Responses, reflections, and afterthoughts

Birgit Meyer

Published online: 28 Oct 2016.

Submit your article to this journal ⬚

Article views: 364

View related articles ⬚

View Crossmark data ⬚

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Review Symposium

Responses, reflections, and afterthoughts

Birgit Meyer*

Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Utrecht University, Janskerkhof 13, 3512 BL, Utrecht, Netherlands

This is the author's response to the comments offered by J. Kwabena Asamoah-Gyadu, Rosalind I. J. Hackett, Duane Jethro, Stefanie Knauss, David Morgan, and Don Seeman on Birgit Meyer's book *Sensational Movies*. It addresses the entanglement of Africa and the West; positive and negative evaluations of African tradition and culture; the importance of a comparative stance towards imaginaries and the imagination in religious studies; the role of sound in relation to the visual; and material religion.

KEY WORDS   Africa; evil; heritage; imagination and imaginaries; sensation; materiality; Birgit Meyer

I feel honored and delighted that my book *Sensational Movies* is featured in a review symposium in *Religion*, which continues an earlier face-to-face debate organized by Adrian Hermann in the framework of an Author-Meets-Critics session at the American Academy of Religion annual meeting in Atlanta in November 2015 (co-sponsored by the 'African Religions,' 'Anthropology of Religion,' 'Religion, Colonialism and Postcolonialism,' 'Religion, Film, and Visual Culture,' and 'World Christianity' Groups). The research for this book started way back in the early 1990s, unfolding over a long time span until 2010. The main site is Accra, where I tracked how four interlocking developments – the deployment of video feature-film production by local cultural entrepreneurs, the rise of various movements in the Pentecostal-Charismatic spectrum, the turn to a democratic constitution, and the opening up of Ghanaian society to neo-liberal capitalism – yielded salient transformations of the public sphere and everyday worlds of lived experience. Based on historical and ethnographic research, the book takes

*Email: b.meyer@uu.nl

the production, circulation, and consumption of video movies as an entry point into a world in turmoil. I propose that video movies, and the pleasures, anxieties, and irritations they generate, may well be analyzed as seismographic devices that register transforming dynamics of cultural representation. They spotlight how state policies with regard to the profiling of culture, tradition, and identity are at logger-heads with alternative viewpoints grounded in a world of lived experience shaped by Christianity. Focusing on the entanglement of religion and popular culture, this is a study of the politics and aesthetics of world making in Southern Ghana.

The writing phase – between 2010 and 2014 – took place in a transitory moment in my scholarship, when I moved from a professorship in cultural anthropology to one in religious studies. While my research interests – geared towards the study of religion in Africa, on the one hand, and conceptual issues regarding an approach to religion that foregrounds practices, corporeality, and the physicality of material forms, on the other – did not change as such, this move broadened the horizon against which I place my work in general, and this book project in particular. I very much wished to come up with a book that would speak to scholars in anthropology, African studies, religious studies, media studies, and the study of visual culture. The generous responses by Rosalind I. J. Hackett, Don Seeman, David Morgan, J. Kwabena Asamoah-Gyadu, Stefanie Knauss, and Duane Jethro suggest to me that my book may have succeeded in doing so. Rather than raising fundamental criticisms with regard to my approach and arguments, they think along and ahead, pointing at potentials, weaknesses, and loose ends in a highly engaging manner. Obviously, their comments echo the nature of this book, which I would characterize as a historical ethnography grounded in and generative of theoretical concepts (and thus a book of a different kind than the more explicitly theory-driven publications that are usually featured in the review section of *Religion*). As Rosalind Hackett (2016, 630) aptly observes, the book 'contains in one place all that Meyer has advocated as a scholar of religion, media and mediation since the 1990s.' Similarly, Kwabena Asamoah-Gyadu (2016, 646) finds that the book 'culminates almost two decades of ethnographic research in Ghana.' Indeed, in my own view the book unfolds the setting that prompted me to develop concepts as 'sensational form' and 'aesthetic formation,' as well as a material approach to the study of religion, thus pinpointing the provenance and – I hope – usefulness of these concepts and this approach for deeper understanding.

