16 September 2013

Thank you for your interest in the NEH grant workshop at the University of California, Santa Cruz on 24 September.

In the following pages you will find three sample applications for the mock panel portion of workshop. To get the most out of the session, please read the applications and assign each a rating using the attached rating scale and evaluation criteria. Please keep in mind that these applications have been selected for a particular purpose: that is, to give workshop participants a chance to consider three approaches to crafting applications. They are not intended to serve as models, nor are they intended, by virtue of their subjects, to suggest a particular area of Endowment interest. Applications for NEH awards are as diverse, in both subject matter and methodology, as the applicants who submit them.

These proposals were submitted to NEH. For reasons of confidentiality, we have omitted cover sheets, résumés, and letters of recommendation for this exercise.

I look forward to meeting with you on 24 September.

Daniel Sack
Program Officer, Division of Research Programs
dsack@neh.gov
Criteria and Guidelines for Evaluating NEH Fellowships

Guidelines (excerpted from www.neh.gov/grants/research/fellowships)

Fellowships are opportunities for individuals to pursue advanced work in the humanities. Applicants may be faculty or staff members of colleges or universities, of primary or secondary schools, or independent scholars and writers.

Projects may contribute to scholarly knowledge or to the general public's understanding of the humanities. Recipients might eventually produce scholarly articles, a monograph on a specialized subject, a book on a broad topic, an archaeological site report, a translation, an edition, or other scholarly tools.

Fellowships support projects that can be completed during the tenure of an award or those that are part of a long-term endeavor.

Applicants need not have advanced degrees, but only scholars who have completed their formal academic training are eligible to apply.

Evaluation Criteria:
Evaluators are asked to apply the following criteria in evaluating applications:
1. The intellectual significance of the proposed project, including its value to humanities scholars, general audiences, or both.
2. The quality or promise of quality of the applicant's work as an interpreter of the humanities.
3. The quality of the conception, definition, organization, and description of the project and the applicant's clarity of expression.
4. The feasibility of the proposed plan of work, including, when appropriate, the soundness of the dissemination and access plans.
5. The likelihood that the applicant will complete the project.

Rating Scale:
E = Excellent
VG = Very Good
G = Good
SM = Some Merit
NC = Not Competitive

The majority of Buddhist monastics in Sri Lanka begin their vocation as children, usually entering a monastery between the ages of seven and twelve. Some enter the monastic order encouraged by family members; most become novices of their own accord. Many boys entering the monastic community do so with little understanding of what life in a monastery entails and how monks differ from their lay counterparts, besides the more obvious characteristics of dress and physical appearance. For many, the idea of becoming a monastic is prompted, in part, by an aesthetic and emotional encounter with Buddhism, expressed by the commonly-used Sinhala phrase "attracting the heart/mind" (hita aedaganima; lengatu). This expression is often regarded as being synonymous with or closely related to conceptions of what is beautiful (lassana) as well as to certain emotions such as desire/longing (asava) and happiness (pritiya).

Drawing on material collected from interviews at seven temples in upcountry Sri Lanka as well as from English and Sinhala language documents and texts, "Attracting the Heart" examines the phenomenon of child monastics in contemporary Sri Lanka. Focusing on the place of emotions in an experience of Buddhism, this project asks: What role does the heart/mind (hereinafter, heart) play in monastic recruitment? What places do emotions and the heart have in monastic training? What is the relationship between feelings of devotion, temple affiliation, and an emotionally satisfying encounter with Buddhism? How are the laity's notions of what attracts the heart communicated and how does this shape monastic behavior and deportment?

