

## Introduction

### *A New Field?*

SIMON COLEMAN AND ROSALIND I. J. HACKETT

The anthropological study of Pentecostalism and evangelicalism (P/e)<sup>1</sup> has undergone a striking transformation in recent years. In the 1980s, when the editors of this volume were beginning their careers, it was still seen as relatively unusual for an anthropologist to focus on *any* form of Christianity, let alone Protestantism. For much of the twentieth century, fieldworkers might have been very aware of the presence of missions where they carried out research, but they often saw these proselytizing Christians as background “noise”—sometimes deeply irritating noise—distorting their attempts to concentrate on what they saw as more authentic, local expressions of culture. Ethnographers visited the same regions where colonial officials and Western missionary churches had worked, but liked to think of themselves as engaged in a fundamentally different enterprise to either: listening rather than dictating to informants, and translating ways of life rather than attempting to transform them.

Nowadays, however, the anthropology of Christianity is a burgeoning subfield, reflecting a growth that has undoubtedly been led in its early stages by hugely increased interest in P/e. Many of the old ambivalences remain, but such Christians are beginning to be understood to represent far more than cultural noise, and to raise questions of key anthropological significance. The chapters of this book reflect such a shift in disciplinary focus. They are written by scholars whose careers trace the intellectual transformation we are describing: some contributors have been writing on Christianity over the past two to three decades, whereas others represent just a few of a newer generation of scholars whose intellectual development has emerged in and through the paradigm shift that

we are sketching out. The authors come from different intellectual traditions within anthropology—British, Dutch, French, German, North American.<sup>2</sup> To some degree, then, we see this book as indicating a “coming of age” of anthropological studies of P/e, embodying a period when we can reflect back on what has been achieved so far, but also indicate what needs to be done.

Why, however, has such a paradigm shift begun to occur? The answers tell us about changes within both P/e and anthropology, and the combined histories of both. One set of reasons lies in developments within Christianity itself. Many social scientific scholars of the contemporary world—though not, in general, anthropologists—have spent much of the past century predicting the disappearance of religion in the West and possibly elsewhere; however, P/e (along with other expanding religious forces such as Islam) has proved capable of resisting secular forms of modernity and of thriving in environments characterized by global markets, cultural pluralism, industrialization and postindustrialization, mass migration, and the explosion of the mass media. Furthermore, an apparent shift in gravity in the weight and authority of Christianity has become increasingly evident. Lamin Sanneh (2013, xiv) tells us that in 1950, 80 percent of the world’s Christians lived in Europe and North America; but by 2005 the vast majority of the world’s two billion Christians lived in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In line with such developments, the long-standing assumption that resources, prestige, and decision making would mostly emanate from liberal, Euro-American contexts has been replaced by recognition that powerful centers of religion have increasingly been “Southernized,” rooted more and more in the Majority World, in regions such as Latin America or West Africa.<sup>3</sup> A notable example of such a shift came from a well-known secular source, the pages of *Newsweek*: in 2008 the magazine named Enoch Adeboye, Nigerian head of the Pentecostal Redeemed Christian Church of God, one of the fifty most powerful people in the world.<sup>4</sup>

Arguably, then, the cultural noise from P/e has become too loud for anthropologists to ignore, reinforced by these Christians’ use of media technology and well-resourced missionary activities (Hackett 1998, 2012). But the shift in focus also indicates significant transformations within anthropology. The discipline retains its interest in the everyday details of life, but it has become difficult to sustain an older vision of an-

thropology as studying bounded cultures that can be analyzed without reference to much wider scales and spheres of reference (Coleman and von Hellermann 2010). Nor can one invoke the “ethnographic present” nowadays in naïve fashion without acknowledging the inherently shifting, historical, dynamic character of all cultural forms. These changes in the way that anthropology frames its research have been accompanied by the realization that sharp distinctions between “home” (where anthropologists live, teach, and write) and “the field” (where they gather data) are collapsing, as is the idea that anthropology is predominantly carried out by Western scholars in non-Western contexts. Thus Christianity in Euro-America is increasingly coming under scrutiny. There is also more awareness that anthropology must be seen as a discipline with a particular cultural as well as intellectual history, and one where a Christian heritage has had considerable influence in its understandings of culture, humanity, and religion.<sup>5</sup>

These observations about the changing shape and focus of anthropology are not new: they have been debated extensively since at least the 1980s. Our point is that they indicate some of the reasons why P/e has now become recognized by anthropologists as an exciting field of study. If anthropology in a world of accelerating globalization becomes interested in the links between different scales of analysis, in understanding how localities require work to be sustained rather than simply reproducing themselves, in seeing how informants develop their own theories of culture contact and culture change, then P/e comes into focus as a vital field of research.

Fascinating epistemological ambiguities, moral quandaries, and analytical challenges are created by such developments. Ethnographers have always worried about how to understand others’ religion—this is typically called the “insider-outsider” problem—but such questions are often compounded in research on Christianity, given that it has been such a significant contributor to the history of Western thought despite the avowed secularity of many Euro-American ethnographers. Fenella Cannell (2006, 20), for instance, assesses the ways Protestant thought has been linked to ideas of the interior self as well as to ideas of the modern Western person. Furthermore, members of P/e often maintain their own, strongly held understandings of why an anthropologist has come to work amongst them: the fieldworker may explain that s/he has

come to gather social scientific data, but informants may be equally convinced that God has sent *this* person to them and that it is their duty to convert someone who seems so keen to ask questions and participate in worship. Such encounters indicate the complex power dynamic involved in the study of P/e: older, paternalistic assumptions about giving oppressed peoples a voice gain little traction in encounters where informants have the confidence and motivation to redefine the ethnographic relationship on their own terms and through their own narratives. Such encounters also raise tricky methodological and ethical questions for secular fieldworkers: how far *should* they go in participating in as well as observing P/e worship practices? Is it all right to sing a hymn, but not appropriate to pray? Elaine Lawless (1992) has expressed parallel worries in her work on Pentecostal women preachers in Missouri: how should she reconcile her growing intimacy with a friend who also happens to be an informant, and one with ethical views so different from her own?

So far we have assumed that the anthropologist of P/e is likely to be secular. Again, this is too simple a preconception. Some members of the discipline either have been or still are practicing Christians (or are members of another tradition). In addition, the process of carrying out ethnography can take the fieldworker close to feeling that his/her identity has been taken over, however temporarily, by a P/e view of the world. In a famous piece, the anthropologist Susan Harding notes how her fieldwork interview with a Baptist pastor left her somewhat dazed, caught up in the language of her interlocutor, so that “I began to acquire the knowledge and vision and sensibilities, to share the experience, of a believer” (1987, 178; see also Harding 2000). Vincent Crapanzano also describes his unease at having an evangelist in Los Angeles questioning him astutely about his beliefs: “He caught me off guard and offered me no escape for more than four hours” (2000, 83).

