Chapter 13
Cliometrics: Past Achievements, Present Challenges, and Future Horizons

Claude Diebolt and Michael Haupert

Abstract This chapter examines the historical development of cliometrics and its contribution to the evolution of empirical reasoning in economics and the social sciences. Rather than presenting cliometrics solely as the application of econometric methods to historical data, it argues that the field has served as a laboratory for methodological innovation, confronting challenges related to data construction, causal inference, institutional complexity, and long-run analysis. The chapter traces the emergence of cliometrics from its intellectual roots in economic history and econometrics, reviews major advances in historical data collection and modelling, and discusses the growing importance of identification strategies in contemporary research. It also examines the field's principal achievements, critiques, and transformations, highlighting its role in bridging quantitative analysis and historical interpretation. Particular attention is devoted to recent developments in Big Data, machine learning, and artificial intelligence, and to their implications for future cliometric research. The chapter concludes that the enduring contribution of cliometrics lies not in any specific technique, but in its capacity to combine rigorous empirical inquiry with sensitivity to historical context, institutional change, and the complexity of long-run economic and social processes.

13.1 Introduction: Cliometrics and the Econometric Turn in Economic History

Over the past several decades, history has progressively re-emerged as a central dimension of economic analysis. Questions related to long-run development, in-

Claude Diebolt ✉
CNRS, BETA, Université de Strasbourg, Strasbourg, France, e-mail: cdiebolt@unistra.fr

Michael Haupert
University of Wisconsin–La Crosse, USA, e-mail: mhaupert@uwlax.edu

stitutional persistence, inequality, demographic transitions, technological change, political economy, and cultural transmission increasingly rely on historical evidence and historically grounded identification strategies. Economic research has become progressively more attentive to temporal depth, path dependence, and the enduring effects of past shocks and institutional configurations on present outcomes. In many respects, some of the most influential developments in contemporary empirical economics, ranging from historical natural experiments to persistence studies and long-run institutional analysis, have contributed to restoring history to a position of analytical centrality within the social sciences (Diebolt & Haupert, 2019b).

This renewed importance of history within economics did not emerge spontaneously. It was made possible by a long intellectual and methodological transformation through which historical inquiry progressively incorporated formal economic reasoning, quantitative measurement, and econometric inference. The development of cliometrics played a decisive role in this transformation. More than a simple application of statistical techniques to historical questions, cliometrics fundamentally altered the standards of empirical investigation in economic history by introducing explicit modelling, systematic data construction, counterfactual reasoning, and progressively more sophisticated approaches to causal inference.

From its origins in the late 1950s and early 1960s, cliometrics sought to move beyond descriptive historical narratives toward analytically structured explanations grounded in economic theory and empirical verification. In doing so, it became closely associated with the broader econometric revolution that transformed economics during the second half of the twentieth century. The rise of formal modelling, the growing influence of the Cowles Commission tradition, the expansion of national accounting frameworks, and the increasing availability of computational resources collectively contributed to redefining the relationship between theory, data, and historical interpretation. Historical research was no longer confined to the reconstruction of singular events or descriptive chronologies; it increasingly became a domain in which hypotheses could be formally tested, competing explanations evaluated, and long-run mechanisms empirically identified.

Yet the rise of cliometrics was never free from controversy. From the outset, critics accused cliometricians of excessive formalism, reductionism, and an overreliance on abstract modelling at the expense of historical complexity and contextual understanding. Debates surrounding the role of quantification, the limits of econometric reasoning, the quality of historical data, and the tension between narrative interpretation and causal identification became defining features of the discipline's evolution (Diebolt, 2025a). These criticisms, however, did not simply weaken cliometrics. On the contrary, they contributed to its transformation. Over time, cliometric research progressively incorporated richer archival evidence, more sophisticated identification strategies, greater methodological transparency, and broader interdisciplinary perspectives. Contemporary cliometrics now operates at the intersection of economic history, econometrics, political economy, demography, sociology, geography, and increasingly computational social science.

This chapter argues that cliometrics remained relevant not because of any single methodological approach, but because of its capacity to continuously adapt its

empirical standards, theoretical ambitions, and modes of historical inference. The history of cliometrics is therefore not merely a specialized chapter in the history of economic history. It also constitutes a revealing perspective on the broader evolution of econometric practice itself. Many methodological challenges that now occupy contemporary econometrics, imperfect and heterogeneous data, identification difficulties, causal complexity, reproducibility, interdisciplinarity, and the integration of large-scale digital datasets, were confronted within cliometric research long before they became central concerns elsewhere in empirical economics.

Drawing on recent research, particularly as reflected in the journal Cliometrica and in the third edition of the Handbook of Cliometrics (Diebolt & Haupert, 2024), the chapter proceeds as follows. Section 13.2 situates the emergence of cliometrics within the broader transformation of econometrics and historical research during the twentieth century. Section 13.3 examines cliometrics as a domain of econometric innovation, focusing on data construction, modelling strategies, causal inference, and interdisciplinary applications. Section 13.4 discusses the major achievements of cliometrics together with its criticisms, limitations, and internal methodological transformations. Section 13.5 explores the future of cliometrics in the context of Big Data, machine learning, artificial intelligence, and computational historical research. The final section reflects on the broader lessons that the evolution of cliometrics offers for the future development of econometric inquiry itself.

13.2 The Historical Roots of Cliometrics: Theory, Data, and the Econometric Revolution

The emergence of cliometrics during the late 1950s and early 1960s cannot be understood in isolation from the broader transformation of economics and the social sciences that followed the Second World War. Cliometrics did not arise ex nihilo as a sudden methodological rupture within economic history. Rather, it emerged at the intersection of several long-term intellectual and technological developments: the progressive formalization of economic theory, the consolidation of econometrics as a scientific discipline, the expansion of statistical infrastructures and national accounting systems, and the rapid growth of computational capacities. The cliometric revolution was therefore not simply the product of a new generation of economic historians; it was part of a much broader transformation in the standards of empirical reasoning across the social sciences (Diebolt & Haupert, 2024).

Although cliometrics is often associated with the pioneering works of Alfred Conrad and John Meyer, Robert Fogel, Douglass North, and their contemporaries, quantitative approaches to historical phenomena long predated the emergence of cliometrics itself. Earlier traditions of quantitative historical inquiry had already developed through the work of scholars such as Simon Kuznets, Wesley Mitchell and Edwin Gay in the United States, while European intellectual traditions associated with Gustav Schmoller and the German Historical School, and later with the Annales School founded by Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre, emphasized long-run structural

analysis, demographic evolution, and historically grounded approaches to economic and social change (Diebolt and Haupert, 2021). Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, historians, statisticians, and economists increasingly relied on demographic records, trade statistics, price series, fiscal archives, and national accounting estimates to reconstruct long-run economic dynamics, with a growing interest in systematic measurement and long-term economic fluctuations (Diebolt, 2025b).

Yet these earlier quantitative traditions differed fundamentally from cliometrics in at least two respects. First, they generally lacked the formal econometric framework that progressively transformed economics after the 1930s and 1940s. Second, while quantitative evidence was increasingly mobilized for descriptive and documentary purposes, it was less frequently integrated into explicit theoretical models designed to identify causal mechanisms and evaluate competing hypotheses. In this sense, cliometrics represented less the invention of quantitative history than the 'econometricization' of historical inquiry itself.

The development of econometrics played a decisive role in this transformation (Wright, 1971). The interwar and postwar periods witnessed the gradual emergence of a new conception of empirical economics grounded in formal modelling, probabilistic reasoning, and statistical identification. The contributions associated with the Econometric Society and later the Cowles Commission profoundly reshaped the relationship between theory and evidence within economics.

Cliometrics emerged precisely at the moment when these econometric standards began to diffuse beyond the traditional boundaries of economics into historical research (Temin, 1973; McCloskey, 1987). Economic historians increasingly adopted explicit behavioral assumptions, formal optimization frameworks, and statistical estimation techniques in order to evaluate historical propositions that had previously remained largely narrative or interpretive. Historical processes such as industrialization, slavery, migration, demographic transition, technological diffusion, and institutional change were progressively reformulated as analytically tractable problems susceptible to quantitative testing. In this respect, cliometrics transformed history into a laboratory for econometric reasoning, offering access to long temporal horizons, large institutional variations, and historical shocks that could rarely be observed within contemporary datasets alone.

The pioneering cliometric contributions of Conrad and Meyer (1957, 1958), and Fogel (1964) counterfactual analyses, and North's (1961) institutional interpretations collectively demonstrated the analytical potential of combining historical inquiry with formal economic reasoning. These studies showed that historical evidence could be mobilized not merely to document the past, but also to test theories, evaluate mechanisms, and assess alternative trajectories of economic development. The cliometric program progressively transformed historiographical debates into empirically testable propositions, aligning historical inquiry with the broader cumulative logic of modern empirical science. It transformed the discipline from merely understanding the past to explaining it, e.g. from Verstehen to Erklären.

Technological transformations reinforced these methodological changes. The rapid expansion of computing capacities after the Second World War radically

altered the scale and complexity of empirical research that could be conducted within economic history. Early mainframe computing and large-scale tabulation technologies substantially expanded the capacity of researchers to process historical series, demographic records, and national accounting datasets over long temporal horizons. Although early cliometricians still operated under severe computational constraints by contemporary standards, they nevertheless benefited from the increasing availability of electronic computation, machine-readable statistical records, and large-scale data processing systems. Over time, advances in computing power facilitated the construction of increasingly sophisticated historical databases, including linked census records, longitudinal demographic datasets, historical national accounts, geocoded administrative archives, and large-scale digitized textual collections. Many contemporary developments associated with computational social science, digital humanities, and historical Big Data therefore extend tendencies already present in the early cliometric project.

The intellectual ambitions of cliometrics rapidly extended beyond simple quantification. Early cliometricians sought not merely to measure historical processes, but to evaluate competing interpretations through formal empirical analysis. Robert Fogel's Railroads and American Economic Growth remains one of the most emblematic illustrations of this transformation, notably through its explicit use of counterfactual reasoning to evaluate the economic significance of transportation infrastructures within long-run development. Similarly, the work of Douglass North contributed to the emergence of institutional analysis within cliometrics by emphasizing the role of property rights, transaction costs, and institutional structures in shaping long-run economic performance in response to his frustration with the ability of the standard neoclassical economic modeling process to explain why some nations experienced economic growth and others, with access to the same capital, labor and natural resources, did not.