Background
Children in robes are a common sight in the Theravada Buddhist world (i.e., Sri Lanka, Burma, Thailand, Laos, and Cambodia); yet, there has been no in-depth study of the phenomenon that draws on the voices of the ordinands, novices, and monks themselves, except for a short collection of life-stories of twelve young novices in Thailand (Pannapadipo, Little Angels). The several ethnographies that have touched upon the subject of child novices (Spiro, Buddhism and Society, Bunnag, Buddhist Monk, Buddhist Layman; Tambiah, World Conquerer and World Renouncer) have examined the phenomenon using Western concepts and categories (etic). This study provides a more comprehensive understanding of religion, monastic culture, and--more specifically--the phenomenon of child monastics through evoking the categories and terms employed by Sri Lankans themselves as they speak about their experience of Buddhism (emic). By drawing heavily on the voices of my informants yet situating each voice within wider social contexts and other conversations with monastics, lay people, and parents of monastics, this study seeks to strike a balance between etic and emic understandings of how religion is encountered and experienced in contemporary Sri Lanka.

This study also complements current research on Buddhism and religion by examining the roles that emotions and the heart (hita) play in monastic recruitment and training. The term "hita" or heart/mind refers to both a cognitive and emotional center, but does not necessarily correspond to the physical brain or heart. Its frequent occurrence in everyday conversations as well as in medieval and contemporary texts reveals its importance in Sri Lankan culture. To date, however, there has been no in-depth study locating a place for an affective experience of Buddhism for monastics and lay people, with the exception of two dissertations on Buddhist devotionalism and the construction of emotions in medieval Sri Lanka (Hallisey, Berkwitz). While some scholars (Carrithers, Gombrich and Obeyeskere) briefly examine the role that emotions play in an experience of religion in Sri Lanka, it has nonetheless been argued that a comprehensive study that takes into account how religion is experienced in the everyday lives of Sri Lankans is lacking (Kemper, "Buddhism without Bhikkhus"). Thus, this study which highlights the role of attracting the heart in the experience of Buddhism in contemporary Sri Lanka will open up crucial avenues of exploration on aesthetics and devotion, as well as be an important complement to the current range of scholarship on emotions in religion as a whole (Bynum, Corrigan) as well as, more specifically, in religion and culture in South and Southeast Asia (Trawick, Monius, Hopkins, Lynch).

The material for this project--which was collected using several field methods such as person-centered ethnography (an ethnography in which the categories and terms come from those interviewed), closely observed accounts of monastic life, and interviews based on photos that interviewees were asked to take on various aspects of their monastic life (auto-driven photo-elicitation)–emphasizes the centrality of emotional experiences of ordinands, novices, lay people, and family members of monastics. Of particular interest to this
emphasis is how caste affiliation and social status in Sri Lanka shape ideas of what attracts the heart, as well as the relationship between a satisfying experience of religion and feelings of devotion and piety. This project will examine these topics through studying the role of attracting the heart among child monastics in three interrelated dimensions of Buddhist monastic culture: monastic recruitment, monastic training, and the interactions between monks and lay people.

Manuscript Organization
* -- part of chapter published, under review, forthcoming, or presented at a professional conference
** -- draft of chapter already written

Introductory chapter

Section one: Attracting the Heart and Monastic Recruitment
Chapter one **
Examines the techniques employed by head monks to attract boys' and parents' heart to the monastic order. Focuses specifically on the role that monastic appearance, ritual performance, and youth groups/Buddhist Sunday schools play in monastic recruitment.

Chapter two **
Considers the factors that create longing (Sinhala: asava) for the monastic life by presenting accounts of ordinands, recently ordained novices, and family members of ordinands. Examines the degree to which boys' notions of what attracts the heart is dependent upon larger social and economic factors, such as the civil war and poverty, by juxtaposing the voices of ordinands, novices, and their parents from three distinct locations (Ampara, Anuradhapura, and Matale).

Chapter three *
Discusses the relationship between attracting the hearts of young children amidst perceived declining numbers of monastic members and reviving or saving the Buddhist religion amidst the perceived threats of religious conversion of Buddhists to Islam and Christianity. Explores how those recruiting poor and war-affected boys to the monastic order interpret their actions within larger discourses of traditional Buddhism by referencing Buddhist history, texts, and commentaries.

Section two: Attracting the Heart and Its Place in Monastic Training and Performance
Chapter four *
Looks at the ways in which novices learn about attracting the hearts of the lay community through ritual performance, monastic appearance, and appropriate monastic behavior. Investigates the place of observing, spiritual modeling, and performing in the training of novices. Examines how role performance (i.e., performing rituals and preaching in a manner that attracts the hearts of others) functions to shape novices' short- and long-term goals.

