



Gertrude Elizabeth Smith (1894-1985)

Author(s): Michael Gagarin

Source: *The Classical World*, Vol. 90, No. 2/3, Six Women Classicists (Nov., 1996 - Feb., 1997), pp. 167-177

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press on behalf of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4351928>

Accessed: 08-08-2016 18:20 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Johns Hopkins University Press, Classical Association of the Atlantic States are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Classical World*

GERTRUDE ELIZABETH SMITH (1894–1985)

More than a half-century ago, on April 10, 1941, at the thirty-seventh annual meeting of CAMWS in Indianapolis, those who attended the annual banquet¹ heard a presidential address delivered by Gertrude Elizabeth Smith, professor of Greek at the University of Chicago. At the age of forty-six she was at the midpoint of a distinguished forty-year career at Chicago, and of a long, active, and in all respects remarkably successful life.

For that occasion in Indianapolis Professor Smith chose as her title a fragment of the poet Simonides, ΠΟΛΙΣ ΑΝΔΡΑ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΕΙ (“the city is the teacher of the man”).² In her talk she offers a broad consideration of the educational function of poetry in Greece and the nature of Greek education. Along the way she laments the lack of education for women in classical Athens, notes the didactic force of Greek art as well as literature, and concludes with quotations from Sir Henry Maine and Sir Richard Jebb on the preeminent role of Greek culture in shaping modern civilization. As she puts it, “Pericles said that Athens was the school of Hellas. Just as truly Hellas is now the school of the world.”

It is a grand address, full of noble sentiment, with only passing reference to the dark clouds of war across the Atlantic. The talk is well suited to the occasion: moderately scholarly with a wide range encompassing archaic and classical Greek literature and society and modern classical scholarship. It also illustrates her commitment to classical education in the modern world. She was an active member of CAMWS for decades, serving in addition to president as first Vice-President in 1933–34, and working long and hard to further the teaching of Latin in the schools in Chicago and elsewhere. In recognition of this service, CAMWS presented her with an *Ovatio* in 1955. She was also president of the American Philological Association in 1958, the only woman ever to preside over both associations.³ After her retirement from the University of Chicago she held a number of visiting professorships.⁴ In all, by the time she retired for good at the age of seventy-four, she had been teaching Classics for forty-eight years.

Daughter of James Almon and Edith Mann Smith, Gertrude Elizabeth Smith was born December 23, 1894 in Peoria, Illinois. She studied at Bradley College (1912–14) before completing her B.A. at the University of Chicago in 1916, and remained at Chicago for her M.A. in 1917 and her Ph.D. (*summa cum laude*) in 1921. She immediately joined

¹ It may be of interest to note that in 1941 the annual dinner cost \$1.50 and that single hotel rooms (all with private baths and radios!) were priced at \$2.50–3.50; for further details see the announcement in *CJ* 36 (1940/41) 385–89.

² For the bibliographical particulars of this and Smith's other published works see the complete list in the Appendix (below).

³ Eight men have been president of both CAMWS and the APA.

⁴ University of Illinois, 1961–65; Loyola University (Chicago), 1966–68; Vanderbilt University, 1968–69.

the faculty of the Department of Greek, serving as instructor (1921–25), assistant professor (1925–30), associate professor (1930–33), and finally as Edwin Olson Professor of Greek from 1933 until her retirement from Chicago in 1961. Among other distinctions, she was a founder of the national undergraduate honor society, Eta Sigma Phi, in 1924, served on the editorial board of *Classical Philology* from 1925 to 1965, and received an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters from Ripon College in 1953.

A large portion of Smith's career was devoted to departmental administration. In 1934 she was appointed acting chairman of the Department of Greek, and two years later the qualifier "acting" was removed. In 1953 the Department of Greek was merged into the Department of Classics, at which time she assumed the chairmanship of this new department until her retirement, a total of twenty-seven years as departmental chair in one of the largest and most important Greek/classics programs in the United States.

