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Christianity, place/space, and anthropology: Thinking across recent research on evangelical place-making

*Ingie Hovland*

Place-making is a central activity for Christian groups. Yet the scholarly literature contains little comparative conversation on local Christian theories of place. This article ‘thinks across’ ten ethnographic descriptions of evangelical communities in order to pay attention to what these Christians pay attention to in their everyday place-making. It discusses seven problematics that commonly recur in evangelical place-work (namely linguistic, material, temporal, personhood, translocal, transcendent, and worldly concerns). This analysis nuances current anthropological debates on Protestant materiality, temporality, and personhood. The article argues that a central tenet of evangelicals’ place-making is a simultaneous taking apart and bringing together of faith and place. This results in a simultaneous fusing and ‘unfusing’ of situation and setting, which cannot be labeled either dis-placement or thorough emplacement. More broadly, evangelical place-making provides a modern example of deterritorialization that is different from placeless-ness. It also speaks to the complex interplay between ideals, intentionality, and agency.

# Introduction: Christian theories of place

Christian communities congregate. They gather in places ranging from cathedrals to fields, from living rooms to warehouses. How do different Christian communities choose what kind of place to congregate in? How do they shape their space on earth to correspond to the prayer ‘Let your kingdom come, on earth as it is in heaven’? And how do their places in turn shape their Christianity? One field that would be well suited to address such questions is the anthropology of Christianity, but this field has not yet integrated conversation around problems of religion and space very well.[[1]](#footnote-1) I am not the first anthropologist to observe this paucity (Bielo 2013c; Collins 2013; Robbins 2014). However, this has prompted at least one religious studies scholar to politely wonder why anthropologists seem to believe there is a lack of literature on religion and place/space when the literature is, in fact, overwhelming (McConeghy 2013). I think this interesting moment of interdisciplinary bewilderment provides a good starting point for delineating what anthropologists perceive to be missing from the broader interdisciplinary conversation on space and religion, especially space and Christianity.

There is, of course, a tremendous amount of literature. Scholars from several fields – including religious studies, theology, history, archaeology, anthropology, sociology, and geography – have produced a great number of individual case studies of Christians’ interaction with place/space, including specific localities, buildings (churches, shrines, etc.), material environments, domestic environments, historical sites, views of ‘Christian’ and ‘non-Christian’ spaces, and so on.[[2]](#footnote-2) Some scholars, especially in religious studies, have produced generalized analytic models of how to study the relationship between religion and place/space, as well as the relationship between religion and movement across places (e.g. Jones 2000; Knott 2005; Tweed 2006). There is also growing interest – especially from religious studies, anthropology, sociology, and geography – in religion and migration/diaspora[[3]](#footnote-3) and religious pilgrimage and tourism.[[4]](#footnote-4) Much of this work has initiated questions around religious identity and re-territorialization, contestations over places, and the transnational connections between places.

Given these wide-ranging, and fragmented, literatures, why is it that anthropologists of Christianity still comment on the lack of work on Christianity and place? I would suggest that what they perceive to be missing from this broad swath of interdisciplinary study of religion and place/space, and what they can potentially contribute, is a rich, comparative conversation on local Christian theories of place. This situation has a recent analogy: while there is a large amount of interdisciplinary work on language and religion, what anthropologists of Christianity have recently taken up an interest in, and are now contributing, is a sustained conversation on local Christian theories of language.[[5]](#footnote-5) We lack a similar conversation on local Christian theories of place. ‘Local Christian theories’ here refers to how specific Christian communities use and think about their places, and I use ‘comparative conversation’ loosely to refer to a conversation across such local theories in relation to a broader question.[[6]](#footnote-6) I am drawing here on the anthropological perspective that seeks to attend to what particular Christians attend to, as a way of speaking to a larger academic problem. Exploring this idea further, this article will ‘think across’ ten ethnographic descriptions of evangelical communities, paying attention to what these specific Christians pay attention to in their everyday place-making.

The choice to focus on evangelicalism is due, firstly, to pragmatic reasons: my own research has been on evangelical Christianity, and there has been a recent wave of anthropological (and anthropologically-inflected) work on evangelical communities, which has resulted in the availability of several good ethnographic studies.[[7]](#footnote-7) But there are also two further motivations. First, evangelicalism, being a modern phenomenon, has long proven an interesting companion when thinking about Western modernity (e.g. Mauss [1938] 1985; Weber [1905] 2002). In this article I will use it as an example that challenges the narrative of apparent placeless-ness in Western late modernity, or the sense of a ‘loss’ of place (Bielo 2013a; Harvey 1993). The evangelical tradition has not uniformly picked up the modern narrative of placeless-ness, but has rather, I will argue, settled on a different and more agentive form of deterritorialization (and re-territorialization). Second, evangelicalism is a particularly apt example for thinking more broadly around the complex interplay between agency, intentionality, ideals, and hope.

So, what is ‘evangelicalism’? It is, if anything, notoriously difficult to define. But, briefly, I will draw on three vantage points here. First, I take it to be important that evangelicalism originated in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century evangelical revivals, with their emphasis on conversionism, activism, Biblicism, and crucicentrism (Bebbington 2003). Second, when considering world Christianity today I see evangelicalism and Pentecostal/charismatic Christianity as two distinct global Christian movements that may intersect with any given denomination (though usually Protestant) as well as with each other, and I see fundamentalism as a sub-category of evangelicalism.[[8]](#footnote-8) Third, this article is a contribution to the nascent project of building an ethnographic understanding of everyday evangelical Christianity, rather than an analysis of its public leaders and institutions.[[9]](#footnote-9)

The article’s guiding question is: Which recurring features tend to characterize local evangelical theories of place-making? It echoes one of James Bielo’s (2013c: 302) orienting questions in his introduction to ‘Urban Christianities’: How do these particular Christians ‘dwell’?[[10]](#footnote-10) Which ‘problematics’ (Bialecki 2012) become especially pressing for them in their place-work, and which solutions do they turn to? In raising these sorts of questions, I draw on a long-standing scholarly interest in how places are socially produced (e.g. Appadurai 1995). In naming a particular place, such as an ‘evangelical church,’ congregants (and others) are pulling together a large array of interactions and defining them as ‘evangelical church,’ which requires continuous social work. Kim Knott (2010) suggests that this line of questioning, based in the work of French theorists and critical geographers, may be labeled the ‘politics of space,’ to differentiate it from the phenomenological ‘poetics of space.’[[11]](#footnote-11) While this article is indeed more oriented toward the ‘politics,’ with an emphasis on the production, practice, and representation of space, these questions will also at times be set in dialogue with the ‘poetics,’ including the experience, aesthetics, and sensory mediation of place. I use the words ‘space’ and ‘place’ somewhat loosely here, which I think best captures people’s place-making practices. I find the two words most helpful insofar as they give us two different terms for capturing the sliding difference (and overlap) between concrete ‘places’ and more amorphous ‘spaces,’ and I take both ‘place’ and ‘space’ to be meaningful to the people concerned.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Places can shape people’s lives, but not necessarily in predictable ways. There has traditionally been an emphasis in the ‘politics of space’ approach on tracing the homology between the spatial and the social (especially following Bourdieu’s [1980/1990] analysis of the Kabyle house). But alongside this there has been something of a counter-current within the ‘politics’ approach that views places as less deterministic, and instead emphasizes the multivocality of materiality along with its multiple affordances (i.e. the range of actions that can be performed within a given built environment). This brings in a stronger emphasis on the possible contestation of how life can be lived in a given place, and the possibility of change in that place (Coleman and Collins 2006).[[13]](#footnote-13) I find the latter angle more productive when examining evangelical place-making, and will use it in this article.

