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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACLM</td>
<td>The Archives of the Committee for Liturgy and Music of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKF</td>
<td>Arbetsgruppen Kyrklig Förnyelse (The working Group for Ecclesiastical Regeneration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KJMK</td>
<td>Kirkon Jumalanpalvelus- ja Musiikkoimikunta (The Committee for Liturgy and Music of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW</td>
<td>Luther’s Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VELPA</td>
<td>Vaasa Evangelical Lutheran Parishes: Parish Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFPA</td>
<td>Vaasa Finnish Parish Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPCA</td>
<td>Vaasa Parishes Common Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSPA</td>
<td>Vaasa Swedish Parish Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Weimarer Ausgabe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
« Cette opposition de principe entre le hiératisme byzantin et l'historisme occidental se retrouve dans l’interprétation de tous les thèmes religieux. Il en résulte une conséquence très importante : c’est que, tandis que la formule byzantine reste immuable, le thème initial apparaît dans l’art d’Occident en voie d’évolution continue. » (Réau 1957, p. 584.)

“Conventional wisdom takes one of the two polarized views regarding the relation of art and religion: either art is the handmaiden of religion, or else the artist is an autonomous agent working out of his or her own inspiration, which may or may not parallel the specific concerns of religion. But surely the relationship is much more complex than this simplistic opposition suggests…” (Morgan 1998, p. 2)
Abstract

This study applies art sociological, Bourdieusian methodology in an analysis of the appearance of revivalist Byzantine imagery in Swedish and Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces in 1960-2000, with a particular focus on the icon painter Erland Forsberg’s large and still continuing production. Forsberg is presented as a produced producer, as an agent related to the social, cultural and religious structures making his production, his influence, and his position-takings manifest and possible. These structures are discovered among several Lutheran ecclesiastical agents and movements such as the High Church and Retreat movements, and also amid the promotional and restrictive field of the Swedish language and culture. Generally, the opponents and supporters of this phenomenon were divided in their opinions in terms of the authenticity of the production and the right to adapt Byzantine/Orthodox pictorial expressions into Lutheran usage. The promotional agents, in particular, intermingled theology and art history in an attempt to present the re-produced religious image as the original Christian one. Ultimately, Forsberg’s production is conceptualized as related to cultural currents: earlier rejection of Byzantine expressions (in Finland), contemporary esteem, modernist and post-modernist ideas, and Protestant consumption of reproduced religious prints.

The analysis concentrates on Finnish acquisitions of the implemented public works of Forsberg. Often placed as Lutheran altarpieces and realized in several instances as triptychs and polyptychs, Forsbergian icons represent an infusion of Byzantine pictorial materials. Additionally, several details adopted from historical works of church art and certain adapted structural and spatial solutions make the icons appear potentially suitable for Lutheran ritual use. In comparison to the diverse icons in Lutheran sacred spaces in Finland, such as those pertaining to the emergence of the Marian image, Forsbergian icons present unequaled solutions as pictorial position-takings.

Keywords: art sociology, Bourdieu, Byzantine, contemporary, culture, Finnish, icon, language, Lutheran, the Mother of God, nationality, Orthodox, Pantocrator, position-taking, religion, ritual, sacred space, saints, Swedish
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1. Encountering Peripheral Cultural Phenomena

1.1. Forsberg’s Icon Painting in Art Sociological Analysis: Conceptual Issues and Selected Perspectives

The relevance of one single icon painter might be questioned as an object of research on religious Evangelical Lutheran art in present-day Finland and Sweden. The few revivalist Byzantine icon paintings located in Lutheran sacred spaces might easily be understood as a marginal and peripheral phenomenon, even as too unstructured for a closer analysis. In order to prevent potential subject marginality, therefore, I aim to present a relatively extensive and structured object of study with a many-faceted and complex manifestation, a phenomenon that can well be described within the framework of at least some of its contextual backgrounds.

I use the concept of revivalist Byzantine icon painting to combine certain stylistic and technical solutions in contemporary practice. These characteristics could be considered specifically typical of Russian emigrant revivalist icon painting – concepts that Kotkavaara explored profoundly in his dissertation. However, unlike Kotkavaara in some of his other works, and because of the specifically Orthodox religious context they represent, I do not use the term “neo-Orthodox icon doctrine/icon art” – particularly in view of the mainly non-Orthodox religious sphere of my study. I am also seeking a deeper insight into what is considered contemporary icon painting in terms of the methodological basis of this work. As to the history of the icon, the reader is invited to examine certain previous works covering complementary approaches to the subject. I use the term “icon” in this study primarily in the Christian liturgical sense, that is as a reference to the Byzantine pictorial tradition of sacred images and objects found in that tradition. On the other hand, I do not intend to use the terms “iconography” and “iconographer” in view of their general art historical connotations.

Furthermore, the concept of the Lutheran sacred space signifies a Lutheran place of worship and, more precisely, a place for the celebration of the Eucharist. A sacred space must be consecrated for its religious function in accordance with the rituals common to Lutheranism – generally in Finnish and Swedish contexts covered here in a religious ritual conducted by a bishop during the time-frame of the study. The selection of the act of consecration as the symbolic and ritual activity designating the interior of a building used for religious rituals as a “sacred space” is a practical solution for certain reasons. Firstly,

---

1 E.g. the data in Appendices 6.1., 6.2., and 6.3.
2 E.g. Kotkavaara 1999, Table of Contents. See also the definitions on pp. 20-22.
4 On the Bourdieusian method and concepts, see ch. 1.2. and ch. 1.3.
6 See e.g. Panofsky 1972.
7 On the concept “religious ritual”, this study uses the classic definitions by Émile Durkheim, in the sense of specifically emphasizing the social aspect of ritual activity. See Durkheim 2003, 56-57, 60-66.
according to existing liturgical sources, the consecrating ceremony was a necessary ritual element in inaugurating a new or renovated sacred space. Secondly, the consecration of the sacred space was considered a prevalent requirement for continuous ritual activity concerning the celebration of the Eucharist, thus binding religious consecration to continuous ritual practice by church law. Thirdly, there remains the fact that the name of a religious building does not necessarily reveal whether it, in fact, functions as an accepted place of worship; some buildings, such as Mäntä funeral chapel in the Tampere Diocese were turned into churches later on. Finally, in an effort to objectify all available objectifications, I intentionally regard the question of whether or not there actually are any sacred material objects in Lutheranism as an issue that characterizes the dispositions that are probably common to High and Low Church movements, and as a set of beliefs that presumably unmask many of the details in this analysis. Consequently, the approach chosen is practical, ecclesiastical-administrative, and cultural-sociological.

I intentionally use the concept “Lutheran” primarily to refer to Finnish and Swedish religious structures defined by different agents and documents as “Lutheran” and, accordingly to their collective and individual adherents (possibly also defining themselves as Lutherans) and a number of different agents and discourses defined by others as “Lutheran”, or commonly understood as adherents to the Lutheran Reformation of the 16th century. The sacred spaces under analysis are limited to the churches and chapels owned, maintained, and used primarily by local parishes of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland and the Church of Sweden or, in certain cases, by religious organizations in connection with either of these churches or existing as components of their structure. Hence, ecumenical chapels in retreat centers, ecumenical prison and tourist chapels, chapels in Catholic monasteries, school meeting rooms and so forth are excluded from the in-depth examination of the icons in which the methods described in Chapter 1.3. were used. Some of these “ecumenical” sacred spaces shared or of a different tradition, are nevertheless used:

1) in order to accumulate data apt to reveal accessible public presentations of Forsberg’s works and relations meaningful to his work,
2) and in certain cases of choice, as reference material to shed light on comparative sociological aspects in particular parts of the study (e.g. ch. 3.1., 3.2., and 4.2.).

---

10 See Database 2001.
11 Bourdieu 1996, 207. On the chosen method and its basic concepts, see ch. 1.2.
12 E.g. in the question of whether or not sacred, consecrated, religious images exist in Lutheran sacred spaces.
My aim is thus to introduce one individual icon painter as a “produced producer” within the necessary socio-cultural boundaries of his icon production, to present one example related through the positions occupied in social spaces to most of the religious-cultural structures that make the object conceivable, understandable, and explainable. This approach was deliberately chosen. I focus my analysis on the art-sociological and the religious, on cultural conflict and the exercise of power. I chose Erland Forsberg as the subject of this analysis, with the aim of using him as a “lens” through which the relations and structures may be made visible and observable. His influences are observable in many details, thus making him a fitting object of study: his activities in various fields over a long period, his Finnish origin, his work as a Lutheran Pastor, his being a Finn who immigrated to Sweden and who is considered an authority on icon painting, and all the newspaper articles on him and other available source material.