Chapter five *
Looks at how the laity's notions of what attracts the heart are communicated and, in turn, shape monastic behavior. Considers how novices, head monks, senior monks and lay people interpret attracting the heart as a form of social service. Explores the relationship between proper role/ritual performance, social service, and ideas of the decline and revival of Buddhism.

Chapter six **
Investigates the relationship between the laity's caste affiliation and their temple patronage. Pays particular attention to how unhappiness in the laity's heart (hite asatutak) may function as an impetus to influence the structure of the monkhood. Looks at the role of attracting the heart in the very important Buddhist practice called "merit-making."

Concluding chapter
Work Plan
Over the past six years I have spent more than three years in Sri Lanka collecting Sinhala and English primary
texts and government documents that pertain to the ordination and training of young children in contemporary
Sri Lanka (e.g., ACBC, Baddegama Vimalavamsa, Kusaladhamma, Girambe). I have also amassed over 1000
pages of field notes and interview material from conversations (mostly in Sinhala with which I am conversant)
conducted over a span of six years with forty Buddhist novices, seven head monks, family members of twenty
ordinands and novices, and fifteen lay people.

All of the material collected has been transcribed and translated. In addition to having completed drafts of
three chapters, I have presented material (in the form of seven conference papers and five articles) that pertains
to the remaining three chapters. By the time of the fellowship's start date, I will have completed a draft of one
more chapter.

I will use the NEH fellowship to complete the following tasks over the twelve month grant period:
1. Write the introduction, conclusion, and chapters four and five (6 months)
2. Return to Sri Lanka to collect recent documents not available outside the country and to bring interview
material up to date (2 months)
3. Revise drafts of the four chapters already written (4 months)

My aim is to complete a manuscript consisting of approximately 300 pages (including one map, twenty
photographs, and five charts) by the end of the grant period, when it will be submitted to a major academic
press. Routledge Press has indicated interest.

Contribution to the Humanities
Many studies on monasticism published to date assume that the majority of children become novices for social
and economic reasons and that the best way to understand monastic education is through a careful
consideration of the texts employed in the training of novices. A number of previous studies on Buddhist
monasticism also approach the topic through Western terms and categories, such as several ethnographies that
have interpreted religion and Buddhist monastic culture through a Freudian lens (e.g., M.E. Spiro, Buddhism
and Society; G. Obeyesekere, Medusa’s Hair).

While it is certainly the case that some boys become monastics to improve their socio-economic standing, a
careful consideration (in section one) of the role of emotions and the heart in the religious life expands the
current range of scholarship on aesthetics and emotions in South Asia, Buddhism, religious studies (Corrigan,
Rosenwein), and, more widely, the humanities (Jaeger and Kasten, Eco). Furthermore, by paying particular
attention (in section two) to the conversations of novices and head monks that pertain to monastic training and
by drawing attention to other ways (besides studying texts) in which religious ideals and worldviews are
transmitted and internalized (e.g., through performing rituals and by spiritual modeling), the proposed
manuscript complements extant scholarly material on monastic training and education (Dreyfus, Blackburn,
Jaeger) while offering a more comprehensive and interdisciplinary perspective. Finally, by examining the role
that attracting the heart plays in establishing ties between the monastic and lay communities, the proposed
project seeks a more nuanced understanding of what binds lay and monastic communities in South and
Southeast Asia as well as within monastic communities of other religions.

