

INTRODUCTION

New Directions in the Anthropology of Religion and Gender: Faith and Emergent Masculinities

William Dawley, *University of California, San Diego*

Brendan Jamal Thornton, *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

This special collection featured in *Anthropological Quarterly* considers an underexplored topic in anthropology: the critical relationship between masculinity and religion. Despite the fact that this relationship is, in many parts of the world, a subject frequently commented upon and stereotyped—with popular media often depicting religion as a source of support for gender inequality and for “toxic masculinity”—sustained attention to religion and masculinity by anthropologists is surprisingly new and remains relatively unexplored conceptual terrain. This is likely in part because a specific scholarly interest in masculinity itself is still a relatively recent phenomenon, the result of a series of developments in how gender has been approached in anthropology, from “a neglected set of subjects (‘the anthropology of women’) and a specific attitude to them (‘feminist anthropology’), [to a] recognition of [gender’s] ubiquity (‘men have gender, too’)” (Laidlaw 2014:1–2). In fact, while anthropologists have addressed both religion and gender from a variety of different angles throughout the discipline’s history, it might also be said that viewing religion and gender as mutually constitutive analytical categories has never really taken off.

When anthropologists of religion *have* explicitly focused on gender, the literature has tended to coalesce around women as a “neglected set of subjects” within many religious communities. Such literature tends to center on questions about women’s relative subordination and/or their numerical dominance in a given community, or on the extent to which women in these communities are subordinated to patriarchy or perhaps resisting various forms of domination, and how they are helped or hindered by their faith in the process. Popular examples of this range from Saba Mahmood’s acclaimed *Politics of Piety* (2005) to I.M. Lewis’s 1971 classic, *Ecstatic Religion*. Thus, for years—and for good reasons—scholars interested in gender within both the anthropology and sociology of religion have regularly trained their analytic attention on the popularity of religious institutions for women and have produced a rich and varied literature focused largely on how religious movements (many with an emphasis on evangelicalism) have reimagined sexuality, the family, and women’s agency (e.g., Willems 1967; Stacey and Gerard 1990; Cucchiari 1990; Brusco 1995; Smilde 1997; Metcalf 1998; Lorentzen and Mira 2005; Mahmood 2005; Deeb 2006; Martin 2007; Pfeiffer, Gimbel-Sherr, and Joaquim Augusto 2007; Mayblin 2010; Bochow and van Dijk 2012).¹

Such studies have done much to correct for male biases in academic scholarship, reconceptualize female agency, and help rethink the dynamic relationship between gender and religion, especially as it pertains to women. Until recently, however, most anthropological studies of religion ignored the question of masculinity *per se*, overlooking not only how masculinity transforms religion, but also the transformative role of religion for “men as *men*,”² despite scholars’ broad general agreement that ideas about masculinity and femininity are usually co-constructed, and that, no less than women, “men have gender, too.”³

By contrast, the four essays featured here make the question of masculinity and men’s gender central to their explorations of religion. They ask how alternative or “emergent” masculinities are being imagined, practiced, felt, and socially organized through Islamic and Christian religious movements and institutions, which often depict these alternative masculinities in an explicit contrast with local, “toxic” masculinities that are portrayed as being un- or anti-Islamic/Christian.⁴ Marcia Inhorn examines, in some detail in this issue and at various moments in her book *The New Arab Man* (2012), how many of her male interlocutors from across the Middle East (largely Muslim and mostly Arab men, interviewed in fertility clinics in Lebanon

and Dearborn, Michigan) struggled in their efforts to craft a masculinity recognizable both as properly Islamic and also exemplifying certain contemporary norms of companionate marriage (as devoted, responsive, and affectionate) that are valorized in media and cultural currents in many parts of the world. She finds that men struggled in part because they blamed themselves for the pain that their fertility problems had caused them and their wives (attributing it to their past acts of sexual misconduct, captured by the Islamic term *zina*), and because these men lacked psychological, social, or religious resources for coping with this guilt.

Arsalan Khan's piece (this issue) shows how members of Tablighi Jamaat, a transnational pietist movement based in Pakistan, seek to reform themselves and to enjoin others to piety through preaching tours focused on *dawah/dawat* (literally "calling [i.e., to Islam]"), a style of face-to-face preaching on personal themes, accompanied by group prayer.⁵ These 40-day and four-month tours are modeled on gestation, the lengths of time in which a fetus is believed to take human form and become ensouled, respectively. Moreover, these preaching tours require men to live temporarily in mosques, understood symbolically as God's home, and to perform domestic "service" (or *khidmat*) in these "homes," which Tablighis describe using feminine metaphors. By performing what are viewed as feminine roles, men learn to occupy the lower position in hierarchical, yet intimate relationships of love (*mohabbat*) with God and the movement's elders. In turn, to the benefit of their families and others, they learn to model kindness (*shafqat*) and a "soft," "cool" masculinity associated with the Prophet. Although there are differences between this style of masculinity and that stressed by Inhorn's interlocutors, the members of Tablighi Jamaat also distinguish themselves sharply from a worldly, impious masculinity that they view as hard-hearted.⁶

Likewise, the "spiritual masculinity" that William Dawley's (this issue) interlocutors seek to cultivate is constructed in opposition to the concept of *machismo*, which, like Khan's "impious masculinity," is conceptually linked to violence, as well as to carnality and sinfulness in general. As his male interlocutors watch their rural town in northern Costa Rica rapidly urbanize and develop ideas about gender and the family that are more in tune with those in the country's metropolitan capital, many of them have been drawn to a style of religious practice with its roots in Alcoholics Anonymous, but which has been adopted by a multiplying number of non-sectarian, religious, and non-religious groups as well. Like Alcoholics

Anonymous itself, frequently an all-male organization in Latin America, this support group style of spirituality seems uniquely adapted to allowing men to develop new ideas about masculinity and spirituality and to practice cultivating intimate, caring human relationships. Brendan Jamal Thornton (this issue), considering data from the Dominican Republic, similarly argues that preexisting ideas about masculinity and carnality born in the local term *tigueraje* (as well as the broader term *machismo*)⁷ have given men the sense that their spiritual journey towards God requires special struggles. Although Thornton's review of the recent histories of several bachelors living in a church shows just how contextual and relational religion is, such spiritual struggles do not always produce the images of blissful marital companionship and nurturant fatherhood that are common in portrayals of evangelical triumph over *machismo* in Latin America.

