS	10,193	Richard Saller	Stanford	180
William Harris	Columbia	10,012	Angelos Chaniotis	IAS	178
Erich Gruen	Berkeley	9,809	Roger Bagnall	NYU	171
Roger Bagnall	NYU	9,240	William Harris	Columbia	170
Brent Shaw	Princeton	8,139	Erich Gruen	Berkeley	169

4. Discussion

Little has changed since 2019: male scholars still dominate these rankings, as do white academics. I refer readers to previous versions of my survey (and especially to my 2019 paper) for evidence of baseline metrics and change over time.[16]

Only 3 of the 25 scholars in Table 1 are women, or 12%, as are 4 (16%) in Table 2, which shows that the "broader" definition of Greco-Roman historians does not greatly affect the gender ratio. These numbers conceal even greater imbalances at the top: No women are in the top ten in Table 1 and just 1 appears in Table 2, which measure total scores. 2 women (15.4%) rank among the 13 scholars with mean annual citation scores of 100+. The lists are just as white as they are male: all but 3 of the 25 scholars in Table 1 and 4 of the 25 scholars in Table 2 belong in this category.

Institutional affiliation is highly unevenly distributed. Stanford's showing remains particularly strong, continuing a trend that was already visible in my earlier surveys. 4 of the top 5 scholars in Tables 1, 2 and 3 are based at Stanford, and all of them in California. The contrast to the affiliation of the top emeriti/ae in Table 4 is striking, a roster that is dominated by Ivy League and other East Coast institutions.

Top-scoring scholars remain concentrated in the US. Following the move of Greg Woolf from London to UCLA in 2021 and Mary Beard's (12,365; *h*-index: 46; c/y: 294) retirement at Cambridge at the end of September 2022, the most frequently cited Greco-Roman historians 'in post' in the UK appear to be Robin Osborne (Cambridge; 10,971; *h*-index: 50; c/y: 261) and Nicholas Purcell (Oxford; 8,307; *h*-index: 38; c/y: 203), both of whom are close to retirement. Mary Beard is the most cited woman (dead or alive) in the field overall. Otherwise, in terms of both active and retired top-scoring scholars, the US maintains a strong lead, not just over the UK and Canada but also, as spot checks suggest, worldwide.

[16] Scheidel 2019 (cited n.2), 7-8, for comparisons with earlier survey results.