At the same time, the rise of cliometrics generated intense methodological and historiographical controversies. Critics frequently accused cliometricians of excessive formalism, unrealistic behavioral assumptions, and insufficient attention to historical specificity. Historians argued that economic theories were too abstract to reliably explain historical events. The debate surrounding Time on the Cross (Fogel & Engerman, 1974[1995]) remains one of the most visible examples of these tensions, illustrating both the analytical power and the historiographical sensitivity of quantitative reinterpretations of major historical questions. More broadly, the cliometric revolution raised enduring questions concerning the relationship between explanation and interpretation, causal inference and contextual understanding, quantification and historical meaning (Diebolt, 2026). Far from disappearing, these tensions would continue to shape the subsequent evolution of cliometrics and contribute to its progressive methodological diversification.

By the end of the twentieth century, cliometrics had become fully integrated into the broader landscape of empirical economics while simultaneously expanding its interdisciplinary reach. Its evolution reflected not only the growing sophistication of econometric techniques, but also a broader transformation in the understanding of historical evidence itself. Historical data increasingly came to be viewed not

as passive records of past events, but as constructed empirical objects requiring harmonization, contextualization, and methodological reflexivity. In this respect, the historical roots of cliometrics reveal a discipline shaped as much by evolving epistemological standards as by advances in quantitative techniques alone.

13.3 Cliometrics as Econometrics in Action: Methods, Models, and Applications

13.3.1 Data Innovations in Cliometric Research

One of the most distinctive contributions of cliometrics to empirical economics lies in its transformation of historical data construction and usage. From its earliest stages, cliometric research confronted a challenge largely absent from many other areas of applied econometrics: historical data rarely existed in a directly usable statistical form. Unlike contemporary datasets produced through standardized administrative or survey procedures, historical evidence was fragmented, heterogeneous, incomplete, and institutionally contingent. As a consequence, cliometricians were required not merely to analyze data, but to construct them.

This process of data construction became one of the defining methodological characteristics of cliometric research. Early cliometricians devoted considerable effort to reconstructing long-run series from archival materials such as census manuscripts, parish registers, tax records, trade statistics, shipping logs, wage books, probate inventories, and demographic records. Historical national accounts, long-run price series, educational indicators, occupational structures, and demographic datasets were progressively assembled through labor-intensive processes of harmonization, standardization, and interpolation. In many respects, the cliometric revolution depended as much on the creation of new forms of historical evidence as on the econometric techniques subsequently applied to them.

The reconstruction of long-run macroeconomic series represented one of the earliest and most influential dimensions of this transformation. Building on the earlier statistical and later expanded through the comparative historical accounting work, cliometricians progressively enlarged the temporal and geographical scope of historical economic measurement (Diebolt & Haupert, 2019a). Long-run datasets on output, productivity, population, wages, literacy, trade, and capital formation made it possible to analyze structural change, demographic transition, business cycles, and economic growth across extended historical horizons. Such datasets also contributed to the emergence of comparative approaches capable of examining divergence, convergence, and institutional heterogeneity across countries and regions.

Over time, cliometric data construction progressively shifted from aggregate reconstruction toward increasingly disaggregated forms of historical evidence. The expansion of linked census databases, longitudinal demographic records, geocoded administrative archives, and micro-level occupational data profoundly transformed

the empirical possibilities of historical research. Large-scale historical microdata infrastructures such as IPUMS considerably accelerated this transition by enabling the systematic linkage and harmonization of census materials across countries and periods. Historical populations could now be followed across time and space, allowing researchers to investigate migration, intergenerational mobility, educational attainment, labor market transitions, mortality, fertility, and social networks at an unprecedented level of precision. The growing availability of linked microdata substantially reinforced the micro-foundations of contemporary cliometric analysis.

These developments also contributed to the growing integration of spatial methods within cliometric research. Geographic Information Systems (GIS), geocoded historical datasets, and spatial econometric techniques increasingly allowed researchers to analyze the geographic diffusion of institutions, infrastructure, human capital, technological change, migration, and demographic shocks. Spatial heterogeneity, once largely treated as a descriptive feature of historical processes, progressively became an explicit object of econometric identification. Historical space itself was transformed into an empirical dimension of causal analysis. The rise of historical GIS infrastructures further reinforced this spatial turn by allowing researchers to reconstruct changing territorial boundaries, transportation networks, urbanization processes, and regional inequalities over long periods of time.

Recent developments in computational methods have further expanded these possibilities. Digitization technologies such as Optical Character Recognition (OCR), Handwritten Text Recognition (HTR), text mining, and machine-assisted archival classification now permit the exploitation of massive historical corpora that would previously have remained inaccessible to systematic analysis. Historical newspapers, parliamentary debates, legal archives, notarial records, and administrative documents can increasingly be integrated into quantitative research pipelines combining textual analysis, structured databases, geospatial information, and econometric modelling. In this respect, contemporary cliometrics increasingly intersects with digital humanities and computational social science while preserving its commitment to historically grounded empirical analysis.

Yet the growing abundance of historical data has not eliminated the methodological difficulties associated with historical measurement. On the contrary, it has often made them more visible. Historical datasets remain shaped by changing administrative definitions, incomplete archival survival, selection biases, inconsistencies in territorial boundaries, and variations in institutional recording practices across time. Historical categories themselves are often historically contingent and institutionally constructed rather than stable analytical objects. As cliometricians progressively recognized, historical data are not passive observations waiting to be analyzed; they are constructed empirical objects whose interpretation requires contextual knowledge, methodological reflexivity, and careful attention to the historical conditions under which they were originally produced.

In many respects, these methodological challenges anticipated several concerns that later became central within modern data science and applied econometrics more broadly. Problems of data harmonization, missing observations, measurement error, probabilistic linkage, reproducibility, metadata documentation, and linkage

uncertainty were confronted within cliometric research long before the contemporary rise of Big Data and computational social science. The contribution of cliometrics to empirical economics therefore lies not only in the historical questions it addressed, but also in the methodological innovations it developed in order to transform fragmented archival traces into analyzable quantitative evidence.

13.3.2 Econometric Modelling in Historical Contexts

Cliometrics did not simply extend econometric methods toward historical materials; it also substantially enlarged the empirical and temporal domains within which econometric modelling could operate. Historical environments offered researchers access to long-run processes, institutional transformations, demographic transitions, technological shocks, and large-scale structural changes that were often difficult to observe within contemporary datasets alone. As a consequence, cliometric research progressively became a major site for the development and application of econometric models designed to analyze long-run economic dynamics under historically heterogeneous conditions.

One of the earliest and most influential applications of cliometric modelling concerned long-run economic growth and convergence. Building on the historical measurement traditions, cliometricians increasingly investigated the determinants of long-run divergence, industrialization, technological diffusion, and structural transformation across countries and centuries. Historical datasets provided a uniquely rich empirical environment for evaluating theories of economic growth because they allowed researchers to observe developmental trajectories across extended temporal horizons characterized by major institutional and technological discontinuities.

The integration of human capital into long-run historical analysis represented another major development. Historical studies increasingly examined the relationships between education, literacy, demographic transition, labor productivity, and economic development over long periods of time. And more recently, the role that institutions, ideas, the transmission of knowledge, culture, and geography play in long run growth.

The reconstruction of educational datasets and demographic indicators enabled researchers to investigate the historical foundations of inequality, social mobility, and economic modernization in ways that connected cliometrics to broader debates within growth economics and development theory. Such approaches also reinforced the interdisciplinary character of cliometric research by integrating demographic history, labor economics, educational history, and macroeconomic analysis within unified empirical frameworks.

Historical modelling also contributed significantly to the analysis of business cycles, structural breaks, and long-run fluctuations. Economic historians increasingly applied time-series techniques to examine industrial cycles, price dynamics, demographic shocks, financial crises, and regime changes across extended historical periods. Historical macroeconomic analysis offered important opportunities for studying economic adjustment under conditions involving wars, technological revolutions,

institutional transitions, monetary transformations, and demographic disruptions that rarely appear in contemporary data with comparable intensity or duration. The analysis of long-run cycles and structural discontinuities therefore became an important dimension of cliometric modelling.

The development of panel approaches further expanded the methodological possibilities of historical analysis. Comparative regional datasets, cross-country historical panels, and longitudinal administrative records increasingly allowed researchers to investigate institutional heterogeneity, regional divergence, policy variation, and long-run persistence across space and time. Historical panel models proved particularly valuable because they allowed cliometricians to combine temporal depth with cross-sectional variation, thereby improving identification possibilities within environments characterized by substantial institutional and geographic diversity. Such approaches increasingly connected cliometric research with broader developments in panel econometrics, comparative political economy, and institutional analysis.

Counterfactual analysis became one of the most distinctive methodological contributions of cliometrics. By explicitly modelling alternative historical trajectories, cliometricians sought to evaluate the economic significance of institutions, technologies, infrastructures, and policy regimes that could not be directly observed through simple historical comparison alone. Robert Fogel's Railroads and American Economic Growth remains here the canonical example of this approach. By estimating how transportation systems and economic development might have evolved in the absence of railroads, Fogel introduced a rigorous form of counterfactual reasoning that profoundly influenced both economic history and empirical economics more broadly. Counterfactual approaches were subsequently extended to questions involving slavery, industrialization, migration, institutional change, demographic transition, and technological diffusion. At the same time, the use of structural and general equilibrium models within cliometric research revealed both the possibilities and the limitations of highly formalized historical modelling (Williamson, 2024). General equilibrium approaches offered the intellectual advantage of integrating multiple sectors, factor markets, regional interactions, and institutional structures within coherent analytical systems capable of tracing indirect effects and feedback mechanisms across entire economies. Historical applications of such models proved particularly influential in studies of trade, migration, industrialization, and long-run development.

Yet the empirical implementation of historical general equilibrium models often depended on strong structural assumptions, calibration procedures, partially observed parameters, and limited forms of validation that later became increasingly difficult to reconcile with evolving econometric standards. In many historical contexts, data scarcity constrained sensitivity analysis, robustness checks, and alternative specifications. Calibration frequently substituted for direct estimation when historical evidence remained incomplete or fragmented. Moreover, the complexity of historical institutional environments often exceeded the simplifying assumptions necessary to render highly structured models operational. As econometric research increasingly emphasized identification, heterogeneity, and empirically observable variation, confidence in highly calibrated historical models gradually weakened.