The fragmented and complex nature of the phenomenon inevitably presents some major challenges regarding the source material available. The material largely comprises the archives of the Vaasa parishes, several newspaper articles primarily from two collections of cuttings but also from the Finnish Lutheran church newspaper Kotimaa, interviews with some of the selected representatives, recorded personal observations, and a videotape of the ritual of the consecration of one of Forsberg’s icons. Other material includes the published writings of Forsberg, his religious radio broadcasts, pictures in books, postcards, web-sites, and even a CD cover. Naturally, his original paintings and other works are included in the source material. The accessible corpus of these works is presented in Appendix 6.1., and some of them are analyzed in Chapter 3. The icons are scrutinized

---

13 On the notion of “produced producer”, see e.g. Bourdieu 1991b, 28, « …il [Marcel Duchamp] produit des objets dont la production comme œuvres d’art suppose la production du producteur comme artiste… [Emphasis added] » Naturally, in this reference the context of the notion is discovered in the modernist art world. However, it is a central concept in Bourdieusian Cultural Sociology, and it is also functional even in the analysis of the production of religious images. See also Bourdieu 1998a, 375, « …Elle doit donc prendre en compte… …aussi l’ensemble des agents et des institutions qui participent à la production… …et l’ensemble des instances… …qui peuvent agir sur le marché de l’art… …sans oublier les membres des institutions qui concourent à la production des producteurs [emphasis added]… » See also the Bourdieusian method utilized in this study as presented in ch. 1.2.

14 See e.g. Bourdieu & Darbel & Schnapper 1969, 162, « Le sociologue ne se propose pas de réfuter la formule de Kant pour qui « le beau est ce qui plaît sans concept » mais plutôt de définir les conditions sociales qui rendent possibles cette expérience et ceux pour qui elle est possible, amateurs d’art ou « d’hommes de goût », et de déterminer par là dans quelles limites elle peut en tant que telle exister. »


16 Koskimies-Envall 1993, 66.
according to the methodical ideas derived from the theoretical framework.\textsuperscript{17} Paintings by Forsberg include the altarpieces in Vaasa Vetokannas/Dragnäsbäck church and in the chapel of Alskathemmet recreation center.\textsuperscript{18} Kumlinge parish in Åland also acquired one icon,\textsuperscript{19} and the Swedish-language parish of Kauniainen has a series of five.\textsuperscript{20} My interest in this study is exclusively in the public acquisitions and those executed/acquired especially for a sacred space.\textsuperscript{21} A corpus of icons in Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces is also presented by way of comparison to the production of Forsberg.\textsuperscript{22}

The perspective is particularly Finnish, focusing geographically on Finland and Åland, in a non-linguistic sense.\textsuperscript{23} The selected time frame is from the 1960s to the end of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century when Forsberg’s influence was at its present height. It was not only the easier accessibility of the source material that led me to select the Finnish acquisition cases as descriptive examples for closer analysis, but also, and in particular, Forsberg’s influence in the Finnish ecclesiastical field, as well as the limits of his influence in the Finnish cultural and religious realm. Naturally, his main sphere of influence in terms of sheer numbers of realized public works in Sweden necessarily forms an explanatory horizon and a network of relations to be analyzed. Finally, some of the Vaasa examples are characteristic of the varying contexts and the problematic and lengthy acquisition processes, perhaps often revealing the exercise of power (even behind-the-scenes) better than brief processes that are in some cases unseen by the public, since the literary source material available is scarce.\textsuperscript{24}

Nevertheless, the research principles present certain problems. Firstly, the study concerns a fragmented area of culture and religion largely ignored in previous research.\textsuperscript{25} Obviously, many of its characteristics observed through the relations (that is, the relationships, contacts, resources, and background) of Forsberg the producer are possibly unique in one way or another. This exceptionality is a challenge that I attempt to meet in a positive manner, in particular by connecting the unique, exceptional, and fragmental phenomena if and when feasible to the wider background, in other words to the socio-cultural structures that ultimately define them. In the analysis I strive to describe and contextualize the relations that

\textsuperscript{17} On the utilized Bourdieusian concepts, see ch. 1.2. and esp. ch. 1.3., which present the preconditions for and framework of analysis of the accessible corpus of Forsberg’s public icons and other icons available as source material.

\textsuperscript{18} Koskimies-Envall 1993, 83. See also ch. 3.1.

\textsuperscript{19} Interview I, 2001; Interview IX, 2001.

\textsuperscript{20} Interview VII, 2001.

\textsuperscript{21} Accordingly, all acquisitions made by private persons for their homes, for example, are excluded.

\textsuperscript{22} See ch. 1.3. for more details.

\textsuperscript{23} Language and nationality are scrutinized as related (structuring) structures in ch. 4.

\textsuperscript{24} See the processes analyzed in ch. 4.

\textsuperscript{25} Forsberg has been only rarely studied. To my knowledge, four works have been produced by Stockholm and Uppsala students: “Nutida Svenska Ikonmålare” by Lars-Åke Nilsson (1982) briefly presents Forsberg as one of four selected exemplary painters, “Nutida Ikonmålare i Sverige” by Katja Agugliaro (1986) examines some of the basic qualities of the Swedish icon-painting phenomenon, “Ikonen – ett Fönster mot Himlen” by Rogaliski-Sandström-Elerton-Pisconor (1988) provides (on pp. 76-77) also some unanalyzed interview material on Forsberg, and “Mellan tradition och nyskapelse” by Johnsén (1999) is a compact study principally based on interviews focusing on Forsberg’s thinking about his own painting, and also presenting some of his works. Furthermore, recently Hedvig Brander Jonsson covers Forsberg in “Svensk forskning kring kyrkorummets gestaltning och utsmyckning”, and gives certain explanatory ideas regarding his work. See Brander Jonsson 2000, 20-22.
could be considered prerequisites of Forsberg’s production, and which gave rise to the Lutheran icon phenomenon. How were the producers of icons, their supporters, opponents and customers linked together? What kind of formative religious and cultural structures influenced them and contributed to the discussion on the genuineness and acceptance of the contemporary icon? Naturally, the relational model of analysis used is interconnected with the theoretical background. The study offers a closer analysis of the different forms of available relations in its use of accessible data that reveal ecclesiastical acquisitions of icons, acquisitions that, in turn, are analyzed through the concepts adopted within the Bourdieusian methodical framework. Thus, the relational is always understood through the Bourdieusian idea of the “field” and the positions in it – not as abstract, stable, and inflexible classificatory elements divorced from the elemental totality of their proper socio-cultural structures.

Furthermore, the designation of an icon painter as a producer is closely connected with the selected methodical solution, which is used to challenge the tacit ideological presumption celebrating the painter, sculptor and writer as autonomous cultural actors operating as “creators” and “artists”. The silent acceptance of these labels, utilized by actors engaged in various activities and in various contexts, would inevitably bring to an end all future efforts to contextualize the discussion and the dispositions of the operators in connection with the right and power to utilize these highly symbolic expressions full of incompatible meanings.27 These perspectives could be summarized in form of the following two questions: Who has the power to define what is art? Who can be acknowledged as true artists?28 I deliberately renounce the ideologically framed artist idiom in preference to the more open and utilizable term “producer”.

The production of a “work of art”, or of any pictorial presentation, necessarily calls for co-producers, a succession of production in time and in social space with actors and institutions capable of participating in the processes. This can be done both by creating the necessary preconditions (e.g. the value and significance of the work) and by co-producing (and thus maintaining or demolishing) the work through criticism, explanation, adoration, condemnation, and research.29 Furthermore, it is evident that the researcher is not a neutral observer, but rather a participant in the co-production of the meaning, publicity and so forth of the objects of study, in other words the mental and dispositional existence of the same objects. The researcher could also be regarded as an operator within projects in the Fine Arts and theology.