Each of the contributing authors draws on and links their research to a number of different literatures and approaches to studying religion and gender. Nevertheless, as this brief introduction will suggest, each takes a thoroughly *relational* perspective in at least two senses. The first of these is the more abstract, conceptual sense of the term: the way that a given masculinity is defined in a semiotic relationship—not merely with a singular, essential femininity, but necessarily with other masculinities and femininities. These multiple masculinities and femininities are, in turn, differentiated from one another by their association with other concepts and forms of identity. Central among the concepts with which these multiple masculinities and femininities are associated are kinds of religiosity, or spirituality, or secularity, as the case may be. Furthermore, religion and gender themselves, as conceptual fields, are frequently co-constituted in the ethnographic worlds explored in this collection. Each author attends carefully to the ways in which many or even most *religious* concepts, practices, affects, and institutional relationships are *gendered*, as well as to how *gendered* concepts, practices, affects, and institutional relationships (not limited to masculinity) are often imbued with *religious* meaning.

Additionally, there is a second, more social sense in which the approaches to religion and gender taken here are “relational”: the authors' consistent reckoning with the reality that religion and gender emerge, not only as qualities of individuals, but also as the products of social intercourse within relationships with others. Like many anthropologists, the authors here adopt a contextual view for understanding both religion and gender, insisting that they are imagined, practiced, felt, and organized in particular

interpersonal relationships (among and between men and women, often involving various other forms of difference) and in institutionalized relationships (including, but not limited to institutions like the family, the workplace, public spaces, communities, and social groups of various types). Too often what is understood in the abstract as “masculinity” consists of a gendered set of ideas, attitudes, and practices supported by very particular social relationships and understandable only through those relationships.

The impetus for putting together this special collection derived from the apparent lack of literature on religion and masculinity in anthropology and related fields and the clear interest in the development of new research on the subject, something often mentioned to us when presenting our research to anthropologists and scholars working on religious traditions. The panel on religion and masculinities that we organized and convened at the 2012 American Anthropological Association annual meeting in San Francisco only reinforced this impression. We were pleasantly surprised by the positive responses of participants and attendees alike and also by the high level of interest in the anthropology of masculinity that we perceived at other panels at the conference. Most of the papers and discussants wondered why so little scholarship seemed to have been published on religion’s role in shaping masculinities. Several of the discussants and attendees pointed out that this absence was all the more puzzling because efforts to ethnographically “test” common sense assumptions about the relationship between gender and religion had already yielded two decades worth of groundbreaking work on women, religion, and the family, and moreover because those assumptions seemed to have been revived recently by perceptions that masculinity was playing a key role in religious and nationalist militarism.⁸

The essays published here test these common sense assumptions and suggest ways that anthropologists might conduct research on the intersection of religion and masculinities. They do so first by examining social fields that have frequently been overlooked in the anthropology of Islam and Christianity, thereby producing portraits of masculinities that are often contrary to assumptions about male gender construction and performance among Muslims and Christians.⁹ Second, they link these portraits of emergent masculinities with familiar anthropological conversations about religion and gender, as well as more recent publications and parallel conversations occurring in other fields of study. Among these are a number of ethnographies that explore new approaches to gender identity formation

and new spaces that religious movements and institutions have opened up to allow new gender identity models to emerge (Mayblin 2010, Mahmood 2005, Lester 2005, Deeb 2006, Smilde 2007, Brandes 2002). In seeking to make these links we were fortunate to have Stanley Brandes—whose *Metaphors of Masculinity* (1980) is credited as the first ethnography to place masculinity at its center (Gutmann 1997:386)—act as a discussant in our initial panel and offer a retrospective of how the anthropological study of masculinity and male religiosity has progressed (cf. Brandes 2002). We were also pleased, after the panel, to work further on this special collection with Marcia Inhorn and Arsalan Khan, both of whose presentations at the 2012 AAA conference made clear a commitment to connecting their ethnographic research with enduring, interdisciplinary conversations about the semiotics of reproduction and sexuality in Islam,¹⁰ with overlooked comparative work on masculinities and religion,¹¹ and with newer conversations about cultural and political economic changes among Muslims that make earlier forms of masculinity impractical or undesirable.¹² Our research has similar goals, and seeks to tie together scholarship on the contemporary history of Christianity, stretching across two generations of research and multiple fields of study,¹³ with more recent work on masculinities in the anthropology of Christianity, not only by scholars working in Latin America and the Caribbean, but also in the Africanist literature, which is pioneering new approaches to evangelical masculinities.¹⁴ Each of the contributors hopes to integrate this burgeoning interest in the anthropology of religion and masculinity with the extant literature on religion and gender and to carve out a theoretical space broad enough to draw critical insight into the variety of social fields, affects, and motivations that animate gendered religious actors, especially men, as they work both within and against social convention and the authority of cultural norms.

Putting aside momentarily the question of masculinities (or gender), the study of religion has a long history in anthropology, even serving as the cornerstone of many early and foundational ethnographies that sought to record holistic accounts of the social and cultural life of a people (e.g., Radcliffe-Brown 1922, Malinowski 1922, Redfield 1930, and Evans-Prichard 1937). These early works emerged in an intellectual climate in which such supra-disciplinary titans as Weber, Durkheim, and Freud (to say nothing of Müller, Frazer, or James) had placed religion at the center of their systematic analyses of human life, regarding religion as an expression of human cultural capacities par excellence.¹⁵ For at least several decades

following World War II, anthropology as a whole seemed to have overcome an earlier “attitude...towards religious faith and practice” that Evans-Pritchard (1960:104) had bemoaned as being “for the most part bleakly hostile.” A seeming golden age of anthropological studies on religion followed and gave anthropology a new vitality and influence (e.g., Evans-Pritchard 1956; Lienhardt 1961; Spiro 1967; Turner 1969; Tambiah 1970; Geertz 1973; Harris 1974; Rappaport 1979; Asad 1986, 1993). Religion, as a specific focus in anthropology today, may no longer be considered as central to the discipline as it once had been. Its status in the field waxing and waning as a subject of relative interest according to academic and intellectual trends. However, despite this fluctuation, anthropologists working on religion have nonetheless continued to produce some of the most incisive and important work informing the discipline as a whole (e.g., Turner 1967, Crapanzano 1985, Taussig 1987, Tambiah 1990, Brown 1991, Asad 2003, Robbins 2004, Mahmood 2005). The relevance of studying religion to the project of anthropology has never wavered, even though its popularity within the discipline and among anthropologists has been inconsistent.

