Mennonites and Anthropology: An Introduction

Philip Fountain, *Victoria University of Wellington*

While there exists an extensive, vibrant, and sophisticated literature on Mennonites within disciplines such as history, sociology, literature, and theology, a comparable field in anthropology is yet to emerge. It is the purpose of this special issue to outline and illustrate the potential of establishing a vibrant conversation on the anthropology on Mennonites.[1] Such a conversation will be based upon rigorous ethnographic research on Mennonites in North America and elsewhere. The emergence of a vibrant anthropology of Mennonite communities offers productive openings both for Mennonite Studies and for anthropology.

My own research on Mennonites over the past 15 years has highlighted the need to establish a disciplinary conversation within anthropology. As an anthropologist I undertook almost two years of ethnographic research on the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC), a peace, disaster relief and development agency of North American Mennonite churches.[2] My field research was conducted primarily in the context of Indonesia, and included researching Mennonites from North America who worked with MCC as well as Indonesian Mennonites from the three Indonesian Mennonite synods. Over the course of my research I have frequently been struck by the dynamism of scholarly debates about and by Mennonites on diverse questions of faith, identity, ethics, and politics from within a range of disciplines. But though it is beginning to expand, the anthropological literature remains relatively sparse.[3] Moreover, anthropological scholarship on Mennonites, such that it exists, only

infrequently engages other anthropologists of Mennonites in substantive ways.

There have, of course, been a number of notable Mennonite anthropologists. For example, Jacob Loewen, Paul Hiebert, and Charles Kraft were all at the forefront of the emergence of "missionary anthropology" in the 1970s and 80s, and they all had close connections with Anabaptist churches.[4] Their scholarship articulated a confessional collaboration with anthropology for the purposes of extending and deepening Christian missional practice. A rather contrasting case is Elmer Miller's *Nurturing Doubt*, where he presents his transformation from "Mennonite missionary" in the Argentine Chaco into a skeptical, doubting anthropologist.[5] Miller frames this journey as a restless and lonely pilgrimage in a trajectory that begins with his childhood upbringing. John Janzen, in his article in this issue, helpfully provides a more detailed exploration of the surprisingly extensive history of Mennonite anthropologists. Yet, it is notable that Janzen's group of Mennonite anthropologists have tended to focus their attention on other communities, rather than their own. This externally oriented vision is partly explained by its conformity to historical disciplinary patterns in anthropology whereby, building on the classical Malinowskian archetype of fieldworkers, anthropologists embarked from "home" in order to study distant others.[6] Only relatively recently, following the publication of seminal critiques such as that initiated by the *Writing Culture* movement, has anthropology's geographical horizon opened sufficiently to facilitate a more proximate anthropological gaze.[7] Though, as Tomomi Naka reminds us in her article in this issue, what counts as "foreign" or "familiar" depends entirely on one's relative location.[8]

One of the important impetuses for, and also beneficiaries of, the gradual shift toward an anthropologization of the West has been the remarkable emergence of a vibrant scholarship in the anthropology of Christianity.[9] Significant contributions to this field have discarded the lingering tendency to attend primarily to distant and exotic others. The anthropology of Christianity has been thoroughly global in reach, including enabling new attention to diverse Western forms of Christianity.[10] The dynamics driving this expansive vision for studying global Christianities also facilitates new attention to the anthropology of Mennonite communities in Canada, the United States, and elsewhere. Indeed, against the previous trends, there is now an emerging literature on the anthropology of Mennonites. But we are yet to create a common field in which, to slightly misappropriate Joel Robbins, "people working in different geographic areas [or on different Mennonite communi-

ties] . . . read one another's work, recognize the relevance of that work for their own projects, and seek to develop a set of shared questions to be examined comparatively."[11] It is high time that such a field was created, and this issue of the *Journal of Mennonite Studies* is a first attempt at initiating it.

