Of course, like you, I have been wondering why I am the Sather professor who has been invited to speak today, and the only answer I could find is that I may well be one of the Sather professors who has seen the greatest number of Sather lectures — remember, not only can they not be UCB faculty, but often they come from a great distance. This is by the way a chance for me to dedicate the talk to the memory of one particular person in Berkeley, Crawford Greenewalt, Greenie. Perhaps it is unwise to single out one individual in such a long story, but I mention Greenie because he has been a teacher of altruism and friendliness, and the history of the Sathers is *inter alia* a history of hospitality.

As for the idea of distance, this must be key to the history of the Sathers. For a long time, in the age of transAtlantic ocean liners and of the Western Pacific railroad, part of the programmatic force of the Sathers was the idea of bridging a spectacular, staggering distance with the traditional areas of Classical studies. If you allow me to put it that way, the appearance of the Sather professor in the westernmost location of Classical studies was not unlike the cultural poetics of the Liberation Army of Garden Gnomes — where the important point is not so much that the gnome is abducted, but that he reappears in a picture with the Golden Gate Bridge or the Great Wall of China.

Now one of the problems for my assignment today is that the history of the Sathers mostly includes pleasant residence and idyllic memories, at least for the Sather professors, and there is not much dramatic or sensational material.

Not for them Derek Walcott’s memorable line “Nothing hurts as much as the word California” (which is about exile and by the way is about Los Angeles not the Bay Area). Even when it rained a lot, they must have felt like “the king of a rainy country”. If we use the prefaces as evidence, very few Sather professors seem to have noticed the political tensions and passions typical of Berkeley’s history: no mention of teargas and protesters. We should of course factor in the conventions of academic writing, and before that, the fact that in traditional academic style even the preface was not a place for a personal voice. Hermann Fränkel’s lectures were held in early 1943, and famously
one of the lectures was interrupted by a wartime blackout, and there was a decision to schedule the next ones to the early afternoon. But Fränkel, who was a Jewish Hellenist in exile from Nazi Germany, does not even mention World War II, except for a factual aside about his friend Lionel Pearson who supported him with the book project until “he joined the British army”. Fränkel himself was no stranger to war: he had been a cavalry officer on the Russian front in World War I.

The world of California and even the word California was even more remote back in the academic year 1913/1914 when our story begins... The most famous book on 1913, The year before the storm by Florian Illies, is basically a book about high modernism. Like so many books in Classics and so many Sather books it is basically a book about famous individuals of the past (I return to this question in a moment). Example:

Louis Armstrong at 12 arrested with a stolen revolver in N.O. The man later famous as Stalin arrives to Vienna’s Northern Station, then takes a walk at Schonbrunn Park where a young Austrian named Adolf goes strolling regularly. But the two never meet nor will they ever meet in person. An insurance company employee in Prague submits his manuscript provisionally entitled “The Bug”. Malevich presents to an exhibition in Finland a painting called “Black Square on a White Background”. Matisse brings a bunch of flowers to ailing Picasso in Paris. Residents of Vienna in 1914 include Freud, Schnitzler, Klimt, Wittgenstein, Tito, Trotsky and Kokoshka.

Synchronicity is of course a tricky mirage. But it is not necessarily wasted time. Roland Barthes makes fun of a radio broadcast on the parallel evolution of history and music with entries like 1789 Session of États Généraux in Paris and Concerto for strings no. 4 in C minor by Galuppi, yet, Francesco Orlando retorts, is it still so funny if we keep the historical reference to the French Revolution but substitute another musical first performance, the Don Giovanni instead of Galuppi? Clearly the whole idea of a meaningful synchronicity rests on intuition and the problem is selecting in the pool of information available.