Though framed in different terms at different times, the comparative study of gender has also been, from the beginning, a central concern of anthropology and foremost among its contributions to scholarly and public discourse (e.g., Mead 1928, Benedict 1934, Bateson 1936). Margaret Mead’s *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Cultures* (1935), for example, became a classic in anthropology for its ethnographic confirmation of some of the claims of first-wave feminism, as Mead demonstrated convincingly that gender roles and characteristics, being highly variable from cultural setting to cultural setting, must be culturally constructed rather than determined by nature. Moreover, even the study of kinship—a central concern of anthropology for nearly a century, from the publication of Morgan’s *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity* in 1871 to the fundamental critique of that century of work a hundred years later by such publications as *Rethinking Kinship and Marriage* (Needham 1971) and “What is Kinship All About?” (Schneider 1972)¹⁶—is the study of, among other things, local gender frameworks. Whatever the current status of kinship diagrams in the field (anthropology’s own Punnett square), the lessons from kinship studies about the potentialities produced by different systems of gender, residence, authority, and genealogy have long influenced—even if subtly and at distance—how anthropologists think about the complex relationships between family and marriage, the production and distribution, and

basic psychological and cultural realities associated with gender.¹⁷ In fact, as the field of anthropology slowly turned away from kinship as a guiding framework, it has, increasingly, turned toward gender (e.g., Wolf 1972; Goody and Tambiah 1973; Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974; Rosaldo 1974, 1980; Stack 1974; Ortner 1974, Ortner and Whitehead 1981; Abu Lughod 1986; Collier and Yanagisako 1987; Collier 1988; Strathern 1988, 1992; Tambiah et al. 1989; di Leonardo 1991; Weston 1995; Ong and Peletz 1995; Peletz 1996; Bloch and Sperber 2002). Emerging at the moment when kinship studies and their centrality to anthropology were being critiqued by Needham, Schneider, and others, this literature on gender was central to the reformation of kinship studies as a whole and in the increasingly expansive and theoretically sophisticated work that would emerge from this critique, often termed “new kinship studies” (Stone 2004a, 2004b; cf. Carsten 2000, 2004).¹⁸ It is also worth noting that anthropologists of gender (and other gender theorists) have increasingly sought, if not always the heady structural-functionalism of high kinship theory, at least some way of talking about the systemic qualities of gender. They have done this by portraying it more and more as structural and relational, and as taking place at a number of intersections of social life in ways that seem suggestive of the linear intersections of kinship diagrams (e.g., Collier 1988, Strathern 1988, Peletz 1994:155–167). Yet, even considering the exciting work being done in the “new kinship studies” of anthropology (which has often found, in the study of religion as well as gender, a rich soil for cultivating new ideas [e.g., Clarke 2009, Thomas et al. 2017]), the study of gender may have ventured further in terms of its interdisciplinarity. In anthropology, at least by the 1980s, the study of gender had become a popular critical concept in the field and a premiere analytic orientation, not only theoretically (e.g., Abu-Lughod 1986; Strathern 1988; Lamphere, Ragoné, and Zavella 1991; Mascia-Lees and Black 1999), but also methodologically, with the broader turn to critical and reflexive ethnography following influential postmodern and feminist critiques of the field (e.g., Behar’s *Translated Woman* [2003]).

The explicit study of masculinities in anthropology, first examined at length by Gutmann (1997), is much more recent (see, e.g., Brandes 1980; Lancaster 1992; Allison 1994; Peletz 1994; Gutmann 1996, 2003; Blackwood 1998; Silverman 2001; Pascoe 2007; Christensen 2014).¹⁹ The emergence of an anthropology of masculinity, as suggested at the beginning of this introduction, was the resulting culmination of decades of work by feminist, womanist, and gender studies theorists and their calls to make gender

a central rather than peripheral concern in social science and development research—a process which Chant and Gutmann (1999, 2002) call the “men-streaming of gender.” Yet the full inclusion of the study of men and masculinities within a gender analytic has not been even everywhere.

Perhaps it is especially unfortunate that the mainstreaming of masculinities has not been more prominent within the anthropology of religion, precisely because of the ubiquity and apparent salience of masculinity to religious actors themselves, who, as several of the contributors make clear, explicitly address issues of gender as religious problems and, no less crucially, treat religious issues as being gendered. In relation to his work on Pentecostal Christianity in Africa, Adriaan van Klinken has noted that the literatures on African masculinities and on Pentecostalism in Africa rarely if ever intersect and that the few works that do exist tend to privilege official discourses on masculinity in Pentecostal circles rather than “narratives about, experiences with, and performances of masculinity among Pentecostal men” (2012:217). He affirms Birgit Meyer’s recent argument that “much research is still needed on the consequences of becoming born again for [men’s] personal and social identities [and] the[ir] relation[ships] with their partners, children and the wider family” (2010:121).

What van Klinken describes is a widespread pattern found not just in the work on African Pentecostalism, but also more broadly in the anthropology of religion: namely, little work on masculinity in general, with that which does exist paying plenty of attention to “official discourses” on masculinity but too little to how masculinity is constructed through narrative, experience, or performance, among individual actors and groups and their quotidian relationships with others.

The essays collected here try to address the above issues and more. First, the contributors move beyond official (or “hegemonic”) discourses on masculinity, offering analyses that “deconstruct the (a-relational) concept of masculinity” by examining competing, alternative, and emergent discourses of masculinity being generated by a number of religious movements (Peletz 1994:138). The essays show men grappling with competing discourses on masculinity, in particular through the narrativization of their experiences and other performances of gender identity (cf. Somers 1994, Cole 2009). Second, the contributors pay special attention, not just to men, but also to the way in which their masculinity (and all gender) is largely formed in their relationships with others. Prominent among these are their families, friends, and peer groups, of course, but many men also

consider their faith to be central to their place and participation in larger social networks, groups, and institutions. The pieces in this collection touch on a number of issues relevant to men in navigating and cultivating these relationships, including sexuality, violence, intimacy, politics, work, competing visions of equality and hierarchy, as well as a broad array of social changes, including various social movements, broad political economic trends, and other cultural transformations.

