

Unpacking Cultural Imprinting: Roman Rule and Social and Economic Progress in Germany

Michael Fritsch⁺, Martin Obschonka⁺⁺, Fabian Wahl⁺⁺⁺ and
Michael Wyrwich⁺⁺⁺⁺

September 2020

Abstract

There is growing interest in a better understanding of factors helping to explain why history has such a deep effect on present-day socioeconomic outcomes. We provide first systematic evidence on a cultural imprinting effect of Roman rule in the southern part of Germany nearly 2,000 years ago. Our analysis reveals that today's populations living in the former Roman part of Germany are more likely to have personality profiles that are known to contribute to psychological well-being, health behaviors, entrepreneurship, and innovation at the individual and regional level. Indeed, Roman rule positively predicts a broad set of present-day socioeconomic outcomes that are reflective of local culture. The data also provides evidence for the idea that this aspect of the 'Roman effect' on social and economic progress was caused by early enhancements of interregional social and economic interactions, as measured by means of the Roman road network. Our findings help unpacking deep cultural imprinting effects by informing our knowledge on potential mechanisms as well as multifaceted long-term consequences and their interplay.

Keywords: Romans, personality traits, culture, well-being, regional performance, Limes

JEL codes: N9, O1, I31

+ Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Germany. m.fritsch@uni-jena.de

++ Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia.
martin.obschonka@qut.edu.au

+++ University of Hohenheim, Germany. fabian.wahl@uni-hohenheim.de

++++ University of Groningen, The Netherlands, and Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Germany. m.wyrwich@rug.nl

1. Introduction¹

With the growing body of evidence indicating that history affects economic outcomes (e.g., Alesina and Giuliano 2015; Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales 2006), scholars have begun to apply a cultural lens for a better understanding of how historical processes lead to present-day economic outcomes (Diamond and Robinson 2010; Nunn 2009). This perspective assumes that influential historical processes shaping local culture can reach far back in time (Boyd and Richerson 2005)—possibly centuries or millennia ago—with a potentially very deep and persisting imprinting effect that is still detectable in attitudes, values, personality traits, and behaviors of today’s regional population.² Some authors even claim that a number of important ingredients in the present European culture can be traced back to ancient Egypt, centuries before the emergence of Christianity (Assmann 2018). Our knowledge and understanding of such long-lasting imprint of influential historical events on culture and socioeconomic outcomes is still rather unclear.

This study analyzes long-lasting effects and potential underlying mechanisms of the occupation of certain parts of Germany by the Roman Empire about 1,700 years ago. There is initial evidence for an economic imprinting effect of Roman rule in Germany: regions that once belonged to the former Roman part of Germany seem to be today (as judged by night light luminosity) more economically active (e.g., Wahl 2017). While this adds to our broader knowledge on the potential influence of history on economic outcomes, imprinting effects on culture and thus on a broader scope of present-day social and economic outcomes are not well understood and researched. By analyzing the nature and scope of the effect of Roman rule in Germany, we contribute to the literature on historical imprinting mechanisms (e.g., Diamond and Robinson 2010; Nunn 2009), present-day geography of entrepreneurship and innovation (Sorenson, 2017; Crescenzi et al., 2020), geographical psychology (Rentfrow & Jokela 2016), as well as public health and well-being (Roberts, Walton and Bogg, 2005). By following calls to go

¹ We are indebted to Giacomo di Luca, Andy Pickering, Korneliusz Pylak and Michael Stuetzer for helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier draft.

² E.g., Bazzi et al. (2017), Buggle and Durante (2017), Giuliano and Nunn (2013), Lowes et al. (2017), Schulz et al. (2019).

beyond the conventional but criticized GDP approach to assess regional outcomes and social and economic progress (Fleurbaey 2009; Jones and Klenow 2016; Porter et al. 2014), we try to understand the fuller range of alternative measures for regional development and economic vitality of regions that together might go back to the same Roman imprint. We thus analyze a broad spectrum of indicators representing present-day personality profiles, life and health satisfaction and life expectancy of the regional population as well as innovation behavior and levels of entrepreneurship. We assume that the Romans left a deep imprinting effect that shaped regions in several respects and can still be identified in a coherent set of regional outcomes (e.g., the personality traits of the local population and measures for socioeconomic performance) that together are reflective of present-day local culture.

Of particular interest for our study is the Roman Limes—the border that once separated the Roman Empire from the ‘German Barbarians’ in the North. We test whether the assumed imprinting effect of the Romans is indeed particularly deep in a sense that it not only predicts a broad range of alternative outcomes that capture economic development and vitality in different ways, but that it is also robust in forecasting these outcomes when considering other major historical events that could also be regarded as constitutional in the German history³. In doing so, our study contributes to the growing literature on historical roots of psychological well-being and economic performance.⁴ The paper also builds on, and helps to explain the evidence indicating that Roman legacy may have had a positive effect on current economic development.⁵

We find that today’s population in the former Roman territories of Germany have on average a personality profile characterized by higher levels of conscientiousness and lower levels of neuroticism, by higher levels in extraversion and an intraindividual entrepreneurial personality profile. This finding has important real-world implications, given the well-known effect of

³ E.g., influential trade cooperations such as the Hanseatic League, massive cultural and socioeconomic shocks such as medieval plagues, or the effect of Napoleonic occupation.

⁴ E.g., Abdellaoui et al. (2019), Obschonka et al. (2017, 2018), Talhelm et al. (2014), Schulz et al. (2019), Stuetzer et al. (2016), Fritsch et al. (2019).

⁵ See, for example, Wahl (2017) or Flückiger et al. (2019).

such personality patterns on higher levels of psychological well-being, health behavior and outcomes, and economic performance at the individual (e.g., Bogg and Roberts 2004; Costa and McCrae 1980; Judge and Ilies 2002) and regional level (e.g., Garretsen et al. 2018; Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter 2008, Rentfrow, Jokela and Lamb 2015; Stuetzer et al. 2016; 2018). Indeed, we find that German regions with a Roman legacy show higher levels of life and health satisfaction, longer life expectancy, generate more innovations and behave in a more entrepreneurial way (see Figures A1 to A3 in the Appendix). According to our results, such a Roman imprinting effect can be also found when looking at historical outcomes for commercial activity and education in the late Middle Ages.

The long-lasting effect of Roman rule, as indicated by our results, is rather remarkable given the many disruptive shocks and the high levels of the population's geographic mobility over this long time period. One way to interpret our empirical evidence is that there is something 'in the air', as Alfred Marshall has put it, that shapes socioeconomic outcomes in regions and that it is 'places not people' that affect regional development (Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales 2006). The specific coherent set of personality structure, subjective well-being, health conditions and economic performance in the former Roman territory, might altogether form the 'something in the air' in these regions today, as a long-term consequence of imprinting almost 2000 years ago. Hence, we see indications of a Roman effect on exactly those personality traits that are known to shape these beneficial regional outcomes (Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter 2008; Rentfrow, Jokela and Lamb 2015; Obschonka et al. 2013, 2018) and that are reflective of local cultures.

To understand possible historical channels through which Roman influence could have persisted until today, we investigate whether the Roman effect is attributable to two measures of Roman presence, the density of Roman roads and the number of Roman markets and mines. The first measure proxies for the frequency of interregional social and economic interactions and mobility. These can influence attitudes of people towards strangers, risk aversion, and openness towards change and thereby personality profiles that are conducive for the development of 'entrepreneurial culture' and an environment that is economically rewarding for creativity and innovativeness. Indeed, we find that

socioeconomic outcomes, but to some extent also the personality traits, are explained by regional Roman road density. In contrast, the results for the numbers of Roman markets and mines that indicate levels of economic activity are much weaker. However, selective migration and a genetic component might also be responsible for the observed reduced form relationships between personality traits and Roman legacies.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of related literature. Section 3 describes the Limes and Roman occupation in some more detail while Section 4 introduces data and definitions. Section 5 presents the results of the empirical investigation. The final section (Section 6) concludes.

2. Previous research

2.1 Imprinting effect of Roman rule

In a recent study, Wahl (2017) investigated the relationship between the Roman Limes in Germany and regional economic development as measured by night light luminosity about 100 km north and south of the Limes. The study showed that regions in the former Roman part have significantly (at least 10 %) higher luminosity than those north of the Limes. The study also demonstrated that the Roman road network is remarkably persistent until today, as, for example, around 87 % of the contemporary highways in the Roman parts of Germany are located within 10 km of a Roman road. Wahl (2017) and others (e.g., Flückiger et al. 2019) argue, that Roman roads lowered transport costs, fostered city growth and influenced the location of new cities founded during the Middle Ages. Wahl (2017) suggests that these long-lasting consequences of the Roman roads could be regarded responsible for the ‘Roman development effect’ indicated in the data.

Closely related to this study, Dalgaard et al. (2019) investigate night light intensity around the location of all historical Roman roads and find that not only night light intensity, but also road density and density of historical settlements are notably and robustly larger around them. De Benedictis, Licio and Pinna (2018) calculate a measure of interregional trade costs for Italian provinces and show that the length of provincial Roman roads makes a rather significant contribution to explaining these costs. All of these studies make use of the fact that, according to

historical accounts and empirical tests, Roman roads follow an economically sub-optimal path. The reason may be that these roads were primarily built for military purposes (e.g., shifting troops from one location to another) without accounting for terrain characteristics such as elevation or slope—which would be important for the efficient transportation of goods with oxen or by foot. Therefore, the course and the location of Roman roads can be considered exogenous to Roman or pre-Roman economic patterns.

Michaels and Rauch (2017) came to a more nuanced conclusion about the effect of the Romans on subsequent developments. Investigating urbanization in Britain and France from the Roman Era until today, they found that the breakdown of the Western Roman Empire ended urbanization in Britain but not in France. When urbanization started again in the medieval period, towns in France were often rebuilt or founded on old Roman town locations. In England, where Roman rule ended considerably earlier than in France, the urban network of Roman roads did not persist. Much later new towns emerged close to the coast or at navigable waterways. This has given these newly emerging cities a decisive advantage over their counterparts from the Roman period, as access to waterways became a decisive growth factor for cities only after the time of Roman occupation. Michaels and Rauch (2017) conclude that it was actually advantageous to be part of the Roman Empire but better for not too long. Given the specific geography of England as an island, access to navigable waterways and seaports may have been considerably more important for development as compared to France and Germany.

Flückiger et al. (2019) show that the Roman trade network across Europe as proxied by the regional prevalence of excavated Roman ceramics is still important for understanding cross regional investment behavior. More specifically, the authors document that interregional trade in Roman times was highly influenced by connectivity within the ancient transport network. They explain the long run persistence of that connectivity by a relatively high level of cultural integration in terms of converging values and preferences of the population that may be due to dense and repeated social and economic interactions between the well-connected parts of the network.

Previous studies greatly enhanced our understanding of how Roman legacy affected economic development in general, as measured by the level and growth of GDP. However, the imprinting effects of Roman rule on alternative measures for economic development that go beyond a simple focus on GDP remain unclear. Such imprinting effects of historical processes can be reflected by personality traits of the local population (e.g., Talhelm et al. 2014; Stuetzer et al. 2016; Obschonka et al. 2018) and in ‘hard’ socioeconomic outcomes that may be, at least in part, shaped by these regional personality traits (Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter 2008).

For example, a culturally mediated historical imprinting effect could be visible in terms of particular economic behaviors such as innovation and new business formation, that support the economic vitality of regions and are typically growth enhancing (Aghion 2017; Fritsch and Wyrwich 2017). It has been shown that both innovation and new business formation, are significantly related to local cultural attitudes (Beugelsdijk 2007) that, in turn, can be proxied by the aggregate personality traits of the local population (Garretsen et al. 2018; Fritsch, Obschonka and Wyrwich 2019). Personality traits of the local population such as openness and conscientiousness are deemed important for regional entrepreneurship, innovative activity, and local economic development at large (Garretsen et al. 2018).

Other research indicates that historical imprinting effects can also shape psychological well-being, health outcomes, and underlying corresponding personality characteristics of the regional population (Obschonka et al. 2018). Taken together, there is growing evidence indicating that a deep imprinting effect of a major historical event could have shaped the personality traits and profiles of today’s local population as well as those ‘hard’ socioeconomic outcomes that go hand in hand with these personality characteristics.

Altogether, there is a research gap with respect to the imprinting effects of Roman rule, for example on personality traits and certain (growth promoting) economic behaviors but also on the well-being of the local population, which can be captured by health, life satisfaction, and life expectancy as we discuss in the next section.

2.2 Personality traits, economic behavior, and well-being of the regional population

Recent advances in psychological research established that not only individuals but also regions differ in personality traits, with important implications for ‘hard’ regional outcomes that are also shaped by personality characteristics of the local population (Rentfrow and Jokela 2016; see also Florida 2010). Hence, while personality traits are a major shaper of life outcomes at the individual level, this also applies at the regional level, i.e., personality traits of the regional population have an effect on regional outcomes. This led to a new focus in regional on personality interested in a variety of outcomes beyond GDP (Huggins and Thompson 2019).

Why are personality traits so influential? At the individual level, it is well-established that a person’s personality traits shape a wide range of central life outcomes such as psychological well-being (see for example Chamorro-Premuzic, Bennett and Furnham 2007; Steel and Ones 2002; Steel, Schmidt and Shultz 2008), health (Bogg and Roberts 2004; Friedman 2000), as well as motivations, achievements and performance in the occupational career (Barrick and Mount 1991; Judge and Ilies 2002). Personality researchers thus often emphasize “the power of personality” as a major determinant of a person’s life outcomes (Roberts et al. 2007). Simply put, personality traits like the Big Five (extraversion, conscientiousness, openness to new experience, agreeableness, neuroticism)⁶, which show substantial (but not perfect) stability over the life course (Caspi, Roberts and Shiner 2005), influence the way people (a) experience and interpret the self and their environment, (b) are perceived and evaluated by others, (c) make central decisions in life, (d) are motivated to engage in certain behaviors, and (e) succeed in different behaviors (McCrae and Costa 2008). Illustrative examples are the well-researched effects of conscientiousness and neuroticism on a wide range of individual behaviors and life outcomes, including psychological well-being and health-related behaviors and outcomes (Bogg and Roberts 2004; Roberts, Walton and Bogg 2005; Costa and McCrae 1980) as well as work motivation and performance (Barrick and Mount 1991; Judge and Ilies

⁶ The Big Five is the leading, best researched and validated personality model (McCrae and Costa 2008).