Where are we going to find a relevant contemporary reference for the birth of the Sather lectures? — the only link could be that most of the anecdotes I mentioned have something to do with beginnings of something, but they have their center in Europe. California was hardly the center of many things at the time, at least in a Eurocentric perspective.
There was a brand new Tower, but no Sather bells, a recent Sather Gate, but no bridges on the Bay, the Panama Canal, you may surmise, yes, but only from August 1914 onwards. By the end of his tenure, the first visiting professor, J.L. Myres from Oxford England, “virtually walked off the lecture platform onto the deck of a small gunboat in the Royal Navy...and was dispatched to Greek waters” (Sterling Dow, Fifty Years of Sathers, p. 4). Described as “rapid-fire in speech and actions”, Myres spent World War I circling around Greek islands: this adds a certain point to the title of his Sather volume, published only in 1930 after his second Sather incumbency of 1926/7, Who were the Greeks?. In title, size, and ambition, and perhaps even in real chronology, this volume would provide a better volume one to the Sather series, which is officially spearheaded by John Adams Scott, The Unity of Homer (1921), to whom I return later.

Let me give you just one example of how far back 1914 is. One of the things that identify modernity is, unfortunately, airstrikes. Now there had been only one airstrike in human memory until early 1914, and you will immediately realize that it was another era if I tell you that the first and only airstrike in human history up to that moment had been Italian. It was a small-scale attack on an oasis outside Tripoli in Libya, and was connected with the Italian bid for empire in the early twentieth century. The account by the pilot gives me the hope that there was no victim: the pilot was very tense because he had the bombs in a leather container on the seat next to him, he had to throw them down by hand while steering, and his main concern was staying clear of the wings.

In the meantime, in Berkeley, the decision to fund the Sathers was creating an opportunity for publication of exemplary work in Classics before the US had any internationally visible series, or anything like standard internationally visible publications. In fact if we look at the early history of the lectures we can identify a streak of scholars clustered around Chicago, who were interventionists in the war and interested to see a national US profession of Classics grow and become autonomous from Germany. Later on, vigilant management of invitations by the Sather committee has done the rest, and up to now there has been no discussion that this is the principal international lecture series in the world of Classics.

But what is the foundation of the Sathers in 1914 telling us that we don’t know already? According to the Greek traditions of aetiology, or cult of origins, it would be nice if the beginning of it all, the choice of the first speaker by the founders, had some kind of message for us... Believe it or not, probably not, there is such a message.
Remember, the first visitor, John Lynton Myres, has published only much later his Sather magnum opus, where both the title, \textit{Who were the Greeks?}, and the size, 672 pages, the largest Sather book ever, publicizes the intention to start something important. Back in 1914, when he was invited the first time, Myres was already well known, especially for one aspect: his close relationship to anthropology. Myres’ approach to Classics was not anyone’s granddaddy’s approach at the time.

If this was indeed the vision behind the choice of Myres as a first visitor it was a strong one. (But notice that the second Sather visitor, prevented by World War I was going to be Phillimore, a quite different kind of scholar).

The point was not only bringing Oxford to the Bay Area — although this was also programmatic — but a special kind of Classics that one could have defined at the time as ‘modernist’. This is how the situation looked in Oxford around 1910 to a group of scholars, including Myres, who were straddling the area between anthropology and literae humaniores:

“The types of human culture are in fact reducible to two, a simpler and a more complex, and as we are wont to say (valuing our own achievements, I doubt not, rightly) a lower and a higher. By established consent Anthropology occupies itself solely with the culture of the simpler, lower kind. The Humanities on the other hand — the humanistic studies that, for us at all event, have their parent? in the literature of Greece and Rome, concentrate on what is most artistic and characteristic of the higher life of society.”

But then for the Oxford group the question becomes “What of the phenomena of transition?” Is there “A no man’s land between Humanities and anthropology?” “A buffer-tract” perhaps, “left purposely undeveloped”? (the language here has a clear hint of colonialism and powerplay before World War I). “A pacific penetration must be tolerated, nay encouraged, from both sides at once.” “Anthropology — this is the conclusion of the preface — must cast forward, the humanities must cast back.”