We should not underestimate the difficulties Smith faced as a woman forging an academic and administrative career at the University of Chicago. At its founding in 1892, Chicago was strongly committed to the education of women, but a decade later when the number of women undergraduates had surpassed 50 percent, President William Rainey Harper led a majority of the (largely male) faculty in voting to segregate large undergraduate classes by sex.⁵ Despite such indications of resistance to women, by 1910 nearly a quarter of the faculty at Chicago was female—by far the largest percentage of women teaching at a major American university.⁶ Many of these women, to be sure, were relegated to temporary positions in the lowest ranks or were appointed in traditionally "female" disciplines, like household administration (Chicago's name for home economics) rather than the more "academic" departments of sociology or economics. Notable examples of this pattern included such pioneers in social and eco-

⁵ The "reform" proved to be a costly nuisance and lasted only five years; see B. M. Solomon, *In the Company of Educated Women: A History of Women and Higher Education in America* (New Haven 1985) 57–59. As she notes, other universities like Stanford underwent a similar struggle over the number of female students. From a larger perspective, however, the segregation debate of 1902 proved to be the beginning of a half-century of decline for women at Chicago. A good overview of the period 1892–1920 at Chicago is provided by L. D. Gordon, *Gender and Higher Education in the Progressive Era* (New Haven 1990) 85–120; Gordon devotes most of this chapter to the first decade of the University (1892–1902), but at the end briefly acknowledges that the position of women weakened considerably in the following two decades.

⁶ Next after Chicago was the University of Minnesota, where 9.7 percent of the faculty were women. Figures are from S. B. Carter, "Academic Women Revisited: An Empirical Study of Changing Patterns in Women's Employment as College and University Faculty, 1890–1963," *Journal of Social History* 14 (1980–81) 682.

nomic theory as Sophonisba P. Breckinridge⁷ and Edith Abbott;⁸ these women and their colleagues, in conjunction with the practical social reforms carried out in the city of Chicago by Jane Addams and others,⁹ made the University a world leader in this branch of sociology.¹⁰ Despite the renown of these and other women scholars and teachers, Chicago shows an unparalleled decline in the number of women on the faculty from 22.5 percent in 1910 to 15.5 percent in 1920, 11.8 percent in 1930 and 10.3 percent in 1940, when it was eleventh out of sixteen major universities.¹¹ At a time when almost all other universities were making substantial progress in increasing the number of women on the faculty,¹² Chicago was becoming more and more male.¹³

⁷ Breckinridge received a J.D. in 1904 and Ph.D.s in political science and economics in 1905, all from Chicago. She was then appointed to the faculty in household administration, which was later incorporated into the School of Social Service Administration—clearly a women's division of the university. An indication of her scholarly activity is that twenty-four books of hers are listed in the University of Texas library catalogue. See J. Freeman, "Women on the Social Science Faculties since 1892" (unpublished draft of a speech given at the Political Science Association Conference, Winter 1969) 3, 10.

⁸ Abbott received her Ph.D. in sociology from Chicago in 1905. Her first book, *Women in Industry: A Study in American Economic History* (1910), won high praise from her former teacher ("epoch-making . . . it is the first thing of its kind in a new field; and no one is ever likely to do anything which would make it obsolete"). She was appointed a lecturer in sociology in 1913, but by 1920 she still had not been promoted to assistant professor, and so she switched to School of Social Service Administration, where she later became dean and had a distinguished career (ten of her books are listed in the University of Texas library catalogue). See Freeman (above, n.7) 2, 11; and R. E. Streeter, *One in Spirit: A Retrospective View of the University of Chicago on the Occasion of Its Centennial* (an official exhibition catalogue published by the university in 1991) 76–78.

