

National Endowment for the Humanities: review of applications for mock panel

The attached materials are for the mock panel review (pop-up #4.2) on Friday, March 26th.

These are actual proposals submitted for fellowships, used with permission from the NEH Division of Research Programs. To get the most out of the session, please read the applications and assign each a rating using the attached evaluation criteria and rating scale.

We will plan to discuss the application-writing strategies. The strategies we discuss can be applicable to most programs at NEH, as well as competitions outside of the Endowment.

As you read these applications, please keep in mind that they have been selected to give you 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 particular areas of Endowment interest.

For reasons of confidentiality, cover sheets, résumés, and letters of recommendation have been omitted for this exercise (all of which are part of the evaluation process).

Criteria for Evaluation:

Evaluators are asked to apply the following five criteria when judging the quality of applications.

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

Fellowships support projects at any stage of development.

Rating Scale:

E = Excellent

VG = Very Good

G = Good

SM = Some Merit

NC = Not Competitive

Sorry, NEH does not allow split ratings (e.g. VG/G or E/NC) or other types of shading (e.g. VG- or G++).

Project Narrative and Literature Review

With the support of an NEH Fellowship, I will complete the last three chapters of a book manuscript titled “The Allure of Antiquity: Archaeology and the Making of Modern Mexico (1877-1910).” Based on my Ph.D. dissertation, this study examines the ways in which the Mexican government took control of the nation’s pre-Hispanic remains and used them for the purposes of state and nation building during the Porfiriato, the regime of Porfirio Díaz. It argues that the Porfirian regime was the first in Mexico to develop a concerted policy to gather, preserve, and display pre-Hispanic antiquities. The government placed guards at ruins, strengthened federal legislation over artifacts, and in 1885 established the first agency exclusively to protect them, the Inspectorate of Archaeological Monuments of the Republic. It created the nation’s first official archaeological site at Teotihuacán in 1910 and gave unprecedented support to the National Museum, filling it with relics. It turned the pre-Hispanic remains, in other words, into national patrimony. With these under its control, it embraced the Indian past as the basis of the nation’s official history. This was not a neutral project. The political and intellectual elite saw antiquity as a means to defend and shape the national image. Mexico was a nation deemed inferior by the dominant Eurocentric racism of the day, a nation that Europeans and Americans not only saw as backwards and uncivilized but open to archaeological plunder. As in other countries marked by generations of colonialism and exploitation, the embrace of a preconquest past, a past prior to foreign domination, served as a source of cultural reformulation, as a way to counter a history of imperialism as well as the more general hegemony of Western values. The Porfirian elite turned to antiquity to present Mexico as an ancient nation with a prestigious past, and to archaeology to present Mexico as sovereign, scientific, and modern.

Yet although the official history developed out of an elite counterimperial consciousness, it similarly reinforced patterns of domination. It was a selective reconstruction of the past that celebrated certain cultures and omitted others. The government focused on the dominant indigenous groups of antiquity, those that left behind vestiges of “high culture,” works of architecture, pyramids, and ceremonial centers. It glorified the Aztecs, Toltecs, and Maya, but ignored the vast array of other cultures, such as the nonsedentary peoples of the north. The very process of making patrimony, moreover, limited the artifacts’ uses and meanings. For many Mexicans, the objects were not national but local patrimony, symbols of more localized identities. Provincial museums were developing throughout the country, searching for objects for their collections. Indigenous communities also had strong identifications with the ruins, what were often links to traditional rites and rituals as well as sources of land, stone, and income generated from the market in antiquities. The government’s definition of patrimony, however, had no space for such relationships. State officials cleared Teotihuacán of indigenous peoples and stripped communities of artifacts, often amid their protests. Rather than a national unifier, the making of patrimony can thus also be seen as a space of material and symbolic struggle, one that both reflects and reinforces the inequalities inherent in a population.

My manuscript examines the response of native communities, both those who aided and resisted the state project. It focuses on the concrete practices involved in archaeology and the human interactions that these entailed. It shows, for instance, how communities at Teotihuacán and the Morelos villages of Tepoztlán and Tetlama fought to retain artifacts. It also underscores how Indians served as the state’s main source of labor. Native peoples hauled monoliths to the Museum, worked in excavations and as guards at sites, often as elites looked on, denigrating the contemporary Indians but exalting the ancient. While historians have commented on the elite’s contrasting views of the Indian past and present, my manuscript argues that archaeology helped construct and reinforce these perceptions. The very practices aimed at creating a glorified vision of antiquity, in other words, negated the contemporary Indians.

Until recently, the elite’s glorification of antiquity had been largely overlooked by the scholarship on *indigenismo*, the valorization of indigenous cultures. The Porfirian regime was characterized instead as a regime which “denigrated the national heritage,” a consequence not

only of its outright hostility toward the contemporary native population, but of historians' tendency to associate indigenismo with the successive revolutionary state that was touted as pro-Indian.¹ Recent works, however, have begun to delve into the indigenismo of the Porfiriato, an indigenismo that was confined to glorifying antiquity rather than promoting the well-being of the Indians. Scholars such as Mauricio Tenorio, Enrique Florescano, and Rebecca Earle have focused on elite constructions of the antiquity, paying particular attention to cultural expressions such as statues and paintings. Archaeology, in contrast, has been less examined. No comprehensive treatment of the Porfirian archaeological project exists. My manuscript's focus on this project in its entirety offers unique perspectives on elite representations of Indian identity. Historians, for example, have noted how elites portrayed Indian antiquity within the Europeanized framework of classical antiquity, how paintings depicted pre-Hispanic peoples dressed in togas and with Western features. This sort of embellishment was not possible with the actual archaeological remains. Displayed on pedestals in the Museum, each artifact had to be taken as it was; this was pre-Hispanic aesthetics without camouflage. My focus on archaeology thus reveals that elites were coming to terms with Mexican aesthetics, what one Porfirian observer called "our national art."