---

26 For a more compact definition of the basic concepts, see ch. 1.2. in which some of the principles of Pierre Bourdieu’s cultural-sociological conceptualization and its suggested utilization are presented.
27 See e.g. Bourdieu 1991b, 14, « …le flou sémantique de notions comme celles d’écrivain ou d’artiste est à la fois produit et la condition des luttes visant à en imposer la définition. ». See also Bourdieu 1998a, 279, « …on peut mettre en suspens l’idéologie charismatique de la « création » qui est l’expression visible de cette croyance tacite qui constitue sans doute le principal obstacle à une science rigoureuse de la production de la valeur des biens culturels. », p. 280.
28 See e.g. Bourdieu’s analysis in Bourdieu 1991b, 13.
29 See e.g. a comprehensive approach to the question in Bourdieu 1991b, 22-23, « Le producteur de la valeur de l’œuvre d’art n’est pas l’artiste mais le champ de production en tant qu’univers de croyance qui produit la valeur de l’œuvre d’art comme fétiche en produisant la croyance dans le pouvoir créateur de l’artiste… …Elle doit donc prendre en compte non seulement les producteurs directs de l’œuvre dans sa matérialité… …mais aussi l’ensemble des agents et des institutions qui participent à la production de la valeur de l’œuvre à travers la production de la croyance dans la valeur de l’art en général et dans la valeur
One special set of problems lies in defining what icon painting is and who should be regarded as an icon painter. Given the various forms of implementation in different contexts, the activity itself probably cannot be presented as a precise and clearly definable structure. Contemporary icon painting takes many forms: hobby-oriented recreation, a teaching activity, the production of cultural esthetic objects, and the religiously motivated production of religious objects for rituals, interpreted as expressions of theology. Is there, then, any point of describing all these activities within the boundaries of a single field of practice? Moreover, the motivational pattern may manifest itself in different forms if we compare an icon painted in pursuit of a hobby and hung on the bedroom wall or given to a friend with the large and expensive works executed by full-time icon painters for public display and use in religious rituals — not to mention the religious context that may vary from the Orthodox to the Lutheran and the Catholic. I would like to emphasize that my approach is sociological and relational. I include all those who consider themselves “icon painters”, and underline the importance of their being defined as such by others in various contexts. My interest is in the utilization of power and the struggle that becoming an icon painter, and a successful one, calls for. I seek to analyze the strictly contemporary activity of other painters sharing the same occupation, inspired by the same models and ideas, and, at least to some extent, similarly valued.

In the same way, I address the problem of defining the concept of an icon as a social issue. Because of the nature of the phenomenon, the definition is pragmatic and thus far from adequate. All things considered, it may even be impossible to find any absolute qualities that define an icon, especially outside of the traditional Orthodox context, within distinctive de telle ou telle œuvre d’art, critiques, historiens de l’art, éditeurs, directeurs de galeries marchands, conservateurs de musée, mécènes, collectionneurs, membres des instances de consécration, académies, salons, jurys etc., et l’ensemble des instances politiques et administratives compétentes en matière d’art (Ministères divers -selon les époques-, Direction des musées nationaux, Direction des Beaux-arts, etc.) qui peuvent agir sur le marché de l’art, soit par des verdicts de consécration assortis ou non d’avantages économiques (achats, subventions, prix, bourses, etc.), soit par des mesures réglementaires (avantages fiscaux accordés aux mécènes ou aux collectionneurs, etc.), sans oublier les membres des institutions qui concourent à la production des producteurs (Écoles des Beaux-arts, etc.) et à la production de consommateurs aptes à reconnaître l’œuvre d’art comme telle, c’est-à-dire comme valeur, à commencer par les professeurs, les parents, responsables de l’inculcation initiale des dispositions artistiques. » See also Bourdieu 1998a, 280-288, esp. on the idea of a “cycle of consecration” (“cycle de la consécration”), and the collective character of artistic production, p. 287, « …l’œuvre d’art, comme les biens ou les services religieux, amulettes ou sacrements divers, ne reçoit valeur que d’une croyance collective comme méconnaissance collective, collectivement produite et reproduite … le travail de fabrication matérielle n’est rien sans le travail de production de la valeur de l’objet fabriqué… »

30 All these activities are mentioned in the various newspaper articles that were used as source material in this study. See e.g. Göteborgsposten, “Måla ikoner ett kall”, “Konst”, December 5, 1980 by Karin Teghammar; Oskarshamns Nyheterna, “Ikoner – bibeln i bildform!”, August 10, 1993 by Jessica Schale; Borås Tidning, “Ikon för samtiden”, September 4, 1997 by Inger Landström; Döderhults Församlingsblad, “Besök i bygdens ikonmålarstudio”, no. 1/2000 by an anonymous writer; Oskarshamns Tidningen, “Ny Mariaikon till Kolbergakyrkan”, November 20, 2000 by Håkan Carlsson; Falköpings kyrkoblad, “Invigning av ikon i S:t Olofs kyrka”, 1/2001 by an anonymous writer.

31 This presumption follows from the preliminary analysis of the material collected for ch. 3. On the involvement of Catholics in the origin of émigré icon painting, see Kotkavaara 1999, 247-248, 269.

32 It goes without saying that arriving at a conceptual definition of both the icon painter and the icon is a problematic task. In any cultural production the producer and the produced object, together with all of the
which there has been internal conflict over the definition of “true” and “false” icons. For the purposes of this study, all contemporary works that are linked in some way to the Byzantine or revivalist Byzantine forms and realized in a “traditional” or “original” fashion, regardless of the circumstances of their production and questions of quality or motivation, are considered icons. The crucial point is to arrive at a sociological understanding of the limits of the phenomenon: produced to be seen (and to come to be seen) as an icon with all the qualities subsequent to that belief. Different agents define icon painting and its scope in a variety of contexts. It is possible that a simplistic practice-oriented definition will highlight the fragmentary and unique characteristics of the contemporary icon phenomenon, and find its limits, at least in some of its complexity.

Figure 1. Proposed investments, interests, and motivational patterns

Figure 1. depicts the multiple practices centered around the icon in terms of possible interests, investments, and motivational patterns. It shows art-historical, artistic, and collector interests mixed up with other less culture-oriented motivations resulting from one “icon enthusiast” possibly moving from one to another and combining several in their actions and evaluations. The research results may well reveal other forms of interest and motivation, too. It must also be borne in mind that distinguishing between what may be regarded as “historical” or “reproduced” may, in some cases, prove to be all too troublesome and complex: after all, most icon production was once contemporary reproduction following more or less traditional patterns.


34 See ch. 1.2. for a more detailed description of the theoretical background. On the notion of belief, see e.g. Bourdieu 1993, 77, 78, “…it is the field of production, understood as a system of objective relations between these agents or institutions and as the site of the struggles for the monopoly of the power to consecrate, in which the value of works of art and belief in that value are continually generated.” (See also pp. 74-111).

35 E.g. Honour & Fleming 1982, 243, “In accordance with the concept of orthodoxy, Byzantine artists of the post-Iconoclast period began by looking back for models to the sixth century. And orthodoxy governed the subsequent development of Byzantine art, which is insistently symbolic and regulated by strict conventions.

36 institutional and specific actors who are or were participating in the production may, indeed, be regarded as interconnected. See e.g. Bourdieu 1998a, 279-288.
Even though icon painting in the Lutheran context may seem a rare and special religious-cultural phenomenon, it should be seen in the context of the cultural structure changes that took place during the 20th century. It was a century of re-evaluation in terms of the artistic, cultural, and religious values of Byzantine religious art. The modernist artistic era put a value on the originality and folkloristic authenticity of Eastern ritual art, which has often been stripped of its original cultic frames and re-located in museums, galleries and collections as objects of artistic contemplation rather than retaining their role as a means of worship and source of spirituality. This development, or change, or expansion of context and use affected both Sweden and Finland, and indeed the whole of Western Europe. In view of the above, and given the simultaneously focal and complex nature of the phenomenon, its characterization as modernist remains largely indeterminate in the present study. I am aware of the variety of definitions in scholarly discourses, and hence strive to use the term primarily with reference to the various and often practically oriented ideas of the agents who were involved in the production of icons either as promoters or as adversaries in the Protestant context. For them, the practical side of modernism may appear complex and multifaceted.

It is worth reminding the reader that interest in icons is not necessarily limited to the possession of art works produced by and in the possession of legitimate representatives of higher culture. We could ask whether the phenomenon of a Lutheran re-producer of icons could also be seen in the context of producing popular religious imagery artifacts. The gradual decline in production of traditional religious kitsch or l’art de Saint-Sulpice after the 1950s, possibly to be replaced by the mass production of the “re-discovered” icon among certain Protestant groups, is also worth investigating: it may well connect the Protestant icon phenomenon to the mass production of printed icons and icon cards sold in Christian bookstores. In addressing these questions, the researcher has to deal with the larger structures of cultural reception and consumption, which at least in all of their totality, are beyond the scope of the present study. Likewise, the cultural goodwill shown to the Orthodox community in Finland after the 1960s – a community previously underestimated and alienated as “Ryssän kirkko”, “the Church of the Russkies” – may be another explanatory factor. This means dealing, if all too briefly, with questions of nationality and

The figure of a saint had to face the spectator in order to act as a channel for prayer to his or her prototype in heaven. Biblical scenes had to conform to established iconographical norms.” See also Mondzain 1999, 193. « Dans l’icône byzantine, la répétition est institutionnelle et réelle. L’icône doit recopier un modèle qui, la plupart du temps, est une autre icône à laquelle elle se soumet totalement et sans variation. D’où la nécessité, en remontant d’icône en icône, de statuer d’images principales et miraculeuses.»

