

EXAMPLE

1

Abstract

If awarded, a Summer Faculty Research Grant would provide the critical time necessary to implement the revisions requested by one of the premier series in early Christian studies—"Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion," published by the University of Pennsylvania Press—as part of their continued courtship of my current monograph project, *Specters of Paul: Sexual Difference, Creation, and Resurrection in Early Christian Thought*.

Specters of Paul's completed draft manuscript (403 pages including notes and bibliography) just emerged in January from a rigorous review by multiple members of the series' internal faculty editorial board and an outside reader. Both levels of review strongly recommended the manuscript for publication, characterizing it as "richly original" and "a brilliant effort," while at the same time offering constructive suggestions for revision. The faculty editors of the series and the senior editor of the press are optimistic about being able to offer me a contract sometime in the spring of 2010—together with a final list of requested revisions. I am therefore applying for a Summer FRG in order to devote myself entirely to these revisions during summer 2010 so that I can submit the final, revised manuscript to University of Pennsylvania Press by September.

The publication of my completed monograph will prove a significant complement to the content in early Christian studies that Penn's seminal series has already provided. By examining contrasting theologies of sexual difference in second- and third-century Christian thought, *Specters of Paul* will not merely illustrate the Apostle's often contentious legacy in this arena, but innovatively illuminate the ways in which his thought fueled, shaped, and also constrained early Christian approaches to the issue.

Background

Recent scholarship in classics, early Judaism, and early Christianity emphasizes the ways in which ancient Mediterranean thinking about the sexed, sexualized, and embodied human being differs fundamentally from modern conceptions. Scholars argue that early Christians operated with a model of sexual difference, common to the ancient world, that conceptualized this difference not in terms of two opposite or complementary sexes, but rather on a single sliding scale, hierarchically oriented towards maleness (women thereby being lesser versions of men) and deeply rooted in variables of social status. While agreeing generally with the thrust of this scholarship, I maintain that sexual difference was nevertheless not completely stable as a conceptual category across the spectrum of formative Christian thinking.

In the fluid environment that preceded fixed Christian creeds or canon, multiple options emerged for conceiving of the human within the contested arena of theological anthropology. And while the “single spectrum” model predominated, Christians still found ways to exercise theological creativity and to think differently from one another as they probed the enigma of sexually-differentiated bodies. *Specters of Paul* therefore seeks to explore these complexities within early Christian theological anthropology, building upon my two most recently published articles in major peer-reviewed journals:

“What Sort of Thing Is This Luminous Woman?: Thinking Sexual Difference in *On the Origin of the World*.” *The Journal of Early Christian Studies* 17:1 (2009) 55-84.

“Virgin Earth, Virgin Birth: Creation, Sexual Difference, and Recapitulation in Irenaeus of Lyons.” *The Journal of Religion* 89:1 (2009) 57-88.

Not only did the scholarship underlying these articles lay the foundation for the larger argument of my monograph, but their prominent publication will also provide a platform to promote *Specters of Paul* and the dissemination of its central thesis.

Contribution

Specters of Paul's argument begins not with re-examining the Apostle's legacy, but with re-visiting the Apostle himself through a broader reading of his Epistles in order to understand the narrower issue of his select statements on sexual difference. This innovative approach is required because the problem of Paul's theological anthropology (and its implications for women and men) is already well-worn scholarly territory, with a significant body of scholarship on the interpretation of the so-called "gender" passages (and the implications for Christian thought and practice) in both Paul and his interpreters of the second and third centuries.

However, it is my contention that Paul's theology of creation and resurrection, although not explicitly dealing with sexual difference, is in fact crucial to understanding how later generations of early Christian thinkers approached the problem. This is because the human body is a philosophically troubled issue in Paul's text, one that consequently generated a cluster of pressing anthropological questions: What constitutes the created body? What relation does that body have to the resurrected eschatological body? And what does Christ's death and resurrection (as well as the various transformations operative upon Christ's body) mean for the relationship between the two bodies—created and resurrected? Paul delves into these questions primarily by appeal to an Adam-Christ typology (Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15), thereby looking to creation through an eschatologically-inflected lens as a way of contemplating not only what the human body is, but also what it will be.

So what about sexual difference?

Paul does not work out its place within his Adam-Christ typology in any systematic way. In fact, his two extended appeals to the typology seem to ignore the question. As a result, early readers of Paul were left to wrestle with a problem not of their making, but rather inherited from the generative tensions of the Pauline text: whatever the sexually-differentiated

human being might be, it had to be conceptualized not only in terms of where it had come from (i.e., Adam), but also in terms of where it was going (i.e., Christ). And within this theology of creation and resurrection grounded in the paradigmatic figures of Adam and Christ, *sexual difference simply does not fit* in any obvious or uncomplicated way.

This dilemma, I contend, continued to exercise an indirect influence that long outlived Paul, haunting Christian discourse on the question of sexual difference into the second and third centuries and beyond. To articulate this thesis, the project's theoretical framework builds on the work of Jacques Derrida and Slavoj Žižek on haunting and "spectrality." On the one hand, this "specter of Paul" is most apparent in the work of those early Christian writers who had the deepest veneration for the Apostle—thinkers such as Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian of Carthage, and various "Valentinian" theologians. But on the other hand, certain writers who *contest* Paul's authority (such as the anonymous author of *On the Origin of the World*) find themselves no less haunted—the Pauline anthropological apparatus continuing to influence their thinking by constraining their theologies of sexual difference, albeit in a generative way.