As an anthropologist, I locate myself at the interface of concrete research situated in the life worlds of my interlocutors and the realm of theory. I need concepts to 'unlock' these life worlds and get a clearer understanding of the stakes, while at the same time I try to be alert to the potential of the research setting to evoke critiques of existing theories and concepts and generate new ones that can be used to unlock yet other, comparable settings – a spiraling move. In my response, I would like to focus on a set of conceptual issues raised more or less explicitly by the contributors that in my view are of central importance for current debates in the study of religion.

Africa and the West

Addressing a multidisciplinary readership, this book seeks to bridge the cleavage between *area* studies (such as African studies) and the so-called systematic disciplines that are defined by *objects* for research, such as religion, media, or visual

culture. However, theory formation in the 'systematic' disciplines in the social sciences and humanities is to a large extent still grounded in Western frames that structure inquiry and analysis. Critical postcolonial scholarship revealed that presumably universal notions turn out to be Eurocentric and hence much more tied to the area in which they were generated than scholars may be inclined to admit. The validity of generalizing concepts for knowledge production in our highly diverse, globalized world is subject to more or less intense debate that plays out differently in various disciplines. It is certainly a central issue in anthropology and the study of religion. In his recent book *Empire of Religion* (2014), David Chidester traced the processes of increasing abstraction through which knowledge produced in African frontier zones was gradually stripped of its situatedness in actual encounters and became part of a general vocabulary in the study of religion and anthropology. Next to the important project of resituating abstract notions in past encounters and ideologies, there is also need for a complementary move that explores the transition and translation of a religious vocabulary into the non-Western world, for instance as part and parcel of 19th-century missionary activities (Hermann 2016).

My own attempts to understand African appropriations of Christianity and unravel their distinct character take both lines into account. Asamoah-Gyadu (2016, 651) credits my study for offering 'a non-Western approach to contemporary African popular cultures.' It means much to me that apparently I succeeded to bring across 'emic' perspectives that mirror his everyday familiarity with my research setting. In fact, my insights owe much to intense conversations with Asamoah-Gyadu in the course of my research. Still I would be hesitant to circumscribe my approach as 'non-Western.' Ever since I started writing about Christianity in Africa, I sought to trace longstanding entanglements that implicated African and Western agents in the frontier areas of Western imperial expansion and subsequent geopolitical structures, from the 19th-century mission post to contemporary television screens. Any attempt to do justice to local notions needs to take these entanglements and the notable preparedness on the part of Africans to incorporate and appropriate new ideas in their own interested ways – described by Bayart (2000) as a logic of extraversion – as a starting point, as I argue throughout my book. Zooming in on African engagements with the world – via partly separate and partly enmeshed registers of religion and film – my study is quite critical (as is also pointed out by Don Seeman) of recent theoretical moves in anthropology that overemphasize ontological difference at the expense of taking into account the legacies of longstanding historical entanglements. Of course, I do not deny that my research setting in Ghana has its own specificity and differs from my own life world in significant ways. But it is a difference than can only be properly understood by taking entanglement into account.

Against this backdrop, the reference to a predominant 'enchanted worldview' (a notion launched by Paul Gifford and quoted by Asamoah-Gyadu) characteristic of Africa that indicates its difference from the West strikes me as somewhat problematic. I do not deny that my book offers evidence for such a mind-set. My problem is that the invocation of an 'enchanted worldview' may easily place Africa in a hierarchical opposition to a 'disenchanted' Western worldview. This fits in a longstanding trend of framing Africa as 'incurably religious' (Parrinder 1969), as a continent in which 'religion occurs with authoritative force' (Lamin Sanneh, as quoted by Asamoah-Gyadu 2016, 645). Being religious becomes the key marker of African identity. Of course, I recognize the overwhelming presence of the Christian religion and its constant emphasis on the demonic and occult,

which is ever more enhanced through modern mass media, including film. None-theless I find the implicit contrast drawn between a religious Africa and a secular West misleading. For what religion actually entails in Africa is far removed from what religion means according to modernist Western understandings, which basically frame it in terms of inner belief and even as outmoded and passé. In the African setting, as Asamoah-Gyadu also asserts, religion in general and Pentecostal Christianity in particular has a markedly this-worldly, material orientation, with emphasis on health and well-being, and a strongly embodied religiosity in which people feel filled by the Holy Spirit or possessed by demons that are to be cast out in order to proceed and be modern. In many ways, current Pentecostalism challenges conventional modernist views of what religion is all about. I think that a characterization of Africa as defined by an 'enchanted worldview' is haunted by the hegemony of a Western standard from which what is qualified as different can only digress. Could we try to read and appreciate difference outside of this hegemonic frame? Could the study of African ways of being Christian open up possibilities for alternative ways of thinking about humanity and religion that may envelop Western experiences and enchantments, too?