Research Plan, Chapter Outline, Project Significance

"The Allure of Antiquity" is organized thematically into six chapters, with an introduction and epilogue. Its geographical focus corresponds to the state's archaeological work which was carried out mainly in the central plateau and the state of Oaxaca. The introduction, first three chapters and epilogue have been revised and polished. If I am fortunate enough to obtain an NEH grant, I will go on leave and spend twelve months, from January 1 to December 31, 2011, completing my manuscript, revising chapters four and six, and researching and writing chapter five. My manuscript is based on documents in Mexico City's Archives of the National Anthropology Museum (AHMNA) and the Inspectorate records in the National Archives (AGN). In order to complete the book I must return to the AHMNA to research material for the fifth chapter which examines the Museum, a topic that was not fully explored in my dissertation.

The introduction situates the book's argument within its historical, historiographical, and theoretical contexts, laying out a conceptual framework that focuses on nation building as a cultural process and its relationship to indigenismo, patrimony, museums, and the construction of official pasts. It builds on the theoretical work of scholars such as Bruce Trigger and Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer.² Chapters One and Two draw from Arjun Appadurai's concept of "the social life of things" to examine the significance of the ruins to a variety of people. The two chapters work in conjunction with each other. The first considers the meanings of the ruins to those who most frequented them: the locals, foreign scientists, and antiquities traffickers. The Porfirian archaeological project developed largely in reaction to these groups, as elite Mexicans sought to take artifacts out of circulation, out of the reach of the locals and the antiquities market which funneled objects to American and European museums. Chapter Two, therefore, explores what the antiquities had come to signify to Porfirian elites. It examines how artifacts and their conservation were intertwined with the nationalist impulse of statesmen such as Justo Sierra and archaeologists like Leopoldo Batres and Alfredo Chavero. Elites based the state's claims to the objects on arguments that rested on appeals to nation and science. The chapter problematizes these claims. Mexico at the time was hardly a unified, modern nation, and archaeology was hardly an established science. Even the elites seemed to sense this as they expressed their concerns with controlling the past always with a degree of apprehension about Mexican

¹ David Brading, *The Origins of Mexican Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 1.

² See: Bruce G Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), and Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, *The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1985).

nationhood. Their appeals to science were also tentative, as the archaeologists carried out their work with little agreement, unsure about the meaning of the objects and how to categorize them.

Chapters Three – Six focus on different facets of the state's project. Chapter Three looks at the mechanisms established to control the ancient remains: the legislation, network of guards, and Inspectorate of Monuments, headed by Leopoldo Batres, the colorful protagonist of my story. Among his many tasks, Batres oversaw the work of foreign archaeologists who, up until then, had operated without supervision and often made off with relics. He also centralized artifacts in the National Museum, a topic examined in Chapter Four. This chapter looks at the transfer of artifacts from around the country to the Museum, focusing on the response of native communities. Its revision will include a lengthy discussion of how the transfer impacted provincial museums in Yucatán, Oaxaca, and several other states.

Chapter Five, which remains to be written, is essential to the manuscript as it examines the Museum, the nation's principal center of archaeological conservation and study. With the grant, I will spend five months analyzing AHMNA documents which offer insight into the professionalization of archaeology, archaeological research and interpretations, and the display of artifacts. The chapter will detail how Museum exhibits reflected state-building concerns. The purpose of one room known as the Gallery of Monoliths, for instance, was to hold artifacts from as many areas in Mexico as possible. For a country that had witnessed several foreign invasions, the exhibit thus echoed elite concerns with controlling the national territory.

The final chapter examines the reconstruction of Teotihuacán, the other principal showcase of antiquity. Undertaken by Batres, the reconstruction was driven by the desire to assert Mexico's image during the Centenario, the 1910 centennial celebration of Independence which drew visitors from around the world. The chapter's revisions will include a detailed analysis of Batres's archaeological methods. Within weeks of the Centenario, the 1910 revolution erupted. The epilogue examines the revolution's impact on the ruins, Museum, and the Porfirian archaeological project in general. It emphasizes that the Porfirian mechanisms to control the past remained intact, forming the basis of the revolutionary state's archaeological infrastructure. It examines some of the legacies of the Porfirian project by addressing contemporary archaeologists' critiques of the science and its relationship to the state today.

Once completed, my book will contribute to several scholarly disciplines and reach a broad audience of scholars and readers interested in history, nation-building, race, identity, anthropology, indigenous peoples, and the history of memory, museums, and material culture. It will make a significant contribution to the fields of Mexican and Latin American history. While rooted in the Mexican setting, its examination of a peripheral country's use of antiquity to recast its image will resonate with the broader field of postcolonial studies. The postcolonial studies movement has alerted us to the challenges such countries face in constructing their national histories and cultures. Inspired by this field, historians of Latin America similarly have shown nationalist projects to be fraught with contradictions that are never reconciled. They have also moved away from the examination of nation building as a top down process to look at the subaltern subject as well as hegemony and resistance. In doing so, they have placed the state and popular culture into the same frame of study. The scholarship on the history of archaeology in Mexico, however, has been untouched by these approaches. Archaeology's relationship to nation building and to popular culture has gone largely unexplored, even though the science has played a central role in Mexico's nationalist project. In fact, Mexican archaeology is still romanticized as a series of great discoveries and brave explorers. My work challenges these depictions. It reveals that while state archaeology developed out of an elite counterimperial consciousness, it similarly reinforced patterns of domination. "The Allure of Antiquity" offers insights into the process by which nations base their histories on glorified visions of past autochthonous cultures while simultaneously marginalizing contemporary indigenous cultures. It thus addresses the exclusionary practices of modern states, a timely concern that will resonate with scholars and the broader public. Thank you for considering my application.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PRINTED SOURCES
(Please see [project narrative for archival sources](#))