A central concern in establishing a field for the anthropology of Mennonites is to inquire into the subject of our research: "Who are the Mennonites?" This question is an exceedingly fraught one because Mennonite identity is deeply fragmented and contested. There is also a voluminous literature on the subject across diverse disciplines. Nevertheless, the question remains useful. Instead of providing another overview of the conundrum of Mennonite identity, I seek here to explore some of the distinctive ways in which anthropologists might contribute to answering this question in order to provide signposts for further scholarship.[12]

The question "Who are the Mennonites?" is the title of an article published by James Urry in 1983.[13] Urry is the most widely known anthropologist of Canadian Mennonites.[14] It is instructive to return to Urry's paper in order to reconsider what anthropology might contribute to the study of Mennonites. At the outset, Urry limits the scope of his study to "Russian" Mennonites in Canada. The Mennonite mosaic is composed of diverse groups and Urry sensibly focuses on a particular community.[15] At the outset of his research Urry thought he would be the one asking all the questions, and was disconcerted by how frequently Mennonites posed questions to him: "What do you think the Mennonites are? What do you think their future will be?" Although Urry was "placed in the role of the expert and expected to issue a final judgement," he soon "learnt to be very cautious of providing answers."[16] Urry's article can be read as an attempt to provide a systematic answer which he avoided giving at the time.

Urry's approach is to provide a non-essentializing historical narrative of "Russian" Mennonites. What it means to be Mennonite has changed considerably over time, depending on need and circumstance. Being "Mennonite" is a highly malleable identification which has encompassed, at different times and places, religion, ethnicity, ethical norms, language, politics, kinship, and practices of separation.[17] In furnishing a rich, layered narration of a particular Mennonite group, Urry treads a classic and productive path for anthropological research. While Urry's approach is historically oriented, a similar aspiration to examine the complexity of quotidian life lends itself to an ethnographic methodology. The key manoeuvre, as I see it, is to frame descriptions in ways that avoid essentialization and that aspire to "richness, texture and detail."[18]

Many of the papers in this issue adopt a similar approach in their research into particular congregations (Christa Mylin), conferences (Tomomi Naka), colonies (Paola Canova; Abigail Carl-Klassen and Jonathan Klassen; Miriam Rudolph), refugee service organizations (Elizabeth Phelps), and informal ritualized gatherings (Laura Meitzner Yoder and James Huff). The same general strategy could be used for studying diverse other Mennonite organizations, communities, materialities, and social relationships.

The question "Who are the Mennonites?" invites consideration into precisely how far the term "Mennonite" should stretch. Should "Mennonite" be restricted to what is sometimes called "cradle" or "ethnic" communities, or should it be considered primarily as a matter of religious affiliation, and therefore be attributed to anyone who seeks to identify as such? The problem of the limits to the malleability of Mennonite-ness is long-standing within Mennonite scholarship. One pathway is to frankly acknowledge that the term Mennonite should be understood as applying to different groups in different ways. This is Calvin Redekop's approach in his classic sociological study *Mennonite Society*, published in 1989.[19] Redekop introduces his book as an attempt to understand "who the Mennonites are" and within the first few pages he provides a rough and ready initial definition:

> I begin by suggesting that there are now two kinds of Mennonites: the Germanic (the birthright descendants) and the non-Germanic (the converted and convinced nondescendants). The latter are so different and dynamic that it is almost impossible to say much about them—they are probably closest to the original utopian nature of Anabaptist-Mennonitism. The future clearly belongs to them.

Redekop correctly acknowledges that through processes of missionization and conversion, and as a consequence of reconfigured identities, "Germanic" Mennonites are not the only potential focus of analysis. However, while he states that the future belongs to "non-Germanic" Mennonites and suggests, remarkably, that they are probably more "Mennonite" than those that speak Plautdietsch and have recognizably Mennonite family names (like Redekop, for example), the rest of his book gives them scant attention. Redekop clearly feels he can only provide a sociological analysis of one side of this binary distinction. It appears that Redekop's sociological inclination toward generalizing requires that the heterogeneity of "Other-Than-Mennonites" (OTMs)—a term I was introduced to during my fieldwork that roughly equates to people who participate in Mennonite congregations, but do not share an identifiably

"Germanic" background—poses an insurmountable analytical problem.