What all of these thinkers and texts have in common is a failure to fulfill their promise to provide conceptual stability to the sexual division: the specter of Paul persists, visible in the disavowed and unacknowledged fault lines and failures that each of their theological positions necessarily generates. My book thus seeks to chart the history of a breakdown entailed in the question of sexual difference at a particular moment in Christian thought. Though this breakdown was not by any means acknowledged by the ancient thinkers in question, *Specters of Paul* shows that that it was there all the same—and as such, the analysis that it offers may prove illuminating to issues that continue to haunt the question of the sexed and sexualized body in Christian theological anthropology down to the present day.

As an indication of the merit and magnitude of this contribution, various aspects of

Specters of Paul have already undergone successful peer review in high-caliber, competitive academic venues. As noted above, selected material from the manuscript has been published in two peer-reviewed articles. I have also received two major national awards in connection with earlier phases of this scholarship: a grant from the E. Rhodes and Leona B. Carpenter Foundation and a Harvard Women's Studies in Religion Research Fellowship (WSRP). Furthermore, I am the first male candidate to hold the Harvard fellowship in the program's 35-year history—a fact that has been widely publicized by the WSRP—which has further raised the profile of my research both within its specific theological arena and amongst a broader range of academics. As such, I envision some heightened anticipation surrounding the book's publication and enhanced interest in the completed monograph.

Conclusion

Specters of Paul will not only advance scholarship in early Christian studies and feminist theology, but also—as my second independently-authored monograph—will establish me as a prominent emerging voice in these scholarly conversations. This in turn will be a significant benefit to Fordham Theology Department's newly formed doctoral program in Christianity in Antiquity. As evidenced by the recent publication of my first monograph (also with University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), I have a proven track record of completing research projects in a timely fashion. However, the revisions of my first book that were required following the review process took the equivalent of three months of dedicated research time. I anticipate needing a similar amount of time for revisions with this second manuscript. A Summer FRG would allow me to forgo seeking summer opportunities for supplemental income, thereby making it possible for me to devote my undivided energies to completing the revised manuscript and bringing the *Specters of Paul* to light.

EXAMPLE

2

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Derrida's Inheritance of Democracy

[REDACTED]

Abstract

I am applying for a Summer Faculty Research Grant (Summer FRG) to gain dedicated time to complete required revisions to my book manuscript, *Derrida's Inheritance of Democracy*, which is currently under review at Indiana University Press. In this monograph I offer a new interpretation of Jacques Derrida's writings on democracy, arguing that the act of inheritance – how ideas and theories are transferred to and transformed by subsequent generations – plays a central role in his conception of democratic action. My interpretation is both sympathetic and critical – I argue that Derrida's work contains several original insights that enrich our understanding of democracy, but that it also has certain weaknesses and blind spots that call for modification. In this way, *Derrida's Inheritance of Democracy* presents a general model for productively inheriting from Derrida's work as a whole, while also marking out a critical path on which future research within the Derridean framework can be pursued.

Prior to prospective publication, Indiana UP is sure to request revisions to the work. Furthermore, in the course of collaborations and research made possible in part by the award of a 2008-09 "1st Year at Fordham" FRG in support of this project's earlier stages, I have identified three main areas of my present text that I wish to improve in advance of publication. Toward this end, a Summer FRG and its commensurate time off from teaching will facilitate the following timeline:

- **June:** Strengthen my central claim concerning the link between democracy and inheritance in Derrida’s work spanning Chapters 1-3, by incorporating references to primary and secondary material published since these chapters were first drafted.
- **July:** Re-examine my interpretation of normativity in Derrida’s work by doing further research on how this question is addressed in the secondary literature.
- **August:** Broaden my claims in Chapter 5 on the role of birth in Derrida’s writings by researching the wider treatment of this concept in Twentieth Century European thought.

Background

Derrida’s Inheritance of Democracy is a substantial revision of my dissertation “Derrida, Arendt, and the Inheritance of Democracy,” defended in 2006, and I have published earlier versions of some of the material in several journal articles (“Derrida and Democracy at Risk”, “Inheriting Democracy to Come”, “Reading Derrida Reading Derrida: Deconstruction as Self-Inheritance”, “A Genealogy of Violence, from Light to the Autoimmune”, and “Language Remains”; see Bibliography).

My work builds on recent interpretations of Derrida and inheritance by Geoffrey Bennington (in *Interrupting Derrida*), Michael Naas (in *Taking on the Tradition*), and Matthias Fritsch (in *The Promise of Memory*), greatly extending their work and bringing it into relation with Derrida’s writings on democracy. I also explicitly challenge two of the main interpretations of the role of normativity in Derrida’s work, represented in Leonard Lawlor’s *This is Not Sufficient* and Martin Hägglund’s *Radical Atheism*.