- Aguirre, Robert D. *Informal Empire: Mexico and Central America in Victorian Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Anales del Museo Nacional*. Épocas 1-3. Mexico City: Museo Nacional, 1909.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1991.
- Benavides, Hugo. *Making Ecuadorian Histories: Four Centuries of Defining Power*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004.
- Bennett, Tony. *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Breglia, Lisa. *Monumental Ambivalence: The Politics of Heritage*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2006.
- Castañeda, Quetzil E. *In the Museum of Maya Culture: Touring Chichén Itzá*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- Chatterjee, Partha. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*. London: Zed Books, 1986.
- Earle, Rebecca. *The Return of the Native: Indians and Myth-Making in Spanish America, 1810–1930*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Florescano, Enrique. *El patrimonio nacional de México*. 2 vols. México: CONACULTA, 1997.
- García Canclini, Néstor. *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995.
- García Mora, Carlos, and Enrique Florescano, eds. *La antropología en México*. 15 vols. Mexico City: INAH, 1987.
- González Stephan, Beatriz, and Jens Alderman, eds. *Galerías del progreso: Museos, exposiciones y cultura visual en América Latina*. Rosario: Beatriz Viterbo Editora, 2006.
- Hobsbawn, Eric, and Terence Ranger, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Lombardo de Ruiz, Sonia. *El pasado prehispánico en la cultura nacional (memoria hemerográfica, 1877-1911)*. 2 vols. Mexico City: INAH, 1994.
- Lomnitz, Claudio. *Deep Mexico, Silent Mexico: An Anthropology of Nationalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001.
- Mauch Messenger, Phyllis. *The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property: Whose Property? Whose Culture?* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999.
- Méndez, Cecilia. "Incas Sí, Indios No: Notes on Peruvian Creole Nationalism and its Contemporary Crisis." *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 28:1 (1996).
- Peñafiel, Antonio. *Monumentos del Arte Mexicano*. 3 vols. Berlin: A. Asher and Co., 1890.
- Rappaport, Joanne. *The Politics of Memory: Native Historical Interpretation in the Colombian Andes*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Riva Palacio, Vicente, ed. *México a través de los siglos*. Barcelona: Espasa y Cia., 1887-1889.
- Ruiz, Cármen. *Insiders and Outsiders in Mexican Archaeology, 1890-1930*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas, 2003.
- Ruiz Gutiérrez, Rosaura. *Positivismo y Evolución: Introducción del Darwinismo en México*. Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma de México, 1987.
- Rutsch, Mechthild. *Entre el campo y el gabinete: nacionales y extranjeros en la profesionalización de la antropología mexicana (1877-1920)*. Mexico City: INAH, 2007.
- Sierra, Justo. *Obras completas del maestro Justo Sierra*, edited by Agustín Yañez. 17 vols. Mexico City: Universidad Autónoma de México, 1948.
- Tenorio-Trillo, Mauricio. *Mexico at the World's Fairs: Crafting a Modern Nation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Villoro, Luis. *Los grandes momentos del indigenismo en México*. Mexico City: El Colegio de México, 1996.

Project Description-Charlotte Lennox: A Powerful Mind: It is only very recently that scholars have begun to understand that women writers in eighteenth-century England could be innovative. For the last two hundred years it has been thought that they were constrained by their time and place simply to reproduce what their male counterparts were already publishing successfully. Most scholars believe that this period in English history was very limiting for a woman's mind and that any form of intellectual expression primarily happened within the domestic sphere. More recent scholarship, especially Betty Schellenberg's *The Professionalization of the Woman Writers in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge, 2005), is beginning to question this assumption.

The eighteenth century is compelling today because its definition of Enlightenment informs current understandings of Western democracy, and, like today, feminist concerns in the eighteenth-century lagged behind other manifestations of "enlightened" progress. Women's writing thus was able to show that universalized claims were, in reality, simply masculine claims. The middle years of the British eighteenth-century were a time of shifting values and perspectives, and these new ideas and attitudes were represented most intimately in the literary marketplace. Literacy was expanding at a much greater rate, novels were beginning to be valued as a genre for respectable intellectuals, and mass-produced periodicals were exploding in production and popularity. Into this new world of nascent modernism, Charlotte Lennox (1729/30-1804), a Londoner hard on her luck, found an arena open in unprecedented ways to her seventeen publications. In six different genres, Lennox shunned convention and rendered familiar critical categories obsolete, becoming a pioneer in many of the genres that she undertook and being described by contemporaries as having a powerful mind.

This fellowship would allow me to complete the critical biography *Charlotte Lennox: A Powerful Mind*. This prolific London author worked at the cutting edge of debates about literature and gender during the Enlightenment. Her diverse background and independent spirit allowed her to launch a literary career that put her at the heart of many of the most important literary discussions: the development of the novel, the role of Shakespeare as a literary hero, the transnational exchange of literary works between England and the continent, women's access to playwriting careers, as well as the role of periodicals for an increasingly literate population. During Lennox's lifetime her novel *The Female Quixote* was an enormous success throughout Europe. Today it is still popular for its humor, unique perspective on women's power in the mid-eighteenth century, and sophisticated critique of the genre of the novel. In addition, she is the author of five other novels, five translations, three plays, a book of poems, one periodical, and a critical work on Shakespeare. Born in Gibraltar, Lennox led a transient and liminal childhood, accompanying her military father, her mother, and two siblings, and settling from the ages of eleven to thirteen in the colony of New York. At thirteen, she was sent back to England without her family and found herself without a reliable guardian. All of Lennox's novels present heroines with an unusual degree of self-sufficiency and self-respect, qualities that describe Lennox herself. Her accessibility as an author significantly expanded in 2008, when three of her novels—*Henrietta* (1758; University Press of Kentucky, 2008), *Sophia* (1761; Broadview, 2008), and *Euphemia* (1790; Broadview, 2008)—were published for the first time in modern editions. These novels join two others—*Harriot Stuart* (1750; Fairleigh Dickinson, 1995) and *The Female Quixote* (1752; Oxford, 1989)—already widely used in classrooms. Also, for the first time all of Lennox's extant correspondence will be published by Bucknell University Press this year. There is no doubt that Lennox's moment has arrived.