2002). Hence, both traits, conscientiousness and neuroticism, are deemed particularly influential factors co-shaping individual biographies and life outcomes.

While the majority of personality research traditionally focused on the single individual, the field of geographical psychology (Rentfrow and Jokela 2016; Oishi 2014) begun studying regional differences in personality traits—the ‘personality of regions’ as a whole (Florida 2010). A growing body of research indicates that regions within countries show more or less systematic differences in the personality profile of their population.⁷ The historical sources and mechanisms that led to such a differentiation in the psychology of regions are, however, still not well understood.

The existing personality differences across regions are not mere descriptive psychological features of regions but can have important real-world consequences for their performance and thus future trajectories. Studies of the effects of region-specific personality traits suggest that regional personality differences correlate with, and may even contribute causally to, important regional outcomes such as well-being and health level of the population (Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter 2008, Rentfrow, Jokela and Lamb 2015; Obschonka et al. 2018) as well as regional economic vitality and growth (Garretsen et al. 2018; Stuetzer et al. 2016, 2018). There are at least two basic mechanisms through which regional personality differences can shape the regional culture and socioeconomic outcomes (Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter 2008). First, more individuals in a regions with a certain personality structure make a certain outcome more likely at the individual level that can also lead to corresponding outcomes at the regional level.⁸ Second, pure region level factors such as a certain psychological climate that is “in the air” (Marshall 1920) could be at work. Via peer and role model effects, such a psychological climate could stimulate

⁷ Oishi (2014), Obschonka et al. (2018), Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter (2008), Rentfrow, Jokela and Lamb (2015).

⁸ E.g., more people with an entrepreneurial personality profile can lead to higher propensities in these people to act entrepreneurially, which in turn can get manifested via increased entrepreneurship rates in the region

corresponding behavior of people in the region that do not show such personality traits themselves.⁹

Previous research indicates that regional differences of personality traits of the local population may show considerable degrees of stability and persistence over time (Elleman et al. 2018; Plaut et al. 2012; see also Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter 2008). These relatively stable regional personality differences, in turn, might contribute to (and interact with) the often-observed regional persistence in local economic performance (Acemoglu and Robinson 2012; Fritsch, Obschonka and Wyrwich 2019). Hence, inspired by a trait perspective to culture (McCrae 2004; Hofstede and McCrae 2004), researchers have begun to understand region specific personality traits as components of the local culture that might have evolved and persisted over longer periods of time (Fritsch, Obschonka and Wyrwich 2019; Stuetzer et al. 2016). This links the psychological research on regional personality differences to the vast literature on culture that shapes important regional outcomes (Diamond and Robinson 2010; Guiso et al. 2006; Huggins and Thompson 2019; Nunn 2009).

With respect to the origins of regional personality differences, Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter (2008) presented a theory that emphasizes selective historical migration patterns (e.g., genetic founder effects) as well as socialization mechanisms via local institutions that together influence the emergence and persistence of regional personality differences (see also Oishi 2014). A growing number of studies is addressing these potential historical mechanisms, for example with a focus on the Industrial Revolution (Obschonka et al. 2018), regional industry structure (Stuetzer et al. 2016) or selective migration patterns (Abdellaoui et al. 2019). Hence, existing studies could already find effects of historical events on present-day regional personality traits over periods of up to 200 years.¹⁰ It is, however, an open general question whether historical factors can shape personality characteristics for a time period of nearly two thousand years that is characterized by numerous disruptive developments and particularly high

⁹ E.g., more people with an entrepreneurial personality could lead to stronger, collective entrepreneurial climate effects that also motivate people who have a less pronounced entrepreneurial personality to engage in entrepreneurship.

¹⁰ Abdellaoui et al. (2019), Fritsch, Obschonka and Wyrwich (2019), Talhelm et al. (2014), Obschonka et al. (2018), Plaut et al. (2012), Stuetzer et al. (2016).

mobility of the population. Could it be the case that Roman rule had a long term, constituting impact on the mentality of today's regional population in Germany?

Taken together, the new literature on regional personality differences strongly suggests to study and understand such regional personality differences in a broad approach goes beyond measuring regional performance with GDP. As a consequence our analysis focuses on various regional socioeconomic outcomes that also include population well-being (e.g., Obschonka et al. 2018).

2.3 Did the Romans leave an imprint on personality traits, economic behavior, and well-being?

The present study works under the hypothesis that Roman rule left an enduring, deep cultural imprint in the German regions south of the old Roman border wall, the Limes. A main reason for such a relationship between Roman occupation nearly 2,000 years ago, personality traits of today's population and current socioeconomic outcomes indicating regional development could be the integration into Roman empire that implied higher levels of interregional mobility and a wider geographic scale of social and economic interactions, such as larger markets. Higher levels of mobility and interregional interactions could very likely affect the attitudes of the population important for entrepreneurial activity, such as the attitude towards strangers, the level of risk aversion and tolerance towards change as well as its openness for new ideas. This corresponds to the reasoning by Flückiger et al. (2019) who show that highly integrated and interconnected regions in the Roman trade network continue to have more intensive economic linkages today and higher cross regional investments of firms. These authors argue that the persistence of interregional linkages comes from cultural integration achieved by convergence of preferences and values between the populations of the highly interconnected regions.¹¹

The road system that the Romans built is a representation of this mobility and trade. It has been shown for a number of countries that Roman roads had

¹¹ An illustrating example of such an integration into larger markets that had long-lasting effects is the export of basaltic millstones from the *Eifel* region. Due to geological specificities, the basaltic rock in that region had special properties that made it well-suited for the use as a millstone. The Romans developed the production and the export of these millstones to other parts of their empire (e.g., North Africa). This demand for basaltic millstones from the *Eifel* region lasted until the late 19th century. For details see Mangartz (2008).

long-lasting effects by shaping the traffic infrastructure and urbanization patterns to today (Wahl 2017; Dalgaard et al. 2019). Hence, Roman roads had an influence on the level and pattern of interregional mobility and the geography of social and economic interactions. We therefore expect that the density of Roman roads could be responsible for and explain a persistent effect of the Romans on personality traits.

A second explanation of a relationship between Roman legacy, current personality traits and socioeconomic outcomes builds on the presence of Roman markets and mines. Such centers of economic activity might have been characterized by pronounced incentives for creativity and innovativeness and may, therefore, have attracted people with such traits to these places. High levels of economic activity may have particularly contributed to the emergence and persistence of a local culture of entrepreneurship that is also partly captured by the personality profile of the local population (Fritsch, Obschonka and Wyrwich 2019) that may have persisted until today. Potential reasons for such long-term persistence are selective migration, continuing high levels of economic activity since and eventually also a collective memory of successful entrepreneurial activity in the past. Such a collective memory could lead people to consider entrepreneurship as a viable economic activity and result in an entrepreneurial culture that is ‘in the air’ (Marshall 1920) and is able to survive hostile socioeconomic framework conditions for longer periods of time. It is particularly remarkable that empirical studies on the persistence of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial culture show that a culture or collective memory that shapes the behavior of population is regionally bounded (e.g., Fritsch, Obschonka and Wyrwich 2019; Stuetzer et al. 2016).

Historical research (Badian 1980, 1997 and Löffl 2014) supports the idea that the Romans stimulated a pronounced entrepreneurial culture by outsourcing public tasks in order to limit the size of the administration. In the Empire period (31 BC – AD 476) that includes the time where the Limes was an effective border, many state tasks were done by private entrepreneurs, most importantly, tax collection. Therefore, an “entrepreneurial mindset” and a belief in the ability of the private economic sector to be efficient might have already existed during the Roman era and could have given these regions a headstart in entrepreneurship and economic activity that persists until today. Furthermore, research showed a

genetic pathway, and associated migration patterns, that could have contributed to today's regional personality differences and corresponding regional disparities in health, economic, and cultural outcomes (Abdellaoui et al. 2019).

Finally, there should be also a relationship between Roman legacy and life satisfaction, health, as well as life expectancy. This idea is based on the assumption that well-being is typically positively correlated with the degree of economic development (Abdellaoui et al. 2019; Obschonka et al. 2018). Thus, given that the presence of the Romans was conducive to higher levels of economic development (e.g., Wahl 2017) there may also be an effect of Roman rule on well-being,

3. The historical Roman border through Germany

The Romans built the Limes around 150 AD and it acted as border of the Empire for more than 100 years. It consisted of three major rivers, namely the Rhine, the Danube and the Main ('Main Limes') as well as a physical wall. This wall consisted of two parts, the Upper Germanic and the Rhaetian Limes, which were connected by the river Main.¹² The walled parts of the border left physical traces like the remains of walls and towers, surviving ditches and forest aisles as well as hills with stone rubble at the location of watchtowers. Additionally, many Roman

¹² The Limes originated from the fact that, after the defeat in the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest (in 9 CE), the Romans retreated to the Rhine and the Danube. As a result, it was difficult for them to move troops between both separated areas. The area to the east of the Rhine, especially the Black Forest, constituted significant obstacles for troop movements and acted like a block between the two Roman areas to the east of the Danube and the west of the Rhine. Therefore, the Romans aimed to connect their territory to the west of the Rhine with that on the east of the Danube. To do so, in 74/75 CE the Romans—coming from Mainz—conquered the area between the Wetterau (the south of the northernmost parts of the Limes) and the High Black Forest and built new forts there and in the area between the rivers Rhine and Main. At the same time, they began to build new forts in the Neckar area and the south of Bavaria by sending legions from Strasbourg eastwards and from Switzerland northwards.


After the victory against the Germanic tribe of the Chatti in Hesse in 85 CE, the Roman Emperor Domitian was able to further expand the area controlled by the Romans to the north and east. He also ordered the building of new forts and developed the Limes borderline by moving troops into newly constructed camps along the Limes. In the following, Trajan extended the line of Limes forts first on the Main and then later along and south of the Danube. He also built the so called "Odenwald-Limes" (a more or less straight line connecting the Main area with the Neckar). However, in around 150 CE the Limes was moved to the east, to its final location, to further shorten the travel time between the Upper German and the Rhaetian province capitals Mainz and Augsburg.

forts along the walled Upper Germanic and the Rhaetian Limes are helpful in identifying the course of the Roman border (Henrich 2012, 2014).

The Romans abandoned the Limes latest in 275/276 AD due to invasion of German tribes and retreated to positions west of the Rhine, south of the Danube and east of the river Iller.¹³ The Limes represents the border of the largest territory in Germany that the Romans were able to retain for a longer period of time. During these more than 100 years the Limes constituted not only of a physical but also an economic and cultural border between the Roman and the Germanic culture during the Roman period (Von Schnurbein 1995). There was, however, a rather significant amount of controlled trade between the Roman and the non-Roman areas. The Limes also marks the boundary of the Roman road network (according to McCormick et al. 2013). It should be noted that there were no significant roads in terms of constructed routes for travel on land north of the Limes in those times.

From the viewpoint of identifying a causal effect, it is important to note that the general course of the Limes was determined by the need to establish a safe connection between the two Roman provinces of Upper Germany and Rhaetia. Hence, the Limes tried to connect these two provinces by conquering the smallest territory necessary in order to avoid additional wars with the German barbarians. Its course reflects primarily military and strategic, not economic considerations. This reasoning is further supported by the fact that for around 80 kilometers, the Limes followed a straight line and was built without regard to the varied topographies of the. One reason for this was to make the surveillance of the border as well as communication between watchtowers via smoke and light signals easier. Another reason could have been to demonstrate the superior scientific knowledge of the Romans to the barbarian Germans area (Wahl 2017; Schallmayer 2011; Planck and Beck 1987).

¹³ In consequence, the area which roughly corresponds to the part of Germany south of the Danube and west of the Rhine, experienced Roman rule for a longer period than the area that was given up after the Limes wall was invaded.



Note: The Limes Germanicus (Upper-Germanic and Rhaetian Limes) is the solid black line. Roman forts are shown as black dots. The borders are those of current German Federal States.

Figure 1: The Limes Germanicus in 200 AD, major rivers and cities, Federal States, and Roman forts

Figure 1 shows the course of the Limes wall through Germany around the year 200 AD.¹⁴ It also depicts the rivers Rhine, and Danube, as well as the parts of the river Main that constituted a part of the border. It also shows the location of

¹⁴ Based on a shapfile of European borders from the Digital Atlas of Roman and Medieval Civilizations (DARMC) by McCormick et al. (2013), which is the digital version of Talbert's (2000) atlas. The DARMC can be accessed at <http://darmc.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=k40248&pageid=icb.page188865>. Regarding Roman roads, we limit ourselves to roads that are classified by Talbert to be certain and major. We do not show the location of earlier border walls like the 'Odenwald Limes'.

Roman forts, which can be used to check the validity of the location of walled parts of the border (the Upper Germanic and Rhaetian Limes), as well as some contemporary large cities.

4. Data and empirical approach

4.1 Data

4.1.1 Historical and geographical data

The spatial framework of our analysis are planning regions (*Raumordnungsregionen*) that represent functionally integrated spatial units comparable to labor-market areas in the United States. There are 96 German planning regions.¹⁵ We overlay shapefiles of the walled Limes parts, and the courses of Danube, Rhine and Main, with one on the borders of the planning regions. In doing so, we are able to assign the planning regions to the historical Roman area. We are also able to identify regions that are split by the Roman border, i.e., located partly within the Roman Empire and partly in the non-Roman area. We create a dummy variable equal to one (and zero otherwise) for such ‘split regions’. They could be special as they are partly treated and partly not.

We calculate a host of historical variables at the level of planning regions. To account for pre-Roman settlement patterns in the non-Roman areas, we report the number of Celtic settlements (Oppida, i.e., hillforts or princely residences) within a region.¹⁶ For each region, we also create a variable for the number of

¹⁵ Shapefiles for the borders of the planning regions are from the Federal Institute of Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (Bundesinstitut für Bau-, und Stadt- und Raumforschung, BBSR). They are freely available at https://stern.carto.com/tables/shapefile_raumordnungsregionen_nach_bbsr/public. Shapefiles of the borders of Germany and of the Federal States are from the Federal Agency of Cartography and Geodesy (Bundesamt für Kartographie und Geodäsie). These shapefiles are available at http://www.geodatenzentrum.de/geodaten/gdz_rahmen.gdz_div?gdz_spr=deu&gdz_akt_zeile=5&gdz_anz_zeile=1&gdz_unt_zeile=15&gdz_user_id=0

¹⁶ Information on Celtic settlements come from the Digital Atlas of the Roman Empire (DARE) and the Pleiades Database of Ancient Places that is hosted by the Ancient World Mapping Center (AWMC) of the University of North Carolina. This digital atlas is edited by Johan Ahlfeldt from Lund University. It can be accessed under this url: <http://dare.ht.lu.se/>. The Pleiades database is from the AWMC website http://awmc.unc.edu/awmc/map_data/shapefiles/cultural_data/Pleiades_data/. We validate and supplement the DARE data based on information in several other historical and archeological publications (Kristiansen 2000; Kuckenburg 2000; Menghin 1995; Rieckhoff 2008).

