

# HISTORY AND SCIENCE IN TENNEY FRANK'S SCHOLARSHIP

E. CHRISTIAN KOPFF

---

Tenney Frank (1876–1939) was born on a farm near Clay Center, Kansas. His father was a first-generation immigrant from Sweden and his mother the daughter of a Swedish immigrant. His early life was shaped by the double discipline of life on a small family farm and a strict religious upbringing. He told his student, Robert Broughton, that Sunday reading “was restricted to the Bible and the Lives of the Saints, in Swedish, which was the language of the household.”<sup>1</sup> After his death, his friend Norman W. DeWitt recalled, “It seemed to him a precious personal asset that he had been permitted to grow up in a genuinely American small town and rural community, where pioneer standards of conduct continued strong. In the course of time the conviction grew upon him also that some experience of farm life is essential to historians, especially historians of Greece and Rome, dealing, as they must, with countries and races whose economy in the main was agricultural.”<sup>2</sup> Frank might have been pleased that at the end of the twentieth century a classicist who was also a farmer published an agricultural interpretation of the birth and growth of Western civilization, Victor Davis Hanson’s *The Other Greeks*.<sup>3</sup>

In 1890 the economic turmoil of the period led to the loss of the family farm. The family moved to Kansas City, Missouri, where his father worked in the stockyards, as did Tenney when school was not in session. In school an exciting and theatrical teacher of German origin named von Minckwitz encouraged young Tenney and excited him about classical studies. At the University of Kansas he majored in classics and in 1898 was awarded his B.A. with highest distinction and his Phi Beta Kappa key. He minored in geology and was offered a fellowship to study that subject in graduate school. Frank’s love, however, was for the ancient world, and after receiving his M.A. at Iowa (1899), he enrolled in the University of Chicago (where he worked in the stockyards).

American classics in the generations before the Great War was known for research on grammar and syntax. Without access to the great libraries and universities of Europe, it was natural for even first-rate minds to concentrate on the texts. William Gardner Hale of Chicago was a leading expert in this area and Frank soon became one of his favorite students. Frank was appointed instructor in Latin from 1901 to 1904 and received his doctorate in 1903 with a dissertation on *Attraction of Moods in Early Latin*. He studied with other scholars at Chicago, but found no real mentor.

Frank was appointed associate in Latin at Bryn Mawr College in 1904. The intellectual atmosphere was lively. President M. Carey Thomas was a feminist whose ideas are still remembered there. ("Only our failures marry.") Frank began the substantial publication record which he continued until his death.<sup>4</sup> Syntactical articles appeared not just on Latin but also on Germanic languages, e.g., "The Use of the Optative in the Edda" (1906), "Latin vs. Germanic Modal Conceptions" (1907), and "Classical Scholarship in Medieval Iceland" (1909) in the *American Journal of Philology*, edited by the dean of classical grammarians, the old Confederate Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, where Frank was to be called as professor in 1919.

Increasingly Frank wrote on Roman history. His articles investigated the role of economics and Rome's traditional institutions in Roman expansion. "A Chapter in the History of Roman Imperialism" (1909), "Commercialism and Roman Territorial Expansion" (1910), and "The Import of the Fetial Institution" (1912) appeared in the University of Chicago's *Classical Philology*. With "Mercantilism and Rome's Foreign Policy" (1912) in the *American Historical Review*, Frank began to speak to a wider professional audience.

Frank spent his sabbatical year 1910-1911 in Germany at Göttingen and Berlin, attending lectures on ancient history, especially those of the greatest living ancient historian, Eduard Meyer. He discovered that for important German scholars imperialism was not a problem. A biological instinct to expand one's species, combined with the excitement created by the publication of Nietzsche's notions of the Will to Power,<sup>5</sup> made aggressive war natural. Frank came home determined to explain not only his objections to a purely biological explanation of historical causality, but also with his own positive vision of Roman expansion. As he explained in the preface to *Roman Imperialism* (New York, 1914), European views were too much influenced by modern history. In Europe, he wrote,<sup>6</sup>

the over-crowding of population threatens to deprive the individual of his means of subsistence unless the united nation makes for itself "a place in the sunlight." Old-world political traditions also have taught historians to accept territorial expansion as a matter of course. For hundreds of years the church, claiming universal dominion, proclaimed the doctrine of world-empire; the monarchs of the Holy Roman Empire and of France reached for the inheritance of ancient Rome; the dynastic families, which could hold their own in a period of such a doctrine only by the possession of strong armies, naturally employed those armies in wars of expansion. It is not surprising, therefore, that continental writers, at least, should assume that the desire to possess must somehow have been the mainspring of action whether in the Spanish-American War or the Punic wars of Rome.