More broadly, cliometric modelling progressively transformed the relationship between theory and historical evidence. Historical processes such as migration, demographic transition, institutional persistence, technological diffusion, and educational expansion increasingly became analyzable through formal econometric frameworks capable of connecting individual behavior, institutional structures, and long-run macroeconomic outcomes. At the same time, the historical complexity of these processes frequently forced econometric models to confront issues of path dependence, non-linearity, institutional heterogeneity, and temporal instability that challenged standard modelling assumptions.

In this respect, cliometric modelling contributed not only to the empirical analysis of historical change, but also to the broader evolution of econometric reasoning itself. By operating within environments characterized by incomplete data, evolving institutions, long temporal horizons, and historically contingent causal structures, cliometrics repeatedly confronted methodological problems that later became central across empirical economics more generally. Its contribution therefore lies not merely in the historical applications of econometrics, but also in the way historical complexity helped reshape the practice of econometric modelling itself.

13.3.3 Causality and Identification

Over time, cliometrics increasingly evolved from a discipline primarily concerned with quantification and formal modelling toward one more explicitly focused on causal identification (Diebolt & Haupert, 2025). While early cliometric research substantially improved the measurement and analytical formalization of historical processes, subsequent developments in econometrics progressively transformed expectations regarding empirical credibility, identification strategies, and causal inference. Historical research became an increasingly important environment for addressing some of the central methodological questions confronting modern applied econometrics: how to identify causal relationships in non-experimental settings, how to exploit institutional and geographic variation, and how to distinguish long-run causal mechanisms from simple historical correlations.

Historical environments proved particularly valuable for causal analysis because they frequently contain forms of variation difficult or impossible to observe in contemporary settings. Wars, pandemics, institutional reforms, colonization processes, migration waves, technological shocks, religious conflicts, educational expansions, political transitions, and infrastructure developments often generated quasi-experimental conditions capable of producing substantial variation across regions, populations, and time periods. Historical inquiry therefore increasingly functioned as a natural laboratory for causal inference.

The growing emphasis on identification profoundly transformed cliometric research. Earlier generations of quantitative economic history often focused on aggregate relationships, structural decompositions, and long-run correlations. By contrast, more recent cliometric work increasingly relies on explicit identification strategies

designed to isolate causal effects from confounding historical processes. Instrumental variables, difference-in-differences estimators, regression discontinuities, spatial discontinuities, event studies, and linked microdata progressively became central components of empirical historical analysis. These methodological developments connected cliometrics directly to the broader credibility revolution that reshaped applied econometrics from the late twentieth century onward.

Historical political economy became one of the most influential domains of this transformation. Research on institutions, colonialism, state formation, slavery, legal systems, and political persistence increasingly relied on historically grounded identification strategies to evaluate the long-run effects of institutional arrangements on contemporary economic outcomes. The influential work associated with Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson (2001) on colonial institutions, for example, demonstrated how historical variation could be mobilized to identify persistent institutional effects across countries and regions.

The rise of persistence studies substantially reinforced the role of history within modern econometrics. Historical variables increasingly became instruments, explanatory mechanisms, or sources of exogenous variation capable of identifying contemporary outcomes through long-run institutional and social persistence. In this respect, cliometrics progressively moved beyond the study of the past for its own sake and became directly integrated into broader empirical debates concerning development, inequality, institutions, social capital, political behavior, and economic growth. Historical depth itself increasingly became an econometric resource.

Spatial identification strategies further expanded these possibilities. Geographic discontinuities, transportation networks, border changes, ecological variation, and historical settlement patterns increasingly provided sources of plausibly exogenous variation capable of supporting causal inference. Historical GIS systems and geocoded archives allowed researchers to combine spatial econometrics with long-run historical reconstruction in ways that substantially deepened the analysis of regional persistence, migration, urbanization, infrastructure diffusion, and institutional heterogeneity. Historical space progressively became not merely descriptive context, but an explicit dimension of econometric identification itself.

The growing availability of linked historical microdata also transformed the microfoundations of causal analysis within cliometrics. Researchers increasingly reconstructed individual trajectories across censuses, educational records, military archives, tax registers, parish documents, and administrative datasets in order to analyze mobility, migration, occupational change, fertility, mortality, educational attainment, and intergenerational persistence. Such developments considerably strengthened the capacity of cliometric research to analyze heterogeneous effects, local mechanisms, and individual-level responses to institutional and economic change over long periods of time.

Contemporary studies on religion, migration, education, and institutional persistence illustrate particularly well this methodological evolution. Research on Protestantism, Jewish communities, Huguenot migration, forced displacement, educational expansion, and demographic transition increasingly combines archival reconstruction,

econometric identification, spatial analysis, and institutional interpretation within highly integrated empirical frameworks (Diebolt & Huesler, 2026).

Yet historical identification also confronts important limitations. Historical environments are characterized by changing institutions, evolving administrative categories, incomplete archives, migration processes, territorial instability, and heterogeneous forms of data construction that complicate causal inference. Instruments that appear exogenous within one historical setting may prove historically endogenous when examined over longer temporal horizons. Administrative boundaries evolve, populations relocate, institutional structures interact, and historical shocks frequently generate multiple indirect effects difficult to isolate econometrically. Historical causality therefore remains intrinsically complex. These difficulties reinforce the importance of historically grounded interpretation within empirical analysis itself. Identification strategies cannot be evaluated solely through statistical criteria detached from historical context. Credible historical inference requires substantial knowledge concerning the institutional environments, political processes, demographic structures, and archival conditions generating the observed empirical variation. Econometric identification and historical understanding therefore increasingly appear as complementary rather than competing dimensions of cliometric research.

In many respects, the evolution of causal analysis within cliometrics mirrors broader transformations within empirical economics more generally. Historical research repeatedly forced econometricians to confront problems of endogeneity, measurement error, institutional heterogeneity, temporal instability, and complex causal structures long before many of these issues became central within applied econometrics more broadly. The contribution of cliometrics to econometric history therefore lies not only in its application of causal methods to historical data, but also in the way historical complexity itself contributed to reshaping modern standards of empirical credibility and identification.

13.3.4 Cliometrics as a Frontier Discipline

Over the course of its development, cliometrics progressively evolved beyond a narrowly defined subfield of economic history and became an important frontier discipline "[. . .] to close the gap between the Geisteswissenschaften and the Naturwissenschaften, i.e., to move from the historical verstehen or understanding side to the economic erklären or explaining side or, much better, mixing both approaches, facts and stylized facts, explaining the economic experience of the past and understanding the ways in which economic factors influence social and political developments, for an increased knowledge of the past, present, and future economic and social development of developed and developing economies, for the achievement of a unified approach of the social sciences." (Diebolt, 2016, p. 3-4). While initially associated primarily with the application of econometric techniques to historical questions, cliometrics increasingly contributed to broader debates concerning institutions, political development, demographic transition, education, migration, inequality, technological

change, social networks, and long-run economic dynamics. Its evolution reflects the growing recognition that historically grounded causal analysis frequently requires interdisciplinary forms of inquiry capable of integrating multiple levels of explanation and heterogeneous forms of evidence.

The long-run analysis of institutions became particularly influential because historical environments provided opportunities to study institutional emergence, persistence, and transformation across extended temporal horizons. Questions concerning the historical origins of inequality, governance structures, property rights, educational systems, and state capacity increasingly became central to cliometric analysis.

Demographic history also played a major role in broadening the scope of cliometric inquiry. Historical datasets concerning fertility, mortality, migration, family structures, urbanization, and household composition allowed researchers to analyze demographic transition processes in relation to industrialization, education, labor markets, public health, and social mobility. The integration of demographic reconstruction with econometric analysis substantially enriched the study of long-run social change and reinforced the interdisciplinary connections between cliometrics, population studies, sociology, and public economics. Historical demography increasingly became one of the major empirical foundations of modern cliometric research. Cliometrics likewise expanded toward historical sociology and cultural analysis (Angrist & Pischke, 2015). Questions involving religion, social norms, trust, human capital formation, identity, collective behavior, and social persistence progressively entered the domain of quantitative historical research. The growing use of linked microdata, geocoded archives, textual corpora, and network analysis enabled researchers to investigate the long-run interactions between institutions, beliefs, education, migration, and economic performance. Historical cultural variables that had once appeared difficult to operationalize econometrically increasingly became analyzable through sophisticated empirical frameworks integrating archival evidence, spatial methods, and causal identification strategies.

The development of network analysis and computational social science further reinforced this interdisciplinary expansion (Pablo-Martí, Alañón-Pardo & Sánchez, 2021). Historical trade networks, migration chains, kinship structures, scientific communities, financial systems, and political organizations increasingly became objects of quantitative analysis through advances in graph theory, network econometrics, and computational modelling. Such approaches substantially expanded the analytical capacities of cliometric research by allowing scholars to examine relational structures, diffusion processes, and institutional interactions across large and complex historical environments. The integration of computational methods into historical analysis therefore contributed to the emergence of increasingly multidimensional forms of empirical inquiry.

At the same time, cliometrics continued to maintain strong connections with core econometric concerns involving identification, modelling, and causal inference. This dual orientation partly explains the durability of the field. Cliometrics remained empirically rigorous while simultaneously expanding its thematic and interdisciplinary scope. Rather than abandoning econometric standards in favor of purely qualitative historical interpretation, contemporary cliometric research in-

creasingly combines econometric identification with institutional analysis, archival reconstruction, demographic modelling, and contextual interpretation within integrated analytical frameworks.

The frontier character of cliometrics also stems from its capacity to confront forms of complexity that challenge standard empirical frameworks. Historical processes frequently involve path dependence, institutional layering, cumulative causation, spatial interactions, temporal instability, and heterogeneous treatment effects unfolding over long periods of time. These characteristics force cliometric research to engage continuously with methodological questions concerning identification, interpretation, non-linearity, and historical contingency. In this respect, cliometrics often operates at the boundaries of existing econometric techniques, pushing empirical methods toward increasingly sophisticated forms of historical and institutional analysis. More broadly, the evolution of cliometrics as a frontier discipline reflects a deeper transformation in the organization of empirical social science itself. Contemporary empirical research increasingly confronts problems that cannot easily be contained within the traditional boundaries separating economics, history, sociology, demography, political science, geography, and computational social science. Cliometrics occupies a particularly important position within this transformation because it developed precisely through the integration of these multiple analytical traditions around the common objective of historically grounded causal explanation. In this sense, cliometrics increasingly represents not simply the quantitative branch of economic history, but a broader methodological framework for analyzing long-run social and economic change through the combination of econometric rigor, archival reconstruction, theoretical modelling, and contextual historical interpretation.

