INTRODUCTION

From the beginning Arnaldo Momigliano believed that biography was an important means of understanding the past. For him the lives and aspirations of historical figures provided a point of entry into their world, their ideas, and their traditions. Two of Momigliano's earliest books were biographical studies. His influential revisionist study of the Emperor Claudius was first published in 1932 (at the same time as his article on Caligula's personality), and the extended essay on Philip of Macedon appeared just two years later.[1]

Throughout the 1930s Momigliano contributed a vast number of articles to the *Enciclopedia Italiana,* of which the majority were biographical entries. Most of these were on ancient personalities such as Caligula, Corbulo, Demetrius of Phaleron, Phlegon, Nero, Otho, Poppaea, and many others (there are well over two hundred entries).[2] But some, such as the entry on Eduard Meyer, adumbrated Momigliano's later work on modern masters of historical scholarship. This is the work brought together here, including nine pieces published originally in Italian and appearing now in English for the first time. After the war, when Momigliano resumed his contributions to the *Enciclopedia Italiana,* the new direction of his biographical interests is shown by the preponderance of essays on contemporary scholars, such as Frank Adcock, Norman Baynes, Maurice Bowra, Eduard Fraenkel, and others.

The first part of the introduction is the work of G. W. Bowersock, and the second of T. J. Cornell. We are both profoundly indebted to Anne Marie Meyer for her constant support, advice, and correction of error.

References in the introduction to Momigliano's *Contributi alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* are given by volume number and page: for example, VII:171–77 refers to the *Settimo contributo,* pages 171–77.

During the forties and fifties Momigliano undertook the writing of biographical entries for the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* and for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica.* Subsequently he turned with renewed zeal to ancient biography when he delivered the Jackson Lectures at Harvard University in 1968 on *The Development of Greek Biography.* At that time biography was an unfashionable subject in contemporary historiography. It took considerable courage for Momigliano to open up this field when so many historians had abandoned it.

The reaction against biography had been fueled in part by the reaction against prosopography that set in during the late 1950s and early 1960s in the wake of the enormous popularity and influence of Ronald Syme's *Roman Revolution* (1939), which was widely read and imitated after the war, and, subsequently, his *Tacitus* (1958). Both Momigliano and Syme shared a deep interest in the importance of personality, but from an entirely different perspective. Syme himself had virtually no interest in biography as traditionally conceived. Such books as *Tacitus* and *Sallust,* which bear the names of ancient writers as their titles, are in no sense biographies of those figures. Prosopography, for Syme at least, was not a subcategory of biography but rather an analytical method for precise and scientific deductions. When Momigliano once ascribed to Syme a lifelong interest in biography (VIII:392), he was transferring his own predilections to a scholar whom, as we can see from the essay republished here, he never fully understood.

Momigliano's inability to understand Syme reveals, in a positive way, the fundamental characteristics of his own biographical approach. He was perplexed by the lack of personal details about Syme's life—his teachers, his background in New Zealand, and his personal habits. Momigliano wrote with a certain incredulity: "It might even be said that he [Syme] is suspicious of any revealing communication between individuals. His intellectual development is still unclear to me. Even local Oxford gossip has been unable to do anything other than emphasize the more outward and prodigious aspects of his personality: his extraordinary memory and his exceptional linguistic proficiency in both ancient and modern languages. It remains unclear, for example, whether he owes anything personally to that other legendary outsider educated at Oxford, . . . Sir Lewis Namier." Momigliano's attempt to find some kind of intellectual and personal pedigree for Syme arose from his belief that no scholar arrives in the world fully trained and independent of the work of others. And obviously he was right.

Syme did indeed try to conceal the forces that had shaped him. In the *Roman Revolution* he paid tribute to Friedrich Münzer, the great German pioneer of prosopography, and yet at the end of his life he denied that he owed much of anything to Münzer. As for Namier, it is hard to say. To the end, Syme claimed that he had never read Namier's work until after the *Roman Revolution* had been published. Yet for Momigliano the *Roman Revo-*

lution was inconceivable as an Oxford product without reference to that eminent Polish exile in Oxford who specialized in prosopography. Toward the end of his life Momigliano became even more emphatic about the need for biography in understanding the past.

The complaint about Syme's reticence was echoed some years later in Momigliano's appreciative but frustrated attitude to the émigré historian Felix Gilbert. In reviewing a volume of Gilbert's essays, Momigliano wrote, "The collection, as a whole, confirms Gilbert's disinclination to speak about himself. . . . There are moments in which something more is really needed—for instance, about the very gifted Jewish wife of Otto Hintze, Hedwig Guggenheimer, a historian in her own right, who left Germany on her own and committed suicide in Holland" (VI:771).