Where, then, to start in thinking more closely about evangelical place-making? Let us begin by considering Simon Coleman and Peter Collins’s (2006) suggestion that the ideal form of revivalist Christian space might be represented by the tent: it can be pitched in one place for a series of enthusiastic revival meetings, offering a temporary converted space set apart from the outside, and then it can be moved on. It displays ‘the revivalist mistrust of place’ (35), and is indicative, more broadly, of nonconformist Protestant ‘effacements of place, in favour of non-conformist space’ (41).[[14]](#footnote-14) While Coleman and Collins point to important aspects of the evangelical orientation, I want to pause here to present the other side of the case. It seems to me that evangelical communities do not usually mistrust or try to efface the concrete places to which they are anchored. Rather, most evangelical communities engage in careful, sustained work to actualize their Christian concerns in specific, enduring places.

In this article I will argue, therefore, that a central tenet of evangelicals’ place-making is the simultaneous taking apart and bringing together of their faith and their place. In making this suggestion I am reworking Coleman and Collins’s suggestion that revivalist-inflected Christianity tends toward ‘space’ rather than ‘place’. On the other hand, I am also reworking the classic anthropological argument that ‘local theories of dwelling’ entail ‘ways of fusing setting to situation, locality to life-world’ (Feld and Basso 1996: 8). The evangelical case, I will argue, is neither devoted only to an ‘unfusing’ of locality and faith-world (a tendency toward ‘space’), nor only to a fusion of the two (a tendency toward ‘place’). Rather, it provides an ethnographic example in which place-making is thought of and used, by the people concerned, as a process of simultaneous fusing and unfusing of setting and situation.

I will present this argument by highlighting seven features that recur across most of the descriptions of evangelical place-making presented here: linguistic, material, temporal, personhood, translocal, transcendent, and worldly concerns.[[15]](#footnote-15) I am discussing these aspects of place-making because they are salient across the ethnographic cases, but they are not meant to form a comprehensive typology. They are, rather, an attempt to use both my own research as well as that of others to think about a larger question – how do evangelicals think about place-making? – and provide an open-ended answer (that will hopefully be added on to by others). I have had to leave out some dimensions of place-making that were either not discussed very fully in these particular ethnographies or that took me beyond the scope of a single article.[[16]](#footnote-16)

I will discuss each aspect of place-making in relation to one or two ethnographic studies that I think illustrate it particularly well. Needless to say, each ethnographic case actually illuminates several facets of place-making. For example, the first case below (an evangelical amphitheater) is especially well suited to discussing linguistic concerns, but even in the brief description I have given it will be evident that it also touches on questions about what a chapel should look like (material concerns), how congregants should think of themselves (personhood concerns), and how the place can act as a witness in the world (worldly concerns). Moreover, Kilde’s (2002) original account of the amphitheater is much longer, and opens up further dimensions of the place. In other words, each ethnographic case sheds light on several of the seven features of place-making, even though only one feature is discussed in detail in each section. I will point out some of these intersections along the way; the reader will probably also find many more.

# Linguistic concerns

Let me start, then, with the type of linguistic concerns that evangelicals demonstrate when making spaces, which are illustrated in Jeanne Kilde’s (2002) account of an evangelical amphitheater. The account begins with Charles Finney, an evangelical revivalist preacher. He traveled around upstate New York in the 1820s until a group of Presbyterians in New York City invited him to come and establish a new ‘free church’ in the city (i.e. a church without the traditional Presbyterian pew fees). The building they found for the new church was an old theater building. The interior held a stage, a sloping floor with curved benches for audience members, and theater boxes in three tiers. This lay-out was unprecedented in Protestant churches at the time, which traditionally used a flat floor with the pastor elevated above the congregation in a pulpit. Elevation had long been bound up with associations to the divine, heaven, and religious authority. It was therefore a daring experiment that the free-church Presbyterians decided to carry out when they placed the preacher physically lower than most of the congregation.

Finney found, however, that this architectural inversion offered a number of advantages. One was better acoustics. The lay-out facilitated attentive listening and speech that could be clearly heard. It supported the evangelical emphasis on using words, such as in explication of the text of the Bible, or in personal testimonies of conversion. Another advantage was the expanse of the stage, which allowed Finney to pace around and hold people’s attention during the sermon – the key element of his services. Directly in front of the stage he placed a single bench called the ‘anxious bench.’ Anyone who was struggling with their conscience was invited to come and sit on this bench, facing the congregation, in order to help them through their struggle with sin toward salvation. In this way the lay-out facilitated the revivalist emphasis on the individual conversion experience, and the link between individual conversion and individual listening. At the same time the anxious bench was placed firmly in the communal gaze, thus also emphasizing the importance of being socialized into the right kind of attentively listening subject in this new evangelical community.

As the evangelical congregation became more important as listeners, this introduced a new type of power that promoted increased negotiation (though as Kilde observes, the new type of popular authority was often successfully blended with authoritarian authority). The new evangelical arrangement also pushed toward greater social engagement. While Finney required that white and black congregants be seated in separate sections during his services, the congregation and its locale still quickly became a site in which broader questions were raised. The theater was rented out to various civil society groups, including the Anti-Slavery Society. The tension surrounding this mixture of politics with religion fed into the race riots in New York in 1834, during which people tried to break into the theater to ransack it. The following year the free-churchers left the building and relocated to an uptown district instead, which offered a more secluded space. Already during the evangelical revivals, then, we can observe some of the difficulties inherent in the evangelical desire to be active in the world.

# Material concerns

A second evangelical concern when shaping places is how to engage with materiality. I first grew interested in materiality when I conducted archival research on the Norwegian Missionary Society, a largely pietistic Lutheran organization established in 1842 as an outcome of the evangelical revivals (Hovland 2013). Some of their first missionaries were sent to Southern Africa to work among the Zulus. When the missionaries arrived they were confronted with the question of what kind of place to make in this new landscape, and they decided to build a mission station. The mission station was still a relatively new type of space for Protestants. The evangelical Norwegians started by building a few square buildings. The first square house was for them to live in, and in the beginning it also doubled as a church in which to hold Sunday services. They built a square barn for their cows. They plowed fields. They hired young Zulus to work on the station – mostly doing farm work and housework – and built a square house for these young Zulus to live in.

The mission station was from the outset intended to be strikingly different from its surroundings. The Africans in the area lived in rounded beehive huts, arranged in circular polygynous homesteads, with a circular cattle enclosure in the center. The Norwegian mission station was meant to express a different moral world, and it did this in part through its architecture, including the upright walls of the buildings, and the monogamous family residence. The missionaries soon constructed a square school house in which to hold reading lessons for nearby Zulu children (reflecting the evangelical linguistic emphasis on the importance of being able to read the Bible). The children learnt to sit on benches, which were uncommon in Zulu homesteads at the time, and to handle pamphlets and books, with which they were unfamiliar. The missionaries turned the wholly oral Zulu language into a written language that could be rendered materially on paper, and used this as the basis for their reading lessons. The missionaries also brought with them other artefacts, including European clothes in a plain style, medical creams and tools for pulling teeth, ox-drawn plows, clocks and lamps, mirrors and glass windows. This new material environment was associated with new mental and moral possibilities, and arguably helped to introduce not just evangelical sensibilities but also a certain Christianized version of European modernity (cf. Comaroff and Comaroff 1991).

In due course the Norwegian missionaries built a fairly small, rectangular church on the station. Its interior held a rectangular altar table, a baptismal font, and an elevated pulpit. The congregation sat on straight benches facing the pastor at the front. Unlike Finney’s amphitheater in New York, the church on the mission station was quite traditional in its architectural lay-out, though it was markedly evangelical in its pared-down aesthetics. The evangelical revivals contained an iconoclastic streak that usually led to the rejection of sculptures and intricate ornamentation. The inclusion of an altar and baptismal font in their church signaled that the pietistic Lutherans placed a higher value on the sacraments than the free-church Presbyterians in New York. However, the pietists shared the free-churchers’ linguistic concerns, and usually devoted the Sunday service to the word: Bible reading, a long sermon, the creed, prayers, and hymns. The fairly small church space in which the preacher stood in the pulpit to speak, with the congregation directly in front of him on low benches, made it possible to an extent to instill the evangelical disposition of attentive listening (though the missionaries did from time to time complain of the noise and giggling during their services, indicating that the lay-out did not fully allow them to control the space).