Equally importantly, we might ask whether, from a social scientific point of view, it is reasonable to assume that there is a single, stable barrier that divides believer from nonbeliever. It is true that important research on P/e congregations has argued that believers learn specific ways to recognize signs of divine action in their lives (Luhmann 2012). We add, however, that members of the same congregation may relate to common symbols and rituals in varied ways, and indeed differently

at different times. There is also the tricky question of how culture in a broader sense relates to religion. As Brian Howell, an anthropologist at the evangelical Wheaton College, notes,

My own experience, and I think our common sense, tells us that two people identifying as Christians, one from North America and one from, say, the northern Philippines, do not share as much “culturally” as would the North American Christian and his or her secular neighbor, regardless of how “orthodox” the beliefs of the Filipino and secularized the identity of the non-Christian North American. (2007, 374)

The dividing line between a person’s past biography as religious believer and present status as academic nonbeliever can also be fascinatingly ambiguous. Michael Warner, currently professor of English literature and American studies at Yale University, recalls his youth growing up in a family that moved restlessly between congregations. He begins his piece by stating, “I was a teenage Pentecostalist” (2004, 215), but it might seem that Warner has traveled about as far as he can from his childhood—intellectually, culturally, spiritually, linguistically. He now characterizes himself as “a queer atheist intellectual” (215). However, he asks whether one’s former self can go away quite so easily, even among “us who once were found and now are lost” (216). Thus, despite its use of the past tense, Warner’s opening confession closely echoes Pentecostal testimony—a public declaration of personal religious conviction. The language of the pious youth seems to live on in the apparently secular adult. And perhaps the rupture between being secular and born-again, lost and saved—so much a part of the rhetoric of much radical Protestant culture—need not be quite as stark as we might have thought, even at levels beyond individual experience.

So we are beginning to learn about the uneasy but sometimes inevitable conjoining of academic, cultural, and P/e worlds. We also see how, in certain respects, anthropology has been subject to some of the same cultural and social forces as P/e in recent years. Our authors come from different religious backgrounds, and most would probably define themselves as agnostic or atheist in religious orientation. However, anthropological research always involves a fascinating kind of alchemy, a transformational blending of subject and object, discipline and case

study. This book attempts to illustrate the power and the potential of such alchemy.

## Defining Terms

In considering the difficulties of giving precise definitions of Pentecostalism and evangelicalism, we are tempted to quote the anthropologist Roy Wagner: “The things we can define best are the things least worth defining” (1981, 39; see Engelke and Tomlinson 2006, 8). Many of the people who are generally regarded by analysts as coming under the rubric of P/e would reject dry, academic terms as ways to describe their religious experience and sense of personal identification with God. Even among scholars, very different approaches are evident. It is common at academic conferences to hear the argument that the defining characteristic of a Pentecostalist must ultimately be the ability to speak in tongues. Such an apparently simple and clear approach has its initial attractions, and yet should also give us pause. How should we deal with believers who have spoken in tongues in the past, but have not done so for years? At what point would they cease to be classifiable as “genuinely” Pentecostalist? And what kind of tongues would qualify? Only that which involves syllables with no ready counterpart in any known language (*glossolalia*—described by St. Paul in I Corinthians 12–14)? What would we make of the (rarer) case of *xenoglossia*: the speaking of a recognized language, but one that is not consciously known by the speaker? And how should we classify somebody who is a fluent tongues speaker and yet is radically opposed to much of the theology of the congregation to which he or she belongs? Perhaps one-dimensional and rigid characterizations are not very helpful after all.

But we have to start somewhere. The word “Pentecostal” derives from a Greek term meaning “fiftieth” and points to the Christian festival of Pentecost (also called Whitsunday), which occurs fifty days after Easter Sunday. The festival corresponds with the Jewish celebration of Shavuot, a commemoration of the day that God gave the Torah to the Israelites on Mount Sinai; it also marks the event, described in the New Testament, of the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Apostles, when “they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance” (Acts 2:6, KJV). As André Corten and

Ruth Marshall-Fratani put it (2001, 5), we see here a scriptural template for the contemporary Pentecostal desire to “reach a fusional relationship with God, in which the individual’s praise and prayers may reach Him unmediated even by language.”

“Classical” Pentecostalism is commonly associated with outbreaks of glossolalia in the United States in the early part of the twentieth century (as well as with earlier, Methodist roots [Martin 2002, 7–9]). In 1901 Agnes Ozman, a student of Charles Parham’s Bethel Bible School in Topeka, Kansas, is reported to have spoken in tongues;<sup>6</sup> subsequently, another student of Parham called William Seymour, a black pastor and son of former slaves, led a congregation based in Azusa Street, Los Angeles, which in 1906 began to experience similar miraculous events. Seymour’s congregation attracted considerable attention from the press and fellow Christians, much of it deeply skeptical, but it was remarkable for its interracial character. It also seems to have acted as an international catalyst for the spread of the movement, which soon split up into different groups. Allan Anderson (2013, 2) notes that Pentecostalism had reached perhaps fifty different nations within its first decade. In fact, the very idea, even the rhetoric, of global expansion has now become part of many Pentecostals’ self-image. It is possible that the number of adherents had climbed to over 600 million by 2010, constituting a quarter of the world’s Christian population, though this estimate may well be inflated (Anderson 2013, 2).

The beginnings of Pentecostalism illustrate what was to become a characteristic desire to bypass the details of ecclesiastical history not only by establishing a direct relationship with the Early Church and with scripture, but also by placing a high value on the cultivation of powerful religious experience. Tongues and other spiritual gifts such as healing and prophecy were used to reenact the Acts of the Apostles.<sup>7</sup> Spiritual more than earthly authority was to be respected. After all, the first figures who “spoke” the movement into existence—a modest white woman and a black pastor—were certainly not representatives of any ecclesiastical elite.

At the same time, Pentecostalism is perhaps too slippery a movement to be confined in our interpretations to single origins in the United States. The venerable historian of Pentecostalism Walter Hollenweger (e.g., 1997) has emphasized the African roots of some of its worship

styles. Another distinguished chronicler, Allan Anderson (2004, 35), argues that religious revivals occurring not only in different parts of Europe but also in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the nineteenth century helped to lay the ground for the spread of Pentecostal practices.<sup>8</sup> Jean DeBernardi's chapter in this volume indicates very clearly the difficulties in attributing single places of origin to Spirit-filled religion. In any case, a movement or set of movements was being put in motion that could spread through shifting, expansive social networks and through a ritual "grammar" consisting of asserting the need to be born again, belief in the tangible results of prayer, focus on praise and worship, powerful sermons expecting direct responses from congregations, democratic exercise of gifts of the Spirit, frequent use of the "altar call" toward the end of the service (encouraging people to come up to the front to receive salvation or healing), the assumption that we are entering the "end-times" before the return of Jesus to the world,<sup>9</sup> and a valuing of ritual spontaneity over fixed liturgy or organizational hierarchy.