Furthermore, each of the following pieces attends to the formation of masculinity over time and in relation to one's past, and, in doing so, tries to understand how this developmental view of masculinity may coexist with, articulate, and cooperate with, or even contest local ideas about masculinity (its privileges no less than its burdens [cf. Foreman 1999:14]) as essential or as something greater than the sum total of any man's experiences of maleness. In some cases, this negotiation develops in response to "hegemonic masculinities" (Connell 1995) that circumscribe, if not handcuff, alternative ways of being manly (and, thus, also womanly). However, in many social settings, including several discussed in this collection, challenges to the supremacy of dominant gender ideologies are shown to put their very "hegemony" into question. This constitutes yet another way that the *relationality* of gender is emphasized in each of the essays: the way the relationships between different masculinities are contextual, emerging in relation to ideas about femininity and in relation to specific social networks, social groups, social movements, and institutional settings.²⁰ Likewise, scholars have long argued that religion is not in any straightforward sense a transhistorical aspect of culture, but is itself an ever-emergent category, its local meanings emerging in relation to its others and its alternatives (e.g., Smith 1978; Asad 1993; McCutcheon 1997, 2003; Masuzawa 2005). Each of the authors in this collection strive to show how their interlocutors and informants constructed their own sense of masculinity from careful negotiations with competing ideas about religion and spirituality, and with competing categories of social life—especially secular life and the models of masculinity associated with it.

Although this collection does not claim to be comprehensive, it was conceived in anticipation, looking towards new developments and areas of growing scholarly interest. One of these is the growing interest in the broader, comparative study of masculinity in anthropology and in other social sciences and humanities, thanks partly to the "men-streaming of gender" described by Chant and Gutmann (2002). In pursuing the

question of comparative masculinities, the authors here examine what have been referred to as *emergent masculinities* (Inhorn and Wentzell 2011): new²¹ models or configurations of masculinity emerging and developing in response to social and cultural change, and usually in relation to—often in contrast to—dominant local masculinities that are seen as harmful or destructive. By exploring the emergence of new masculinities as well as highlighting how the nuances of conventional forms of masculinity are navigated, the authors here demonstrate how religious masculinities emerge in concert with or in contrast to preexisting ideas, affects, practices, and institutions pertaining to men’s gender, making masculinity an important locus of contemporary religious and cultural transformation.

Finally, this collection aims to provide another point of contact for studies of gender and religion that analyze them as co-constitutive social categories, especially in many contemporary contexts where religion and spirituality provide an important avenue for reproducing, contesting, and transforming various gendered aspects of social life. Taking men and masculinity as a starting point for a critical, relational view of gender, the authors move to offer what we hope the reader will consider to be novel explorations of fundamental, contemporary questions about belief and ideas, ritual and practice, affect and “structures of feeling,” and the social organization of religion and spirituality. In so doing, we hope to foster a productive discussion about some of the transformative relations between religious movements and identities, on the one hand, and male gender performance and identity, on the other. By considering the stakes of masculinity for the religious and the wages of religion for the masculine, we hope to highlight religion’s role as a strategic avenue of identity formation for many actors, men included, and to uncover new areas of cultural reproduction, contestation, and change. ■

Endnotes:

¹Eriksen characterizes the literature on Pentecostalism and gender similarly: “Early anthropological studies of Pentecostalism and gender, dominated by Latin American and Caribbean ethnography, focused to a large extent on women’s conversion and how Pentecostal ideology has limited masculine oppressive behavior...Gender relations are often analyzed as power relations [and]...The basic enigma has been why women are so numerically dominant but so absent in representational offices” (2014:262–263).

²One of the descriptors Gutmann repeatedly used to describe the growth of interest in an anthropology not only of men but of masculinity, commenting that “very few within the discipline of the ‘study of man’ had truly examined men as *men*”—that is, as “engendered and engendering subjects” (1997:385).

³See endnote 14 for counterexamples.

⁴For the most part, the discussions of masculinities have moved past debates about the value in speaking of hegemonic, subordinate, and complicit masculinities (as in Connell's [1995] groundbreaking *Masculinities*), largely because of acknowledgments that, despite Connell's intentions being quite the opposite, most discussions have tended to depict the hegemonic masculinity of a given place as singular rather than plural, or as static rather than in flux, or as a securely dominant hegemon rather than a temporary and often-contested ideal, or as general rather than specific to a social context. Because these contributions do not seek to claim a hegemony for any of the masculinities under discussion, we have instead focused on the multiplicity of competing masculinities, on exemplars and models of masculinity and on cultural change, similar to Connell's initial intentions (e.g., Connell and Messerschmidt 2005:831–832, 846; cf. Whitehead 1998, Demetriou 2001), rather than on Connell's seemingly typological guide to the "configuration of practice" that leads to the dominance of a hegemonic masculinity (cf. Martin 1998:473).

⁵Like Mahmood (2005) and many students of the pietist movements have noted, a focus on "preaching" is important, but the emphasis on face-to-face meetings and group prayer is more consistent in Tablighi Jamaat than in many piety movements (cf. Hirschkind 2006:108ff).

⁶This language about hard-heartedness is similar not only to language used by Inhorn's interlocutors but is also common among Abrahamic religions. Its presence throughout Christian scripture (e.g., Exodus 7:13, Ezekiel 3:8, Matthew 19:8) explains in part why it also appears among Dawley's interlocutors, although there may also be something about the *kinds* of masculinity that these movements are opposing that makes language about hardness and hard-heartedness an especially useful discourse.

⁷Cf. Jiménez (2004) in Puerto Rico.

⁸A fact which scholars had begun addressing with greater frequency. See, for example, Blom Hansen (1989), Devji (2005), Seidler (2006, 2007), Cavanaugh (2009), Samuel (2011), and Brennehan (2011).

⁹Surprisingly, these sites have, by and large, been neglected by anthropologists paying special attention to both religion *and* gender. Yet, to be fair, not all of these ethnographic fields have been overlooked entirely, and the authors draw on this literature whenever possible. As, for example, when Khan dialogues with Barbara Metcalf's earlier work on Tablighi Jamaat, and as Thornton notes in his discussion of the extensive and often high quality work, done on evangelical and Pentecostal Christianity in the Caribbean and Latin America (e.g., Brusco 2010[1995]).

¹⁰E.g., see, respectively, Bhoudiba (2008) and Khuri (2001), as well as Mernissi (1975), Delaney (1991), Metcalf (1989), and Murata (1992).

¹¹E.g., see, respectively, Scott (2011) and Krondorfer (2010).

¹²E.g., see, respectively, El Feki (2013), Dhillon and Yousef (2009), Inhorn (2012), and Singerman (2013), Blom Hansen (1989), Chatterjee (1984), and Verkaik (2004).