13.4 Staying Relevant: Contributions, Critiques, and the Evolution of the Cliometric Paradigm

13.4.1 Major Achievements of Cliometrics

Few methodological transformations within the historical social sciences have had an impact comparable to that of cliometrics. Since its emergence during the mid-twentieth century, cliometrics has profoundly reshaped economic history by introducing systematic quantification, formal modelling, and econometric reasoning into the analysis of historical processes. Its achievements extend far beyond the simple application of statistics to historical data. Cliometrics transformed the very standards through which historical economic explanations were constructed, evaluated, and debated.

One of the most enduring achievements of cliometrics was the establishment of empirical verification as a central component of historical inquiry. Earlier traditions of economic history frequently relied on descriptive narrative, institutional interpretation, or historically informed intuition without always subjecting competing explanations

to explicit empirical testing. Cliometricians progressively introduced a different methodological standard grounded in formal hypothesis evaluation, transparent data construction, and econometric analysis. Historical propositions increasingly became testable claims rather than solely interpretive narratives. In this respect, cliometrics contributed decisively to the broader transformation of empirical reasoning within the social sciences.

The cliometric revolution also profoundly expanded the empirical foundations of economic history. Through the reconstruction of historical national accounts, demographic series, occupational structures, educational indicators, trade flows, wage datasets, and fiscal archives, cliometricians created entirely new forms of quantitative historical evidence. Long-run databases covering centuries of economic and demographic evolution substantially enlarged the temporal scope of empirical analysis. Historical research increasingly became capable of investigating structural transformations unfolding across generations rather than being confined to shorter chronological horizons.

These developments proved especially important for the study of long-run economic growth and development. Building on the pioneering quantitative traditions associated with Kuznets (1966) and later expanded through the comparative historical reconstructions of Maddison (1991), cliometric research significantly improved our understanding of industrialization, productivity growth, demographic transition, technological diffusion, and international divergence. Historical evidence allowed economists and historians to analyze developmental trajectories across long periods characterized by major institutional and technological discontinuities that could rarely be observed within contemporary datasets alone.

Cliometrics also played a central role in transforming the study of institutions. The contributions of Douglass North and subsequent institutional cliometric research, most notably Acemoglu, Johnson and Robinson, demonstrated how property rights, legal systems, political structures, state capacity, and transaction costs could be integrated into long-run analyses of economic performance. Historical inquiry increasingly became a privileged environment for studying institutional persistence, institutional change, and the long-run consequences of political and legal arrangements. These developments strongly influenced comparative political economy, development economics, and institutional economics more broadly.

Another major contribution involved the integration of causal inference into historical analysis. Over time, cliometric research progressively moved beyond descriptive quantification toward increasingly explicit identification strategies designed to isolate causal mechanisms operating within historical environments. Historical natural experiments, institutional discontinuities, geographic variation, and long-run persistence studies allowed researchers to evaluate the effects of slavery, colonization, migration, religion, education, infrastructure, and political institutions on subsequent economic outcomes.

Counterfactual analysis represented another defining achievement of cliometrics. Counterfactual analysis profoundly transformed historical explanation by introducing explicit comparisons between observed and alternative historical outcomes. Although later debates revealed important methodological limitations and sensitivities as-

sociated with counterfactual reasoning, its influence on empirical economics and historical methodology remained substantial.

Cliometrics also contributed significantly to the methodological modernization of historical research itself. Problems of measurement error, missing data, linkage uncertainty, spatial heterogeneity, comparability, reproducibility, and metadata documentation became central concerns within cliometric practice long before many of these issues emerged prominently within modern data science and computational social science. The methodological challenges associated with fragmented and institutionally contingent historical data forced cliometricians to develop sophisticated procedures for harmonization, probabilistic linkage, archival reconstruction, and longitudinal analysis. Many contemporary empirical practices associated with Big Data and computational social science therefore have important antecedents within cliometric methodology.

The interdisciplinary expansion of cliometrics also constitutes one of its major achievements. Over time, cliometric research increasingly connected economic history with demography, sociology, political science, geography, institutional economics, network analysis, and computational social science. Historical inquiry became an empirical meeting ground for multiple social-scientific traditions concerned with long-run processes of institutional transformation, migration, inequality, technological change, and demographic evolution. Contemporary cliometrics now operates simultaneously across multiple analytical scales ranging from individual-level microdata to global historical processes unfolding over centuries.

Perhaps most importantly, cliometrics transformed the relationship between historical evidence and economic theory. Historical environments increasingly became laboratories for evaluating models of growth, institutions, human capital formation, political development, and technological change under conditions of substantial institutional heterogeneity and temporal depth. Historical complexity repeatedly forced econometric reasoning to confront problems of endogeneity, path dependence, non-linearity, and evolving causal structures that later became central concerns within empirical economics more broadly. In this respect, cliometrics contributed not only to the modernization of economic history, but also to the broader evolution of econometric reasoning itself.

The enduring influence of cliometrics ultimately stems from its capacity for continuous methodological adaptation. Its relevance never depended upon the preservation of fixed analytical techniques or rigid theoretical paradigms. Rather, cliometrics remained influential because it continuously incorporated new forms of data, evolving standards of causal inference, computational innovations, and increasingly sophisticated forms of historical interpretation. The major achievement of cliometrics therefore lies not merely in the quantification of history, but in the creation of a historically grounded empirical science capable of integrating econometric rigor, theoretical modelling, archival reconstruction, and contextual interpretation within unified frameworks of causal analysis.

13.4.2 Approaches and Models That Did Not Age Well: Limitations and Lessons

Not all cliometric approaches retained the same degree of influence or empirical credibility over time. However, this observation should not be interpreted as a retrospective dismissal of earlier work. Many of the models and empirical strategies that later appeared limited were, in their own historical context, methodologically innovative and intellectually ambitious. Their subsequent decline in influence reflected less their intrinsic failure than the evolution of empirical standards, advances in econometric theory, improvements in computational capacity, and changing expectations regarding causal identification. The history of cliometrics is therefore also a history of evolving criteria of empirical credibility within econometrics itself. A first set of limitations concerned the restrictive behavioral assumptions embedded in some early cliometric models. In order to render complex historical processes analytically tractable, researchers frequently relied on assumptions involving rational adjustment, competitive markets, representative behavior, stable preferences, or frictionless institutional environments. Such assumptions facilitated formal modelling and quantitative estimation, but they sometimes simplified the heterogeneity, coercion, institutional rigidity, political contingency, and social stratification that shaped historical economies. As richer archival evidence and increasingly disaggregated microdata became available, these simplifications often proved difficult to sustain without substantial qualification.

Some early macroeconomic and growth-oriented approaches also relied heavily on aggregate relationships that later appeared insufficiently attentive to heterogeneity and identification. Long-run correlations between industrialization, education, urbanization, productivity, or demographic transition frequently provided valuable descriptive insights, yet the underlying causal mechanisms often remained difficult to isolate econometrically. In retrospect, portions of early cliometric research measured historical transformations more successfully than they identified their causal structures. The subsequent evolution of applied econometrics progressively shifted empirical standards toward more explicit identification strategies capable of distinguishing causal effects from broader historical correlations.

The use of structural and general equilibrium models provides one of the clearest illustrations of these methodological tensions. Historical general equilibrium modelling represented an important intellectual advance because it allowed cliometricians to analyze multiple sectors, factor markets, regional interactions, and institutional arrangements within unified analytical frameworks. Such models offered the possibility of tracing indirect effects, feedback mechanisms, and economy-wide adjustments across complex historical systems. Applications involving trade, migration, transportation, industrialization, and factor allocation demonstrated the analytical appeal of these approaches and substantially influenced historical economic analysis. Yet the empirical implementation of historical general equilibrium models often depended on strong structural assumptions, calibration procedures, partially observed parameters, and limited forms of validation that later became increasingly difficult to reconcile with evolving econometric standards (Temin, 1971). In many historical contexts, data scarcity constrained sensitivity analysis, robustness checks, and alternative

specifications. Calibration frequently substituted for direct estimation when historical evidence remained incomplete or fragmented. Moreover, the complexity of historical institutional environments often exceeded the simplifying assumptions necessary to render highly structured models operational. As econometric research increasingly emphasized identification, heterogeneity, and empirically observable variation, confidence in highly calibrated historical models gradually weakened.

These limitations became even more visible as the credibility revolution transformed applied econometrics more broadly (Angrist & Pischke, 2015). The growing emphasis on instrumental variables, natural experiments, difference-in-differences estimators, regression discontinuities, and micro-level causal inference progressively altered expectations regarding empirical validation. Earlier cliometric studies that relied primarily on aggregate decompositions, structural simulations, or broad historical correlations increasingly appeared vulnerable to concerns regarding endogeneity, omitted variables, and model dependence. Historical complexity itself repeatedly exposed the fragility of inferential strategies insufficiently grounded in identifiable variation.

Technological constraints also played an important role in shaping the limitations of early cliometric research. Early cliometricians operated under severe computational restrictions relative to contemporary standards. Historical datasets were often incomplete, highly aggregated, geographically fragmented, and difficult to process electronically. Extensive robustness analysis, repeated sensitivity testing, probabilistic linkage procedures, and computationally intensive estimation methods were frequently impossible or prohibitively costly. Some methodological limitations retrospectively attributed to early cliometrics therefore reflected not intellectual shortcomings alone, but the empirical and technological environments within which researchers were operating.