Of course, even a common grammar is eminently capable of producing quarrels over boundaries, especially given the chronic tendencies of Pentecostals to break off from established groupings to create new alliances and networks. Bitter disputes have been evident over such matters as the timing and character of God's grace and spiritual baptism, and over the extent to which maintaining piety and personal holiness is consonant with enjoying material luxury. Racial divisions have marked some parts of the movement for much of its history. Although historically American and European ministries have had considerable influence around the world, other groups in parts of Africa and countries such as Chile and Brazil have asserted their national independence.<sup>10</sup> While some congregations have remained autonomous, others have formed large denominations or allied themselves with fellowships of broadly like-minded Christians. As Anderson puts it,

"Pentecostalism" has been used to embrace large movements as widely diverse as the celibacy-practicing Pentecostal mission in India, the Saturday-Sabbath keeping . . . True Jesus Church in China, the uniform-wearing, highly ritualistic Zion Christian Church in Southern Africa, and Brazil's equally enormous, prosperity-oriented Universal Church of the Kingdom of God. (2013, 4)

Beyond classical Pentecostals, “neo-Pentecostal” churches have developed in recent decades, often taking on what is called “megachurch” status (by maintaining congregations of more than two thousand people) and frequently proving attractive to middle-class as well as working-class populations. The largest congregation in the world, Yoido Full Gospel Church, located in Seoul, South Korea, emerged in the late 1950s out of the Assemblies of God, and now claims over a million members while preaching a variant of the Prosperity Gospel—the idea, increasingly popular among some believers, that links the possession of faith with the ability to attract good health and material well-being (see, e.g., Bowler 2013; Coleman 2000; Hackett 1995; Marti 2008).

Meanwhile, “charismatic” is a term often used by scholars to refer to yet another variant in this religious landscape, namely, those Christians who practice spiritual gifts but retain their membership in older, established denominations. Elements of the grammar we described above have proved highly transferable to Catholic as well as Protestant congregations, as Thomas J. Csordas’s chapter in this book illustrates. Some commentators claim that the emergence of classical Pentecostalism represents a “first wave” of revivalist history, while the “second wave” is constituted by the diffusion of Pentecostal and charismatic ideas to many Christians since the 1970s or so. According to this logic, the “third wave” of revival refers to the diffuse and dynamic growth of independent, broadly Holy Spirit–led churches that we see emerging in many parts of the contemporary world.<sup>11</sup> Such churches, we should note, often emerge in places where there has already been a long tradition of P/e mission, so that they may constitute something of a revival of a revival.

What, then, of evangelicalism? The word derives from Greek terms that, combined, mean “good news” (“gospel”). Mark Noll notes that at the time of the European Reformation in the sixteenth century it was broadly equivalent to Protestant (2004, 421), while the most common use of the term refers to revival movements of the eighteenth century onwards, initially based in Europe and North America and then spreading more globally. The word therefore encompasses movements such as Baptism, Lutheranism, Methodism, Presbyterianism, some streams within Anglicanism, and so on; occasionally—when used in its very broadest sense—it may also encompass Pentecostal and charismatic Christians.

Probably the most widely cited attempt to characterize evangelicalism has been produced by the British historian David Bebbington, who isolates four key and interlinked features (1989; Noll 2004, 422). We summarize these as follows:

1. Conversionism, implying the conviction that humans need to be turned away from sin and toward belief in God.
2. Biblicism, meaning that the Christian should see scripture as the ultimate guide in life, encouraging a close relationship to sacred text and potentially implying skepticism toward “merely” human traditions and institutions.
3. Activism, indicating the need to work at a number of levels, ranging from social reform to spreading the “Good News” and its associated salvation to others. In the United States and elsewhere, evangelicals have sometimes been deeply involved in politics, historically playing significant roles in Prohibition and the antislavery movement and more recently becoming involved in debates over the teaching of evolution in schools and legal frameworks surrounding abortion.
4. Crucicentrism, literally “cross-centered,” expressing the notion that Christian existence is focused on Christ’s death and subsequent resurrection; through his sacrifice, Christ is said to have paid the price for human sins, so that spiritual life is available to those who accept his atoning work.

As with Pentecostalism, these characteristics might be seen as constituting a “grammar” that takes varied expression in real-life communities. Evangelicals also clearly overlap with Pentecostal practices in their mistrust of fixed and hierarchical liturgies, emphasis on the need to proselytize, desire to develop a “personal relationship” with God and scripture, and distinctions between those who have and those who have not given themselves to Christ. While, as noted, evangelicalism is therefore sometimes used as a blanket term for activist, Reformed Protestants, it may also be distinguished from other revivalist orientations. Most evangelicals do not emphasize baptism in the Holy Spirit in the same way as Pentecostals, for instance. Meanwhile, fundamentalism emerged in the United States at roughly the same time as Pentecostal-

ism in opposition to what it saw as liberal tendencies within established American denominations, and thus reemphasized the need to “go back” to viewing the Bible as an infallible, literally true, and all-encompassing text.

The dividing line between fundamentalists and evangelicals can be a difficult one to draw, depending on ecclesiastical and cultural context. In Germany, for instance, *Evangelische* is a very broad term used to refer to a wide variety of Reformed churches, while in Hispanic contexts *evangélico* may refer to virtually any non-Catholic Christian.<sup>12</sup> Hunter (1987, 4), describing the American context, sees fundamentalism as “a faction *within* Evangelicalism and not a movement *distinct from* Evangelicalism.” Famously, George Marsden (1980, 235) has defined a fundamentalist as “an evangelical who is mad about something.” However, significant American figures such as Jerry Falwell (1933–2007) have been adamant in stating that they are fundamentalist *rather* than evangelical. We might ask, with David Goodhew (2013, 231–32), just how “angry” a believer has to be in order to be classified as fundamentalist. We might also worry with him that it has become a profoundly pejorative “f-word” in some circles, even as we understand that boundary formation has been a central, dynamic element in the identity of believers such as Falwell in their crusades against secular humanism and liberalism.

At least in the United States from the 1930s on, self-identified fundamentalists and many conservative evangelicals engaged in a relatively low-key consolidation of networks that provided parallel educational and communications institutions to those of mainstream society. They were therefore in a strong position to react when both the opportunity and the desire to reenter political and other public realms became ever more apparent from the 1960s in North America and elsewhere (Coleman 2000, 2011a). A world-renowned evangelist, Billy Graham, had already become the “preacher to the presidents” in America.<sup>13</sup> From the 1970s and 1980s, members of some of the more conservative evangelical and fundamentalist denominations and churches cooperated through such political lobbying groups as the Moral Majority, Religious Roundtable, and Christian Voice, in opposition to “secular humanism.” Beyond the United States, analysts began to wonder whether the power of evangelicals could displace the hegemony of the Catholic Church in large parts of Latin America (Stoll 1991; see also, e.g., Martin 1990, 2002).