Frank felt that while Europeans, because of their history, misinterpret the actions of Rome and the United States, an American scholar is able to interpret Rome more justly.

Let us imagine a people far removed from the economic pressure as well as the political traditions of modern Europe, an agricultural people, not too thickly settled and not egged on by commercial ambitions; a republic in which the citizens themselves must vote whether or not to proclaim a war and in voting affirmatively must not only impose upon themselves the requisite war tax – a direct tribute – but must also go from the voting booths to the recruiting station and enroll in the legions; a republic, moreover, in which the directing power is vested in a group of a few hundred nobles, suspicious of the prestige that popular heroes gain in war and fearful of a military power that might overthrow its control. In such a nation are there not enough negative cross currents to neutralize the positive charge that rises from the blind instinct to acquire? Such a nation was the Roman republic.<sup>7</sup>

Such a nation was also the American republic, and this historical situation gave the American scholar a privileged position from which to investigate the foreign policy of the Roman republic. Each case and each age needs to be investigated on its own terms. Rome's expansion in Italy was distinctively different from its dealings with the great Hellenistic monarchies of the eastern Mediterranean. The first Romans to come in contact with the Greek world were overwhelmed by admiration and there is a brief period of "sentimental politics" (probably the book's most famous chapter). This is followed by a "reaction to practical politics." The Gracchan attempt to exploit the provinces for the masses is followed by a period of Senatorial *laissez faire*, but the rise of the commercial class, the *equites*, finds a champion during the middle of the first century B.C. in Pompey, who uses military power to create a commercial empire. The excesses of this regime lead to the dictatorship of Caesar, who has a plan for world conquest. After Caesar's assassination Augustus takes the Romans back to a more restrained and moderate policy. Roman moral ideals and their distinctive political and religious institutions were still vital during Rome's rise to world eminence in the second century B.C., and the weakening of those ideals and institutions is an important factor in the growing coarseness of Roman imperialism in the age of Pompey and Caesar. According to Broughton, "In later life Frank was willing to grant that Roman desire for conquest did increase in the second century before the period of Pompey and Caesar, but he continued to believe that the fetial tradition did not lose all of its moral influence."<sup>8</sup>

During his sabbatical Frank visited Italy and his time in Rome led to his next major research project. The first paragraph of his second article for the *American Historical Review* clearly implies that Frank received the impetus for writing it while taking "his first walk up the Appian Way. As he stops to decipher the names upon the old tombs that line the road, hoping to find one familiar to him from his Cicero or Livy, he finds praenomen and nomen promising enough, but the cognomina all seem awry. L. Lucretius *Pamphilus*, A. Aemilius *Alexa*, M. Clodius *Philostorgus* do not smack of freshman Latin."<sup>9</sup>

Frank asked three questions: (1) "Do these names imply that the Roman stock was completely changed after Cicero's day?" (2) "If so, are these foreigners ordinary immigrants, or did Rome become a nation of ex-slaves and their offspring?" (3) "Or does the abundance of Greek cognomina mean that, to a certain extent, a foreign nomenclature has gained respect...?"