Just a few years before his death Momigliano wrote a striking essay on ancient biography and the study of religion. There he wrote revealingly, "We need personal stories—whether biographical or autobiographical. Personal education, personal religious commitments, punctual relations between social life and personal experience (dreams included) are what we want to know."[3] This astonishing claim reflects the work that Momigliano, in his last years, was doing on ancient religion, for which biography serves as a particularly useful point of access. It is evident that the personal details that he called for were not to be anecdotal or titillating but revelations that would help to explain the thought, presuppositions, and actions of his biographical subjects. The surprising reference to dreams is probably a reflection of Momigliano's study of the famous *Sacred Discourses* of Aelius Aristides in the second century. But not even he had yet turned to the extensive hagiographic literature to pursue this biographical approach to religion. Had he lived, it might have come, and the form of it is perhaps indicated by an essay of the same year as the one on biography and religion, in which Momigliano investigated in detail the life of Saint Macrina by Gregory of Nyssa (VIII:333–47).

The conviction that biography was an important tool for the historian was undoubtedly rooted in Momigliano's abiding concern to work out the tangled fabric of his own life. This is a subject that seems to underlie the work he undertook at the very end of his life on Marcel Mauss and the concept of the person,[4] to say nothing of those remarkably candid revelations about his childhood prepared for the *Pagine ebraiche* in the last months before his death.[5] The relation between his academic career and his scholarship is almost certainly mirrored in his attempts to see the relation between world and scholarship in the great figures whom he studied in the essays presented in this volume. Rostovtzeff, about whom he had first written in the 1930s, became for Momigliano in the 1950s a powerful symbol of the scholarly exile. It was undoubtedly with an eye on himself that Momigliano argued that Rostovtzeff's exile made him in a certain way the

great man that he was. A similar interest in another famous exile can be seen in Momigliano's consideration of the family of Elias Bikerman ("The Absence of the Third Bikerman," in Italian, VII:371–75). As a Jew, Bikerman seemed to provide a close parallel to Momigliano; and yet, whenever he looked for the parallels, they seemed to evaporate.

Perhaps most difficult for Momigliano were his relations with his teacher, the Catholic historian Gaetano De Sanctis. Momigliano never hesitated to acknowledge his intellectual debt to this formidable man, and yet there was always a certain tension about their relationship that is now well documented in the reminiscences published recently by Carlo Dionisotti.[6] They can easily be felt in the essay on De Sanctis reprinted in this volume. That essay evidently belongs to the genre of a homage to one's master, but its beginning is anything but eulogistic: "The man was obstinate, sure of himself, scornful, and quick to take offense." A little later on Momigliano says, not without irony, "From the Germans he learned the method which at that time combined the habit of harsh polemic with a refusal to admit to the possibility of error." His somewhat critical view of De Sanctis was perhaps Momigliano's way of exorcising his own feelings of uncertainty about the relations that he had himself maintained with the world of German scholarship in the middle of the 1930s. He had been the author of a detailed article on Italian scholarship published in German in a German periodical, an article that aroused the ire of De Sanctis.[7] This had happened at a time not too many years after De Sanctis had refused to swear the Fascist oath. The state imposed the oath on all its employees, including university professors. Momigliano, as we know, did take it when he was asked to assume the teaching position of none other than De Sanctis himself.

These are sensitive and perilous topics, and in writing long after the end of the war on the subject of De Sanctis, Momigliano appeared to be trying to work them out. He would seem to have rebelled against De Sanctis, with whom his relations had even been stormy at times. This is probably the background for the rather harsh judgment that he passed on Mommsen in the same essay, when he wrote, "It seemed that he [Mommsen] left no room for other truly independent research, and treated his pupils as involuntary collaborators in collective enterprises such as the *Corpus inscriptionum* and the *Monumenta Germaniae*. That Mommsen was impatient of dissent and a tenacious advocate of collective work directed by himself cannot be denied."