Counterfactual analysis similarly revealed both the strengths and vulnerabilities of cliometric reasoning. Counterfactual approaches represented one of the most distinctive methodological innovations of cliometrics because they allowed researchers to evaluate the historical significance of institutions, technologies, infrastructures, and policy regimes that could not be directly observed through simple historical comparison. Yet some early counterfactual exercises depended heavily on assumptions concerning behavioural responses, market adjustments, technological substitution, or institutional stability that later researchers considered insufficiently validated empirically. Over time, the credibility of counterfactual analysis increasingly came to depend on transparent assumptions, explicit mechanisms, sensitivity analysis, and historically plausible alternative scenarios grounded in observable empirical variation. Importantly, the approaches that aged less well nevertheless contributed significantly to the evolution of cliometrics itself. Their limitations became productive sources of methodological reflection. Critiques concerning calibration, aggregation, identification, robustness, and unrealistic assumptions encouraged subsequent generations of researchers to develop more sophisticated forms of causal inference, richer archival reconstruction, linked microdata infrastructures, spatial econometric approaches, and more explicit treatments of institutional heterogeneity. In this sense, the less durable

components of the cliometric tradition played an essential role in the maturation of empirical historical research.

The broader lesson emerging from this evolution is that methodological relevance within cliometrics has never depended on the preservation of fixed analytical frameworks. It has depended instead on the continuous capacity to revise assumptions, improve empirical strategies, enrich historical evidence, and adapt econometric techniques to the complexity of historical processes under investigation. Approaches that remained influential were generally those capable of combining theoretical discipline with empirical flexibility and historically grounded interpretation. Approaches that progressively lost influence were often those whose assumptions became increasingly detached from evolving standards of empirical credibility and historical realism.

13.4.3 Historiographical and Epistemological Criticisms

From its emergence in the 1950s and 1960s, cliometrics generated substantial historiographical and epistemological controversy. Few methodological transformations within the historical social sciences provoked reactions as intense or as polarized as those associated with the cliometric revolution. Supporters viewed cliometrics as a necessary modernization of economic history through the introduction of formal theory, quantitative evidence, and econometric reasoning. Critics, by contrast, frequently regarded it as an excessively reductionist enterprise that risked subordinating historical complexity to abstract modelling and statistical formalization. These debates became central to the intellectual evolution of cliometrics itself and profoundly shaped the subsequent transformation of the field.

One of the most persistent criticisms directed at cliometrics concerned reductionism. Critics argued that cliometric approaches sometimes compressed multidimensional historical realities into relatively narrow sets of quantifiable variables and formal behavioral assumptions. Historical actors increasingly appeared within models emphasizing optimization, rational choice, equilibrium behavior, or representative responses, while political contingencies, symbolic structures, cultural meanings, and historically specific forms of agency occasionally remained underdeveloped. In this perspective, cliometrics risked transforming historically situated social processes into analytically convenient abstractions detached from the complexity of lived historical experience.

Related concerns emerged regarding what some critics described as the ‘tyranny of the model’. The growing influence of formal econometric frameworks occasionally created the impression that theoretical elegance and statistical tractability were being prioritized over contextual interpretation and historical specificity. Historical phenomena difficult to quantify or formalize could appear marginalized within cliometric analysis, while measurable variables acquired disproportionate explanatory authority. Debates surrounding slavery, industrialization, institutions, demographic transition, and long-run development repeatedly revealed tensions between analytical formalization and historically grounded interpretation.

The controversies surrounding Time on the Cross became emblematic of these broader historiographical tensions. The work demonstrated the analytical power of quantitative reinterpretation and counterfactual reasoning, but it also generated intense criticism concerning the interpretation of slavery, the treatment of coercion and violence, the use of productivity measures, and the relationship between statistical findings and broader social meaning. More generally, the debate illustrated that quantitative historical analysis could never be fully separated from normative, interpretive, and political questions concerning the historical phenomena under investigation. Cliometric methods themselves became objects of historiographical debate. Broader methodological criticisms also emerged from historians skeptical of what was sometimes perceived as the excessive scientization of historical inquiry. Some critics argued that cliometrics reflected a form of 'physics envy' within the social sciences, importing models of explanation more appropriate to the natural sciences than to historically contingent social processes. Others emphasized that historical events are embedded within complex sequences of intentions, institutions, ideologies, and contingent interactions that resist reduction to stable probabilistic regularities. From this perspective, historical explanation required forms of contextual understanding irreducible to econometric modelling alone.

The critiques associated with Deirdre McCloskey (1976) played a particularly influential role in these debates. McCloskey challenged both the rhetorical claims of scientific objectivity and the implicit epistemological assumptions underlying portions of cliometric research. Her work emphasized that econometric analysis itself relies on interpretive choices, narrative structures, conceptual framing, and rhetorical persuasion rather than purely mechanical statistical demonstration. More broadly, these critiques contributed to a growing awareness that empirical historical research necessarily involves forms of interpretation extending beyond formal estimation procedures alone.

Additional criticisms concerned the nature and reliability of historical data themselves. Historical archives are not neutral repositories of empirical information. They are institutionally produced records shaped by administrative procedures, political priorities, legal categories, fiscal systems, and selective preservation processes. Census materials, tax registers, parish records, commercial archives, educational statistics, and demographic data frequently reflect changing classificatory systems, territorial discontinuities, incomplete coverage, and evolving institutional definitions across time. As critics increasingly emphasized, historical datasets are not simply discovered; they are reconstructed, harmonized, interpreted, and continuously mediated through methodological choices.

These concerns became even more significant as cliometric research expanded toward increasingly sophisticated forms of causal inference. Identification strategies relying on historical instruments, geographic discontinuities, institutional shocks, or natural experiments often depend on assumptions whose validity may prove difficult to evaluate over long temporal horizons. Administrative boundaries evolve, populations migrate, political systems change, and historical shocks frequently generate indirect effects extending across multiple institutional domains. Historical causality therefore rarely conforms to the stable environments presupposed by

simplified empirical frameworks. The complexity of historical processes imposes limits on purely mechanical applications of econometric techniques detached from contextual interpretation.

Yet the historiographical importance of these criticisms lies not merely in their opposition to cliometrics. Over time, many critiques contributed directly to the transformation and intellectual maturation of the field itself. Contemporary cliometric research increasingly incorporates richer archival reconstruction, greater attention to institutional specificity, explicit discussion of data construction, and more sophisticated forms of contextualized causal interpretation. Historical context progressively re-entered quantitative analysis not as a rejection of econometric reasoning, but as a necessary condition for credible empirical inference.

This evolution contributed to a broader methodological shift within cliometrics. Earlier oppositions between quantitative analysis and historical interpretation became progressively less rigid as researchers increasingly recognized the complementarity between econometric identification and historically grounded explanation. Quantitative methods alone rarely suffice to establish convincing historical causality, just as narrative interpretation alone may struggle to evaluate competing explanatory hypotheses systematically. The strongest forms of contemporary cliometric research therefore increasingly combine econometric rigor, theoretical structure, archival depth, institutional analysis, and contextual interpretation within integrated empirical frameworks.

In this respect, the historiographical debates surrounding cliometrics reveal a deeper transformation in the nature of empirical historical inquiry itself. The central question progressively shifted from whether history should become quantitative toward how quantitative analysis, causal inference, and historical interpretation could be articulated within coherent explanatory frameworks. Far from weakening cliometrics, the criticisms directed at the field contributed substantially to its methodological diversification, epistemological reflexivity, and continued relevance within the contemporary social sciences.

13.4.4 Toward a Broader Historical Science

Over time, cliometrics progressively evolved beyond the initial oppositions that had structured many of the early debates surrounding quantitative history. Earlier controversies frequently portrayed econometric analysis and historical interpretation as competing approaches: formalization appeared opposed to contextualization, quantitative methods to narrative understanding, and abstract modelling to historical specificity. Yet the subsequent evolution of cliometric research increasingly demonstrated that these oppositions were often overstated. Far from eliminating historical complexity, many of the most sophisticated forms of contemporary cliometrics emerged precisely through a deeper engagement with institutions, archival reconstruction, social heterogeneity, spatial variation, and historically grounded causal mechanisms.

One important dimension of this transformation involved the reintegration of historical context into empirical analysis. Earlier cliometric approaches sometimes treated institutional environments primarily as background conditions within which economic behaviour unfolded. Contemporary research increasingly views institutions, political structures, legal systems, religious organizations, educational frameworks, social norms, and cultural practices as central components of causal explanation itself. Historical context no longer functions merely as a descriptive setting. Instead, identification strategies, mechanism analysis, and the interpretation of empirical relationships are now imposed with analytical rigor in order to fully incorporate time and institutions as variables. In this respect, cliometrics evolved toward forms of inquiry in which econometric modelling and contextual historical reconstruction increasingly reinforce one another.

This transformation also reflected the growing recognition that historical causality is frequently multidimensional and temporally layered. Economic outcomes often emerge through cumulative interactions between demographic processes, institutional evolution, technological change, political decisions, cultural norms, geographic constraints, and social networks unfolding over long periods of time. Such complexity cannot easily be reduced to isolated variables detached from their historical environments. Contemporary cliometric research therefore increasingly combines econometric identification with historically informed reconstruction of the institutional and social mechanisms generating observed empirical variation.

The development of richer historical datasets substantially reinforced this evolution. Linked microdata, geocoded archives, textual corpora, network databases, and digitized administrative records increasingly allowed researchers to reconstruct historical environments in greater scope and with far greater precision than was previously possible. Historical actors could now be situated within evolving institutional, demographic, spatial, and social contexts rather than treated as abstract representatives of homogeneous behavioural categories. As a result, econometric identification became increasingly inseparable from historically grounded reconstruction of the processes producing the observed data themselves.

This methodological evolution also contributed to the interdisciplinary broadening of cliometric research. As historical inquiry increasingly addressed complex long-run processes involving institutions, migration, education, demographic transition, technological diffusion, inequality, and political development, the boundaries separating economic history from neighbouring disciplines became progressively more permeable. Contemporary cliometrics frequently integrates concepts and methods originating from sociology, demography, political science, geography, anthropology, network analysis, and computational social science. Such interdisciplinarity does not imply a weakening of analytical rigor. On the contrary, it reflects the growing recognition that historically grounded causal explanation often requires multiple forms of evidence and complementary analytical perspectives.

Historical political economy illustrates this interdisciplinary expansion particularly well. Research on institutions, colonialism, religion, state formation, social capital, educational systems, and political persistence increasingly combines econometric methods with historically detailed institutional analysis. Similarly, studies on mi-

gration, forced displacement, religious minorities, and long-run regional inequality frequently integrate demographic reconstruction, spatial analysis, archival evidence, and contextual historical interpretation within unified empirical frameworks. Contemporary cliometrics therefore increasingly operates simultaneously across multiple analytical scales ranging from individual trajectories and local institutions to national and transnational historical processes unfolding over centuries.