Contribution

Derrida's Inheritance of Democracy is distinguished from existing scholarship because it will provide the first comprehensive interpretation of Derrida's writings on democracy, making explicit the central importance played by the concept of inheritance in these writings. It thus brings together two important themes from Derrida's work – his widely influential approach to engaging the history of philosophy (represented here in the figure of inheritance) and his later focus on democracy. Despite receiving some attention in the last few years, the latter is still under-theorized in the secondary literature, in part because scholars are only beginning to connect it with broader themes in Derrida's work.

In the course of the argument I also advance an original interpretation of the status of normativity in Derrida's writings. This is an issue that currently divides his commentators into two opposing camps, with some arguing that Derrida strongly endorses a greater openness to others in our social and political relations, and others arguing that Derrida cannot coherently endorse any normative positions at all. My position is that the inherited nature of language highlighted by my interpretation demonstrates that there is in fact a normative space opened up in Derrida's writings, but that the normative claims that can be legitimately advanced in this space are not as strong as some would wish.

While my project's central contribution is thus to Derrida scholarship, *Derrida's Inheritance of Democracy* also addresses topics of interest to scholars working outside this area. Derrida's importance in contemporary political theory is growing, but the standard representation of his work in this field is overly simplistic. One of my goals is to present the complexity of Derrida's theorization of democracy such that his particular contribution is apparent and accessible to those not familiar with his writings. I do not propose to say the last word on Derrida

and democracy, but aim rather to provide political philosophers and theorists working in a range of traditions with a detailed, sophisticated, and accurate account that will be an important resource for their own work.

Finally, the critical dimension of my book, developed in Chapter 5, focuses on the relation between birth and politics. This topic has been an important and growing theme in recent feminist scholarship, but no one has yet analyzed it at length in the context of Derrida writings. In *Derrida's Inheritance of Democracy* I show that the concept of birth does important, if often unacknowledged work in supporting some of Derrida's clearest political stances. Further, I argue that the temporal structure that Derrida implicitly imputes to birth follows that of inheritance, in which both past and future are entwined. This challenges the more usual understanding which aligns birth more straightforwardly with the future, an understanding that I suggest is politically disabling.

My project's potential to contribute to these disparate areas of scholarship has been evident over the course of its development, as earlier incarnations having been accepted for presentation at multiple conferences and publication in the aforementioned articles. Two of these in particular – “Derrida and Democracy at Risk” and “Inheriting Democracy to Come” – already being cited in journals and books across a variety of disciplines (for example, in Paul Patton's “Derrida, Politics, and Democracy to Come”, Lisa Guenther's “Being-from-Others: Reading Heidegger after Cavarero”, Dany Lang's “Why Economists should choose their Inheritance: Physics and Path-independence in Economic Systems”, Aletta Norval's *Aversive Democracy: Inheritance and Originality in the Democratic Tradition*, Leonard Lawlor's *This is Not Sufficient: An Essay on Animality and Human Nature in Derrida*, Ed Cohen's *A Body Worth Defending: Immunity, Biopolitics, and the Apotheosis of the Modern Body*, and Nick Mansfield's

The God who Deconstructs Himself: Sovereignty and Subjectivity between Freud, Bataille, and Derrida; see Bibliography). The deepening and extensive development of my earlier analyses thus promises to play a role in future scholarship.

Conclusion

The publication of *Derrida's Inheritance of Democracy* is an essential step in establishing my reputation as a Derrida scholar, and will enhance the Fordham's reputation as a leading center for the study of Continental Philosophy. It will also lay the groundwork for my next project, which will continue my research on the concept of inheritance, investigating the role it plays in philosophies of pedagogy in the work of a number of French theorists (including Derrida, Pierre Bourdieu, Michèle Le Dœuff, Michel Foucault, and Jacques Rancière).

The teaching relief that the Summer Faculty Research Grant provides will prove invaluable to the timely completion of this project – I have been able to progress on my research while teaching classes, but this is no comparison with the amount of research writing that I can achieve in three uninterrupted months devoted exclusively to this one task. While I am only at the beginning of my career, I have been able to publish at a steady rate of one article a year since 2004, demonstrating my productivity. I am thus confident that I will be able to complete this project by the end of August 2011 in order to advance its prospective publication with Indiana University Press.

EXAMPLE

3

Divine Fathers, Divine Sons: Christian Theology and Family Politics in the Roman Empire

Abstract

If awarded, a Faculty Research Grant would enable me to hire two long-term graduate student research assistants to facilitate my completion of a work of interdisciplinary scholarship: *Divine Fathers, Divine Sons*. During the Roman imperial era, two famous figures received public acclamation as both “god” and “son of god”: the Roman emperor and Jesus Christ. My project investigates the ramifications stemming from the two most influential people in the Roman Empire having been considered divine sons of divine fathers. Specifically, how did the theological concept “son of god” resonate in the social and political contexts of the Roman world?

Through engagement with recent scholarship in Roman history—especially studies of family relationships, imperial ideology, and emperor worship—my research will produce the first monograph addressing this question. The book will be a fresh and provocative history of theology, politics, and family relations in early Christianity. The manuscript is in the final stage of review at Oxford University Press, from which I have recently received two positive readers’ reports. One of the readers predicted that the project “will help significantly to change the whole field,” and “the market for the book is potentially huge.” However, if the delegates from Oxford University Press decide not to move the project forward, I have received other interest from Yale University Press and Mohr Siebeck (Germany). I am also considering the “Transformation of the Classical Heritage” series at University of California Press because of its list of innovative monographs in Roman history and early Christianity.

