Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Journal of Contemporary Religion

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/cjcr20

Theorizing lived religion: introduction

Kim Knibbe & Helena Kupari

To cite this article: Kim Knibbe & Helena Kupari (2020) Theorizing lived religion: introduction, Journal of Contemporary Religion, 35:2, 157-176, DOI: 10.1080/13537903.2020.1759897

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/13537903.2020.1759897

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

Published online: 13 Jul 2020.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 19893

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Citing articles: 10 View citing articles

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=cjcr20

JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY RELIGION
2020, VOL. 35, NO. 2, 157–176
https://doi.org/10.1080/13537903.2020.1759897

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

OPEN ACCESS Check for updates

Theorizing lived religion: introduction

Kim Knibbe and Helena Kupari

ABSTRACT
The introduction to this special issue describes the emergence of the lived religion approach in relation to other approaches within the study of religion and sociology of religion as a way of going beyond the emphasis on texts and institutions, on the one hand, and the focus on the fate of religion in modern times, on the other hand. It also introduces the aim of this special issue, namely 'theorizing' lived religion. To do this, the authors summarize how the founders of this approach have conceptualized the topic of 'lived religion', adjacent approaches, and the theoretical underpinnings of their work. The authors propose three directions to develop the contribution a lived religion approach might make to theorizing: 1) explicating what is meant by 'religion' by drawing on work that studies religion as a category; 2) explicating how concepts and theories are developed based on lived religion research, with particular emphasis on the way tensions between modernist, disenchanting epistemologies and the enchanted, supernatural worlds of practitioners may inform theory and methodological reflection; 3) anchoring the *doing* of research, emphasizing the full research cycle in religious studies programs so that students have a solid basis for learning how to move back and forth between carrying out original research and conceptual/theoretical work.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 10 February 2020
Accepted 15 February 2020

KEYWORDS
Lived religion; discursive study of religion; theorizing; practice theories; spirituality

Introduction

In the past two decades, the concept of lived religion has spread from the discussions of scholars based in the United States and focusing on North American religion (Ammerman 2007a; Hall 1997a; McGuire 2008; Orsi 2010) into academic parlance across many countries and continents. Within the study of religion in North America, the emergence of lived religion as a field reflected a newfound interest in ordinary people as religious subjects (Hall 1997b, vii–viii). The study of lived religion has become a prolific strand of research in sociology of religion and religious studies. It has been applied to the investigation of a wide array of topics, ranging from religion in the ancient Mediterranean (Raja and Rüpke 2015) to religion-inspired social activism in present-day Latin America (Rubin, Smilde, and Junge 2014) and from everyday Islam in twenty-first-century

CONTACT Kim Knibbe k.e.knibbe@rug.nl

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

Europe (Dessing et al. 2013) to manifestations of queer religiosity in early, medieval, and contemporary Christian culture (Talvacchia, Pettinger, and Larrimore 2015).

The lived religion approach has pioneered a strand of ethnographically grounded scholarship that navigates between several imposing bulwarks of research which make up the landscape of religious studies and sociology of religion. One of these bulwarks could be identified as the vast body of work comprised by the history of religion. This 'lumping together' certainly does not do justice to this body of work, yet for the purpose of creating a contrast with the lived religion approach it serves to underscore that religious studies has to a large extent been dominated by scholars for whom religious texts form the main sources. Partly, this bulwark shares a disciplinary history with some adjacent fields, such as the study of classics and Indology. In order to create coherence to the 'study of religion', founding scholars attempted to formulate *sui generis* definitions of religion. Distinctive for the study of religion has thus been a phenomenological emphasis on discovering 'the sacred' or 'the numinous' across traditions and historical periods, such as found in the work of Rudolf Otto, Gerardus van der Leeuw, and Mircea Eliade (Allen 2005; Kippenberg 2002). Increasingly, however, any notion of a universal *sui generis* definition of religion has been criticized. As many authors have argued, religion cannot be reliably defined across cultures and historical periods; moreover, these attempts often lead to a focus on belief, scripture, and notions of a universal sacred (Asad 2002; McCutcheon 1995; Smith 1998). Among more pragmatic solutions avoiding the definition question altogether, this has given rise to a body of work that develops a discursive approach to studying how the category of religion is constructed in different settings and periods of time (e.g. Taira 2013; Wijsen and von Stuckrad 2016).

Another bulwark, dominant especially within European but also present within North American sociology of religion, is the body of theories focusing on the fate of religion in modern times, including the various guises of the secularization thesis. This work focuses on contemporary religion, but with a narrow research agenda inspired by the founding fathers of sociology. Following insights developed by Max Weber, both early proponents and later defendants of secularization theory proceeded from the premise that there is an irreconcilable inconsistency between religion and modernity (Berger 1967; Dobbelaere and Voyé 1990; Bruce 2001, 1992). When it became clear that in the United States patterns of de-churching developed differently from Europe, Rodney Stark and William Bainbridge formulated a theory that employs rational choice and the metaphor of the religious marketplace to understand the relative success or decline of religious groups (Stark and Bainbridge 1985, 1996). Furthermore, in the face of thriving religious traditions and their reform

movements outside Europe, in the global North and South, the question whether Europe is indeed an exceptional case became paramount. This led the author of one of the most influential forms of secularization theory, Peter Berger, to formulate a different understanding of the relationship between religion and modernity (Berger 2014, 1999; Davie 2002).

The lived religion approach abandons such macro-level questions and attempts at theorizing the future of religion in modernity by focusing on how religion is practised. Rather than assuming an inherent incompatibility between religion and modernity, it enquires into how religion is encountered and experienced—how it comes into play—in different environments: public and private, official and informal, sacred, secular, and religiously 'neutral' (e.g. Ammerman 2013; Bender 2003). In response to the crisis of definition, the lived religion approach has promoted the abandoning of pre-defined understandings of religion as a starting point of analysis in favor of an emphasis on the activities and interpretations of individuals. This has the added advantage of circumventing the Protestant bias often embedded in conventional academic definitions of religion (e.g. McGuire 2008, 20–24; Orsi 2010, xxxii–xxxvii). Where discursive approaches often center on the question of what 'counts' as religion and who decides this, the study of lived religion gives this issue less priority in order to devise research strategies that employ mostly ethnographic and historiographic methods to show how what is commonly understood to be 'religion' is shaped through countless daily practices, habits, and patterns of social life.

