tong together an energetic board of people to put together the Old English volumes; they saw it as being of great benefit to the field...and he did a great job of enlisting Robert Fulk [professor of early English at Indiana University] to take care of the Beowulf manuscript, with extensive commentary,” Ziolkowski says. “What's exciting is that, just a few years ago, the theory was advanced that maybe the Beowulf manuscript as a whole was a sort of anthology that had to do with monsters, and this new collection enables one to appraise certain ideas like that.” DOML’s first volume in Byzantine Greek will appear next spring: three collections of accounts of miracles, a distinctive genre of medieval Greek literature.

Like the Loeb and I Tatti Libraries, DOML will have its own signature appearance. “One of the first things that anyone asks us, when we talk about the project, is ‘What color?’” Sen says. “I Tatti has a very lovely light blue color scheme, and we decided to do something different: a kind of metallic light bronze. These are going to be jewel-like books.” The three series’ complementary visual appearance is far from accidental, underlining their shared vision of producing accessible, high-quality editions of important literature in their original languages. Sen hopes the three collections, together with the forthcoming Hackmey Hebrew Classical Library and Murty Classical Library of India, will present an unparalleled set of tools for “a whole new generation of scholars who might be able to do a completely new type of research,” explaining, “I don’t think there’s any other publisher in the world right now who can present such an extensive and exhaustive list of classical titles across these languages.”

Ziolkowski agrees. “Every morning I walk past the inscription from the bequest [for Dumbarton Oaks], which says, ‘The Dumbarton Oaks Research Library has been assembled...that the continuity of scholarship in the Byzantine and medi­eval humanities may remain unbroken,’” he says. He hopes that the DOML will continue the spirit of that gift: “I want the series to be here forever,” he explains, laughing. “I would love to dream that it would grow into the sort of series the Loeb has become.”

—SPENCER LENFIELD

UNDERGRADUATE

Walking a Mile in My Own Shoes

by SARAH ZHANG ’11

B lack, closed-toe, not too shiny, enough of a heel to announce her arrival—this is the kind of shoe I imagine on successful women. Two days before the Harvard-Radcliffe Women’s Leadership Conference (WLC) in August, I found myself in dire need of such shoes. The sneakers that had protected my feet from lab chemicals during the rest of summer certainly would not do. A hasty shopping trip ensued, and I strode into the conference with two extra inches of height. By lunchtime of day one, however, a blister was already asserting itself, and I was hobbling in a manner that was neither lady-like nor leader-like.

My feet were telling me what I had suspected, that maybe this conference on women in leadership wasn’t quite the right place for me. WLC brings together 30 female undergraduates for six days of panels, discussions, and workshops on planning our future personal and professional lives. I had applied on blind faith in a friend’s recommendation, even though I was personally ambivalent about female-only undertakings. By drawing these circles around women, aren’t we further isolating ourselves from the men with whom we have to compete?

At a pre-conference meeting in the spring, we each received a packet of readings for discussion that included an essay by Joanne Lipman, founding editor of Portfolio magazine. “When I was in college in the 1980s,” she writes, “many of us looked derisively at the women’s liberation movement. That was something that strident, humorless, shrill women had done before us. We were sure we were beyond it. We were post-feminists. After all, we lived equally with men.” And here I was in college in the 2010s, still wanting to be post-feminist, and largely indifferent toward women’s movements.

Or was I? On second thought, I have been involved in a number of women’s organizations. I had joined Women in Business freshman year (which is also when I first encountered difficulty in finding good dress shoes). When my interest in business waned and I turned to science, I signed up for the Radcliffe Mentor Program and the Women in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics mentoring program. But I never consciously chose to join women’s organizations, and if equivalent ungendered organizations had existed, I probably would have joined those.

As a young woman in science, I have not personally experienced discrimination based on gender. But that is not to say my experience has been gender-neutral. Of the dozen courses I have taken toward my concentration in neurobiology, exactly two were taught by female professors, both of whom were co-teaching with male colleagues. The neurobiology concentration is 65 percent female. When I took physics, most students who showed up for help at office hours were female, even though the class itself was predominantly male. These statistics are more anecdotal than rigorous, but the fact that these observations have stayed with me suggests their subtle influence.

The conference reminded me how far we have come from a time when discouraging women was not at all subtle. Sandra Moose, Ph.D. ’68, formerly senior vice president and director of the Boston Consulting Group, gave the keynote ad-
dress. She impressed me as sleek and steely. In the Vietnam era, when Moose earned her doctorate in economics, the campus was especially hostile toward women, she said, because she was seen as taking the place of a male student who would then have been exempt from the draft. In fact, she was not especially interested in academic research, but her preferred choice, Harvard Business School’s two-year M.B.A. program, did not admit women. Neither, she discovered, did Lamont Library. During her first week at Harvard, she settled in to study at Lamont, only to be told, when leaving, never to return. Today, she serves on the Harvard Library’s visiting committee.

In spite of such stories, the more sobering realization, I discovered, is that women still have a long way to go. Throughout the week, we heard repeatedly that women make up at least half of college students, professional-school students, and middle-management positions, yet hold only a fraction of such top positions as tenured professor, partner, or CEO. There are plenty of women in the pipeline, but they are opting out.