\footnote{R.R. Marett, preface to Id., ed., \textit{Anthropology and the Classics. Six lectures delivered before the University of Oxford 1908}, by Marett, Myres and others, pp. 3-4. It is important to realize that the strategy, and the style, was dictated by the attempt to find a space for the growth of anthropology as an academic institution, and to draw support from the prestige of Literae Humaniores. Like other dynamic Classicists in early twentieth-century Britain, Myres had links with the excavations at Crete and Cyprus, and was convinced that there was another story to be told about antiquity, one not dictated and made predictable by the written sources.}
Now of course this is not the discussion or the language we still have today, and the Berkeley anthropologists as I will tell you in a moment were already different in 1914. Yet this is the Ursprung, the proximate origin of the territory that we still inhabit today: it has become our own modernity after the rise of anthropology, more or less one century ago. For my money, the emergence of anthropology is the main new factor in this 100 years of Sathers, and therefore of Classics, that we celebrate today.

So from now on Classics will have a double prospect — either becoming more integrated in anthropology or being a history of great individuals of the past, just like the book on 1913 that I was quoting a moment ago — Joy Connolly has ironically compared this second approach to ‘fandom’, the deliberate illusion of living in a self-constructed past, of contributing to a fictional past, and its history could be traced back to Cicero and Petrarch.

Of course anthropology has had many different forms over the last century and much depends on which one we want to pick. Most influential has been Levi-Strauss’ definition that anthropology is “description of cultures from the outside” and therefore different from “insider’s jobs” like history of manuscripts or cultural history etc.

Note however that even this definition does not eliminate a certain ambiguity about the state of Classics vis-à-vis anthropology, because the state of Classical languages as dead languages, and the long continuous tradition that harks back to the past, make us eternally ambivalent: are we insiders or outsiders? Is our job to defamiliarize the past or to look for meaningful continuities? Which antiquity do we prefer, do we want to study the birds, who are arguably much the same over time, the environment, the geomorphology, space constraints, or, say, the relationship between the poetics of fiction and the practice of financial calculations, which arguably varies a lot over time?

Recent scholarship, in response to anthropology, has put the pressure on those two extremes, searching for an access to the past both through continuity and defamiliarization. In my optimistic mode, favored by the current atmosphere of celebration, I am going to say that this is a productive tension, precisely because it is as yet unresolved.

This productive tension is enormously helped by the rise of Western anthropology and has contributed to most of the really successful Sather projects that we all remember.
They have been regularly not so much a development of trajectories internal to the area of study, but the encounter with something modern, unclassical, unplanned even. To a certain extent every successful project in Classics is a comparative exercise, because at the very least it is comparing the past with modernity. Not by chance the one Sather book that most people easily remember is: Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational*. I am not saying that it is necessarily one of the best, or that it is a finished contribution. On the contrary, it is unfinished and problematic but one feels that somehow it had to happen, and also, it does no harm that it is frequently the favorite Sather volume of people who are not full-time Classicists or academics.

In fact Dodds had always been a little unusual for his generation — at Oxford as a student he had been in a class on Plotinus, daemons and spiritualism where the only other pupil was T.S. Eliot — and later on Dodds of course had brushed with the evolution of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy. So the first positive message of the Satherian century is that new research needs to look outside: as every graduate student knows already, it is necessary to read the bibliography if we want to write on a specific topic, but this is typically not the way that new ideas will come to us.

**The disappearance of close reading**

There are of course other ways in which the evolution and trajectory of the Sather volumes can help to illuminate the history of change in Classics as a profession.

One is the literary flavor issue raised by Dow in 1964 (54-55). He notes that the first Sathers were “well-read men” (he emphasizes “well-read” but I return to “men” in a couple of minutes) and that lately literary quotations tend to become rarer in the style of the Sather volumes. Dow clearly thought that bellettrism was a thing of the past and should be jettisoned. However, in the fifty years after him another disappearance strikes us even more, if we do a survey of titles and topics of the entire century.