¹³E.g., see, respectively (despite some overlap): Willems (1967), Wuthnow (1988, 1994a, 1994b, 1998), Martin (1990), and Brusco (1995); Stoll (1990), Burdick (1993), and Chesnut (2003).

¹⁴See Chitanda (2007), van Klinken (2011, 2012, 2013), Soothill (2007), Lindhardt (2015); cf. Smilde (2007), Brennehan (2011), Lindhardt (2012), Thornton (2013, 2016) in Latin America.

¹⁵This despite the differences in their appraisal of those capacities: see, respectively, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (Weber 1905), *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (Durkheim 1912), and *Totem and Taboo* (Freud 1913); *Sacred Books of the East* (1879–1910, 50 vols.), *The Golden Bough* (Frazer 1890–1915), and *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (James 1902).

¹⁶In addition to many other ethnographies that focused on kinship, see also Malinowski's *The Family Among the Australian Aborigines* (1913); Levi-Strauss's *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* (1969); Murdock's *Social Structure* (1949); Leach's *Rethinking Anthropology* (1961); Fortes's *Marriage in Tribal Societies* (1962) and *Kinship and the Social Order: The Legacy of Henry Morgan* (1969); Needham's *Rethinking Kinship and Marriage* (1971); Schneider's "What is Kinship All About?" (1972) and, later, *A Critique of the Study of Kinship* (1984).

¹⁷For much of the period from 1871 to 1971, it would have been difficult to argue that "kinship is to anthropology what logic is to philosophy or the nude is to art; it is the basic discipline of the subject" (Fox 1967:10). Even those strong critics of kinship's dominance in the field who followed this proclamation, such as Needham and (here) Schneider (1972), grounded their own critiques by acknowledging that "the genealogically defined [kinship] grid is the only analytic device that has been applied to most of the systems which anthropologists have studied. There has been almost no systematic attempt to study the question without employing this device," adding that, "To put it simply, it is about time that we tested some other hypotheses (Schneider 1972:49).

¹⁸These “new kinship studies” attend to issues not considered in earlier studies of kinship and were suggested by the critiques of it above, including: family law, new reproductive technologies (NRTs), a number of non-normative and diverse family types, adoption (including international adoption), international marriage, same sex marriage and other struggles over marital law, the study of industries involved in kinship, genetics, and family planning such as labs, blood banks, DNA analysis, and so on, including the influence these changes have had on ideas, practices, and affect related to the family.

¹⁹However, behind Brandes’s *Metaphors of Masculinity* (1980), which Gutmann (1997) credited with being the first ethnography focused particularly on masculinity, was an earlier era of Mediterraneanist work on which Brandes was building and which must also be credited with a focus on gender systems at least as far back as Campbell’s *Honor, Family, and Patronage* (1964) and Peristiany’s edited volume on male and female virtues *Honor and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society* (1966). Of course, this Mediterraneanist literature followed in turn earlier groundbreaking work by anthropologists like Benedict, Mead, and other aforementioned anthropologists.

²⁰In addition to Peletz and the citations on relationality above, see a genealogy of gender and identity literature on relationality including Scott (1988:49, 1986:1054, citing Davis [1976:90] as an example of this tradition of American feminism and its emphasis on the relationality of gender); Connell (1987:220); Goldner (1991); Cameron (2011:259); Burkitt (1998); Ridgeway and Correll (2004); Shotwell and Sangrey (2009). As the latter point out, this relational perspective on gender does not contain, but is not entirely distinct from, queer theory approaches to gender, and overlaps a great deal with intersectional approaches to gender, as we have indicated above, while emphasizing anthropology’s critical distance from the presumed universalisms of some Western models of selfhood and identity.

²¹Adopting the perspective of emergence or “novelty” (Inhorn and Wentzell 2011) was a useful analytic perspective for each of the scholars in asking questions about social change and indeterminacy. However, these notions may be more or less relevant to local perspectives and, in describing these local worlds, the collection’s contributors have used the concept (to a greater or lesser extent) depending upon how it articulates with local analytical frameworks and with those local worlds’ affinity for, or avoidance of, using *novelty* as a framing for religion and spirituality—a framing which many religious worlds, in fact, tend to avoid altogether.

References:

- Abu Lughod, Lila. 1986. *Veiled Sentiments: Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Allison, Anne. 1994. *Nightwork: Sexuality, Pleasure, and Corporate Masculinity in a Tokyo Hostess Club*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Asad, Talal. 1986. *The Idea of an Anthropology of Islam*. New York: Center for Contemporary Arab Studies.
- _____. 1993. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- _____. 2003. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bateson, Gregory. 1936. *Naven*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Behar, Ruth. 2003 [1993]. *Translated Woman: Crossing the Border with Esperanza’s Story*. Boston: Beacon.
- Benedict, Ruth. 1934. *Patterns of Culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Blackwood, Evelyn. 1998. “Tombois in West Sumatra: Constructing Masculinity and Erotic Desire.” *Cultural Anthropology* 13(4):491-521.
- Bloch, Maurice and Dan Sperber. 2002. “Kinship and Evolved Psychological Dispositions: The Mother’s-Brother Controversy Reconsidered.” *Current Anthropology* 43(5):723-748.
- Blom Hansen, Thomas. 1989. “Recuperating Masculinity: Hindu Nationalism, Violence, and the Exorcism of the Muslim ‘Other.’” *Critique of Anthropology* 16(2):137-172.
- Bochow, Astrid and Rijk van Dijk. 2012. “Introduction: Christian Creations of New Spaces of Sexuality, Reproduction, and Relationships in Africa: Exploring Faith and Religious Heterotopia.” *Journal of Religion in Africa* 42(4):325-344.
- Bouhdiba, Abdelwahab. 2008 [1975]. *Sexuality in Islam*. London: Routledge.