Nevertheless, while applications of the lived religion concept have multiplied in recent years, this approach is still often used in a general sense, to describe a particular focus and the basic contours of research. Where theory and concepts are employed, they are usually taken from other disciplines such as history, anthropology, cultural sociology, and gender studies. In this special issue, we offer a selection of focused discussions that reflect on, consolidate, and move forward the theoretical and methodological dilemmas and advances particular to the lived religion approach.

More specifically, the articles focus on two themes of wide relevance to this approach. Both exemplify well the challenges inherent in the study of lived religion as it requires researchers to break with deep-seated scholarly conventions and patterns of thought. The first links with discursive approaches and broaches the topic that often seems to be sidelined in the lived religion approach: what counts as religion and how it is constructed by scholars and their research subjects, also in the interaction between them. Circumventing the issue of defining religion still begs the question what 'religion' is. Is 'religion' taken as a matter of course in the study of lived religion and how problematic is this? Often, authors describe their focus on lived religion as a concern with the ways people relate to 'supernatural beings' or 'the sacred'. How are we to understand these terms? This leads

to the second theme that runs through this special issue: how to deal with the 'reality' of the experiences of religious practitioners that run counter to 'common sense' understandings of the world, which—at least in the West—are informed by a pervasive form of cultural scientism. Since the turn from *sui generis* definitions in the study of religion it seems that the question of what to make of the 'alterity' of lived religion has become suspect to discuss. Several articles in this special issue show that it is possible to develop, both conceptually and theoretically, non-reductive and respectful ways of approaching this issue, interpretations that go beyond an either–or dichotomy: either dismissing religious thought and experience altogether or embracing it as primary. One interesting aspect of this problematic issue is how religious practitioners themselves negotiate the tension between common-sense views and their 'enchanted' understandings of the world.

In this introduction, we trace the emergence and conceptualization of the lived religion approach and the theoretical approaches that have historically informed it and present some guidelines and directions for developing the lived religion approach in terms of theory and methodology.

Lived religion: the founding scholars

The work that first introduced the concept of lived religion to Anglophone academic audiences was the collection *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice*, edited by historian David Hall (1997a; see also Ammerman 2014, 194). In his introduction, Hall (1997b, vii) explains that the concept originated as a literal translation of the term *la religion vécue* in French sociology of religion. Since its adoption in English it has, however, developed independently from the French tradition. Hall (1997b, vii) describes lived religion as "a way of doing American religious history" that enlists perspectives heretofore relatively unused within this scholarly field, to advance academic knowledge of the everyday doing and thinking of lay people. Among the contributors to *Lived Religion in America* were sociologist Nancy Ammerman and historian Robert Orsi, two scholars that over the course of time have become strongly identified with the lived religion approach. Furthermore, a decade later, another seminal anthology was edited by Ammerman (2007a). *Everyday Religion: Observing Modern Religious Lives* includes an article by sociologist Meredith B. McGuire who now belongs to the most prominent advocates of lived religion. All these scholars envision the approach in slightly different ways, based on their specific interests and disciplinary backgrounds. In the following, we briefly discuss their respective angles.

McGuire's (2008, 4) objective in *Lived Religion: Faith and Practice in Everyday Life* is to challenge sociologists of religion "to rethink fundamental conceptualizations of what we study and how we study it". She argues that

religion as practised by individuals is often vastly different from religion as prescribed by institutions and proposes a re-centering of sociological inquiries of individuals. The value of the term 'lived religion' thus lies in "distinguishing the actual experience of religious persons from the prescribed religion of institutionally defined beliefs and practices" (McGuire 2008, 12). While this statement is rather simplistic and risks denigrating institution-oriented religious activity to second-class status, the problem for McGuire is not institutional religion as such, but the fact that sociological theories and methods have traditionally been biased towards 'religion-as-prescribed'. She (2008, 22, 24, 43) emphasizes academic definitions of religion as socially constructed and calls for historical analysis of their underpinnings. Her own reading (2008, 20–24) pinpoints the so-called long Reformation (ca. 1300–1700) as a crucial period when many of the assumptions formed that have dominated Western scholarly understandings of religion to the present day.

For McGuire (2016, 160; 2008, 13–15; 2007, 187), a particularly important characteristic of lived religion is its embodied nature. According to her (2008, 39–41; 2007, 188–189; 1990, 284, 294), the results of historical struggles about definitional boundaries include a devaluation of religious practice in general and embodied practices in particular as well as a dichotomous understanding of spiritual and material, mind and body. In accounting for the material body as the basis of people's religious expression and experience, McGuire (e.g. 2016) makes use of tools provided by phenomenologically oriented philosophers and social theorists. In fact, she (2008, 216: n. 9, 234: n. 2) explicitly connects the concept of lived religion to philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology of the body—the idea of the 'lived body' as the vehicle through which people engage with the world; this enables scholars to recognize how religious practice and experience are connected with human embodiment.

Robert Orsi also sees phenomenological connotations in the concept of lived religion. In his interpretation (2010, lii–liii: n. 4; 1997, 20: n. 11), the lived religion approach concerns religion as embedded in the 'life-world' of existentialist philosophy and phenomenological anthropology. For Orsi (2010, liv–lv: n.10; 2003, 174; 1997, 7–8), the study of lived religion constitutes a radically empiricist approach as developed by anthropologist Michael Jackson, focused on religion as an ongoing and dynamic process of interaction with everyday reality:

> The interpretive challenge of the study of lived religion is to develop the practice of disciplined attention to people's signs and practices as they describe, understand, and use them, in the circumstances of their experiences, and to the structures and conditions within which these signs and practices emerge. (Orsi 2003, 172)

Proceeding from this starting-point, Orsi (2005, 2–4; 2003, 172–173) describes religion as, among other things, a network of relationships between people and 'special beings', which is inherently ambivalent and ambiguous as well as shot through with structures of power.