Frank complains that "most of the sociological and political data of the empire are provided by satirists," but, in this case, at least, there are several clear statements of the historian Tacitus. His *Annals* (4.27) report the replacement of free by servile populations in Italy and (at 13.27.2) assert that in the age of Nero, "Ex-slaves are everywhere. They provide the majority of the voters, public servants, attendants of officials and priests, watchmen, firemen. Most knights, many senators, are descended from former slaves. Segregate the freed – and you will only show how few free-born there are!"<sup>10</sup> Are these comments only "an exaggerated thrust by an indignant Roman of the old stock?" Frank decided to look for evidence in the enormous number of inscriptions published in the *Corpus of Latin Inscriptions* (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* or *CIL*, one of the great works of nineteenth century German classical scholarship). Without an *index nominum* to help him Frank worked through the 13,900 names found on sepulchral inscriptions found in the volumes devoted to the city of Rome (*CIL* VI, parts 2 and 3). The results were striking. "Of the aforesaid 13,900 inscriptions of volume VI., parts 2 and 3, we find that of the 4485 persons apparently born at Rome, 3723 (eighty-three per cent.) fall into the list which by our criteria represents foreign extraction."

To the first of his three questions Frank's awe-inspiring labors gave a resounding "Yes!" Was the change in population due to immigration, as is suggested by Seneca, *To Helvia* 6 and Juvenal, *Satire* III 58–125? The inscriptional evidence does not support these witnesses. "In volume VI, part 2, which contains the sepulchral inscriptions classified according to arts and crafts, there is very little trace of the free-born foreigner." Question 3 receives an equally clear and compelling answer. Of the 13,900 inscriptions 1,347 record both father and son. A father with a Greek cognomen is almost equally likely to give his son a Latin (46 percent) as a Greek cognomen (54 percent), while only 11 percent of fathers with Latin cognomina have sons with Greek cognomina and in every case where the evidence suffices (more than half) it is clear we are dealing with a Greek family (from the mother's name) or a stepfather.

Frank discusses other interesting problems. Why are there not more slaves of European origin from Roman campaigns in Thrace and Gaul? Frank speculates on their absence from the inscriptional record. Less well educated than eastern slaves, they may have been used for hard work on the borders far from Rome or for mining or gladiatorial shows, where many would die before reproducing. Frank refutes modern speculation on another point. The ancient sources report that rural slaves were encouraged to reproduce. Modern historians

guessed from these comments that urban slaves had fewer children or none. The inscriptions show that they had children at a rate similar to rural slaves.

Frank also discusses the “race suicide” of the traditional upper classes. Inscriptions are not so helpful here as with the urban plebs, but “combining epigraphical and literary references” shows that the aristocratic families virtually disappear during the empire. “Of course members of the aristocracy were the chief sufferers from the tyranny of the first century, but...the voluntary choice of childlessness accounts largely for the unparalleled condition...Be the causes what they may, the rapid decrease of the old aristocracy and the native stock was clearly concomitant with a twofold increase from below: by a more normal birth-rate of the poor, and the constant manumission of slaves.”

Frank’s speculations on the disappearance of the aristocracy shows that he understood the evolutionary ideas he had found insufficient to explain Roman (and American) foreign policy. “The race of the human animal survives by means of instincts that shaped themselves for that purpose long before rational control came into play. Before our day it has only been at Greece and Rome that these impulses have had to face the obstacle of sophistication. There at least the instinct was beaten, and the race went under.” Like Patrick J. Buchanan,<sup>11</sup> Frank connected decline in offspring “then, as now,” with loss of religious belief. “Religious considerations and customs – which in this matter emanate from the fundamental instincts that continue the race – were questioned as all else was questioned before Augustus’s day. Then the process of diminution began.”

Frank was aware of economic interpretations of Rome’s decline and fall, as we can see in his sceptical article, “The Economic Interpretation of Roman History.”<sup>12</sup> He had already begun work on ancient economic history, which he would pursue for over two decades until his death in 1939. He did not, however, consider economic causes sufficient to explain what happened to the Roman Empire. “What lay behind and constantly reacted upon all such causes of Rome’s disintegration was, after all, to a considerable extent, the fact that the people who built Rome had given way to a different race.”

It is apparent that at least the political and moral qualities which counted most in the building of the Italian federation, the army organization, the provincial administrative system of the republic, were the qualities most needed in holding the empire together. And however brilliant the endowment of the new citizens, these qualities they lacked. The Trimalchios of the empire were often shrewd and daring business men, but their first and obvious task apparently was to climb by the ladder of quick profits to a social position in which their children with Romanized names could comfortably proceed to forget their forebears. The possession of wealth did not, as in the republic, suggest certain duties toward the commonwealth.