The quiet, progressive disappearance of close reading

A pattern is visible — since the 70’s the great and the exemplary authors tend to occupy a limited space, and it is very uncommon to find anything like a project of close reading of a canonical text or school text. We still have a few books with single-author title, about Lysias, Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Pausanias, but those authors are
not particularly canonical, and arguably they were in much need of a book-length situated historical reappraisal.

The latest books that actually look like a close reading of a major author or text are the Tacitus by the ultra-conservative Austrian scholar Viktor Poschl in 65, the Aeneid by Wendell Clausen in 82, and Conte’s Petronius in 95 — although arguably Clausen’s book is a reevaluation of the neglected influence of Hellenistic poetry, and Petronius had never been a canonical author before at least in the US.

The decline of close reading of major authors in the Sathers is in fact part of a major trend of scholarship worldwide — if we examine the titles of scholarly publications we can verify the disappearance, almost total disappearance, of papers entitled “Tibullus 2.5”, “The Unity of Horace Ode 3.3”, “A reading of Bacchylides 5”, or the like (fictional titles).

Supported by New Criticism, those papers were a typical expression of the rise of a new professionalism between the 50’s and the 80’s.

Some of them were bad and some were smart, but taken as a whole they did function very well as links between research and teaching ability (the crucial aspects in the job market of the humanities), as samples of the required skills, including language and familiarity with literary criticism, and also had an ideological component: their implicit aim was often to decipher a hidden unity, or irony, or to bring an additional complexity to an already highly valued author or text, or, later on, to propose reappraisal and a re-evaluation, value being still a crucial if half-concealed aim of literary criticism. True, a large part of this production was literary praise more than literary criticism. But the matter of the disappearance of close reading raises a number of questions that should still engage your attention. Close reading had been the really North-American thing in literary studies. It has promoted on the one side empiricist resistance against literary theory, on the other, a welcome attention to interpretive practices, and at least implicitly a common ground with modern literary criticism and art history. It is still worth asking the question of how it has been replaced, and by what. One thing is for sure, and confirms what I was trying to say about the rise of anthropology and the human sciences: the new paradigm for research that has supplanted close reading is in many ways affiliated, although at some degrees of separation, with problem-driven research, familiar to us from the evolution of social and historical research.
The portrait of Emily Vermeule

Now I have decided to include at least one criticism of Berkeley in my paper to avoid the impression of creating a traffic in praise. The people of Berkeley Classics have destroyed the Sather wall, the institutional series of portraits of the Sather professors on a physical wall in Dwinelle Hall. They must have chosen to do that for reasons of space, and also a bit of (understandable) iconoclasm. The series of pictures from 1914 on now rests in a coffee-table album, while oddly only the latest four or five Sather portraits are facing the Sather professor in search of inspiration on a small portion of his Sather office wall.

This is at least curious in a generation where the picture wall is not only a memory of the past but the basis for the whole triumphant aesthetics of Facebook — in fact, this will be my only recommendation to the Sather committee, why not recreate one, a virtual wall of Sather pictures for the 100 years?

For a long time Berkeley students have toiled literally “under the gaze” of those austere professors in the seminar room. Why not recreate the effect for their luminous portable devices?

The reason I mention this is that for me at least the Sather wall has had one important message in the past. This has to do with the effect of the Sather wall as experienced in the mid-90’s (by a mid-career male scholar on his first visit to UCB), and of one picture in particular, the picture of Emily Vermeule, the Sather Professor of ‘74-‘75. As I was scanning the picture gallery, all or most of the black and white pictures seemed unfamiliar to me, more exactly, the people looked exactly like some of my favorite black and white portraits from the UK in the thirties to fifties, let’s say images of John Gielgud, Philip Larkin, Eric Ambler.