However, both evangelicalism and its study continue to evolve, and some of the most interesting current work examines believers whose relationship to more conservative political and worship stances is one of considerable ambivalence (Bielo 2011; Elisha 2011; compare also Miller 1999).

In this section we hope to have provided you with some background orientations, without drowning you in detail. We suggest that the most effective next step is for you to work inductively—as anthropologists tend to do—by seeing how these terms play out in practice in the case studies contained in this book. After all, life worlds have a habit of confounding definitions. One useful way to think about any example of P/e comes from the anthropologist Rodney Needham’s description of “polythetic classification” (1975).<sup>14</sup> By this term, Needham essentially means that a polythetic class is defined by having a number of *possible* characteristics; while any given example of that class will contain a certain minimal number of those characteristics, it need not contain all of them. Different examples will therefore have certain similarities, certain family resemblances, but will not be identical. In this sense, the term “P/e” is itself useful because it not only points to these as sometimes separate religious orientations, but also indicates their frequent overlaps and parallels.

### P/e, the Anthropology of P/e, and the Anthropology of Christianity

Important anthropological studies of Christianity have appeared before the current burst of research. For instance, Catholicism played a significant part of the context of work on “honor and shame” in the culture of the Mediterranean (Peristiany 1966). Accounts of churches in colonial and postcolonial contexts included J. D. Y. Peel’s celebrated work *Aladura* (1968), an analysis of independent churches among the Yoruba of Nigeria, as well as Jean Comaroff and John Comaroff’s (e.g., 1991, 1997, 2000; see also Comaroff 1985) well-known studies of the past and present impacts of relations among Christian mission, colonialism, and resistance in South Africa. Victor Turner and Edith Turner’s *Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture* (1978) was both a pathbreaking study of pilgrimage and an attempt to characterize Christian (especially Catholic) culture across different sites.

However, it is only within the last fifteen years that the anthropological study of Christianity has become a marked subfield, with its own specialists, commonly recurring themes, and growing literature. As we have suggested already, the *recognition* of Christianity as a proper object of study had to overcome some opposition. In his important article “What Is a Christian? Notes toward an Anthropology of Christianity,” Joel Robbins argues (2003, 193), “Neither real others nor real comrades, Christians wherever they are found make anthropologists recoil by unsettling the fundamental schemes by which the discipline organizes the world into the familiar and the foreign.” A 1991 essay by Susan Harding had already described how scholars saw Christian fundamentalists as “the repugnant cultural other,” while in the introduction to her edited book *The Anthropology of Christianity*, Fenella Cannell (2006, 4) referred to Christianity functioning as the “repressed” of anthropology during the formation of the discipline, as part of its attempts to differentiate itself from theology.<sup>15</sup>

Adapting the work of another anthropologist of religion, Mary Douglas (1966), we might say that P/e functioned for years as a taboo object, constituting cultural matter “out of place” for the discipline precisely because it inhabited borders between categories that had been kept apart: self and other, local and “global,” home and abroad, anthropology and theology. As Douglas notes, such matter is both threatening and powerful precisely *because* it breaks down or challenges previously established boundaries. But we have seen how the study of P/e has followed a fascinating trajectory, from being ignored or suppressed because of its anomalous character to actually being highlighted for its powerful, boundary-breaking orientations. In effect, it has become ethnographic matter that is now much more “in place” because it now appeals to a discipline that is changing its own forms and boundaries. P/e has become “good to think with.”

Our argument is reinforced when we look at the direction that much of the newer P/e literature has taken so far. Work has been carried out on belief and conversion,<sup>16</sup> diasporas,<sup>17</sup> gender (sometimes linked with ethnicity),<sup>18</sup> language,<sup>19</sup> materiality and media,<sup>20</sup> personhood,<sup>21</sup> and numerous intersections with economic and political practice;<sup>22</sup> but one of the key theoretical tropes so far—and one that has in fact encompassed many of the topics mentioned—has revolved around the question of

“rupture.” What is meant by this term? In one sense, it has referred to the question of whether P/e has caused fundamental transformations in the societies and cultures that it has encountered. We have already mentioned the issue of whether Latin America is being “turned” away from Catholicism by evangelicals who are promoting a new, politically oriented Protestant ethic, but the notion of rupture has had still wider implications, suggesting that in various ways encounters with P/e have facilitated the shift of populations toward radically new forms of self-conception and practice involving engagement with “modernity” and rejection of past customs. Thus Peter van der Veer’s (1996) important edited volume explores links between conversion and modern notions of personhood (see also Hann 2007, 391). Bialecki, Haynes, and Robbins (2008, 1149) note that discussions of Pentecostalism in Africa have emphasized its role in severing kinship ties and traditional economic obligations, thus freeing believers to participate more “freely” in market economies (Meyer 1999; van Dijk 1999). Such freedom takes on Weberian implications as conversion seemingly shifts the person’s “obligation away from lateral [horizontal] social bonds among consociates towards dyadic [and more vertical] bonds between the individual and the divine” (Bialecki, Haynes, and Robbins 2008, 1147).

We can see why Robbins (2004b, 127; also 2004a, 2007) talks of Pentecostal and charismatic Christianity’s “cult of discontinuity.” Furthermore, such transformations can be seen as occurring at different scales, ranging from the individual’s sense of becoming born again, to the conversion of particular ethnic or social groups, to society-wide shifts in attitudes in relation to tradition (Hefner 1993). Indeed, Robbins (2004b) argues that the emphasis on discontinuity plays an important role in the ways that such Christianity globalizes, as it pits itself against aspects of “local” culture while also accepting the reality of already existing spiritual forces. This use of locally meaningful idioms for talking about—and reclassifying—the past and thus continuing ritual engagement with local spirits not only distinguishes such Christianity from other forms, but also allows it to imply different things in different places: its ruptures may involve denial of kin relations, challenging the power of the elders, and so on (Robbins 2004b, 129).<sup>23</sup> Thus “even as it absorbs local content,” it “maintains its globally recognizable shape as a struggle between the divine and the demonic” (129).

For our purposes, what is most striking is how the very imagery of rupture, of breaking from one state or category to another, speaks to how *anthropologists* as well as believers operate. Remember our use of Douglas's work to discuss how the analysis of P/e redraws cherished anthropological boundaries. In *temporal* terms, a perspective that draws on P/e to demonstrate cultural and religious discontinuity challenges ideas of the ethnographic present and assumptions anthropologists have had that, even under new circumstances, people tend to maintain the worldviews that they were first socialized into. In *cultural* terms, it asks how ethnographers of "local" culture are to deal with a heterogeneous and volatile religious orientation that takes on globally recognizable characteristics. In *spatial* terms, it forces the analyst to consider using "multi-sited" ethnography to capture the ways P/e often connects people from different parts of the world through use of mass media, religious imagination, and ritual events.<sup>24</sup> In *ethical* terms, it forces secular analysts to ask what they are to make of a cultural object that is powerful and may be pushing forms of change that they mistrust or find distasteful. Finally, in *epistemological* terms (i.e., those concerned with the nature and construction of knowledge), it upsets the traditional academic monopoly of anthropology itself, not only maintaining its own versions of truth but also sometimes using the very methods of anthropology to promote mission. One of us vividly remembers an ethnographic interview conducted in London with a member of the Redeemed Christian Church of God that concluded with the latter asking for advice on how to apply for master's courses in anthropology.