Roman era settlements and Roman markets or mines. These variables are extracted shapefiles from the DARMC.

We calculate a dummy variable equal to one if a region includes at least one leading member of the medieval German Hanseatic League based on Dollinger (1966).¹⁷ This variable controls for historical openness and social interactions with strangers due to intensive interregional trade relationships and the resulting economic prosperity. Data on the number of historical plague outbreaks in a region are taken from Biraben (1975) who collected information on the spread of the plague in Europe and the Mediterranean from 1347 to 1900. Overall, he recorded 11,180 major outbreaks. Imprecise geographical descriptions and other remaining uncertainties reduce the number of localizable outbreaks to 6,929. We use the geo-located data for these outbreaks provided by Büntgen et al. (2012). Since historical plague outbreaks may have left traces in the regional population we control for this potential influence in our empirical models.¹⁸


The intersection of a region with the rivers Danube, Elbe, Oder or Rhine indicates relatively easy means of transportation and interregional trade. We account for such an influence with a dummy variable equal to one if a region intersects with one of those rivers.¹⁹ For the same reason we consider a location at the coast with a respective dummy variable (yes=1, no=0).²⁰ As further geographic variables we consider the suitability of a region's soils for growing crops (according to Zabel, Putzenlechner and Mauser 2014). This measure reflects a combination of climatic and geographic factors (topography etc.) as well as of soil characteristics (pH value etc.) ranging from 0 (no suitability) to 100 (perfectly suitable). Furthermore, we include measures for the mean elevation in meters and terrain ruggedness (according to a digital elevation model of the EEA) as well as

¹⁷ Leading members are either the capitals of Hanseatic quarters or cities considered to be important by Dollinger (1966).

¹⁸ The data can be downloaded at https://www.wsl.ch/fileadmin/user_upload/WSL/Landschaft/Landschaftsentwicklung_Monitoring/Landschaftsgeschichte/Historical_plague_outbreaks.txt

¹⁹ Information about the location of these rivers is taken from a shapfile provided by the European Environment Agency (EEA). Downloadable at https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/wise-large-rivers-and-large-lakes/zipped-shapefile-with-wise-large-rivers-vector-line/zipped-shapefile-with-wise-large-rivers-vector-line/at_download/file

²⁰ A respective shapefile is downloadable at: <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/eea-coastline-for-analysis-1/gis-data/europe-coastline-shapefile>



Note: The Limes Germanicus (Upper-Germanic and Rhaetian Limes) is the solid black line. Blue solid lines are major rivers (Danube, Elbe, Oder and Rhine). Red solid lines are certain, major Roman roads. Black rectangulars are Celtic Oppida and diamonds indicate the location of a Roman market or mine. The borders are planning region borders.

Figure 2: Planning regions, the Limes Germanicus, Roman roads, markets, mines and Celtic Oppida

mean sunshine duration and temperatures in July.²¹ These variables control for natural conditions in a region.

Finally, we consider the effect that access to coal fields could have on personality traits and socioeconomic outcomes because of its important role in the process of industrialization and the sectoral change of the regional economy (Fernihough and O'Rourke 2014; Stuetzer et al. 2016). As actual coal access and regional coal employment could be endogenous we proxy coal access with the presence of late carboniferous rock strata. Rock strata from the Carboniferous Age are where coal is often found. Hence, coalfield locations should be close or on such rock strata (Fernihough and O'Rourke 2014). We used a geological shapefile of Europe showing the location of those rock strata²² and created a dummy variable equal to one if there are late carboniferous rock strata in a planning region. Figure 2 shows the historical data alongside the borders of planning regions and the course of large rivers.

4.1.2 Personality traits

Data on the present-day regional personality profile of the local population comes from the German dataset of the global Gosling-Potter Internet Project.²³ The project collected personality data via a non-commercial Internet website. People can voluntarily participate in this study by completing a questionnaire on socio-demographic variables, personality traits, and state of residence. As an incentive, participants received a personality evaluation based on their responses.

In the present analysis, we use the data collected from German respondents between 2003 and 2015 (N = 73,756). The personality profile of the respondents was assessed via the German language version (Rammstedt and Danner 2007) of the well-established Big Five Inventory (BFI; John and Srivastava 1999), which

²¹ The digital elevation model is provided as raster file and can be downloaded from <https://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/eu-dem>. The data from the DWDs Climate Data Center can be accessed at https://opendata.dwd.de/climate_environment/CDC/observations_germany/climate/multi_annual/mean_61-90/. Soil suitability and climate variables are averaged over the period 1961 to 1990.

²² The shapefile is downloaded from the website of the Federal Institute of Geoscience and Natural Resources (Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoff). The link to the download is the following: <https://download.bgr.de/bgr/Geologie/IGME5000/shp/IGME5000.zip>.

²³ Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter (2008). For more details on the German dataset see Obschonka et al. (2017, 2019).

consists of 44 items (5-point Likert scale, 1 = disagree strongly, 5 = agree strongly). This individual level personality data was then aggregated to the regional level (regional average scores in each Big Five trait) using the zip code of the respondent's current residency. The share of respondents per region over total national population as well as the sociodemographic structure of the respondents highly correlate with the respective data as provided by the Federal Statistical Office. Therefore, the dataset can be regarded as representative at the regional level (for details, see Fritsch et al. 2018)

In addition to the regional variation of these Big Five traits (which follows a variable-oriented approach to personality), we also study the regional variation of an entrepreneurship-prone intraindividual profile (which follows a holistic person-oriented personality approach, Obschonka et al. 2013; Magnusson and Torestad 1993). Such a person-oriented approach attempts to focus more on the individual character, the intraindividual constellation of a person's traits. Following earlier research²⁴, an entrepreneurship-prone intraindividual entrepreneurial personality profile can be defined as an intraindividual pattern of higher values in extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness, and lower values in agreeableness and neuroticism. The profile index measures the deviation of the individual empirical Big Five profile from a fixed reference profile that simply represents the highest potential scores on extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness and the lowest potential scores on agreeableness and neuroticism in the scales used in the personality test. The individual level entrepreneurial personality index is the sum of the squared deviations of the individual Big Five scores from this reference profile (the D_2 measure of Cronbach and Gleser 1953). The individual values on the profile are then aggregated to the regional level using the information on respondents' current residence to achieve the regional value. This regional index has a mean of 19.39 (standard deviation: 0.563) across German planning regions.²⁵ Empirical research of aggregate values of individual personality scores at the regional level found a robust link between regional

²⁴ Fritsch, Obschonka and Wyrwich (2019), Garettsen et al. (2018), Obschonka et al. (2013), Stuetzer et al. (2018).

²⁵ See Fritsch, Obschonka and Wyrwich (2019) for further details.

variation in this entrepreneurial personality profile and regional variation in regional entrepreneurial activity and regional growth.²⁶

4.1.3 Socioeconomic outcomes

A first type of socioeconomic outcome that we are interested in is the effect the Romans had on the current economic vitality of regions. Economic vitality is understood as the presence of drivers of economic growth in the sense of Schumpeter (1934) that help regions to cope with external shocks. It is proxied by the levels of innovative activities and entrepreneurship. Innovation activity is measured as the number of patents per region that is taken from the RegPat database provided by the OECD (see Maraut et al. 2008). Patents as an innovation indicator have a number of advantages and disadvantages (for an overview see Griliches 1990, and Nagaoka, Motohashi and Goto 2010). We consider the average number of patent applications filed in the years 2008 to 2014 with at least one inventor residing in the region per 10,000 workforce. If a patent has more than one inventor, the count is divided by the number of inventors and each inventor is assigned his or her share of that patent. Information on the size of the regional workforce comes from labor market statistics of the German Federal Statistical Office.

Entrepreneurship is measured by the average number of start-up companies per 10,000 economically active population in the years 2008 to 2014. The information on the number of new businesses comes from the Enterprise Panel of the Center for European Economic Research (ZEW-Mannheim). These data are based on information from the largest German credit rating agency (*Creditreform*).²⁷

²⁶ Fritsch et al. (2018), Fritsch, Obschonka and Wyrwich (2019), Garretsen et al. (2018), Obschonka et al. (2013), Stuetzer et al. (2018).

²⁷ As with many other data sources on start-ups, these data may not completely cover the case of all solo entrepreneurs. However, once a firm is registered, hires employees, requests a bank loan, or conducts reasonable economic activities, even solo entrepreneurs are included, and information about their activities is gathered beginning with the ‘true’ date the firm was established. Hence, many solo entrepreneurs are captured along with the correct business founding date. This information is limited to the set-up of a firm’s headquarters and does not include the establishment of branches. For details see Bersch et al. (2014).

A further type of socioeconomic outcome that we study is psychological well-being and health as indicators of the general welfare of regions. We consider life and health satisfaction as measured by the survey data of the German Socioeconomic Panel (SOEP) on an 11-point Likert scale.²⁸ These data are averaged over different waves of the survey from 1984 to 2016. Life expectancy indicates regional health conditions and well-being based on more objective facts as compared to the subjective assessment of life and health satisfaction. Our indicator is the life expectancy of a newborn child averaged over the years 2013-2015.²⁹

4.1.4 Descriptives

Table A1 in the Appendix provides an overview on the definition of variables and data sources. Table A2 shows some descriptive statistics and Table A3 depicts correlations between the outcome variables including the average regional GDP per capita over the period 1992-2016. There are considerable correlations between this conventional measure of the regional level of economic development and the other outcome indicators, but these correlations are far from perfect. This clearly shows that the set of outcome variables that we focus on in our analysis provides a more comprehensive picture than the GDP measure.

4.2 Empirical Approach

Our main analysis of the effect of the Romans on personality traits and socioeconomic outcomes in Germany is based on cross-sectional ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions. We estimate the equation

$$Y_{is} = \alpha + \beta R_{is} + \gamma' \mathbf{X}_{is} + \varepsilon_{is} \quad (1)$$

where Y_{is} is a socioeconomic outcome. The indices i and s represent regions (i) and federal states (s), respectively. R_{is} is a dummy variable equal to one if region i in federal state s is entirely located in the historically Roman area. \mathbf{X}_{is} is a vector

²⁸ For the German Socioeconomic Panel see Goebel et al. (2019).

²⁹ The data is provided by the Federal Institute of Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR) and can be accessed under <https://www.bbsr.bund.de/BBSR/DE/Home/Topthemen/interaktive-karten/lebenserwartung/lebenserwartung.html>

of geographical and historical control variables. ε_{iS} is the error term. We estimate heteroskedasticity robust standard errors throughout the analysis.

5. Results

5.1 Main results

In an initial step we demonstrate the relationship between Roman legacy and the regional wealth level today by regressing the average Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita in the period 1992-2016 on a simple dummy variable that indicates if a planning region was part of the Roman Empire or not. The result indicates a significantly higher GDP per head in those regions once occupied by the Romans (Table 1 column 1). GDP per capita is also statistically significant when control variables are added to the model.³⁰ This confirms the study by Wahl (2017) who, however, used night light luminosity as measure for the wealth level.

Table 1: Personality traits and Roman legacy

Dependent variable	(1) Average GDP per capita 1992- 2016	(2) Extraver- sion	(3) Agreeable- ness	(4) Neuroticism	(5) Conscien- tiousness	(6) Openness	(7) Entrepreneurial personality profile
Roman (1=yes)	0.221*** (0.045)	0.0327** (0.0135)	0.0264*** (0.0078)	-0.0467*** (0.0113)	0.0208* (0.0114)	0.0426*** (0.0114)	0.395*** (0.0997)
R ²	0.188	0.042	0.094	0.139	0.025	0.093	0.105

Notes: Ordinary least squares regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. The number of observations (regions) is 96 in all models.

For our central main results, we separately regress the Roman legacy dummy on the Big Five personality traits of the regional population without any control variables. We find statistically significant coefficients of the Roman dummy for all the Big Five as well as for the entrepreneurial personality profile (Table 1, column 2 to 7). According to these results the population in those regions that were occupied by the Romans nearly 2,000 years ago show higher levels of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness as well as lower levels of neuroticism. The entrepreneurial personality profile that is a

³⁰ For details, see Table A 4 in the Appendix.

construct based on the Big Five traits, shows also significantly higher scores for the regions of the former Roman Empire. The statistical fit of the models as indicated by the R^2 values is, however, not very high.