E.g. see the ideas expressed by Maurice Denis in 1896 and 1912. Kotkavaara 1999, 249-250; Kotkavaara 2000, 59-62. On the “discovery” of the icon as an art form by Henri Matisse in Russia in 1911, see Durozoi 1989, 18. As an example of the development that has been taking place in the re-evaluation of the historical craft of icon painting, see e.g. the forewords to two exhibition catalogues: Abel 1970 and Willamo 1997, 7-8. On the production of the museological value and artistic valuation of icons, see Kotkavaara 1986, 49, 50, 64-65, 74-75; Kotkavaara 1991, 58; Kotkavaara 1999, 170-175; Nikkanen 1979, 5; Jääskinen 1987, 7-8; Jääskinen 1990, 58; Flinckenberg-Glushkoff 2000, 100, 104-106. See Smith 1996, 777-779. On the related concept of Modernity, see pp. 777-779.

See also Smith 1996, 776, “Regional, local, even national, modernisms have occurred all over the world since the 1920s, each with their own distinctive concerns and values.”


“Lupauksen näyttämö oli Joensuun ortodoksinen kirkko, vaatimaton puupyyhkö jota pilkkakirveet kutsuivat ryssän kirkoksi…”, Jääskinen 1998, 13, see also p. 136. It is difficult to give accurate examples
language as form-giving cultural structures. The cultic-liturgical and Christian-theological ideological structural backgrounds of the producers and promoters of the icon within Protestant boundaries also deserve closer observation and analysis.

Faced with these challenges, I aim to center my work on the proposed and potential efforts at creating, within Lutheranism, a special religious-cultural space inspired by Byzantine culture. I include in this the structural and occasional features used in and created for this attempt: the project and strategies of the icon painter in the process and endeavor of being recognized as a producer in public, the dispositions, capitals, and position-takings\(^{41}\) that are available, meaningful and in formation in this effort, and the restrictive and formative cultural and institutional structures that are operative and powerful in the process: language, nationality, parish administration, religious distinctions, and a variety of artistic and cultural currents as well as the objects through which the phenomenon is realized in sacred spaces. Consequently, several cultural and religious formations are used as explanatory discourses giving shape to the set-up of the agent’s influences.

Finally, it is impossible to comprehend cultural phenomena consciously or unconsciously in the absence of any cultural matrix of perception and classification.\(^{42}\) Moreover, since this study focuses on artistic or semi-artistic productions, comprehended as systems of relations and discourses of continual processes, the chosen perspective necessarily invokes the scrutiny and contextualization of power. The icon produced and intended for Lutheran sacred spaces is an object of study of special interest given its potential contribution in addressing one of the crucial questions of the present study. Who has the power of definition? What is sacred art and why it is sacred?\(^{43}\)

« L’image et l’icône sont au coeur de toute méditation sur le symbole et le signe, ainsi que sur leur relation avec la problématique de l’être et du paraître, du voir et du croire, de la puissance et du pouvoir. »\(^{44}\)

\(^{41}\) See the definitions in ch. 1.2. and ch. 1.3.

\(^{42}\) See e.g. Bourdieu & Darbel & Schnapper 1969, 71, « L’œuvre d’art considérée en tant que bien symbolique n’existe comme telle que pour celui qui détient le moyens de se l’approprier, c’est-à-dire de la déchiffrer. » and pp. 72-77, esp. p. 76 on the enticing idea expressed as the “double-production” of cultural objects: « Ainsi, l’histoire des instruments de perception de l’œuvre est le complément indispensable de l’histoire des instruments de production de l’œuvre, dans la mesure où toute œuvre est en quelque sorte faite deux fois, par le créateur et par le spectateur, ou mieux, par la société à laquelle appartient le spectateur. »

\(^{43}\) See Bourdieu’s brief comment on art and the power to present oneself in Bourdieu 1998, 97, footnote 19, « Le dominant a, notamment, le pouvoir d’imposer sa propre vision de lui-même comme objective et collective… d’obtenir des autres que, comme dans l’amour ou la croyance, ils abdiquent leur pouvoir générique d’observation, et il se constitue ainsi en sujet absolu, sans extérieur, pleinement justifié d’exister comme il existe. »

\(^{44}\) Mondzain 1996, 12.

of the usage of the disparaging Finnish phrase “ryssän kirkko” because of the low-style usage of this slang expression. See the analysis by Petri J. Raivo regarding the utilization of the phrase in the early 20th century in Raivo 1997, 110-118. On the underestimation of the Eastern Church, see e.g. Paavolainen 1982, 133, 134, 156, 158, 240-241. On the impossibility of acquiring an icon collection for the Finnish National Museum of Art before the 1960s, see Kotkavaara 1986, 61, “Bara tanken att anskaffa ryska konstverk väckte så konsekvent motstånd att Ateneum i decennier förblev stängt för ikoner.” On the reviving interest in the 1960’s, see pp. 72-73. On the fate of the church and the icons of the Viapori St. Alexander Nevski, see Hanka 1994, 64.
1.2. An Adaptation of Bourdieu’s Theory of Cultural Fields

Distinctive methodology was required in finding a conceptual approach to the relations and tensions contained in the source material. My examination is focused on the relations between the producer, the description and conceptualization of the exercise of power, the dispositions of the operators, and the different position-takings within various social spaces. Hence, as my fundamental methodological basis I chose to adapt Pierre Bourdieu’s apparatus of cultural-sociological analysis with its special clusters of concepts. Given the complexity of the theory, I only took the essential ideas, and accordingly, I present and elucidate certain concepts throughout the analysis.

However, the adaptation of the theory is neither self-evident nor unproblematic. Bourdieu’s hard-to-define genetic structuralism may seem to be too structured, too strong and definitive in the analysis of peripheral, and even to some extent, fragmentary, phenomena. Several of his studies are based on extensive statistic source material. Works such as “La Distinction” are conceptual analyses of vast socio-cultural phenomena, but his writings also include research into particular phenomena through which the large cultural structures are also recognized, conceptualized, and analyzed. Because of the flexibility of the theory and its earlier applications, I did not consider this an obstacle. As far as some of the criticism of Bourdieu’s work is concerned, I am inclined to conclude that a closer methodological approach to the problem-posing around specific versus collective institutional agents and their conceptualization might have been useful. Bourdieu did provide some general outlines, however, for example in “Science de la science et réflexivité”, and they will be applied in this study. Indeed, it is challenging to try to sort out how distinct institutions (or in some cases smaller administrative organs operating together) are and were positioned in different fields of action or administration, and how the field affects and disposes the institution, or how agents utilize institutions, organizations, and groups in their efforts. Yet, there remains the stimulating enigma that the agent’s actions and position-takings are transformed through certain institutional formations into the position-takings of the collective organ positioned in a larger social structure, thus obviously representing something more than and quite different from the sum of its individual members.