So there are good reasons why the notion of "rupture" (itself often associated with the idea of modernity) has cropped up so much in recent anthropological discussions of P/e. But the concept also has its limitations. To begin with, it should not tempt us into thinking that all converts somehow adopt similar visions of the modern world along with their adoption of Christianity. Equally problematically, it may encourage us to focus too much on one topic to the exclusion of others. As Cunniff has pointed out (2006, 38), "It may be that the history of modernity is inextricably bound up with the history of Christianity, but this does not mean that the meaning of Christianity is sufficiently explained by the history of modernity." Furthermore, in arguing that P/e consistently causes transformations in many parts of the world, we are assuming that

it has a coherence and influence that may be exaggerated. Ironically, despite the broad family resemblances that allow us to recognize P/e in different parts of the world, any strong assertion that P/e has an inherent and consistent cultural logic perhaps takes anthropologists closer to theology than they are likely to intend.<sup>25</sup> Very obviously, we need also to ask whether a focus on P/e has encouraged us to ignore the significance of Roman Catholicism and forms of Orthodoxy (Hann 2007, 403), with their own notions of temporality, salvation, materiality, and so on.

We end this section by suggesting that, just as three “waves” of P/e may be said to have emerged over the past century, so we might be able to discern three phases in its fate as an object of anthropological study.<sup>26</sup> The first phase refers to that period before a self-conscious anthropology of Christianity had been formed. Such work remained relatively rare and was not linked into a wider subfield or set of integrated conversations. The second phase has involved the recent formation of a subfield with its own dynamism, set of themes, and identity. This phase has allowed us to talk of the anthropology of Christianity as we might talk of the anthropology of Islam, in the knowledge that such subfields will have their own distinct conversations. The third phase, which may just be beginning, acknowledges the maturity and growth of the subfield, the sense that it is here to stay, but is beginning to branch out into new areas of research, including but also going beyond examinations of “rupture,” and starting to link the study of P/e with other, wider themes in the anthropological literature. We see this book as itself on the borders between the second and third phases that we describe here, and we suggest just a few of these potential new directions for the study of P/e in the conclusions to this introduction.

### Gathering the Book Together

If our volume can be located in the borderlands of the second and third phases of the anthropological study of P/e, then this position is reflected in the way it brings together pieces on both classic and newer areas of study of Pentecostalism and evangelicalism, at least for English-speaking academic contexts. It includes studies of the “epicenters” of these religious movements, such as the United States and Brazil, as well as research from scholars working in lesser-studied areas such as

Polynesia, Central, East, and Southeast Asia, and Lusophone Africa. These postcolonial and, in some cases, post-atheist contexts, at times fragile and insecure, reveal new conditions of possibility for Pentecostal and evangelical movements to take root and flourish. Even when more established P/e forms are the subject of some of the chapters in this book, the authors provide current data and fresh angles revealing a new interplay of “old” concepts, such as language and body, affect and power, prayer and politics.

A common concern of many of the chapters is to address the ambiguities, as well as the paradoxes, of this newer phase of P/e growth in their respective regions, often leading them to consider a reformulation of some of the assumptions about the parameters of these movements and their provenances. As might be expected in our study of this globalizing phenomenon, networks and networking feature prominently in the lives of P/e organizations and their members. Now empowered by modern media technologies, communities can become supercommunities; parachurch agencies and organizations can advertise and raise funds on a global scale; and individuals can communicate to their pastors, their headquarters, and fellow believers around the world.

Relatedly, another notable feature of this collection is the range of different scales and institutional forms for the expression of P/e—not just churches, but the whole spectrum from individual actors to cell groups to networks, popular culture, political and civic life, and so on. The concept of individualism, deriving from evangelical notions of salvation, looks very different when individuals are so transnationally interconnected via their P/e networks. In this regard, it is noteworthy that many of the contributors treat as central the idea of spatiality in their accounts of these movements, whether this is framed in terms of actual places or virtual spaces, centers or peripheries, emplacement or displacement, home territories or diasporic lands. Because nonchurch locations can be as important as churches themselves, we show P/e in dialogue with other areas of life—politics, economics, but also dieting, feminism, the city, music, and so forth. Again, many of the chapters demonstrate the blurring of public and private spheres in the activities of the newer generation of P/e movements, as much as the leaders (and perhaps some members too) seek to constitute discrete and distinctive organizations.

From the outset, we envisaged our primary audience as anthropological researchers and students whom we wanted to persuade that Pentecostalism and evangelicalism are productive and timely areas of inquiry—sometimes in ways that have not yet been fully explored. We remain intrigued by the way Pentecostalism and evangelicalism have indeed become much more popular topics of inquiry within anthropology, despite the ambivalent feelings, discussed above, that many anthropologists have had and in some cases still have toward these phenomena. This volume seeks to discuss and illustrate the specifically anthropological contribution to the topic, while also exploring some of the tensions and contradictions inherent in such contributions. For example, just one tension revolves around the ways such movements may present direct epistemological and moral challenges to the role and authority of the ethnographer as participant observer. We also seek to demonstrate to readers from other disciplines and/or nonanthropological analysts of these globalizing movements the merits of localized ethnographies (with an associated focus on language, embodiment, subjectivity, communities and networks, cultural practices, and so on). Several of our authors have long-term associations with the regions and movements that they study, allowing them to discern internal changes and multiple perspectives even after they have left the field.

To general readers, we recommend this work as an accessible resource on one of the most significant developments in contemporary Christianity. It provides an updated and diversified perspective on these increasingly influential religious movements. The chapters contain stories and vignettes from the authors' field experiences that bring alive the religious worlds of P/e but also serve as springboards for academic analysis. From these studies, readers will be exposed to a more multi-centered and multilateral perspective on P/e as it has expanded from its early twentieth-century roots in the United States.

We have not set out to present a single theoretical framework to “explain” the spread of P/e movements. Rather, our aim is to provide studies of the landscape of those movements in particular regions. Each author operates with a particular conceptual or theoretical focus, such as language, gender, generation, or politics and power, which in turn shapes the methodological emphasis. In addition to their field research, some contributors use historical and archival materials, while others turn to

mass and social media or popular culture. Just as the local movements are engaged by or in the translocal and transnational aspects of P/e, whether they are in the global north or global south, so too the researchers explore the dynamics of local and global interactions in their particular settings. Concomitantly, they reflect upon the possibilities and problems of comparison across movements, historical time periods, cultural settings, and geographical regions. For example, does the concept of the “individual” remain a viable comparative concept?