Table 2: Personality traits and Roman legacy with control variables

Dependent Variable	(1) Extraversion	(2) Agreeableness	(3) Neuroticism	(4) Conscientiousness	(5) Openness	(6) Entrepreneurial personality
Roman (1=yes)	0.0433** (0.0192)	0.0156 (0.0108)	-0.0568*** (0.0186)	0.0517*** (0.0186)	0.0090 (0.0191)	0.473*** (0.152)
Intersects major river (1=yes)	-0.0136 (0.0185)	0.0087 (0.00921)	-0.0024 (0.0146)	0.0174 (0.0145)	-0.0038 (0.0161)	-0.0563 (0.145)
Border region (1=yes)	0.0425*** (0.0156)	-0.0067 (0.0087)	-0.0311** (0.0151)	-0.0182 (0.0156)	0.0101 (0.0155)	0.298** (0.129)
Mean elevation	2.10e-05 (5.82e-05)	-3.88e-05 (3.07e-05)	-1.03e-05 (4.94e-05)	-9.86e-05** (4.77e-05)	9.24e-05* (5.34e-05)	0.0003 (0.0005)
Terrain ruggedness	0.0001 (0.0001)	0.0001* (7.00e-05)	-0.0001 (0.0001)	-2.88e-05 (9.44e-05)	0.000156 (0.0001)	0.0009 (0.0009)
Soil suitability	-0.0008 (0.0007)	0.0007* (0.0004)	0.0006 (0.0007)	0.0008 (0.0007)	0.0001 (0.001)	-0.0040 (0.0063)
Coastal region (1=yes)	-0.0454 (0.0361)	-0.0345** (0.0167)	-0.0213 (0.0277)	-0.0562* (0.0308)	0.0536** (0.0240)	0.0575 (0.307)
Number of Celtic Oppida	-0.0036** (0.0017)	-0.0017*** (0.0006)	0.0022* (0.0013)	-0.0061*** (0.0012)	0.0019 (0.0018)	-0.0260** (0.0118)
Mean sunshine duration	-0.0005** (0.0002)	0.0002 (0.0001)	6.29e-05 (0.0001)	-0.000113 (0.0001)	-4.86e-05 (0.0001)	-0.0032* (0.0018)
Mean temperature	0.0013 (0.0106)	0.00091 (0.0059)	0.0039 (0.0089)	-0.0119 (0.0085)	0.0251*** (0.0092)	0.0593 (0.0721)
Hanseatic League	0.0065 (0.0203)	0.01 (0.0107)	-0.0116 (0.0171)	0.0096 (0.0207)	0.006 (0.0169)	0.108 (0.168)
Number of plague outbreaks	0.0016*** (0.0006)	0.0001 (0.0003)	-0.0009* (0.0005)	-0.0011* (0.0006)	0.0022*** (0.0006)	0.0108** (0.004)
Carboniferous rock strata	0.0103 (0.0168)	-0.0297*** (0.00975)	0.0168 (0.0157)	-0.0490** (0.0208)	0.0130 (0.0196)	-0.0871 (0.133)
R^2	0.328	0.291	0.263	0.247	0.321	0.271

Notes: Ordinary least squares regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. The number of observations (regions) is 96 in all models.

Including control variables that may have an effect on the personality traits of the populations leads to statistical insignificance of agreeableness and openness while the entrepreneurial personality fit remains highly statistically significant (Table 2). It is remarkable that only some of the control variables are statistically significant. There are significant relationships between some of the personality traits and being located at the border or at the coast, the mean temperature, sunshine duration, and the number of plague outbreaks in the Middle Ages. Variables that indicate characteristics of the landscape and quality of the soil

Table 3: Socioeconomic outcomes and Roman legacy

Dependent Variable	(1) Life Satisfaction	(2)	(3) Health Satisfaction	(4)	(5) Life Expectancy	(6)	(7) ln(Patents)	(8)	(9) Start-Up Rate	(10)
Roman (1=yes)	0.164*** (0.0512)	0.313*** (0.0868)	0.177*** (0.0455)	0.209** (0.0845)	0.987*** (0.167)	0.562** (0.225)	0.885*** (0.121)	0.570*** (0.177)	3.301** (1.408)	9.030*** (1.800)
Intersects major river (1=yes)		-0.106 (0.0670)		-0.0224 (0.0591)		-0.0476 (0.164)		-0.266* (0.149)		-0.972 (1.522)
Border region (1=yes)		0.122** (0.0592)		0.106 (0.0696)		0.0701 (0.173)		0.462*** (0.151)		2.594* (1.409)
Mean elevation		6.53e-05 (0.0003)		6.81e-05 (0.0002)		0.000864 (0.0006)		0.0013*** (0.0005)		0.0027 (0.0051)
Terrain ruggedness		-0.0005 (0.0006)		-5.64e-05 (0.0005)		0.002 (0.0014)		0.001 (0.001)		-0.0026 (0.0121)
Soil suitability		-0.00234 (0.0032)		0.000659 (0.0027)		0.0120 (0.0083)		0.00338 (0.0058)		-0.273*** (0.0797)
Coastal region (1=yes)		0.108 (0.128)		0.0891 (0.0980)		-0.0479 (0.295)		-0.0354 (0.259)		4.481* (2.427)
Number of Celtic Oppida		0.0002 (0.0053)		-0.0052 (0.0051)		-0.0225 (0.0139)		-0.0357** (0.0152)		-0.272 (0.184)
Mean sunshine duration		-0.0016 (0.001)		-0.0006 (0.0007)		-0.001 (0.0015)		-0.002 (0.0014)		-0.0399*** (0.0124)
Mean temperature		-0.0672 (0.0536)		-0.0700* (0.0415)		0.200* (0.101)		0.122 (0.0864)		-0.0641 (0.807)
Hanseatic League		0.0710 (0.111)		0.0446 (0.0915)		0.0507 (0.250)		-0.0371 (0.188)		-1.783 (2.205)
Number of plague outbreaks		0.0005 (0.0032)		-5.84e-05 (0.0028)		0.0034 (0.0064)		0.0087 (0.0057)		0.225*** (0.0636)
Carboniferous rock strata		-0.0205 (0.0995)		0.0438 (0.0907)		-0.821*** (0.243)		-0.263 (0.190)		-0.941 (1.508)
R ²	0.064	0.202	0.102	0.205	0.291	0.510	0.293	0.576	0.054	0.346

Notes: Ordinary least squares regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. The number of observations regions is 96 in all models.

(mean elevation, terrain ruggedness, soil suitability) are never statistically significant. The number of Celtic Oppida is statistically significant in four of the six models. Quite interestingly, those coefficients of this variable that are statistically significant assume an opposite sign as the dummy for being part of the Roman Empire. This underlines the differences of the personality traits between Roman regions and those of the German barbarians.

Turning to socioeconomic outcomes of economic vitality, we find positive relationships between Roman occupation and life and health satisfaction as well as life expectancy of the regional population (Table 3). There are also pronounced and statistically significant positive relationships between the Roman dummy, the number of patents per workforce and the number of business start-ups per workforce. All results for the Roman dummy remain statistically significant with a positive sign if the set of control variables is included. The effect sizes are remarkable. For example, Roman legacy is associated with a 6 months longer life expectancy (0.5 years). The patent rate increases by 0.5 percent while the start-up rate increases by 9 start-ups per 10,000 economically active persons.

5.2 Where does the effect of the Romans come from?

We focus on two particularly promising mechanisms that may be responsible for a long-lasting effect of the Romans on current regional performance and economic vitality; Roman roads and the number of Roman markets and mines. Either mechanism could have led to the development and persistence of a local ‘entrepreneurial culture’ due to selective migration on the one hand and persistence of economic activity since Roman times on the other. Hence, we substitute the dummy variable for Roman presence by variables for the density of Roman roads and the number of Roman markets and mines (Table 4). There is a certain overlap between both measures³¹ and many cities located at Roman roads that were not original centers of the Roman economy in Germania, developed into trade centers in later periods. In this sense, one may suppose that the effect of

³¹ The correlation coefficient between the two measures is 0.501.

markets and mines is likely to pick-up an ‘early start advantage’ of the original Roman economic centers.

According to the results, density of road infrastructure built by the Romans shows a statistically significant effect on life satisfaction, life expectancy, the number of patents per population and the start-up rate (Panel A in Table 4). While there is a negative relationship with neuroticism the relationship with conscientiousness is not statistically significant. While the relationship with the other three personality traits is also insignificant³² the entrepreneurial personality profile that is a combination of all five traits (see Section 4.1.2) is significant with the expected positive sign. In terms of magnitude, there is a dramatic increase for many of the outcomes. An increase in Roman road density by a 1 unit leads to a rise in the number of patents by almost 12 percent while there are 112 more start-ups rate per 10,000 people of the economically active workforce.

Table 4: Personality traits, socioeconomic outcomes and Roman legacy: accounting for potential mechanisms

Dependent Variable	(1) Neuroticism	(2) Conscientiousness	(3) Entrepreneurial personality	(4) Life satisfaction	(5) Life expectancy	(6) ln(Patents)	(7) Start-up rate
<i>Panel A: Roman road density</i>							
Roman road density	-0.925*** (0.313)	0.126 (0.289)	6.498** (2.824)	6.240*** (1.833)	12.04*** (4.083)	11.74*** (3.099)	119.5** (47.00)
R ²	0.238	0.188	0.240	0.205	0.518	0.679	0.299
<i>Panel B: Number of Roman markets & mines</i>							
Number of Roman markets & mines	-0.0197*** (0.00523)	0.0135** (0.00606)	0.151*** (0.0533)	0.0549** (0.0261)	0.137 (0.0830)	0.0744 (0.0522)	2.004* (1.119)
R ²	0.249	0.215	0.253	0.129	0.488	0.643	0.278
<i>Panel C: Roman road density and number of markets & mines</i>							
Roman road density	-0.583* (0.311)	-0.249 (0.313)	3.700 (3.215)	6.297*** (2.089)	11.19** (4.288)	12.72*** (3.381)	91.61** (40.97)
Number of Roman markets & mines	-0.0143** (0.00559)	0.0158** (0.00632)	0.118* (0.0674)	-0.00239 (0.0305)	0.0356 (0.0841)	-0.0413 (0.0524)	1.170 (1.125)
R ²	0.266	0.218	0.261	0.206	0.519	0.680	0.315
Observations	96	96	96	96	96	93	96
Controls Included	Yes*	Yes**	Yes*	Yes	Yes***	Yes***	Yes***

Notes: Ordinary least squares regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. The number of observations (regions) is 96 in all models. Controls are identical to the ones included in Tables 2 and 3. Significance stars after the “Yes” indicate the lowest level of joint significance of the control variables.

³² The models are omitted here to economize on space.

Running the models with the number of markets and mines as indicator for Roman presence shows slightly stronger relationships for the personality traits but weaker relationships for the socioeconomic outcomes; the relationships with life expectancy and patents is insignificant while the relationship with the start-up rate is only statistically significant at the 10% level. Including both variables, Roman road density and the number of Roman markets and mines into the models (Panel C in Table 4) clearly indicates that markets and mines are more strongly related to the personality traits while Roman road density is more closely related to the socioeconomic outcomes.

The evidence supports the notion that Roman roads are an important mechanism for a persistent effect of Roman presence on regional performance over long periods of time as described in Section 2.1. The relationship is considerably stronger with current socioeconomic outcomes than for explaining personality traits.

5.3 Further results for historical outcomes

Until now we have only investigated the relationship between variables determined at Roman times and variables determined today. However, if there is really a persistent effect of the Romans, it should also be visible when looking at earlier outcomes from the long time period between Roman presence and today. To test whether we find a Roman effect in these periods we use data sets from other studies that related to 15th and 16th century.

One of these data sets is the study of Dittmar and Meisenzahl (2020) containing information for 239 German-speaking cities for which Bairoch, Batou and Chevre (1988) offer city population figures in 1800. This data set is a cross section where most of the variables are measured in the 15th or 16th century. Based on the information about the course of the Roman border we assign each city to the Roman and the Germanic part. We also create a dummy variable if a city is located closer than 5km from a Roman road. Among the variables in this data set the average number of students in a city between 1458 and 1508 and the number of books printed before 1517 are of most interest to us, as they could proxy for innovativeness and human capital back then. Apart from these two variables we include a host of control variables coming from their data set, like dummy

variables for cities that were members of the Hanseatic League, had a university or are located on a river, among others. As both outcome variables are count data, we estimate Poisson models here. We also include territory fixed effects and report heteroskedasticity robust standard errors.

Table 5: Roman Legacy and Medieval Economic Outcomes

Dependent variable	(1) Number of students 1458-1508	(2)	(3) Number of books pre 1517	(4)	(5) Number of markets in 1470	(6)	(7) Share of economic buildings 1400-1600	(8)
Data set	Dittmar and Meisenzahl (2020)				Cantoni et al. (2018)			
Method	Poisson				OLS			
Roman (1=yes)	0.628*** (0.193)		2.937*** (0.812)		0.111 (0.069)		0.0198** (0.0088)	
Roman road (1=yes)		0.228 (0.179)		0.916* (0.497)		0.137* (0.0751)		0.0194* (0.0106)
(Pseudo) R ²	0.471	0.464	0.504	0.488	0.086	0.087	0.037	0.036
Number of observations	229	229	229	229	2218	2218	2218	2218
Controls Included	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes. Robust standard errors in parentheses. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. In columns (1)-(4), following control variables are always included: a river, Hanseatic League, university by 1517 and Reformation law before 1600 dummy, the number of monasteries of non-mendicant orders and the Augustinians within 10km of the city in 1517, the natural logarithm of a city's distance to Wittenberg and historical states dummies are included. For the sources see Dittmar and Meisenzahl (2020). In columns (5)-(8), the controls are a university by 1517 (from Dittmar and Meisenzahl), city near the border of a different religious denomination dummy, a Protestant dummy and a variable indicating which noble family ruled the territory in 1500. For the sources see Cantoni, Dittmar and Yuchtman (2018)

Columns (1) to (4) in Table 5 show the results of the Poisson regressions. These estimates suggest that cities in the historically Roman part of Germany had significantly more students (even when controlling for university location) and more printed books in the 15th and 16th century. This implies that their human capital stock and probably also their level of innovativeness were already higher during the late Middle Ages. Location close to a Roman road does however, only matter for explaining the number of students, not the number of books. This suggests that Roman roads are only one of several mechanisms explaining the effect of the Romans on these outcomes.

Next, we use the data set of Cantoni, Dittmar and Yuchtman (2018) that provides information on historical construction activities in all 2,257 cities in the German Empire (as of 1937) that ever had city rights. This data set provides

yearly information for the period from 1400 to 1600. Information on construction activities in those cities comes from the “*Deutsche Städtebuch*” (Handbook of German Cities) edited by Keyser and Stoob (1939–1974). From the information in the *Städtebuch*, Cantoni, Dittmar and Yuchtman et al. (2018) also take information on the number of markets in each of the cities in 1470. Their data set also includes other variables such as a dummy for Protestant religion, and on the number of Monasteries in the region around a city (and whether they were closed in course of the Reformation or not).

We are interested in testing whether cities in the Roman area had more markets and constructed more economic buildings. We calculate the average number of buildings constructed in each year between 1400 and 1600 and then calculate the share of economic buildings. As before, we assign each city in their data set to the historically Roman part of Germany or to the non-Roman part based on our map of the Limes and we assess whether a city was located within 5km from a Roman road. We include several controls from the data sets of Cantoni, Dittmar and Yuchtman (2018) and that of Dittmar and Meisenzahl (2020), among them a dummy for the presence of a university in 1517, and a dummy for cities that became Protestant.