With these publications it becomes even more apparent that there are significant gaps in our understanding of Lennox's literary career, and of her innovative contributions to a large number of genres. Previous biographical writing about Lennox appropriately documents the significance of the fact that she established a career as a writer in the early years of professional authorship, published the first narrative that challenged the masculine perspective of Cervantes' *Don Quixote* and drew from her three years living in America for her first and last novels. Along with these accomplishments it is often asserted, for example in the main biographical works on Lennox—Miriam Small's *Charlotte Lennox* (Archon, 1935, Yale 1969), Gustavus Maynadier's *Charlotte Lennox, The First American Novelist* (Harvard, 1949), Phillip Séjourné's *The Mystery of Charlotte Lennox* (Faculté Provence, 1967)—that she was an interesting, yet minor player on the literary stage. These monographs, all over fifty years old, were

primarily interested in Lennox's identity: her gender, attempts to conceal her personal life, and her youth in the forts of Albany and Schenectady. They do not take Lennox's skill as a writer or as a marketer of her work as a primary consideration, nor do they show how and why her work was not only pervasive in London, but throughout Europe. Also, they did not have the benefit of a cache of forty-five letters published in 1970-1. Since then another twenty-seven letters, which I have access to, have been found.

Even today critical assessments of Lennox's literary output are predominantly interested in her most popular work *The Female Quixote*, and a few essays address *Shakespeare Illustrated*. However, no scholarship to date takes into account her wide-ranging and unique literary output. Her subtle ability to depict strong female heroines in her novels and her innovative approach in a variety of genres, including literary critique, dramatic writing, and early periodical writing/editing, are worthy of far more consideration. For example, Lennox's *Sophia* can be considered the first novel by a major English novelist written specifically for publication. This critical biography will also elucidate Lennox's impressive skill at adapting genres with a sharp eye for the literary marketplace and her nimbleness at working within the constraints put on women who dared to sell their writing. Instead of offering a study of Lennox's personality and motivation, *Charlotte Lennox: A Powerful Mind* focuses on this writer's pioneering publications and her unique perspective as an outsider. Not being a member of the Bluestockings allowed Lennox to develop another version of the female intellect. Studying Lennox through transatlantic and feminist interpretive frameworks brings to light Lennox's sharp intellect and offers illuminating details about her career; for example that her works were translated into eight different languages and published in ten countries in Europe and America by 1850 and the fact that she collaborated with Samuel Johnson in their research on Shakespeare, rather than simply worked as his assistant, as has been commonly asserted.

Six of the nine chapters of this critical biography are completed in first draft. These proceed chronologically and use Lennox's works, the genres in which she wrote, and especially her letters, which speak to each period of her literary career, as focal points. "Poet and Actress," details Lennox's early literary formation in poetry and drama and shows that her recent experience in the New World shaped her critical notions of the world of British literature. Then, "Harriot Stuart, as Herself" highlights the complex nature of Lennox's first novel, which suggests autobiographical elements reflecting Lennox's years in Albany and Schenectady. "A Treatise on Difference in *The Female Quixote*" argues that Lennox's Arabella is in fact a reflection of "the other," and thus the foreign, and criticizes strong imperialistic sentiments at mid-century. "From Page to Stage" addresses Lennox's original publication strategy of turning her own novel *Henrietta* (1758) into a play, *The Sister* (1769). Research for this chapter was completed thanks to a summer fellowship at Chawton House Library, Hampshire, England. A comparison of her novel and play reveals her unorthodox position on patriarchy when she writes for the stage. Next, "Cultivating the Female Mind" details how Lennox the journalist designed a magazine that sets aside fashion and marriage advice to create a curriculum that debates the methods for fostering female intelligence. This chapter was completed thanks to a one-month joint fellowship from the British Academy and the Huntington Library. "Euphemia: Transatlantic Reflections," chapter eight, analyzes Lennox's thoughts at the age of sixty about the characteristics of a life well-lived. In the novel *Euphemia* the vexations and moralizing effects of poverty and the intimacies and disappointments of motherhood become catalysts for social commentary.

Plans and Goals: Against the backdrop of my twenty-year history researching and writing about Lennox, which includes establishing Lennox's birthdate, bringing *Henrietta* to contemporary light, and proving that women novelists played a significant role in the novel's development at mid-century, this year-long fellowship will allow me to complete three main tasks: finish two chapters, write the last one, and polish the entire manuscript. I have collected all the primary material I need for this research in libraries in England and the US; including The Bodleian, Cambridge University Library, the British Library, the Public Records Office, the Greater Metropolitan Archives, the Sheffield Library, the Beinecke, the Huntington, and the Clark. The remaining work can be done with the material that I have

ready access to, either in photocopy form (such as Lennox's correspondence), or at the Huntington Library and the Clark Library, both of which are near my home in California and where I am a reader.

In January and February I will revise the chapter "Challenging the Sacred Canon," which continues my study of the plays that Lennox annotated in *Shakespeare Illustrated* (1753-54) compared to the same ones that Samuel Johnson annotated in 1765. In my preliminary study of three of the plays, I found that Johnson, often referred to as "the father of English literature," borrowed significantly from Lennox's assertions for his own edition. This finding does not conform to the current critical consensus that Lennox was encouraged to compile her commentary as an aid to Johnson. Because there is significant disagreement between Lennox and Johnson, the current critical consensus no longer seems likely. The degree to which Lennox disagrees with Johnson's edition makes this possibility unlikely. Instead, Johnson and Lennox through their respective works carry on a dynamic literary dialogue concerning the great poet. This debate influenced both of them to reconsider Shakespeare's importance for their society and for future generations. In many ways they are at odds with one another concerning the merit of Shakespeare's works. Now I need to study the other seventeen plays that Lennox and Johnson wrote about. From my preliminary comparisons, their dialogue addresses three significant aspects of Shakespeare's writing: invention, probability and characterization, which produces a merging of some of their thoughts and a nuancing of their differences. My new research will either confirm this fact and/or help me to make more subtle distinctions in my argument.