The lion's share of the research and writing for *Divine Fathers, Divine Sons* has already been accomplished, including a completed draft of the manuscript. With research assistance from able graduate students in theology and classical philology, I will be able to capitalize on the interest this work has generated by going to press with one of the aforementioned scholarly publishers within the next twenty-four months.

Background

Divine Fathers, Divine Sons is a big-picture, thematic contribution to the study of early Christianity. Its chief objectives are (a) to critique the conceptual framework within which the term "son of God" has usually been construed in biblical scholarship, particularly in the work of Larry Hurtado, Martin Hengel, and James Dunn; and (b) to re-interpret divine sonship in the socio-political context of early Christianity, specifically that of Roman family politics and imperial ideology, by building upon the recent work of such historians as Simon Price, Clifford Ando, Christiane Kunst, and Ittai Gradel. Some major presuppositions of scholarship on the New Testament and early Christian theology will be challenged, but from a firm foundation rooted in rational argument from primary and secondary sources. The book will be controversial without appearing confrontational or strident.

Other experts have vetted these historical and theological arguments and lent their support to my project. *Divine Fathers, Divine Sons* originated out of my doctoral work at Yale in Religious Studies and Classics, which was supported by an external merit fellowship (\$20,000) from the Catholic Biblical Association. A portion of chapter 3 of my planned text won the annual prize (\$2,300) from the Yale Classics department, and part of chapter 4 received the "Best Paper" award at a Society of Biblical Literature conference. I look forward to fulfilling the

promise these institutions and scholars saw in my early work by soon being able to present the full text of *Divine Fathers, Divine Sons* and its innovative arguments.

Contribution

Divine Fathers, Divine Sons' historical narrative proceeds in the following way. It begins by showing how the theological doctrines forged at the Council of Nicea have hindered our ability to interpret the "son of God" language in the New Testament (ch. 1). It then emphasizes two historical contexts that can help us interpret that language anew: the figure of the Roman emperor as "son of god" (ch. 2) and the unique importance of adoption in Roman society and imperial ideology (ch. 3). In short, when we focus on the fact that the most powerful "son of god" in the Empire gained his sonship by adoption, we are able to read several early Christian texts in unexpected ways. I treat the Gospel of Mark at length, as the first narrative Christology and one that has long been connected with Rome (ch. 4). I then bring the reader forward from the first century to Nicea, showing how the resonance of "son of God" changed over time (ch. 5).

As an interdisciplinary, thematic, and occasionally iconoclastic project, *Divine Fathers, Divine Sons* will have a broad audience. I see the market for the book as several intersecting circles. The center is undoubtedly New Testament studies because my argument engages a core concept for several New Testament authors. I have also received great interest from elsewhere in religious studies, especially from scholars of early Christianity and systematic theologians. For example, my final chapter offers a new take on the development of early Christology through the fourth century—by charting the shifting relationship between begotten and adoptive metaphors—that will be of interest to scholars of the Nicene era. Furthermore, my argument has

implications for Trinitarian theology, because it offers both a new way of discussing the human/divine relationship and an alternative to progenitorial / begotten language. Roman historians will also be interested, especially in the book's synthetic presentation of the *status quaestionis* on Roman divinity and emperor worship and its original analysis of the competing family ideologies concerning natural and adopted sons in the Roman Empire. Finally, I have received inquiries from political theorists because of their recent and intense interest in the intersection of religious power and political power. I am fortunate to find my research at the core of this nexus and to be one of a growing set of scholars examining the relationship between the Roman emperor and Jesus Christ—the two famous “sons of god”—with nuanced theories of power and cultural interaction.

Cost

Divine Fathers, Divine Sons covers the first four centuries of Christianity, replete with primary material from Greek, Roman, and Christian sources of the period. Therefore, a doctoral student versed in early Christian theology would provide critical research assistance with the voluminous secondary literature on Christology in the third and fourth centuries. Readers of my manuscript have unanimously recommended that I expand and deepen my research on those centuries—the book's final chapter—during the revision process. A second doctoral student (or students) with impeccable knowledge of Greek and Latin would prove crucial in proofreading, cross-checking, and formatting the hundreds of original-language translations and citations throughout the book. These two assistants would save me hundreds of hours of labor over the coming year, help to speed this manuscript toward publication, and ensure its accuracy and thoroughness.

To gain research assistants with the prerequisite competence in scholarly theological research and classical philology will require a competitive wage of \$20/hour. The volume of work would require a commitment of approximately four hours/week to complete the text within the academic year. Therefore I have calculated my budget for completing *Divine Fathers*, *Divine Sons* as follows: I have budgeted for two assistants, each for an average of 4 hours per week for two semesters (or one semester plus one summer, depending on their availability).