Intended Audience
This book is aimed at scholars as well as undergraduate and graduate students interested in Buddhism, South
Asian culture, anthropology, psychology, sociology, and religious studies. By focusing on the role of an
aesthetic experience in the religious lives of child monastics, ordinands, and lay people closely connected to
temple life, "Attracting the Heart" will be a valuable source for students and scholars of the humanities
interested in the intersection of religion, culture, and emotions.
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The initial question propelling this project is whether the American environmental movement in the post-WWII era was elitist as has been charged. For nearly a decade I have explored this question, using the late-twentieth century history of forest politics in the mountains of western North Carolina as a case study laboratory. The manuscript examines how three decades of pitched national battles over federal lands management in the wake of the 1964 Wilderness Act played themselves out at local and regional levels. My study focuses on a particular region, a particular set of natural resources, and a particular series of debates over how best to manage these resources. This tightly focused study has reshaped my understanding of the conceptual underpinnings of American environmentalism, and it has led me to place the concept of the “commons” alongside the concept of “wilderness” as central to American thought about nature. “Commons environmentalism” is the name I have given to the determined forest defense efforts of rural, working-class people in the Southern Appalachians, people who were typically not friends to wilderness.

The American environmental movement was one of the most important developments to shape U.S. history in the postwar period. Like other giants of the time—the Civil Rights Movement, or the Cold War, for instance—its long reach extended not only into law and politics, but also into economics, philosophy, and culture. Environmentalist thinkers troubled key American concepts such as “property” and “progress;” they questioned basic categories such as “nature” and “human.” In politics, the movement etched its mark into national, state, and local legislation; into legal briefs and court decisions; and into electoral contests at every level. It also carved into the very landscape of the nation, leaving its signature in the forests, plains, deserts, and wetlands; in the air, soil and water; and even among the animals, plants, and insects. Americans everywhere continue to feel its influence in countless ways. Diplomats negotiating international treaties walk in its shadow, and so do everyday Americans confronting empty soda bottles. Like other giants of the postwar period, the environmental movement and its legacy are still unfolding, still shaping politics and culture in the twenty-first century.

In spite of this enormous influence, however, we still know relatively little about the history of American environmentalism. Compared to the voluminous literature on the Cold War or the Civil Rights Movement, for instance, the literature on the environmental movement in the United States is still remarkably thin. Excellent work on the movement by leading scholars such as Robert Bullard, Robert Gottlieb, Samuel Hays, Richard Judd, Char Miller, Carolyn Merchant, Roderick Nash, and Hal Rothman has traced its origins and broad outlines. Recent case studies by Brian Donahue, Karl Jacoby, Kevin Marsh, Karen Merrill, and others have illuminated particular instances of competing claims and conflict over specific sets of natural resources. Like the nuanced studies of local Civil Rights struggles that have recently flourished, these explorations have enriched our understanding of the movement as a whole.

My current book project, Commons Environmentalism: Forest History, Culture, and Politics in the Appalachian South, takes its place alongside this second set of studies. The manuscript is a history of postwar environmental battles fought over the nearly one million acres of national forest land in mountainous western North Carolina—the Pisgah and Nantahala National Forests. It explores how environmentalists, their allies, and their opponents framed issues and built coalitions in the decades after passage of the 1964 Wilderness Act, which established the federal wilderness system.

Late 1970s efforts to expand this wilderness system in the southern mountains met with fierce local resistance. The second Roadless Area Review and Evaluation (RARE II) process initiated by President Jimmy Carter’s administration enjoyed only minimal success in the North Carolina mountains. RARE II advocates, including national environmental groups such as the Wilderness Society, came out of the process largely defeated and keenly disappointed. Yet just a few years later, before wilderness-battle dust had even settled, North Carolina’s rural mountain residents raised loud and determined voices again, this time to oppose petroleum exploration and clearcut timber harvesting in the national forests. They fought industrial development of the Pisgah and Nantahala Forests with a vigor and tenacity that took Forest Service officials completely by surprise. In this second round of campaigns some longtime residents’ goals were actually more far-reaching than national environmental groups such as the Sierra Club were willing to support.