The chosen theoretical structure and its essential concepts form the basis of this attempt at describing the preconditions that generate this special religious-cultural phenomenon: icon painting within Lutheranism. The theoretical background is of crucial importance, as

---

45 See e.g. Subject Index, Bourdieu 1979, 641-659.
48 See e.g. the critical approach of Richard Jenkins in Jenkins 1992 and note the critical notes in Broady 1991, 307-308; and Swartz 1997.
50 See Bourdieu 2001, 93-94, in this context giving the conceptual means for the analysis of the scientific field. See also the brief note on the subject in Bourdieu 1991b, 18.
it provides a network of concepts that makes it possible to analyze a multiphenomenal area of religious-cultural practices and their characteristics. Naturally, the theoretical basis could also be used to broaden the analysis beyond strictly personalist understanding of the variegated connections and exercise of power. In particular, I will use Bourdieu’s “Les règles de l’art”, the translated collection of essays entitled “The Field of Cultural Production”, Bourdieu’s and Wacquant’s methodical guide book “Réponses”, Bourdieu’s “Science de la science et réflexivité” and “La Distinction : Critique sociale du jugement”, “L’amour de l’art “ and even “La domination masculine”, together with some of his scientific articles in different publications, also influenced and inspired the analysis.51

Bourdieu’s theoretical background is valuable for and adaptable to the present study because it facilitates the conceptualization of the observed persons as agents,52 whose actions can be explained through the dynamics of the fields (champs)53 and through the structured and structuring structures of their agents’ habituses,54 which also co-form


53 See e.g. the concise definition given by Broady: “… med socialt fält avses ett system av relationer mellan positioner besatta av specialiserade agenter och institutioner… ”; Broady 1991, 266, and further 266-293, 420. See also Bourdieu 1991b, 18-19, « Le champ est un réseau de relations objectives (de domination ou de subordination, de complémentarité ou d’antagonisme, etc.) entre des positions… » ; ; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992a, 77-78, « Champ de forces actuelles et potentielles, le champ est aussi un champ de luttes pour la conservation ou la transformation de la configuration de ces forces. Le plus, le champ, en tant que structure de relations objectives entre des positions de force, sous-tend et oriente les stratégies par lesquelles les occupants de ces positions cherchent, individuellement ou collectivement, à sauvegarder ou à améliorer leur position et à imposer le principe de hiérarchisation le plus favorable à leur propre produit. » ; ; Bourdieu 1998a, 297-303; Bourdieu 2001, 120-121.

54 Broady 1991, 225-265. Note also Broady’s explanatory comment on efforts to develop the concepts in Broady 1991, 430-431, “Begreppen kapital eller habitus utvecklades som redskap med vilkas hjälp såväl människors levnadstingelser som deras erfarenhet, såväl den objektiva sociala världen som representationernas värld, lät sig infångas.” p. 430; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992a, 25-26, « L’habitus est un mécanisme structurant qui opère de l’intérieur des agents… L’habitus est, selon Bourdieu, le principe générateur des stratégies qui permet aux agents d’affronter des situations très diverses. Produit de l’intériorisation des structures externes, l’habitus réagit aux sollicitations du champ d’une manière grossièrement cohérente et systématique.” See also pp. 91-115; Johnson 1993, 5. According to Bourdieu, the habitus concept was even created to overthrow the contradiction between positivist materialism and intellectual idealism, see
their trajectories (trajectoires).\textsuperscript{55} It is well known that Bourdieu has rejected “biographical illusion” – life interpreted as a coherent story in the form of a “road” – as an attempt to interject into the scientific realm expressions that carry more literary and everyday-speech phrases.\textsuperscript{56}

Regarding this Bourdieusian rejection of the coherent biographical narrative and the constructed nature of the objectified agent,\textsuperscript{57} I intend to utilize traditional biographical presentations and brief biographical texts solely as source material for further analysis. Biographical life stories are set aside in favor of presenting a possible trajectory in the form of social spaces occupied at certain points of history as an instrument for presenting the production of Forsberg the producer and agent, that is, a produced producer and some of the most substantial structural formations making the phenomenon possible. Hence, narrative discourses (e.g. Forsberg’s different stories recalling incidents, the recollections of people and relations) are used as source material, and presented in more detail in certain parts of the text as enabling devices to situate and condition agents in differing fields, to display dispositions and position-takings, and also in the acquisition cases, to outline certain plain facts concerning prevalent material and structural conditions.\textsuperscript{58}

\textsuperscript{55} Bourdieu 1993, 189, “In contrast to ordinary biographies, the trajectory describes the series of positions successively occupied by the same writer [i.e. in general: the same agent] in the successive states of the…. …field, it being understood that it is only in the structure of a field that the meaning of these successive positions can be defined.” See also p. 276, footnote 44; Bourdieu 1998a, 425-429.

\textsuperscript{56} Bourdieu 1991b, 39, “On comprend pourquoi la biographie construite ne peut être que le dernier moment de la démarche scientifique : en effet, la trajectoire sociale qu’elle vise à restituer ce définit comme la série des positions successivement occupées par un même agent ou un même groupe d’agents…… dans des espaces successifs. (L’illusion de la constance du nominal consiste à ignorer que la valeur sociale de positions nominalement inchangées…. …peut différer aux différents moments de l’histoire propre du champ)…. …Essayer de comprendre une carrière ou une vie comme une série unique et à soi suffisante d’événements successifs sans autre lien que l’association à un « sujet » dont la constance n’est peut-être que celle d’un nom propre socialement reconnu, est à peu près absurde que se tenter de rendre raison d’une traject en le métro sans prendre en compte la structure du réseau, c’est-à-dire la matrice des relations objectives entre les différentes stations. » See also p. 40; Bourdieu 1987, http://www.homme-modern.org/societe/socio/bourdieu/Bdoots.html – February 14, 2001; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992a, 178-180. See also Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992b [English translation], footnote 169 on pp. 207-208; Rahkonen 1999, 94-97.

\textsuperscript{57} See Broady 1991, 390-393, 537-538.

\textsuperscript{58} See Bourdieu 1991b, 39, « C’est par rapport aux états correspondants de la structure du champ que se déterminent à chaque moment le sens et la valeur social des événements biographiques, entendus comme des placements et des déplacements dans cet espace, ou, plus précisément, dans les états successifs de la structure de la distribution des différentes espèces de capital qui sont en jeu dans le champ… » See further pp. 39-40.
The perspective of the analysis is relational.59 The relations conceptualized as positions60 in different fields give form to the habituses of the agents, and these habituses also affect the relations in the accessible fields. All in all, these concepts are incapable of existing without one another. Generally, the theory and the model of analysis are holistic: the central ideas of the theory are intimately interconnected.61 Because the field is understood as a system of relations62, as a “network of objective relations between positions”63, it can be contemplated via using the metaphor of a game (jeu) with differing stakes (enjeux)64: a game in which even the limits of the field are constantly tried and formulated,65 and the illusion (illusio) that is special to and typical of it,66 gives form to the implemented practices of the agents sharing in it a common doxa, “a tacit, fundamental agreement on the stakes of the struggle between those advocating heterodoxy and those holding on to orthodoxy”.67

In any field, special and typical types of economic, cultural, social, and symbolic capital68 are utilized in the ongoing battle for domination over and possession of the available cap-

59 Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992a, 72, « Penser en termes de champ, c’est penser relationnellement… le réel est relationnel… »

60 See Bourdieu 1991b, 19, « Toutes les positions dépendent, dans leur existence même, et dans les déterminations qu’elles imposent à leur occupants, de leur situation actuelle et potentielle dans la structure du champ… » See also Bourdieu 1993, 30, “…the structure of the field, i.e. of the space of positions, is nothing other than the structure of the distribution of the capital of specific properties which govern success in the field…”

61 Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992a, 23-26, 71, « Des notions telles qu’habitus, champ et capital peuvent être définis, mais seulement à l’intérieur du système théorique qu’elles constituent, jamais à l’état isolé. »

62 Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992a, 72, « …un champ peut être défini comme un réseau, ou une configuration de relations objectives entre des positions. » On the concept as a field of forces, struggles, and position-takings, the field and the space of possible, see Bourdieu 1993, 30 and, further on the field of cultural production and the field of power p. 37 and onwards.

63 Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992b, 97.

64 Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992a, 73-75; Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992b, 98-100.


66 Bourdieu 1991b, 22; Bourdieu 1998a, 373, « Les luttes pour le monopole de la définition du mode de production culturelle légitime contribuent à reproduire continûment la croyance dans le jeu, l’intérêt pour le jeu et les enjeux, l’illusio, dont elles sont aussi le produit. Chaque champ produit sa forme spécifique d’illusio, au sens d’investissement dans le jeu qui arrache les agents à l’indifférence et les incline et les dispose à opérer les distinctions pertinentes du point de vue de la logique du champ… bref, l’illusio est la condition du fonctionnement d’un jeu dont elle est aussi, au moins partiellement, le produit.», p. 444. See also Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992a, 29-30, 91-93.

67 Swartz 1997, 125. See also Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992a, 73, « …une croyance (doxa), une reconnaissance qui échappe à la mise en question (les joueurs acceptent, par le fait de jouer le jeu, et non par un « contrat », que le jeu vaut la peine d’être joué, que le jeu en vaut la chandelle) et cette collusion est au principe de leur compétition et de leurs conflits.»