But this binary framing—"Germanic" *or* "non-Germanic"—erases a much more complex and variegated field. Laotian Hmong Mennonite refugees in Ontario, Indonesian members of Gereja Injili di Tanah Jawa (GITJ), congregants of the Kenya Mennonite Church, and the Old Order Wenger Mennonites (Groffdale Conference Mennonite Church) based in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, for example, are all Mennonites and should be studied as such.[20] Indeed, the obvious and expansive diversity of Mennonites, and the polyvalence of the term "Mennonite" as it circulates within global networks, are only problems if our methodologies and analytical tools are poorly suited to the task. This is where ethnography proves invaluable. Ethnographic studies of particular groups can trace diverse uses of "Mennonite," including the vagaries of genealogy and its contested re-imaginings, without requiring these to conform to reified general patterns and without necessitating clearly demarcated boundaries.

This approach may be perceived as risking dissolving the term "Mennonite" altogether. But this is not the intention. Instead, by embracing a conceptualization of what it means to be Mennonite as dynamic and changing, the quotidian nature and effects of projects that construct Mennonite communities (and the inverse, how Mennonite communal identities are undone) can be foregrounded. The question of who or what is a Mennonite can, via ethnography, include approaches that leave space for difference and ongoing reconfiguration. Accordingly, instead of seeking to provide a clear guide to the current status of "Mennonite identity," it is more productive to focus on the dynamics of conflict and change. A model of how to do this is provided in an early paper seminal in the anthropology of Christianity by Joel Robbins, where he argues for an approach centred on "tensions."[21]

Robbins states that his goal is to establish Christianity as "an object of comparative study."[22] He does this by first analyzing the problem that Christianity has historically posed for the discipline. For Robbins, anthropologists have experienced an enduring awkwardness about engaging with Christianity. This can be seen in the discomfort anthropologists have expressed toward missionaries, even when they have relied on missionary linguistics and mission notebooks for their field research. It is also apparent in Susan Harding's descriptions of fundamentalist Christians as the "repugnant cultural others" of anthropology.[23] For Robbins, this awkwardness reveals a deep ambivalence: "Christians, almost wherever they are, appear at once too similar to anthropologists to be wor-

thy of study and too meaningfully different to be easily made sense of by the use of standard anthropological tools."[24] It is in response to this history of neglect that Robbins proposes to establish an anthropology of Christianity grounded in the study of tensions. This focus on tensions provides an analytical approach which moves beyond reification and generalization, while still maintaining the capacity for a common interdisciplinary conversation. He identifies two particular tensions which he regards as especially productive: the tension between the mundane and the transcendent, and a spatial tension concerned about the relationships between global and local. Although these are worked out in different ways in different contexts, he argues that these two tensions are widespread across Christianity.

These two tensions may also prove valuable for the study of Mennonites.[25] However, it is interesting that despite resonance with some of the articles in this issue, none of the authors have located these particular tensions as central to their analysis. Instead, authors have foregrounded other tensions that arise out of Mennonite communities themselves.[26] For a number of the articles in this issue, the tensions they analyze are related to conflict within Mennonite churches over the nature of membership and the limits of community. In her article, Christa Mylin examines the withdrawal of Lancaster Mennonite Conference from Mennonite Church USA, a decision that was made effective in 2018. A focus on schism highlights tensions between processes and projects of unification and those of separation. In her article on "singleness," Tomomi Naka attends to how women navigate the gendered and sexual opportunities and constraints of Conservative Mennonite expectations. Though she argues that singleness is frequently an uncomfortable state within Conservative Mennonite communities, it is not without potential opportunities and status. Naka carefully explores how women encounter and adjust to these tensions as they shift over time and according to life stage. John Janzen's "Confessions" probes into tensions between Mennonite ethnicity, ethics, and religiosity in a series of ethnographic vignettes. His autobiographical exploration of what being Mennonite has meant for his own anthropology helpfully illuminates the productive ambiguity over the question of what it means to be Mennonite, and not just in terms of his own scholarly vocation.