As in the case of Roman foreign policy in *Roman Imperialism*, Frank implies a parallel with the contemporary United States, which he makes explicit only

on the next page, near the end of his analysis of the effect of the changed population on the growth of mystery cults in Rome, a subject of lively scholarly debate at the time.

As the populace enforced their demands upon the emperor for *panem et circenses*, so they also secured recognition for their *externa sacra*. One after another of the emperors gained popularity with the rabble by erecting a shrine to some foreign Baal, or a statue to Isis in his chapel, in much the same way that our cities are lining their park drives with tributes to Garibaldi, Pulaski, and who knows what –vitch.

In this classic article Tenney Frank combines a masterful command of scholarly technique in his own field, an awareness of scientific research and speculation in other areas, and a lively response to social and political issues of his time. In Broughton's assessment, Frank "showed clearly the great extent to which the older free Roman stock had been replaced by the stock of foreigners and their progeny, largely easterners of slave origin."<sup>13</sup>

The standard scholarly critique of Frank's article is by Mary L. Gordon.<sup>14</sup> She dwells on the problem of explaining the disappearance from the epigraphical record of the many slaves of European descent from Thrace and Gaul. Frank had suggested that their background and lifestyle may have made them more suitable for jobs that were not conducive to reproducing, including mining and the gladiatorial games. Most of the followers of Spartacus, for instance, appear to come from Thrace and Gaul. For Gordon their almost complete absence from Roman inscriptions remains a problem. "Only the minority of prisoners would be suitable for the arena and the ergastulum...The women and children of the enemy, and non-combatants generally, were normally enslaved, not butchered."<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, there is Caesar's report of his treatment of the Helvetians in his *Commentaries on the Gallic War* I.29. From a total of 368,000, of which 92,000 were men able to bear arms, 110,000 survived to return home.

Gordon questions the use of Greek names as indicating Greek, or at any rate eastern, origin. She cites the Greek names of some of the emperor's German bodyguard and other anecdotal evidence. She speculates on how slaves received their Greek names:

As the name and origin of a slave were announced in the slave-market, we must suppose that the slave-dealer provisionally named his own wares, or retained the names with which they were already endowed. The master, however, could re-name the slave at his pleasure, as arbitrarily and fancifully as we name our pet animals or "villa residences"...As the slave trade doubtless remained largely in the hands of Greeks, whether free merchants or freedmen agents, great numbers of slaves might thus receive Greek names irrespective of nationality...Greek was the original language of the slave trade, and this is reflected in servile nomenclature, much as the use of French on modern menus and in the names affected by dressmakers suggests the history and associations of particular trades.<sup>16</sup>

Gordon's arguments depend on expressions such as "we must suppose" and "doubtless" supported by modern parallels, which are not mentioned as suggestive hints, but are essential for her argument. She concluded by arguing that what is relevant is not the national origin of Italy's slave and ex-slave population, but their status as slaves.

The typical slave of the early empire belonged to neither east nor west: he was a product of Graeco-Roman civilization, an example of Rome's strange power of absorbing and assimilating aliens. His name was Greek or Latin; his speech, Latin; his talk chiefly concerned with gladiators and chariot-races, the ancient equivalent of 'the pictures'...His characteristics were not oriental but servile, resulting from the abnormal conditions of slavery. This denationalization of the slave played its part for good and evil in the history of the empire. An increasingly large portion of the free citizens of Rome and Italy, and to some extent of the larger cities of the provinces, came to consist of freedmen and their descendants. Hence precisely that portion of the Roman world from which its government, its culture and its ideas proceeded, was derived to a great extent from a servile class, of no nationality and of a civilization not their own. The conventionality, the waning literary and artistic inspiration, and the general creeping paralysis of ancient culture may find part of its explanation here.<sup>17</sup>