- 4 hrs per week x 25 weeks = 100 hrs per assistant
- 100 hrs x \$20/hr = \$2000 per assistant
- 2 assistants = \$4000 total

Conclusion

Divine Fathers, *Divine Sons* will be the first monograph to provide an interdisciplinary, thematic, and occasionally iconoclastic examination of how the theological concept “son of god” resonated in the social and political contexts of the Roman world—a potentially field-altering contribution.

Funding for two graduate research assistants will expedite my completing this promising project in order to capitalize on the hearty encouragement it has received from senior scholars in the fields of early Christianity and Roman history—at Yale, Fordham, and beyond—and publish *Divine Fathers*, *Divine Sons* with a major scholarly press within the next two years.

EXAMPLE

4

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Moral Responsibility: Attributability, Accountability, and Capacities

[REDACTED]

Abstract

I am seeking a Fordham Summer Faculty Research Grant ("Summer FRG") in order to complete my monograph entitled *Moral Responsibility: Attributability, Accountability, and Capacities*. I submitted the complete manuscript to Oxford University Press in December 2010, after they expressed interest in it, and it is currently under review. A Summer FRG would afford me time off from teaching so that I can devote the summer to revising the manuscript in light of the reviewer reports, which I expect to receive prior to Summer 2011. At the end of August 2011, I will submit the final manuscript to Oxford for publication or submit the revised manuscript to my alternative targeted presses: Harvard and Cambridge.

Moral Responsibility starts from the idea that moral responsibility is actually comprised of two crucially different aspects: attributability and accountability. A person is *attributably responsible* for an action if and only if he has control over the fact that he performs it. He is *accountable* for that action, on the other hand, if and only if it is appropriate to praise or blame him via reactive attitudes – e.g., resentment, indignation, or gratitude – on account of it. I argue for novel capacity-based theories of these two aspects of moral responsibility. I then demonstrate the relationship between them, showing that the capacity required to be accountable for an action builds upon the capacity required to be attributably responsible for it. I

then extend my theories beyond the context of actions to explain morally responsibility for attitudes, such as desires and intentions.

Background

The idea that agents can be morally responsible for their actions plays a central role in human interaction. Understanding the nature of moral responsibility thus promises to give us insight into what we presuppose about human nature. Unfortunately, the two crucially different aspects of moral responsibility mentioned above – attributability and accountability – have not been adequately distinguished, nor has the connection between them been made fully clear. *Moral Responsibility* corrects this problem, and so makes significant progress in our understanding of the nature of moral responsibility. The ideas in it primarily grow out of my engagement with recent work on moral responsibility by Gary Watson, R. Jay Wallace, and Stephen Darwall.

In “Two Faces of Responsibility,” Watson argues persuasively that we must distinguish between attributability and accountability. This is because all views of moral responsibility are really attempts to elucidate one or the other, and unless we see them in this way, we could wrongly take them to be lacking in crucial respects. For example, failing to recognize this distinction has led some critics to a superficial evaluation of Watson’s view as deficient. Yet in spite of the importance of this distinction, it has been largely underappreciated. This is mainly due to Watson’s vague, metaphorical way of discussing attributability – an error that I correct in my manuscript. Once I elucidate the concept of it, I critique the prevailing view of

attributability – the *Self-Disclosure View*, presented by Watson in “Free Agency” and also held by Harry Frankfurt – on the grounds that it cannot account for our being attributionally responsible for our weak-willed actions. The view that I argue for does not succumb to this problem.

The second face of responsibility – accountability – comes into sharp relief in the work of Wallace and Darwall. Although both have made important contributions and their views are extremely influential, each is lacking in important respects. Wallace correctly identifies the capacity required for accountability – the capacity to recognize and respond to moral reasons. Yet he fails to recognize why it is required for accountability and fails to appreciate the role that attributability plays in understanding accountability. Darwall correctly focuses our attention on the relational aspect of accountability; however, he incorrectly claims that an agent’s being accountable is a first-order relational property - namely, the property of standing in reciprocal authority relations to other members of the moral community. My view of accountability builds on the strengths of Wallace’s and Darwall’s views while significantly improving upon them. My critique of Darwall, whose view is currently the most influential, extends my recently published article, “Moral Obligation, Accountability, and Second-Personal Reasons.”

Contribution

My manuscript is a significant contribution to the philosophical literature on moral responsibility. It is the first to take seriously the distinction between attributability and accountability and to present original theories of each within a

single work, which allows the relationship between them to emerge clearly. It is also the first to extend this dual account of responsibility from the context of actions to the context of attitudes, such as desires and intentions.

My theory of attributability is novel. I first elucidate the metaphysical nature of attributability in terms of control over actions rather than in the slippery metaphorical language of authorship. I then advance the discussion by linking attributability to the appropriateness of appraisal in terms of virtues and vices. This gives me the resources to show that the Self-Disclosure View, the prevailing view of attributability held in different versions by Watson and Frankfurt, cannot be correct. Because it focuses on what the agent does, rather than on what he has the ability to do, the Self-Disclosure View mistakenly claims that we are not attributionally responsible for all of our weak-willed actions. The solution is to take a capacity-based approach to understanding attributability. This insight leads me to adopt and defend my view, the *Judgment Responsiveness View* (JRV). According to it, an agent is attributionally responsible for an action if and only if, at the time of action, he has the ability to respond to his judgments about reasons for or against that action by performing or not performing it, respectively. This capacity-based view makes sense. When an agent has the *ability* to respond to his judgments about reasons, even when he does not respond to them, his actions say something about what he is like morally, and so moral appraisal of him in terms of virtues and vices on account of those actions is appropriate.