In the epilogue I suggest more or less in passing that a comparison between sur-realism and Ghanaian video movies may pinpoint intriguing similarities, in that both address 'broader human concerns about the sphere of the unseen, the anxieties and desires evoked, and the potential of their depiction' (Meyer 2015, 296). Taking this suggestion as a starting point, Stefanie Knauss (2016, 655) offers a reading of my book as a case study that opens up possibilities for 'a broader theo-logical-anthropological conversation.' For her as a Catholic theologian my book appears to be of use to acknowledge the importance of imagination, imaginaries and embodiment that have received too little attention in mainstream theology (see below). I would find it intriguing to involve her in a conversation with Asamoah-Gyadu. What would he think about her point that my study of video-movies, lauded by him for offering a 'non-Western approach,' offers possibilities to open up and transform Western theology?

Demonized tradition and the question of cultural heritage

It is intriguing to find out that my ethnographic work speaks to the concerns of criti-cal theologians who struggle with mainstream Eurocentric positions and are open to integrate insights from anthropology, religious studies, and media studies. On my part, given the centrality of Christianity in Africa, I have closely followed theo-logical debates about Africanization and inculturation. Asamoah-Gyadu finds my work useful for developing 'a proper theology of evil' from an African perspective. Of course, such a project comes with its own problems, since local understandings of evil as they are profiled in Pentecostal circles and more broadly in popular grass-roots Christianity thrive on the demonization of African gods and spirits and a strong emphasis on witchcraft (see also Meyer 1999). This is what the movies I have been working on also endorse. Developing a 'theology of evil' requires that one comes to terms with such negative attitudes to indigenous culture that hark back to stereotype missionary views of Africans as 'heathen' and yet have been embraced and transformed in local appropriations of Christianity. Moreover, anxieties about witchcraft and occult forces – despised as merely imaginary from a rational perspective, and yet experienced as enmeshed with modern urban life

– would have to be a central theme for such a theology. For long, as I showed in my research, intercultural theology sought to embrace positive aspects of indigenous culture, thereby echoing the valuation of African culture and tradition profiled by state policies that were also guiding the state film industry against which the video movies analyzed in my book position themselves (see Chapter 7). So the incorporation of hitherto side-lined, popular ideas and practices with regard to evil and witchcraft into an emergent African theology faces a paradox: the African dimension to be recuperated by this theology is to a large extent understood as negative, as something to leave behind and protect oneself against.

While – fortunately, I would say – I need not bother about this paradox as a theologian (but I will follow Asamoah-Gyadu's further ideas with keen interest), as an anthropologist I have been struggling with the issue of evil and witchcraft, and the overall centrality of Christianity with its peculiar demonizing stance regarding African culture and tradition that was eagerly taken up by filmmakers. How to do justice to local viewpoints without reiterating longstanding exoticizing scripts in Western imaginaries of Africa? How to convey the irony that such scripts have entered – via missions in the past, and via Hollywood movies in the present – African popular imaginaries and been embraced in self-descriptions? In my book, I opted for an extended historicized description of the configuration in which attitudes towards culture and tradition are situated, offering a detailed analysis of the ways in which video movies render the presumed existence of occult forces credible. While I find the positions taken by critics of the movies understandable, thus agreeing with Asamoah-Gyadu (2016, 649) that they are not 'totally misplaced', in my book I refrain from an explicit critique of the video phenomenon. Taking some distance from the social configuration in which the movies were discussed, as a relative outsider I wanted to understand how the filmic representations of culture and tradition related to the more celebratory stance profiled by the National Commission for Culture.