Orsi's (2003, 172) understanding of religion as ongoing 'cultural work' includes religious scholarship. Like McGuire, he (2010, xxxii–xxxvii; 2005, 183–192; see also 2012, 3–6) points to the power exercised by academia in defining some practices, beliefs, and experiences as authentic and essential to religion (or to a particular religious tradition) and in denigrating others. Due to his own research interests, he is most acutely concerned with the historical processes that have resulted in the unfavorable treatment of Roman Catholicism in the study of religion (Orsi 2016, 2005). Nevertheless, he (2003, 170–172) emphasizes the importance of cultivating a self-consciousness of the broader social and political agendas that have influenced the historical development of the discipline of religious studies as imperative to the study of lived religion in general. Moreover, according to Orsi, the study of lived religion stands in a critical relationship with the discipline of religious studies. It "holds the possibility of disentangling us from our normative agendas and defamiliarizing us in relation to our own cultures" and thus forces us "to confront in a direct way the implications of the discipline's history for its contemporary work" (Orsi 2003, 174).

Compared to Orsi and McGuire, Ammerman's understanding of the lived religion approach is less radical. She (2013, 2–3; 2007b, 4; 1997) does not advocate "a fundamental rethinking of what religion is" (Orsi 1997, 7), but conceives of the study of lived religion in more pragmatic terms, as a way to understand religion, particularly the religion of 'the American mainstream', in the modern world. Thus she (2014, 191–196; 2010) develops her ideas about everyday religion—a term she mostly uses, but seems to consider more or less interchangeable with lived religion (e.g. 2014)—as a contribution and corrective to sociological theorizations of secularization, pluralization, institutional differentiation, and the religion–spirituality divide. While Ammerman (2013, 4–5) acknowledges the historical baggage of sociological definitions and categories concerning religion, she does not propose abandoning or displacing, but rather expanding, them. Therefore, she does not frame her work as a critical discussion of the ethics and politics of the academic study of religion, but simply as a search for better definitions and categories.

According to Ammerman (2014, 190), the concept of lived religion refers to religion as interwoven with the everyday lives of people. Moreover, to privilege the everyday entails prioritizing the experiences of people who are not religious experts or specialists as well as social locations and situations that are not institutionally religious (Ammerman 2013, 4–5, 325: n. 10; 2007b, 5). Ammerman (2013, 6, 293–299; 2007c, 228–229) thus sets the study of

everyday religion against the longstanding tradition, within sociology of religion, of presupposing that religion takes place primarily in certain hermetic social arenas, namely within the sphere of either religious institutions or the home. Nevertheless, she (2016, 86–88) also warns against an exclusive focus on non-professionals and non-institutional settings, noting that it *de facto* perpetuates the binary between 'official' and 'unofficial', which is harmful to the wider agenda of the approach. In her own research, leaning both on narrative analysis and symbolic interactionism, she (2014, 196–198; 2013, 7–9, 300–301; 2007c, 226–227) has highlighted the role of narratives and conversations in the way spiritual resources, identities, and realities are generated and deployed in everyday life.

Related concepts and approaches

Our reading of the thought of McGuire, Orsi, and Ammerman—arguably the three best-known and most cited scholars connected with the study of lived religion—makes explicit that the lived religion approach does not rely on a specific, fixed theory or method, but rather designates a broad research trend. This trend has developed, and gained currency, as scholars and sociologists of religion have increasingly taken issue with formerly unquestioned theoretical and methodological presuppositions of their respective disciplines, such as the construction of normative categorizations, a reliance on survey-based methods and large-scale generalizations, and a focus on texts, institutions, and official spokespersons (e.g. Bender et al. 2012). In the United States and elsewhere, these concerns have also given rise to other concepts and approaches, with some aims convergent with those of the study of lived religion.

Theorists of lived religion commonly identify the term 'popular religion' as a prime example of scholarly categorizations that carry with them normative assumptions about religion (Hall 1997b, viii–ix; McGuire 2008, 45–46; Orsi 2010, xxxii–xxxvii). In recent decades, this term (and its parallel 'folk religion') has come under increasing criticism, also in folklore studies. In his essay of 1995, folklorist Leonard Norman Primiano introduced the concept of *vernacular religion* as an alternative to popular religion, to dismantle two-tiered models ultimately relying on a division between 'official' and 'unofficial', 'high' and 'low' or 'authentic' and 'corrupted' forms of religion (see e.g. Bowman and Valk 2012; Whitehead 2013). Primiano's understanding of vernacular religion comes very close to standard interpretations of lived religion; his definition of vernacular religion is "religion as it is lived: as human beings encounter, understand, interpret, and practice it" (Primiano 1995, 44). However, his emphasis does differ from the way lived religion is commonly viewed, particularly by sociologists, in that he consistently emphasizes the vernacular nature of

even institutional and organized religion (Primiano 2012, 384; 1995, 45–46). While there are institutions and bodies that represent 'official' religion, the beliefs and practices of religious experts do not express 'official' religion in a pure form either. In other words, "since religion inherently involves interpretation, it is impossible for the religion of an individual not to be vernacular" (Primiano 1995, 44).

Alongside lived and vernacular religion, the concept of *everyday religion* has gained ground in contemporary religious scholarship. This is, as mentioned above, Ammerman's preferred term to designate her object of study. Nevertheless, other theoretical articulations of everyday religion exist, with at least some of them drawing upon *theories of the everyday* in a manner that Ammerman never does.[1] For instance, leaning on Michel de Certeau's theorizations of everyday life and Michael Jackson's phenomenological anthropology, anthropologists Samuli Schielke and Liza Debevec propose an approach that views religious life as inseparable from life in general and starts from everyday practice, "looking at actual lived experiences and their existential significance for the people involved" (Schielke and Debevec 2012, 2, 8–10). Furthermore, sociologist Linda Woodhead (2013, 15–16) applies de Certeau's understanding of the dynamics between strategies and tactics to develop a framework for studying everyday lived religion. The emphasis of her account (ibid, 9–10) is on relations of power, which are also reflected in the "skewed, partial and variable articulation of social experience" in culture and academia. Thus, while Schielke and Debevec (2012, 8) interpret everyday religion as a modality of action, for Woodhead (2013, 11), the potential of the concept lies in a change of scholarly perspective from the dominant to the dominated.