New Directions in the Anthropology of Religion and Gender:
Faith and Emergent Masculinities

- Brandes, Stanley. 1980. *Metaphors of Masculinity: Sex and Status in Andalusian Folklore*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- _____. 2002. *Staying Sober in Mexico City*. Austin: University of Texas Press
- Brenneman, Robert. 2011. *Homies and Hermanos: God and Gangs in Central America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Karen McCarthy. 1991. *Mama Lola: A Vodou Priestess in Brooklyn*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Brusco, Elizabeth. 1995. *The Reformation of Machismo: Evangelical Conversion and Gender in Colombia*. Austin: Texas University Press.
- Burdick, John. 1993. *Looking for God in Brazil: The Progressive Catholic Church in Urban Brazil's Religious Area*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burkitt, Ian. 1998. "Sexuality and Gender Identity: From a Discursive to a Relational Analysis." *The Sociological Review* 46(3):483-504.
- Cameron, Deborah. 2011 [1997]. "Performing Gender Identity: Young Men's Talk and the Construction of Heterosexual Masculinity." In Sally Johnson and Ulrike Hanna Meinhof, eds. *Language and Gender: A Reader*, 250-263. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Campbell, John K. 1964. *Honor, Family, and Patronage: A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carsten, Janet. 2000. *Cultures of Relatedness: New Approaches to the Study of Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2004. *After Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cavanaugh, William. 2009. *The Myth of Religious Violence: Secular Ideology and the Roots of Modern Conflict*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chant, Sylvia and Matthew Gutmann. 1999. "'Men-streaming' Gender? Questioning New Currents in Gender and Development Policy." Washington, DC, World Bank.
- _____. 2002. "'Men-streaming' Gender? Questions for Gender and Development Policy in the 21st Century." *Progress in Development Studies* 2(4):269-282.
- Chatterjee, Partha. 1989. "Colonialism, Nationalism, and Colonized Women: The Contest in India." *American Ethnologist* 16(4):622-633.
- Chesnut, Andrew. 2003. *Competitive Spirits: Latin America's New Religious Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chitando, Ezra. 2007. "A New Man for a New Era? Zimbabwean Pentecostalism, Masculinities, and the HIV Epidemic." *Missionalia: Southern African Journal of Mission Studies* 35(3):112-127.
- Christensen, Paul A. 2014. *Japan, Alcoholism, and Masculinity: Suffering Sobriety in Tokyo*. Lanham: Lexington.
- Clarke, Morgan. 2009. *Islam and New Kinship*. New York: Berghahn.
- Cole, Barbara A. 2009. "Gender, Narratives, and Intersectionality: Can Personal Experience Approaches to Research Contribute to 'Undoing Gender'?" *International Review of Education* 55(5/6):561-578.
- Collier, Jane Fishburne. 1988. *Marriage and Inequality in Classless Societies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Collier, Jane Fishburne and Sylvia Yanagisako. 1987. *Gender and Kinship: Essays toward a Unified Analysis*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, Raewyn. 1987. *Gender and Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- _____. 1995. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell, Raewyn and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender and Society* 19(6):829-859.
- Crapanzano, Vincent. 1985. *Tuhami: Portrait of a Moroccan*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cucchiari, Salvatore. 1990. "Between Shame and Sanctification: Patriarchy and its Transformation in Sicilian Pentecostalism." *American Ethnologist* 17(4):687-707.

- Davis, Natalie Zemon. 1976. "Women's History in Transition: The European Case." *Feminist Studies* 3(3/4):83-103.
- Deeb, Lara. 2006. *An Enchanted Modernity: Gender and Public Piety in Shi'a Lebanon*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Delaney, Carol. 1991. *The Seed and the Soil: Gender and Cosmology in Turkish Village Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Demetriou, Demetris Z. 2001. "Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique." *Theory and Society* 30(3):337-361.
- Devji, Faisal. 2005. *Landscapes of the Jihad: Militancy, Morality, Modernity*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Dhillon, Navtej and Tarik Yousef, eds. 2009. *Generation in Waiting: The Unfulfilled Promise of Young People in the Middle East*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- di Leonardo, Micaela, ed. 1991. *Gender at the Crossroads of Knowledge: Feminist Anthropology in the Postmodern Era*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Durkheim, Emile. 2001 [1912]. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Carol Cosman, trans. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- El Feki, Shereen. 2013. *Sex and the Citadel: Intimate Life in a Changing Arab World*. New York: Pantheon.
- Eriksen, Annelin. 2014. "Sarah's Sinfulness: Egalitarianism, Denied Difference, and Gender in Pentecostal Christianity." *Current Anthropology* 55(10):262-270.
- Evans-Pritchard, Edward E. 1937. *Witchcraft, Oracles, and Magic Among the Azande*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1956. *Nuer Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1960. "Religion and the Anthropologists." *Blackfriars* 41(480):104-118.
- Foreman, Martin. 1999. *AIDS and Men: Taking Risks or Taking Responsibility?* New York: Panos.
- Fortes, Meyer, ed. 1962. *Marriage in Tribal Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1969. *Kinship and the Social Order: The Legacy of Lewis Henry Morgan*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Fox, Robin. 1967. *Kinship and Marriage: An Anthropological Perspective*. Baltimore: Penguin.
- Frazer, James G. 1920 [1890-1915]. *The Golden Bough: A Study in Comparative Religion*. New York: MacMillan.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1918 [1913]. *Totem and Taboo: Resemblances Between the Psychic Lives of Savages and Neurotics*. A.A. Brill, trans. New York: Moffat Yard.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic.
- Goldner, Virginia. 1991. "Toward a Critical Relational Theory of Gender." *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 1(3):249-272.
- Goody, Jack and Stanley Tambiah. 1973. *Bridewealth and Dowry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gutmann, Matthew. 1996. *The Meanings of Macho: Being a Man in Mexico City*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1997. "Trafficking in Men: The Anthropology of Masculinity." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26:385-409.
- _____, ed. 2003. *Changing Men and Masculinities in Latin America*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Harris, Marvin. 1991 [1974]. *Cows, Pigs, Wars, and Witches: The Riddles of Culture*. New York: Vintage.
- Hirschkind, Charles. 2006. "Cassette Ethics: Public Piety and Popular Media in Egypt." In Birgit Meyer and Annelies Moors, eds. *Religion, Media, and the Public Sphere*, 29-51. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Inhorn, Marcia. 2012. *The New Arab Man: Emergent Masculinities, Technologies, and Islam in the Middle East*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Inhorn, Marcia and Emily Wentzell. 2011. "Embodying Emergent Masculinities: Men Engaging with Reproductive and Sexual Health Technologies in the Middle East and Mexico." *American Ethnologist* 38(4):801-815.
- James, William. 1902. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. New York: Longmans Green.