Gordon did not deny that the old Roman stock was replaced by non-Romans of servile origin. She argued that we cannot be sure of the proportions which each non-Roman element contributed to the new mixture. She did not deny that this replacement was significant for the decline of ancient culture. She saw another, more positive side to this matter, however. "The slave," she wrote,

lost the great gifts of nationality, its inheritance and inspirations, its vigorous creativeness, its unique, individual quality; but he also escaped the limitations of race and tradition, and found it easy to become a citizen of the world. He had one great advantage over the free man — the habit of hard work, and, through the hope of emancipation, a constant incentive to work diligently and well. Work was the saving salt which kept the slave class from utter corruption, and gave it a certain unacknowledged dignity of its own. Moreover, the innumerable sepulchral inscriptions, on which freedmen and their sons record the loss of parents, wife or child (*pater carissimus, coniunx incomparabilis, filius dulcissimus*), suggest that home ties must have had a peculiar preciousness to one who had emerged from the forlorn degradation of slavery...The earliest Christians were for the most part of humble and probably servile descent...To Christianity they brought their traditionless cosmopolitanism, their discipline of work and suffering, and that family affection which still smells sweet and blossoms in their dust; while from Christianity they received at once an inspiration greater than that of race, and a spiritual emancipation as daring as its was triumphant.<sup>18</sup>

They did the work the Romans did not want to do, they had strong family values and, after all, they were Christians. It sounds somehow familiar.<sup>19</sup>

In 1920 Frank published *An Economic History of Rome to the End of the Republic*,<sup>20</sup> which collected the ancient evidence on economic activity in Italy to the age of Augustus. His plan to write a second volume on the imperial period was forestalled by Michael Rostovtzeff's *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*,<sup>21</sup> a work with a flabbergasting command of the wide range of sources for the entire Mediterranean world during the Roman Empire and with its own distinctive interpretation of the fall of Greco-Roman culture. (The peasants joined with the army to overthrow the urban aristocracy, like the serfs and the Red Army in Russia, from which he had just fled.) In 1927 Frank published a second edition of his *Economic History of Rome* with seven new chapters on the provinces and the imperial age to supplement and respond to Rostovtzeff.<sup>22</sup> Both editions include a chapter on "The Plebs Urbana," in which he repeats and develops the themes of "Race Mixture in the Roman Empire." In the second edition he mentions Gordon's article in footnotes without discussing it.<sup>23</sup> He probably saw that her contribution lay in suggesting difficulties in ascertaining exactly which nationalities replaced the old Roman stock, not in denying that that stock had been replaced or that this change had important repercussions for the development of ancient culture.

Frank refers in the second edition to Martin P. Nilsson, *Imperial Rome*.<sup>24</sup> Nilsson, one of the twentieth century's greatest scholars of Greek and Roman religion, argued that race was the most important factor in the fall of ancient culture. Culture rests on a racial basis. During the Empire the original Roman stock was overwhelmed by those it had conquered. "Hybridization on a considerable scale involves the break up of unified races into a heterogeneous and loose mass lacking stable spiritual and moral standards. This is, of itself, a sufficient explanation for the collapse of ancient culture and the Roman Empire. . . Nemesis ordained that the consequences of victory should be destructive to the victors, who were first engulfed and finally disappeared in the mass of the vanquished."<sup>25</sup>

Frank had discussed the disappearance and even "race suicide" of the older Roman stock rather than cross breeding, despite the article's title. (The early pages of *Roman Imperialism* discuss the role of "race amalgamation" in the formation of the Roman people.)<sup>26</sup> He devoted substantial space to this problem in his college text, *The History of Rome*.<sup>27</sup> The chapter on "The Causes of Rome's Decline" treats economic considerations as secondary to racial ones.

Race-mixture may produce good results, but it has also been established that in the mixture of two excellent stocks of widely different qualities an unstable fusion often results which perpetuates the poorer qualities of both. Applying this consideration to Rome, if we find that the Latin stock advanced consistently along certain lines so long as it was fairly unmixed, and that it gradually declined from about the time that racial fusion was marked, we may fairly attribute this new trend in some measure to the process of the "melting-pot" . . . It is difficult to escape the conclusion that the change [i.e., in the "spirit" or "culture" of Rome] is primarily due to

the fact that the Romans partly gave way before and partly merged their inheritance in a new brood which came largely from Asia Minor and Syria. According to this view the decline of Rome had begun in the last decades of the Republic.<sup>28</sup>

Frank concludes at the end of the chapter, "If from these many causes of Rome's decline we must select the most potent ones, we should be inclined to name first Rome's rapid and ill-considered expansion, the existence of slavery on a vast scale, and as an immediate consequence of these two, the thorough-going displacement of Romans by non-Romans."<sup>29</sup>

Although Frank here traces the beginnings of Rome's decline to "the last decades of the Republic" in the first century B.C., his text introduces the issue in its discussion of "Roman Society in the Days of Cato," the mid-second century B.C.