68 Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992a, 74, « …un capital ou une espèce de capital, c’est ce qui est efficient dans un champ déterminé, à la fois en tant que ‘arme’ et en tant qu’enjeu de lutte, ce qui permet à son détenteur d’exercer un pouvoir, une influence, donc, d’exister dans un champ déterminé… », 77, 94-95; Broady 1991, 169-224, 274, 435. On symbolic capital, see Bourdieu 1993, 75, “‘Symbolic capital’ is to be understood as economic or political capital that is disavowed, misrecognized and thereby recognized, hence legitimate, a ‘credit’ which, under certain conditions, and always in the long run guarantees ‘economic’ profits.” See also Bourdieu’s remark on cultural capital in Bourdieu & Darbel & Schnapper 1969, 109, « Etant donné que l’expérience directe des œuvres de culture savante et l’acquisition institutionnellement
ital, and differing strategies are implemented in the game in order either to conserve and increase the capital in possession or to reverse its value and thus to fundamentally transform the game. In accordance with the Bourdieusian capital concept, religious capital could be categorized as pertaining to a specifically religious field or fields. Furthermore, the field is principally a space of struggle in which the dominant agents and institutions have to confront resistance and take it into account.

Within the given Bourdieusian context the habitus is understood as “socialized subjectivity”, a relation of conditioning”, “a relation of cognitive construction”, and as a historically produced “open system of dispositions”, which is formulated by the field to correspond to that which is actually needed in it, and which cognitively constructs the field as an understandable and possible space of action. According to Bourdieu, the habitus concept makes it possible to understand the sensibility of actions through the capability to read the conditions in the fields: the habitus is most often appropriate to the field in which it operates even without an intended purpose. Naturally, this derives from the history of the “structured and structuring structure”, that is, the habitus.
All in all, by utilizing Bourdieusian conceptual solutions, at the same time alienated from day-to-day lingual expressions and practically rooted in the observation and conceptualization of social and cultural practices, I have attempted to characterize icon-painting activities, as observed through chosen producer’s practices and constellation of positions, as a field or a fraction of a field, even in the first place as an attempt at a field-formation with its special type of capital, its battles for domination, and its own specific system or systems of entry. Bourdieu’s theory is also used to analyze the different dispositions and position-takings observable in the socio-cultural space in formation. Furthermore, I attempt to present features of Forsberg’s accumulated capital in the form of a possible trajectory line. Even if the object of this study could be considered to some extent unstructured, I look forward to uncovering some of the typical characteristics of this form of religious-cultural practice in its exciting distinctiveness.

1.3. The Pictorial Source Material: Questions of Accessibility and Method

Forsberg’s public production is both accessible to scrutiny in various forms (icons in numerous churches, published pictures, postcards, web-pages and so forth), and especially troublesome to cover in its totality for several reasons. Problems in locating and cataloguing his public works are inevitable because of the ideas of anonymity and withdrawal that Forsberg the agent embodies: there remains no record of executed works. What is more he never signs his icons. Even pressed, he was somewhat unwilling to recall the locations in which his earlier paintings had been placed. Collecting these data is a demanding task because of the large number of paintings executed from 1977 to 2000 and because some icons have probably been replaced, or even removed. Consequently, because of the sample-like nature of the data at this stage, any full-scale geographical locating of the accessible works is, on the surface at least, uninformative. However, I intend to begin the job of collecting data on works that are located in sacred spaces in the hope and expectation that future efforts will complete the picture.

It could, indeed, be regarded as paradoxal for a production intended to be anonymous to be interpreted and categorized as a set of works known as their producer’s formation. Given his numerous relations and media visibility that offer information about his icons, their placement, and motifs, one might, with reason, question the purpose and nature of

77 Broady 1991, 442-446.
78 This generally means an adaptation-in-situ of Bourdieu’s three-dimensional analysis as presented e.g. in Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992a, 80, « Une analyse en termes de champ implique trois moments necessaires et connectés entre eux… Premièrement, on doit analyser la position du champ par rapport au champ du pouvoir… …Deuxièmement, on doit établir la structure objective des relations entre les positions occupées par les agents ou les institutions… …Troisièmement, on doit analyser les habitus des agents, les différents systèmes de dispositions qu’ils ont acquis à travers l’intériorisation d’un type déterminé de conditions sociales et économiques et qui trouvent dans une trajectoire définie à l’intérieur du champ… »
79 See ch. 2.3. for a closer analysis.
80 Interview I, 2000. See also the utterly futile attempt to compile a list of Forsberg’s public works in Interview III, 2000.
82 E.g. the published articles presenting Forsberg’s works in Sources 7.1.2.2.
anonymity, which has obviously reached a state of public and well-known anonymity. This paradox of the “well-known name” that is always absent from the icons defines the space of Forsberg’s pictorial position-takings almost as if it were a collective effort, a visual statement of a producer intending to appear as an anonymous component in their production. Although the absence of the artist’s signature is also relatively common in contemporary art, this phenomenon is of a different character: an anonymity not celebrating the unique style and creativity of the artist, but, on the contrary, celebrating idealized anonymous adherence to the tradition and liturgical continuity of the Christian Church. Indeed, the Forsbergian icon production manifests no miracle of the signature (le miracle de la signature), a Bourdieusian characterization emphasizing the significance of the artist’s name in the consecration of artistic objects. Yet, I presume that Forsberg’s name, along with several religious and cultural structures, dispositions, and ritual activities, is an essential component in the production of the meaning and value of these works. There appears to be a “miracle of the omitted signature”, after all.

The placements and other crucial data regarding the icons raise a problem because the repositioning and removing of some of these works mentioned and discussed in this and the following chapters means that they may no longer be traced to the given locations. Moreover, the information found in the various sources and fragments of literature may even be found misleading in the details, some of which are based on the available texts and others on my interviews and personal observations around Gothenburg and in Falköping. My attempts to interpret the sometimes fragmented photographs published in different leaflets and newspapers were also carefully used if and when possible, but also sometimes left aside because of the uncertainty surrounding these efforts. Prints and various published pictures also provide information on the types of icons, their locations, and placements, and intrinsically contain substantial amounts of data for analyzing the use of the Forsbergian pictures. Information on his icons is available in previous studies and published writings, too, although validity of these data is extremely difficult to assess at this stage of the analysis.

Consequently, my efforts at compiling a corpus of Forsberg’s implemented public works for this study must be understood as introductory and incomplete. The analysis is further limited on account of his continuing production. It covers over thirty acquisitions of icons (painted by him), and I hope it will be understood as an introductory attempt in which various and often inadequate data are used to construct a corpus. Even if the material basis could be considered as fragmentary, the relatively extensive corpus of accessible works allows the identification of several representative and illustrative characteristics.

In addition, as mentioned in Chapter 1.1., the corpus of accessible Forsbergian works is not the only set of icons available for scrutiny. “The Protestant icon phenomenon” is also manifest in the large number of pieces placed in Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces during the past thirty years. An accessible set of such icons, realized by several different agents

83 See the analysis and references in ch. 2.2.
84 Bourdieu 1991b, 23.
85 On the production of the meaning and value of a cultural object, see e.g. the ideas presented in Bourdieu 1991b, 23 and Bourdieu 1998a, 375-378.
86 See ch. 1.1.
87 See the data in Appendix 6.1.
with clearly differing positions, is used for the purpose of comparison with Forsberg’s production, as a background for the assessment and an analysis of his icons found in Finland at four different locations. Furthermore, certain iconic or icon-type objects found in the available source material could be classified as miscellaneous or hard-to-define on account of the mixture or fusion of qualities detectable in them. These pictorial objects are briefly categorized and mentioned in Chapter 3.2. for, after all, although exceptional, singular, and probably even unrepresentative, they may be illustrative despite their fragment-ed appearances.

On the question of method, the Bourdieusian theoretical structure not only makes the analysis of relations, the exercise of power, and perceivable religious, cultural, and other structures, conceptually feasible, it also correspondingly allows for the conceptualization of icons and other analogous cultural objects.

According to Bourdieu’s theory, cultural capital can subsist in three different forms: as embodied in durable dispositions of the agents (inkorporiertem Zustand), as objectified in cultural objects (objektiviertem Zustand), and as institutionalized (institutionalisiertem Zustand), for example in educational structures. These conceptual specifications and, especially, the notion of objectified cultural capital, gives the analyst a perspective from which to judge whether or not, when, and how objectified cultural capital could possibly form variegated components affecting the acquisition, production, placement (and removal), and interpretation of the cultural objects in the sacred space. If cautiously applied to the analysis of these objects and the often discordant dispositions related to them, these conceptualizations could perhaps also make it feasible to comprehend how and why certain pictorial objects have found their place in the sacred space so effortlessly and, in contrast, how and why some of the acquisition processes have become so lengthy and troublesome.