New Directions in the Anthropology of Religion and Gender:
Faith and Emergent Masculinities

- Jiménez, Félix. 2004. *Prácticas de la Carne: Construcción y Representación de las Masculinidades Puertorriqueñas*. San Juan: Vertigo.
- Khuri, Fuad I. 2001. *The Body in Islamic Culture*. London: Saqi.
- Kronorfer, Björn. 2010. *Male Confessions: Intimate Revelations and the Religious Imagination*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Laidlaw, James. 2014. *The Subject of Virtue: An Anthropology of Ethics and Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lamphere, Louise, Helena Ragoné, and Patricia Zavella, eds. 1991. *Situated Lives: Gender and Culture in Everyday Life*. New York: Routledge.
- Lancaster, Roger N. 1992. *Life is Hard: Machismo, Danger, and the Intimacy of Power in Nicaragua*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Leach, Edmund. 1961. *Rethinking Anthropology*. London: London University Press.
- Lester, Rebecca J. 2005. *Jesus in Our Wombs: Embodying Modernity in a Mexican Convent*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1969 [1947]. *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*. John Richard von Sturmer and Rodney Needham, eds. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Lewis, I.M. 2003 [1971]. *Ecstatic Religion: A Study of Shamanism and Spirit Possession*, 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Lienhardt, Godfrey. 1961. *Divinity and Experience: The Religion of the Dinka*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lindhardt, Martin. 2012. "'We, the Youth, Need to Be Effusive': Pentecostals and Youth Culture in Contemporary Chile." *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 32(4):485-498.
- _____. 2015. "Men of God: Neo-Pentecostalism and Masculinities in Urban Tanzania." *Religion* 45(2):252-272.
- Lorentzen, Lois Ann and Rosalina Mira. 2005. "El Milagro Está en Casa: Gender and Private/Public Empowerment in a Migrant Pentecostal Church." *Latin American Perspectives* 32(1):57-71.
- Mahmood, Saba. 2005. *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1913. *The Family Among the Australian Aborigines: A Sociological Study*. London: London University Press.
- _____. 1922. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. London: Routledge.
- Martin, Bernice. 2007. "The Pentecostal Gender Paradox: A Cautionary Tale for the Sociology of Religion." In *The Blackwell Companion to Sociology of Religion*, 52-66. New York: Blackwell.
- Martin, David. 1990. *Tongues of Fire: The Explosion of Protestantism in Latin America*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Martin, Patricia Yancy. 1998. "Why Can't a Man be More Like a Woman? Reflections on Connell's Masculinities." *Gender and Society* 12(4):472-474.
- Mascia-Lees, Frances E. and Nancy Johnson Black. 1999. *Gender and Anthropology*. Prospect Heights: Waveland.
- Masuzawa, Tomoko. 2005. *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mayblin, Maya. 2010. *Gender, Catholicism, and Morality in Brazil: Virtuous Husbands, Powerful Wives*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.
- McCutcheon, Russell T. 1997. *Manufacturing Religion: The Discourse on Sui Generis Religion and the Politics of Nostalgia*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2003. *The Discipline of Religion: Structure, Meaning, Rhetoric*. London: Routledge.
- Mead, Margaret. 1935. *Sex and Temperament in Three Societies*. London: Routledge.
- _____. 2004 [1928]. *Coming of Age in Samoa: A Psychological Study of Primitive Youth for Western Civilisation*. New York: Perennial Classics.