In several instances, in keeping with the methodological transparency of anthropology, our authors reflect critically on the challenges of conducting research on such a burgeoning field. Many of the P/e movements—driven by their conversionist impulses—are leaving their homelands to establish new diasporic communities, subsequently constituting new online networks to service their expanding virtual communities. These recent trends offer both logistical difficulties and opportunities for researchers. A new church website may be full of news and information, but will not reveal internal tensions in leadership or disagreements over public modes of representation. In sum, for present-day researchers on the globalizing phenomenon of P/e, skills of dexterity and multitasking are the order of the day.

We have therefore designed the book to provide both a geographical and an analytical map of Pentecostalism and evangelicalism. Moreover, it is intended to help readers navigate across a burgeoning field of study, as well as gain a sense of how it has been and is being constituted. Our four sections are designed to reflect key themes within the religious movements under study, but also to point us toward more generic issues in the anthropology of religion and the study of culture as a whole. Within sections, titles of chapters are meant to indicate some of the fundamental themes that readers might wish to reflect on in considering what makes up P/e, ranging from “Personhood” to “Prayer” to “Mediation,” and so on.

Both Pentecostalism and evangelicalism are frequently depicted as providing “dualistic” ways of viewing the world, engaging in forms of “spiritual warfare” to combat evil in the self, in others, in particular objects and locations, and across territories and cultures. The first section, “Moralizing the World,” asks how such general terms can be conceptualized and compared cross-culturally. How might they be refracted

through local notions of agency, spatiality, temporality, and causality? How do notions of the Spirit as well as demonologies relate to processes of social, cultural, and economic change? In the first chapter, Omri Elisha draws on his fieldwork on evangelical megachurches in Knoxville, Tennessee. Focusing on the social interactions and spiritual aspirations of a men's fellowship group, Elisha argues that these groups should not be read in solely individualistic terms, as only "reinforcing Protestant ethics of self-discipline and self-actualization." As his ethnographic involvement in evangelicalism as a lived religion reveals, evangelicals are taught to become involved in the spiritual and emotional lives of others and to allow such involvement by others. This emphasis on what he terms the "immersive sociality" of these relational networks and communities of practice thus challenges—without completely displacing—the long-standing popular and academic assumption that the values of evangelical theology are primarily individuating in their emphasis and effects.

Jean DeBernardi writes about the emplacement of evangelical and Pentecostal Christianity in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Singapore and Penang. Through archival and field research she is able to demonstrate the early indigenization of evangelism, through the agency of independent lay missionaries such as the Brethren and their Asian coworkers, and the creation of independent, locally led churches, whose revivalist impact was felt across Southeast Asia. She discusses how improved communication and travel facilitated this interconnected world for Christians, even in early modernity. She pays particular attention to the negotiations between local Christians and missionaries over the education and religious leadership of women, which led to the eventual transformation of gender roles in Asia.

Kristine Krause's chapter concerns how Pentecostal believers evaluate, sustain, and create moral geographies of their inner selves, their surroundings, and the wider world in their charismatic practices. She explores these practices based on fieldwork conducted with migrants from Ghana in London, but also on research in transnational Pentecostal networks of Ghanaian-founded churches based in Berlin and Hamburg. While her focus is on how moral subject positions are created in this "simultaneously universal and deeply personal" movement, she also emphasizes, as does Omri Elisha, that Pentecostal practices are inevi-

tably relational. Importantly, she proposes that the question of rupture that dominated the anthropological literature for quite some time needs to be reformulated in light of the diversification of the Pentecostal scene; for young Ghanaian migrants born into born-again families, the challenge is how to preserve these moral boundaries.

Pentecostalism and evangelicalism focus on the holy word as an instrument of both instruction and power. However, as becomes clear in our second section, “Language and Embodiment,” such a statement conceals the multiple ways words are articulated and understood by believers and embedded within nonverbal practices that question the divisions between scripture and orality, the written and the embodied. While the focus on language clearly overlaps with issues of transmission and mediation in the next section, the main emphasis in section 2 is on the links between bodily and linguistic practices in ritual and other contexts.

Drawing on his eight years of ethnographic engagement with the Vineyard, a hybrid evangelical/Pentecostal California-originated church planting movement (i.e., one that focuses on creating new local congregations), Jon Bialecki argues that by concentrating on affect, we can think about language and embodiment together without privileging either term. He defines affect as “the intensities and energies found in a particular moment or object that has consequences on others.” He shows how affect serves to structure both linguistic and embodied performance and suggests that Pentecostal/charismatic Christianity has been particularly successful in using heightened levels of affect to “expand, reinvigorate, and reconfigure individual and collective identities.” Tracing the “lines of affect,” he proposes, would develop greater appreciation for the growth of Pentecostalism and evangelicalism in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, as well as a greater theoretical understanding of broader religiosities.

Kelly H. Chong takes us to South Korea, renowned for the phenomenal success of its evangelical churches, to explore middle-class women’s experiences and encounters with evangelicalism and patriarchy. Her focus on a female, small-group culture thus provides an interesting counterpart to Elisha’s examination of a male fellowship group. She studies “the ways women become constituted as new feminine subjects through the development of a novel evangelical habitus, one that is constituted by new dispositions, both embodied and linguistic, and is

developed through ritualized rhetorical, bodily, and spiritual practices.” Through Chong’s participation in cell groups, she could observe how women sought healing for experiences of “intense domestic suffering,” notably when “attempts at other solutions failed, such as psychotherapy or shamanistic intervention.” Yet in spite of the empowered sense of self that many achieved through these therapeutic, charismatically oriented communities, women were still resubjugated to the structures of social and religious patriarchy.

Finally, in this section, Thomas J. Csordas explores the “global geography of the spirit” evident among Catholic charismatic communities, and he thus combines some of the spatial concerns evident in our first section with the more language-based focus of the second. Csordas takes geography to have both literal and metaphorical implications, and thus to “refer to a figurative conceptual terrain as well as to the physical features on the face of the earth.” Both of these meanings are at play in Csordas’s examination of the “cartographic self-representation” of Catholic charismatics, who draw for instance on websites to exhibit a powerful “sense of international presence and progress toward world evangelization.” He includes but goes beyond the examination of maps, however, as he traces the workings of the geography of the spirit in the everyday lives of members, their verbal and body languages, and their (often gendered) experiences of space.

The high profile of evangelical and Pentecostal movements can be attributed in part to their easy adaptation to numerous forms of (mass) mediation and circulation, ranging from missionary tracts in the nineteenth century to Internet sites in the twenty-first. The chapters in section 3, “Transmission and Mediation,” raise many questions about this trend: How are we to understand the apparent resonances between these religious movements and such (re)mediation, especially given the apparent valorization of immediacy and spontaneity expressed by many believers? How are these trends related to discourses on fake/authentic sources and practices of spiritual power? How are ritual practices being adapted at the local level to accommodate the flows of global actors, musics, texts, performances, images, and ideas?