⁹ Addams was, of course, much more than a practical reformer; she was a powerful thinker as well, who was gradually marginalized by the (male) sociology department. This is demonstrated in great detail by M. J. Deegan, *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892–1918* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1988) especially 194–96, 313–17), who relates the treatment of women in sociology to larger political and social forces and shows how academic sociology also repressed or marginalized male scholars who studied "women's issues" (i.e., applied sociology). By the time of the creation of the School of Social Service Administration in 1920, no women were left in the sociology department: "women were now social workers and the men were sociologists" (Deegan, 196).

¹⁰ The university's approved view can be seen in *One in Spirit* (above, n.8, 75–80), where Streeter, a former dean at Chicago, reviews this era of dual programs (as he sees it)—the academic side in the Department of Sociology (virtually all male) and the practical, pedagogical side in the School of Social Service Administration (virtually all female), without any apparent awareness of the sexual discrimination this structure incorporated.

¹¹ Carter (above, n.6) 682; Freeman (above, n.7) 13 gives figures for 1968–69, which work out to 8.4 percent women (104 out of 1,240).

¹² The exception is Princeton, which in 1940 still had no women faculty.

¹³ A recent collection of memoirs of Chicago scholars during the half-century or so after the First World War (*Remembering the University of Chicago: Teachers, Scientists, and Scholars*, ed., E. Shils [Chicago 1991]) includes only one woman

This context makes Smith's rise through the "normal" *cursus honorum* all the more remarkable. She must have had strong and constant support from her teacher and mentor Robert Bonner (see further below), but she must also have relied on an extraordinary tenacity of her own. Not only did Smith survive, however; she forged an administrative career notable both for the leadership she provided for the program at Chicago and for the large number of students whom she taught and supervised. A major difference between Smith and virtually all other female classical scholars of her generation is that she was not only the product of a coeducational institution but (more importantly) she made her professional career at a coeducational institution. She thus stands alone among female classicists in this period in having taught and influenced large numbers of male as well as female students.¹⁴

On the other hand, Smith's gender may have exacerbated the difficulties classics faced at the University of Chicago during her administration. The Department of Greek, as she conceived it, did not fit well into the broad-ranging educational reforms of Robert Maynard Hutchins, president of the University from 1929 to 1950, and his associates, especially Mortimer J. Adler and Richard McKeon.¹⁵ It is ironic, of course, that these men all worked to increase the influence of Greek texts, especially Greek tragedy and Aristotle, in undergraduate education, and stimulated a good many students to learn some Greek,¹⁶ and yet they succeeded in alienating the Department of Greek and ultimately reducing its stature considerably.¹⁷ Shils puts it well:¹⁸

The department of classics should have thrived under Hutchins' jurisdiction, but it did not. . . . When Hutchins settled into the presidency of Chicago and began to espouse the superiority of the ancients to the moderns, it would have been reasonable to predict that he would treat the department of classics with special indulgence. He did not. He was indifferent to it. Werner Jaeger came to the depart-

among its forty-seven profiles, Maria Goeppert Mayer, who was appointed a "voluntary associate professor of Physics" (an unpaid position).

¹⁴ Bryn Mawr took male graduate students as early as the 1930s, but the numbers were very small until the 1960s.

¹⁵ For accounts of the Hutchins presidency, see W. H. McNeill, *Hutchins' University: A Memoir of the University of Chicago 1929-1950* (Chicago 1991); and E. Shils, "Robert Maynard Hutchins," *American Scholar* 59 (1990) 211-35. Two other accounts are of less use: H. S. Ashmore, *Unseasonable Truths: The Life of Robert Maynard Hutchins* (Boston 1989); and M. A. Dzuback, *Robert M. Hutchins: Portrait of an Educator* (Chicago 1991). None of these mentions Gertrude Smith.

¹⁶ Adler later incorporated the study of Greek as a requirement in the new college he helped found, St. John's.

¹⁷ In 1925 the department was ranked third in the country (see Ashmore, above, n.15, 77). By 1957 it was ranked seventh; by 1964 had fallen to twelfth.