At first glance this history seems to indicate that mountain people suffered a kind of environmental schizophrenia. It seems they could not make up their minds; they did not know what they wanted for neighboring forests. A closer look, however, reveals logic beneath this apparent paradox. The key lies in the intersections between regional forest history and culture and regional forest politics. In order to understand late
The concept of the commons has existed in various forms across many human cultures over millennia. The word "commons" whisk many of us immediately to past centuries and distant lands. Especially in the United States, where private property holds center stage, we rarely think in terms of commons systems. Yet these systems are very much alive, and affect all our lives, as frequent references to the "global commons" among contemporary environmentalists attest. There is a rich literature on the history and current outlines of commons systems across the globe. I will offer only an introductory definition here. Any resource that is widely accessible, used by many people, and communally owned may be considered a commons. Commons resources are not privately owned by any single person or group, though within a commons some specific resources may be reserved for certain claimants. Commons systems are regulated and managed, either through formal laws and rules or through informal traditions and social sanctions. Illegal or unsanctioned harvest of commons resources is considered poaching, theft, or invasion, and these infractions are punished. Commons systems are dynamic. They are nearly always contested and they are subject to change over time. One enemy to commons systems takes the form of "enclosure" moves, or attempts at privatization.

In the southern Appalachians, a commons model of forest thought had roots in a nineteenth-century economy dependent on small-scale woods extraction. It lived on, however, in traditions important to twentieth century rural culture--hunting, fishing, herb-gathering, and the like. Pioneering folklorist Mary Hufford has done critically important work documenting a rich set of commons cultures in contemporary West Virginia. Parallel cultures thrived in mountainous North Carolina. Local residents often valued mountain forests as working and peopled commons harvest grounds, not as unspoiled wilderness. They saw any policy that threatened to remove large tracts from commons use as "enclosure," though they did not use that term. Whatever form it took--wilderness designation or industrial development--perceived forest enclosure met with determined resistance. Just as elsewhere, postwar battles over mountain forests pitted industrialists against environmentalists. In western North Carolina, however, commons users (who were typically rural and working-class) served as "swing voters" in these battles. The side that most effectively hitched commons culture to its wagon won.

In order to illuminate how commons culture came to be such a powerful force in western North Carolina, the first half of the manuscript explores the history of forest use in the region in the centuries before WWII. After an initial chapter exploring the concept and briefly tracing the history of the commons, the manuscript discusses forest economies in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, and the emergence of commons cultures linked to these economies. The eighteenth century deerskin trade, the ante-bellum livestock trade, and the industrial-era chestnut and tanbark industries all were pillars of the mountain economy. Each linked the region to national and international markets, and each relied on the availability of large forest commons. This section of the manuscript echoes the organization of "Working the Woods: Economics and Cultures in the Blue Ridge Mountains, 1650-1950," a set of NEH Landmarks of American History and Culture workshops for community college faculty Mars Hill College presented in the summers of 2005 and 2006. I served as Project Director on these workshops, and I took the concept and organizational structure for them from my own research. I believe this work may be unique; I do not know of another work that traces the history of a particular American commons over a long span of time (though I am convinced there are many such stories to tell). I also know from my experience with the workshops that this material generates keen interest among historians, environmentalists, geographers, folklorists, sociologists, and even biologists.

The second half of the manuscript centers on three political battles over National Forest management—the 1970s RARE II controversies, early 1980s debates over oil and gas exploration, and fights over clearcutting that crescendoed in the late 1980s and continued into the 1990s. The first chapter in this section traces how the timber industry tapped commons concerns to defeat RARE II, and how mainstream
wilderness-style environmentalists, with little understanding of the regional power of commons culture, unwittingly played into industry’s hands. This section’s second chapter explores the Southern Nantahala area, site of one of the only RARE II victories in the region. There local bear hunters mobilized commons concerns on behalf of wilderness designation. A third chapter follows mountain native and retired beautician Esther Cunningham, who founded the regional Western North Carolina Alliance when she grew concerned about oil and gas exploration in the national forests. The organization mobilized raccoon and turkey hunters, and outlined an ambitious program of forest protection—one far more ambitious than national groups such as the Sierra Club and Wilderness Society were willing to support. This section ends with a chapter on the Alliance’s “Cut the Clearcutting” campaign, which successfully mobilized commons users from across the region—some of whom still had “Stop RARE II” bumper stickers on their trucks—against the practice of clearcut timber harvesting on the national forests.