Columns (5) to (8) of Table 5 report the results of OLS estimations explaining the number of markets and the share of economic buildings with a Roman dummy or a Roman road dummy and controls. It turns out that both cities in the Roman area as well as those located close to Roman roads had significantly more markets and significantly higher shares of economic buildings. This suggests that those cities were centers of trade and commerce already during the late Middle Ages and the early modern period.

Finally, we re-estimate the regressions from Table 3, column (8) and Table 4, column (4) using the average number of patents per capita in 1890, 1900 and 1910 as an outcome variable. We obtained these data from the historical patent database of Donges, Meier and Silva (2019) which is an extended and updated version of the patent database by Streb, Baten and Shuxi (2006). Their data is on the level of counties in 1900 and we aggregate them up to contemporary planning regions by assigning each historical county to the planning region where it is located and then we calculate the sum of all historical patents in a contemporary

planning region. We also calculate the historical population of a planning region and then divide the number of historical patents by the historical population to arrive at the number of historical patents per capita. Table 6 shows the results of the regressions using this historical patent activity measure. We find a significant and positive Roman dummy also for historical patent activity.

Table 6: Historical Patent Activity and Roman Legacy

Dependent variable	Historical patents (ln)
Roman (1=yes)	0.906** (0.376)
Controls included	Yes**
R ²	0.233

Notes: Ordinary least squares regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. The number of observations (regions) is 96 in all models. Controls are identical to the ones included in Tables 2 and 3. Significance stars after the “Yes” indicate the lowest level of joint significance of the control variables and Federal State Dummies.

All in all, the results are not only in line with previous results on the persistent development effect of Roman legacies in Germany (Wahl 2017) but also show that the Roman part of Germany was more economically vibrant and had a better human capital stock and more patenting activity already in earlier periods. However, we are not able to test the persistence of personality traits as there exists no historical psychological survey data that would allow us to do so. The same applies to entrepreneurship since there is no information on historical start-up activity. However, there could well be an underlying cultural pathway, imprinted by Roman rule, and with various corresponding expressions in local outcomes over the centuries, including human capital and economic activity between the 15th and 20th century and also present-day personality characteristics as indicated by our results.

5.4 Robustness check: spatial regression discontinuity design (RDD) using individual-level data

The results of the main analysis have two notable weaknesses. At first, they are based on highly aggregated data, which both implies a relatively low number of observations and masks potentially important heterogeneity in psychological traits that exists at the individual level. Second, while we control for a host of potential confounders these variables might also lead to a bias of our estimates.

To address both concerns, we run spatial RDD (regression discontinuity design) using the Limes as a two-dimensional cut-off variable (Keele and Titiunik 2014). Such a spatial RDD is valid under two conditions. First, there should not be a ‘compound’ treatment, i.e. the border of the Roman Empire should not coincide with other historical or contemporary borders. Second, the border should be drawn exogenously, i.e., in an (economically) unsystematic way. Regarding, compound treatment the Limes does not coincide with any important contemporary or historical border. It is not identical to the border of a present Federal State, district or county, and it does also not follow other historical borders, like those of the occupational zones after World War II, the Prussian border (for a more detailed discussion of compound treatment see Wahl 2017). With regard to the exogeneity of the border, the discussion in Section 3 suggest that one can indeed assume that the Limes was drawn in an unsystematic way (e.g. as a straight line). Tests of continuity of relevant observables such as soil quality or elevation in Wahl (2017) provides further evidence that the course of the Limes was not shaped by these factors. Therefore, the Roman border seems to be a suitable candidate for a spatial RDD.³³

Our spatial RDD analysis relies on the individual-level raw survey data on which our Big Five personality trait variables are based (see Section 4.5). The data allow to determine the location of an individual who participated in the survey at the level of a five digit zip code area. To conduct the spatial RDD we determine the coordinates (latitude and longitude) of the centroid (mid-point) of

³³ A further condition for a valid spatial RDD is the absence of selective sorting. This means that the observed units should not be able to (completely) control the assignment variable and hence the treatment status. Such an effect should be no valid concern in our case since migration between the Roman and non-Roman parts of Germany was rather limited and controlled by the authorities.

each zip code area in Germany and calculate the geographic distance of these centroids to the closest point of the Limes border as depicted in Figure 1. From the individual level data set we also take the age of an individual and gender (female=1) as control variables. A descriptive overview of the variables used for the spatial RDD is provided in Table A2b in the Appendix.

This identification strategy³⁴ has the following intuition: If there is a systematic difference between personality traits of individuals in the Roman and the non-Roman area, one can model personality traits as a function of geographic distance to the Roman border and should see an upward shift in the intercept of that function at the border (i.e., at distance 0). This shift in the intercept can be estimated using a spatial RDD (where it is represented by the Roman dummy).

A spatial RDD is a special case of an RDD with a two-dimensional forcing variable. We estimate different variants of such a spatial RDD. First, we treat the border as a one-dimensional threshold and estimate a classical RDD with Euclidean distance to the Roman border as forcing variable, i.e. we include a linear function of each zip code area's distance to the closest Roman border point to the regression. Second, we treat the border as a two-dimensional threshold and estimate the spatial RDD including, a control for the geographic location of an individual. This means that we include a linear function of a zip code area's centroid latitude and longitude to the regression equation. In both cases, we include 'flexible' polynomials meaning that we allow the polynomials to differ in the treated and non-treated area (we interact distance or latitude/longitude with the treatment variable). Finally, we combine both approaches and include the distance and the coordinates polynomial simultaneously in one regression. We also include county fixed effects in all the regressions. We estimate a parametric (or semi-parametric RDD) and only consider observations that are located less than 100km away from the border. We cluster the standard errors on zip code area level.

Formally, we estimate variants of the following regression equation using OLS:

$$Y_{ics} = \alpha + \beta R_{ics} + f(D_s) + f(x_s, y_s) + \gamma' \mathbf{X}_{ics} + \lambda_c + \varepsilon_{ics} \quad (2)$$

³⁴ For similar approaches see Dell (2010), Wahl (2017) and Huning and Wahl (2019).

with Y_{ics} being the score in one of the personality trait measures of individual i in county c and zip code area s . R_{ics} is a dummy variable equal to one if individual i is living in a zipcode area s that is located within Roman Germany. This is our variable of interest measuring the persistent effect of Roman legacies on personality traits. $f(D_s)$ is a flexible function of each zip code area's centroid geodesic distance to the closest point on the historical Roman border. $f(x_s, y_s)$ is a flexible function of the longitudinal and latitudinal coordinates of each zip code areas's centroid (x_s and y_s). X_{ics} is a vector of control variables, namely a female dummy and the age of the survey participant. λ_c represents county fixed effects accounting for remaining unobserved heterogeneity on county level and ε_{ics} is the error term.

Table 7: Personality traits and Roman legacy—Individual level spatial RDD results

Dependent Variable	Extraversion			Agreeableness			Neuroticism		
Roman (1=yes)	0.0529** (0.0214)	0.0512** (0.0212)	0.0495** (0.0213)	0.0353** (0.0156)	0.0346** (0.0155)	0.0313** (0.0155)	-0.0538** (0.0240)	-0.0475** (0.0238)	-0.0461** (0.0220)
Linear Coordinates Polynomial	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Female (1=yes)	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Age	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Number of observations	68,566	68,566	67,779	68,566	68,566	67,779	68,566	68,566	67,779
R ²	0.007	0.007	0.020	0.008	0.008	0.034	0.007	0.007	0.076

Dependent Variable	Conscientiousness			Openness			Entrepreneurial personality		
Roman (1=yes)	0.00402 (0.0185)	0.00456 (0.0185)	-0.00538 (0.0184)	0.00391 (0.0125)	0.0198 (0.0185)	0.0201 (0.0183)	0.333* (0.186)	0.313* (0.185)	0.292 (0.179)
Linear Coordinates Polynomial	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Female (1=yes)	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Age	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Number of observations	68,566	68,566	67,779	68,566	68,566	67,779	68,566	68,566	67,779
R ²	0.009	0.009	0.084	0.001	0.015	0.026	0.007	0.007	0.028

Notes: Standard errors clustered on zip code area are in parentheses. All models contain County dummies. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. The observations are individuals living in a certain zip code area. All regressions are estimated for a buffer area 100km around the Limes. All regressions include a constant not reported.

Table 7 reports the results of estimating these alternative specification of spatial RDD for the six personality trait variables. We find our results regarding

extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism confirmed by the spatial RDD. All three variables are significantly related to the Roman dummy, with individuals in the Roman part of Germany being significantly less neurotic, more agreeable and more extraverted. We also find significant results for the entrepreneurial personality profile although the coefficients are only marginally significant and become insignificant (with only slight changes of coefficient values) when the controls for gender and age are added. Compared to the results of the aggregate level analysis (Tables 2 and 3), the coefficients are of similar size or—in the case of agreeableness—notably larger. These estimates clearly indicate that our earlier results for the personality traits are not shaped by an endogeneity bias.

5.5 Further robustness checks

We conduct several further robustness checks to challenge our findings. In a first series of alternative specifications, we include dummy variables for the current German Federal States in the models presented in section 5.1. These dummy variables control for influences of current policies since the Federal States are an important level of policy making in Germany. Introducing state fixed effects implies that the variation with respect to Roman legacy stems only from those (N=40) regions in those Federal States in which the Limes border was located historically. For the analysis of personality traits, this exercise does not lead to any major changes of the results (Table A5). In particular, the results for the Roman dummy remain rather robust. This is not surprising as the Federal State dummies are only jointly significant for neuroticism and extraversion. Thus, there seems to be not much of a systematic variation between current Federal States in those traits. It should be noted

Introduction of Federal State dummies does, however, lead to a considerable decrease of the statistical significance of the Roman dummy for explaining regional variation in socioeconomic outcomes (Table A6). This might indicate that the socioeconomic outcomes are more affected by current policies than the Big Five personality traits. At the same time, the case number in our setting is relatively low (N=96) and therefore a reduced statistical power of the coefficient estimates comes as little surprise when introducing state fixed effects.

It should be noted that the Federal State fixed effects completely account for a possible “GDR effect”—the potential long-term cultural influence of four decades of socialism. The border of the former GDR, that is completely identical to the border of the contemporary eastern Federal States (Brandenburg, Mecklenburg-West Pomerania, Saxony-Anhalt, Saxony and Thuringia).³⁵ Thus, our results indicate that above and beyond a potential imprint of socialism and the massive social change during the rapid transition to capitalism in East Germany since 1990, the Limes and the deep, lasting imprint of the Romans seems to be an even deeper underlying “line of fate” separating German regions today with regard to culture, economic vitality, and population well-being. Finally, the results for our analysis on Roman road density and the number of market mines are robust when Federal State dummies are included (Table A7).

Finally, it can be useful to have a look at alternative indicators for innovation and entrepreneurial activity. We consider the number of high tech start-ups per 10,000 inhabitants as a more specific measure combining information about the local level of entrepreneurial spirit of innovativeness. Furthermore, we look at the regional share of employees working in the R&D sector. For both measures, we look at the average numbers during the period 2008 to 2014. Results for these dependent variables are shown in Table A8. As before, we first run regressions including a full set of controls and then add Federal State fixed effects. For both variables the results suggest a significant and positive relationship with the Roman legacy dummy. There are on average more high tech start-ups per workforce in the Roman part of Germany and the share of R&D employees is also higher. In sum, none of our results contradict the baseline analysis.

6. Conclusions

We presented empirical evidence for a statistically significant relationship between being part of the Roman Empire nearly 2,000 years ago, personality traits

³⁵ The contemporary city and Federal State of Berlin does include both the Western and Eastern parts of Berlin. However, the western part of Berlin was split itself into four occupation zones. We cannot use this variation as we only have data on the contemporary planning region consisting of the reunified Berlin.

of today's population, and several current socioeconomic outcomes reflecting social and economic progress. These statistical relationships remain rather robust when controlling for a number of alternative explanations such as locational characteristics, climate, quality of the soil, the number of plague outbreaks in the Middle Ages or being a main center of Roman trade. According to our results, the population in the former Roman areas has higher levels of conscientiousness and extraversion, lower levels of neuroticism, and a higher prevalence of an entrepreneurial personality profile. In line with these regional personality patterns, the population in the former Roman areas also has higher levels of life and health satisfaction, longer life expectancy, is more inventive, and tends to found new companies more often.

Although we have no definite explanation of the transmission of the 'Roman effect' over the period of nearly 2,000 years, there is solid indication that the density of the Roman road network played an important role in this deep cultural imprinting. The establishment of the Roman road network in southern Germany facilitated interregional mobility and social and economic interactions in these regions, which in turn might have shaped positive attitudes of the population towards strangers, lesser risk aversion and greater tolerance towards change as well as a more entrepreneurial psychological and economic climate. It is also important to note that these routes connected this part of Germany with Rome (and the Roman Empire). Hence, this road network could have helped to establish a certain early civilization advantage in these German regions, compared to the less developed 'barbaric' cultures North of the Limes.

Another reason for expecting a relationship between Roman legacy, current personality traits and socioeconomic outcomes that indicate socioeconomic development and vitality builds on the presence of Roman markets and mines that indicate high levels of economic and social activity. High activity levels may have created pronounced incentives for creativity and innovativeness and may, therefore, have attracted people with such traits to these places. In our statistical analysis the number of Roman markets and mines turned out to be statistically significant for some of our outcome indicators, but the relationship was much weaker than for the density of Roman roads.

Whether, among others, selective migration of like-minded people into the Roman area or the persistence of specific characteristics of the Roman population of the area (maybe an already existing entrepreneurial spirit or higher openness or less risk aversion) are responsible for our results can, therefore, not be investigated empirically. Since the Roman part of Germany was inhabited by Roman soldiers and their relatives from all over the Empire, the population was comparatively heterogeneous. This also suggests that the population of Roman Germany could have been characterized by a higher level of creativity, openness, and tolerance.³⁶ This is, however, speculation and the vast migration movements following the demise of the Roman Empire make it extremely difficult to assess this such type of conjecture. Nevertheless, Gomtsyan (2017) provides evidence in this direction by showing that cities in the former Roman part of Germany experienced higher in-migration rates until today and that these migration movements have shaped the attitudes of the city's residents towards migration.