¹⁸ Shils (above, n.15) 225.

ment for a short stay [1936–39] but then went on to Harvard. For a time in the 1930s, as a result of the Nazi dismissal of Jewish university teachers, the world was flooded with outstanding classical scholars. Hutchins, as far as I know, had no desire to take advantage of these misfortunes on behalf of the classics department.

The basis of Hutchins' hostility to the Department of Greek may have been in part a matter of personality. Not that Smith was alone in this: Hutchins irritated, indeed outraged, many on the faculty, and Smith certainly did not fit the type of scholar who joined Hutchins' inner circle, one feature of which was that it included no women.¹⁹ It seems reasonable to speculate that he did not feel comfortable with professional academic women, and (whether consciously or not) worked to reduce their number and influence at Chicago.²⁰ More than personal differences were involved, however, for Hutchins valued classical works primarily for their eternal truths, and had little regard for either linguistic skill or the historical and archaeological context that Smith (like most classicists of this period) felt was important. In the general education program developed at Chicago, history had almost no role and the foreign languages were of minimal importance. Smith, with her broad view of the totality of Greek culture—language, literature, history, art, and archaeology—disagreed fundamentally with Hutchins' new program and maintained the department in its traditional ways, resisting full participation in Hutchins' new programs with all the benefits that might have brought.

Another aspect of the promotion of classics to which Smith devoted considerable time and energy was her work for the American School of Classical Studies in Athens. She was annual professor in Athens in 1949–50 and directed the summer session three times. Even more important was her service on the Managing Committee for almost half a century, and especially on the Committee on Admissions and Fellowships, of which she became chair in 1945. She chaired this committee for eighteen years, developing and implementing policies and standards as the School emerged from the devastating impact of the Second World War and regained its former eminence. Lucy Meritt²¹ recalls particularly her insistence that students in the field of His-

¹⁹ In all the accounts of Hutchins' tenure, no woman scholar or faculty member is mentioned among those he worked closely with. On the other hand, accounts note that Hutchins was extremely handsome and that he had a very difficult marriage.

²⁰ Although the decline in the percentage of women on the Chicago faculty began before Hutchins' arrival in 1929, we may note that Stanford, a very similar private, coeducational university, also shows a decline in the percentage of women from 1920 to 1930 (from 10.4 to 8.0 vs. 15.5 to 11.8 for Chicago); at Stanford, however, this figure then increased to 19.8 in 1940, whereas at Chicago it continued to decline (to 10.3) during Hutchins' first decade; see Carter (above, n.6) 682.

²¹ Private communication.

tory or archaeology should have a strong background in the Greek language and literature. By this and by the encouragement she gave students at Chicago and elsewhere to attend the American School, she played as large a role as anyone in restoring the school to its position of eminence. For this work she received the Cross of Commander, the Royal Order of Beneficence from King Paul of Greece in 1957. At her death in 1986 she left a generous bequest to the school.

I stress Smith's accomplishments in teaching and administration partly because when we turn to consider her scholarly achievement, we encounter a large uncertainty that can never be fully resolved: what was her contribution to the work published jointly with her teacher and colleague, Robert J. Bonner? Smith's list of publications is not long: it includes a published dissertation and eleven articles in her own name, about which I will say more below. But by far her best-known scholarly achievement is the two-volume work she co-authored with Bonner, *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*. Three later articles were also published jointly with Bonner in the early 1940s (on Sparta, Delphi, and Boeotia); these were *prolegomena* to a planned third volume "devoted to various aspects of other Greek legal systems [i.e., other than Athenian],"²² but Bonner died in 1946 and Smith did not continue the project on her own.