Theoretical influences

The above summary of the programmatic statements about lived religion and related approaches revealed several important theoretical foundations: theories of the everyday, phenomenological anthropology, embodiment theory. Other seminal influences include theories of practice and feminist theory.

Theories of the nature of everyday life have much in common with *theories of practice*, a strand of social scientific theorization which attributes to practice a fundamental role in the formation and functioning of the social world (Ortner 1984, 144–149). 'Practice' here refers to human activity—embodied and linguistic—which simultaneously constructs individuals as social beings and the social world that surrounds them. Several scholars, starting with Hall (1997b, xi), have noted the importance of practice to understand lived religion as something that unfolds in the

junction of structure and agency (see also Neitz 2011, 47–49; Orsi 2003, 171–172). Sociologist Courtney Bender (2012; 2003, 6–8) has applied sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's practice theory to highlight the importance of capturing lived religion as it manifests in mundane interactions between people across various social settings. She (2012, 273–275; also 2010, 182–183, 185) advocates focusing on 'practising' religion (rather than particular practices) as a way to shake up the deep-seated sociological assumption that religious activity only takes place in a designated 'religious' sphere. Through this analytical shift, it becomes possible to uncover and explicate processes "that *make* certain things (activities, ideas, institutions) recognizably religious" and thus challenge the notion of a separate, self-contained religious field as the point of origin of all things religious (Bender 2012, 275, emphasis in original).

The search for concepts and methods better suited to the analysis of the religion of marginalized groups has led scholars of lived religion to favor research strategies similar to those used for studying gendered religion. Feminist scholars have also implemented a transfer of focus from doctrine, texts, and authorities to the activities and interpretations of ordinary believers and lay specialists (Gross 2002, 44–47; King 1995, 19–24; Neitz 2004, 398–399). Moreover, they have called for sensitivity to the differences between the religious interests, concerns, and agency of individuals holding different positions in social space (Rinaldo 2014, 828–829). McGuire (2008) and Orsi (e.g. 1996) both studied lived religion through an explicitly gender-sensitive lens. Overall, there is much overlap between recent contributions to the study of lived religion and the study of gendered—and especially women's—religion (see Ammerman 2016, 89–90; Neitz 2011, 52–53). The lived religion approach can be seen to tie in with feminist epistemologies that argue that supposedly 'objective' and universal knowledge hides the researcher's standpoint, elevating this view to the position of 'view from nowhere' and thus privileging certain types of knowing over others. In contrast, feminist standpoint epistemologies emphasize the importance of recognizing that knowledge is always developed as a "view from somewhere" (Haraway 1988; Woodhead 2013, 12).

The study of lived religion thus draws from a number of theoretical sources. The discussions that we have introduced here are prominent in the work of the founding scholars and feature in the articles of this special issue. Moreover, these articles elaborate additional currents of thought, such as ritual studies, material theory, and new animism. They demonstrate how these theorizations—some of which have received relatively little attention in lived religion scholarship—can be used to lend support to the lived religion approach. However, our list remains far from conclusive. As the background of all the contributors to this special issue is either in religious

studies or anthropology, we have left it to others to trace parallel discussions within other disciplines, including history and (practical) theology.

How to go forward

There is a pressing need for more systematic inquiries into the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of the study of lived religion, especially from a comparative perspective (cf. Ammerman 2016, 95). Such inquiries would identify and account for points of convergence and disagreement in existing research, also across disciplines and national contexts. This would greatly benefit the theoretical and methodological advancement of the lived religion approach. Nevertheless, producing more comprehensive outlines of the state of the art does not suffice; we need guidelines for future research. In the following, we list three directions that we think deserve to be explored and indicate the issues that are linked to them.

1) 'Lived religion' needs to be clarified, theorized, made methodologically explicit, and brought into conversation with scholarship that studies the emergence and deployment of religion as a category.

In the literature, lived religion is treated variously as a term, a concept, an approach, and a field of study—or all of these. It can be seen to designate: a) religion as practised in particular locations or by particular people; b) a specific modality of religious practice; c) the fundamental nature of all religion. It can be seen as an argument about the way religion should be studied or as an approach that is complementary to others and helps to redirect scholars' analytical gaze. In light of this ambiguity, we strongly recommend that scholars explicitly articulate how they understand 'lived religion'. It should not be assumed that the term is self-explanatory. They should also offer their views on the craft and objectives of the study of lived religion: what it involves and achieves regarding their research.

We take lived religion to indicate both an approach and a conceptual stance. As an approach, it builds from the ground up, emphasizes empirical case studies, but also uses them to reflect critically on existing concepts and theories, bringing attention to phenomena, people, and locations marginalized by conventional perspectives. The lived religion approach does not rely on *a priori* definitions of religion or propose phenomenologically to establish what is common to all religions. Furthermore, it does not delineate a particular segment of religious phenomena (e.g. 'unofficial' practices and beliefs) and leave out others (see also Hall 1997b, viii–ix; Orsi 2010, xxxii–xxxvii). Nor does it presuppose its subject: lived religion is not 'out there' for us to study. Rather, lived religion is an approach that is suitable for inquiring into what people do that they identify as religious, spiritual or generally as going beyond common-sense understandings of the world.

This (still rather vague) indication of the subject of lived religion could be fleshed out by engaging with the scholarship on religion as a category, which includes discursive approaches. This move has already been suggested by Bender (2012) who recommends looking for the way 'religion' manifests in everyday contexts; it has also been applied in research studying secularity and secularism as lived (Scheer, Fadil, and Johansen 2019). By focusing on the ways in which 'religion' is separated from other domains of life in daily interactions, scholars have recently begun to combine a lived religion approach with discursive approaches (Schrijvers and Wiering 2018) or, as Helena Kupari does in this special issue, with a practice approach. Developing this research agenda further can provide a fresh perspective, for instance, on how what is recognized as 'religious' intersects with other structuring categories, such as age, gender, class, and race.