In his comment, Duane Jethro refers extensively to Chapter 7, which analyses how culture is mediated in various registers. He is particularly interested in the recent genre of the epic. Digressing from the downright negative stance towards culture and tradition that typifies a great deal of movies, epics nonetheless do not tie in smoothly with the take on cultural heritage and tradition propagated in the framework of state cultural politics. Working on these movies, set designers and stylists designed and thus fabricated tradition in ever new, aesthetically pleasing ways. Jethro contrasts the epic with a performance of traditional Ewe dances on the premises of a priestess attended by him and myself in the context of an excursion to Dzodze in the framework of a conference in 2010. While the former 'made up' tradition, in the latter it was 'already made' and actualized in performance (Jethro 2016, 666). In my view, the fabrication of tradition for the sake of movies is not as far removed from the performance we witnessed in Dzodze as Jethro suggests. The distinction between 'already made' and 'made up' is not absolute, but one of degree. Tradition never exists by itself, but depends on mediation. The epic reveals this to the extreme. I show in the chapter that the various mediations put forward, notwithstanding the differences between them, are far removed from and beyond the control of the actual representatives of tradition, such as chiefs and priests. Their possibilities to represent themselves are hampered by the exigency of secrecy, on the one hand, and the cultural (rather than political) role assigned to them in state cultural politics, on the other.

Furthermore, Jethro (2016, 666) asks about the epic: 'What forms of power and institutions does this new cinematic genre work to enable and sustain?' Situated in between conventional rejections of culture and tradition as demonic and their celebration as cultural heritage, the genre of the epic did not enable any new institutions in the politics of cultural representation. It does not fit in with the two dominant modes of cultural representation – the demonizing and the celebrating one – that were constantly at loggerheads with each other. Nevertheless, while it remained marginal, it still opened up innovative ways of imagining the past. Maybe – but this would have to be explored in future research – epics open up alternative possibilities for engaging with the past in a more playful, aesthetically pleasurable manner that transcends earlier oppositions. It would certainly be interesting to go into deeper comparison of heritage formation in Ghana and South Africa (studied by Jethro), where Pentecostalism is less prominent.

Imaginaries and the imagination

Pondering the idea of tradition being imagined in ever new ways, Jethro (2016, 667) wonders whether 'audiences questioned the authenticity of the representations made in popular video films.' Of course they did, the point being the extent to which what was shown on screen would resonate with one's own experiences, ideas, and convictions. Films were frequently criticized for being 'artificial' (for instance, because a dress style or way of speaking was considered inappropriate). However, the fact that movies were *made* was not at all understood to stand in a contrast to their ability to reveal a (spiritual) reality that was not readily accessible and yet held to exist. Hence the appeal of the 'film as revelation' format. I would like to assert that the truthfulness or authenticity attributed to cinematic pictures is not a consequence of an 'enchanted worldview' that predisposes people to believe in the existence of weird supernatural stuff, but is effected through a perceived resonance between these pictures and broader imaginaries by which people live. As pointed out in the Introduction to my book, I do not see real and imaginary as standing in opposition to each other, but regard what is taken for real as being 'realized' through imaginaries and the imagination. The power of imaginaries and the imagination to constitute reality and make a world is not limited to this particular Ghanaian setting, but valid in a much broader sense.

This is the point of entry for Stefanie Knauss, who offers a perceptive close reading that draws out similarities between my ideas and hers. I appreciate her emphasis on the creative dimension of imaginaries and the imagination. Of particular interest to me is her suggestion to focus on encounters between imaginaries and the transformations ensued by them. I like the suggestions to trace the travel of images 'from one imaginary to another, crossing cultural, national, religious, and conceptual boundaries' (Knauss 2016, 656). This would certainly help to flesh out further the modus operandi of Bayart's (2000) notion of extraversion. Her point that imaginaries are always 'syncretistic' because 'they are made up of the ideas and images and bodies and practices of so many different people, across space and time' (Knauss 2016, 656) complements the recognition of the power of shared imaginaries to form identities and bring about closure which is the main focus of my book. Indeed, imaginaries may confirm as well as unsettle the worlds which they help to make. Strict dualisms that invoke God and the devil may get unhinged. Stability and closure may make room for openness and possibility.