Although there are other proponents of a similar view of accountability, my argument for my position is original, avoids the errors of other approaches, and is

the first to make the connection between attributability and accountability clear. On my view, an agent is accountable for an action if and only if he is attributionally responsible for it and has the ability to recognize and respond to moral reasons. I argue for this by examining the nature of reactive emotions, such as resentment, indignation, and gratitude, which are appropriate when an agent is accountable. I also elucidate the nature of accountability by arguing for the innovative idea that a person's being accountable is not a first-order relational property, as Darwall thinks, but is rather a second-order relational property: it is the property of his having properties that give others reasons to respond to him with reactive attitudes.

Finally, my constructive account of the two aspects of moral responsibility provides a platform for explaining how we can be both attributionally responsible and accountable for our attitudes, such as desires and intentions. This has not been done before.

Conclusion

I am excited to be preparing *Moral Responsibility* for publication, and I am honored that a prestigious press like Oxford is already reviewing it. A summer FRG at this crucial juncture will allow me to devote myself exclusively to revising the manuscript in light of the reviewer comments that I will receive. This in turn will enable me to submit the final manuscript for publication by the end of the summer. Publishing this work will be a significant step towards achieving tenure at Fordham and establishing myself as a major scholar in the field of moral responsibility and, more broadly, moral philosophy.

EXAMPLE

5

Advancing the Enlightenment:

Kantian Courage in Contemporary Political Theory

Abstract

If awarded, a Summer Faculty Research Grant would enable me to expedite completion of my book manuscript, *Advancing the Enlightenment*, for presentation to editors at the 2010 American Political Science Association (APSA) Conference in Washington, DC in September. To fully leverage APSA's opportunity, a Summer FRG would also provide me with undistracted time to assemble recently published and previously presented portions of this manuscript to establish a pre-conference connection with key editors in my field—including David McBride (Oxford), Michael Aronson (Harvard), William Frucht (Yale), Courtney Berger (Duke), and Sanford Thatcher (Penn State).

The book articulates a vision of the twenty-first century Enlightenment. I build upon debates surrounding the legacy of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), widely considered to be the most profound and influential Enlightenment philosopher. For many, Kant's ideas, properly understood, represent the best expression of the still-unrealized ideals of the French Revolution: liberty, equality, and community. I argue, however, that Kant's greatest legacy is a mental disposition to face squarely the problems of our day and invent concepts accordingly. To support this claim, I show how John Rawls and Gilles Deleuze—preeminent figures in contemporary Anglo-American and Continental political theory, respectively—exercise Kantian courage to create their own political theories. The overlap between their

theories illuminates the strength of the Enlightenment as a moral and intellectual resource; the divergences suggest that the Enlightenment benefits from the charge between its moderate and radical poles. I end the book by showing a practical benefit of Kantian courage, namely that it empowers us to create concepts to engage Islam, a religion virtually absent from Europe and North America in the eighteenth-century but whose presence is rapidly growing in the West. I also show how Rawls's and Deleuze's efforts are being reciprocated by an Islamic political thinker, Tariq Ramadan, who presses Muslims to exercise Kantian courage in the realm of social affairs.

Advancing the Enlightenment, in sum, presents a fresh interpretation of Kant's legacy, brings Anglo-American and Continental political theory into conversation through Rawls's and Deleuze's common Kantian vocabulary, and demonstrates the power of Kantian courage to address one of the most pressing issues of our time, namely, the relationship between Islam and the West.

Background

My research to date has focused on how individual thinkers take up the legacy of Kant and the Enlightenment. My publications includes peer-reviewed articles on how: (i) Rawls embodies the Kantian ethos to create his theory of political liberalism (2007); (ii) Deleuze invents the concept of assemblage to inspire left-coalitions (2009); and (iii) Ramadan proposes a Kantian intellectual revolution in Islamic political thought (under review). I have also published review essays on how (i) contemporary political theorists utilize the Enlightenment to think about political science, the left, feminism, and global

justice (2006a); and (ii) political theorists rework and defend Kant's accounts of provisional right, culture, and subjectivity (2006b). The guiding intuition of these publications has been to consider, from a variety of angles, the future of the intellectual and political tradition of the eighteenth-century North Atlantic Enlightenment. It is from this established platform that I will propose my first book-length manuscript.

Advancing the Enlightenment asserts itself into a raging debate about Kant's legacy for contemporary political theory. On one side of the spectrum, numerous political scientists and philosophers defend the core of Kant's political vision, even if they modify how Kant's principles are applied to contemporary circumstances (Ripstein 2009, Wood 2008, Guyer 2006, Shell 2009, Ellis 2008, Ellis 2005, Riley 1983). In the middle of the spectrum—and closest to my own work—several authors consider how Kant's ideas have been appropriated and modified by pragmatists, liberals, Marxists, critical theorists, feminists, and postmodernists (Rockmore 2006, Pippin 2005, Deligiorgi 2005, Flikschuh 2000, Hutchings 1996). On the far side of the spectrum, several political theorists view Kant as primarily an enemy to creative political thinking (Saurette 2005, Coles 1997, Honig 1993). My book proposes a fresh perspective on Kant's political theory, a new dialogue between key figures in competing philosophical traditions, and an argument for how Kantian courage can help forestall the religious wars of the twenty-first century.