In order to complete "Working the Marketplace," I will study Lennox's translations: *The Memoirs of the Duke of Sully* (1756), *The Memoirs of the Countess of Berci* (1756), *Memoirs for the History of Madame de Maintenon* (1757), *The Greek Theater of Father Brumoy* (1760), and *Meditations and Penitential Prayers* (1774) in March and April. As scholars recognize more fully the larger cultural forces at work in the act of interpreting a text for a different language group, translation studies has become a growing field. Andre LeFevre demonstrates the crucial work of translators, who bring to light prevailing attitudes about otherness. Sherry Simon notes that translators are particularly important because they open up new avenues of communication that contribute to their communities' intellectual and political climates and that the eighteenth century was unique in its high esteem for the creative effort of translators. Not only did Lennox work to bridge cultures through her translations, but she was in fact able to market herself better by producing these works, which often included her name on the title page. I will read these translations next to their originals with French eighteenth-century translation scholar Gillian Dow, who has already agreed to work with me at the Chawton Library, Hampshire, England, where she is a permanent fellow. I already have an established relationship with this research library after a fellowship in 2008. This research will help explain Lennox's priorities in these texts and how she nuanced issues of female intelligence in these popular texts. These results will allow me to complete the seventh chapter, "Working the Marketplace."

In May and June I will analyze a work by Lennox that has been entirely ignored in scholarship, *Old City Manners* (1775), and complete "Fame Rediscovered," the final chapter of this critical biography. This play is an adaptation of Ben Jonson's *Eastward Ho* (1605) and was considered a resounding success, as it appeared on stage eight times and was thoroughly lauded by the reviewers. Lennox's ability to understand the intellectual climate may have been responsible for this success. This adaptation of a successful seventeenth-century play for an eighteenth-century audience sharpens the focus on a number of timely themes that her audience would have been particularly attuned to: religious freedom, human rights, a woman's place in society, human agency, and capitalism. I will analyze these works side-by-side to put Lennox's adaptation work into the context of the eighteenth-century stage and to determine how she understood her audience and why this play, unlike her other two, put her back into the literary spotlight. Finally, in July, August, and September I will polish all of the chapters. In October I will revise my already existing introduction and write the Epilogue. And in November and December I will send out proposals to publishers. Oxford, Cambridge, Johns Hopkins, Ashgate, and Palgrave Macmillan have all expressed interest in this biography.

Bibliography- Charlotte Lennox: A Powerful Mind

- Bannet, Eve Tavor. "Charlotte Lennox." *The Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature*. 5 vols. Ed. David Kastan. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. III 271-5.
- Berg, Temma. "Getting the Mother's Story Right: Charlotte Lennox and the New World." *Papers on Language and Literature* 32.2 (Summer 1996): 369-98.
- Doody, Margaret Ann. "Shakespeare's Novels: Charlotte Lennox Illustrated." *Studies in the Novel* 19.3 (Fall 1987): 296-310.
- Gillespie Stuart and David Hopkins (eds.). *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English: Vol. 3: 1660-1790*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005.
- Green, Susan. "A Cultural Reading of Lennox's *Shakespeare Illustrated*." *Cultural Readings of Restoration and 18c English Theater*. Eds. Canfield and Payne. Athens: The U of Georgia P, 1995. 228-57.
- Hayes, Julie. *Translation, Subjectivity, and Culture...France and England, 1600-1800*. Stanford UP, 2009.
- Isles, Duncan. "The Lennox Collection." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 18.4 (October 1970): 317-344; 19.1 (January 1971): 36-60; 19.2 (April 1971): 165-186; 19.4 (October 1971): 416-35.
- Kramnick, Jonathan. "Reading Shakespeare's Novels: Literary History and Cultural Politics in the Lennox-Johnson Debate." *Modern Language Quarterly* 55.4 (December 1994): 429-53.
- LeFevre, Andre. *Translation, Rewriting...the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Looser, Devoney. "Charlotte Lennox and the Study and Use of History." *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2000. 89-118.
- Mack, Ruth. "Quixotic Ethnography: Charlotte Lennox and the Dilemma of Cultural Observation." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 38.2-3 (Spring-Summer 2005): 193-213.
- McMurrin, Mary Helen. *The Spread of Novels: Translation and Prose Fiction in the Eighteenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2010.
- Palo, Sharon Smith. "The Good Effects of a Whimsical Study: Romance and Women's Learning in Lennox's *The Female Quixote*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 18.2 (Winter 2005-6): 203-28.
- Runge, Laura. "Aristotle's Sisters: Behn, Lennox, Fielding, and Reeve." *Gender and Language in British Literary Criticism, 1660-1790*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. 121-67.
- Schellenberg, Betty. "The (Female) Literary Careers of Sarah Fielding and Charlotte Lennox." *Professionalization of Women Writers in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. 94-119.
- Simon, Sherry. *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Staves, Susan. *A Literary History of Women's Writing in Britain, 1660-1789*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.