The two volumes of Bonner and Smith, as it is universally known, published in 1930 and 1938, constitute the most important and influential American work in the field of Greek law and are still invaluable to scholars everywhere. Until the publication of Harrison's handbook,²³ it was the only comprehensive study of Athenian law in English. The work is notable both for its broad scope (it covers the entire history of Athenian law through the fourth century B.C.) and for its wide use of literary and documentary evidence. It had a broad and immediate impact in Europe, where volume 1 was reviewed in ten journals. Most notable is the high praise bestowed on it by the leading French authority in the field, George Glotz, who calls the work "un exposé remarquable autant par l'étude pénétrante des textes que par la clarté des idées."²⁴ Similarly, Paul Cloché concludes that this is an "ouvrage solidement documenté, nourri de discussions précises et d'aperçus originaux."²⁵ In the United States, by contrast, volume 1 was reviewed only in *CJ* and *CP*, both journals with which Smith had some connection.²⁶ American scholars responded a bit better to volume 2: in addition to *CJ* and *CP* it was reviewed in *AJP* and *CW*.

²² *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle* II, vi.

²³ A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* (2 vols. Oxford 1968–71).

²⁴ *REG* 45 (1932), 339; Glotz does take exception to some points, including the treatment of oaths.

²⁵ *REA* 33 (1931), 165.

²⁶ Smith was an editor of *CP* and was connected with *CJ* through her involvement with CAMWS.

This time there were fewer European reviews, perhaps because of increasing political distractions.

The main thrust of Bonner and Smith's examination of the history of Athenian law in volume 1 is to take the "evolutionary" view of Greek law, pioneered by Sir Henry Maine and furthered by such scholars as Glotz, Vinogradoff, and Gernet and modify it considerably by giving it a sounder historical foundation. Bonner and Smith rely less on the comparative evidence from other early societies, in particular early Germanic law, which has strongly influenced (and continues to influence) the Continental approach to Greek law.²⁷ Rather, they try to limit their conclusions to what can be supported by the historical evidence from Greece itself. In doing this they put considerably more weight on practical considerations—the community's efforts to contain violence and regulate self-help—as opposed to religious factors such as the ordeal or homicide pollution.²⁸ This approach is characteristically American, and is shared by the other great American scholar in the field at the time, George Calhoun.²⁹ It owes much, I think, to American legal scholarship, especially to the "realist" school of Oliver Wendell Holmes, Karl Llewellyn (who taught at Chicago during this period), and others.

Volume 2 has a different focus. Here the authors, following the lead of the second half of Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians* (which was only discovered in 1891), take a synchronic approach to several aspects of fifth- and fourth-century Athenian procedure; historical considerations are only prominent in the chapter on oaths. Their concern is, as they make clear, to revise Lipsius' great handbook,³⁰ and they discuss at some length points on which they wish to correct Lipsius. Reviewers (including Gernet) had generally favorable reactions, interspersed with disagreement on certain points. Only Kahrstedt was strongly critical, maintaining that the work is of little value for students of law, though he grants its usefulness for students of Athenian culture and society.³¹ American reviewers all concluded that Bonner and Smith provide a welcome alternative to Lipsius, who presents considerably more information but in a way that is not always clear or easy to find.

In sum, there is no doubt that the two volumes of Bonner and Smith constitute a distinguished scholarly achievement. There remains,

²⁷ Note the complaints of several reviewers: "enough use does not seem to have been made of the comparative method" (Jolowicz in *JHS* 51, 127); "Der Berichterstatte hätte nur gewünscht, dass die Gesichtspunkte der vergleichenden Rechtswissenschaft wirksamer geworden wären" (Weiss in *Gnomon* 8, 391).

²⁸ Contrast, e.g., G. Glotz, *L'ordalie dans la Grèce primitive* (Paris 1904); L. Gernet, "Droit et prédroit en Grèce ancienne," *L'année sociologique* ser. 3 (1948–49) 21–119, and K. Latte, *Heiliges Recht* (Tübingen 1920).

²⁹ See especially *The Growth of Criminal Law in Ancient Greece* (Berkeley 1927).

³⁰ J. H. Lipsius, *Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren* (Leipzig 1905–15).