One critique of the anthropology of Christianity as it emerged in early publications by Robbins and others is that it has taken the concerns of modern Protestants and Pentecostals as archetypal and assumed that other forms of Christianity should be treated similarly. Implicit answers to the question "Who is a Christian?"

have tended to assume disjunctive relations between Christians, their imagined pasts, and other communities, characteristic of Pentecostal and broader Protestant theologies of belonging and conversion. Major themes in the anthropology of Christianity include notions of rupture, sincerity, individualism, and interiority. This tendency has ensured that other Christianities, including Roman Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy, have been neglected or displaced.[27] Bringing these other forms of Christianity into the anthropological conversation, and adjusting the preoccupations to accommodate them, is a necessary corrective. Similarly, attending to Mennonites may also help "round out" the anthropology of Christianity in interesting ways.

One possible gift that the study of Mennonites offers the anthropology of Christianity is the ways in which Mennonites fail to conform to easy or neat categorizations. Some North American Mennonites, of course, aspire toward a conspicuous marginality—a preferential peripheral option—in which they are located outside the established poles of Western Christianity.[28] Indeed, if Fenella Cannell is correct that Christians in general have a notable belief in their own exceptionalism, then some Mennonites, at least, may be regarded as "exceptional exceptions."[29] But Mennonite difference can be overplayed; and the Mennonite experience has, despite some hard-fought attempts to the contrary, rarely been one of complete isolation or rigid separation.

As a globally, if sometimes rather precariously and tenuously, interconnected movement, Mennonites are notable for their diversity. Their identification with being Mennonite "stretches" or "bridges" across a series of divides. Theologically, Mennonites are remarkably heterogenous, extending across the polarization of "culture wars" contestations.[30] As Christa Mylin reminds us in her paper in this issue, Mennonite communities can be remarkably tight-knit and also chronically schismatic. Mennonites can practice Christianity as both a "religion as belief" and "religion as heritage."[31] Mennonites have sought to relocate to the edges of Protestant modernity and they have embraced their roles square at the centre of it. This "stretching" and "bridging"—including all its tensions and contradictions—confers upon the anthropology of Mennonites, as an emergent empirical field, a remarkable opportunity for broad-ranging discussion. Attending to these matters should also be considered as an investigation of Mennonite tensions.

Importantly, many of the articles in this special issue point to how the tensions of stretching and bridging are not limited to "internal" dynamics; instead, such tensions are also apparent in the

ways in which Mennonites relate with other communities.[32] These "borderlands," as described by Laura Meitzner Yoder and James Huff, are particularly productive for reconsidering the ways in which Mennonites seek to perform, enact, and embody ethical and religious practices. Meitzner Yoder and Huff's study explores how being Mennonite is both asserted and effaced within the decades-long practice of "Mennonite Dinner"—also known as "Thursday Dinner"—for students from Wheaton College, Illinois, a flagship Evangelical institution. In their article, Abigail Carl-Klassen and Jonathan Klassen describe the dynamic roles of those located in-between Mennonite, Mestizo, and Rarámuri communities in Chihuahua, Mexico. Their discussion of concerns with "intermarriage" and practices of excommunication—both forms of boundary maintenance—illustrate the ways in which exclusion and intimacy are bound together in dynamic ways to create new forms of intermediation and bridge-building between communities. Paola Canova's rich and incisive paper explores the relationships between Mennonite communities and indigenous peoples in Paraguay. For Canova, the rhetoric of ethical engagement with indigenous people among Mennonites in Fernheim Colony frequently fails to live up to practice. She narrates the injustices faced by Ayoreo charcoal producers, whose limited opportunities are in significant ways determined by Mennonite communities. Miriam Rudolph's reflection on her artwork also explores the tensions between Mennonite communities in Paraguay and their indigenous neighbours, and can helpfully be read alongside Canova's article. Lastly, in her article on Mennonite advocates and activists for immigrants and refugees in Virginia, Elizabeth Phelps points to a complex politics of multiculturalism. While there is a powerful discourse and ethics of hospitality and welcome among these Mennonite groups, the encounter with Latinx families is not without limits. Phelps argues that Mennonites practice a "sequestered inclusion" that opens new forms of encounter and also circumscribes these in important ways. The ambivalence inherent in this manoeuvre is not a cause for resignation, however, and Phelps issues an impassioned call for a more comprehensive ethical practice of hospitality.