Another aspect of the Bourdieusian theoretical approach, is the characterization of cultural objects (artistic works, for example) categorized as objects of conceptual analysis as position-takings (prises de position) by each producer, in other words as the agents’ actions in defining themselves in the social space in relation to other agents. Some agents make remarkable and unusual statements that affect the field, while others repeatedly produce in the same fashion with perhaps less effect. Together, the position-takings of the different producers are categorized as the space of position-takings (l’espace des prises de position). Research into and the analysis of any cultural object should necessarily consist of two fundamental and related aspects: the space of positions determining the
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88 See the data in Appendix 6.2.
89 Bourdieu 1983, 185-190, first published in German. See also Bourdieu 1979, 251-252, « Il ne faut aucun doute que les œuvres d’art héritées du passé et déposées dans les musées ou les collections privées et, au-delà, tout le capital culturel objectivé, produit de l’histoire accumulée sous forme de livres, d’articles, de documents, d’instruments, etc., qui sont la trace ou la réalisation de théories ou de critiques de ces théories, de problématiques et de systèmes conceptuels, se présentent comme un monde autonome… » See also Swartz 1997, 76.
90 See Bourdieu 1991b, 19, « Aux différentes positions… correspondent des prises de position homologues, œuvres littéraires ou artistiques, évidemment, mais aussi actes et discours politiques, manifestes ou polémiques… En phase d’équilibre, l’espace des positions tend à commander l’espace des prises de position… Ainsi lorsqu’un nouveau groupe littéraire ou artistique s’impose dans le champ, toute la
producers in the field of cultural production, and the space of position-taking in which the objects are scrutinized as interrelated.91

Furthermore, even the sacred (i.e. religiously consecrated) space92 itself forms a structure that necessarily needs contextual analysis in relation to the pictorial, cultural and religious objects in it. My preliminary observation-based analysis of Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces notes the tendency to place acquired artistic and analogous objects often in accordance with their relation to the ritual center of the space, which is the altar.93 It seems to be fairly common that the works of art regarded as the most important are placed right upon the altar table, whereas works of minor status or those made by non-artists may be located at the back of the sacred space (even in some cases in the entrance hall). There are, naturally, variations and local adaptations, and consequently this apparently both practical and ideal principle could not be taken as a determinative rule in all cases.94

Nevertheless, on the basis of these observations and of Bourdieusian principles, it might be possible to characterize and analyze sacred spaces as symbolic systems formed and commonly understood as having dual divisions95 which, furthermore, are apparent in diction, in expressions typical of the characterizations of a church interior and its function. One could mention the following commonly used96 distinctions: sacred – profane (and even holy – sinful), secluded – open, high – low, new (covenant) – old (covenant), in other words the north and south sides of the church interior, close – distant, central – peripheral, luminous – dark (also the east and west sides of the central axis), distinguished – common, and so forth. According to these conceptual notions, a space designated as religious and consecrated could be characterized as a hierarchized space, a space for religious cults and activities. Its implementation has a powerful impact on one’s practical orientation in the space, and accordingly continuously often constitutes and shapes the
mental image of the space and its different parts as unequally valued. It is, indeed, likely that these distinctions, which are more or less enduring dispositions and elements of the mental image of a sacred space among other influential factors (i.e. the cultural, social, and material-structural conditions of each unique case in question), influence the acquisition, installation, and even the displacement of the religious and cultural objects.

The icons included in this study are scrutinized according to these basic Bourdieusian ideas. Moreover, these works, understood as position-takings, as “the product and the stake” (le produit et l’enjeu) in the struggles in the battlefield of production and as a “system of oppositions,” are analyzed in accordance with the ideas given by Bourdieu particularly in Les règles de l’art. He challenges the researcher to use the hypothesis of homology between the structures in the field of production and the space of position-takings (l’hypothèse de l’homologie entre les deux structures) and, accordingly, to adopt a “stylistic strategy” (la stratégie stylistique). This means establishing a comparative analysis between these two structures (the field of production and the space of position-takings) and their parallel data, and then accumulating data that reveals the interrelations of the analyzed works in the space of position-takings and also the interrelations of the agents in their positions in the field of production. A “stylistic strategy” of this kind may require the researcher to commence the construction of a producer trajectory. The observable biographical details may invite a new interpretation of the formal particularities (les particularités formelles) of the cultural works and the different properties of their structures (« …ou telle propriété de sa structure. »). In the context of the given method, previous works also operate as the space of formerly realized position-takings which, in Bourdieusian terms, tend to mould future efforts, in other words possible position-takings. Furthermore, a cultural producer scarcely ever operates as an agent who is entirely sovereign and totally liberated from any constraints or influences, but rather acts constantly in relation to the formative structures in the space of possibles.

In reading the characteristics and interrelations of the works, certain preconditions are needed. Firstly, categorizing Forsberg’s and other contemporary icon production as a field of production is far too sweeping in the present context. I am rather inclined to see
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97 Bourdieu 1998a, 381.
98 Bourdieu 1998a, 381, « Et le prises de position (œuvres, manifestes ou manifestations politiques, etc.), que l’on peut et doit traiter comme un « système » d’oppositions pour les besoins de l’analyse, ne sont pas le résultat d’une forme quelconque d’accord objectif mais le produit et l’enjeu d’un conflit permanent. Autrement dit, le principe générateur et unificateur de ce « système » est la lutte même. »
99 See Bourdieu 1998a, 383.
100 See Bourdieu 1998a, 383.
101 Bourdieu 1998a, 383, see also pp. 378-384.
102 Bourdieu 1998a, 383, see also pp. 384-392.
103 See Bourdieu’s comment in Bourdieu 1998a, 385, « …il faut rappeler qu’en ces matières la liberté absolue, qui exaltent les défenseurs de la spontanéité créatrice, n’appartient qu’aux naïfs et aux ignorants. »
104 The space of possibles (l’espace des possibles), see e.g. Bourdieu 1991b, 17, « Bref, il est vain de tenter d’établir une relation directe entre l’œuvre et le groupe qui a produit le producteur ou qui en consomme les produits : il y a entre eux tout un monde social, qui redéfinit le sens des demandes ou des commandes et assigne aux habitus des producteurs leurs lieux d’application en leur imposant l’espace des possibles dans et par lesquels ils se réalisent et passent à l’acte. », 36, « …un espace des possibles, c’est-à-dire comme un ensemble de contraintes probables qui sont la condition et la contrepartie d’un ensemble fini d’usages possibles… » See also pp. 37-38 ; Bourdieu 2001, 71, « La structure du champ, définie par la distribution
it in terms of initiating a fraction of a field. Secondly, because of the difficulties in tracing all of his public production (and also for the reasons given in Chapter 1.1.), my analysis of his pictorial works is specifically focused on Finnish acquisitions of his icons, and is related to other accessible icons in Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces. Forsberg’s icons in sacred spaces in Sweden are analyzed in Chapter 3.1., in as far as valid source materials were available. Thirdly, certain conceptual instruments are necessary for reading the characteristics and interrelations of the available works, which are also subject to ritual utilization and differing placements in the sacred space.

Accordingly, I intend to investigate the icons as source material in a four-dimensional framework in order to determine their structural properties and formal particularities. This will enable me to objectify the relationships of these pictorial objects as follows: 1) traditional Byzantine structural properties deriving from the Orthodox context (commonly accepted pictorial forms, technical and material solutions, Byzantine equivalences, questions of repetition and likeness); 2) earlier and contemporary Lutheran (and Catholic) structural properties in realizations of church art; 3) the placement of the icon within the hierarchy of the sacred space; 4) the ritual practices of utilizing these pictures (prayer, liturgy, symbolic gestures). The four dimensions are necessarily interrelated, as shown in Figure 2.