The missionaries spent much of their time on the physical labor required to set up the buildings and fields, tend to the animals, and manage the station. They expressed an ongoing ambivalence about this effort. They referred to it sometimes as ‘the secular work,’ as opposed to ‘the actual mission work’ (by which they meant linguistic activities: direct teaching and verbal evangelizing). As Protestants, and especially as evangelicals, they were guided by the theological doctrine of justification by faith alone, and were skeptical of anything material that might detract from an unmediated, personal relationship with God. Yet they also sought out the material in order to address the ‘problem of presence’ (Engelke 2007), namely the problem of how to make an invisible God present to themselves and the Africans around them. They did not try to solve the problem of presence by dispensing with materiality (as in the case explored by Engelke, in which a Christian community in Southern Africa has sought to dispense with the material Bible in order to foster a more direct relationship with God). Instead the Norwegians were typical of evangelicals more broadly, I would argue, in that they did not shy away from consciously using materiality when it was seen to perform a specific function – such as solving the problem of presence, or fulfilling the need to witness – even though the investment in materiality was often associated with an ongoing tension. I differ here from Birgit Meyer’s (2010) suggestion that Protestants, especially Pentecostals/evangelicals, usually claim that materiality is not important in their Christianity. My view is closer to that of Hillary Kaell (2014), who argues that evangelical pilgrims carefully link the problem of presence to materiality, and to Webb Keane’s (2007) suggestion that Protestant communities display modulations between materialization and de-materialization.

Paying attention to the materiality of places helps us observe that not only do evangelicals try to use their Christianity to shape their places, but the places in turn contribute to the shape of their Christianity (though not necessarily in predictable ways). As I found with the Norwegian missionaries, the evangelically-inflected built environment – centered on the nuclear family residence, the school house, and the church – facilitated certain patterned interaction between the white missionaries who ran the station and the Africans who visited and lived there. And, after several decades, a racial hierarchy had been normalized on the stations that had not originally been intended. This contributed, I argue, to the missionaries’ shift from an initial skepticism of British colonialism to becoming theological cheerleaders for the Empire. At the same time, the environment of the mission station spaces also provided resources for later African political leaders, which had not been intended either. Again we can see some of the challenges of putting evangelical intentions into practice in the world.

# Temporal concerns

A third facet of evangelical place-making is the evangelical attentiveness to questions of time. The communal gathering for worship on Sunday stands out as a remarkably continuous trait of Christian communities across centuries of history, across most countries in the world, and across most denominations.[[17]](#footnote-17) Evangelical communities too usually wish to be ordered by the continuity of this global Christian timetable. Evangelicals often organize additional gatherings on other days of the week, such as prayer meetings, house groups, or Bible studies. And at times they gather based on alternative temporal models, such as in intense camp revival meeting series or prayer months. However, the overall temporal pattern is one of consistency: the vast majority of evangelical communities organize their main communal gatherings on Sundays, Sunday after Sunday after Sunday.

It is perhaps somewhat surprising that revivalists would want to fit into this established temporal order, and this observation has not been integrated very well into the anthropological discussion on Pentecostal/evangelical temporality. Instead, anthropologists have picked up on the Pentecostal/evangelical view that there are temporal ruptures that usher in momentous changes in the timeline of humanity: the break in time that was effected by the death and resurrection of Jesus, and the break that will be effected by Jesus’s second coming, as well as the break in individual life histories that is effected by conversion (Meyer 1998; Robbins 2007; though see Dulin 2015). This Pentecostal/evangelical attentiveness to discontinuity is important. But when we employ the lens of place-making we are forced to account for the simultaneous heavy evangelical emphasis on temporal continuity.

Joseph Webster (2013) gives a contemporary account that illustrates this evangelical desire to be ordered by temporal continuity, from the town of Gamrie on the Scottish coast. Some of Gamrie’s inhabitants are Brethren (a group that grew out of the nineteenth-century evangelical revivals), with a dispensationalist, fundamentalist orientation and a strict morality. They never set foot in the local pub. Many of the Brethren are fishermen, and the Christian skippers, as opposed to those who are not Christian, plan their fishing trips around Sunday worship: they leave the harbor on Sunday night and return on Saturday. One man told Webster that he thought the devil, aware of their desire to return to land for Sunday services, frequently organized poor weather during the week and ideal fishing conditions on Sundays, while others interpreted this meteorological pattern as a test set up by God (166). Why do these evangelical skippers not simply celebrate Sunday on board the trawler, together with their Christian crew, and plan their trips around the best fishing weather? While there may be multiple reasons in play here, evangelicalism plays a key role in their framing of the issue: a central aspect of evangelical place-making is the importance of returning continuously to the communal gathering place on Sundays. At the same time, these Brethren also exemplify a commitment to temporal ruptures, especially in their millennialist expectation that Jesus will return soon. They gather in little meeting halls whose walls are bare except for, in two of them, hand-painted banners that proclaim: ‘Therefore be ye also ready’ and ‘Till He come’ (xvii). Just as their attentiveness to the temporal discontinuity of Jesus’s expected return is inscribed on the walls, their attentiveness to temporal continuity is inscribed in their bodies regularly seated in the pews each Sunday.

But Evangelicals do not just want to be ordered by Christian time. They also tend to want places that can aid them in ordering time in a Christian way. Here we return to their attentiveness to discontinuity: they want to produce events, in Alain Badiou’s (2005) sense of ‘event’ as an appearance of truth that causes a rupture in the established order. They want to impact both individual lives as well as the world, setting up places that can cause events both there and elsewhere. This too is illustrated in Webster’s work on the Brethren in Gamrie (2013: 185-190). For example, many of them followed the fortunes of Israel, because they believed the Bible foretells that Israel must convert to Christianity and the desert must bloom before the second coming of Jesus. Webster describes a Christian Zionist conference at which there was intense discussion and prayer over particular events – the challenges faced by particular political parties in Israel, handling of specific political crises – that would impact the next months, the next few years, and the next decade. He also describes how several Gamrics supported the ‘Million Trees’ project, a tree planting project in Israel organized by various Christian organizations, including God TV. Christians in Gamrie frequently consumed such transnational evangelical media outputs. This perceived need to come together in particular kinds of spaces – in conference rooms, in the virtual space of the Million Trees website – in order to study, discuss, plan, and execute actions that represent ‘eschatological agency’ (190) do not just relate to the distant future, but, as Webster points out, hinge on the desire to impact the near future.

Webster here challenges the perspective on evangelical temporality put forward by Jane Guyer, who has argued that evangelicals tend to emphasize the present and the distant future, leading to an ‘evacuation of the near future’ (Guyer 2007: 409).[[18]](#footnote-18) Guyer builds her analysis of evangelicalism on the premillennialist ‘Left Behind’ phenomenon, for which she offers a thoughtful interpretation.[[19]](#footnote-19) But when we take into account a broader and more representative sample of evangelical Christian communities, they do not on the whole come across as having ‘no organization and no midterm reasoning’ (416). On the contrary, it seems to me that a majority of evangelicals display a tendency toward thinking about and acting in order to impact the near future – whether in social projects at home, mission abroad, or their engagement (not without friction) with the international development paradigm (e.g. Girard 2013; Hovland 2008; O’Neill 2015). Evangelicals use their places to plan – for the near future, for events, for change. This does not mean, of course, that the planning is easy, or that it is smoothly put into practice. Recall the difficulty of intentions and evangelical agency in the world. In particular, the correct distribution of agency – between individual, group, and God – is often a point of concern for evangelicals, and when a workable resolution is not achieved this may hinder their ability to plan effectively (e.g. Bialecki 2009).