Martin Lindhardt is interested in how Pentecostal and charismatic beliefs and practices regarding spiritual warfare entail a specific stance toward materiality. Most of the scholarship to date has centered on the

human body as the main material form in which spiritual powers are held to reside, but Lindhardt wants to explore the ways the battle against diabolic powers is fought through the handling of physical objects. Drawing on long-term fieldwork in south-central Tanzania, where P/e has experienced significant growth over the last three decades, he provides a range of ethnographic sketches of how people pray over money to cleanse it from evil powers. Using the lens of the “anthropology of things,” he argues that coins and bills constitute a particularly significant object of mediation and a pointer to how adherents of P/e believe they can influence the spiritual world to generate wealth and prosperity in miraculous ways. He notes further that concerns about the moral and potentially dangerous aspects of exchange of money, and rumors about what he calls the “witchcraft of wealth,” have been influenced by the increasing impact of the Gospel of Prosperity. In sum, he contends that spiritual warfare “provides a language for speaking about this-worldly concerns” and that money offers a material form for expression of these fears, demonstrating, in his view, the success of P/e in offering viable solutions to “problems of presence and mediation” in religion more generally.

Pentecostal media and music in Brazil have popular appeal, but particularly in the *favelas*, or slums, where conditions are tough. Martijn Oosterbaan’s chapter begins with an account of a performance by the renowned gospel singer Elaine Martins at a crusade in a Rio de Janeiro *favela*. Drawing on her case, he seeks to show that Pentecostal musicians struggle with both the potential gain and loss of charisma owing to the current mergers between P/e and electronic media. Not only have media technologies transformed and expanded the “reproduction of charisma,” but they have also generated controversies about the sincerity of the performers as converts and evangelists. To defend themselves in the face of the commercialization of the gospel music industry, singers integrate prayers and testimonies into their recordings and performances. Oosterbaan’s analysis underscores the need to take seriously the spiritual aesthetic of popular music and its technological (re)mediation, as well as the structural life conditions and cultural backgrounds of the people involved, in understanding the localization and globalization (what some call the “glocalization”) of P/e in settings such as Brazil.<sup>27</sup>

In his study of the Pentecostal advance in post-Soviet Central Asia, Mathijs Pelkmans opts to focus on the academically neglected area of

miracles and their sustainability, not just because they characterize the effervescent qualities of Pentecostal conviction, but also because they illustrate its fragility. Using the many stories he collected during his research on Kyrgyzstan's largest Pentecostal church, the Church of Jesus Christ, he is able to identify the attractiveness of the Pentecostal message to those struggling with the vagaries of life in a former Soviet state. Miracles are central to this process, circulating through sermons and informal settings and allowing congregants to actively engage with questions of divine intervention and life transformation. However, they need to gain social and semiotic *recognition* as miracles first. Furthermore, the truth of miracles runs the risk of failure in those contexts where the miraculous is needed the most, but "in which it was most difficult to produce success in the form of jobs, regained health, and reliable husbands." The paradox of charismatic action involves its instability, as it is either repeated so often as to strain credibility, or is linked to institutions that destroy its effervescence. Doubt can lead to disaffection, and eventually a (re)turn to the rival tradition of Islam. Instability can both prompt and provide the death knell for faith in the miraculous.

As discussed in our final section, "The State and Beyond: New Relations, New Tensions," Pentecostal and evangelical Christians frequently display ambivalent relations to the state, sometimes seeking its patronage (and even supporting forms of sacralized nationalism), and sometimes self-consciously bypassing its jurisdiction, creating wider "publics" within and beyond state boundaries. The connections between missionary and development discourse are evident, often following old colonial pathways of influence. At the same time, the centers of gravity in Christianity are shifting, so that older sites and states of colonial and missionary power are themselves becoming the objects of proselytization.

Over the last twenty years or so, Angola's religious landscape has undergone considerable transformation. State-sponsored atheism has been replaced by a policy of strategic alliances with major religious institutions. Ruy Llera Blanes explores in his chapter how Pentecostal and evangelical movements are increasingly engaging in aspects of governance and partisan policy in the public sphere, and how they are negotiating these shifting developments and evolving state-sponsored religious policies. These developments raise the question for Blanes of how such movements translate "their transnational, universalizing ethos and nar-

rative into specific, located engagements with national regimes.” From the bottom-up perspective of anthropology, the “nationalization” of religion is anything but linear, as the complex field of P/e movements in this context reveals. Categories of foreignness and sovereignty, as well as economic value, intervene in the intersection of government and religious institutions in Angola. Blanes tries to find out from interviews and local media why some P/e churches receive differential treatment, ranging from public recognition to deregistration and persecution. He concludes that the growth and diversification of local and foreign P/e churches have resulted in greater competition and a peculiar system of “fracture and reconnection between government and religious institutions” in which the official narrative of nationalization and “partnership” is frequently overridden by “interpersonal logics.”

A focus on the biographies of Pentecostal politicians does not yield the same insights as studies of the everyday experiences of believers who perform their politics through their Christian practices, especially prayer. So argues Kevin O’Neill in his analysis of formations of citizenship among Guatemalan Pentecostals, notably in relation to a particular cause, the decriminalization of drugs. He recounts how, in a visit to Washington, DC, in 2012, this cause was championed—somewhat counterintuitively—by Harold Caballeros, then foreign minister and one of Guatemala’s leading Pentecostal politicians. This was an extension of the prayer campaigns he had led against drug trafficking in Guatemala. In this connection, churches such as the Guatemala City megachurch El Shaddai provide a body of literature that instructs members on how to win back the capital as well as the country from the Devil. Through his field research, O’Neill was able to observe how interceding in a spiritual war was primarily enacted as a private and personal activity, with prayer sheets kept at bedsides and workplaces and in individual Bibles, rather than used in public spaces. He stresses that even though such religious activity would not be classified as citizenship participation from the perspective of political science, for Guatemalan Pentecostals, it is a practice that works, and in fact *is* Pentecostal politics. It works primarily because it makes the individual, with his or her power of choice, the “very terrain upon which political action takes place.” O’Neill’s thematizing of the individual as location of action contrasts in interesting ways with Elisha’s emphasis on the relationality of evangelicals in Knoxville. Rather than

seeing a simple contradiction in such an apparent disjunction, however, we might be better advised to explore how different dimensions of P/e personhood can be foregrounded according to temporal and social, as well as cultural, context.