This evolution progressively transformed the relationship between explanation and interpretation within cliometric research itself (Diebolt, 2026). Earlier methodological debates often implicitly opposed causal explanation to historical understanding, as if econometric inference necessarily required the reduction of historical complexity into simplified statistical regularities. Yet contemporary cliometrics increasingly demonstrates that causal identification and contextual interpretation are not mutually exclusive forms of inquiry. Econometric techniques may identify patterns, discontinuities, and probabilistic relationships, but the interpretation of these relationships frequently depends on historically grounded knowledge concerning institutions, social structures, political processes, demographic dynamics, and cultural environments. Quantitative inference and historical understanding therefore increasingly appear as complementary, rather than competing, dimensions of empirical historical analysis.

In this respect, the evolution of cliometrics reveals a broader epistemological transformation within the historical social sciences (Diebolt, 2025a). The objective of empirical analysis is no longer simply to quantify historical phenomena or to estimate isolated causal effects. Rather, it increasingly involves reconstructing historically situated mechanisms operating within complex institutional and temporal environments. The strongest forms of contemporary cliometric research consequently combine econometric identification, theoretical structure, archival depth, spatial analysis, and contextual interpretation within integrated explanatory frameworks capable of addressing multidimensional processes of long-run social and economic change.

These developments also help explain the continued relevance of cliometrics within contemporary empirical research. Approaches that remained influential were generally those capable of adapting to new forms of evidence, evolving identification standards, richer historical reconstruction, and increasing methodological reflexivity. Conversely, approaches that became less persuasive were often those whose assumptions remained insufficiently responsive to the growing complexity of historical evidence and causal analysis. The durability of cliometrics therefore stems not from methodological rigidity, but from its continuous capacity for intellectual and empirical adaptation.

More broadly, the evolution of cliometrics suggests that the most durable forms of quantitative historical inquiry do not eliminate historical complexity in favour of abstract formalization. Rather, they are capable of integrating econometric rigor with historically grounded interpretation. In this sense, cliometrics progressively evolved toward a broader historical science in which causal explanation and historical understanding increasingly function as mutually reinforcing dimensions of empirical inquiry rather than as opposing methodological traditions.

13.5 Cliometrics and the Future of Econometrics: New Data, New Tools, New Questions

13.5.1 Big Data and Digitized Historical Archives

The digital transformation of historical research is profoundly reshaping the empirical environment within which cliometrics operates (Wehrheim, 2024). For much of its history, cliometric research was constrained by the scarcity, fragmentation, and limited accessibility of historical sources. The expansion of digitization technologies, computational infrastructures, and large-scale archival projects has progressively altered this situation by enabling unprecedented access to historical records across vast temporal and geographic scales. In many respects, contemporary cliometrics is entering a new phase characterized less by documentary scarcity than by rapidly growing forms of documentary abundance. Digitization technologies such as Optical Character Recognition (OCR), Handwritten Text Recognition (HTR), automated transcription systems, and machine-assisted archival classification increasingly allow researchers to transform previously inaccessible historical materials into analyzable datasets. Historical newspapers, parliamentary debates, legal archives, tax records, census manuscripts, notarial registers, shipping logs, educational archives, commercial directories, and administrative correspondence can now be processed at scales unimaginable to earlier generations of cliometricians. Massive digitization initiatives undertaken by libraries, archives, universities, and public institutions have dramatically expanded the empirical frontier of historical research.

These developments have transformed not only the quantity of available evidence, but also the nature of historical analysis itself. Researchers are increasingly able to combine structured numerical datasets with textual corpora, geocoded information, network structures, and spatially referenced archival materials within integrated analytical frameworks. Historical GIS systems permit the reconstruction of changing territorial boundaries, transportation infrastructures, migration patterns, disease diffusion, educational expansion, urban growth, and regional inequality across long periods of time. Linked historical microdata allows us to follow individuals, households, firms, and institutions across multiple sources and temporal sequences. The resulting expansion of empirical granularity substantially enlarges the range of questions that can be investigated within cliometric research.

The growing availability of digitized archives also reinforces the convergence between cliometrics, computational social science, and the digital humanities. Text mining, semantic analysis, network extraction, topic modelling, and computational visualization increasingly complement more traditional econometric approaches. Historical inquiry progressively becomes a hybrid empirical environment combining archival scholarship, statistical inference, spatial analysis, and computational processing within interconnected research infrastructures capable of operating across massive volumes of heterogeneous historical evidence.

At the same time, digitization does not eliminate the fundamental methodological difficulties associated with historical data. Historical archives remain institutionally

produced, selectively preserved, and unevenly distributed across time and space. Digitized corpora often reproduce pre-existing archival asymmetries, political priorities, cataloguing conventions, and preservation biases. OCR and transcription systems may generate systematic classification errors, especially when dealing with degraded documents, multilingual materials, changing orthographies, or handwritten records. Large historical datasets therefore continue to require extensive processes of verification, harmonization, metadata reconstruction, and contextual interpretation.

Indeed, the expansion of historical Big Data may in some respects increase rather than reduce the complexity of empirical historical analysis. Larger datasets frequently magnify problems of comparability, selection bias, linkage uncertainty, and changing institutional definitions across time. Administrative categories evolve, territorial boundaries shift, statistical conventions change, and archival survival remains highly uneven. Historical categories themselves are often historically contingent rather than stable analytical objects. The growing scale of historical databases consequently reinforces the importance of methodological reflexivity concerning the construction, interpretation, and limitations of historical evidence.

These developments also raise important questions concerning reproducibility and transparency. Historical datasets are rarely fixed empirical objects. They are reconstructed through successive processes of transcription, harmonization, probabilistic linkage, geocoding, interpolation, and archival interpretation. As cliometric research increasingly relies on computationally intensive infrastructures, documenting these transformations becomes essential for empirical credibility. Reproducibility within historical research therefore extends beyond the replication of econometric code alone; it also requires transparency regarding archival selection, data construction, linkage procedures, and institutional context.

At a deeper level, the rise of historical Big Data reveals a broader transformation in the nature of empirical historical inquiry itself. Earlier generations of cliometricians operated primarily under conditions of documentary scarcity. Contemporary researchers increasingly confront the opposite problem: how to extract meaningful causal interpretation from overwhelming quantities of heterogeneous and computationally mediated evidence. Yet greater data abundance does not automatically resolve the fundamental epistemological challenges associated with historical explanation. Massive datasets may reveal correlations, patterns, and regularities at unprecedented scales, but the interpretation of these patterns continues to depend upon historically grounded knowledge concerning the institutional, political, social, and cultural environments within which the underlying records were originally produced.

In this respect, digitization increases access to historical evidence without abolishing historical uncertainty. Problems of measurement error, archival mediation, representativeness, causal interpretation, and temporal comparability remain central despite growing computational sophistication. The future development of cliometrics will therefore depend not simply on the accumulation of larger historical datasets, but on the capacity to combine computational expansion with theoretically informed, methodologically transparent, and historically grounded forms of empirical analysis.

13.5.2 Machine learning, AI, and historical inference

The rapid development of machine learning and artificial intelligence is introducing new methodological possibilities into cliometric research. Advances in computational power, natural language processing, pattern recognition, and automated classification increasingly allow historians and econometricians to analyze historical materials at scales previously impossible to manage manually. Machine learning techniques can process vast textual corpora, identify latent structures within complex datasets, detect non-linear relationships, classify historical documents, reconstruct damaged records, and automate forms of archival extraction that traditionally required extensive human labor. In many respects, these technologies are expanding the empirical frontier of historical inquiry in ways comparable to the earlier computational transformations that accompanied the rise of cliometrics itself (Grajzl & Murrell, 2024).

One of the most significant applications of machine learning within historical research concerns the extraction and organization of unstructured archival information. Historical newspapers, parliamentary debates, court records, administrative correspondence, educational reports, commercial directories, personal writings, and diplomatic archives increasingly become accessible to systematic quantitative analysis through advances in natural language processing and automated text recognition. Named-entity recognition, topic modelling, semantic analysis, sentiment analysis, and network extraction techniques now permit researchers to reconstruct patterns of communication, institutional interaction, ideological diffusion, social networks, and political discourse across extensive historical corpora. Such approaches substantially enlarge the empirical basis of historical investigation.

Machine learning methods also increasingly contribute to historical classification and prediction tasks. Algorithms can identify occupational categories, infer missing demographic information, classify firms or institutions, detect anomalies within archival records, and assist in probabilistic linkage between fragmented historical datasets. In contexts characterized by incomplete, damaged, or degraded records, computational methods may significantly improve the reconstruction of historical populations and institutional structures. Historical research thereby benefits from forms of computational scalability capable of processing levels of archival complexity far beyond the capacities of traditional manual analysis alone.

Recent developments in generative artificial intelligence may further expand these possibilities. Large language models and advanced semantic systems increasingly facilitate automated transcription, translation, summarization, and semantic organization of multilingual and heterogeneous archival materials. Such technologies may substantially accelerate the processing of large documentary corpora while lowering barriers to access across linguistic and institutional boundaries. More broadly, artificial intelligence increasingly contributes to the transformation of archives themselves into dynamic and searchable computational environments capable of supporting large-scale historical analysis.

At the same time, the integration of machine learning into cliometrics raises important methodological and epistemological questions. Many machine learning techniques are optimized primarily for predictive performance rather than causal

interpretation. Algorithms may identify highly accurate correlations and latent structures without necessarily clarifying the mechanisms generating the observed relationships. In this respect, prediction and explanation remain fundamentally distinct analytical objectives. Historical inquiry, however, is rarely satisfied with prediction alone. The central ambition of cliometric research has traditionally involved the reconstruction of historically grounded causal mechanisms operating within specific institutional and temporal contexts. Computational prediction therefore cannot substitute for causal interpretation.

These tensions become particularly important in historical environments characterized by changing institutions, unstable classifications, evolving languages, and temporally heterogeneous data-generating processes. Historical archives frequently contain ambiguities, discontinuities, semantic shifts, and contextual dependencies that are difficult to capture through purely statistical optimization procedures. Patterns detected by machine learning algorithms may reflect institutional recording practices, archival selection effects, political categorization, or changing linguistic conventions rather than stable causal relationships. Without substantial historical contextualization, computational models risk generating analytically sophisticated but historically fragile interpretations.