# Personhood concerns

A fourth striking aspect of evangelical place-making is the complex interplay that is created in these spaces between the individual and the group. Some anthropologists have argued for the individualism of Protestantism, especially Pentecostalism/evangelicalism (Meyer 1998; Robbins 2004a, 2012). It is of course true for evangelicals, as for Protestants more broadly, that nobody else can be saved in your stead or can perform any action on your behalf to save you, and that this strongly marks the moral situation of the self: ‘alone before God,’ as Kierkegaard put it ([1849] 2004: 35). And to this end, evangelical places accommodate an individual relationship with God, for example by ensuring that each listener can hear the word of God clearly. Yet ‘alone before God’ is a paradox: alone, in a relationship with someone. Therefore it seems to me that our understanding of Christian place-making is advanced further by the recent conversation among anthropologists that recognizes some of this paradoxical situation, and seeks to relativize Christian individualism by examining the distributed or decentered Christian self and Christian sociality (e.g. Bialecki 2015; Handman 2015).

To illustrate these personhood concerns let me turn to a church that is evangelical in theology but charismatic in worship style. The Vineyard is a nondenominational, neo-Pentecostal church planting movement that originated in California in the 1980s. Tanya Luhrmann (2012) opens her book on the Vineyard with an account of a Sunday service in Chicago, which was at the time held in the neighborhood club locale (though the congregation later moved into a Lutheran chapel). The service begins with thirty minutes of ‘worship.’ Familiar worship songs are displayed on powerpoint projections in the front. Luhrmann observes that, unlike many traditional hymns, most of these worship songs are not *about* God, but are sung *to* God (5):

The techies dim the lights. Some people stand, eyes closed, palms out and upward, swaying slightly, their cheeks sometimes wet with tears. Some sit and rest their foreheads on clasped hands. Some kneel in prayer. Occasionally someone lies prostrate or dances in the open space to the side […] Meanwhile, latecomers wander in for coffee and doughnuts at the back. (4)

It is acceptable to come late, in one’s own tempo, precisely because this worship period is a time to communicate personally with God. Now, there is a double-edged quality to the relationship that these charismatic evangelicals are seeking with God in worship. As Luhrmann puts it: ‘He is in you, but he is also apart from you’ (5). Worship is, amongst other things, a time to be reminded of this complicated vision of the self and God. It is matched by the double-edged quality to the privacy of the worship period. Again, Luhrmann sums up the paradox succinctly: it is ‘a time to commune with God alone while in the presence of others’ (4). People are gathered together, rather than choosing to worship by themselves, yet they gather and worship in their own tempo. There is a productive dynamic between the individual and the group. Simon Coleman elaborates on this in his study of neo-Pentecostals in Sweden, pointing out how charismatic worship instills a communal disciplinary gaze and awareness of gaze (Coleman and Collins 2006). People who are new and unfamiliar with the normal bodily positions may be singled out and seen as potential converts. Like the evangelical ritual of the sermon, which places certain requirements on the bodies involved, the evangelical charismatic ritual of the singing worship period also requires fitting – in one’s own way – into certain communal patterns of bodily action.

In the rest of her book Luhrmann discusses the vital role of the community in each member’s growth as a Christian. She argues that the prayer practices that these evangelical charismatics advocate – a form of intimate, everyday conversation with God in which one learns to discern God’s responses – cannot be learnt apart from the community. Learning takes place through listening to sermons, listening to and giving testimonies, talking with others, reading recommended literature, and so on, which requires places in which people can give intimate testimonies, recommend literature, and talk together. They therefore need spaces that allow for both group sociality as well as intimate conversations. It is interesting to note that they do not erect specific architectural structures to accommodate this latter need, such as, for example, something akin to the Catholic confessional. Rather, evangelicals, again demonstrating a certain ambivalence about overly ornate architectural forms, prefer instead to whisper over coffee and doughnuts at the back of the worship hall.

Jon Bialecki (2011) gives a description of another type of place used by the Vineyard community, namely one of the church’s ‘small groups.’ The small group meeting he describes took place one evening in Southern California, in the living room of one of the members, and was led by a young married couple. It was attended by a group of mostly young, well-educated, middle class professionals. It was a somewhat larger gathering than usual (around twenty people) because this evening there was a visiting speaker, seated on the couch. This was an unusual visitor; he was referred to as ‘the prophet.’ The meeting began with a worship period in which people sang, prayed, and spoke softly in tongues: ‘the “polite” sub-vocal speaking in tongues found in so many Middle-Class white Vineyard Church events’ (688). Then the prophet spoke for a while, before walking around issuing prophecies regarding those present. One young man, a university student, was strongly moved by the prophecy and became possessed, displaying such external signs as falling off his chair, moaning, coughing up phlegm, unfocused eyes, and incoherent responses. While this was an unusual event for these evangelical charismatics, they found ways to respond, such as praying for him, commanding the spirit to leave in Jesus’s name, holding him, wiping his face clean, providing water to drink, reading the Bible next to him, speaking to him and asking him questions, and anointing his forehead with oil. At one point, being told that Jesus had died for him and that he needed to reject his sins, the young man shouted ‘No!,’ and after this apparent turning point he started to return to normalcy and was helped up on the couch.

Bialecki observes that this unusual episode helps to draw out the ‘unstable subject of Protestant language ideology’ (679)(and we see here again the close dynamic between evangelical personhood and linguistic concerns). He argues that Protestant language use relies on both a centripetal and a centrifugal force, and that these are ‘uncanny doubles,’ each containing the other (684). The centripetal force leads to an emphasis on the bounded individual as an agent who engages in sincere speech that matches her interior state (cf. Keane 2007). The Vineyard members’ attentiveness to this disposition may be seen, for example, in their commitment to using worship as individual communication with God, or in the moment when the young possessed man shouted ‘No!’ and it was taken by those around him to manifest an important individual, sincere speech act, ushering in his return, consciously, to the group. The centrifugal force, on the other hand, leads to a valuing of a porous self that internalizes external words and whose own words in turn circulate beyond the self, extending the person and perhaps even leading to concrete effects, such as healing of other bodies (cf. Coleman 2006). The Vineyard small group was drawn to this type of language use too, as they spoke in tongues and allowed God to guide the opaque sounds emanating from them, or as they listened to the prophet conveying exterior messages from God that would affect them. The young man’s incoherent orientation and speech during possession was later interpreted by those present to be the outcome of previous social trauma, emphasizing the ability of people to hurt each other (thus differing from the classical Pentecostal interpretation that a possessed person is overtaken by a demon). The centripetal and centrifugal forces work together: we see here a dynamic arrangement of selves around the living room. In moments they are attentive to being individually centered and sincere before God, and in other moments they are attentive to being decentered and open to God and each other (and others beyond the group), making use of certain interactions in the space in order to be both centered and decentered evangelical persons.

Luhrmann and Bialecki’s studies illustrate the ways in which evangelical spaces are set up to aid the interplay between individuating and socially embedding members. The emphasis on the corporate body of believers in group settings (rows of chairs, listening together) is blended with intimate, familial settings (chatting over doughnuts, a living room) in order to aid both individual and group expressions of worship and working with words. We see both how an evangelical becomes an evangelical alone before God, and how an evangelical becomes an evangelical through other evangelicals, and how these two processes occur together. The complicated role of agency in evangelicalism, passing between the believer and God, between the individual and the group, needs both communal and intimate gathering places to be continuously worked out.

# Translocal concerns

Let me turn now to another dimension of evangelical place-making: evangelicals take seriously the Gospel of John’s charge to be in the world, but not of it. This desire takes at least two forms: a striving toward translocal evangelical spaces, and toward spaces that are touched by the transcendent divine. In both cases, this type of place-making (or the dissolution of place-making into more amorphous space-making) helps evangelical Christians to be ‘not of this world,’ or ‘of’ a different world, a different order. It helps them connect with other evangelical communities and with God. While the previous four sections have largely discussed some elements that go into evangelical ways of ‘fusing setting to situation, locality to life-world’ (Feld and Basso 1996: 8) (with some counter-currents), I will now concentrate more strongly on evangelical tendencies to unpick lifeworld from locality, to untangle situation from setting. I will discuss the evangelical cultivation of translocal ‘Christian space’ in this section, and transcendence in the next.