Momigliano's essay on De Sanctis contains one tiny detail that perhaps confirms more than anything else the implicitly autobiographical character of this tribute to his teacher. Momigliano wrote, "When he [De Sanctis] saw me to the door in March 1939 on the eve of my departure for Oxford, his last words were: 'And remember to write to Salvemini and tell him that

I am always with him in his struggle for liberty.'" But this was not the end of Momigliano's contact with De Sanctis in 1939. Soon after his arrival in Oxford he wanted to get out and move on to the United States. In late May he appealed to De Sanctis in a long and anguished letter in which he begged the great man to assist him in trying to find him some kind of research position in America.[8] He had received a modest award (£250) for research in England, but it was hardly adequate and was only available for a year. Momigliano mentioned to De Sanctis that he had been in contact with Rostovtzeff about a fellowship from an unnamed institution, and he asked De Sanctis to write to Benjamin Meritt at the Institute for Advanced Study in case a vacancy should come up there. He also asked De Sanctis for a general letter for a dossier he was compiling and went on to suggest in considerable detail the items that the master should include in that letter.

Momigliano monitored his own career with the sharp eye of a scholar who had studied closely the careers of others. He was quick to respond to disagreement or polemic, since he knew well from his reading that misinformation, faulty reasoning, and outright error could easily become accepted by a public always willing to believe the last thing to be published. In a personal letter dated 10 November 1980 he confessed that he had perhaps done too little to assure the victory of his views.[9] "I recognize," he wrote, "I committed a mistake in not replying enough to critics." Even so he replied frequently, and some scholars will know that not all of his replies were committed to print.

Although Momigliano's long-standing interest in biography undoubtedly impelled him to look closely at his great scholarly predecessors in the writing of history, the essays he wrote about them are, for the most part, not biographical in form. It was the complex interplay of intellect and personality that particularly attracted Momigliano. His essays are major contributions to intellectual history, and yet personality and character are never far away. The more one reads Momigliano's essays on modern scholars, the more one sees that their exceptionally profound insights into the humanity and thought of their subjects reflect an unceasing struggle on the part of their author to comprehend the counterpoint of thought and action in his own career. The example of his scholarly predecessors was ever present in Momigliano, and he conversed with the luminous dead in the justified conviction that they would consider him an equal.

• • •

The nineteen essays in this volume have been selected from the vast output on the history of historiography which Arnaldo Momigliano produced in the last forty years of his life. Although this output was the result of a lifelong passion, he himself seems to have felt that he was embarking on a new

venture around 1946, when he told his Oxford friends, to their evident dismay, that he proposed to devote his future research to the history of historiography.[10]

The first fruit of this research was the essay on F. Creuzer with which the present volume begins. The essay was an appropriately "self-referential" starting point; its purpose was to call attention to the first modern attempt to write a history of Greek historiography. Creuzer saw that the Greek historians could only be studied in relation to a broader conception of historiography in general. For Momigliano Creuzer's work served as a reminder that ancient history and its methods were once exemplary and were considered capable of answering questions of general historical importance. The essay is in fact a programmatic statement, announcing a clear intention to rescue ancient history from the margins of contemporary historical scholarship. One way of doing this, Momigliano suggested, was "quite simply, to regain contact with those writers of the past who treated classical subjects of vital importance to history in general." In accordance with this general aim, he proceeded over the next forty years to publish the great series of studies on individual historians that made him famous among historians and scholars of all periods and disciplines. The present book presents a selection of these studies in chronological order of publication. Momigliano himself would have wanted them to be read with their original dates of publication in mind.

The essays acknowledge the debt we owe to our predecessors in what Momigliano once called our mildly absurd profession. The magnitude of their achievement is constantly stressed. More than once he refers to their lesser known works—monographs, articles, or editions of texts—with the observation that any one of them would be enough to make the reputation of a scholar. To study the work of past historians was for Momigliano an intellectual duty. Edward Shils has described how Momigliano used to begin a lecture by writing on the blackboard a list of the proper names that were going to be referred to, including those of the scholars who had made important contributions to the subject under discussion. When he mentioned one of the names, "he turned towards it deferentially, almost as if its bearer, ancient or modern, were sitting there in a gallery behind him."[11]

Momigliano's studies of past and present historians contain some of his profoundest thoughts about history and historical method. He was writing biography that was, at the same time, intellectual history. One may observe that his study of the Emperor Claudius (1932) deliberately made no mention of Messalina, Agrippina, "and their like."[12] The personal portraits in these essays are drawn with an extreme economy, although the physical appearance, temperament, and drinking habits of the subjects do find their place. Some strong and vivid images emerge, as we are brought face to face with the creative energy of Rostovtzeff, the austere courage of De Sanctis,

the melancholy vigor of Beloch, the eccentric genius of Usener, and the human warmth of Eduard Schwartz.