Project Narrative:

'Nietzsche and the Ancient Skeptical Tradition'

Friedrich Nietzsche is notorious for his rhetorically and philosophically dramatic statements concerning truth: that “truths are illusions we have forgotten are illusions,” and that “facts are precisely what there are not, there are only interpretations.” Such proclamations have caused Nietzsche to be labeled a ‘postmodernist’, a ‘relativist’, a ‘pessimist’ about truth, even an ‘epistemological nihilist’; but perhaps most frequently Nietzsche is characterized as a *skeptic*. With the exception of a handful of short discussions, however, this affiliation between Nietzsche and skepticism has generally been alleged without any head-on engagement with philosophical skepticism, its history, or its methodological commitments. Most recent discussions use ‘skepticism’ in a fairly casual sense, as a non-technical term requiring no special treatment or explanation. Since it typically denotes little more than a somewhat radical and mostly negative attitude toward the existence of facts or the possibility of human knowledge, the question, “what *kind* of skepticism?” has not yet been raised in the literature. Nietzsche scholars have in particular failed to take account of the rich and substantial philosophical difference between the skepticism that originated in ancient Greece and its modern, post-Cartesian derivatives. The oversight is significant, for at least two reasons. The first is that Nietzsche, who was trained as a professor of classical philology and maintained a fascination with Greek literature, culture, and philosophy throughout his productive academic life, clearly appreciated the difference. Second, since ‘skepticism’ in the ancient sense is incompatible with ‘relativism’ and many other positions commonly attributed to Nietzsche, appreciating properly his understanding of and debt to the Greek skeptics will force us to re-evaluate a good deal of what has been written of one of the last century’s most influential thinkers.

The impact of Nietzsche’s engagement with the Greek skeptics has never been systematically explored in a book-length work. Here I propose to bring together under the title *Nietzsche and the Ancient Skeptical Tradition* my previous research on Nietzsche and the Greek skeptics, expanding on published articles and papers presented over the last several years. Much of this story has been told piecemeal in my publications to date, yet scholars in the field have encouraged me to bring these disparate parts together in a sustained, book-length argument. My project has generated substantial interest among scholars on Nietzsche, but it has also appealed to specialists in Ancient philosophy and to those who have interests in epistemology and skepticism more broadly construed—in short, those who have not thought Nietzsche had anything of philosophical value to say on the subject of truth or knowledge. This work fills a gap in the literature on Nietzsche by demonstrating precisely how an understanding of ancient skepticism—the Pyrrhonian tradition in particular—promises to illuminate Nietzsche’s own reflections on truth, knowledge, and ultimately, the nature and value of philosophic inquiry.

More specifically, the proposed book promises an original contribution to the field in two ways: first and most obviously, from the standpoint of the history of philosophy. While there are a handful of volumes that take up Nietzsche’s intellectual relationship with Socrates and Plato, or “the Greeks” more generally, the treatment is often philosophically too thin or too broad and not philologically sensitive, which limits the value of the works for those interested in Nietzsche and has made them downright unappealing to specialists in Ancient philosophy.¹ I propose to correct these problems, at least with respect to Nietzsche and the Hellenistic skeptics, with this more focused volume. Second, my research engages with the extant literature on Nietzsche’s epistemology and his views on truth, but offers a reading that is novel and that challenges many widely-respected works on the topic (e.g., Wilcox (1974), Grimm (1977), Cox (1999)), including works that are considered ground-breaking and highly cogent interpretations, such as Maudemarie Clark’s (1990) *Nietzsche on Truth and Philosophy*. Reading

¹ Recent exceptions include Bett (2000a), and Porter (2000a and 2000b). Otherwise, Schlechta (1948) is a useful volume, but seriously dated. Tejera (1987) and Dannhauser (1974) are dated as well; in addition, the philosophical handling of Nietzsche is in each of these works uneven, and neither work handles the Greek texts in a way that meets the standards of contemporary specialists in Ancient philosophy. The most recent treatment, by Wilkerson (2006), is certainly less dated, but it suffers from weaknesses similar to the other treatments.

Nietzsche's work on the model of the Pyrrhonian skeptics helps to illuminate his provocative but often opaque remarks on the very topics that have so revitalized Nietzsche scholarship in the last twenty years.

Finally, this reading will afford us deeper insight into Nietzsche's ethics, since the Greek skeptics (like Nietzsche) take up the position they do as a means of promoting well-being and psychological health. Thus, it will help to recover a portrait of Nietzsche as a philosophical psychologist and ethical naturalist that has been too often obscured by commentaries on his thought. The Pyrrhonian skeptics have also been described as ethical naturalists: like so many of their Hellenistic contemporaries (most notably the Stoics and Epicureans), they present a robust account of the good for human beings and a series of recommendations or practical suggestions for attaining it. Their conception of the good identifies it with psychological balance or equanimity, *ataraxia*—commonly, though in some cases misleadingly translated as 'tranquility'. The Pyrrhonian formula for realizing this state, however, often raises eyebrows, for the skeptic argues that the good we seek will be the result of a total suspension of belief, especially with regard to claims that take us beyond what our best empirical evidence could support. The skeptic, aptly captured by Nietzsche's description of the "philosopher of the future," is "curious to a vice, an investigator to the point of cruelty," and sets out in good faith to satisfy his curiosity. Soon, however, he discovers that he consistently comes across *equipollent* arguments: arguments of roughly equal persuasive force for and against just about any claim. In light of this discovery, the skeptic finds himself psychologically compelled to suspend judgment on the issues he investigates, a state upon which psychological well-being follows fortuitously, "like a shadow follows a body." Maintaining his state of equanimity requires the skeptic to maintain his suspension of judgment, which in turn requires, perhaps contrary to our expectations, that he continue actively to investigate the matters that concerned him initially. This restless intellectual curiosity is in fact the hallmark of Pyrrhonian skepticism, for while everyone else has given up inquiring, either because they take themselves to have definitive answers to their questions or because they have succumbed to epistemological hopelessness and decided their questions are unanswerable (a condition Nietzsche would characterize as a kind of intellectual death), the skeptic alone remains engaged with the world and open to the *possibility* of truth—though he no longer stakes his happiness on its attainment.