Together, these articles make a powerful case for the analytical value of ethnography and the need to establish a more sustained anthropological conversation on Mennonites. Anthropology provides valuable approaches for moving beyond essentialization in order to investigate the tensions that shape diverse Mennonite communities. It is my hope that these articles will serve as a valu-

able stimulus for furthering the anthropology of Mennonites as an emergent field, in North America and elsewhere.

Notes

[1] The papers included in this special issue were initially presented at the ground-breaking conference "Mennonites and Anthropology: Ethnography, Religion, and Global Entanglements," which took place on October 25-26, 2019 at the University of Winnipeg. The conference was hosted by the Centre for Transnational Mennonite Studies and was supported by Plett Foundation. I am very grateful to Royden Loewen for his leadership of the Centre and his organization of the conference. The conference itself provided precisely the kind of vibrant disciplinary conversation we had sought to initiate. I am grateful to all the presenters who contributed to the dynamic conversations.

[2] MCC is a peace, development, and disaster relief organization associated with Canadian and American Mennonite churches. I conducted almost two years of ethnographic fieldwork on MCC, primarily in Indonesia, but also with brief visits to the US and Canada. See especially: Philip Fountain, "Translating Service: An Ethnography of the Mennonite Central Committee" (PhD diss., Australian National University, 2011). See also: Philip Fountain, "Blurring Mission and Development in the Mennonite Central Committee," in *Mission and Development: God's Work or Good Work?*, ed. Matthew Clarke (London: Continuum, 2012), 143–166; and Philip Fountain and Laura Meitzner Yoder, "Quietist Techno-Politics: Agricultural Development and Mennonite Mission in Indonesia," in *The Mission of Development: Religion and Techno-Politics in Asia*, ed. Catherine Scheer, Philip Fountain, and R. Michael Feener (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 214–242.

[3] Some significant recent contributions include: Lorenzo Cañás Bottos, *Christenvolk: Historia y Etnografía de una Colonia Menonita* (Buenos Aires: Antropofagia, 2005); Jonathan Dueck, *Congregational Music, Conflict and Community* (London and New York: Routledge, 2017); Tomomi Naka, "In the World but Not of the World: Virtuous Economic Practices Among Mennonites in Lancaster, Pennsylvania" (PhD diss., University of Iowa, 2009); Elizabeth Phelps, "Sequestered Inclusion: Social Service Discourses and New Latino Diaspora Youth in the Shenandoah Valley" (PhD diss. University of Cornell, 2015); Carel Roessingh and Tanja Plasil, eds., *Between Horse & Buggy and Four-wheel Drive: Change and Diversity Among Mennonite Settlements in Belize, Central America* (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 2007). James Urry's work is discussed below, and my own research has already been noted.

[4] Jacob Loewen, *Culture and Human Values: Christian Intervention in Anthropological Perspective* (South Pasadena, CA: William Care Library, 1975); Paul Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1986); Charles Kraft, *Anthropology for Christian Witness* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1996). Both Loewen and Hiebert were Mennonite Brethren and Kraft was born into the Church of the Brethren (with origins in Schwarzenau Brethren).

5 Elmer Miller, *Nurturing Doubt: From Mennonite Missionary to Anthropologist in the Argentine Chaco* (Urbana, Il: University of Illinois Press, 1996). Sadly, Miller passed away in December 2019.

6 In their classic paper dissecting the anthropological approach to fieldwork Gupta and Ferguson pithily locate this anthropological archetype as "the lone, white, male fieldworker living for a year or more among the native villages." See Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, "Discipline and Practice: 'The Field' as Site, Method, and Location in Anthropology," in *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science,* eds. Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), 11.

7 James Clifford and George Marcus, eds., *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986).

8 As a New Zealander, this is a point that I eagerly affirm.

9 For valuable reviews and introductions to this expansive literature, see especially: Joel Robbins, "What is a Christian? Notes Toward an Anthropology of Christianity," *Religion* 33:3 (2003): 191–199; Fenella Cannell, ed., *The Anthropology of Christianity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006); Chris Hann, "The Anthropology of Christianity per se," *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 48:3 (2007): 383–410; Jon Bialecki, Naomi Haynes, and Joel Robbins, "The Anthropology of Christianity," *Religion Compass* 2:6 (2008): 1139–1158; Timothy Jenkins, "The Anthropology of Christianity: Situation and Critique," *Ethnos* 77:4 (2012): 459–476; Joel Robbins, "The Anthropology of Christianity: Unity, Diversity, New Directions," *Current Anthropology* 55:10 (2014): S157–S171.