It is equally important to stress that these studies offer more than historiography as it is often understood—that is, as a mildly diverting alternative to serious historical research. It was no doubt this image of historiography as a harmless but worthless activity that caused the dismay of Momigliano's friends in 1946. There was a certain feeling, especially in the English-speaking world,[13] that historians of past generations have little to teach us. This attitude, which demeans the writing of history by regarding it as ephemeral, infuriated Momigliano; in particular, he attacked the practice of treating earlier historians purely as representatives of their own time and without reference to what they themselves studied. He hated all those "dear little dissertations on Baronio, Gibbon, Renan, and Grote by people who would not be able to translate any of the texts which those historians controlled" (VII:54–55).

In Momigliano's view historiography should be centered as much on the object as on the subject under discussion. That is to say, one studies Eduard Meyer in order to understand (or to understand better) the things Meyer wrote about. "History of historiography," he wrote in 1974, "like any other historical research, has the purpose of discriminating between truth and falsehood. As a kind of intellectual history which purports to examine the achievements of an historian, it has to distinguish between solutions of historical problems which fail to convince, and solutions . . . which are worth being restated and developed" (VI:31–32). Great historians of the past are great because they still have much to teach us.

This message is most movingly conveyed in the essay on "New Paths of Classicism in the Nineteenth Century," where we learn how Hermann Usener returned to life during Momigliano's seminar on him in 1982: "We felt that Usener's peculiar use of philology to clarify problems of religion and custom . . . was saying something to us. The old professor of Bonn, who had died in 1905, had suddenly become a real teacher in the Scuola Normale of Pisa."

There is always a danger that a purely subjective treatment of historians, taking no account of the object of their research, will become at its worst the mere retailing of gossip about their personal lives. Research can degenerate into an effort to uncover evidence of their weaknesses and indiscretions. The opening lines of "New Paths of Classicism" are eloquent about this type of production: "In our time there is a great danger that those who talk most readily about historians and scholars may not know too much about history or scholarship. Housman's homosexuality or Wilamowitz's erratic behavior with his father-in-law Mommsen are easier to describe than Housman's achievements as an editor of Manilius or Wilamowitz's understanding of Aeschylus."

Another problem can arise from historicism—that is to say, from the recognition that research is invariably influenced by contemporary circumstances and the personal preoccupations of the historian. If it is too subjective, this approach can lead to relativism and to the production of works "the sole purpose of which is to prove that every historian and any historical problem is historically conditioned—with the additional platitude that even a verdict of this kind by the historian of historiography is historically conditioned" (VI:31).

In Momigliano's view the history of historiography, approached in the proper way, was itself the best defense against relativism and the identification of history as ideology. The proper approach emphasizes the need to examine the evidence and to assess earlier interpretations in the light of it. "No student of the history of historiography does his job properly unless he is capable of telling me whether the historian or historians he has studied used the evidence in a satisfactory way" (VI:54).

As for historicism, Momigliano of course accepted the trite notion that every historical interpretation is the product of a historically conditioned environment and that no one can presume to stand outside the historical process. But as far as he was concerned, this fact gave a positive value to the work of serious historians; it made it possible for them to ask questions that would not otherwise have occurred to them and permitted them to see what others could not see.

Historiography also offers the best defense against ideological or propagandist history. Momigliano frequently came close to identifying intellectual liberty with research, erudition, and respect for the evidence. These are the distinguishing characteristics of the liberal mind, "which is religious in examining the evidence." A determination, like Grote's, "to understand and respect evidence from whatever part it came" provided an antidote to the dishonest misuse of history for ideological and partisan purposes. In Italy in the 1930s, "with Croce as an example, the habit of studying became almost an antifascist habit." Able and intelligent scholars who devoted themselves to propaganda remained able and intelligent, "but they no longer entered a library to discover something new."

Naturally many historians, especially the serious ones, have strong political opinions, religious convictions, and social attitudes, and these are often liable to find expression in their interpretations of the past. Some of the subjects of the present selection of essays had beliefs and opinions that Momigliano did not share and with which he would have had little sympathy. Meyer, Schwartz, and De Sanctis were extremely conservative and nationalistic, Burckhardt was antidemocratic, Freeman flirted with racism, and Beloch was openly anti-Semitic. But such traits do not in themselves make people bad historians, and they do not necessarily have much effect on their personal conduct or their dealings with others. Momigliano noted

that even the revered Mommsen had urged Jews to convert but nevertheless continued to count unrepentant Jews, such as Jacob Bernays, among his friends. Momigliano's explanation is that "men are better than their doctrines," a lapidary statement typical of Momigliano.