One example of evangelical engagement with translocal concerns can be found in the work of Omri Elisha (2013), who describes how evangelical leaders of a number of churches in Knoxville, Tennessee, collaborated to organize a city-wide ‘prayer month.’ The prayer month involved a series of inter-denominational events, such as evening prayer services, a March for Jesus, and the distribution of an annotated prayer calendar. Local congregations were encouraged to preach on prayer. In this case evangelical prayer was seen not just as a private, intimate conversation with God (as described by Luhrmann 2012), but also as a communal, socially transformative practice. Communal prayer was presented as having a distinct power to facilitate God’s action in the world, whether praying together in the same place, or praying simultaneously in multiple places, or praying individually over the same topics on the same days. The organizers of the prayer month drew inspiration from the charismatic-inflected ‘global prayer movement,’ which includes several international organizations that produce literature, manuals, how-to guides, DVDs, etc. (Elisha 2013: 315). While evangelicals usually retain a strong emphasis on Jesus, this is a good illustration of how evangelical charismatics are also inspired by the biblical account of prayer summoning the power of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost (317).

The prayer calendar was meant to be an intervention in the social life of Knoxville, with specific prayer topics for each day during the prayer month. It also promoted a specific view of Knoxville. White evangelicals in the United States, as Elisha observes, have typically been associated with groups that promote moral remedies to social problems, rather than social justice or political redress. However, since the 1990s there has been a trend of social critique within evangelical circles, including an increasing self-consciousness among white suburban evangelicals of the gaps between them and communities on the other side of race or class lines, which has in turn led to a growing emphasis on the need for repentance in this regard (Elisha 2011). The prayer calendar cultivated this particular type of gaze on the city, describing different groups in Knoxville and the need for greater connection between them, thus inviting participants to view the city in terms of gaps and potential reconciliations. It suggested that urban modernity displaces people, and evangelicalism can help remedy that displacement. For them, ‘prayer serves as a key medium for reimagining one’s sense of place, against the disorientation and alienation associated with urban life’ (Elisha 2013: 312). In addition, the annotated prayer calendars ‘invite participants to inhabit multiple coexisting temporalities’ (312), continuously reminding them that they live not just by worldly time but, more importantly, by Christian time (thus highlighting the intersection here between translocal and temporal concerns). I would add that the prayer calendars also remind them that they are inhabitants of Christian space in Knoxville, which is not to be confused with Knoxville itself, thus allowing them to see a different future for the place.

Elisha notes that it was difficult to gauge the extent of participation in the prayer month; some congregations and individuals clearly joined in enthusiastically, but one churchgoer remarked to Elisha that he was ‘too busy to add more items to my prayer list’ (2013: 325) (illustrating well the limits of evangelical processes of communal socialization when there is recourse to individual conscience). Some organizers blamed instances of lower than expected attendance on the ‘fortress mentality’ (325) of some local churches, which seems to me to be a way of expressing that these other churches, in their view, did not have a proper evangelical attitude toward translocal Christian space. Others, such as inner city and smaller churches, were at times suspicious of the motives of the large megachurches and their well-known pastors, wondering if the prayer month might simply be a vehicle for their expansion, again expressing a critique of these groups and individuals as not holding a proper understanding of what the Christian translocal community ought to be.

The evangelical engagement with translocal concerns sometimes merges with similar concerns in the Pentecostal/charismatic movement. For example, Coleman and Collins (2006: 36-37) describe the architectural ‘warehouse’ style that characterizes many megachurches and neo-Pentecostal congregations, some with an orientation toward the prosperity gospel. The Word of Life congregation that Coleman studied in Sweden worshipped in an old converted warehouse on the industrial outskirts of Uppsala, and when they built a new building it too was made to look like a large warehouse. It was located near a highway and an international airport, and at the entrance had a shop that sold faith gospel products from across the world; all pointers toward an awareness of a global fellowship, translocal movement and connection.

Another feature of translocal place-making, also associated with the Pentecostal/charismatic movement, is what Bruno Reinhardt (2014: 315) has called the ‘flow-orientated materiality of global Pentecostal power’ – and, we might add, global evangelical power. Intensely mediated translocal Pentecostal and evangelical spaces can be held together through the circulation of people and objects: circulated sermons, cassette tapes, videos, books, pamphlets, and so on. Kevin Lewis O’Neill, echoing Susan Harding’s description of Southern Baptists in the United States, observes how a neo-Pentecostal megachurch in Guatemala City ‘smelted, shaped, packaged, and distributed myriad fundamentalist rhetorics and narratives’ (2010: xx, citing Harding 2000: 15); there is an industrial quality to this massive production of material, circulating media. Even some evangelical groups who might appear fairly secluded, such as dispensationalist Brethren in northeastern Scotland, still actively consume products of the virtual transnational evangelical mediascape, including DVDs, TV shows, and literature (Webster 2013).

# Transcendent concerns

Another facet to the evangelical wish to take apart faith and place (even as these are simultaneously brought together in other ways) is the orientation toward transcendence. Not surprisingly, evangelicals do not tend to lean too heavily on architecture to display this concern, usually eschewing the awe-inspiring tall pointed arches that lead our eyes heavenward in Gothic cathedrals. Instead, their engagement with transcendence often manifests as a tension between ‘the world’ and what is ‘not of the world,’ or between earth and heaven, or between what is of humans and what is of God. Sometimes (but certainly not always) this may overlap with the Pentecostal/charismatic commitment to ‘spiritual warfare,’ dividing the world into two realms: the demonological and the divine. At a more general level Evangelicals, in striving to shape themselves and their spaces according to God’s will, employ ‘a second map […] a map of earth and heaven’ to guide their everyday life (Robbins 2014: S164). Another way of phrasing this concern is to say that, for evangelicals, the Kingdom of God is ‘the only time and place that ultimately matters’ (Elisha 2013: 328). While anthropologists and sociologists may have difficulty dealing with the importance of God to Christians (Bialecki 2014; Strhan 2015b), it seems to me that examining Christian modes of place-making offers one anthropological way of approaching ‘the social life of the transcendent’ (Robbins 2012: 20).

An example of the evangelical connection to transcendent space can be found in Brian Howell’s (2003) work on second and third generation Southern Baptists in the Philippines. Howell describes their Sunday worship service, which includes songs, testimonies, and the sermon as ‘the focal element’ (237). He is interested in the practice of listening to the sermon, and how these Baptists use this linguistic form to resituate themselves in relation to the world (thus bringing out again the interplay between linguistic and personhood concerns). The sermons often center on the work of subjectivation, repeating themes of ‘growth, improvement, and change’ (240). There is a subtle interplay here between a transnational element of reaching beyond (some of the songs are English worship songs, some of the sermon illustrations are downloaded from U.S. websites), and a theological element of reaching beyond. At an individual level, Howell comments that listeners cultivated attentiveness to a new self. Importantly, the Baptists saw the new self as the real self. As one preacher put it: ‘If we do not know [God’s] word; if we do not pray to him; how will we hope for those blessings? How will we know who we are?’ (241). The preachers also encouraged their listeners to shift their attention from their everyday, local context toward the church writ large. This rubbed against Filipino traditions of being bound to one’s family and birth place, as well as one’s fate. Thus, as Howell puts it, ‘these messages brought people out of their situation’ (241).

We see here how evangelical Christians aim not just to use their places to produce situations, but also to pull themselves out of situations, to resituate themselves. Howell argues that these Christians’ attentiveness to local places, translocal spaces, and transcendent space are part and parcel of the same project of relating to ‘a really real world that exists quite independently, a deterritorialized religion beyond any speciﬁc location’ (236). In other words, we could say that, for them, there is an equivalence between engaging with the omnipresent (deterritorialized) God and their local selves and relationships (territorialized yet deterritorialized); between engaging with the (deterritorialized) global Christian community and their local church space (territorialized yet deterritorialized). Is this simultaneous engagement of multiple registers an untangling, or a tangling, of situation and setting? In this section I want to highlight the emphasis on untangling, but Howell’s example is especially illustrative of the important undercurrent of tangling that is always present. Howell himself puts the emphasis more strongly on the tangling, arguing that the territorialized and deterritorialized aspects of the really real are not juxtaposed for the Filipino Baptists. Instead, they experience their religious practice as ‘utterly “emplaced” and connected to their sense of a locally situated and socially relevant identity’ (236). They have been resituated in their locality: in it, but not of it.