- Mernissi, Fatima. 1975. *Beyond the Veil: Male-Female Dynamics in a Modern Muslim Society*. Cambridge: Schenkman.
- Metcalf, Barbara D. 1998. "Women and Men in a Contemporary Pietist Movement: The Case of the Tablighi Jama'at." In Amrita Basu and Patricia Jeffery, eds. *Appropriating Gender: Women's Activism and Politicized Religion in South Asia*, 107-121. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2000. "The Tablighi Jama'at and Women." In Muhammad Khalid Masud, ed. *Travellers in Faith: Studies of the Tablighi Jama'at as a Transnational Movement for Faith Renewal*, 44-58. Leiden: Brill.
- Meyer, Birgit. 2010. "Pentecostalism and Globalization." In Allan Anderson et al. eds. *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods*, 113-130. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Morgan, Lewis Henry. 1970 [1871]. *Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family*. Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, vol. 12. New York: Oosterhout.
- Müller, Max. 1879-1910. *Sacred Books of the East, 50 Volumes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Murata, Sachiko. 1992. *The Tao of Islam: A Sourcebook on Gender Relationships in Islamic Thought*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Murdock, George. 1949. *Social Structure*. New York: MacMillan.
- Needham, Rodney. 1971. *Rethinking Kinship and Marriage*. A.S.A. Monographs, no. 11. London: Tavistock.
- Ong, Aihwa and Michael Peletz. 1995. *Bewitching Women, Pious Men: Gender and Body Politics in Southeast Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ortner, Sherry. 1974. "Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture?" In Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere, eds. *Women, Culture, and Society*, 68-87. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Ortner, Sherry and Harriet Whitehead. 1981. *Sexual Meanings: The Cultural Construction of Gender and Sexuality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Parkin, Robert and Linda Stone, eds. 2004. *Kinship and Family: An Anthropological Reader*. Malden: Blackwell
- Pascoe, C.J. 2007. *"Dude, You're a Fag": Masculinity and Sexuality in High School*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Peristiany, John. G., ed. 1966. *Honor and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Pfeiffer, James, Kenneth Gimbel-Sherr, and Oravhlo Joaquim Augusto. 2007. "The Holy Spirit in the Household: Pentecostalism, Gender, and Neoliberalism in Mozambique." *American Anthropologist* 109(4):688-700.
- Peletz, Michael. 1994. "Neither Reasonable nor Responsible: Contrasting Representations of Masculinity in Malay Society." *Cultural Anthropology* 9(2):135-178.
- _____. 1996. *Reason and Passion: Representations of Gender in Malay Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Radcliffe-Brown, Alfred. 1964 [1922]. *The Andaman Islanders*. New York: Free Press.
- Redfield, Robert. 1930. *Tepoztlan, a Mexican Village: A Study in Folk Life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rappaport, Roy. 1979. *Ecology, Meaning, and Religion*. Richmond: North Atlantic Books.
- Ridgeway, Cecilia L. and Shelley J. Correll. 2004. "Unpacking the Gender System: A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Beliefs and Social Relations." *Gender and Society* 18(4):510-531.
- Robbins, Joel. 2004. *Becoming Sinners: Christianity and Moral Torment in a Papua New Guinea Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rosaldo, Michelle. 1974. Woman, Culture, and Society: A Theoretical Overview." In Michelle Zimbalist Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere, eds. *Women, Culture, and Society*, 17-42. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- _____. 1980. "The Use and Abuse of Anthropology: Reflections on Feminism and Cross-cultural Understanding." *Signs* 5(3):389-417.
- Rosaldo, Michelle and Louise Lamphere, eds. 1974. *Woman, Culture, and Society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Samuel, Geoffrey. 2011. "Islamic Piety and Masculinity." *Contemporary Islam* 5(3):309-322.
- Schneider, David. 1972. "What is Kinship All About?" In Priscilla Reining, ed. *Kinship Studies in the Morgan Centennial Year*, 32-63. Washington, DC: The Anthropological Society of Washington.
- _____. 1984. *A Critique of the Study of Kinship*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Scott, Joan W. 1986. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *The American Historical Review* 91(5):1053-1075.
- _____. 1988. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- _____. 2011. *The Fantasy of Feminist History*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Seidler, Victor Jeleniewski. 2006. *Young Men and Masculinities: Global Cultures and Intimate Lives*. London: Zed.
- _____. 2007. *Urban Fears and Global Terrors: Citizenship, Multicultures, and Belongings After 7/7*. London: Routledge.
- Shotwell, Alexis and Trevor Sangrey. 2009. "Resisting Definition: Gendering through Interaction and Relational Selfhood." *Hypatia* 24(3):56-76.
- Singerman, Diane. 2013. "Youth, Gender, and Dignity in the Egyptian Uprising." *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies* 9(3):1-27.
- Silverman, Eric Kline. 2001. *Masculinity, Motherhood, and Mockery: Psychoanalyzing Culture and the latmul Naven Rite in New Guinea*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Smilde, David. 1997. "The Fundamental Unity of the Conservative and Revolutionary Tendencies in Venezuelan Evangelicalism: The Case of Conjugal Relations." *Religion* 27(4): 343-359.
- _____. 2007. *Reason to Believe: Cultural Agency in Latin American Evangelicalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. 1978. *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Somers, Margaret. 1994. "The Narrative Construction of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach." *Theory and Society* 23(5):605-649.
- Soothill, Jane. 2007. *Gender, Social Change, and Spiritual Power: Charismatic Christianity in Ghana*. London: Brill.
- Spiro, Melford E. 1967. *Burmese Supernaturalism: A Study in the Explanation and Reduction in Suffering*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Stacey, Judith and Susan E. Gerard. 1990. "'We are not Doormats': The Influence of Feminism on Contemporary Evangelicals in the United States." In Faye Ginsburg and Anna L. Tsing, eds. *Uncertain Terms: Negotiating Gender in American Culture*, 98-117. Boston: Beacon.
- Stack, Carol. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Stoll, David. 1990. *Is Latin America Turning Protestant? The Politics of Evangelical Growth*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stone, Linda. 2004a. "The Demise and Revival of Kinship." In Robert Parkin and Linda Stone, eds. *Kinship and Family: An Anthropological Reader*, 241-256. Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____. 2004b. "Contemporary Directions in Kinship." In Robert Parkin and Linda Stone, eds. *Kinship and Family: An Anthropological Reader*, 331-341. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Strathern, Marilyn. 1988. *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and Problems with Society in Melanesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1992. *Reproducing the Future: Anthropology, Kinship, and the New Reproductive Technologies*. New York: Routledge.
- Tambiah, Stanley J. 1970. *Buddhism and the Spirit Cults of Northeast Thailand*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1990. *Magic, Science, and Religion, and the Scope of Rationality*. Lewis Henry Morgan Lectures. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tambiah, Stanley J., et al. 1989. "Bridewealth and Dowry Revisited: The Position of Women in sub-Saharan Africa and North India (and Comments and Reply)." *Current Anthropology* 30(4):413-435.

- Taussig, Michael. 1987. *Shamanism, Colonialism, and the Wild Man: A Study in Terror and Healing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Thomas, Todne, Asiya Malik, and Rose Wellman, eds. 2017. *New Directions in Spiritual Kinship: Sacred Ties Across the Abrahamic Religions*. New York: Springer.
- Thornton, Brendan Jamal. 2013. "Residual Masculinity and the Cultivation of Negative-Charisma in a Caribbean Pentecostal Community." In Charles Lindholm, ed. *The Anthropology of Religious Charisma*, 117-146. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- _____. 2016. *Negotiating Respect: Pentecostalism, Masculinity, and the Politics of Spiritual Authority in the Dominican Republic*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Turner, Victor. 1967. *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- _____. 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure*. Chicago: Aldine.
- van Klinken, Adriaan. 2011. "Male Headship as Male Agency: An Alternative Understanding of a 'Patriarchal' African Pentecostal Discourse on Masculinity." *Religion and Gender* 1(1):101-124.
- _____. 2012. "Men in the Remaking: Conversion Narratives and Born-again Masculinity in Zambia." *Journal of Religion in Africa* 42(3):215-239.
- _____. 2013. *Transforming Masculinities in African Christianity: Gender Controversies in Times of AIDS*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Verkaaik, Oscar. 2004. *Migrants and Militants: Fun and Urban Violence in Pakistan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Weber, Max. 2003 [1905]. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Dover.
- Weston, Kath. 1995. *Families We Choose: Lesbians, Gays, Kinship*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Whitehead, Stephen M. 1998. "Hegemonic Masculinity Revisited." *Gender, Work, and Organization* 6(1):58-62.
- Willems, Emilio. 1967. *Followers of the New Faith: Culture Change and the Rise of Protestantism in Brazil and Chile*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Wolf, Margery. 1972. *Women and the Family in Rural Taiwan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Wuthnow, Robert. 1988. *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith and Since World War II*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. 1994a. *Sharing the Journey: Support Groups and America's New Quest for Community*. New York: Free Press.
- _____. 1994b. *"I Come Away Stronger": How Small Groups are Shaping American Religion*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- _____. 1998. *After Heaven: Spirituality in America since the 1950s*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Foreign Language Translations:

New Directions in the Anthropology of Religion and Gender: Faith and Emergent Masculinities

人类学背景下宗教与性别研究之新方向：信仰与男性特质之涌现

Новые направления в антропологии религии и гендера: Вера и новые маскулинности

Novas Direções na Antropologia da Religião e do Gênero: Fé e Masculinidades Emergentes

عنوان المجموعة والمقدمة اتجاهات جديدة في إنثروبولوجيا الدين والنوع الجنسي: الإيمان والذكورة الناشئة