Our results also add to the ongoing debate in Germany about today's (growing) North-South divide that seems to be so influential for regional disparities in a range of socioeconomic outcomes and their persistence (e.g., Lammers 2003). Our data illustrate how 'deep' this divide goes, even with respect to corresponding personality traits and personal well-being, in addition to economic outcomes. Hence, public policies addressing these economic differences should also consider the deep cultural and psychological divide, and the common historical roots behind these regional patterns (Abdellaoui et al. 2019; Obschonka et al. 2018; Talhelm et al. 2014).

Attempted to unpack important factors and mechanisms in deep imprinting, our findings contribute to the literature linking history and its long-lasting effects to present-day outcomes with a particular consideration of 'soft factors' such as culture and psychology (e.g., Alesina and Giuliano 2015; Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales 2006; Nunn 2009). What is particularly interesting and impressive is that this 'Roman effect' seems to be able to 'survive' the many disruptive changes that the German regions experienced over the last centuries

³⁶ Ashraf and Galor (2013) theoretically and empirically show that in-group genetic diversity is positively related to creativity and innovativeness, as for example, measured by scientific output.

such as in- and out-migration of population, devastating wars and diseases, changing administrative borders and political regimes, changing religions as well as—last but not least—enormous developments of technology, social practices, and a pronounced increase of economic welfare. This implies that our understanding of more recent disruptive changes and developments in history needs to be informed by an updated understanding of underlying *deeper* historical path dependencies that run deep in the regions and local populations and may ‘survive’ such more recent disruptive changes and developments as a product of particularly deep cultural imprinting. This would not only call for more research on such deeper cultural imprinting in various regions and countries, but also reminds today’s public policy addressing the essential social and economic progress of local populations that regions may have a deep (often not directly ‘visible’) cultural imprint that shape the past, present, and future of these regions.

Literature

- Abdellaoui, A., D. Hugh-Jones, L. Yengo, K.E. Kemper, M.G. Nivard, L. Veul, L., Y. Holtz, B.P.Zietsch, T.M. Frayling, N.T. Wray J. Yang, K.J.H. Verweij and P.M.Visscher (2019): Genetic correlates of social stratification in Great Britain. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 3, 1332-1342. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-019-0757-5>
- Acemoglu, D. and J.A. Robinson (2012): *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Books: Washington D.C.
- Aghion, P. (2017): Entrepreneurship and growth: lessons from an intellectual journey. *Small Business Economics*, 48, 9–24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-016-9812-z>
- Alesina, A. and P. Giuliano (2015): Culture and institutions. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 53(4), 898-944. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.53.4.898>
- Ashraf, Q. and O. Galor (2013): The “Out of Africa“ Hypothesis, Human Genetic Diversity, and Comparative Economic Development. *American Economic Review*, 103(1), 1-46. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.103.1.1>
- Assmann, J. (2018): *Achsenzeit – Eine Archäologie der Moderne*. München: Beck.
- Badian, E. (1980): *Römischer Imperialismus*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Badian, E. (1997): *Zöllner und Sünder-Unternehmer im Dienst der römischen Republik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Bairoch, P., J. Batou and P. Chevre (1984): *The population of European cities from 800 to 1850*. Geneva: Librairie Droz.
- Barrick, M.R. and M.K. Mount (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel psychology*, 44(1), 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x>
- Bazzi, S., M. Fiszbein and M. Gebresilasse (2017): Frontier Culture: The Roots and Persistence of “Rugged Individualism” in the United States. NBER Working Paper, No. 23997. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w23997>
- Bersch J., S. Gottschalk, S., Müller, B. and M. Niefert (2014): The Mannheim Enterprise Panel (MUP) and Firm Statistics for Germany. Mannheim: ZEW (ZEW Discussion Paper No. 14-104). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2548385>
- Beugelsdijk, S. (2007): Entrepreneurial culture, regional innovativeness and economic growth. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 17, 187–210. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-006-0048-y>
- Biraben, J.-N. (1975): *Les hommes et la peste en France et dans les pays européens et méditerranéens: La peste dans l’histoire*. Paris: Mouton.
- Bogg, T. and B.W. Roberts (2004): Conscientiousness and health-related behaviors: A meta-analysis of the leading behavioral contributors to mortality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(6), 887-919. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.6.887>

- Boyd, R. and P. J. Richerson (2005): *The Origin and Evolution of Culture*. Oxford University Press.
- Buggle, J. and R. Durante (2017): Climate Risk, Cooperation and the Co-Evolution of Culture and Institutions. CEPR Discussion Paper No. 25243-1507990110.
http://www.cepr.org/active/publications/discussion_papers/dp.php?dpno=12380
- Büntgen, U., C. Ginzler, J. Esper, W. Tegel and A.J. McMichael (2012): Digitizing Historical Plague. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 95, 1586-1588.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/cis723>
- Cantoni, D., J. Dittmar and N. Yuchtman (2018): Religious Competition and Reallocation: The Political Economy of Secularization in the Protestant Reformation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 133(4), 2037-2096.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjy011>
- Caspi, A., B.W. Roberts and R.L. Shiner (2005): Personality development: stability and change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 453-484.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141913>
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., E. Bennett and A. Furnham (2007): The happy personality: Mediation role of trait emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(8), 1633-1639.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.10.029>
- Costa, P.T and R.R. McCrae (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(4), 668.
- Crescenzi, R., S. Iammarino, C. Ioramashvili, A. Rodríguez-Pose and M. Storper (2020): The Geography of Innovation and Development: global spread and local hotspots. Papers in Economic Geography and Spatial Economics, London: London School of Economics.
<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/id/eprint/105116>
- Cronbach, L.J. and G.C. Gleser (1953): Assessing the similarity between profiles. *Psychological Bulletin*, 50, 456-473. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0057173>
- Daalgard, C.-J., N. Kaarsen, O. Olsson and P. Selaya (2019): Roman Roads to Prosperity: Persistence and Non-Persistence of Public Goods Provision. Mimeo
- De Benedictis, L., V. Licio and A.M. Pinna (2018): The Long-term Effects of the Historical Roman Road Network: Trade Costs of Italian Provinces. CRENoS Working Paper 2018/1.
- Dell, M. (2010): The Persistent Effects of Peru's Mining MITA. *Econometrica*, 78(6), 1863-1903.
- Diamond, J. and J.A. Robinson (Eds.). (2010): *Natural experiments of history*. Harvard University Press.
- Dittmar, J. and R. Meisenzahl (2020): Public Goods Institutions, Human Capital, and Growth: Evidence from German History. *Review of Economic Studies*, 87, 959-996. <https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdz002>

- Dollinger, P. (1966): *Die Hanse*. Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner.
- Donges, A., J-M. Meier and R.C. Silva (2019): The Impact of Institutions on Innovation. Mimeo.
- Elleman, L.G., D.M. Condon, S.E. Russin and W. Revelle (2018): The personality of US states: Stability from 1999 to 2015. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 72, 64-72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2016.06.022>
- Ferninhough, A. and K.H. O'Rourke (2014): Coal and the European Industrial Revolution. NBER Working Paper No. 19802. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w19802>
- Fleurbaey, M. (2009). Beyond GDP: The quest for a measure of social welfare. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 47(4), 1029-75.
- Florida, R. (2010): *Who's your city?: How the creative economy is making where to live the most important decision of your life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Flückiger, M., M. Larch, M. Ludwig and A. Mees (2019): Roman Transport Network Connectivity and Economic Integration. Mimeo
- Friedman, H.S. (2000): Long-Term Relations of Personality and Health: Dynamisms, Mechanisms, Tropisms. *Journal of Personality*, 68(6), 1089-1107. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00127>
- Fritsch, M., Obschonka, M., Wyrwich, M., Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Potter, J. (2018). Regionale Unterschiede der Verteilung von Personen mit unternehmerischem Persönlichkeitsprofil in Deutschland—ein Überblick [Regional differences in an entrepreneurial personality profile in Germany – an overview]. *Raumforschung und Raumordnung Spatial Research and Planning*, 76(1), 65-81.
- Fritsch, M. and M. Wyrwich (2017): The Effect of Entrepreneurship for Economic Development—An empirical analysis using regional entrepreneurship culture. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 17, 157-189. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbv049>
- Fritsch M., Obschonka, M. and M. Wyrwich (2019): Historical Roots of Entrepreneurial Culture and Innovation Activity—An Analysis for German Regions. *Regional Studies*, 53, 1296-1307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2019.1580357>
- Garretsen, H., J.I. Stoker, D. Soudis, R. Martin and J. Rentfrow (2018): The relevance of personality traits for urban economic growth: making space for psychological factors. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 19(3), 541-565. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lby025>
- Giuliano, P. and N. Nunn (2013): The Transmission of Democracy: From the Village to the Nation-State. *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings*, 103, 86–92. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.103.3.86>
- Griliches, Z. (1990): Patent statistics as economic indicators: A survey. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 28, 1661-1707. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2727442>
- Goebel, Jan, Markus M. Grabka, Stefan Liebig, Martin Kroh, David Richter, Carsten Schröder and Jürgen Schupp (2019): The German Socio-

- Economic Panel (SOEP). *Journal of Economics and Statistics*, 239(2), 345–360. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jbnst-2018-0022>
- Gomtsyan, D. (2017): The Roman Origins of Modern Migration. Mimeo.
- Guiso, L., Sapienza, P. and L. Zingales (2006): Does Culture Affect Economic Outcomes? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 20(2), 23–48. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.20.2.23>
- Henrich, P. (ed.) (2012): *Der Limes vom Niederrhein bis an die Donau*. Vol. 6. Beiträge zum Welterbe Limes. Stuttgart: Konrad Theiss.
- Henrich, P. (ed.) (2014): *Der Limes in Raetien, Ober- und Niedergermanien vom 1. bis 4. Jahrhundert*. Vol. 8. Beiträge zum Welterbe Limes. Darmstadt: Konrad Theiss.
- Hofstede, G. and R.R. McCrae (2004): Personality and culture revisited: Linking traits and dimensions of culture. *Cross-cultural research*, 38(1), 52-88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397103259443>
- Huggins, R. and P. Thompson (2019): The behavioural foundations of urban and regional development: culture, psychology and agency. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 19, 121–146. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbx040>
- Huning, T.R. and F. Wahl, (2019): The Fetters of Inheritance? Equal Partition and Regional Economic Development. Working Paper No. 165, European Historical Economics Society. http://www.ehes.org/EHES_165.pdf
- John, O.P. and S. Srivastava (1999): The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L.A. Pervin and O.P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, 2nd ed., pp. 102-139, New York: Guilford.
- Judge, T.A. and R. Ilies (2002): Relationship of personality to performance motivation: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 797-807. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.797>
- Keele, L.J. and R. Titiunik (2014): Geographic Boundaries as Regression Discontinuities. *Political Analysis*, 23(1), 127-155.
- Keyser, E. and H. Stoob (Eds) (1939-1974): *Deutsches Städtebuch. Handbuch städtischer Geschichte*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer. Voll1—11.
- Kristiansen, K. (2000): *Europe Before History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuckenburg, M. (2000): *Vom Steinzeitlager zur Keltenstadt. Siedlungen der Vorgeschichte in Deutschland*. Stuttgart: Konrad Theiss.
- Lammers, K. (2003): Süd-Nord-Gefälle in West-und Ostdeutschland?. *Wirtschaftsdienst*, 83(11), 736-739.
- Lowes, S., N. Nunn, J.A. Robinson and J.L. Weigel (2017): The evolution of culture and institutions. Evidence from the Cuba Kingdom. *Econometrica*, 85, 1065-1091. <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA14139>
- Löffl, J. (2014): *Negotiatores in Cirta. Sallusts Jugurtha und der Weg in den jugurthinischen Krieg*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

- Magnusson, D. and B. Torestad (1993): A holistic view of personality: A model revisited. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44, 427.
- Mangartz, F. (2008): *Römischer Basaltlava-Abbau zwischen Eifel und Rhein*. Mainz: Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum.
- Marshall, A. (1920): *Principles of Economics*. 8th edition, London: Macmillan.
- Maraut, S., H. Dernis, C. Webb, V. Spiezia and D. Guellec (2008): The OECD REGPAT Database: A Presentation. OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers, 2008/02, OECD Publishing.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/241437144144>
- McCormick, M., G. Huang, G. Zambotti and J. Lavash (eds.). (2013): *Digital atlas of Roman and Medieval Civilizations*. Cambridge, MA: DARMC, Center for Geographic Analysis, Harvard University.
- McCrae, R.R. (2004): Human nature and culture: A trait perspective. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38(1), 3-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2003.09.009>
- McCrae, R.R. and P.T. Costa Jr. (2008): The five-factor theory of personality. In O.P. John, R.W. Robins and L.A. Pervin (eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, 3rd ed., pp. 159-181. New York: Guilford Press.
- Menghin, W. (1995): *Kelten, Römer und Germanen. Archäologie und Geschichte in Deutschland*. Augsburg: Weltbild.
- Michaels, G. and F. Rauch (2017): Resetting the Urban Network: 117-2012. *Economic Journal*, 128(608), 378-412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecoj.12424>
- Nagaoka, S., K. Motohashi and A. Goto (2010): Patent Statistics as an Innovation Indicator. In Bronwyn H. Hall and Nathan Rosenberg (eds.): *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation*, Vol. 2, Dordrecht: Elsevier, pp. 1083-1127.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218\(10\)02009-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-7218(10)02009-5)
- Nunn, N. (2009): The importance of history for economic development. *Annual Review of Economics*, 1, 65-92.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.economics.050708.143336>
- Obschonka, M., E. Schmitt-Rodermund, R. Silbereisen, S.D. Gosling and J. Potter (2013): The regional distribution and correlates of an entrepreneurship-prone personality profile in the United States, Germany, and the United Kingdom: A socioecological perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105(1), 104–122. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032275>
- Obschonka, M., M. Stuetzer, P.J. Rentfrow, J. Potter and S.D. Gosling (2017): Did strategic bombing in the second world war lead to ‘German angst’? A large-scale empirical test across 89 German cities. *European Journal of Personality*, 31(3), 234-257.
- Obschonka, M., M. Stuetzer, P.J. Rentfrow, L. Shaw-Taylor, M. Satchell, R.K. Silbereisen and S.D. Gosling (2018): In the shadow of coal: How large-scale industries contributed to present-day regional differences in personality and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 115(5), 903- 927. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000175>