Another example of how transcendent concerns can play out in evangelical place-making is found in Anna Strhan’s (2013b) work on St John’s (a pseudonym), a large non-charismatic, conservative evangelical Anglican church in London. Strhan observes that living in a city can lead to experiences of fragmentation, and that being an evangelical Christian introduces another layer of tensions insofar as evangelicals are often viewed as ‘intolerant’ in a ‘tolerant’ metropolis (because of their views, for example, on sexuality or on other religions). One member of St John’s told Strhan that in this situation one has to draw one’s ‘own red line’ (346). These evangelicals might, for example, commit to no sex before marriage, to stop after two drinks in the pub with colleagues, to take clients somewhere other than lap-dancing clubs, or to give a percentage of their income to St John’s. They use actions to mark evangelical space in the city.

Another and harder challenge for these conservative evangelicals involves the injunction to speak with non-Christians about Christianity. Most of the congregants seem to have held the typical evangelical belief that non-Christians, when they die, will be sent to hell. Immense importance is therefore attached to speaking with them about Jesus. At the same time this is very difficult, because it counters the widespread cultural taboo on speaking publicly about one’s private faith in late modern London. Recognizing this difficulty, St John’s organized a ten-week course to teach congregants how to speak about Christianity with others, and also developed the theme in sermons. In one sermon the rector explained: ‘It’s a wonderful, godly thing to care for your neighbour, to love others. But it is not *Christian* mission unless the gospel is being proclaimed *verbally*’ (337, orig. emph.). In another sermon one of the curates said:

maybe you’ll get on the bus, driven by someone who’s not a Christian, maybe the bus will take you up to your hall of residence, and you’re going past the porter, who’s not a Christian, up the lift to your ﬂoor, populated by people who mostly aren’t Christians […] We pray, Father, for us as your people, with your words in our hands, that we would speak these words to […] neighbours, security guards, bus drivers, people on our course, people in our ofﬁce, family. (338)

In developing this theme St John’s displays a classic revivalist evangelical emphasis on both linguistic concerns and intentional action in the world.

But, again, the intention plays out unevenly. One of the congregants of St John’s is a lawyer named Clara. In addition to being involved at St John’s she also organizes a Christian group at her firm, hosts biannual evangelistic events with outside speakers, is on the committee for a Christian lawyers’ association, leads an ‘Introduction to Christianity’ course, and meets with a newly converted woman to read the Bible on her lunch break. She told Strhan that her team members were aware that she was a Christian, ‘but after six years working with them, she has “not had the opportunity to share the gospel with them”’ (342). She is, however, part of an evangelistic outreach project to London council estates. The project is a result of British conservative evangelical churches’ perception that they are dominated by middle-class congregants and values, but wish to reach beyond this sphere (much like the American suburban evangelicals described above by Elisha). Clara and other members of the church therefore spend Sunday afternoons knocking on doors in the council estates, and if anyone answers they offer to fill out a questionnaire about values and to read the Bible with them. The anxieties surrounding public faith-talk operates differently across city spaces: it is easier for middle-class evangelicals to do it in poorer areas, such as council estates, than in their own places.

In trying to cultivate these dispositions, congregants develop a different experience of space. They are encouraged to feel distinction from ‘the lost city of London,’ as the rector referred to it, yet also compassion for the city (Strhan 2013b: 333, 346). Their spatial orientation hones in on the transcendent that is outside, yet in, London. As Strhan puts it, they are ‘learning to understand themselves as “aliens and strangers” in the city’ (332). While they separate from the worldly London, they re-attach themselves by committing to its salvation. However, constant awareness of falling short of being the ideal evangelical subject leads to constant work on the self as an ethical subject (much like the Filipino Southern Baptists). Therefore Strhan argues that these practices also introduce a division within the evangelical believer: between the ideal and the actual. The constant falling short is narrativized as an internal battle. Perhaps in response to this internal division, these conservative evangelicals value whole-heartedness. They strive to place their relationship with God, a constant orientation toward transcendence, ‘at the centre of our beings’ (350). Their involvement with the spaces of St John’s provides patterns of coherence, including working with narratives, giving themselves over to undistracted listening to a sermon, or sharing a meal in the church community. These practices are also, as Strhan puts it, ‘a means of ﬁnding a space outside this’ (347).

Both Howell and Strhan’s examples illustrate well how evangelicals can learn to understand themselves as of a different order, and there is an accompanying process of dissolving ‘here-and-now place’ into ‘space beyond.’ But the here-and-now place is not abandoned; in fact, there is a strong commitment to it. Again, it does not seem to me that evangelical place-making is simply a matter of turning ‘space’ into ‘place,’ and neither is it an inversion, i.e. turning ‘place’ into ‘space.’ Something more complicated is going on, namely a friction-filled process of simultaneously needing to fuse and unfuse setting and situation, needing to both tangle and untangle (though never quite successfully) faith and place.

We also see here how evangelicalism offers two ways of thinking about utopian or desired Other places. The first is heaven (also referred to as the heavenly city, the new Jerusalem, or the ‘new heaven and new earth’ to come). A general characteristic of this space is that it is either wholly deferred to the end of times, or, if it is believed to exist presently, is wholly unreachable by the living. Another characteristic is its ultimate high value; it is worth any price to gain admission. The extreme importance of entering this place in the distant future, and ensuring that others gain admission by converting to Christianity, may cast a sense of urgency over all present-day activities that contribute toward this goal, including place-making. However, as we have already seen, these general characteristics still leave a range of interpretations open concerning heaven, from the Zionist concern with the key role played by Israel, through the *Left Behind* eschatology or the awaiting of imminent rapture, to those evangelicals who clearly distance themselves from these beliefs (Bielo 2011: 141-143), and to those who primarily feel the guilt of not witnessing enough. Different emphases are available to different groups.

The second utopian site is the Kingdom of God, which functions differently than heaven in everyday place-making. The Kingdom of God is believed, in different ways, to be able to break into the everyday, and to be both ‘already’ and ‘not yet’ (and there is much theological disagreement about what this means, even within evangelicalism). It gives evangelical place-making a heterotopic quality, with two different spaces intersecting in one place. Foucault (1986) used the term ‘heterotopia’ to refer to ‘something like counter-sites, a kind of effectively enacted utopia’ (24), such as theaters, museums, cemeteries, Jesuit stations, and Puritan colonies. For evangelicals, though, the heterotopic sensibility encompasses the whole world. We might speak here of heterotopic or utopian vision. Evangelicals learn to live with another possible space always in view, in addition to the space around them, and to steer their deepest allegiance and identity toward this other space.

Robbins (2006) has proposed that this constant sense that ‘a different world is possible’ must give hope (and that this sensibility is one that anthropologists too should strive toward). I think this is true. However, the evangelical case also shows that utopia is difficult. The evangelicals described by Howell and Strhan, for example, increase their hope while becoming more aware of the failures of the world and themselves. The sense that ‘a different world is possible’ necessarily also strengthens the sense that ‘this world is wrong.’ It heightens awareness of boundedness and the wish to move beyond, as in the Philippines, and throws into relief fractures and fragmentation of selves and relationships and the wish for wholeness, as in London. In a heterotopic space, the utopian glance rebounds (Munt 2002). Evangelical place-making offers a useful complication, then, of ‘utopia’ or ‘hope.’