The increasing use of artificial intelligence also raises broader questions concerning interpretability and transparency. Many machine learning models operate through highly complex computational structures whose internal logic may remain difficult to interpret directly. Yet historical explanation often requires precisely the opposite: explicit identification of mechanisms, institutions, actors, and causal sequences situated within historically specific contexts. Black-box prediction may therefore conflict with the explanatory ambitions of historical social science if computational performance is prioritized over interpretability. For this reason, the future integration of machine learning within cliometrics will likely depend on approaches capable of combining computational power with theoretically interpretable and historically meaningful forms of inference.

Rather than replacing econometric reasoning, machine learning increasingly appears likely to complement it. Econometric models remain particularly valuable for causal identification, theoretical interpretation, counterfactual analysis, and explicit mechanism reconstruction. Machine learning methods, by contrast, offer powerful tools for data extraction, dimensionality reduction, classification, and large-scale pattern detection. The future of cliometric research will therefore probably involve hybrid empirical frameworks combining econometric identification strategies with computational methods capable of exploiting increasingly large and complex historical datasets.

These developments ultimately reinforce one of the central lessons emerging from the history of cliometrics itself. Greater computational sophistication does not eliminate the need for historical understanding; it may in fact intensify it. As historical datasets become larger, more heterogeneous, and computationally mediated, the interpretation of empirical patterns increasingly depends upon contextual knowledge concerning institutions, archival production, linguistic evolution, demographic structures, political environments, and social organization. The future relevance of

cliometrics will therefore depend less on technological automation alone than on its capacity to integrate artificial intelligence, econometric reasoning, and historically grounded interpretation within coherent frameworks of causal analysis.

13.5.3 Future Methodological Challenges

The future development of cliometrics will depend not only on the expansion of computational capacities or the increasing availability of historical data, but also on the ability of the field to address a series of methodological and epistemological challenges that become more complex as empirical environments grow richer and more technologically sophisticated. Many of the central difficulties confronting contemporary cliometrics are therefore not merely technical. They concern the conditions under which historical evidence can be transformed into credible forms of causal inference and theoretically meaningful explanation.

One major challenge involves the integration of theory and data within increasingly data-intensive research environments. The growing availability of large-scale historical datasets and machine learning techniques creates new opportunities for exploratory analysis, pattern detection, and high-dimensional modelling. Yet the expansion of computational capacity also risks encouraging forms of empiricism insufficiently anchored in explicit theoretical reasoning or historically grounded mechanisms. Historical datasets may reveal correlations, clusters, and statistical regularities without necessarily clarifying the institutional, political, demographic, or social processes generating these patterns. The future of cliometrics will therefore depend in part on its capacity to preserve the connection between empirical analysis and theoretically interpretable causal structures.

A related challenge concerns the tension between prediction and explanation. Machine learning methods may significantly improve predictive accuracy and pattern recognition within historical datasets, but historical inquiry ultimately seeks more than predictive performance alone. The central objective of cliometric research remains the explanation of long-run social and economic transformations through historically situated causal mechanisms. Prediction without interpretation risks producing empirically sophisticated but analytically incomplete forms of knowledge. Future methodological developments will therefore need to reconcile computational efficiency with the explanatory ambitions traditionally associated with historical social science. Questions of transparency, reproducibility, and data traceability will also become increasingly important. Historical datasets are rarely static empirical objects. They are reconstructed through complex processes of archival selection, probabilistic linkage, harmonization, interpolation, geocoding, transcription, classification, and metadata construction. As historical databases become larger and more computationally mediated, documenting these procedures becomes essential for empirical credibility. Reproducibility in cliometric research therefore extends beyond the replication of statistical code or econometric specifications; it also requires transparency regarding archival construction, data transformation, linkage uncer-

tainty, and institutional context. The future development of open science practices within cliometrics will consequently involve both computational and historiographical dimensions.

The growing scale of historical data may also create new forms of inferential illusion. The availability of massive datasets does not automatically resolve the fundamental problems of causality, identification, and historical interpretation. Historical processes remain characterized by institutional heterogeneity, path dependence, temporal discontinuities, spatial interactions, and evolving data-generating environments that complicate causal inference regardless of sample size. In some respects, increasing data abundance may even intensify these challenges by generating larger numbers of potentially spurious correlations, unstable classifications, or context-dependent statistical relationships. More data do not necessarily produce clearer historical explanation (Diebolt, 2026).

Another major challenge concerns the integration of micro-level and macro-level analysis. Contemporary cliometrics increasingly benefits from linked individual-level records, longitudinal demographic data, geocoded spatial information, and highly disaggregated administrative archives. These developments substantially improve the analysis of heterogeneity, mobility, social networks, local institutional dynamics, and intergenerational persistence. Yet long-run historical explanation also requires understanding broader structural transformations involving states, markets, demographic systems, technological change, institutional and cultural evolution, and macroeconomic adjustment across extended temporal horizons. Future cliometric research will therefore need to articulate increasingly sophisticated relationships between micro-level behaviour and macro-level historical dynamics.

The internationalization of historical data infrastructures presents additional opportunities and methodological difficulties. Comparative historical research increasingly relies on harmonized transnational datasets involving different archival systems, statistical conventions, territorial definitions, and institutional histories. Such comparative work offers substantial analytical possibilities for understanding divergence, convergence, institutional persistence, migration systems, and global historical processes. At the same time, it raises difficult questions concerning comparability, standardization, translation, and the historical specificity of categories constructed within distinct political and administrative contexts. The future expansion of global cliometric research will therefore require increasing attention to the historical construction of statistical comparability itself.

The future of cliometrics will also depend on its capacity to maintain methodological pluralism while preserving rigorous standards of empirical inference (Diebolt & Haupert, 2022b, 2022a). Contemporary historical research increasingly combines econometric methods with textual analysis, network modelling, spatial approaches, computational linguistics, and qualitative archival interpretation. Such diversification substantially enriches empirical inquiry, but it also creates challenges concerning coherence, interpretability, and the integration of heterogeneous forms of evidence. The future development of cliometrics will likely require increasingly sophisticated frameworks capable of combining multiple methodological traditions without sacrificing analytical clarity or causal credibility.

More broadly, the methodological future of cliometrics will depend upon the preservation of epistemological reflexivity alongside computational innovation. The history of cliometrics demonstrates that empirical standards evolve continuously alongside changing technologies, theoretical paradigms, and forms of historical evidence. Methods that once appeared highly sophisticated may later prove limited when confronted with richer data, improved identification strategies, or evolving epistemological expectations. The future cliometrician must therefore remain attentive not only to technical innovation, but also to the historical and methodological conditions under which empirical credibility itself is constructed.

In this respect, the future challenges confronting cliometrics are inseparable from the broader evolution of empirical social science. Historical inquiry continues to force econometric reasoning to confront complexity, contingency, institutional heterogeneity, and long-run temporal dynamics in ways that repeatedly test the limits of existing methodological frameworks. The continued relevance of cliometrics will depend not only on technological sophistication, but its capacity to integrate computational methods, econometric reasoning, theoretical interpretation, and historically grounded contextual analysis within coherent frameworks of empirical inquiry.

13.5.4 The Historian-Econometrician of the Future

The methodological transformations currently reshaping cliometrics are also transforming the intellectual profile of the cliometric researcher. The future historian-econometrician will likely require a combination of competencies considerably broader than those associated with earlier generations of quantitative economic history. Advances in econometrics, computational methods, digitized archives, machine learning, geospatial analysis, and historical microdata increasingly demand forms of expertise extending simultaneously across historical scholarship, statistical inference, computational literacy, and theoretical reasoning. The evolution of cliometrics thus reflects not only changing methods, but also changing forms of scientific practice within the historical social sciences.

Strong theoretical foundations will remain indispensable. Despite the growing availability of large-scale historical datasets and increasingly sophisticated computational techniques, empirical analysis continues to depend upon theoretically meaningful questions, explicit causal frameworks, and interpretable mechanisms. Data alone do not serve to explain. The future cliometrician must therefore remain capable of articulating historical evidence within coherent analytical structures linking individual behavior, institutional dynamics, demographic transition, technological change, political evolution, and long-run economic development. Theoretical reasoning will remain essential for distinguishing historically meaningful causal mechanisms from purely statistical regularities.

Advanced econometric training will likewise continue to occupy a central position within the discipline. Historical environments confront researchers with complex identification problems involving endogeneity, selection effects, missing data, spatial

dependence, temporal instability, heterogeneous treatment effects, and evolving institutional structures. The increasing sophistication of empirical methods does not reduce the importance of econometric reasoning; it intensifies it. Future cliometric research will require a deep understanding of causal inference, panel econometrics, spatial methods, time-series analysis, microeconometrics, network models, and increasingly hybrid frameworks combining structural modelling with computational approaches.

At the same time, computational literacy will become progressively more important. The expansion of digitized archives, linked historical databases, machine learning applications, geospatial infrastructures, and automated text processing requires researchers capable of managing increasingly large and heterogeneous forms of historical evidence. Skills involving programming, database construction, probabilistic linkage, computational text analysis, GIS systems, reproducible workflows, and metadata management will increasingly become part of the standard methodological toolkit of cliometric inquiry. The future cliometrician will therefore operate within empirical environments far more computationally intensive than those faced by earlier generations of economic historians.

Yet the expansion of computational capacity does not diminish the importance of historical method. On the contrary, the increasing scale and complexity of historical datasets make archival rigor and contextual interpretation even more necessary. Historical sources remain institutionally produced, selectively preserved, and historically contingent forms of evidence. Understanding how records were created, classified, transmitted, and transformed over time remains indispensable for credible inference. The future historian-econometrician must therefore retain strong expertise in archival analysis, source criticism, institutional history, and historically grounded contextual reconstruction.

This requirement becomes especially important as machine learning and artificial intelligence play a growing role in empirical historical research. Computational systems may identify patterns, classify documents, reconstruct textual corpora, or optimize predictions at scales impossible for manual analysis alone. Yet historical explanation ultimately depends on the interpretation of mechanisms, institutions, actors, and causal sequences situated within historically specific contexts. The future cliometrician will therefore need to combine computational sophistication with epistemological reflexivity concerning the limits of algorithmic inference and the distinction between statistical association and historically meaningful explanation. Interdisciplinary openness will also become increasingly important. Contemporary cliometric research already operates at the intersection of economics, demography, sociology, political science, geography, network analysis, and computational social science (Diebolt & Haupert, 2021). Future historical inquiry will likely depend even more heavily on collaborations capable of integrating diverse forms of evidence and methodological expertise. The historian-econometrician of the future will thus increasingly function not as a narrowly specialized technician, but as an interdisciplinary empirical researcher capable of navigating multiple analytical traditions simultaneously.