- Obschonka, M., M. Wyrwich, M. Fritsch, S.D. Gosling, P.J. Rentfrow and J. Potter (2019): Von unterkühlten Norddeutschen, gemütlichen Süddeutschen und aufgeschlossenen Großstädtern: Regionale Persönlichkeitsunterschiede in Deutschland [Reserved Northerners, Jovial Southerners, and Open Urbanites: Regional Personality Differences in Germany]. *Psychologische Rundschau*, 70(3), 173-194.
- Oishi, S. (2014): Socioecological psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 581-609. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-030413-152156>
- Planck, D. and W. Beck (1987): *Der Limes in Südwestdeutschland*. Stuttgart: Konrad Theiss.
- Plaut, V.C., H.R. Markus, J.R. Treadway and A.S. Fu (2012): The cultural construction of self and well-being: A tale of two cities. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(12), 1644-1658. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212458125>
- Porter, M. E., S. Stern and M. Green (2014): *Social progress index 2014*. Washington, DC: Social Progress Imperative.
- Rammstedt, B. and D. Danner (2017): Die Facettenstruktur des Big Five Inventory (BFI): Validierung für die deutsche Adaptation des BFI. *Diagnostica*, 63, 70-84. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1026/0012-1924/a000161>.
- Rentfrow, P.J., S.D. Gosling and J. Potter (2008): A theory of the emergence, persistence, and expression of geographic variation in psychological characteristics. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(5), 339–369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00084.x>
- Rentfrow, P.J., M. Jokela and M.E. Lamb (2015): Regional personality differences in Great Britain. *PLoS One*, 10(3), e0122245. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0122245>
- Rentfrow, P.J. and M. Jokela (2016): Geographical psychology: The spatial organization of psychological phenomena. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25(6), 393-398. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721416658446>
- Rieckhoff, S. (2008): Geschichte der Chronologie der Späten Eisenzeit in Mitteleuropa und das Paradigma der Kontinuität. Leipziger Online-Beiträge zur Ur- und Frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie, No. 30. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:15-qucosa2-338709>
- Roberts, B.W., K.E. Walton and T. Bogg (2005): Conscientiousness and health across the life course. *Review of General Psychology*, 9(2), 156-168.
- Roberts, B.W., N.R. Kuncel, R. Shiner, A. Caspi and L.R. Goldberg (2007): The power of personality: The comparative validity of personality traits, socioeconomic status, and cognitive ability for predicting important life outcomes. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2(4), 313-345. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00047.x>
- Schallmayer, E. (2011): *Der Limes. Geschichte einer Grenze*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

- Schulz, J.F., Bahrami-Rad, D., Beauchamp and J.P. Henrich (2019): The Church, intensive kinship, and global psychological variation. *Science*, 366(6466), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau5141>
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1934): *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.
- Sorenson, O. (2017): Regional ecologies of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 17, 959–974. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbx031>
- Steel, P. and D.S. Ones (2002): Personality and happiness: A national-level analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(3), 767-781. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.3.767>
- Steel, P., J. Schmidt and J. Shultz (2008): Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134(1), 138-161. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.1.138>
- Streb, J., J. Baten and Y. Shuxi (2006): Technological and Geographical Knowledge Spillover in the German Empire 1877-1918. *Economic History Review*, 59(2), 347-373. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0289.2006.00347.x>
- Stuetzer, M., M. Obschonka, D.B. Audretsch, M. Wyrwich, J.P. Rentfrow, M. Coombes, L. Shaw-Taylor and M. Satchell (2016): Industry structure, entrepreneurship, and culture: An empirical analysis using historical coalfields. *European Economic Review*, 86, 52–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2015.08.012>
- Stuetzer, M., D.B. Audretsch, M. Obschonka, S.D Gosling, P.J. Rentfrow and J. Potter (2018): Entrepreneurship culture, knowledge spillovers and the growth of regions. *Regional Studies*, 52, 608-618. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2017.1294251>
- Talbert, R.J.A. (ed.). (2000): *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Talhelm, T., X. Zhang, S. Oishi, C. Shimin, D. Duan, X. Lan and S. Kitayama (2014): Large-scale psychological differences within China explained by rice versus wheat agriculture. *Science*, 344(6184), 603-608. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1246850>
- Von Schnurbein, S. (1995): *Vom Einfluss Roms auf die Germanen* (Vol. 331). Vorträge: Nordrheinwestfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Wahl, F. (2017): Does European Development Have Roman Roots? Evidence from the German Limes. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 22(3), 313-349. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10887-017-9144-0>
- Zabel, F., B. Putzenlechner and W. Mauser (2014): Global Agricultural Land Resources. A High Resolution Suitability Evaluation and its Perspectives until 2100 Under Climate Change Conditions. *PLOS One*, 9, e114980. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0107522>

Appendix

Table A1: Definition of variables

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Data source</i>
Roman	Dummy variable for a planning region being completely Roman territory in the 2 nd century AD (=1) or not (=0)	McCormick et al. (2013)
Density of Roman roads	Kilometers of major Roman road per km ²	McCormick et al. (2013)
Numbers of Roman markets and mines	Number of Roman Markets and Mines in a region	McCormick et al. (2013)
Extraversion	Measure of the Big Five personality trait extraversion (being outgoing, energetic) on a five-point Likert scale. Average value of a sample of the regional population.	Gosling–Potter Internet project (http://www.outofservice.com). For details see Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter (2008).
Agreeableness	Measure of the Big Five personality trait agreeableness (being friendly, compassionate) on a five-point Likert scale. Average value of a sample of the regional population.	See above.
Neuroticism	Measure of the Big Five personality trait neuroticism (being nervous, not very resilient) on a five-point Likert scale. Average value of a sample of the regional population.	See above.
Conscientiousness	Measure of the Big Five personality trait conscientiousness (being efficient and organized) on a five-point Likert scale. Average value of a sample of the regional population.	See above.
Openness	Measure of the Big Five personality trait openness to experience (being inventive, curious) on a five-point Likert scale. Average value of a sample of the regional population.	See above.
Entrepreneurial personality profile	Sum of the squared deviations of the individual Big Five scores from the reference profile of an ideal entrepreneurial personality (highest scores on extraversion, conscientiousness, and openness; lowest scores on agreeableness, and neuroticism).	See above.
Life satisfaction	Response to the question “How satisfied are you with your life, all things considered?” measured on an eleven-point Likert scale. Averaged for the period 1984-2016.	German Socio-economic Panel (SOEP)
Health satisfaction	Response to the question “How satisfied are you with your health?” measured on an eleven-point Likert scale. Average for the period from 1984-2016.	SOEP
Life expectancy	Life expectancy of a newborn child, averaged over the years 2013-2015	Official statistics from the Bundesinstitut für Bau-, Stadt- und Raumforschung (BBSR)
Patents per workforce	Average Number of patent applications in 2008 to 2014 by 10,000 employees	RegPat database of the OECD (version February 2019)
Historical Patents per capita	Average number of Patents per capita in 1890,1900 and 1910 in the region	Donges et al. (2019)/ Streb et al. (2006)
Start-up rate	Average number of new businesses in a region in the years 2008 to 2014 over 10 thousand persons in the workforce.	Enterprise Panel of the Center for European Economic Research (ZEW-Mannheim)
High tech Start-up rate	Average number of new high tech businesses in a region in the years 2008 to 2014 over 10 thousand persons in the workforce.	Enterprise Panel of the Center for European Economic Research (ZEW-Mannheim)

R&D employment share	Average share of employees working in the R&D sector in 2008 to 2014	German Establishment History Panel
Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per population	Average Gross Domestic Product in German planning regions for the period	Federal Statistical Office
Intersection major river	Dummy variable for a planning region intersecting with a major river (Danube, Elbe, Oder or Rhine) (=1) or not (=0)	WISE Large Rivers and Lakes dataset provided of the European Environment Agency (EEA)
Border region	Dummy variable for a planning region intersecting with the Roman border in 200 AD (=1) or not (=0)	Own calculation using QGIS
Coastal region	Dummy variable for a planning region being located on the coast line (=1) or not (=0)	Europe coastline shapefile from the EEA
Mean elevation	Mean elevation of a planning region in m.	Digital Elevation Model over Europe (Euro-DEM) of the EEA. The resolution of the raster data is 1 arc second.
Terrain ruggedness	Standard deviation of a planning region's elevation	Own calculation using QGIS
Soil suitability	Average suitability of a planning region's soils to grow the 16 globally most important food and energy crops (from 1961 to 1990)	Zabel et al. (2014)
Mean sunshine duration	Mean hours of sunshine in July (from 1961 to 1990).	Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD)
Mean temperature	Mean temperature in July (from 1961 to 1990).	Deutscher Wetterdienst (DWD)
Number of Celtic Oppida	Number of Celtic Oppida in a region.	Atlas of the Roman Empire (DARE); Pleiades Database of Ancient Places; Kristiansen (2000); Kuckenburg (2000); Menghin (1995); Rieckhoff (2008)
Hanseatic League	Dummy variable for a planning region being an important member of the Hanseatic League (either a capital of a quarter or otherwise considered to be a leading city)	Dollinger (1966)
Number of plague outbreaks	Number of major historical plague outbreaks in a planning region	Biraben (1975); Büntgen et al. (2012)
Carboniferous rock strata	Dummy variable for a planning region having late carboniferous rock strata (=1) or not (0)	Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften und Rohstoffe (BGR)
Federal State dummies	Dummy variable assigning each planning region to a Federal State.	Bundesamt für Kartographie und Geodäsie (shapefile of Federal State borders)

Table A2a: Descriptive statistics of the planning regions data set

<i>Variable</i>	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Standard deviation
Agreeableness	3.460	3.323	3.594	0.040
Border region	0.188	0.000	1.000	0.392
Carboniferous rock strata	0.125	0.000	1.000	0.332
Coastal region	0.115	0.000	1.000	0.320
Conscientiousness	3.539	3.358	3.677	0.062
East Germany	0.219	0.000	1.000	0.416
Entrepreneurial personality profile	-19.377	-21.215	-18.220	0.566
Extraversion	3.390	3.116	3.547	0.074
GDP per capita (average 1992-2016)	10,145	9,685.6	10,817.5	0.238
Hanseatic League	0.156	0.000	1.000	0.365
Health satisfaction	6.697	5.972	7.352	0.258
High-tech Start-up rate	2.285	0.907	5.499	0.741
Intersects major river	0.385	0.000	1.000	0.489
Life expectancy	80.690	78.779	82.794	0.853
Life satisfaction	7.064	6.110	7.680	0.303
ln Patents per workforce	1.353	-0.998	2.707-	0.762
ln Historical Patents per capita	1.795	1.276	0	4.218
Mean elevation	264.425	1.360	922.738	217.409
Mean sunshine duration	204.137	0.000	247.400	34.766
Mean temperature	16.963	14.467	18.857	0.891
Neuroticism	3.020	2.856	3.161	0.058
Number of Celtic Oppida	1.844	0.000	22.000	3.543
Number of plague outbreaks	7.646	0.000	46.000	10.577
Number of Roman markets and mines	0.365	0.000	4.000	0.884
Openness	3.721	3.532	3.872	0.065
Roman	0.313	0.000	1.000	0.466
Roman road density	0.012	0.000	0.097	0.021
Share R&D employees	1.981	0.752	4.51	0.783
Soil suitability	41.713	4.592	71.144	12.402
Start-up rate	34.547	23.374	59.151	6.636
Terrain ruggedness	88.861	4.232	317.405	70.417

Table A2b: Descriptive Statistics of the individual level data set used for the spatial RDD

Variable	Observations	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Standard deviation
Age	68,124	29.782	1.000	125.000	12.270
Agreeableness	68,566	3.442	1.000	5.000	0.635
Conscientiousness	68,566	3.455	1.000	5.000	0.767
Distance to Roman Border	68,566	-25.665	-224.047	99.769	61.485
Distance to Roman Border (treated)	68,566	-38.824	-224.047	0.000	46.382
Entrepreneurial Personality	68,566	-19.331	-62.904	-1.765	7.005
Extraversion	68,566	3.421	1.000	5.000	0.839
Female	68,185	0.581	0.000	1.000	0.493
Latitude	68,566	8.711	5.988	13.760	1.672
Latitude*Latitude	68,566	432.320	305.438	671.128	75.708
Longitude	68,566	49.794	47.384	52.614	1.231
Neuroticism	68,566	3.010	1.000	5.000	0.864
Openness	68,566	3.743	1.000	5.000	0.655
Roman (1=yes)	68,566	0.659	0.000	1.000	0.474

Table A3: Correlations among outcome variables

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Ln (GDP per capita)	1.00											
2	Roman (1=yes)	0.43 (0.00)	1.00										
3	Extraversion	0.44 (0.00)	0.21 (0.04)	1.00									
4	Agreeableness	0.22 (0.03)	0.31 (0.00)	0.30 (0.00)	1.00								
5	Neuroticism	-0.34 (0.00)	-0.37 (0.00)	-0.52 (0.00)	-0.39 (0.00)	1.00							
6	Conscientiousness	-0.07 (0.50)	0.16 (0.13)	0.20 (0.05)	0.32 (0.00)	-0.42 (0.00)	1.00						
7	Openness	0.55 (0.00)	0.30 (0.00)	0.42 (0.00)	0.24 (0.02)	-0.19 (0.06)	-0.29 (0.00)	1.00					
8	Entrepreneurial spirit	0.46 (0.00)	0.32 (0.00)	0.82 (0.00)	0.22 (0.03)	-0.78 (0.00)	0.42 (0.00)	0.47 (0.00)	1.00				
9	Life expectancy	0.63 (0.00)	0.54 (0.00)	0.46 (0.00)	0.43 (0.00)	-0.52 (0.00)	0.12 (0.23)	0.48 (0.00)	0.54 (0.00)	1.00			
10	Life satisfaction	0.60 (0.00)	0.25 (0.01)	0.28 (0.01)	0.09 (0.37)	-0.22 (0.03)	-0.13 (0.20)	0.28 (0.01)	0.25 (0.01)	0.36 (0.00)	1.00		
11	Health satisfaction	0.58 (0.00)	0.32 (0.00)	0.19 (0.06)	0.15 (0.16)	-0.23 (0.02)	-0.07 (0.50)	0.30 (0.00)	0.23 (0.02)	0.42 (0.00)	0.83 (0.00)	1.00	
12	In (Patents)	0.70 (0.00)	0.54 (0.00)	0.51 (0.00)	0.28 (0.01)	-0.40 (0.00)	0.00 (0.98)	0.46 (0.00)	0.51 (0.00)	0.77 (0.00)	0.50 (0.00)	0.49 (0.00)	1.00
13	Start-up rate	0.74 (0.00)	0.37 (0.00)	0.49 (0.00)	0.25 (0.01)	-0.46 (0.00)	0.03 (0.80)	0.57 (0.00)	0.55 (0.00)	0.61 (0.00)	0.38 (0.00)	0.37 (0.00)	0.58 (0.00)