Contributions

Advancing the Enlightenment makes three critical contributions to the literature.

First, the book provides a new look at Kant's legacy for contemporary political theory. Michel Foucault (1997) famously remarked that the thread that connects us to the Enlightenment is an ethos—a way of thinking, feeling, and acting—rather than a doctrine. Yet Foucault does not specify the form that this ethos takes in contemporary political theory. My book shows how Rawls and Deleuze embody this Enlightenment ethos to construct their political theories. The book, in other words, provides a provocative account of what is living, and what is dead, in Kant's legacy today.

Second, my book builds a bridge between Anglo-American and Continental political theory. Numerous scholars have focused on how Kant has been taken up by Rawls (Freeman 2007, Pogge 2007, O'Neill 1989) or Deleuze (Willatt 2009, Kerslake 2009, Bryant 2008, Williams 2005). Yet few authors bring Rawls and Deleuze into sustained conversation through their shared Kantian terminology. This project illuminates the Kantian themes in Rawls's and Deleuze's political theories and, more significantly, stretches how both Anglo-American and Continental theorists think about such matters as common sense, reason, pluralism, constructivism, authentication, and the purpose of philosophy. The Enlightenment tradition as a whole will benefit from this respectful yet contentious dialogue between its moderate (analytic) and radical (postmodern) branches.

Third, *Advancing the Enlightenment* helps us think about the terms appropriate to the new global religious pluralism. In the eighteenth-century, Kant invented the term "ethical commonwealth" to describe a coalition of diverse faiths united on common moral presuppositions. Yet Kant excluded Jews, Muslims, and atheists from the ethical commonwealth, thus rendering it a problematic concept for contemporary political life.

Fortunately, Kantian courage empowers us to create terms of political-religious pluralism that better facilitate interreligious dialogue and cooperation—such as “overlapping consensus” (Rawls), “assemblage” (Deleuze), and “space of testimony” (Ramadan). The book thus contributes to the emerging literature on the relationship between modern political thought and Islam (March 2009, Hashemi 2009, Ramadan 2009, An-Na‘im 2008).

Conclusion

What is the best way to take up the intellectual and political tradition of the Enlightenment in the twenty-first century? *Advancing the Enlightenment* draws upon several of the most important figures in Western political philosophy—including Kant, Rawls, and Deleuze—to chart a course for a contemporary Enlightenment. The book argues that partisans of the Enlightenment—in the academy and the broader political world—must exercise the courage to think for themselves. A Summer Faculty Research Grant would provide me an uninterrupted block of time to organize the manuscript into a powerful, polished narrative for presentation to publishers at the September 2010 American Political Science Association (APSA) Conference in Washington, DC. Fordham’s support for *Advancing the Enlightenment* would amplify my tenure file and raise the university’s profile in political theory. More importantly, it would launch me into academic and policy debates about the role political theory can play in improving relations between Islam and the West.

EXAMPLE

6

PAINTING IN THE PRIEST:
SACERDOTAL ICONOGRAPHY AND THE IMAGING OF LATE MEDIEVAL FEMALE MONASTICISM

Abstract

Priests loomed notably large in late medieval and early modern European culture--so much so, perhaps, that modern scholarship has long overlooked them and their representations in art. My current book project, unique in the field, examines the emergence of a newly expressive sacerdotal, or priestly, iconography in 14th- and 15th-century Italy. It does so by focusing on images of an important late medieval relationship: that of certain pious women, especially female mystics like Catherine of Siena, and the male clerics who served them as confessors, disciples and, ultimately, hagiographers.

Growing out of my doctoral dissertation, *Painting in the Priest* is, in the view of advisors, substantially complete. In the case of approximately one dozen images, however, I still lack adequate photographic reproductions. These include an important subset of unpublished or rarely published historiated initials from illuminated Siense choir books. To finish the project, which I am presenting to potential publishers this fall (2009), I will spend a portion of next summer in Italy arranging for professional photographic services in Siena, Rome, and Genoa to obtain the necessary images. The Fordham Faculty Research Grant will significantly aid me in that effort and therefore speed completion—within the next twelve months—of the planned monograph.

Background

Inherently inter-disciplinary, *Painting in the Priest* is nevertheless a conscious exercise in art history that reflects my long-standing research interests, methods and goals. This book will expand on my exploration of iconographic innovation, mechanisms of devotion, religious culture, and social history, by analyzing visual images that refer to

unexpectedly complex personal bonds between often celebrated holy women and their relatively obscure clerical collaborators. Viewed in the context of late medieval penitential culture, Eucharistic devotion, and hagiographic production, these depictions open a window onto an equally significant but generally neglected phenomenon of the period: the rising social profile of priests and the increasingly conscious deployment of priesthood as an iconographic motif. Without neglecting traditional methodologies (style, iconography, connoisseurship, and visual traditions), I am engaged in a deeply contextual art history that will expand and enrich these methods with the study of function, patronage, gender, and other social, political, economic, and religious circumstances.