To trace this postwar political history I rely on extensive oral history interviews with participants on all sides of the debates, on newspaper coverage in the national, regional, and local press, on organizational records from the Western North Carolina Alliance, on industry journals, and on government documents from the U.S. Forest Service. The work is informed by secondary literature on environmental history, Appalachian history and culture, the history of environmentalism as a social movement, women’s history, oral history, and the history of the U.S. South. My expectation is that it will, in turn, contribute to each of these literatures. I also aim to reach general audiences with interests in these areas. I am convinced that commons culture was not unique to the southern mountains, and that other instances of commons environmentalism in American history exist but are currently invisible because we lack the tools to recognize their pattern.

The book project grows out of my doctoral dissertation in U.S. History, which I completed at UNCCH in 2001, just before joining the faculty at Mars Hill College. Like most dissertations, the piece needs significant revisions before it is ready for publication. The demands of my teaching and administrative jobs at this small, private, non-elite college have prevented my working full time on the manuscript, but I have recently built momentum behind the project. Thanks to a partial leave from the college, I spent time during the fall of 2006 revising the first two chapters of the manuscript, reading relevant recent literature, and talking with promising publishers. Several respected academic publishers have expressed serious interest.

In the summer of 2007 I had fellowship support from the Appalachian College Association to complete primary research on one final chapter. This chapter serves as a fulcrum between the earlier background chapters on commons culture and the later chapters tracing the emergence of commons environmentalism in western North Carolina. It explores the arrival of the U.S. Forest Service in the southern mountains after passage of the 1911 Weeks Act authorized federal purchase of eastern lands. Unlike national forests in the West, which were carved out of lands already held by the federal government, eastern national forests were re-acquired by purchase from private owners. In the Appalachians as elsewhere in the East, this development turned privately owned but de facto commons forests into publicly owned de jure commons forests, and set the stage for later battles over how best to manage these publicly owned lands.

An NEH fellowship would enable me to take a leave not only from teaching, but also from administrative responsibilities that demand much of my time even in summers. Without leave time I will finish the book, but it will take me several years of snatching time where I can. With NEH support I could devote full time to the project. I would complete the last chapter and finish manuscript revisions on seven dissertation chapters and the conclusion in preparation for publication. At the end of the fellowship year, I will have completed the book.

This work centers on ideas, history, and culture, and how they intersected with nature, government and politics in an American region wrestling with its environmental and economic future. I know of no endeavor more central to the humanities than the study of ideas at work in the public square. I will do my best to do justice to the compelling history I have discovered, and to make it accessible to as broad a cross-section of the American citizenry as I am able.
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Why do popes canonize saints? During the Middle Ages, official (papal) canonizations peaked in the thirteenth century, when papal authority and the requisite legal processes were functioning at optimal levels. Thereafter, the number of officially recognized saints declined during the fourteenth and fifteenth century, reaching its lowest point in the sixteenth century. Only in the seventeenth century did the papacy begin to authorize saints in numbers approaching thirteenth-century levels. Since canonization procedures during this same period (13th to 17th centuries) were progressively refined and routinized, it would seem that one should look to the papacy itself for explanations of this decline and revival in official saint-making.

Undoubtedly, historical context accounts for much of this variation. During the 14th and 15th centuries, Rome’s authority over Christendom diminished as the Avignonese papacy gave way to schism, the conciliar movement and subsequent “Renaissance papacy”; while at the same time, the unity of Christendom was itself disintegrating, as European monarchical states underwent a process of self-definition through warfare, leadership by ambitious kings and princes, increasingly effective bureaucratic administration, and individual “deals” (concordats) established with the papacy. Finally, and obviously, the 16th-century Reformation and Counter-Reformation in their multiple forms added further layers of complexity to papal policies.

It is clear, from studies by Prodi and others, that foreign relations were of the utmost importance to the papacy especially between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries; popes behaved just as other temporal princes in many ways, but unlike them, their responsibilities included all of Christendom with its various rulers, and all of Christendom’s enemies. To what extent did their manipulation of canonizations, often at the behest of secular heads of state, reinforce this concept, locating popes at the center of a political milieu in an increasingly fragmented Europe?