Table A4: Regional Gross Domestic Product per capita and Roman legacy

Dependent Variable	ln(GDP per capita)					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Roman (1=yes)	0.221*** (0.045)	0.243*** (0.0630)	0.1902** (0.0721)			
Roman road density				4.569*** (1.604)		4.785*** (1.559)
Number of Roman markets & mines					0.0345 (0.0341)	-0.00909 (0.0338)
Intersect major river (1=yes)		-0.0500 (0.0471)	-0.0476 (0.0507)	-0.0515 (0.0514)	0.00587 (0.0510)	-0.0561 (0.0522)
Border region (1=yes)		0.191*** (0.0496)	0.1531** (0.0606)	0.155*** (0.0559)	0.170*** (0.0554)	0.155*** (0.0570)
Mean elevation		0.000184 (0.000158)	0.0003 (0.0003)	0.000310* (0.000168)	0.000322* (0.000167)	0.000320* (0.000165)
Terrain ruggedness		-0.000439 (0.000471)	-0.0004 (0.0005)	-0.000415 (0.000480)	-0.000280 (0.000504)	-0.000416 (0.000484)
Soil suitability		-5.80e-06 (0.00243)	0.0003 (0.0034)	-0.000571 (0.00233)	0.00235 (0.00240)	-0.000711 (0.00237)
Coastal region (1=yes=)		-0.0204 (0.0731)	-0.0091 (0.0807)	-0.000575 (0.0729)	-0.00231 (0.0799)	0.00221 (0.0754)
Number of Celtic Oppida		-0.00677 (0.00521)	-0.0101 (0.0063)	-0.000560 (0.00561)	6.58e-05 (0.00551)	-0.000296 (0.00588)
Mean sunshine duration		-0.000583 (0.000427)	0.0002 (0.0004)	-0.000490 (0.000419)	-0.000272 (0.000435)	-0.000491 (0.000426)
Mean temperature		0.0169 (0.0315)	0.0498 (0.0341)	0.0247 (0.0280)	0.0480 (0.0317)	0.0248 (0.0280)
Hanseatic League		0.0627 (0.0715)	0.0457 (0.0739)	0.0593 (0.0738)	0.0690 (0.0753)	0.0580 (0.0754)
Number of plague outbreaks		0.00586** (0.00239)	0.0063** (0.0025)	0.00516* (0.00286)	0.00483* (0.00255)	0.00519* (0.00290)
Carboniferous rock strata		-0.0660 (0.0644)	-0.0608 (0.0884)	-0.0489 (0.0517)	-0.0626 (0.0682)	-0.0434 (0.0576)
Federal State Dummies	No	No	Yes**	No	No	No
R ²	0.1880	0.429	0.5078	0.423	0.351	0.423

Notes: Ordinary least squares regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. The number of observations (regions) is 96 in all models. Stars after the “Yes” indicate the level of joint statistical significance of the Federal State dummies.

Table A5: Personality traits and Roman legacy—including Federal State fixed effects

Dependent Variable	(1) Extraversion	(2) Agreeableness	(3) Neuroticism	(4) Conscientiousness	(5) Openness	(6) Entrepreneurial personality
Roman (1=yes)	0.0316* (0.0189)	0.0187* (0.0110)	-0.0467** (0.0213)	0.0528** (0.0201)	0.0081 (0.0196)	0.368** (0.167)
Intersects major river (1=yes)	-0.0117 (0.0196)	0.0080 (0.0107)	-0.0013 (0.0156)	0.0200 (0.0164)	-0.0083 (0.0181)	-0.0706 (0.163)
Border region (1=yes)	0.0390** (0.0165)	-0.0028 (0.0097)	-0.0380** (0.0147)	-0.0087 (0.0163)	0.0110 (0.0151)	0.343** (0.136)
Mean elevation	8.07e-05 (8.51e-05)	-5.39e-05 (4.55e-05)	2.01e-05 (8.97e-05)	-0.0001 (7.31e-05)	0.0002* (8.21e-05)	0.0007 (0.0007)
Terrain ruggedness	0.0001 (0.0001)	0.0001** (6.95e-05)	-0.0002 (0.0001)	-2.71e-05 (0.0001)	0.0001 (0.0001)	0.0009 (0.0009)
Soil suitability	-0.0007 (0.0009)	0.0008 (0.0005)	0.0008 (0.0008)	0.0012 (0.0009)	0.0002 (0.0012)	-0.0051 (0.0086)
Coastal region (1=yes)	-0.0456 (0.0391)	-0.0349* (0.0197)	-0.0103 (0.0301)	-0.0623* (0.0348)	0.0718** (0.0278)	0.0523 (0.335)
Number of Celtic Oppida	-0.0047** (0.0021)	-0.0013 (0.0009)	0.0015 (0.0017)	-0.0069*** (0.0015)	0.0011 (0.0023)	-0.0316** (0.0151)
Mean sunshine duration	-0.0003 (0.0002)	9.34e-05 (0.0001)	0.0001 (0.0002)	-0.0003 (0.0002)	1.17e-05 (0.0002)	-0.0025 (0.0018)
Mean temperature	0.0057 (0.0115)	-0.0025 (0.0071)	0.0083 (0.0114)	-0.0235** (0.0108)	0.0290** (0.0114)	0.0698 (0.0960)
Hanseatic League	-0.0047 (0.0209)	0.0084 (0.0129)	-0.0002 (0.0176)	0.004 (0.0226)	0.0124 (0.0188)	0.0537 (0.184)
Number of plague outbreaks	0.002*** (0.0006)	0.0002 (0.0004)	-0.0011* (0.0005)	-0.0007 (0.0007)	0.0023*** (0.0007)	0.0127** (0.0049)
Carboniferous rock strata	0.0148 (0.0259)	-0.0236* (0.0119)	0.006 (0.0208)	-0.0684** (0.0303)	0.0128 (0.0364)	-0.0721 (0.171)
Federal State dummies	Yes*	Yes	Yes***	Yes	Yes	Yes
R ²	0.428	0.313	0.334	0.287	0.358	0.316

Notes: Ordinary least squares regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. The number of observations (regions) is 96 in all models. Significance stars after the “Yes” indicate the level of joint significance of the Federal State dummies.

Table A6: Socioeconomic outcomes and Roman legacy—including Federal State fixed effects

Dependent Variable	(1) Life satisfaction	(2) Health satisfaction	(3) Life expectancy	(4) ln(patents)	(5) Start-up rate
Roman (1=yes)	0.190** (0.0852)	0.110 (0.0927)	0.475* (0.254)	0.3409* (0.1829)	8.5710*** (2.2180)
Intersects major river (1=yes)	-0.105 (0.0663)	-0.0288 (0.0617)	-0.127 (0.179)	-0.2972* (0.1707)	-1.0390 (1.6399)
Border region (1=yes)	0.0497 (0.0801)	0.0365 (0.0760)	0.180 (0.185)	0.3632** (0.1640)	1.9123 (1.8736)
Mean elevation	0.0002 (0.0004)	0.0001 (0.0003)	0.00105 (0.0008)	0.0018*** (0.0007)	0.0024 (0.0076)
Terrain ruggedness	-0.0004 (0.0006)	4.64e-05 (0.0005)	0.00225 (0.0015)	0.0012 (0.0010)	-0.0003 (0.0135)
Soil suitability	-0.00362 (0.0039)	-9.30e-05 (0.0037)	0.00713 (0.0098)	0.0029 (0.0065)	-0.2529** (0.1003)
Coastal region (1=yes)	0.0888 (0.125)	0.0876 (0.106)	-0.0467 (0.322)	0.0375 (0.2827)	5.2821* (2.8209)
Number of Celtic Oppida	-0.0010 (0.0054)	-0.0087 (0.0073)	-0.0142 (0.0184)	-0.0377** (0.0169)	-0.2075 (0.2214)
Mean sunshine duration	0.0001 (0.0008)	0.0007 (0.0007)	-0.0007 (0.0017)	0.0006 (0.0012)	-0.0303** (0.0142)
Mean temperature	0.00691 (0.0551)	-0.0174 (0.0473)	0.205* (0.120)	0.2600*** (0.0955)	0.5938 (1.0278)
Hanseatic League	0.0521 (0.0959)	0.0203 (0.0917)	-0.0425 (0.287)	-0.0988 (0.1933)	-1.6811 (2.386)
Number of plague outbreaks	-0.0006 (0.003)	-0.0004 (0.003)	0.0058 (0.0082)	0.0095 (0.0065)	0.2269*** (0.0674)
Carboniferous rock strata	0.0318 (0.138)	0.0406 (0.127)	-0.492 (0.352)	-0.0394 (0.2277)	1.1526 (2.6001)
Federal State Dummies	Yes***	Yes***	Yes	Yes***	Yes**
R ²	0.435	0.359	0.555	0.668	0.41

Notes: Ordinary least squares regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. The number of observations (regions) is 96 in all models. Stars after the “Yes” indicate the level of joint statistical significance of the Federal State dummies.

Table A7: Personality traits, socioeconomic outcomes and Roman legacy—including Federal State Dummies


Dependent Variable	(1) Neuroticism	(2) Conscientiousness	(3) Entrepreneurial personality	(4) Life satisfaction	(5) Life expectancy	(6) ln(patents)	(7) Start-up rate
<i>Panel A: Roman road density</i>							
Roman road density	-0.874** (0.376)	0.0370 (0.340)	4.953 (3.432)	4.349*** (1.641)	12.53** (5.125)	8.449*** (2.835)	105.8** (52.07)
R ²	0.331	0.234	0.301	0.447	0.575	0.748	0.384
<i>Panel B: Number of Roman markets & mines</i>							
Number of Roman markets & mines	-0.0210*** (0.00606)	0.0122** (0.00572)	0.146** (0.0646)	0.0386 (0.0317)	0.167 (0.114)	0.0438 (0.0538)	2.014 (1.227)
R ²	0.355	0.254	0.321	0.415	0.553	0.731	0.382
<i>Panel C: Roman road density and number of markets & mines</i>							
Roman road density	-0.501 (0.337)	-0.286 (0.325)	2.090 (3.129)	4.278** (1.787)	10.80** (5.113)	9.160*** (3.121)	74.95* (44.32)
Number of Roman markets & mines	-0.0168*** (0.00584)	0.0146** (0.00591)	0.129* (0.0684)	0.00320 (0.0308)	0.0777 (0.114)	-0.0320 (0.0529)	1.393 (1.196)
R ²	0.367	0.257	0.323	0.447	0.579	0.749	0.405
Number of observations	96	96	96	96	96	93	96
Federal State Dummies	Yes***	Yes	Yes*	Yes***	Yes*	Yes***	Yes***
Controls included	Yes	Yes*	Yes**	Yes	Yes***	Yes***	Yes***

Notes: Ordinary least squares regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. Controls are identical to the ones included in Tables 2 and 3. Significance stars after the “Yes” indicate the lowest level of joint significance of the control variables and Federal State dummies.

Table A8: Using alternative innovation and entrepreneurship outcomes


Dependent Variable	(1) High-tech Start- up rate	(2) Share R&D employees	(3) High-tech Start- up rate	(4) Share R&D employees
Roman (1=yes)	0.8739*** (0.2138)	0.7042*** (0.2534)	0.8863*** (0.2713)	0.7420** (0.2968)
Intersects major river (1=yes)	-0.1152 (0.1848)	-0.2334 (0.1689)	-0.1357 (0.2028)	-0.2319 (0.1897)
Border regions (1=yes)	0.2777 (0.1675)	0.3641 (0.2219)	0.2570 (0.2126)	0.3414 (0.2476)
Mean elevation	0.0010 (0.0006)	-0.0004 (0.0007)	0.0016* (0.0009)	-0.0001 (0.0009)
Terrain ruggedness	-0.0000 (0.0015)	0.0017 (0.0019)	-0.0003 (0.0017)	0.0016 (0.0020)
Soil suitability	-0.0228** (0.0101)	0.0108 (0.0069)	-0.0205* (0.0119)	0.0169* (0.0100)
Coastal region (1=yes)	0.2688 (0.2372)	-0.1083 (0.2132)	0.3956 (0.2862)	-0.0415 (0.2495)
Number of Celtic Oppida	-0.0462*** (0.0157)	-0.0687*** (0.0150)	-0.0508** (0.0200)	-0.0812*** (0.0207)
Mean sunshine duration	-0.0016 (0.0016)	0.0001 (0.0015)	-0.0007 (0.0017)	-0.0001 (0.0017)
Mean temperature	0.1072 (0.0892)	0.1651* (0.0890)	0.1689 (0.1172)	0.1362 (0.1141)
Hanseatic League	-0.0804 (0.2063)	-0.0295 (0.1762)	-0.0707 (0.2387)	-0.0878 (0.2032)
Number of plague outbreaks	0.0280*** (0.0078)	0.0258*** (0.0076)	0.0296*** (0.0089)	0.0301*** (0.0090)
Carboniferous rock strata	-0.0699 (0.1716)	0.0228 (0.2148)	0.0712 (0.2798)	-0.0408 (0.3086)
Federal State Dummies	No	No	Yes	Yes
R ²	0.386	0.469	0.431	0.494

Notes: Ordinary least squares regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. ***: statistically significant at the 1% level; **: statistically significant at the 5% level; *: statistically significant at the 10% level. The number of observations (regions) is 96 in all models. Stars after the “Yes” indicate the lowest level of joint statistical significance of the Federal State dummies.




Note: Dark red colour indicates high values while dark blue colour indicates low values.

Figure A1: Regional variation of neuroticism and the Limes



Note: Dark red colour indicates high values while dark blue colour indicates low values.

Figure A2: Regional variation of the entrepreneurial personality profile and the Limes



Note: Dark red colour indicates high values while dark blue colour indicates low values.

Figure A3: Regional variation of life expectancy and the Limes