# Worldly concerns

The final place-making concern I wish to draw out is the evangelical tendency to cultivate places as ‘counter-spaces.’ The ‘counter’ indicates the constant friction of countering that which is worldly while still choosing to be in the world. Why do evangelicals seek to be ‘in’ the world while not being ‘of’ it? Why do they not strive toward withdrawal, toward being ‘out’ of the world? Part of the answer to this lies in the strong evangelical wish to be, precisely, evangelical. Evangelicals do not counter the world by renouncing it, but by aiming to save it. They often desire to create places that are in some sense converted and act as witnesses. Even my chosen term ‘counter’ is somewhat misleading, since evangelicals might argue that they are, in fact, not *against* the world, but very much *for* it. In evangelical terminology, they might say that their hearts are on fire for the world. Being able to shift into this evangelical perspective helps us to understand how, even when the world might choose not to convert, evangelical Christianity nevertheless can reinscribe the world, reanimating it (Elisha 2013; Webster 2013).

One example of constructing evangelical counter-spaces comes from the Bible Society in England, studied by Matthew Engelke (2012, 2013). The Bible Society is an independent Christian organization founded in 1804, during the evangelical revivals, in order to promote use of the Bible. Just as in 1804, Bible Society staff today are of the opinion that neither non-Christians nor most Christians read the Bible as much as they should. While the Bible Society staff come from different denominations (or no denomination), virtually all the Protestant staff were comfortable with the label ‘evangelical,’ and ‘even the [three] Catholics were happy to accept its general applicability’ (Engelke 2012: 156). In addition, many of the Bible Society staff are influenced by an inclination toward the Emerging Church movement. This is a relatively recent movement that has attracted followers in both evangelical and other denominations, and which emphasizes social justice issues, a skepticism of what they take to be overly institutionalized religion, and a preference for small non-hierarchical groups (Bielo 2011).

Engelke (2012) describes an episode in which Bible Society staff were planning to provide decorations for an outdoor shopping center in Swindon in the run-up to Christmas. Along with many other evangelicals they tend to see Christianity as ‘embattled,’ and this sense was heightened around Christmas, which they thought spelled out consumerism rather than Christian gospel in the public sphere (157). Therefore, in this project and others, they were seeking ‘to set the terms for religion’s place’ in contemporary England (155). However, like the evangelicals in St John’s they were well aware that they were working in a largely secularized context in which religion is usually viewed as something that ought to be a private matter. The result of these theological and contextual considerations was that they chose to commission a dozen unmarked angels to hang above the heads of the shoppers in Swindon.

The angels were reminiscent of white kites, with a large wingspan and angular proportions, made of a strong, flexible fabric that retained its shape while still moving with the wind. The staff member responsible thought that while people in England are turning away from institutionalized religion, many still affirm the importance of spirituality, including, for example, beings or forces such as angels. Angels, therefore, might be a productive point of contact with the public. The installation was accompanied by leaflets that read: ‘The Angel Said Unto Them: Don’t Worry, Be Happy!’ (161). While a few staff thought the project should be kept separate from local business sponsorship, others disagreed, and in the end part of the costs were covered by local businesses. This was a compromise for some. The angels themselves were not, exactly, overt arbiters of any particular public religion (or, indeed, any particular business in the public square): they were relatively neutral. But neither were they private. It is through this ‘refusal and confusion,’ as Engelke (155) puts it, of notions of ‘public,’ ‘private,’ and ‘religion,’ that Bible Society staff claim an evangelical place in the world. Engelke labels their project one of creating ‘ambient faith’ (155).

The Bible Society staff wanted to mount the angels as if they were flying toward the public bathrooms in the shopping center, where they wanted to place a nativity scene. They thought this might represent the marginalized place in which Jesus was born according to the gospel narrative – by a manger in Bethlehem. This idea, however, was vetoed by the borough council on the grounds that it might be offensive to Christians, which caused amused indignation among the Christians who had suggested it. Nevertheless, as Engelke observes, they too knew that it might indeed be offensive to some Christians, and this was in fact one of their motives: they wanted to provide what they understood to be a provocative, properly evangelical counter-space to those so-called Christians who had, in their view, conformed too much to worldly values.

Without a manger next to the toilets, and only the unmarked angels floating above, the Bible Society’s intervention was in the end, like ambient music, ‘intentionally nonintentional’ (166). While Engelke argues that we see here an intentional reworking of the secular public–private distinction (and I agree), my own reading of Engelke’s material is that we also see here a reworking of the evangelical question of intentionality itself. Intentionality has been a core problematic for evangelicalism since the revivals, manifesting for example in the desire for a highly self-conscious, intentional conversion, as well as intentional engagement in other people’s conversion. Yet the Emerging-influenced, late-modern evangelicals of the Bible Society in England, operating in a largely secularized context (even if this is spiritually attuned in many ways), have worked forth a different mode of intentionality, partly out of choice and partly as a compromise. We have moved far from the nineteenth-century revivals’ tent meetings and mission stations.

However, this is not necessarily a typical shift for all evangelicals interested in the Emerging Church movement. A different example is provided by James Bielo (2013a), who has also worked with Emerging-influenced evangelicals, in Michigan and Ohio. Bielo found that they too were drawn to progressive political values, and were critical of white, middle-class, suburban evangelicalism. They wished to distance themselves from the conservative evangelical culture industry and the lack of intimate accountability in large megachurches. Interestingly for us, they were also specifically critical of suburbia’s ties to the late modern sensibility of generic placeless-ness. In fact, they often saw place as a key tool for change. This had a diverse range of outcomes. Some of them eschewed suburban megachurches, started new congregations in poorer urban neighborhoods, sold suburban homes to move to smaller urban homes, maintained urban gardens and organized city clean-up days, supported neighborhood-focused businesses and volunteering, or even took public vows to never move away from a specific urban neighborhood. Some of these re-urbanizing Emerging evangelicals used and were inspired by a social networking site called ‘The City,’ run by a church planting network, again highlighting the importance of technologically mediated, translocal connections in evangelicalism (and in the Emerging Church movement).

While Bielo was on fieldwork he met Josh, a youth pastor in an affluent exurb on the outskirts of Cincinnati. Josh and his wife recruited fifteen members from the congregation to be a ‘launch team’ for a new church plant in Oakley, an urban neighborhood closer to the city center. Oakley was middle-class, but was situated between a working-class neighborhood occupied predominantly by black families and a downwardly mobile neighborhood occupied predominantly by whites. During the course of Bielo’s fieldwork almost all the members of the launch team bought new homes in Oakley, some of them losing considerable wealth in the move. After their move they set up a new small, middle-class, white congregation (in itself a compromise of sorts), though their new location did enable new encounters, for example a partnership and shared social projects with a black Baptist congregation (Bielo 2013a: 6).

For these Emerging evangelicals, an emphasis on place-work is central to authentic Christianity. Their orientation toward place is also motivated by their view that modern city inhabitants are often alienated and in need of help (echoing the views of congregants of St John’s in London, and the evangelicals who organized a prayer month in Knoxville). In their focus on a specific kind of relationship to a specific kind of place, they too, like evangelicals in other places, aimed to construct different selves and communities. Place, as Bielo puts it, is for them both something to be redeemed as well as ‘a vehicle of redemption’ (5). They invested in both the near future (imagining acts of redemption in the next decade in a specific neighborhood) and the distant future (final salvation). In this striving for authenticity, the Emerging evangelicals were well aware that reality did not always match their ideals. While many of those with whom Bielo spoke wished to distance themselves from a certain kind of business-driven ‘urban redevelopment’ or gentrification that served to heighten exclusion, they were aware that at times their own projects might look similar to, or even be enabled by, these processes. But what they were trying to do was, as Bielo puts it, to invest different political, economic, and ethical ‘possibilities’ in their places (10). Interestingly, in so doing they were – unlike Bible Society staff in England – retaining a heavy emphasis on intentionality.