The problem to be explored in this book-length project, then, is the extent to which geo-political considerations influenced papal decisions as to which individuals they would promote to official sainthood, and which (otherwise, perhaps, deserving candidates) they would ignore. Taking as examples all of the processes that occurred between the canonization of Bonaventura in the later Middle Ages (1482) and the maturation of a post-Reformation, post-Tridentine Catholic Church symbolized by multiple canonizations in 1622, to what extent were popes influenced by politics when elevating the subjects of particular realms to sainthood? My research reviews all the elements that entered into processes resulting in canonizations (1482-1622), paying particular attention, however, to political contexts and diplomatic exchanges that preaced and accompanied these quasi-judicial processes. Political historians and scholars dealing with early-modern “international” relations ought to be able to utilize some of the findings of this project.

Another question to be re-examined here is whether, on the one hand, traditional models of “sanctity” and its characteristics, and on the other hand, the concept of constructed “models of sainthood” are valid heuristic categories in determining why particular individuals became saints, during the period in question. Most scholarly work, certainly on medieval saints, accepts these two concepts as mechanisms to explain canonizations. (Since this project deals only with official canonizations, it does not address whether these categories of explanation are appropriate for “unofficial” saints promoted and recognized at a local or regional level.) If political considerations are paramount, then how much difference, if at all, did the “sanctity” level of the candidate make to the final result?

A related issue, that may well interest scholars of religion and folklore, is the extent to which official recognition of the “supernatural,” in particular miracle-working, was itself manipulable. At this stage in my research, I have found that definitions of the “supernatural” (about which much has been written particularly in connection with medieval saints) could be bent to accommodate empirical (political) necessity. This flexibility seems to be evident in the discussions of miracles by lawyers and theologians charged with examining a saint-candidate’s record, which also reveal much about contemporary legal procedures and modes of argumentation. The lengthy Relationes or reports of debates (largely still unpublished) housed in Vatican and other repositories, suggest that expediency often guided decisions about “miracles.” Further analysis is called for: what were the criteria by which certain events were adjudged to be “miraculous,” and how were these criteria adjusted to meet the political needs of the moment? How did credulity interact with scepticism among the professional miracle-examiners? What part was played, even if superficially, by theories informing contemporary natural philosophy and medicine?

None of the above implies that religious or theological elements were absent from canonizations, or that officially canonized saints were not “saintly”; nor does it suggest that all popes of the period (1482-1622)
shirked their duties as spiritual leaders (though some did). Rather, it analyzes the relationships among all the elements that entered into successful canonizations, and clarifies the extent to which papal political interests were an important, if not the single most important, of those elements during that particular era. The findings and conclusions of this project could be extended to more recent times: to what extent are modern-day “saints” political, rather than—or as well as being—spiritual or theological constructs? (Given the extraordinary numbers of saints created by John Paul II, however, which exceeds in quantity all medieval and early-modern saints combined, this may be an unanswerable question.) A related issue would be modern definitions of the “supernatural” compared with those of the earlier period.

The political nature of canonizations has long been recognized for particular saints, medieval, early-modern, and modern. For instance, the politics of medieval English sainthood, to take one area only, has been explored by Simon Walker, J. Theilmann, M. Goodich and J. W. McKenna. Yet no single study has appeared that addresses both an overview of, and the specifics (the motives and mechanisms) concerning, the saints canonized between 1482 and 1622. One reason for this is specialization: today’s medievalists are not apt to show much interest in 16th- or 17th-century saints, and early-modern specialists usually give only a cursory glance to such trends as appeared prior to, say, AD 1500. Although Vauchez (see Bibliography) published an overview of medieval sainthood (to 1431), specialists dealing with saints canonized in the 16th and 17th century have not, as yet, attempted a synthesis for this period, or a linkage between late-medieval and early-modern processes. As a result, there is no survey of canonizations, in English, between about 1450 and 1650.