At the same time *Painting in the Priest* will draw together several intersecting scholarly concerns of both historians and art historians from the last thirty years. Chief among these has been the recovery for history of a now indispensable category of religious figures, female mystics, and the positing by Caroline Walker Bynum and others of a “feminized” religious culture that dominated the late medieval period. Understandably, in much of this landmark work the role of priestly overseers in the lives of charismatic women has been a sticking point. New research in gender studies, however, by such scholars as Jodi Bilinkoff and John Coakley has focused precisely on these relationships and their epistolary and literary by-products, thus providing welcome nuance and invaluable context for my own investigations into visual representations. Finally, art historians like my own dissertation advisor, Loren Partridge, have led the way with their inter-disciplinary, collaborative approach to the study of material culture in late medieval and Renaissance Italy, to which my own work is deeply indebted.

Contribution

Although deeply rooted in areas of current scholarly debate as presented above, *Painting in the Priest* nevertheless promises to break new ground. Historians like Daniel Bornstein have designated the parish priest “the great unknown of medieval history,” and he and others are working to fill that lacuna. Art historical research, however, has lagged. For example, existing research on episcopal imagery or papal portraiture has no counterpart in the realm of sacerdotal iconography. This lack of scholarship has even fostered an erroneous assumption in the field that little, significant priestly imagery even existed before the sixteenth century; yet *Painting in the Priest* identifies and thematizes an enormous body of sacerdotal depictions from the 13th- and 14th century, the majority of which adorn the pages of books reserved mainly for the clergy, like those I propose to have photographed. Small, conventional and seemingly static, these images have attracted little critical attention. Yet drawing on this supposedly unproblematic imagery, I pinpoint clerical and even explicitly sacerdotal images that begin to emerge by the early 15th century in which the previously anonymous, effaced figures of priests take on a new degree of agency. Depicted alongside representations of saints like Catherine of Siena, they frequently become bearers of additional levels of signification that deserve probing.

To ignore these earlier images of priestly figures risks falling into the historiographical trap of seeing all subsequent early modern Catholic culture through the prism of Reformation polemics. Rereading well-known, monumental, post-Tridentine images of priests-saints from a new perspective based on my analysis of earlier, pre-Reformation images is another critical contribution of my research. Sacerdotal subjects by artists like Peter Paul Rubens and Guercino need no longer be characterized primarily

as mere Catholic reaction to Protestant adversaries. By examining in their social context the late medieval precursors of this apparently triumphalist imagery, I reveal other cultural inflections of sacerdotal iconography that persist in subsequent centuries: popular anxiety over priests who doubt the Real Presence, concern about clerical comportment and the liturgical discipline of priests, and contentious debate over priestly prerogatives, especially access to the Eucharistic cup. Thus *Painting in the Priest* will associate for the first time a whole body of overtly sacerdotal rhetoric in general society—from anti-clerical screeds to extravagant paeans to sacerdotal dignity—with its contemporary innovations in iconography.

Cost

[The following are estimates of expenses for this project are based on current airfare prices and the presumption of relative stability in the US\$/EUR exchange rate.]

My proposed project calls for photography that can only be carried out in Italy. By overseeing arrangements myself, including the hiring of professional art photographers, I can substantially reduce the total cost of the project.

Identifying photographers in advance is extremely difficult from New York but a relatively simple matter once I am in Italy. Institutions like the Archivio dell'Opera Metropolitana di Siena, where many of the relevant manuscripts are housed, customarily have an in-house photographer or will provide a list of contract photographers.

Alternatively, I will seek out appropriate services with the help of the director of the Photographic Archive of the American Academy in Rome, Alessandra Capodiferro.

Calculating fees based on \$25/hour and 8 hours/day, for a minimum of 5 full days of work, the cost for the photographic services would be \$1000.

My per diem request for each of the cities I will visit is based on a reasonable expectation of low-cost lodging and board in Italian houses of my religious order (the Society of Jesus), except in Siena, where I will stay at the Alma Domus hotel.

Travel within Italy will consist of a single roundtrip by bus from Rome to Siena and a single roundtrip by train from Rome to Genoa. The remainder of my travel costs is based on an estimate of \$800 for roundtrip airfare NYC-Rome-NYC.

Conclusion

If awarded, a Faculty Research Grant would prove critical to the final *in situ* research and retention of photographic services that past advisors have said are the only steps remaining in my doctoral dissertation's journey of transformation into a promising book. In the coming weeks I will present *Painting in the Priest* to the following publishers: Yale University Press, Cambridge University Press, University of California Press and Saint Joseph's University Press. It is my intention to generate interest in anticipation of the book's completion by late 2010. I look forward to *Painting in the Priest's* publication and the realization of its potential to focus scholarly attention on a phenomenon too long overlooked by historians of both church and art: the emergence of a newly expressive sacerdotal iconography in Italy centuries before the Reformation, one exemplified in the evocative pairing of important late medieval female saints and mystics together with the lesser known male clerics who served them as chaplains, friends and, ultimately, defenders of their sanctity.