I also agree with her that imaginaries and the imagination certainly should receive more attention in the study of religion. As she points out, in her field of Catholic theology, the imagination has long been regarded as problematic; it was suspected to lead people astray at the expense of gaining wisdom. Her work seeks to appraise the imagination as an indispensable notion to think about crossing boundaries between the immanent and the transcendent, the visible and the invisible, the material and the immaterial. As a non-theologian I will not think with the assumption of the existence of a transcendent, invisible realm. Being an anthropologist, I seek to understand how gods and spirits become and are real for the people among whom I do my research. To do so, I approach religion from what I would circumscribe as a nuanced phenomenological perspective that takes the always already mediated nature of experience as a starting point (so yes, I agree with Seeman that there is no reason to discard phenomenology altogether; see also Vásquez 2011). This means to study religion from the angle of human practices and ideas with regard to an imagined beyond to which they seek to relate via the sensational forms offered by a particular religious tradition. I use 'imagined' here not in the prosaic sense of illusion, but as constitutive for the genesis of a sense and sensation of transcendence. Taking up my proposition that video movies – as sensational forms – enable porous experiences that open up toward the spiritual realm, Knauss makes the intriguing suggestion that the relation between religion and film could be described as sacramental. I find it interesting to note that the notion of the sacrament, as she understands it, seems to allow for a theology of mediation, in which matter (as well as the living body) may be a space for encounter with the divine, for 'tangible transcendence' (see Meyer 2016a). As a scholar working from a social-science perspective it is easy for me to see an affinity with this – for me surprisingly material – theology.

Don Seeman calls for a comparison of the ways in which religions – in the Abrahamic spectrum, to start with – value and deploy the faculty of the imagination. The point is not to do theology, but to take it as a source. He introduces the ideas of the medieval Jewish theologian Maimonides as a counter example to the active deployment of the imagination among Pentecostals and its smooth extension in the medium of film described in my book. Influenced by Aristotelian thought, Maimonides acknowledged the existence of the imaginative faculty, but did not deem it to be of any use for being deployed in religious practice, since, in his understanding, the Law of Moses rejected it altogether. Seeman relates the constraints imposed on the imagination by Maimonides to the struggle against idolatry. As an aside, I want to note that we should be careful to not subscribe to a narrow understanding of the law against idolatry (often referred to as the Second Commandment) as authoritative within the Abrahamic spectrum (Meyer 2016b); after all there are highly divergent ways of valuing the imagination and the use of images (not the same thing, of course) in different traditions (see Luehrmann on Russian Orthodoxy, 2010). This also holds with regard to Islam, in the study of which, as Seeman remarks, habituation so far has received much more emphasis than the deployment of the imagination (the work of Mittermaier 2010 on dreams that Seeman points to indeed being a great starting point). Exactly this diversity within each of the Abrahamic traditions and across them is a fruitful starting point for comparison.

Seeman's (2016, 636) suggestion that for a religiosity emphasizing 'imaginative restraint' film might not be a suitable and easily adoptable medium, and not

lend itself for cinematic representation, is interesting. The reverse would pertain to a religiosity that embraces the imagination – as the case analyzed in my book which displays a strong affinity between cinematic and popular Christian ways of looking. Taking these variants into account, it could be argued that the adoption of new media is, in one way or another, influenced by the particular valuation of the imagination in a religious tradition. It would be exciting to explore this hypothesis through further comparison and in debate with scholars working on religion and media (as outlined by Asamoah-Gyadu). Incidentally, I just co-organized an interdisciplinary workshop and am now involved in preparing a volume that examines the representation of the divine in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. The role of the imagination and the stance towards images in various strands in these traditions is one of the central lines of inquiry. The main advantage of my move from anthropology (where comparison is not en vogue) to religious studies is that such larger projects across a spectrum of religious traditions become imaginable and feasible. I would be happy to engage in a conversation with Seeman and other anthropologists in religious studies about how to shape such a project and how to think about the role of phenomenology – still often found problematic in religious studies, but more easily embraced by anthropologists of religion – therein.