³¹ *Klio* 32 (1939/40), 422.

however, the question I raised earlier with regard to Smith's own achievement: how much of Bonner and Smith is Bonner and how much is Smith? It is impossible, of course, to disentangle fully the contributions of joint authors, especially in a case such as this where the authors give no account of the matter themselves. But my clear sense is that each author contributed to the work in different ways, which in the end can be judged roughly equal in significance. To support this conclusion we must consider first the work Smith published in her own name.

Gertrude Smith began to attack the continental view of early law I have alluded to above in her dissertation, *The Administration of Justice from Hesiod to Solon*, which was directed by Bonner and was published by the University of Chicago in 1924. The dissertation received three reviews, one of which (by Thiel) I have not yet seen. Of the other two, one is a brief notice in the *Classical Review* by the noted British historian of Greece and Rome, Max Cary. Cary states that "like other recent American monographs on Greek law³² it avoids facile *a priori* reconstructions and pays close attention to the ancient sources of evidence." Cary adds special praise for Smith's last chapter on the "evidentiary oath," where she disputes the conclusions of several of the European scholars mentioned above.

The other review of Smith's dissertation is by Louis Gernet in *REG*. It is much longer than Cary's and concentrates on Smith's last chapter, which Gernet considers the most substantial but also the most questionable. "The truth is (Gernet writes) that the author has not succeeded in freeing herself from a modern way of thinking (*une mentalité moderne*)." This "modern way of thinking" involves the (allegedly) mistaken idea that the original purpose of individual and collective oaths in Greece was the establishment of a factual truth. Gernet and others argue that the institution of compurgators or "oath-swearers"—people from the community who swear oaths in support of the litigant without any knowledge of the facts—is primary and that the use of oaths to establish factual truth is a later, "modern" development. Some details of Smith's argument may be untenable, but on the main point of Gernet's criticism—the rejection of Smith's rational approach to early Greek law (and religion) in favor of an "irrational" view that sees primitive judgments as depending on automatic, divine intervention—on this point I would strongly agree with Smith; indeed, my own work in the field is inconceivable without the stimulus and guidance of hers and Bonner's.³³

³² The "monographs" Cary probably has in mind are all Chicago dissertations, directed by Bonner: G. M. Calhoun, *Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation* (Austin 1913), W. D. Ferguson, *The Legal Terms Common to the Macedonian Inscriptions and the New Testament* (Chicago 1913), J. O. Lofberg, *Sycophancy in Athens* (Chicago 1917) and H. G. Robertson, *The Administration of Justice in the Athenian Empire* (Toronto 1924).

³³ I regret that I did not think to consult Smith's dissertation several years ago when I undertook a detailed study of witnesses in the Gortyn laws, since, although

Smith's dissertation gives us the best grounds for assessing her as a scholar in her own right. Before the appearance of Bonner and Smith she had also published four articles on Greek law in *Classical Philology* (1921, 1922, 1924, and 1927), but for the most part these treat details of the subject. Undoubtedly Bonner gave her advice and guidance during this period; he directed her dissertation and must surely have discussed the issues in her articles. It is evident, nonetheless, especially in her dissertation, that Smith could marshal the evidence and formulate a strong argument herself, and I cannot find any passage in Bonner's own books and papers that challenges the work of the German scholars as directly or forcefully as Smith's chapter on oaths.

The original idea to study the subject of "Administration of Justice" was Bonner's, and he wrote two articles on the subject³⁴ before Smith became his student, but he seems to have put aside his interest in the subject until he directed Smith's dissertation and that of H. G. Robertson, who also received his Ph.D. in 1921.³⁵ Smith's dissertation inspired Bonner to return to the subject himself,³⁶ and the two of them worked together on the project from then until Bonner's death. My sense, therefore, is that they were essentially equal partners in the enterprise. After 1926, Bonner devoted almost his entire scholarly career to the joint enterprise.³⁷ The only exception was a pause to give the Sather lectures in 1932, which were published as *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*. These lectures provide a good overview of the Athenian *politeia*, but they are aimed at the general reader and do not constitute a work of original scholarship. Bonner's scholarly energy at the time, and indeed for the last twenty years of his life, went into his work with Smith. The two seem to have had a symbiotic relationship, with Bonner providing the larger overview and Smith contributing the detailed and forceful arguments in support of their views; each depended on the help of the other.