In my naïve view, this had seemed to be a problem caused by ingrained cultural attitudes, which are more difficult to change than rules, not as if women are institutionally deterred from those positions. Not quite, argued dean of student life Suzy Nelson, making a point in her speech that I, as a 20-year-old college student, had barely begun to consider: the most important steps toward gender equality are longer maternity leaves for both men and women and access to affordable, quality daycare.

**How trivial of me to fixate on shoes,** I thought. **Surely a discussion about successful men would start with the head, not the toes. But the truth is:** women are held to standards of appearance that are double and high. Teresa Valmain, a campaign adviser to Hillary Clinton, talked about the endless press coverage of whether Clinton had shown too much cleavage. The current secretary of state’s famous predilection for pantsuits was challenged by another conference speaker, who advised, “Don’t wear pantsuits. They are never flattering on women, and it looks like you’re trying too hard to be masculine.” As the type of girl who still has not mastered the curling iron, I remain conflicted on whether to play the appearance game or try subverting it. I suddenly missed my summer job, where a lab coat was routine and the only clothing criterion was safety.

I noted that the women who presented at the conference were not, actually, all wearing black pumps. They were remarkable and diverse, including a freelance wedding photographer and a nonprofit consultant who had picked up and moved to Cambodia to start a business. Two dozen incredible young women who are my classmates also became my friends. Their stories inspired me, but I admired them for their accomplishments, neither because nor in spite of their gender. I did come out of the conference more conscious of the barriers, both structural and cultural, that women face.

After six days spent with women, I became more curious about how the other half thinks. Did men understand the unequal burden that childcare placed on women? Did they realize the double standards imposed on women as leaders?

When I posed these questions to male friends over dinner, the first response was, “We’re guys! Why would we even think about that?” The jokester’s exaggerated grin assured me he wasn’t serious, but the laughter seemed to be covering the uncomfortable truth of his words taken at face value. “I would have no problem with being a stay-at-home dad,” replied a more serious friend when pressed for a straight answer, “but that’s not what I plan on doing.” The young men I know are mostly of the liberal type who grew up with working mothers or high-achieving sisters, but in their responses I still detected the strain of gender expectations, explicit and implicit.

In the *Crimson* earlier this year, Susan Marine, assistant dean for student life and director of the Harvard College Women’s Center, stressed the role of men in promoting gender equality. “When a man addresses another man about a problem in society, he may be more likely to see it as something pertinent to his own life than if a woman brought it up.” Discrimination against women is indeed a problem for society, not just for women. When a woman leaves her job to take care of children or when her effectiveness as a leader is undermined by double standards, everyone
is affected. It is important that these issues are understood not only by the women who will encounter them but also by the men who will be working alongside those women.

The end of the conference meant the beginning of the new school year, which in turn meant a flurry of e-mails recruiting students for extracurricular activities. One message arrived from Women in Science at Harvard-Radcliffe, seeking upperclassmen to mentor younger students interested in science. I reflected on my three years at Harvard—a sliver compared to the experiences of the women at the conference, but still quite hefty compared to my freshman self. Even though I may not be quite ready to carry the torch for successful women, I am now pretty handy with a Bunsen burner. Yes, I replied, I would like to be a Big Sib. But you know what? The Harvard College Undergraduate Research Association (HCURA), a general organization for students of all genders, has a mentorship program as well. I will be signing up for that, too.

Berta Greenwald Ledecky Undergraduate Fellow
Sarah Zhang '11 is still searching for a good pair of dress shoes.

SPORTS

Hotfoot

Cross-country’s Daniel Chenoweth keeps a cool head while burning the competition.

Few sports events are more elemental than a footrace. There is little fancy equipment to tweak, and no one else to blame or praise for the results. In the hours and minutes before the starting gun fires, says Daniel Chenoweth ’11—Harvard’s first winner of the Ivy League’s Heptagonal Championship individual crown in cross-country in 15 years—runners ask themselves: “Am I going to be tough enough to do what I need to do to win?”

And then there is the pain.

“That is a distinguishing characteristic of cross-country and track,” says the harriers’ captain, who has been a Harvard standout in both since he belted out the second-fastest 3,000-meter time among freshmen nationally in 2008. “There is a certain level of pain in other sports, but you can still have a good game and maybe feel okay,” he explains. In running, “You know that to do your best, it is going to be painful. You need to be ready for that.”

Chenoweth, a sociology concentrator with an interest in architecture and film, doesn’t worry about these things as much as most runners do. “I focus down on the things I can control, making sure I’m ready to go, stretched out, and have enough food and water.” In his first race this fall, he set a new course and meet record at Yale, finishing 25 seconds ahead of his closest competitor. He laid the foundation for speed months earlier, logging 80 to 90 miles a week in the summer to develop a core of endurance. “We put in lots of base training miles, nothing fast, and then slowly transition to faster and harder workouts”—such as regular 400- or 1,000-meter hill runs—as the season approaches, he says. “We want to come back really strong and then get really sharp,” by which he means quick.

The training week begins Sunday with a long run, and ends with a weekend race. Chenoweth credits Jason Saretsky, now in his fifth year as head coach of cross-country and track and field, for taking the mental strain of training off the team. “There’s a lot of trust there,” he says. “Basically, coach is in control” of deciding how to train; the athletes’ job is to “go out and run the workout.” Constant practice pays off, Chenoweth says, because “running fast is a game of efficiency in the end.”

But atop the layers of endurance and biomechanical efficiency that can be built...