The custom of manumission was practiced very freely, — too freely in fact for the good of Rome's civilization. For, however worthy these people may have been — and many Greek and Syrian slaves were more clever than their masters, — they could hardly as citizens have the same respect for Roman institutions and sound traditions as the more austere tempered citizens of Italic stock. One of the most serious factors in the oncoming change in Rome's morals and manners was this rapid introduction of new stocks from below due to Rome's over-generous gift of citizenship to so many slaves.<sup>30</sup>

The theme of "race mixture due to slaves" tolls like a bell through Frank's narrative and is easy to trace, since it is an entry in the book's index.<sup>31</sup> So his discussion of the political and social changes of the early first century B.C. includes a page on the replacement of native Italians "by hordes of slaves who bred up a new race of freedmen and consequently of citizens."<sup>32</sup>

Could these men, mostly of excitable eastern races, become true citizens of a Roman republic? However keen of mind and shrewd of wit they were, their experience as slaves had taught them lessons of individual craftiness rather than of political wisdom. Of Rome's constitution, the *mos majorum*, they knew little and cared less. Those dominating traditions — that an autocrat should never establish a throne in Rome, that men willingly die for liberty, that Rome never acknowledged defeat — were to them meaningless. Whether they might have been Romanized in time, we cannot tell; we know as yet too little about the persistence of racial traits to speculate profitably, but it is very likely that there was a vital and ineradicable temperamental difference between the versatile, choleric, superstitious, mystical and servile Asiatic and the slow minded, composed, rationalistic and liberty-loving Roman, and that the *mos majorum* created by centuries of Romans could neither be comprehended nor respected by the new stock which was taking the place of the old. . . In a word, it would seem that the worst disease of the Republic was the disease that devastated the race which had built the Republic and that made place for peoples who were by temperament incapable of republican government.

Frank returns to this theme in his discussion of "The Literature and Art of the First Century" A.D.

If Scipio could have arisen in Domitian's day to see his native city, he would have found stately marble temples and palaces in the place of huts, but the features of the new Romans would have amazed him. The crowd of the Forum would have resembled the populace he once saw at Pergamum and the senators would have differed little from the people on the streets. One has but to imagine the shade of Washington parading through the Bowery.<sup>33</sup>

The explicit reference to America is implicit in his next discussion of this theme in his chapter on "Art and Government in the Second Century" A.D. Since Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776) second century Rome has been considered the happiest and most successful society in history. Frank questions this interpretation by showing that the troubles of the third century were due to conditions that arose in the late republic and reached their peak in the second century. Once again he summons up the shade of Scipio Africanus to contemplate the Rome of Marcus Aurelius. "He would not have felt at home." Frank imagines Scipio put off by "the strange-looking people on the streets, the jargon of tongues they spoke," but most of all by the presence of oriental cults: "the weird and noisy processions of the worshippers of Isis, the blood offerings of the devotees of Magna Mater seeking life eternal, the mystical congregations of Mithraic initiates performing incomprehensible antics in underground churches."<sup>34</sup>

His reflections at the end of the chapter on the reasons for this sea change in Roman culture have a clear if implicit relevance to contemporary American readers.<sup>35</sup>

It is possible that her greatest mistake was an erroneous liberalism based partly on self-interest, partly on sentimentality. The easy gift of citizenship to hordes of slaves who could never comprehend the Roman institutions that had made the state great, and who were temperamentally unfit for the succession of duties into which they came, and the constant inclusion of foreign territory within the empire, were not always marks of true liberalism. Too often this seeming humanitarianism was spurred on by the desire to have more land to exploit or to cheapen labor, regardless of the consequences to the state. But it was also in some measure the expression of an old-time republican liberalism, and the attraction of the most useless element to Rome by the lavish gifts of grain and games was due in some measure to disheveled sentimentality. Rome, if any nation, needed to discover some formula whereby a state would not through mistaken humanitarianism betray the strong-fibered stock to the exploitation of the morally, mentally, and physically unfit.