And then the real breathtaking moment was seeing the picture of Emily Vermeule. In my memory, and even if it is not true it is instructive, this was the first picture of a woman, the first color picture, and the first picture showing the entire body. She was even reclining on a bed, or so I thought. The contrast with the previous images was so stark, that it was beautiful to see how the form and the content were one and the same.

Note also that Vermeule appeared to me as the first woman in the series, but she had built a career in art history and in archaeology, areas where the access of women to the
best jobs was traditionally less restricted. The first woman to give the lectures as a literary scholar will be Ann Burnett in 93/94 — note that the Sather professor is typically not only a professional Classicist but also a full professor, so what is at stake here is basically not so much access for women to careers, but the number of women who reach the rank of full professor, especially in a visible college or institution. And since this is still an issue at present, I thought I would mention it.

*Now of course Vermeule was not at all the first woman to give the lectures.* It is simply that her picture gave me this impression in a panoramic vision of the Sather wall. The image of Lily Ross Taylor 1946-47 was not very different from the black-and-white Britons surrounding her — except that the frame of the picture was much narrower than the others, depicting not even the entire face let alone the upper body, the hair was very short, only a pearl necklace, with two pearls visible only, the angle from above, looking like she is reading. Unlike her male predecessors, Lily’s image looks like an out-take, not like a frontal and intentional portrait. Taylor gave her impressive lectures on *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*, and of course it would be wrong to generalize, but if one thinks of the link between women’s emancipation in the US and the World War II war effort, it is hard not to mention that before the Sather Lectures Taylor had been, between 1942 and 45, a Principal Social Science Analyst in the OSS, the newly founded US intelligence service.

So the history of the Sathers, through the Sather wall, is a testimony for the whole history of women in academia. For future generations, it will be one thing to be ‘told’ what the difference in jobs and access was, and another to see the visual effect of the wall, or of the virtual wall of course.

**Provincialism and cosmopolitanism**

But, on a lighter note, can the choices of the Sather committee be accused of provincialism or local bias? That would seem unlikely. If we look at the institutional map of the Sathers there is not much of a surprise, if you think of the history of the institutions and of the attempts to rank them.

Oxford and Cambridge are leading, with a tie in my own count (the tie works if we list Bernard Williams as a Cambridge professor, which must be right since he cannot have
been a Berkeley professor when he was invited), followed closely by Princeton and Harvard. The count of Princeton would be higher if we combine the University with the IAS, but I think this would be a mistake. Chicago has accumulated most of its representatives between World War I and the Thirties, and this must be related not only to the geopolitics but also to the high visibility of their graduate-only status at the time. The performances of London and Paris are very low in comparison, and it is not even correct I think to speak of huge networks such as London and Paris as universities, but for the French-speaking institutions there is also the language issue, since the Sather professor is also an instructor at Berkeley. There are five Italians (excluding Anna Morpurgo Davies who had a career in England) and one curiosity — I am the curiosity because I happened to take classes with all of the other four, and this confirms the stereotype of Italy as a tightly, perhaps too tightly textured society. In general, the results confirm the ability of the duopoly Oxbridge in capturing energies, which means basically the openness to international contact, and this is precisely even now the shortcoming of many institutions in Continental Europe.

Fifty Sathers ago Dow, who was not very impressed by the issue of women and the recurring European origin of the professors, made a curious geopolitical remark: (p.48) “apart from B.O. Foster, who died, and one other Stanford professor, born in Germany, none is from West of Chicago” - so no Western provincialism of course for the Sather committee: the only Westerners, in Dow’s witty style, are “one who died” (meaning, before being able to delivering the lectures, and not even included in the official list) and the great Hellenist Hermann Fränkel, who was hired at Stanford after fleeing Germany. Well, after Dow the bias was corrected - I can assure you that at least one of the Sathers was born in Oregon and another in Seattle - but I believe that Dow had a special point in his curious statement about “West of Chicago” and I return to this at the end of my paper.