10 See especially: Simon Coleman, *The Globalisation of Charismatic Christianity: Spreading the Gospel of Prosperity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2000); Susan Friend Harding, *The Book of Jerry Falwell: Fundamentalist Language and Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001); Pamela Klassen, *Spirits of Protestantism: Medicine, Healing, and Liberal Christianity* (Los Angeles and Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011); Tanya Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back: Understanding the American Evangelical Relationship with God* (New York: Vintage Books, 2012); James Bielo, *Words Upon the Word: An Ethnography of Evangelical Group Bible Study* (New York: New York University Press, 2009); Omri Elisha, *Moral Ambition: Mobilization and Social Outreach in Evangelical Megachurches* (Los Angeles and Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011); Jon Bialecki, *A Diagram for Fire: Miracles and Variation in an American Charismatic Movement* (Los Angeles and Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017).

11 Robbins, "What is a Christian?," 192.

12 For helpful entry points into the vast literature on Mennonite identity, see: Calvin Redekop, "The Mennonite Identity Crisis," *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 2 (1984): 87–103; Daphne Winland, "Native Scholarship: The Enigma of Self-Definition Among Jewish and Mennonite Scholars," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 5:4 (1992): 431–461; Daphne Winland, "The Quest for Mennonite Peoplehood: Ethno-religious Identity and the Dilemma of Definitions," *Canadian Review of Sociology* 30:1 (1993): 110–138; Hildi Froese Tiessen, "Beyond the Binary: Re-inscribing Cultural Identity in the Literature of Mennonites," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 72:4 (1998): 491–501; and Karl Koop, "Anabaptist and Mennonite identity: Permeable Boundaries and Expanding Definitions," *Religion Compass* 8:6 (2014): 199–207.

[13] James Urry, "Who are the Mennonites?," *European Journal of Sociology / Archives Européennes de Sociologie* 24:2 (1983): 241–262.

[14] Urry's work sits on the borderlands of historical and anthropological scholarship. In his paper to the 2019 conference, Urry confessed to having a "complicated relationship" with anthropology. James Urry, "Mennonites, Anthropology and History: A Complicated Intellectual Relationship," delivered at the conference on Mennonites and Anthropology: Ethnography, Religion, and Global Entanglements, October 25-26, University of Winnipeg. An earlier biographical paper also details Urry's long-standing relationship with Mennonites: James Urry, "An Englishman and Russian Mennonite studies," delivered at the conference on Mennonites and the Challenge of Multiculturalism: 25 Years of Mennonite Studies at the University of Winnipeg, 1978–2003, October 18, 2003, University of Winnipeg. Urry's major publications include: *None but Saints: The Transformation of Mennonite Life in Russia, 1789–1889* (Winnipeg: Hyperion Press, 1989), and *Mennonites, Politics, and Peoplehood: 1525 to 1980* (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2006).

[15] The term "Mennonite mosaic" was included in the title of a seminal sociological survey of American Mennonites: J. Howard Kauffman and Leo Driedger, *The Mennonite Mosaic: Identity and Modernization* (Scottdale, PA: Herald, 1991).

[16] Urry "Who are the Mennonites?," 241.

[17] Urry would later discuss this combination of different factors that constitute Mennonite identity under the concept of "peoplehood." Urry, *Mennonites, Politics, Peoplehood.*

[18] Sherry Ortner, "Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37:1 (1995): 174.

[19] Calvin Redekop, *Mennonite Society* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989).

[20] For studies of each of these Mennonite groups, see: Daphne Winland, "Christianity and Community: Conversion and Adaptation among Hmong Refugee," *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 19:1 (1994): 21–45; Daphne Winland, "Revisiting a Case Study of Hmong Refugees and Ontario Mennonites," *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 24 (2011): 169–176; Sigit Heru Soekotjo and Lawrence M. Yoder, *Tata Injil di Bumi Muria: Sejarah Gereja Injili di Tanah Jawa-GITJ* (Semarang: Pustaka Muria, 2010); Francis S. Ojwang, ed., *Forward in Faith: History of the Kenya Mennonite Church. A Seventy-Year Journey, 1942–2012* (Nairobi: Kenya Mennonite Church, 2015); Donald Kraybill and James Hurd, *Horse-and-Buggy Mennonites: Hoofbeats of Humility in a Postmodern World* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005).