As for the qualifications and skills necessary to address such a major issue over this chronological period (involving Latin, Italian, French and German documents and secondary sources), though my previous articles and books have dealt with medieval topics, working more recently with 16th and 17th-century manuscripts in Rome (gathering materials during short visits in 1998, 1999 and 2001) has provided me with the opportunity to improve the paleographical and linguistic skills appropriate to these post-medieval periods. This has resulted in a lengthy study (in the Italian journal "Hagiographica") on a late-16th century saint, Hyacinth of Cracow, which explores the politically-driven canonization of a relatively obscure individual. Over the past few years I have also overcome many of the bibliographical challenges of early-modern historiography, with the assistance of patient colleagues. One of these, Simon Ditchfield, of England’s York University, was so impressed by my "Hagiographica" paper that his nomination resulted in my election as a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society in 2002.

There is no lack of material available for this project, as I discovered while working in the two Vatican collections (ASV—Archivio Segreto Vaticano and BAV—Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticano) and the specialized archive maintained by Rome’s modern saint-making office, the Archivio della Congregazione per le cause dei santi (ACCS). Besides revisiting these repositories, to which access will be no problem, I would like to examine other collections as well, such as those housed in Rome’s Biblioteca Vallicelliana and Biblioteca dell’Angelicum. The saints’ dossiers for this project include all officially canonized individuals for the period 1482-1622, viz., Bonaventura (canonized 1482), Leopold of Austria (cd. 1485/90), Francis of Paola (cd. 1519), [Casimir of Poland, said to have been cd. 1521, was not], Benno of Meissen (cd. 1523), Antoninus of Florence (cd. 1523), Diego of Alcalá (cd. 1588), Hyacinth of Cracow (cd. 1594), Raymond of Peñafort (cd.1601), Frances of Rome (cd. 1608), Carlo Borromeo (cd. 1610), and Philip Neri along with four others (cd. 1622). It will be noted that this span includes canonizations that occurred prior to, and following, Sixtus V’s establishing a department specifically to take over the business of canonizations, among other things, the Congregation of Rites (1588). Changes introduced by this Congregation will be examined.

To date I have identified and analyzed much, but not all, of the major published and unpublished documentation pertaining to the saints listed above. This book-length project is well under way, and analysis will continue through 2004, with completion in 2005. My university is awarding me a sabbatical for the first semester of 2005. An NEH fellowship would support residence in Rome in early 2005 for a period of time sufficient to clarify any remaining questions arising from manuscript materials, followed by a return to America and settling down to uninterrupted writing. NEH support would facilitate the writing by eliminating the necessity of my teaching a spring or summer class in 2005. This eight-month window of opportunity (January through August) would enable me to complete much of the writing—up to first draft stage—by the beginning of the fall term, in September of 2005.

The finished study would be intended for scholars of Reformation and Counter-reformation history, the history of European religious beliefs, scholars dealing with early-modern political history, as well as those interested in the relationships between supernatural explanations and contemporary natural philosophy, i.e., historians of science. As presently envisioned, the book would be divided roughly into five parts: (1) Introduction to the Late Medieval Canonization Process: The case of St. Bonaventure; (2) Early 16th-century
canonizations; (3) Procedures subsequent to the creation of the Congregation of Rites (1588); (4) Early 17th-century canonizations (to 1622); (5) Conclusions: Contemporary politics, the papacy, and the fashioning of early-modern saints.

Project Bibliography
Vatican repositories (ASV, BAV) and ACCS contain manuscripts relating to early modern canonizations, most of which have never been printed, or partially or imperfectly published (e.g., in "Acta Sanctorum"). Such mss. include processes, e.g., for Diego, canonized in 1588 (BAV ms. Lat Vat 3517, -18, -19); Hyacinth, cd. 1594 (ACCS X.376, BAV ms. Vat Lat 6060, -61, -62); Peñafort, cd. 1601 (ASV Riti, 219, 223, 224 and 4216—which includes material for Bonaventura, cd. 1482); Borromeo, cd. 1610 (ASV Riti 1681, BAV ms. Vat Lat 14083), etc.