After Bonner's death in 1946 Smith published only three articles. Two of these concern legal topics, including an interesting

she neglects the references to witnesses in other Gortyn laws, she has an intelligent review of the evidence of the Great Code (40–42) and properly modifies the conclusion of W. D. Headlam that all witnesses at Gortyn are formal and procedural. I set forth the case in detail in "The Function of Witnesses at Gortyn," in *Symposion 1985: Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, ed. G. Thür (Cologne 1989) 29–54.

³⁴ "Administration of Justice in the Age of Homer," *CP* 6 (1911) 12–36; "Administration of Justice in the Age of Hesiod," *CP* 7 (1912) 17–23.

³⁵ See above, n.32. Unlike several other dissertations that Bonner directed, Robertson's was not published by the university, but rather in Toronto, where Robertson went to teach. He does not appear to have written anything else in the area of Greek law. Clearly Smith was Bonner's star pupil from this period.

³⁶ "Administration of Justice under Peisistratus," *CP* 19 (1924) 359–61; "Administration of Justice under Athenian Oligarchies," *CP* 21 (1926) 209–17; and "Administration of Justice in Rural Attica," *CP* 23 (1928) 19–24.

³⁷ *Lawyers and Litigants in Ancient Athens* was finished in 1926 (published in 1927).

paper on the Gortyn laws, but both (like her CAMWS address) are general in nature, not works of detailed scholarship. It appears that after 1946 she devoted herself more to teaching and administration than to scholarship. After her retirement in 1961 she accepted short-term positions for several years,³⁸ and then finally retired to Nashville with her husband, Sam Lee Greenwood. She had married Greenwood, who was three months her senior and a professor of classics at Baldwin-Wallace College in Ohio, on June 15, 1940, two years after he received his Ph.D. from Chicago. She lived to celebrate her ninetieth birthday in Nashville and was alert and active almost until her death on May 10, 1985. Her ashes were scattered on the Acropolis.

In a final assessment, although we might wish to have more of Gertrude Smith's own independent scholarly publications, her scholarly achievement remains very impressive, and when taken together with her eminent career as teacher and administrator, the result is a complete classical career few could match. When seen in the context of the treatment of women academics at Chicago and elsewhere during this period, it is nothing short of extraordinary.³⁹

University of Texas
CW 90.2-3 (1996-97)

MICHAEL GAGARIN

³⁸ above, n.5.

³⁹ I wish to thank Bill Calder (himself a student of Gertrude Smith) for the invitation to participate in his panel at the 1992 CAMWS meeting, thus providing the original incentive to investigate Gertrude Smith's fascinating life. My sources for her career include: *Who's Who of American Women* (Chicago 1968-69) 1127; *Directory of American Scholars* vol. 3 (1974) 439; and an "In Memoriam" notice in the *APA Newsletter* 9, 1 (Winter 1986) 11-12; see also *The Biographical Dictionary of North American Classicists*, ed. W. Briggs (Westport, CT 1994) 596-97. Besides these brief, factual notices I could find nothing published about Smith. I have not been able to consult the archives at the University of Chicago, which might provide further insight into Smith's distinguished career there.