It follows that the work of a historian should be judged on the strength of its intrinsic merits as an attempt to interpret the evidence, regardless of external considerations. "The fact that Georges Dumézil was, we are told, a supporter of the Action française is not an argument against his theories on Indo-European society. In an age of ideologies, we must be careful to submit scholarly results to the sole legitimate criterion of evaluation, which is the reliability of the evidence." If Momigliano found Dumézil's theories on early Rome wanting, it was not because they were racist but because they did not fit the Roman evidence and did not help to explain the complex development of Rome in the archaic age (III:581–83; VII:382).[14]

For Momigliano what made great historians worthy of admiration was the fact that they all promoted erudition and commitment to research. The subjects of the essays in this volume are as diverse a group of historians as one could imagine, but they are united by a shared commitment to the search for the truth about the past. That commitment, for instance, linked Croce to De Sanctis, "so different in personal physique, manner, and religious outlook, but so similar in their uninterrupted passion for learning and in love of liberty."

A further aspect of Momigliano's view of historicism is the fact that historical circumstances bear not only on the author but also on the reader, and that serious historical research entails a dialogue between the historian and his predecessors. In the history of historiography a difference of viewpoint can lead to a creative dialogue. The study of past historians not only makes us aware of new questions but suggests new lines of research because we tend to ask the questions in the context of our own contemporary needs and preoccupations.

Without a historiographical dimension, historical research can all too easily degenerate into pointless and arbitrary speculation. This was one of the causes of what Momigliano saw as a crisis in the study of Greek history in the postwar period. Part of the solution, he suggested, was to go back to Grote and once again to embrace the principles that Grote had expounded: "Perhaps it is not altogether surprising that our generation should find it increasingly difficult to assess the value of evidence, but the consequence is that idle and misleading speculation is a factor with which the Greek historian has constantly to reckon. Much of the recent work on early Greek traditions is pre-Grotean in character."

Neither intuition nor common sense can replace a critical knowledge of previous interpretations or guarantee that the historian will come to grips with serious historical problems. Historical research is not worth doing

unless one can find new questions to ask and the evidence to answer those questions. "Too much historical research," he wrote in 1953, "is being done by people who do not know why they are doing it and without regard to the limits imposed by the evidence" (I:373).

In his papers on the work of individual historians, it is worth asking why Momigliano wrote when he did. In general there are two answers. Some of the essays were occasioned by the death of the historians in question (e.g., Rostovtzeff, De Sanctis), by a centenary (Croce), by the reissue (or translation) of a classic work (Burckhardt, Syme), or by a commission (e.g., for an entry on Beloch in the *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*).[15] In these cases his approach is invariably programmatic: the account of the subject is always linked to an assessment of the objective value of his work, how it has influenced subsequent research, why it is still useful, and what it suggests in the way of possible future research.

These concerns are even more evident in the papers belonging to the second broad category, the ones, that is, that Momigliano produced spontaneously on subjects of his own choice. For the most part, these studies arose directly from historical research that he was currently engaged in. In these essays we can see most easily the results of what we have called Momigliano's "creative dialogue" with the historians under examination. By way of example we may mention the case of Fustel de Coulanges; his extraordinary book on the ancient city had a profound influence on Momigliano, who returned to it again and again during the last twenty years of his life.

As far as one can judge, Momigliano's study of Fustel began in earnest during the 1960s and arose from two distinct but connected lines of research: the first was his growing interest in sociology and anthropology and the use of the comparative method in the study of ancient history, and the second was the intensive research he was then doing on the origins of Rome. His first major publication on Fustel appeared in 1970 (chapter 11 of this volume), but some years earlier he and S. C. Humphreys had embarked on a research project which they called "a new *Cité antique,*" with explicit reference to Fustel.[16]

At first sight it might seem surprising that Momigliano should have been so stimulated by *The Ancient City,* with its reactionary political outlook, its many fanciful hypotheses, its rather weak control of the ancient evidence, and its deliberate refusal to make use of modern scholarship. Fustel most decidedly did not try to engage in a dialogue with previous historians (although, as Momigliano points out, his professed ignorance of contemporary historical research was disingenuous). But the most uncongenial feature, one would have thought, was Fustel's vision of the ancient city itself.

Nevertheless there was something in Fustel's work that struck a chord in Momigliano. Fustel saw that religion lay at the heart of social institutions.