As large as possible

It would be great to have a complete series of live recordings of the entire century — the technology was beginning to be available to ethnologists and etnographers around 1914, and in fact both J.L. Myres and the Berkeley anthropologists were staunch supporters of recording people’s voices.
Berkeley being Berkeley, it would be valuable also to have recordings of audience reactions, but this is clearly impossible. But I am sure it would be interesting to do some oral history and compile an anthology of informal audience reactions to the Sathers. The anthology would confirm the lively and rich intellectual life of non-academic audiences at Berkeley.

If I can offer you a personal anecdote, I had given my first Sather lecture and thought I had gotten away with it, when at the cocktail party I was introduced by a shared acquaintance to someone who was described as “working in the software industry” and also “a polymath”. It took ten seconds for the polymath to ask me the question that I most dreaded, the one I was hoping nobody would raise: “If your project is about the evolving memory of conflicts between Rome and Italy, why is your chosen text the _Aeneid_ and not Livy?” We were swept away by the flow of the cocktail party so I could not answer, and I do it now before the onset of another cocktail party. The polymath was right and the truth is that I have a Livy complex. I was born in Padua, my father was a young professor there, and as a child I used to fear the huge marble statue of Livy that dwarfs the atrium of the Faculty of Letters. If you look up the statue on the internet you will realize why. The statue was the work of a gifted sculptor who had been anointed as official artist of Mussolini, and was inaugurated in 1942. Soon after the war the sculptor, in a penitential mode, declared that sculpture was a “dead language” and that he was abandoning his art. The curious fact, considering the sculptor’s relationship to Fascism and the relationship between Livy and Augustus as it was being viewed at that time, is that Livy is represented as writing on his tablets while kneeling, on all fours basically.

Apologies for the digression, but let me keep discussing for a moment the possibilities of an oral history of the Sathers.

If we had this resource we could even create an anthology of opening gambits and entrance jokes by the various Sathers — in my limited experience, the best entrance joke belongs to Tonio Hölscher 2007, who applied to his situation of Sather professor facing the Sather audience the instruction he had just seen in a California park about what to do if you run into a mountain lion — I quote from memory: “Try to look as large as possible.” This joke, however, as is often the case with jokes, opens up a serious question.
As I told you at the outset, there is not a lot of drama involved in being a Sather professor, but is there at least some tension involved?

I think yes. Remember what I told you before about books on 1913 that are basically a collection of famous individuals from the past and their achievements: The Great and the Good and the Beautiful. (PANTA KALA so to speak, but not in Lissarrague’s sense. Although this label covers a large majority of the Sather volume topics, I must caution that it is unfair to studies of philosophy and history of ideas, where the approach to subject choice is understandably quite different.)

Of course, one of the implications here has been of facilitating communication, insofar as the Sathers are lectures, aural performance, and are supposed to be accessible to a broad audience. A number of speakers must have calculated that everybody has some knowledge of the plot of the Aeneid and the Agamemnon or Prometheus Bound. But there is more:

I suspect that many of us have felt they — we— had to be more classical than classics, that they, or we, had to wear a strong suit, a Sunday suit, and to experience some kind of Self-objectification, as in the Sather wall, and to feel Achevé en Sorbonne (of course this being a metaphor, considering the underrepresentation of Paris in the list).

Only very recently we begin to find ‘the low’ (in the sense of Marett and Myers around 1910) and the marginal — note e.g. Beard on Laughter and Purcell on shopping in antiquity.

This is not to say that the Sathers are belated followers of earlier trends: we still find in Classics the study of the postclassical, the ugly, the popular and the sub-literary advertised as a novelty, and although those claims are sometimes exaggerated if we look at neighboring departments of early modern studies, where similar things were happening already by the time Stephen Greenblatt moved from Yale to Berkeley, there must be a reason why they are still being reiterated.