APPENDIX

(A) PUBLICATIONS OF GERTRUDE SMITH

The Administration of Justice from Hesiod to Solon (Chicago 1924); "Athenian Casualty Lists," *CP* 14 (1919) 351-64; "The Prytaneum in the Athenian Amnesty Law," *CP* 16 (1921) 345-53; "Early Greek Codes," *CP* 17 (1922) 187-201; "The Name 'Ten Thousand,'" *CJ* 18 (1922-23) 570; "Dicasts in the Ephetic Courts," *CP* 19 (1924) 353-58; "Homeric Orators and Auditors," *CJ* 21 (1925-26) 355-64; "The Jurisdiction of the Areopagus," *CP* 22 (1927) 61-79; (with Robert J. Bonner) *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle* (Chicago 1930-38); (with Bonner) "Administration of Justice in Sparta," *CP* 37 (1942) 113-29; "ΠΟΛΙΣ ΑΝΔΡΑ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΕΙ" *CJ* 38 (1942-43) 260-79; (with Bonner) "Administration of Justice in the Delphic Amphictyony," *CP* 38 (1943) 1-12; (with Bonner) "Administration of Justice in Boeotia," *CP* 40 (1945) 11-23; "More Recent Theories on the Origin and Interrelation of the First Classifications of Greek Laws," *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale* 3 (1956) 173-95; "Cretan Law and Common Tendencies in Archaic Greek Law," *Acta Congressus*

Madvigiani Vol. 1 (Copenhagen 1958) 235–50; “On Verbal Repetition in Aeschylus,” in *Studies in Honor of Ulmann*, ed. L. B. Lawler (St. Louis 1960) 19–28.

(B) REVIEWS OF GERTRUDE SMITH’S PUBLICATIONS

—of *The Administration of Justice from Hesiod to Solon*, M. Cary in *CR* 39 (1925) 87; L. Gernet in *REG* 38 (1925) 117–19; **Thiel in *Mus. Phil.* 33 (1925) 272.

—of “Dicasts in the Ephetic Courts,” L. Gernet in *REG* 39 (1926) 464–65.

—of *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, vol. 1, A. R. Bellinger in *CJ* 27 (1931–32) 139–41; M. Cary in *CR* 44 (1930) 227–28; P. Cloché in *REA* 33 (1931) 161–65; G. Glotz in *REG* 45 (1932) 339–41; H. F. Jolowicz in *JHS* 51 (1931) 126–27; Ch. Josserand in *Ant. Cl.* 1 (1932) 460–63; **Kamps in *Rev. hist. de droit fr. et ét.* (1936) 163–71; S. B. Smith in *CP* 28 (1933) 134–36; Vinello in *Boll. Fil. Cl.* (1931) 159–65; **von Hille in *Mus. Phil.* 39 (1931) 43; E. Weiss in *Gnomon* 8 (1932) 390–92.

—of *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, vol. 2, M. Cary in *CR* 52 (1938) 231–32; P. Cloché in *REA* 40 (1938) 437–38; A. P. Dorjahn in *CP* 34 (1939) 162–65; L. Gernet in *REG* 52 (1939) 375–76; W. A. Goligher in *Hermathena* 52 (1938) 154–56; R. J. Hopper in *JHS* 58 (1938) 261–65; H. M. Hubbell in *AJP* 61 (1940) 238–43; Ch. Josserand in *Ant. Cl.* 8 (1939) 302–03; U. Kahrstedt in *Klio* 32 (1939–40) 420–23; M. Radin in *CJ* 36 (1940–41) 109–13; H. G. Robertson in *CW* 32 (1938–39) 64; **von Hille in *Mus. Phil.* 47 (1939) 308.

** = Works I have not seen.

CAAS ANNUAL AWARD OF MERIT

Recommendations are now being sought for the CAAS Award of Merit. Any member of CAAS may submit a nomination based on the following qualifications: that the nominee be a member of CAAS in good standing, and distinguished in his or her service to the profession over a period of years, whether in scholarship, teaching, or promotional and organizational work for the Classics.

Nomination forms are available from CAAS Regional Representatives and from the Awards Committee Chair. All nominations must be accompanied by a curriculum vitae and two letters of recommendation for the nominee. One letter should be from a present or former student; the other from a present or former colleague or administrative supervisor.

Please mail nominations and supporting materials as soon as possible to:

Dr. Henry V. Bender
1116 Harvest Road
Cherry Hill, NJ 08002