Frank also used his college minor, geology, in his historical work. In 1917-1918 he was Annual Professor at the American Academy in Rome and he served as Professor in Charge in 1922-23 and 1924-25. He studied the building materials

from which republican temples were constructed and investigated the quarries that were the materials' source. *Roman Buildings of the Republic*<sup>36</sup> related Roman access to the quarries to the expansion of Roman power and was thus able to provide greater precision to dating the temples and the ideological and political implications of their building by the great aristocratic families of the republic. Here again Frank provided an example how science could contribute to the study of history. (Broughton remembered that his wife, Grace, always complained about how hard it was to clean his clothes after a day in the quarries.)<sup>37</sup>

In the 1930s Frank headed a team to write a five-volume *Economic Survey of the Roman Empire*, of which he wrote volumes I and V.<sup>38</sup> (His brief "story of the rise and fall of Rome" in volume V is mainly economic and political, but includes the sentence, "The citizen body changed seriously because of the rapid merging into it of freed slaves.")<sup>39</sup> He was invited to contribute chapters to the prestigious *Cambridge Ancient History* and wrote books on Roman social history and literary studies of his favorite Latin authors, Virgil and Horace.<sup>40</sup>

The range of Tenney Frank's contributions to scholarship is impressive. He strove to use science, economics, biology, and geology as tools to supplement a distinctively humanistic and American vision of the ancient world and its relation to the United States. The distinctive American point of view comes out in the preface to his college textbook, *The History of Rome*:

The older peoples of Europe are more interested than we in the imperialist problems of Rome... We are naturally more concerned with Rome's earlier attempts at developing an effective government while trying to preserve democratic institutions. Whereas modern European nations have experienced a devolution, as it were, from late Roman autocracy, our state, like the Roman Republic, plunged at once into experimenting with more or less accepted theories of popular sovereignty.<sup>41</sup>

Tenney Frank was also interested in how the Romans came to lose those free institutions. He saw the replacement of the original founding stock by others lacking their cultural and political traits as an essential aspect of that loss. He supported that insight with an impressive research project expressed in clear and vigorous language and published in scholarly journals, books, and textbooks with a clear message for his fellow Americans.

---

*E. Christian Kopff, Associate Director of the Honors Program at the University of Colorado, Boulder, is the author of **The Devil Knows Latin: Why America Needs the Classical Tradition** (ISI Books: Wilmington, DE, 1999) and over 100 articles and reviews on scholarly, pedagogical, and popular topics. Dr. Kopff was a Fellow in Classical Studies of the American Academy in Rome.*

---

## ENDNOTES

1. T. Robert S. Broughton, "Tenney Frank," in Ward W. Briggs and William M. Calder III, eds., *Classical Scholarship. A Biographical Encyclopedia* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1990), 68–76; quote on p. 68.
2. Norman W. DeWitt, "Tenney Frank," *American Journal of Philology* 60 (1939), 273–280; quote on p. 273.
3. Victor Davis Hanson, *The Other Greeks: The Family Farm and the Agrarian Roots of Western Civilization* (New York: Free Press, 1995).
4. [Evelyn Holst Clift], bibliography following DeWitt, *American Journal of Philology* 60 (1939), 280–287.
5. Elizabeth Förster-Nietzsche, his sister, published 483 notes from his notebooks as *Die Wille zur Macht* in 1901. She published editions with 1,067 notes in 1906 and 1911 (*Grossoktav* edition); cf. Walter Kauffman, "Editor's Introduction," Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Will to Power* (New York: Random House, 1967), xvii.
6. Tenney Frank, *Roman Imperialism* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1914), vii.
7. *Ibid.*, vii–viii.
8. Broughton, 70.
9. Tenney Frank, "Race Mixture in the Roman Empire," *American Historical Review* 21 (1916), 689–708.
10. Tacitus, *The Annals of Imperial Rome*, translated by Michael Grant (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1956), 296.
11. Patrick J. Buchanan, *The Death of the West. How Dying Populations and Immigrant Invasions Imperil our Country and Civilization* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2002).
12. *Classical World* 11 (1917), 66–71.
13. Broughton, 70.
14. Mary L. Gordon, "The Nationality of Slaves under the Early Roman Empire," *Journal of Roman Studies* 14 (1924), 93–111.
15. *Ibid.*, 103.
16. *Ibid.*, 103–105.
17. *Ibid.*, 110.
18. *Ibid.*, 110–111.
19. Gordon's arguments are accepted by Norman H. Baynes, "The Decline of the Roman Power in Western Europe. Some Modern Explanations," *Journal of Roman Studies* 33 (1943), 29–35 at 32–33, who adds his opinion that the 13,900 inscriptions from *CIL VI* are not a representative sample.
20. Tenney Frank, *An Economic History of Rome to the End of the Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1920).
21. Michael Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1926).
22. Tenney Frank, *An Economic History of Rome* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1927).
23. *Ibid.*, 207, note 8 ("discussed by M. L. Gordon") and 478, note 1 ("criticized by Miss Gordon").
24. Martin P. Nilsson, *Imperial Rome* (London: G. Bell & Sons, 1926).