Alongside 'religion', 'spirituality' is another discursive category of central importance in the lived religion approach. Like 'religion', it has proven hard for scholars to pin down. Scholars of lived religion should tackle this category, too, from the ground up. Explicitly examining how spiritual practitioners themselves claim and use this label in contrast to related terms such as 'religion' is crucial in developing scholarly conceptualizations of spirituality, as suggested in a volume edited by Anna Fedele and Kim Knibbe (Fedele and Knibbe 2020). Informed by discursive considerations, the lived religion approach can be applied to investigate how people creatively use categories discursively linked to 'religion' to claim certain powers and authorities, while distancing themselves from others (Fedele and Knibbe 2013, introduction; Knibbe 2014). This may also further scholarly understandings of how categories such as 'spirituality' are used to undermine, or dialectically overcome, contemporary dynamics between religion and secularity.

All religious phenomena—e.g. practices, rituals, beliefs, norms, values, doctrines, objects, institutions—can be studied as lived religion. This does not mean that all religion should always be studied as lived religion; we do not propose that the approach constitutes a comprehensive and universally relevant research agenda. However, we encourage scholars continuously to reflect on the scope of lived religion scholarship, alert to significant omissions. For example, paying attention to the margins—to people whose experiences have previously been left unarticulated—has been a crucial objective in the study of lived religion. If, however, the center is overlooked in the process, scholars risk perpetuating the dichotomies they are working to overcome. Focusing solely on the disadvantaged is untenable as it gives the impression that 'élite' religiosity does not fit in the category of lived religion and is somehow fundamentally different: perhaps doctrinally purer, more rational or less focused on instrumental concerns (see also Woodhead 2013, 11, 15). For this reason, it is also important to

acknowledge the religion of dominant groups as a legitimate area of enquiry within the approach.

Regarding the theoretical premises and concepts in use, they, too, need to be spelled out. For example, scholars should think about and elucidate what they mean by 'everyday' or 'lived' in their research (cf. Elias 1998). We do not, however, advocate any one specific theoretical foundation. To include and capture people's practices and perceptions in their endless varieties, the lived religion approach has to be porous as well as pragmatic, taking up methods, theories, and concepts developed in sociology, anthropology, religious studies, theology, history, philosophy, and feminism. Moreover, to constitute a critical project, which aims at diminishing the impact of unthought-of scholarly presuppositions on interpretations produced, all these tools have to be subjected to thorough reflection.

For example, scholars of lived religion focusing on contemporary societies need to consider how the ubiquitous presence of (social) media in people's daily lives influences their lived experience of religion and spirituality. To tackle this question, they could turn to theoretical and methodological advances produced within the anthropology of media and the material religion approach. Within both fields, interesting research is being done that easily falls within the scope of a lived religion approach (see also Lynch, Mitchell, and Strhan 2011, 1–2; some of these approaches are also referred to in Amy Whitehead's article in this special issue). However, while doing so, they should also reflexively assess the benefits and drawbacks of their choices. How can, for instance, an investigation of various kinds of virtual contexts contribute to our understanding of religion-as-lived? How should the lived religion approach develop methodologically to give due recognition to the ubiquity of social media in people's lives? Within the lived religion approach, overall, the potential inherent in the combination of online and offline methodologies as well as in the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches has not yet been comprehensively explored. This brings us to our second direction:

> 2) Scholars identifying with the lived religion approach should be more open to the idea that, in addition to producing in-depth scholarship on particular contexts and phenomena, they may also develop concepts and theories. More reflection is needed on how this is done responsibly and critically. Furthermore, concept and theory development could link more explicitly to existing and developing theories in the broader field of the study of religion and beyond. Something that the field has to offer in particular is theorizing and reflecting on how people may have radically different understandings of reality and the role of the supernatural in it as well as reflecting on the positionality of researchers and of knowledge in general.

Starting from the pioneering studies of McGuire, Ammerman, Orsi, and others, lived religion as a scholarly field has been dominated by ethnographic research. Ethnographic methodology provides scholars with

unique tools and notions for getting close to people and gaining a good understanding of the imminent reality of their daily lives. Even historical studies on lived religion often include ethnographically inspired emphases, such as an empathic stance towards research subjects and thorough analysis of the context. Moreover, ethnographic approaches incorporate ethical perspectives that closely align with the views of the founding scholars of the study of lived religion, concerning, for example, the importance of reflecting on researchers' positionality and the conditions for producing research material and knowledge.

Yet another use of ethnographic approaches for the study of lived religion lies in the way they foster a fruitful dynamic between deductive and inductive reasoning and thus concept and theory development. Within the two disciplines that have contributed most to the development of this methodology—social and cultural anthropology and cultural sociology, there are established ways of moving back and forth between etic and emic understandings, theories, and concepts and of conceptualizing and theorizing based on one's own material.[2] The integration of procedures and instruments that help the data 'talk back' to the theory in the process of analysis is crucial for feeding the critical agenda of the study of lived religion.

Furthermore, such tools can be used to more constructive ends: to further new theoretical or conceptual developments. We suggest that the lived religion approach could engage in a more fruitful dialogue with the research traditions that it now opportunistically taps into. How can this scholarly field not only challenge but also positively contribute to the research traditions it draws from? How can it build on them to produce advances within religious studies and sociology of religion?

This special issue provides a rich exploration of conceptual, methodological, and epistemological/ontological tensions between academic and practitioner approaches to religion, in particular concerning practitioner relationships to supernatural or sacred beings. Studying religion very often involves an 'ontological conflict' between the modernist, disenchanted accounts of reality that academics are expected to produce and the rich variety of lived experiences of angels, spirits, auras, and gods that inform the lives and practices of people (see also Orsi 2016). This dynamic tension can be mined for more innovative conceptualizations, especially through careful case studies based on fieldwork.

In this special issue, Terhi Utriainen examines this tension in the context of the lives of so-called angel practitioners—Finnish women living in a secular society where their engagement with supernatural beings may be frowned upon and ridiculed. She proposes an innovative theorizing of the ways these women key into and out of the frames in which angels may be either real or just imaginary. In contrast, Whitehead's article develops a methodologically innovative approach, where the challenge to 'modern'

ontologies and epistemologies posed by the ways people in her research context engage with a statue of the Virgin Mary as a person is taken seriously and explored. Similarly, Knibbe examines the ontological challenge of studying lived religion, particularly when this is at odds, not only with modernist understandings of the world but also with the scholar's own moral and ethical standpoints. Furthermore, Adam Klin-Oron describes the process through which people's initial experience of 'wild channeling' becomes institutionalized, not formally but informally, and thus moves within an accepted range of content and messages in the subculture of channeling.