[21] Robbins, "What is a Christian?"

[22] Robbins, "What is a Christian?," 195.

[23] Susan Friend Harding, "Representing Fundamentalism: The Problem of the Repugnant Cultural Other," *Social Research* 58:2 (1991): 373–393.

[24] Robbins, "What is a Christian?," 192.

[25] Some my work explores how MCCers translate Mennonite theologies of service into practice in Indonesia as part of an ethnography of global interconnections. See especially: Philip Fountain, "Orienting Guesthood in the Mennonite Central Committee, Indonesia," in *Inside the Everyday Lives of Development Workers: The Challenges and Futures of Aidland*, ed. Anne-

Meike Fechter and Heather Hindman (Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press, 2011), 83–106; and Philip Fountain, "Development Things: A Case of Canned Meat," *Sites: A Journal of Social Anthropology and Cultural Studies* 11:1 (2014): 39–73. The relative lack of emphasis on transcendence and the mundane may in part be due to a privileging of ethical immanence as a primary locus of faith among some Mennonite groups.

[26] In response to Robbins, William Garriott and Kevin Lewis O'Neill propose that instead of focusing on "the problems posed by Christianity to anthropology" anthropologists would be better served by researching "the problems posed by Christianity to Christians themselves." To do this they advocate for a dialogic approach in which anthropologists attend to Christian debates over who is, and who is not, a Christian. They argue that becoming attuned to "patterns of problematization" should be coupled with a commitment to being "rigorously ethnographic". William Garriott and Kevin Lewis O'Neill, "Who is a Christian? Toward A Dialogic Approach in the Anthropology of Christianity," *Anthropological Theory* 8:4 (2008): 381–398.

[27] Bernardo Brown and R. Michael Feener, "Configuring Catholicism in the Anthropology of Christianity," *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 28:2 (2017): 139–151; Chris Hann, "Reflections on an Anglophone Academic Sect," *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 28:2 (2017): 242–247; Chris Hann and Hermann Goltz, eds., *Eastern Christians in Anthropological Perspective* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2010).

[28] Cf. Walter Klassen, *Anabaptism: Neither Catholic nor Protestant* (Waterloo, ON: Conrad Press, 1973).

[29] Fenella Cannell, "Introduction," in *The Anthropology of Christianity*, Fenella Cannell, ed. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006), 44–45.

[30] For an ethnographic study of Mennonite theological diversity see: Philip Fountain, "Creedal Monologism and Theological Articulation in the Mennonite Central Committee," in *The Monologic Imagination*, ed. Matt Tomlinson and Julian Millie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 203–230. There remains great potential for anthropological engagements with Mennonite theology, including not only as "data" but also, as Joel Robbins as argued, for anthropologists to be thinking "with." See: Joel Robbins, "Anthropology and Theology: An Awkward Relationship?" *Anthropological Quarterly* 79:2 (2006): 285–294. On emerging conversations about anthropological theologies see: Philip Fountain and Sin Wen Lau, "Anthropological Theologies: Engagements and Encounters," *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 24:3 (2013): 227–234; Philip Fountain, "Toward a Post-secular Anthropology," *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 24:3 (2013): 310–328; and J. Derrick Lemons, ed., *Theologically Engaged Anthropology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

[31] David Lehmann, "Religion as Heritage, Religion as Belief: Shifting Frontiers of Secularism in Europe, the USA and Brazil," *International Sociology* 28:6 (2013): 645–662. See also Chris Hann, "The Heart of the Matter: Christianity, Materiality, and Modernity," *Current Anthropology* 55:10 (2014): S182–S192.

[32] See also: Philip Fountain, "Mennonite Disaster Relief and the Interfaith Encounter in Aceh," *Asian Ethnology* 75:1 (2016): 163–190.