As time went on Momigliano too gave more and more of his attention to religious belief and the role of religion in history. This ultimately lay behind his admiration for Eduard Meyer and led him to find weaknesses in materialists such as Beloch and Rostovtzeff. There is also a curious parallelism between the religious stance of Fustel de Coulanges and that of Momigliano himself. Fustel was not himself a believer, but he saw the importance of belief and had immense respect for religious tradition. Momigliano alludes to Fustel's will but does not quote the famous clause which stipulated that he should receive a Christian burial because "if one does not think like one's ancestors, one at least respects what they believed." Momigliano said virtually the same thing when he left instructions for his burial in the Jewish cemetery at Cuneo, his home town in Piedmont.

There is much to be learned from Momigliano's studies of past historians. The essays in this volume have been compiled in the belief that they contain instructive material for anyone who wants to see how research on the ancient world can be done. They help to explain why the study of earlier modern historians is important. It would take another Momigliano to do them justice.

Notes

1. *L'opera dell'imperatore Claudio* (1932), translated into English by W. D. Hogarth as *Claudius: The Emperor and his Achievement* (1934). Also in 1932: "La personalità di Caligola," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa,* 2d ser. I (1932), pp. 205–28, reprinted in IX:191–217. On Philip, *Filippo il Macedone: Saggio sulla storia greca del IV secolo a.C.* (1934; reprint with corrections, a new preface, and a bibliographical appendix, 1987).

2. For a list of the contributions to the *Enciclopedia Italiana,* see IV:721–25.

3. VIII:199. Exactly what "punctual relations" are remains something of a mystery—points of contact, presumably.

4. See G. W. Bowersock, "Momigliano's Quest for the Person," in *The Presence of the Historian: Essays in Memory of Arnaldo Momigliano, History and Theory,* Beiheft 30 (1991), pp. 27–36.

5. A. Momigliano, *Pagine ebraiche* (1987), pp. xxix–xxxi.

6. C. Dionisotti, *Ricordo di Arnaldo Momigliano* (1989), especially pp. 33–46.

7. A. Momigliano, "Studien über griechische Geschichte in Italien von 1913–1933," *Italienische Kulturberichte,* 1 (1934), pp. 163–95 [I:299–326]; G. De Sanctis, *Riv. Fil. Class.,* 14 (1936), pp. 97–99 [*Scritti minori,* VI, pp. 937–40].

8. Letter dated 30 May 1939 from Momigliano to De Sanctis. I (GWB) am grateful to Leandro Polverini for giving me a photocopy of this letter.

9. For the significance of this date, see the perceptive remarks by Dionisotti, *Ricordo* (n. 6 above), pp. 101–2, on the response of Momigliano to the publication of Luciano Canfora's *Ideologie del classicismo* in 1980.

10. See O. Murray, "Arnaldo Momigliano in England," in *The Presence of the Historian,* pp. 53–54, published in Italian in *Riv. St. Ital.,* 100 (1988), p. 427.

11. E. Shils, "The Community of Learning: Arnaldo Dante Momigliano, 1908–1987," *Encounter* 71 (December 1988), pp. 66–71. The story about the blackboard is from the address he gave at the memorial service at the University of Chicago on 22 October 1987.

12. A. Momigliano, *Claudius: The Emperor and his Achievement* (2d English ed., Cambridge, 1961; reprint, Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn., 1981), p. xv. The whole preface makes Momigliano's historical purpose abundantly clear; but *cf.* also his reply to a critic, IX:219–22 (1932).

13. Thus Murray, n. 10 above; but this attitude was not confined to the English-speaking world. In 1959 Momigliano criticized Italian classicists for their "habit of treating the history of historiography as a Sunday pastime, when one is weary of working on real history and has not enough energy to read books, but only to leaf through them" (III:708).

14. Momigliano never made it clear whether he thought that Dumézil's theories were racist. In IV:442 he wrote, "non c'è nulla di deteriormente razzista nel lavoro originale e profondo dello studioso francese" ["There is nothing badly racist in the French scholar's original and profound work"], but there is a double ambiguity in this sentence, since the meaning depends on whether the key words ("deteriormente," "originale e profondo") are restrictive or nonrestrictive. This ambiguity was intentional, as Momigliano confirmed to me (TJC) when I asked him.

15. It is worth noting that Momigliano first wrote about Eduard Meyer and Niebuhr in the *Enciclopedia Italiana* (vols. XXIII and XXIV, 1937); an article on Grote appeared in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1964.

16. VI:459. Other important contributions on Fustel can be found in VII: 171–77, 179–86; VIII:109–20. In VII:185 he called the *Cité antique* "one of the most stimulating books ever written."