Furthermore, Seeman suggests that, once a medium such as film has been accommodated by virtue of certain religious predispositions conducive to the deployment of the imagination, the medium may in turn influence what kind of ideas can be developed. In this line of reasoning, the dualism purported by the movies studied in my book is more and more unleashed by a logic intrinsic to the medium. This is an intriguing thought, which I would need to ponder for some time. However, a close look at the movies shows, as I argue in my book, that the dualism operates mainly as an organizing frame that allows for porous boundaries and constant transgressions (as also noted by Knauss) which, in turn, potentially derail the dualistic take on the world altogether.

Sound and sensation

One problem entailed by the – however much important – turn to the imaginaries and the imagination is the bias towards the visual. This is where Rosalind Hackett, in her generous comment, situates her critique. She offers a nice overview of sound-related issues in my book. For the sake of completeness I would like to mention that Chapter 3 already has a section – also evoked by David Morgan – in which I explain how my relative indifference when watching the movies alone was due to their rather bad sound tracks. Reflecting on this experience, I noted that the low sound quality invites audiences' loud engagement with film on screen, performing as it were their own collective sound track in response to the images on screen (an attitude which I trace to a tradition of public viewing and of course commenting on 'silent' films in colonial times). But I admit that bringing in this passage does not exempt me from her critique that I pay too little serious attention to sound.

Her question 'why wouldn't the sound effects of films, albeit less technologically proficient than the visual effects, offer superior hearing of the spiritual, or alternative modes of representing and making present occult powers?' (Hackett 2016, 631) is of great importance. Her suggestion to speak of a 'spiritual ear' (Hackett 2016, 632) is well taken, and reminds me of Charles Hirschkind's work on the 'pious

ear' and 'ethics of listening' (2006) which guided my research on the deployment of the sensorium. The fact that movies embraced the Pentecostal imagination and 'copied' its mode of looking made me emphasize the visual more strongly in my research than Hirschkind did in his, where much more emphasis was placed on voice and hearing (this harks back to the point made in the previous section that the imagination is valued and deployed differently). But again, this is no excuse. Working on the book I became more and more aware of a visual bias in my work (and perhaps even my own stance to the world at large). Current work in visual culture and film, though critical of Western occularcentrism, is still much bound to the image.

At the same time, the image is no longer understood as being bound to vision alone. As David Morgan (2016, 642) puts it: 'Seeing happens in the full sensorium.' This implies a synaesthetic approach to images and the imagination that, next to vision and sound, also includes smell, taste, and touch. Many scholars, myself included, endorse this viewpoint theoretically speaking (as my emphasis on 'sensation' clearly shows). I think that taking sensation as central to the operation of power and the shaping of communities 'in the form of tastes, emotions, and artistic styles,' as Morgan (2016, 642) puts it aptly in his comment, is an important step towards a material understanding of the formation of communities. But I acknowledge that it may be difficult to translate the conceptual interest in sensation fully into empirical research; unfortunately occularcentrism still governs research and analysis more than we may be prepared to admit. I think that Hackett's own recent work on sound opens up new questions and methodologies that will be of help to recognize the constitutive role of sound as a potential generator of the sacred in future research. Africa, where the art of oratory and the power of music are so strongly emphasized, may turn out to be a particularly revealing site for research on religion and media able to generate new insights into the role of sound in a broader sensorial approach.

Coda: material religion

David Morgan, long-time companion in championing material approaches to religion, situates my book in this emerging field. As co-editors of *Material Religion* we are involved in a continuous conversation about the nexus of religion and materiality, which is also pursued by his comment. A material approach to religion, he states, is 'not so much about studying discrete things as it is studying the sociality of things' (Morgan 2016, 642). This sociality is not limited to things per se, of course, but involves myriad human-object entanglements. I am all in to grant things some degree of agency, in the sphere of religion and beyond, as humans feel pushed by and obliged to act towards them in a particular way. This dimension surely is entailed when we refer to the materiality of religion. But materiality also involves focusing on corporeality, sensation, and imagination. Therefore it would be limited to develop the material turn in the study of religion only through pursuing object theories, such as Actor-Network-Theory. Morgan (2016, 643) argues for 'the partnership of phenomenology and network studies.' I agree that this is a fruitful direction to develop in further theoretical reflection, to which I would add semiotics (as I still think that signification is central to religion, too). But I wonder what exactly the metaphor of 'partnership' means – that is, on what grounds would one combine what? I look forward to further discussions with Morgan about this issue.