But other areas have been totally excluded from the chosen topics: transmission — fragments — language — meter and sound - stuff that typically is at the core of Classics programs. The growing area of Reception has only recently been taken on board, by Helena Foley (a particularly useful Sather series of 2008, because it is the first project
centered on the modern USA, it is reception without being “great author reads great author” and it opens the way to performance studies, another growing area).

Note that even the Sather professors who could be identified as more technical, for example people who specialize in commentaries or critical texts, have often chosen something more solemn — e.g. the specialist Thucydides commentator Arthur Gomme who decided to speak about “The Greek attitude to poetry and history”. One interesting exception is E.J. Kenney, who would have had no problems in picking a famous text or a subject in high literature, but has decided to give us the only Sather volume completely dedicated to transmission and the history of textuality (personally I would not mind seeing some other project of this kind in the future.)

My prophecy?

So what about the next 100 years of Sathers? Prophecy is easy, much easier than trying to assess a 100 years of scholarship. If the megatrend that started in 1914 continues, in 100 years the Classics will have become a part of an integrated study of the past of mankind. Anthropology will be a major player, together with material culture, and comparative projects. At the same time, Classics will be in some sort of relationship with the future institution that will engulf most of the Humanities, that is, if I can be explicit, mega-departments of English, catch-all departments of English. In those two respects, Classics will still have a function as a stimulus because of its contingent access to evidence. Curiously enough, the two promising things about Classics in 2114 will be the same factors that have made Classics unbearable because elitist, formalist and inscrutable for a long time: its cult of the written word and its cult of philology.

First contingency

The massive availability of written record. And by that I mean not only the Odes of Pindar and of Horace, but the inscriptions on slave collars, since they are frequently inscribed.

And second contingency (based on the first)

Dead languages. With Mega-department of English, but also of post-colonial studies, there will be a feeling of monoglossy. The presentism, and presentification, typical of
US society and of modernized Asian societies will start to need some kind of corrective. In a country like the US where the existence of other languages is constantly hidden from sight, the educational experience of trying to think in another language is becoming rare, and in a century where languages will become extinct by the thousands, it will be useful to have an area study of the past where it is still possible to think, again, thanks to the contingency of the evidence, in the dead language of communities of the past.

**Conclusion: the Angry Young Man from Oakland**

But let me conclude and go back to the *50 Years of Sathers* by Sterling Dow. Dow was a Harvard man and a New England man, with a sometimes tricky and wry sense of humor. He published almost as a samizdat for another Centennial, the Centennial of the Archaeological Institute of America a paper called *a Century of Humane Archaeology*. In the preface, he apologizes for including some personal remarks, but then he maliciously adds “in teaching I came to realize that what might be called a calculated irrelevancy is often what gets remembered”. In fact the paper covers Knossos, The Agora of Athens, Democracy, Alexandria, underwater archaeology, the discovery of the Dark Age, and much more. There is much more ‘calculated irrelevancy’ in his account of the 50 years of Sathers, which was, precisely like my assignment, an impossible assignment.

In *Fifty Years*, Dow salutes the volume by J.A. Scott, *The Unity of Homer*, which as you will remember is Sather Volume One from 1921, as an “epoch-making book”, the “most influential book of the whole Sather series” (6).

In fact volume One of the Sathers does begin as if there was a feeling that this was the beginning of something important, “The great fact of ancient Greece is the poetry of Homer...The first and greatest of poets...” and it ends with a religious overtone: “antiquity was united in the belief of one divine Homer ,and only one.” (Dow in one of his wry asides mentions that Scott was an ardent Protestant and that “his house-guests dreaded his approach on Sunday mornings, with a Bible held firmly under one arm.”)