The plan for the book includes two introductory chapters: one will lay out a brief account of Pyrrhonism and its history, for the purposes of familiarizing non-specialists in Ancient philosophy with some of its salient features; and another will recount the historical evidence for Nietzsche's own familiarity with the relevant sources of this tradition, including for instance his doctoral work and subsequent publications on the 3rd century doxographer Diogenes Laertius, in which he carefully examines Diogenes' accounts of the lives of the skeptic Pyrrho and his followers. The research for these chapters is complete, and I have a draft of each. The core of the book comprises four chapters, drawing upon articles I have published since the completion of my doctoral research. Here, with an eye toward showing how the skeptical strains of Nietzsche's position gain in strength, subtlety, and coherence over the course of his career, I will present them together, organized roughly chronologically: The early chapters will investigate skeptical themes in the writings of the young Nietzsche, concentrating on his treatment of truth in the infamous (unpublished) essay "On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense," and on the naturalism that first emerges in *Human, All too Human*. In later chapters, I examine central features of Nietzsche's middle and late works, including his ethical views and his mature views on truth. Here, for example, I advance a reading of Nietzsche's much-discussed 'perspectivism'—the cornerstone of many postmodern interpretations of his thought—that demonstrates how Nietzsche's claim that there is "only a perspective seeing, only a perspective knowing" does not commit him to an inescapable subjectivism or relativism. Rather, he notices, in a way strongly reminiscent of Diogenes Laertius' presentation of the classic arguments of the Pyrrhonists, that if we have a number of possible cognitions of the same object and no agreed-upon criterion by which to adjudicate disputes about which of them is closest to reality, then we are compelled to suspend judgment and, in a term Nietzsche himself uses, embrace *ephexis* (suspension of judgment) in interpretation. Thus, Nietzsche's position is not that of an atheist about truth

(“there is no truth, since there are hidden things-in-themselves to which our beliefs could never correspond”), as has often been supposed, but that of a principled agnostic. Finally, after making the case for Nietzsche’s use of this skeptical mode of reasoning, I expand on what is distinctly ‘Greek’ about Nietzsche’s skepticism by exploring *via* his interest in the pre-Platonic philosopher Democritus of Abdera (who is sometimes included as one of the earliest influences on the skeptical tradition) the connections between Nietzsche’s epistemology and his ethics. The Pyrrhonists forge a strong connection between what we believe and how we live, how healthy we are as human creatures; Nietzsche, I argue, has exactly the same ends in view.

The last two chapters of the book should be of the broadest philosophical interest. In one, I will defend my interpretation against an important objection—the *prima facie* incompatibility between skepticism and naturalism, both of which I attribute to Nietzsche. Here I will draw upon my presentation of this crucial argument at a workshop on ‘Nietzsche and Naturalism’ sponsored by the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study. In the final chapter, I will demonstrate some of the philosophical merits of this version of skepticism on its own terms, which will strengthen the case for reading Nietzsche on the model of the Pyrrhonian skeptics and underscore the importance of understanding his epistemological views to the project of reading his moral philosophy properly. It would be useful to be able to show, for example, how Nietzsche’s position reveals the internal instability of views like one recently defended by Walter Sinnott-Armstrong (2006) in *Moral Scepticisms*: While Sinnott-Armstrong advances a recognizably Pyrrhonian account of the level at which our moral claims may be said to lack justification, his conclusion that we may nevertheless be entitled to maintain our conventional and pre-established views about right and wrong leaves intact systems of moral belief and practice that Nietzsche diagnoses as pernicious and unhealthy—a betrayal of the ethical aims of the very skeptics who inspire Sinnott-Armstrong’s position.

My primary task during this semester of grant support will be to complete the research for and produce a draft of this final chapter. I will devote the first eight to ten weeks of the grant period to research, engaging the contemporary literature on skepticism and moral philosophy in order to characterize Nietzsche’s views in terms most relevant for the current debate and stake out in Nietzschean terms a position in epistemology and moral psychology that I hope will interest readers beyond this immediate area of specialization. During the next six to eight weeks, I will bring the results of this research together and draft the chapter. Since this is roughly the pace at which each of the other seven chapters has been researched and drafted, I am confident that a teaching release of this duration will afford me the opportunity to bring this chapter to completion. In the remaining time, I will also be able to make significant progress toward carrying the drafts of these eight chapters to final copy, bridging the gaps between chapters, eliminating overlap between one and another (where, for instance, each free-standing article has required its own broad-strokes account of the relevant features of Pyrrhonism, I will here be able to devote an introductory chapter to their thorough discussion), and strengthening those arguments to which I have been able to entertain objections and comments from colleagues and reviewers over the years. A manuscript version of *Nietzsche and the Ancient Skeptical Tradition* has been solicited by one academic press, and a proposal for the book is currently under review at another. That the book has an audience is clear. An NEH grant for the spring will allow me to deliver to that audience in the timeliest fashion a persuasive, novel, and provocative reading of Nietzsche’s philosophy.

Project Bibliography:
'Nietzsche and the Ancient Skeptical Tradition'

In addition to primary texts in Nietzsche (published and unpublished in 'Sämtliche Werke, Kritische Studienausgabe', ed. by Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980)), and in Hellenistic philosophy (particularly Sextus Empiricus and Diogenes Laertius) the following works are among those important to my project:

- Anderson, R. Lanier. 1998. "Truth and Objectivity in Perspectivism," *Synthese* 115: 1-32.
- Annas, Julia and Jonathan Barnes. 1985. *The Ten Modes of Scepticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Barnes, Jonathan. 1986. "Nietzsche and Diogenes Laertius," *Nietzsche-Studien* 15: 16-40.
- Bett, Richard. 2000a. "Nietzsche on the Sceptics and Nietzsche as Sceptic," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 82: 62-86.
- Bett, Richard. 2000b. *Pyrrho, his Antecedents, and his Legacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Breazeale, Daniel (ed. and trans.). 1979. *Philosophy and Truth: Selections from Nietzsche's Notebooks of the Early 1870's* (New Jersey: Humanities Press).
- Burnyeat, Myles (ed.). 1983. *The Skeptical Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Burnyeat, Myles and Michael Frede. 1997. *The Original Sceptics: A Controversy* (Indianapolis: Hackett).
- Clark, Maudemarie. 1984. "On 'Truth and Lie in the Extra-Moral Sense'," *International Studies in Philosophy* 16(2): 57-65.
- Clark, Maudemarie. 1990. *Nietzsche on Truth and Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Cox, Christoph. 1999. *Nietzsche: Naturalism and Interpretation* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Dannhauser, Werner J. 1974. *Nietzsche's View of Socrates* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Danto, Arthur. 1965. *Nietzsche as Philosopher* (New York: Macmillan).
- Fogelin, Robert J. 1994. *Pyrrhonian Reflections on Knowledge and Justification* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Grimm, Ruediger H. 1977. *Nietzsche's Theory of Knowledge* (Berlin: de Gruyter).
- Hales, Steven and Rex Welshon. 2000. *Nietzsche's Perspectivism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press).
- Hankinson, R.J. 1995. *The Sceptics* (London: Routledge).
- Leiter, Brian. 2002. *Nietzsche on Morality* (London: Routledge).
- Long, Anthony A. and David N. Sedley. 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, vols. 1 and 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Nehamas, Alexander. 1985. *Nietzsche: Life as Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- Porter, James. 2000a. *The Invention of Dionysus: An Essay on The Birth of Tragedy* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Porter, James. 2000b. *Nietzsche and the Philology of the Future* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Richardson, John. 2002. *Nietzsche's System* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Richardson, John and Brian Leiter (eds.). 2001. *Nietzsche* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Schacht, Richard (ed.). 1994. *Nietzsche, Genealogy, Morality* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Schlechta, Karl. 1948. *Der junge Nietzsche und das klassische Altertum* (Mainz: F. Kupferberg).
- Schofield, Malcolm, Myles Burnyeat, and Jonathan Barnes (eds.). 1980. *Doubt and Dogmatism: Studies in Hellenistic Epistemology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter. 2006. *Moral Scepticisms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Solomon, Robert C. (ed.). 1973. *Nietzsche: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press).
- Solomon, Robert C. and Kathleen M. Higgins (eds.). 1988. *Reading Nietzsche* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Tejera, Victorino. 1987. *Nietzsche and Greek Thought* (Dordrecht: M. Nijhoff).
- Unger, Peter. 1975. *Ignorance: A Case for Scepticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Whitman, James. 1986. "Nietzsche in the Magisterial Tradition of German Classical Philology," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 47: 453-68.
- Wilcox, John. 1974. *Truth and Value in Nietzsche* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).
- Wilkerson, Dale. 2006. *Nietzsche And the Greeks* (New York: Continuum).
- Williams, Michael. 1988. "Scepticism Without Theory," *Review of Metaphysics* 41: 547-88.

Tips for writing a successful grant application

Prepare

- Don't wait until the last minute. Register with grants.gov well ahead of time.
- Read the guidelines for the program to which you're applying. They will tell you what is eligible and what's not, and what an application should contain.
- The web page for each program includes sample applications. Don't take those as models, but as examples of how someone else made the case for her/his project.
- Contact NEH staff with questions. Contact information is on each program web page. For some programs staff will read and comment on draft applications.

Make your case

- The guidelines will tell you the criteria by which your application will be evaluated. Your application should make a case for how your application meets those criteria.
- For most NEH programs, the most important criterion is the project's *significance*. Tell your readers why your project is important. Who should read your work? How will it change the field?
- Locate your project in a larger scholarly context. Know the literature, issues, questions, and controversies on your topic. How are you building on and/or challenging the work of other scholars in your area?
- Especially for early-stage projects, discuss the questions at the heart of your project.
- For dissertation revision projects, explain how the planned book moves beyond the dissertation.
- Provide a realistic time line and work plan. What chapters will be written? What archives will you visit and for what kinds of materials?
- If you're proposing a book, describe its parts/chapters. Make sure the individual parts/chapters hold together.
- Remember, panelists won't read your application as a bunch of parts, they will read it as a whole. Find ways to strengthen the ties between parts. Understand how your parts work together.

Think about your audience

- Your application will be read by both specialists and generalists. You will need to persuade both groups that your project is important and that you know what you're doing.
- Make it easy for your readers #1. Write clearly and concisely. Avoid language that is too abstract, unclear, or jargon laden. Define concepts and terminology.

- Make it easy for your readers #2. If you know from the criteria that panelists will be interested in “significance,” make it easy for them to find “significance” in your narrative.
- Make it easy for your readers #3. Don’t leave it to panelists to “figure it out.” Do the interpretive work for them.
- Balance the abstract and the particular. Tell readers why your project is important, but also provide examples. This goes double for projects that are predominantly theoretical.
- Show panelists that you know what you’re doing. Describe your planned methods and sources. Tell them why you are using those particular theories or case studies.
- Anticipate your readers’ concerns and address them.
- After your application is drafted, ask yourself what kind of narrative the panelist will put together about YOU and YOUR PROJECT. Reading your cv and narrative, will panelists understand how you’ve arrived at your project? Do they know where you will be in your proposed project when the grant starts? Have you explained what you will do during the grant period? And is it clear when you anticipate completing your project? This narrative is important to panelists when they meet to discuss your application.

Details, details, details

- What separates the Excellent applications from the Very Good applications is often the attention to details.
- Ask colleagues (not friends), both inside and outside your field, to read a draft application.
- Make sure your bibliography is up to date, and it gives a good “snapshot” of your project.
- Proofread your work. Panelists do not expect adherence to a particular style (i.e. MLA, Chicago) but they do expect a well-executed narrative.
- Make sure your references know what you expect them to do; make sure they have the evaluation criteria and a copy of your application; check to make sure they submit their letters.
- If you don’t succeed, ask for feedback and try again.
- If you have already applied and been turned down, remember that panels are constructed anew each year.

Information on NEH grant opportunities, subscribing to our Twitter field, etc. can be found at www.neh.gov

If you get stumped along the way, contact someone at NEH for help.