Our final direction is as follows:

> 3) For a lived religion approach to be viable, it is imperative that those who devise religious studies programs think through how the lived religion approach could and should be taught, integrating a learning-by-doing approach that takes its cues from the best traditions in other disciplines.

Many religious studies programs do not include explicit training in methods, unlike most programs in, for example, the social sciences. We do not promote a focus on methods as mere tricks of the trade, but as taught elements of what should be viewed as the full research cycle: from formulating an initial question to gathering material, from analysis to interpretation and concept development. Thus, 'doing research' should introduce students to the idea and practice of moving back and forth between (self-generated) empirical material and theoretical considerations. At present, there are relatively few teaching resources for research method training in the study of religions (see, however, Stausberg and Engler 2011) and none (to our knowledge) that spell out the methods of the lived religion approach.

Conclusion

As outlined above, the articles in this special issue take up the directions sketched out above, explicating theoretical underpinnings and taking conceptual and methodological approaches already existent within the study of lived religion forward. Klin-Oron's article discusses the spontaneous occurrence of 'wild channeling' and contrasts this with the milder experience of 'cultivated' channeling as it becomes a more regulated experience. He shows that, although channeling—like engagements with angels that Utriainen describes—is not formally institutionalized, it is a social institution, with certain rules, regularities, accepted forms of behavior, and expectations. Channelers who transgress these unwritten rules find themselves not necessarily sanctioned, but simply without an audience or clientèle. His article thus highlights how 'lived religion' can be

studied not as a variation of institutionalized, formal religion, but as a life form that is not linked to any particular formal institution, introducing us to a new understanding of what lived religion can look like. Wholly non-institutional channeling is not sustainable: it is too raw, shattering. Embedding the initial experience within existing understandings and practices allows people to focus on self-empowerment and their own professionalization as a channel.

Utriainen's article discusses a form of non-institutionalized engagement with supernatural beings—angels—by Finnish women. Employing ritual theory, she analyzes how women are able to move between 'framing in', taking seriously the possibility of the presence and guidance of angels, and 'framing out', directing attention away from these possibilities. Ritual demarcation, or framing, is here understood as a dynamic process: women can switch instantly between assuming the world to be a place where enchantment is possible—a feather in the street can be a sign from an angel—and the default assumption that a feather is just a feather from a bird. Thus, Utriainen develops a conceptual framework for understanding the ways lived religion in the sense of regular engagement with supernatural beings is embedded within daily life in secular society: although often invisible to others, it has a presence that is significant, empowering, and life-directing for the practitioners.

Kupari's article follows the recommendation to explicate what is meant by 'religion' in the lived religion approach by applying concepts developed by Bourdieu to the ways Finnish Orthodox women position themselves in the individualized and pluralistic religious field. Thus, like Utriainen, she describes lived religion in a secular setting, but a very different kind: traditional, lifelong, part of childhood socialization. As members of a religious minority, Kupari's interlocutors position themselves reflexively in relation to the current trend within the Finnish religious landscape that favors religious seeking. They see themselves as having formed relations with the supernatural that are embodied to such an extent that they cannot be shaken off.

Whereas these articles all thematize people's relationships with the supernatural to some extent, Whitehead's article explicitly reflects on the methodological challenge this poses to the researcher, describing how she shifted from a modernist position of 'observing' how people in a Spanish village engage with a statue of the Virgin Mary to engaging with this statue herself and discovering how objects and people call into being varying forms of personhood. She thus became 'enmeshed' in the relationships between people, places, and things. She proposes a theory of objects as persons, defying modernist dualisms between subject and object, spirit and matter, sacred and profane.

Finally, acknowledging the impulse within the study of lived religion to avoid reductionism, the article by Knibbe explores how it may nevertheless be possible to be critical of these worlds. Her own experience during fieldwork, centered around the moment when she found herself refusing to participate in Communion during mass, serves as an anchoring of these explorations. Drawing on two anthropological approaches that have most radically explored the possibility of a non-reductionist understanding of people's engagement with the supernatural, she shows how it might be possible to be both non-reductionist and critical of the worlds one engages with in research on lived religion. In the context of the cartoon crisis, Talal Asad and others posed the question whether critique is secular (Asad et al. 2009). Knibbe shows that this is not necessarily the case; rather than conceiving of critique as a debunking or unveiling of religious truths, critique could be conceived of as relational, commenting on the possibilities of life particular religious and ritual worlds call into being and the suffering they may induce.

We wish to underscore that we do not suggest that a lived religion approach should always aim at theorizing. The value of this approach lies precisely in the rich monographs it produces, giving insight into the particulars and dynamics of religion as it is lived. These explorations are valuable in and of themselves. This kind of research and writing should be supported, encouraged, and developed at all levels, with both students in religious studies being facilitated to engage in research and senior scholars having the possibility to take time away from their institutions to engage in their own research and writing (see also point 3). However, there is much that a lived religion approach can bring to religious studies and sociology of religion in terms of concept and theory development. We hope that this introduction and the articles that follow inspire lived religion researchers to explore further how the lived religion approach can be theorized and contribute to theorizing both within these fields and in adjacent disciplines.

Notes

1. In fact, Ammerman (2013, 325: n. 10) seems to side with sociologist Norbert Elias's (1998) view that social scientists sometimes succumb to over-theorizing the everyday.
2. These are usually described in chapters on 'coding' in methodology handbooks (see e.g. Hennink, Hutter, and Bailey 2010).