The volume was greeted in the *American Journal of Philology* by Samuel Bassett, himself a future Sather lecturer and Homeric Unitarian, with the impressive salvo “The greatest single contribution of the Far West — the Great West whither the spirit of the European race has ever striven — to a re-evaluation of the first and unsurpassed Indo-European
poet”. The emphasis on the West refers to the location of Berkeley as the westernmost rising location of Classical studies, not to the origins of Scott, who was from Connecticut. Bassett, writing in 1923, does not disguise that this is a victory of American Unitarianism over German analysis, and even argues that Scott has pierced the defenses of the enemy like General Pershing has done with the Hindenburg line — the reference is not only to the victorious commander in chief of the US army in World War I in Europe, but to his controversial and costly passion for frontal assault and impatience with trench warfare. Bassett himself must have had a fiery temper; he is remembered for giving the most pro-Achilles account of the Iliad ever published.

But, if you recall, I was asking myself what was Dow’s point, in saying that Scott’s book was a great beginning and (in a separate moment) that nobody from the West had ever given the Sather lectures until 1965? The fact is that he knew full well who this Western successor to Scott should have been. In his other retrospective, written for the AIA, Dow has mentioned in print that he regretted not being able to help the career of Milman Parry before Parry's sudden death, of a gunshot in Los Angeles in 1935. Parry was from Oakland, he would have made an impressive first Sather Lecturer from the Far West. Dow in fact claims that he wanted Milman’s portrait to be set up in the Smyth library, another of those monumental walls gazing upon students. Clearly Dow’s admiration for Scott was a rhetorical strategy: he was no stranger to the importance of oral studies: “Never did any scholar open up so much”, he says of Parry, writing in 1979.

So why do we end a retrospect of Sather lectures with the name of someone who did not have the opportunity to be a Sather? It is not only the fascination of missed opportunities; I have two reasons in mind. The first is that when Scott performed the first series of published Sathers, Parry was an undergraduate at Berkeley. What could his reactions have been? Perhaps he did not like the emphasis, which was not so much on unity, as on uniqueness. Perhaps he had feelings of frustration and anger, and this helped him in figuring out his new approach. Don’t forget that Parry famously said that Homer was like Phidias in the sense that Phidias was the expression of a collective Athenian culture, so the art of Phidias is “the work of the Greeks in cooperation with Phidias”. This strikes us as pure European Romanticism, although it is far better than other approaches, but where do those ideas come from in early
twentieth-century Berkeley? In fact my second point is that Parry had been not only a student of Classics at Berkeley, but less obviously a student of *anthropology and ethnology* at Berkeley. As John Garcia has pointed out, Parry took classes for three semesters with the influential Berkeley anthropologist Alfred Kroeber. Like Myres, Kroeber and his group were insisting on the value of archives and photographs and magnetophones, using cylinders at the time c the antecedents of the stuff that Parry brought on his trip to Serbia and Bosnia.

The Berkeley anthropologists were not intimidated by the opposition between high and low typical of Myres and his pioneering generation in England. They had a sense of equality, deriving from Boas, that went beyond the separation of high and low, elite and popular. Also they had helpfuly decided that the object of anthropology was not really Man with a capital M, but *cultural production*. So there were ideal conditions for a dialogue with Classics, but did it really happen? Even if it didn’t, we are still in time to make similar things happen in the future. But I actually think that something did happen, at least at the level of intellectual atmosphere, right here in this soulful campus under the brand new Sather Campanile.

So my hope is that the Sather lectures will continue, especially if this is a sign that the best public university of the Western world continues its mission in good health. Looking back at the Scott and Parry example, my well-wishing is not only about more good lectures (sometimes they are good, but the Sather committee cannot always win), but also — this is the win-win proposition - about more angry young people in the audience. Berkeley, of all places, should not have problems in raising them.

[I am grateful to John Ferrari, Maud Gleason, Richard Martin, Don Mastronarde and Walter Scheidel for help with this project. Errors and infelicities are all mine. The paper retains its conversational style, and sadly offers no systematic coverage of the main achievements in the almost centennial published series.]