25. Ibid., 362–363.
26. Frank, *Roman Imperialism*, index s.v. “race amalgamation,” 363.
27. Tenney Frank, *The History of Rome* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1923; last reprinted 1961).
28. Ibid., 566–568.
29. Ibid., 574.
30. Ibid., 178–179.
31. Ibid., 609.
32. Ibid., 242–243.
33. Ibid., 463–464.
34. Ibid., 508.
35. Ibid., 526–527.
36. Tenney Frank, *Roman Buildings of the Republic. An Attempt to Date Them from their Materials*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome 3 (1924).
37. Grace Frank’s remark was reported to me in a personal conversation with Professor Broughton.
38. Tenney Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, I: *Rome and Italy of the Republic* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1933); V: *Rome and Italy of the Empire* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1940).
39. Frank, *Economic Survey* V, 304.
40. [Clift], 283–287.
41. Frank, *History*, v.

# Right Now!

A magazine of politics, ideas and culture

## Take your mind for a walk

Since 1993, *Right Now!* has been thinking the unthinkable and saying the unsayable with panache and style. Our distinguished writers and interviewees, including Chris Brand, Peter Brimelow, Pat Buchanan, Alain de Benoist, Hans Eysenck, Antony Flew, Frederick Forsyth, Sam Francis, Paul Gottfried, Ray Honeyford, Arthur Jensen, Norman Lamont, Jean-Marie Le Pen, Ezra Mishan, Dwight Murphey, Roger Scruton, Alfred Sherman, Norman Tebbit and Taki, cover every conceivable topic in uncensored but thoughtful fashion. From IQ to the EU, Flynn to Lynn, the GOP to Gramsci, Australia to Zimbabwe, Haider to Horowitz, the *Nouvelle Droite* to the neo-cons, *Right Now!* covers it all.

With articles from such respected commentators, British and overseas political news, arts and literary criticism, profiles of rightwing and conservative thinkers and gently malicious gossip, every issue of *Right Now!* is packed with ideas, information and inspiration. Isn't it time you read the magazine everyone's talking about? Subscribe today, and receive two free back issues, plus the following six issues.

**Dept OQ, PO Box 3471,  
Augusta, Georgia 30914-3471, United States.**

**Telephone (UK): +44 1507 339 056**

**E-mail: [info@right-now.org](mailto:info@right-now.org)**

**Internet: [www.right-now.org](http://www.right-now.org)**



I'd like to subscribe to *Right Now!* Please rush me **TWO FREE BACK ISSUES**, plus the **NEXT SIX ISSUES**. I enclose a US check/money order for \$38.00, made payable to *Right Now!* **or** I enclose my card details (delete as applicable).

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Card type and number: \_\_\_\_\_

Expiry date: \_\_\_\_\_

Cardholder name (if different): \_\_\_\_\_



You may also subscribe on-line at our secure website: **[www.right-now.org](http://www.right-now.org)**

**...because it's time for change**