The future development of cliometrics will also require increasing attention to ethical and epistemological questions associated with data construction, computational inference, and archival representation. Historical datasets often involve incomplete records, vulnerable populations, colonial classifications, politically constructed categories, and unequal archival visibility across social groups. As computational methods become more powerful, researchers will need to remain attentive to the ways in which algorithmic procedures may reproduce or amplify historical asymmetries embedded within archival systems themselves. Methodological sophistication will therefore increasingly require reflexive awareness concerning the historical production of empirical evidence.

More fundamentally, the future evolution of cliometrics will likely depend upon the preservation of methodological reflexivity itself. The history of cliometrics demonstrates that empirical standards evolve continuously alongside changing technologies, theoretical paradigms, and forms of historical evidence. Methods once regarded as highly sophisticated may later appear limited when confronted with richer data, improved identification strategies, or changing epistemological expectations. The future cliometrician must therefore remain attentive not only to technical innovation, but also to the historical and methodological conditions under which empirical credibility is constructed and evaluated.

In this respect, the historian-econometrician of the future embodies the broader intellectual trajectory of cliometrics as a discipline. The field increasingly requires the integration of econometric rigor, computational sophistication, theoretical reasoning, archival depth, spatial analysis, and historically grounded interpretation within unified frameworks of causal inquiry. The continued relevance of cliometrics will therefore depend less on the dominance of any single method than on its capacity to sustain this integration while adapting to evolving forms of empirical research and historical evidence.

13.6 Conclusion: Lessons from Cliometrics for the Future of Econometric Research

The history of cliometrics is inseparable from the broader evolution of empirical reasoning within the social sciences. From its emergence during the mid-twentieth century, cliometrics transformed economic history by introducing formal modelling, systematic quantification, and econometric analysis into the study of long-run historical change. Yet its significance extends far beyond the modernization of a single discipline. Over time, cliometrics progressively became a major laboratory for methodological innovation, causal inference, data reconstruction, and interdisciplinary empirical analysis under conditions of historical complexity.

One of the central lessons emerging from the cliometric experience is that historical inquiry repeatedly forced econometric reasoning to confront forms of complexity that later became central across empirical economics more generally. Long-run historical analysis exposed problems of incomplete data, changing institutional environments,

evolving administrative categories, spatial heterogeneity, temporal instability, path dependence, and complex causal structures long before many of these issues became prominent within contemporary applied econometrics. In this respect, cliometrics did not merely apply econometric methods to historical questions; historical complexity itself contributed to reshaping econometric practice.

Cliometrics also demonstrated that empirical credibility depends not simply on statistical sophistication, but on the continuous interaction between theory, data construction, identification strategies, and historically grounded interpretation. The field evolved from early forms of aggregate quantification toward increasingly sophisticated approaches integrating linked microdata, spatial econometrics, natural experiments, institutional analysis, and computational methods. Throughout this evolution, the most influential contributions were generally those capable of combining formal analytical discipline with sensitivity to institutional specificity and historical context.

The development of cliometrics likewise illustrates the importance of methodological adaptability. Approaches that once appeared highly innovative sometimes lost influence as econometric standards evolved, computational capacities expanded, and richer historical datasets became available. Yet these limitations themselves contributed to the maturation of the field by encouraging greater attention to identification, robustness, transparency, and contextual interpretation. The durability of cliometrics therefore did not result from methodological rigidity or adherence to fixed analytical paradigms. It resulted from the capacity of the field to continuously revise its empirical strategies while preserving its broader commitment to historically grounded causal inquiry.

At the same time, the evolution of cliometrics progressively transformed the relationship between quantification and historical understanding. Earlier historiographical debates often portrayed econometric analysis and contextual interpretation as competing methodological traditions. Contemporary cliometric research increasingly demonstrates the opposite. The growing sophistication of econometric and computational methods has not eliminated the need for historical interpretation; it has intensified it. Larger datasets, more powerful computational tools, and increasingly sophisticated identification strategies all require deeper understanding of the institutional, political, demographic, and archival environments generating the observed empirical evidence. Historical interpretation therefore remains indispensable to credible causal inference.

The digital and computational transformations currently reshaping empirical research reinforce this conclusion. Big Data, machine learning, artificial intelligence, geospatial infrastructures, and digitized archives are substantially expanding the empirical frontier of historical inquiry. Yet greater computational capacity does not automatically resolve the epistemological challenges associated with causality, interpretation, measurement, and historical contingency. If anything, the expansion of computational possibilities often increases the importance of methodological reflexivity concerning the construction and interpretation of historical evidence. The future relevance of cliometrics will therefore depend not only on technological

innovation, but also on its ability to integrate computational sophistication with theoretically informed and historically grounded forms of empirical reasoning.

More broadly, cliometrics illustrates how a discipline can remain intellectually relevant through continuous methodological renewal. Its evolution reflects a broader transformation in the organization of empirical social science itself, where increasingly complex forms of historical evidence require interdisciplinary approaches capable of integrating econometrics, archival reconstruction, spatial analysis, computational methods, institutional interpretation, and historical theory within unified frameworks of causal explanation. In this respect, cliometrics increasingly represents not simply a subfield of economic history, but a broader model of historically informed empirical social science.

Ultimately, the enduring contribution of cliometrics lies less in any specific technique than in a methodological attitude: the conviction that historical processes can be analyzed through rigorous empirical inquiry without sacrificing sensitivity to institutional complexity, historical contingency, and contextual interpretation. The future of econometric research will continue to confront many of the same challenges that cliometrics has addressed throughout its development: imperfect data, identification difficulties, evolving institutions, interdisciplinary complexity, and the tension between formal modelling and historical understanding. For this reason, the history of cliometrics is not only a chapter in the history of econometrics, but also an important guide to its possible futures.

References

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S. & Robinson, J. A. (2001). The colonial origins of comparative development: An empirical investigation. *American Economic Review*, *91*, 1368-1401.

Angrist, J. D. & Pischke, J.-S. (2015). *Mastering metrics: The path from cause to effect*. Princeton University Press.

Conrad, A. & Meyer, J. R. (1957). Economic theory, statistical inference and economic history. *Journal of Economic History*, *17*, 524–544.

Conrad, A. & Meyer, J. R. (1958). The economics of slavery in the Ante-Bellum south. *Journal of Political Economy*, *66*, 95-130.

Diebolt, C. (2016). Cliometrica after 10 years: Definition and principles of cliometric research. *Cliometrica*, *10*, 1-4.

Diebolt, C. (2025a). Economic history in Western Europe: Bridging Verstehen and Erklären. In C. Diebolt & M. Haupert (Eds.), *The state of economic history: A global perspective* (p. 23-35). Berlin: Springer.

Diebolt, C. (2025b). *Konjunkturzyklen: Eine kurze Zeitreise durch die Wellen des Wirtschaftslebens*. Wiesbaden: Springer Gabler.

Diebolt, C. (2026). Twenty years of cliometrica. *Cliometrica*, *20*, 297-310.

Diebolt, C. & Haupert, M. (2019a). Measuring success: Clio and the value of database creation. *Annals of the Fondazione Luigi Einaudi*, *53*, 59-80.

Diebolt, C. & Haupert, M. (2019b). We are Ninjas: How economic history has infiltrated economics. In R. Rubens & M. Van Dyck (Eds.), *Sartoniana. Ghent: Sarton chair of history of science* (p. 197-220). Ghent: Ghent University.

Diebolt, C. & Haupert, M. (2021). Cliometrics: Past, present, and future. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of economics and finance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Diebolt, C. & Haupert, M. (2022a). Cliometrics and the future of economic history. *Essays in Economic & Business History*, *40*, 1-20.

Diebolt, C. & Haupert, M. (2022b). The role of cliometrics in history and economics. In *Bloomsbury history: Theory and method.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Diebolt, C. & Haupert, M. (2024). *Handbook of Cliometrics, 3rd edn.* Berlin: Springer Nature.

Diebolt, C. & Haupert, M. (Eds.). (2025). *The state of economic history: A global perspective*. Berlin: Springer Nature.

Diebolt, C. & Huesler, J. (2026). France's economic wound: How the Huguenot exodus shaped regional development. *Cliometrica*, *20*, 481–513.

Fogel, R. W. (1964). *Railroads and american economic growth: Essays in econometric history*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fogel, R. W. & Engerman, S. L. (1974[1995]). *Time on the cross: The economics of American negro slavery*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Grajzl, P. & Murrell, P. (2024). How will machine learning change cliometrics? In C. Diebolt & M. Haupert (Eds.), *Handbook of cliometrics, 3rd edn,* (p. 2721–2750). Berlin: Springer Nature.

Kuznets, S. (1966). *Modern economic growth: Rate, structure and spread*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Maddison, A. (1991). *Dynamic forces in capitalist development: A long-run comparative view*. Oxford: Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McCloskey, D. (1976). Does the past have useful economics? *Journal of Economic Literature*, *14*, 434–461.

McCloskey, D. (1987). *Econometric history*. London: Macmillan.

North, D. C. (1961). *The economic growth of the United States, 1790–1860*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Pablo-Martí, F., Alañón-Pardo, A. & Sánchez, A. (2021). Complex networks to understand the past: The case of roads in Bourbon spain. *Cliometrica*, *15*, 477–534.

Temin, P. (1971). General-equilibrium models in economic history. *Journal of Economic History*, *31*, 58-75.

Temin, P. (1973). *New economic history*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Wehrheim, L. (2024). Digital methods in economic history: The case of computational text analysis. In C. Diebolt & M. Haupert (Eds.), *Handbook of cliometrics, 3rd edn,* (pp. , 2661–2687). Berlin: Springer Nature.

Williamson, J. G. (2024). *Late nineteenth-century american development: A general equilibrium history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, G. (1971). Econometric studies of history. In M. Intriligator (Ed.), *Frontiers of quantitative economics* (p. 412-459). Amsterdam: North-Holland.