Yannick Fer opens his chapter by showing how the histories of Polynesian island nations are very much bound up with Christianity. As nineteenth-century Protestant missionaries translated the Bible into vernacular languages, they became enmeshed in social life and local cultural traditions, serving to shape a common Pacific Christian culture. In contrast, the early classical Pentecostal churches arriving later in the region from North America were more ambivalent about local culture as they sought ethical respectability. Yet the growth of charismatic movements in Polynesia, against a backdrop of rapid social change and transnational circulations between the island states and strong diasporic communities in New Zealand, Australia, and the United States, has resulted in a type of “nonconformist liberation.” Polynesian youth are drawn to what Fer terms the more “individuated understanding of moral consciousness,” as well as the new possibilities for bodily movements and cultural expression such as dance. Thus, local culture might in fact have a positive moral valency for contemporary Christians, and we see how contemporary forms of Pentecostalism may have very different emphases than more classical forms. As with DeBernardi’s chapter, Fer shows us the value of locating current manifestations of P/e in relation to much longer histories of local Protestantism.

### Moving into the Future

When we talk of the anthropology of P/e, we might want not only to explore links and complementarities between cases, as just described in our summaries of the chapters of this book, but also to contrast it with other ways of studying P/e: historical, sociological, theological, geographical, and so on. Admittedly, divisions between disciplines are not always so simple. We have indicated how the development of a more historical sensibility has helped anthropologists assess whether P/e has or has not made fundamental changes in a given society or group.<sup>28</sup> Overlaps with more qualitative forms of sociology are obvious (e.g., Ammerman 1987), though anthropologists have generally been

less concerned with framing the (re-)emergence of P/e as a reversal of secularization. This latter theme has played a less prominent role in the discipline partly because of a general mistrust of theories suggesting linear trajectories in human history, and partly because many non-Western fields showed few signs of becoming secular. The discipline's relationship with theology has at times been troubled, but in recent years the study of Christianity has encouraged some dialogue between scholars and themes. Interestingly, a focus on rupture has suggested the possibility of interdisciplinary reflections on Pauline notions of conversion (see Robbins and Engelke 2010). Anthropology's links with geography in studying P/e have been least discussed and yet have great potential, given how believers focus so much on territorial spirits and mapping of the world (literally and metaphorically), and are so oriented toward a global view of mission. Both geographers and anthropologists are likely to perceive any vision of the "global" not as a set of ideas to be taken for granted, but as a particular cultural framework whose specific motivations and assumptions need to be examined, as Kristine Krause and Thomas Csordas demonstrate in this volume.

The anthropology of P/e has gained some of its distinctiveness through the kind of fieldwork and case-study approach that you will find in the chapters of this book. It has also taken on a particular character through the kinds of themes and conversations that have developed in the past fifteen years. But, in conclusion, how might the conversation be opened up in ways that complement but also go beyond "rupture"? Very briefly, we suggest a few areas that might help us move into a "third phase" of studying P/e. We divide these areas into three: "reflexivity," "recalibration," and "reframing."

Our first area relates to a common feature of P/e, but one that contradicts somewhat stereotypical views of believers as being somehow seduced into unthinking forms of religious engagement: the extent to which P/e encourages certain forms of *reflexivity* and *flexibility* in relation to questions of truth and culture. By this we do not mean the kind of reflexivity involved in more extreme versions of rupture, whereby tradition may be objectified and morally condemned, but more complex and ambiguous forms of accommodation and negotiation between moral, epistemological, and/or cultural alternatives. Pelkmans's chapter provides one example of what we mean here, as his focus on miracles

shows how people can become “actively engaged with the epistemological and social dimensions of different bodies of knowledge.” In Oosterbaan’s piece, Pentecostal testimony and popular culture come together in the fragile construction of charisma, which can work on both secular and spiritual registers. Fer’s tracing of the way the Island Breeze movement deploys a perhaps surprising strategy of taking up Polynesian cultural forms such as dancing as a means of negotiating a relationship not only with secularization, but also with more classical Pentecostal attitudes, is another case in point. More generally, we note that members of P/e congregations often have to live alongside members of other religious communities for much of their lives (Daswani 2013), and may even themselves move back and forth between different religious frameworks in a given period of time. Engagement with P/e practices and ideologies is likely to involve many more situational stances than even ethnography has sometimes revealed (Walton 2012, 109), and we need more work on how P/e practices may become backgrounded as well as foregrounded in people’s ethical lives. Related to this point, although less covered in our book, is the fact that anthropologists and others have tended in their studies of P/e to focus on more triumphalist narratives and examples of P/e—in other words, cases where believers are demonstrably successful in attracting numbers and commitment. But the global diffusion of P/e will also entail many cases of failure or halfhearted engagement, and such cases of more stuttering, diffuse forms of P/e may well reveal little-known dimensions of religious practice (compare Premawardhana 2013, in press).

Second, we are interested in the ways P/e can *recalibrate* boundaries commonly used by scholars, including many anthropologists, in their analyses of religion and society at large. Many ethnographers have the tendency to assume that they can “explain” religious conversion and engagement by identifying the function that it plays in addressing some gap in a person’s life, whether it be lack of personal or political direction, poverty, desire for healing, or psychological trauma. There is no doubt that P/e can play such a role in people’s lives, as for instance Pelkmans’s chapter demonstrates. However, a particular challenge for secular anthropologists is the need to study engagement in P/e without assuming that religious commitment is “really” about something that scholars often see as more fundamental and measurable, such as economic or

political benefit. Consider then the implications of O’Neill’s argument that the text he studies “repositions the meaning of Pentecostal politics to include prayer itself. To perform this Pentecostal prayer, this chapter argues, is to participate politically.” One of the things that O’Neill is asking us to do here is not only to rethink what prayer is, but also to reconsider how we are to understand political action when viewed from a different way of viewing the world. Bialecki may be doing something similar in his analysis of a notion of affect that allows us to see a thread that runs through the secular *and* the religious. As Lindhardt does in his piece on money, these scholars are prompting us to reimagine categories of secular analysis, including politics, the secular/sacred divide, and the economy, by showing how conventional distinctions do not capture the complexities of the practices being analyzed. While anthropologists have long delighted in showing how non-Western populations blend spheres of life that Western “modernity” has separated (such as religion, politics, and the economy), we need to bear in mind that many P/e advocates are aware of the assumptions of Western modernity, but are—whether consciously or not, with greater or lesser degrees of agency—attempting to remake them.

Finally, by “reframing,” we mean that the opportunity exists to go back to one advantage that studies of Christian contexts had before the self-conscious anthropology of Christianity emerged as a subfield. In other words, we ask, How do we frame our work on P/e by comparing it with and to a much wider set of anthropological questions and literatures than those concerned with Christianity *per se*? Are there significant ways we might see P/e as comparable to certain manifestations of Islam in its use of mass media, for instance? How might we see P/e through the lens of such theoretical frameworks as the anthropology of elites or, say, the anthropology of organizations? The list of potential comparisons is never-ending. There is clearly much still to do.

#### NOTES

We would like to thank our editor, Jennifer Hammer, and an anonymous reviewer for their very helpful comments on a draft of this introduction.

1. When these two terms occur together in this introduction, we will refer to them as P/e.

2. Given size constraints for this text, our coverage of traditions cannot be comprehensive. An obvious and important gap in our coverage is the lack of scholars who