I would like to thank all six contributors for engaging with my book in such a productive manner. As my response hopefully shows, their questions and suggestions have stimulated me to reflect more deeply about the conceptual dimension of my historical ethnography and identify themes and issues that may deserve further exchange and demand more research in the study of religion.

Disclosure statement

Notes on contributor

Birgit Meyer (PhD anthropology, 1995) is professor of religious studies at Utrecht University. She has conducted research on and published about colonial missions and local appropriations of Christianity, modernity and conversion, the rise of Pentecostalism in the context of neo-liberal capitalism, popular culture and video-films in Ghana, the relation between religion, media, and identity, as well as on material religion and the place and role of religion in the 21st century. She is vice-chair of the International African Institute (London), a member of the Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW), and one of the editors of *Material Religion*. Her latest publication is *Sensational Movies. Video, Vision, and Christianity in Ghana* (University of California Press, 2015). For more information see: http://www.uu.nl/staff/BMeyer

References

Asamoah-Gyadu, J. Kwabena. 2016. "Comments on Sensational Movies." *Religion* 46 (4): 644–653. doi:10.1080/0048721X.2016.1210396.

Bayart, Jean François. 2000. "Africa in the World: A History of Extraversion." *African Affairs* 99 (395): 217–267.

Chidester, David. 2014. *Empire of Religion: Imperialism and Comparative Religion*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hackett, Rosalind I. J. 2016. "Resonating with Sensational Movies." *Religion* 46 (4): 630–632. doi:10.1080/0048721X.2016.1210391.

Hermann, Adrian. 2016. "Distinctions of Religion. The Search for Equivalents of 'Religion' and the Challenge of Theorizing a 'Global Discourse of Religion'." In *Making Religion: Theory and Practice in the Discursive Study of Religion*, edited by Frans Wijsen and Kocku von Stuckrad, 97–124. Leiden: Brill.

Hirschkind, Charles. 2006. *The Ethical Soundscape: Cassette Sermons and Islamic Counterpublics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jethro, Duane. 2016. Imagining Tradition: Heritage, Culture and Religion in Contemporary Ghanaian Cinema Culture" *Religion* 46 (4): 662–668. doi:10.1080/0048721X.2016.1210398.

Knauss, Stefanie. 2016. "Imagination and the Crossing of Boundaries: Some Theological Reflections." *Religion* 46 (4): 654–661. doi:10.1080/0048721X.2016.1210397.

Luehrmann, Sonja. 2010. "A Dual Quarrel of Images in the Middle Volga. Image Veneration in the Face of Protestant and Pagan Critique." In *Eastern Christians in Anthropological Perspective*, edited by Chris Hann and Hermann Golz, 56–78. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Meyer, Birgit. 2015. *Sensational Movies. Video, Vision and Christianity in Ghana*. Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Meyer, Birgit. 1999. *Translating the Devil. Religion and Modernity among the Ewe in Ghana*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Meyer, Birgit. 2016a. "Tangible Transcendence and the Presence of Religion in Urban Space." In *The Urban Sacred: How Religion makes and Takes Place in Amsterdam, Berlin and London*, edited by Susanne Lanwerd, 148–151. Berlin: Metropol.

Morgan, David. 2016. "Materializing the Study of Religion." *Religion* 46 (4): 640–643. doi:10.1080/0048721X.2016.1210395.

Meyer, Birgit. 2016b. "Beyond the Second Commandment. Images in Christian World Making." Paper Presented at the Workshop "Contested Desires. Figuration and Sensation in Abrahamic Traditions." ZMO, Berlin, March 14–16, 2016.

Mittermaier, Amira. 2010. *Dreams That Matter: Egyptian Landscapes of the Imagination*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Parrinder, Geoffrey. 1969. *Religion in Africa*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Seeman, Don. 2016. "Sensational Movies and the Anthropology of Religion: Towards a Comparative Moral Imaginary." *Religion* 46 (4): 633–639. doi:10.1080/0048721X.2016.1210393.

Vásquez, Manuel A. 2011. *More than Belief: A Materialist Theory of Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.