Acknowledgments

This special issue originated from a panel held at the IAHR World Congress 2015 in Erfurt, Germany, entitled "Focusing Concepts and Theories for the Study of Lived Religion", chaired by Terhi Utriainen. The panel brought together the scholars of religion Terhi

Utriainen, Amy Whitehead, and Helena Kupari and anthropologist Kim Knibbe. For the special issue, we enlisted an additional contributor, anthropologist Adam Klin-Oron, to produce a fuller account of how this approach is taken forward by scholars educated and based outside the United States (Europe and Israel).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Kim Knibbe is Associate Professor in the anthropology and sociology of religion at Groningen University, the Netherlands. She is currently directing the five-year research project "Sexuality, Religion and Secularism: Cultural Encounters in the African Diaspora in the Netherlands", funded by the Netherlands Foundation for Research. Previously, she has carried out ethnographic research on Catholicism and spirituality in local life in the Netherlands and on Nigerian Pentecostalism in Europe. She has published a series of theoretical and methodological reflections on studying religion that address how the experience of lived religion, as a mode of experiencing reality that is somehow identified as 'different', can be approached in ethnographic research. CORRESPONDENCE: Department Comparative Study of Religion, Groningen University, Oude Boteringestraat 38, 9712 GK Groningen, The Netherlands.

Helena Kupari is a postdoctoral researcher in the Department of Cultures in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Helsinki, Finland. Her research interests include Orthodox Christianity in Finland, gender, ethnicity, embodiment, social memory, and theories of practice. She is the author of *Lifelong Religion as Habitus: Religious Practice among Displaced Karelian Orthodox Women in Finland* (2016). CORRESPONDENCE: Study of Religions, University of Helsinki, Finland, PO Box 59, Unioninkatu 38, FI-00014 Helsinki, Finland.

ORCID

Kim Knibbe http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1921-0871
Helena Kupari http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0984-5996

References

Allen, Douglas. 2005. "Phenomenology of Religion." In *Encyclopedia of Religion*, Vol. 10, edited by Lindsay Jones, 7086–7101. 2nd ed. Detroit, MI: Macmillan Reference.

Ammerman, Nancy T. 1997. "Golden Rule Christianity: Lived Religion in the American Mainstream." In *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice*, edited by David D. Hall, 196–216. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ammerman, Nancy T., ed. 2007a. *Everyday Religion: Observing Modern Religious Lives*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ammerman, Nancy T. 2007b. "Introduction: Observing Religious Modern Lives." In *Everyday Religion: Observing Modern Religious Lives*, edited by Nancy T. Ammerman, 3–18. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ammerman, Nancy T. 2007c. "Studying Everyday Religion: Challenges for the Future." In *Everyday Religion: Observing Modern Religious Lives*, edited by Nancy T. Ammerman, 219–238. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ammerman, Nancy T. 2010. "The Challenges of Pluralism: Locating Religion in a World of Diversity." *Social Compass 57* (2): 154–167.

Ammerman, Nancy T. 2013. *Sacred Stories, Spiritual Tribes: Finding Religion in Everyday Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ammerman, Nancy T. 2014. "2013 Paul Hanly Furfey Lecture: Finding Religion in Everyday Life." *Sociology of Religion* 75 (2): 189–207.

Ammerman, Nancy T. 2016. "Lived Religion as an Emerging Field: An Assessment of its Contours and Frontiers." *Nordic Journal of Religion and Society* 29 (2): 83–99.

Asad, Talal. 2002. "The Construction of Religion as an Anthropological Category." In *A Reader in the Anthropology of Religion*, edited by Michael Lambek, 114–132. Malden, MO: Blackwell.

Asad, Talal, Wendy Brown, Judith Butler, and Saba Mahmood. 2009. "Is Critique Secular? Blasphemy, Injury, and Free Speech." Berkeley, CA: Townsend Center for the Humanities. Accessed 20 March 2020. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/84q9c6ft

Bender, Courtney. 2003. *Heaven's Kitchen: Living Religion at God's Love We Deliver*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bender, Courtney. 2010. *The New Metaphysicals: Spirituality and the American Religious Imagination*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bender, Courtney. 2012. "Practicing Religions." In *The Cambridge Companion to Religious Studies*, edited by Robert A. Orsi, 273–295. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bender, Courtney, Wendy Cadge, Peggy Levitt, and David Smilde. 2012. "Introduction: Religion on the Edge—De-centering and Re-centering." In *Religion on the Edge: De-centering and Re-centering the Sociology of Religion*, edited by Courtney Bender, Wendy Cadge, Peggy Levitt, and David Smilde, 1–20. New York: Oxford University Press.

Berger, Peter. 1967. *The Sacred Canopy*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Berger, Peter L. 1999. *The Desecularization of the World: Resurgent Religion and World Politics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Berger, Peter L. 2014. *The Many Altars of Modernity: Toward a Paradigm for Religion in a Pluralist Age*. Boston, MA: de Gruyter.

Bowman, Marion, and Ülo Valk, eds. 2012. *Vernacular Religion in Everyday Life: Expressions of Belief*. Sheffield: Equinox.

Bruce, Steve. 1992. *Religion and Modernization: Sociologists and Historians Debate the Secularization Thesis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bruce, Steve. 2001. "The Social Process of Secularization." In *The Blackwell Companion to Sociology of Religion*, edited by Richard K. Fenn, 249–263. Malden: Blackwell.

Davie, Grace. 2002. *Europe, the Exceptional Case: Parameters of Faith in the Modern World*. London: Darton Longman & Todd.

Dessing, Nathal M., Nadia Jeldtoft, Jørgen Nielsen, and Linda Woodhead, eds. 2013. *Everyday Lived Islam in Europe*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Dobbelaere, Karel, and Liliane Voyé. 1990. "From Pillar to Postmodernity: The Changing Situation of Religion in Belgium." *Sociological Analysis* 51 (special issue): S1–S13.

Elias, Norbert. 1998. "On the Concept of Everyday Life." In *The Norbert Elias Reader: A Biographical Selection*, edited by Johan Goudsblom and Stephen Mennell, 166–174. Oxford: Blackwell.

Fedele, Anna, and Kim E. Knibbe, eds. 2013. *Gender and Power in Contemporary Spirituality: Ethnographic Approaches*. London: Routledge.

Fedele, Anna, and Kim E. Knibbe. 2020. *Secular Society, Spiritual Selves? The Gendered Triangle of Religion, Spirituality and Secularity*. London: Routledge.

Gross, Rita M. 2002. "Feminist Issues and Methods in the Anthropology of Religion." In *Methodology in Religious Studies: The Interface with Women's Studies*, edited by Arvind Sharma, 41–65. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hall, David D., ed. 1997a. *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hall, David D. 1997b. "Introduction." In *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice*, edited by David D. Hall, vii–xiii. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Haraway, Donna. 1988. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14 (3): 575–599.