# Conclusion: Bringing together and taking apart faith and place

We have covered several features that tend to characterize local evangelical theories of place-making. Some of the concerns that early evangelicalism catalyzed – or the specific Christian ‘problematics’ that became especially pressing in this movement (Bialecki 2012) – reoccur across most of the ten ethnographic cases examined here. Evangelicals tend, on the whole, to want places that facilitate attentive listening and speech that can be clearly heard; places that employ a toned-down, utilitarian material environment; places that can aid them in both being ordered by Christian time and ordering time in a Christian manner;places where the individual can relate to God both as an individual and in a community (not just as an individual, and not just in a community); spaces that help to build an understanding of translocal ‘Christian space’ as opposed to ‘worldly space’; spaces that connect to, and are ‘of,’ a different, transcendent order: of the order of God; and places that are ‘counter-spaces’ in, not out of, the world. At a theoretical level, using place-making as an entry point helps to nuance some of the current anthropological conversations on Protestantism, especially regarding materiality, temporality, and personhood. For example, based on what we know about evangelical place-making I would argue that evangelicals consider materiality to be important, while still being wary of it. Continuity is central to evangelical temporality, along with discontinuity, and this combination prompts evangelicals’ desire to plan for the near future, not evacuate it. Finally, they value an interplay between individual, group, and God in their view of personhood, rather than straightforward individualism. In sum, evangelical place-making results in a simultaneous, double-edged fusing and unfusing of situation and setting, which it seems to me we cannot label either dis-placement or, reversely, thorough emplacement. It is a simultaneous taking apart and bringing together of faith and place.

At the same time, the communities in these examples are each marked by their own trajectories, bringing out some of the shifts and differences within evangelicalism. While megachurch evangelicals in Knoxville may organize a citywide prayer month in order to counter the forces of nominal Christianity (Elisha 2013), Emerging evangelicals in Ohio may establish small urban church plants in order to set themselves apart from the worldly values of such megachurch evangelicals (Bielo 2013a). Bible Society staff in England may organize an installation of angels accompanied by the text ‘Don’t Worry, Be Happy,’ or encourage Bible reading in pubs (as they also do), because they see these as ways of making places that counter worldly Christians (Engelke 2012). But based on these actions, other evangelicals would see the Bible Society staff as the worldly ones. In other words, I hope this thinking across cases has highlighted some of the dynamism of the object under study. Evangelical Christianity and evangelical place-making vary across contexts and change over time. And they do so in interplay: just as the faith of evangelicals plays a role in how they make places, these places in turn play some role (in sometimes unpredictable ways) in shaping their faith.

How does this discussion of evangelical place-making relate to the study of other Christian traditions? Do all Christians try to simultaneously bring together and take apart their faith and their place? I would venture ‘yes’ in quite a broad sense – in the sense that almost all Christians are oriented toward more than the here-and-now – but with the important qualifier that it plays out quite differently in different traditions. A Catholic church, for example, is usually arranged so that mass can be oriented on the Eucharist, with the visual and sensual playing a larger role. In older churches with domes and stone walls, sound may even bounce around, indicating the relatively lesser importance accorded to attentive listening in the space (Kilde 2002: 12).[[20]](#footnote-20) Catholic place-making makes different use of materiality, at times engulfing the visitor with ornate decorations (van de Port 2013), and a pull toward the importance of architectural history and a sense of permanence may play a larger role (Irvine 2011). In Orthodox churches we also find a richly ornamented interior, but in a different register. There are usually icons arranged in a particular order on the iconostasis as well as throughout the church, some of which may be wonderworking. In their traditional form, Orthodox churches contain no chairs or benches; believers stand or pray on their knees. Congregants may at times move around the space, pray and light candles in front of the icons, or venerate the physical relics of a saint (Köllner 2013), much less wary than evangelicals of entangling the God-relationship with materiality. Some Orthodox Christians associate churches with a quality of ‘ancientness,’ thus rendering church buildings problematic if they are perceived to be too new (Manning 2008). Even just scratching the surface, then, we see that there are many differences here with evangelical place-making.

What of Protestantism? Does the evangelical orientation toward place-making reflect a broader Protestant disposition toward place/space? Again I would suggest that there are important differences, though further research is needed. The non-evangelical ‘mainstream’ Protestant tradition, especially in the West, (as well as the Catholic and Orthodox traditions), has often made use of the common version of the basilica church, with its cruciform layout along an east–west orientation (Kilde 2008). This kind of place speaks to different concerns. And if we move on to liberal Protestantism there are further differences, especially in this tradition’s concern to downplay the distinction between the worldly and the transcendent realm. For example, liberal Quakers in England emphasize the non-mediated immanence of the divine, and therefore see it as important not to use any interior objects or architectural details that point toward a transcendent; even a triangular-shaped window on the gable may be suspect (Collins 2013).

Extending our thinking further, we may also consider the large late-modern group of Westerners who do not regularly attend church, but who check ‘Christian’ on the census form or who think of themselves as affiliated with Christianity in some way. Coleman (2014) describes the pilgrimage of one such woman, Donna, who does not see herself as a practicing Christian, yet visits the Anglo-Catholic shrine in Walsingham. This activity, as Coleman puts it, ‘confound[s] easy distinctions between religion and nonreligion’ (S288). For us, her story reminds us that Christian places are never rigidly determined, but are rather continuously made and remade by those who use them.

Evangelicalism provides an interesting case, then, for the study of religion, as well as for the study of dwelling, of one particular tradition’s attempts at simultaneously taking apart and bringing together faith and place. It can open up questions about how other Christian traditions, or other religious traditions, do this: which concerns are they particularly engaged with in their place-making as they try to mediate the actual world around them and the world of their ideals? Taking the question further, it may also apply to other, not necessarily religious, groups who orient their collective life on the notion that another world is possible (such as, perhaps, the sustainable food movement [Bielo 2013a] or the Occupy movement [Tremlett 2012]).

More broadly, evangelical place-making helps us think about modernity’s apparent disposition toward placeless-ness or the contemporary sense of a ‘loss’ of place (which is, as Bielo [2013a: 1] points out, an ideological narrative in itself). There is a long-standing interest in the social sciences in the cross-fertilization between evangelical Protestantism and Western modernity, especially regarding the modern formation of capitalism (Weber [1905] 2002) and individual personhood (Mauss [1938] 1985; Dumont 1985). Bielo adds another possible intertwining of evangelicalism and modernity, namely their common attentiveness to the binary of estrangement versus authenticity. If modernity ‘can be succinctly defined as the condition of living among strangers’ (Lindholm 2008: 3, cited in Bielo 2013a: 5), then this sense of alienation may explain the attraction of ‘authentic’ experience, including in travel, adventure sports, food movements, art and music (and, Bielo adds, in Emerging evangelicalism). Now, evangelicalism too might be defined, by evangelicals, as ‘the condition of living among strangers.’ It is interesting to note, therefore, that the evangelical sense of estrangement has not uniformly been combined with a late modern sense of a ‘loss’ of place or of being rootless (Harvey 1993). Rather, evangelicalism has combined with a narrative of taking apart faith and place (while also bringing them together). It seems to me helpful to view this as a different type of modern deterritorialization (and re-territorialization). Evangelicalism thus gives us an interesting modern example of a group whose narrative of place is more agentive than the narrative of placeless-ness.

But, precisely in its attention to agency, evangelical place-making can also open on to the broader difficulty of intentionality. Anthropologists sometimes use space to think about exclusions. Bielo cites Setha Low on this point: ‘Theories and methodologies of space and place can uncover systems of exclusion that are hidden or naturalized’ (Low 2011: 391, cited in Bielo 2013a: 10). In relation to evangelicalism the most interesting observation in this regard is that evangelical places sometimes result in exclusion even as the intention was inclusion. This is particularly evident in relation to questions of race in the two historical cases in this article, namely Charles Finney’s amphitheater and the Norwegian mission station (and perhaps it is a process that is more readily observed in hindsight), but there is also a hint of it in several of the contemporary examples. Intentionality is a core concept for evangelicals. At times it is easy: they do not usually struggle to create places that enable attentive listening, for example, or that employ a pared-down material environment. But what they often do struggle with is how to place their places in the midst of the world, while simultaneously pledging allegiance to a heavenly moral order. In sum, a study of evangelical place-making shows some of the difficulty of the deceptively simple prayer: ‘Let your kingdom come, on earth as it is in heaven,’ or, more broadly, the complications that accompany ideals.
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