Hennink, Monique, Inge Hutter, and Ajay Bailey. 2010. *Qualitative Research Methods*. London: Sage.

King, Ursula. 1995. "Introduction: Gender and the Study of Religion." In *Religion and Gender*, edited by Ursula King, 1–38. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kippenberg, Hans. 2002. *Discovering Religious History in the Modern Age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Knibbe, Kim. 2014. "Certainty and Uncertainty in Contemporary Spirituality and Catholicism: Finding Proof versus Destabilizing Certainties in Popular Religion in the Netherlands." *Social Compass* 61 (4): 537–549.

Lynch, Gordon, Jolyon Mitchell, and Anna Strhan. 2011. "Introduction." In *Religion, Media and Culture: A Reader*, edited by Gordon Lynch, Jolyon Mitchell, and Anna Strhan, 1–6. Abingdon: Routledge.

McCutcheon, Russell T. 1995. "The Category 'Religion' in Recent Publications: A Critical Survey." *Numen* 42 (3): 284–309.

McGuire, Meredith B. 1990. "Religion and the Body: Rematerializing the Human Body in the Social Sciences of Religion." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 29 (3): 283–296.

McGuire, Meredith B. 2007. "Embodied Practice: Navigation and Resistance." In *Everyday Religion: Observing Modern Religious Lives*, edited by Nancy T. Ammerman, 187–200. New York: Oxford University Press.

McGuire, Meredith B. 2008. *Lived Religion: Faith and Practice in Everyday Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGuire, Meredith B. 2016. "Individual Sensory Experiences, Socialized Senses, and Everyday Lived Religion in Practice." *Social Compass* 63 (2): 152–162.

Neitz, Mary Jo. 2004. "Gender and Culture: Challenges to the Sociology of Religion." *Sociology of Religion* 65 (4): 391–402.

Neitz, Mary Jo. 2011. "Lived Religion: Signposts of Where We Have Been and Where We Can Go from Here." In *Religion, Spirituality and Everyday Practice*, edited by Giuseppe Giordan and William H. Swatos Jr., 45–55. Dordrecht: Springer.

Orsi, Robert A. 1996. *Thank You St. Jude: Women's Devotion to the Patron Saint of Hopeless Causes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Orsi, Robert A. 1997. "Everyday Miracles: The Study of Lived Religion." In *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice*, edited by David D. Hall, 4–21. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Orsi, Robert A. 2003. "Is the Study of Lived Religion Irrelevant to the World We Live in? Special Presidential Plenary Address, Salt Lake City, November 2, 2002." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 42 (2): 169–174.

Orsi, Robert A. 2005. *Between Heaven and Earth. The Religious Worlds People Make and the Scholars Who Study Them*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Orsi, Robert A. 2010. *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880–1950*. 3rd ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Orsi, Robert A. 2012. "Introduction." In *The Cambridge Companion to Religious Studies*, edited by Robert A. Orsi, 1–11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Orsi, Robert A. 2016. *History and Presence*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Ortner, Sherry B. 1984. "Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26 (1): 126–166.

Primiano, Leonard Norman. 1995. "Vernacular Religion and the Search for Method in Religious Folklife." *Western Folklore* 54 (1): 37–56.

Primiano, Leonard Norman. 2012. "Afterword: Manifestations of the Religious Vernacular—Ambiguity, Power, and Creativity." In *Vernacular Religion in Everyday Life: Expressions of Belief*, edited by Marion Bowman and Ülo Valk, 382–394. Sheffield: Equinox.

Raja, Rubina, and Jörg Rüpke. 2015. "Appropriating Religion: Methodological Issues in Testing the 'Lived Ancient Religion' Approach." *Religion in the Roman Empire* 1 (1): 11–19.

Rinaldo, Rachel. 2014. "Pious and Critical: Muslim Women Activists and the Question of Agency." *Gender & Society* 28 (6): 824–846.

Rubin, Jeffrey W., David Smilde, and Benjamin Junge. 2014. "Lived Religion and Lived Citizenship in Latin America's Zones of Crisis: Introduction." *Latin American Research Review* 49 (special issue): 7–26.

Scheer, Monique, Nadia Fadil, and Birgitte Schepelern Johansen. 2019. *Secular Bodies, Affects and Emotions: European Configurations*. London: Bloomsbury.

Schielke, Samuli, and Liza Debevec. 2012. "Introduction." In *Ordinary Lives and Grand Schemes: An Anthropology of Everyday Religion*, edited by Samuli Schielke and Liza Debevec, 1–16. New York: Berghahn Books.

Schrijvers, Lieke L., and Jelle Wiering. 2018. "Religious/Secular Discourses and Practices of Good Sex." *Culture and Religion* 19 (2): 139–159.

Smith, Jonathan Z. 1998. "Religion, Religions, Religious." In *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, edited by Mark C. Taylor, 269–285. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Stark, Rodney, and William Sims Bainbridge. 1985. *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival, and Cult Formation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Stark, Rodney, and William Sims Bainbridge. 1996. *A Theory of Religion*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Stausberg, Michael, and Steven Engler, eds. 2011. *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in the Study of Religion*. London: Routledge.

Taira, Teemu. 2013. "Making Space for Discursive Study in Religious Studies." *Religion* 43 (1): 26–45.

Talvacchia, Kathleen T., Michael F. Pettinger, and Mark Larrimore, eds. 2015. *QUEER Christianities: Lived Religion in Transgressive Forms*. New York: New York University Press.

Whitehead, Amy. 2013. *Religious Statues and Personhood: Testing the Role of Materiality*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Wijsen, Frans, and Kocku von Stuckrad, eds. 2016. *Making Religion: Theory and Practice in the Discursive Study of Religion*. Leiden: Brill.

Winston, Diane, ed. 2009. *Small Screen, Big Picture: Television and Lived Religion*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.

Woodhead, Linda. 2013. "Tactical and Strategic Religion." In *Everyday Lived Islam in Europe*, edited by Nathal M. Dessing, Nadia Jeldtoft, Jørgen Nielsen, and Linda Woodhead, 9–22. Farnham: Ashgate.