---

inégal du capital, c’est-à-dire des armes ou atouts spécifiques, pèse, en dehors même de toute interaction directe, intervention ou manipulation, sur l’ensemble des agents, restreignant plus ou moins l’espace des possibles qui leur est ouvert selon qu’ils sont plus ou moins bien placés dans le champ, c’est-à-dire dans cette distribution. » On previous production and the space of possibilities, see Bourdieu 1998a, 384-387. See ch. 1.2.
Placement in the hierarchy of the space

The Byzantine Orthodox Icon tradition

THE ICON

Trad. Lutheran representations of church art

Trad. Catholic representations of church art

Ritual practices in utilizing the images (also in accordance with the Liturgical Year)

Figure 2. A framework for analyzing contemporary icons in Lutheran sacred spaces

Figure 2. is a graphic representation of the four-dimensional framework for analyzing the accessible icons as source material. The dimensions are also interrelated in terms of the Byzantine and/or Western structural properties and formal particularities of these icons. As far as the potential relations between these categorized phenomena are concerned, the presentation is essentially hypothetical. Accordingly, some of the particularities may turn out to be nonexistent, or some unexpected relations and influences may become visible. (Moreover, the accessible source material may not reveal all of the characteristics referred to). Given the placement of the icons in the sacred space, presumably not only are they defined according to their place in the hierarchy, they also contribute to the definition and shaping of the space. Likewise, the ritual practices may characterize the icon and, in turn, its formal particularities may enhance the practices. Moreover, the observable placements and practices most likely correlate with one another in the hierarchy of the space. I should emphasize that the Eastern and Western traditions of church art should not be regarded as absolute counterparts in every respect, but rather seen as traditions with shared origins, common elements, and influences perforating religious-cultural structures.106 Finally, the analysis of the pictorial objects as complex visual structures should also require extensive semiotic analysis in terms of their iconic, indexical and symbolic elements, for example.107 However, given the main emphasis on the art-sociological perspective of this study, any such efforts must be curtailed in anticipation of further investigation in the future.

This entire undertaking is, of course, far too extensive to be analyzed here in its totality, given the number of accessible works and their numerous details, but still my aim is to commence the task by characterizing particular, selected structures that clearly define Forsbergian works in accordance with the chosen methodical solution. Moreover, any definitively esthetical or analogous evaluations of the author are intentionally set aside, and the esthetic aspects are considered solely as part of the various agents’ dispositions (Chapters 2. and 4.). Formative social structures are scrutinized in relation to Forsbergian icon production especially in Chapter 4.

106 See e.g. Honour & Fleming 1982, 218-251.
107 See e.g. Peirce & Welby 1977, 22-36.
2. Attempts at a Field Constitution

2.1. Educational, Social, and Religious Capital in the Trajectory Formation of the Agent

« La transformation des instruments de production artistique précède nécessairement la transformation des instruments de perception artistique et la transformation des modes de perception ne peut s’opérer que lentement puisqu’il s’agit de déraciner un type de compétence artistique (produit de l’intériorisation d’un code social, si profondément inscrit dans les habitudes et les mémoires qu’il fonctionne au niveau inconscient) pour lui en substituer un autre, par un nouveau processus d’intériorisation, nécessairement long et difficile. »

One of the aspects that influenced the formation of the Forsberg’s trajectory was the educational capital\(^\text{109}\) that has functioned as a means of consecration,\(^\text{110}\) when his studies were publicly presented as qualifications for painting and teaching activities, which was still a novelty in Scandinavia in the early 1970s.\(^\text{111}\) The crucial importance of educational capital is obvious: it could be seen as the basis of preliminary endeavors, and as a necessary factor enabling him to expand his areas of influence. It consecrates his work as a painting teacher or lecturer.\(^\text{112}\) These activities are not only the practical application of his acquired educational capital, however, but also a means of propagating the theological-ideological dispositions of Forsberg, which also promote the sales\(^\text{113}\) of his works. Interestingly, the form of educational capital acquired by him is a triangular combination of academic theological studies at the University of Helsinki before 1970, art-history studies at the University of Uppsala in 1972(?) -1974, and icon-painting studies in Myllyjärvi, Espoo, in 1965 (or 1966?) -1970.\(^\text{114}\)

\(^{108}\) Bourdieu & Darbel & Schnapper 1969, 78.

\(^{109}\) Bourdieu 1979, 21-22, « …le capital scolaire : ce capital est en effet le produit garanti des effets cumulés de la transmission culturelle assurée par la famille et de la transmission culturelle assurée par l’école… » E.g. also p. 12, 88.

\(^{110}\) On the concept of consecration and the power to consecrate, see e.g. Bourdieu 1993, 76-77, 121-122; Bourdieu 1998a, 375-377.

\(^{111}\) As an example, see the the unidentified newspaper article article, “Ikonmåleriet har lett vidare”, no title, from about 1975? By M.T. See also Kyrkpressen, “Kreativiteten är Guds barns lek inför hans ansikte”, May 20, 1989 by Ulla Hannus; Göteborgs-posten, “En bild av Gud”, November 27, 1988 by Monnica Söderberg.

\(^{112}\) Interview I, 2000; see e.g. the unidentified newspaper article, “Ikonmåleriet får nytt liv Förrnarp kristna konsten”, September 4, 1975 by B-n; the unidentified newspaper article, “Ikmålaren lever och nu”, [1976?] by an unknown writer; Oskarshamns-Tidningen, “Full aktivitet på folkhögskolan”, July 11, 1989; Oskarshamns-Tidningen, “Ny Mariaikon till Kolbergakyrkan”, November 20, 2000 by Häkan Carlsson.

\(^{113}\) The promotional effect became clear in the acquisition of Forsberg’s work by Kumlinge church in Åland, for example, where connections made through his lecturing made it possible for him to implement an icon. Interview I, 2000; Interview IX, Kent Danielsson, 2001.

Forsberg’s academic studies, together with his status as a pastor and his previous contacts with the well-known icon painter Robert de Caluwé, have been made public in several newspaper articles defining the agent in the social space. He has also introduced himself to his the audiences by mentioning these forms of education: being taught by a well-known icon painter and teacher seems specifically to legitimize him as an icon painter in the public view and in his self-definition. All these forms of educational consecration differ in nature, but they are combined with dispositions suggesting coherence through religious interpretation, in other words through the agent’s disposition of developing an esthetic-theological-liturgical continuity in his studies.

Forsberg’s first academic degree was in theology from Helsinki University in 1970, his M.A. thesis comprising a practical theological analysis of several sermons and their lingual expressions. It would be easy to presume that his religious home and family heritage formed the dispositions that facilitated his choice of theological studies. He moved to Uppsala in 1972, using his credits from Helsinki as a basis for his studies for the degree of Master of Philosophy in Art History, which he completed in May 1974. He recalls that he prepared (as he later mentions in an interview) for his doctoral studies – which he could have embarked upon only after waiting a year. He clearly wished to combine theological and art-historical knowledge in his potential future studies although he has not yet realized his academic ambitions.

During the early stages of his academic trajectory, concurrently with his studies in theology and later in art history, Forsberg fostered some relations that were apparently unique and of special significance to him. They had an impact on the critical turning points of his trajectory, subsequently opening up opportunities to enter the world of contemporary

---

119 Forsberg 1970; Suomen teologit 1999, 118. Surprisingly, no information about Forsberg’s studies was available at the Uppsala Institute of Art History (Konstvetenskapliga Institutio- nen), but a certificate issued by the university verifies that he passed “the basic course AB 1” with 40 credits in “Konstvetenskap” with the 80 credits gained in theological studies at Helsinki University which qualified him for the “Filosofie kandidatexamen” (Master of Philosophy) in April 1975. Bevis Filosofie kandidatexamen April 8, 1975; cf. Larsson, e-mail March 23, 2001. Note also the delayed timing of his move to Sweden in Kyrkpressen, “Kreativitet är Guds barns lek inför hans ansikte”, May 18, 1989 by Ulla Hannus; Erävuori 1995, 49.
church art production, obviously shaping his habitus, and providing connections that have crucially formulated dispositions, and also created some of the social capital\textsuperscript{120} that later became significant.

Through his role as an occasional interpreter, Forsberg was connected “sometime in the 1960s” with an agent, Tuve Nyström, who visited Helsinki. Since 1969 he has been an artistic leader and consultant and in the 1970s became Superintendent of the Cultural Institute of the Church of Sweden.\textsuperscript{121} (According to Forsberg, Tuve Nyström was already Superintendent of the Swedish Church Cultural Institute, Svenska Kyrkans kulturinstitut, at the time of his Helsinki visit.)\textsuperscript{122} It is obvious that in this encounter certain important dispositions were shared and implemented. Forsberg remembers that they were both interested in Olof Hartman’s theological thinking (“Olof Hartman is perhaps the greatest Swedish theologian in the 20th century – in my opinion – and he had somehow learned quite a lot about icons, and Tuve was influenced by him…”) and shared a common interest in “church drama”. (“And Tuve Nyström was above all the father of liturgical drama in Sweden.”) Importantly, according to Forsberg, Nyström, in particular, “…wanted to study icon art in Finland.”\textsuperscript{123}

It was probably also through the ideas and influences transmitted by Tuve Nyström as a Swedish cultural and religious agent that the icon came to be comprehended as (contemporary) art for the first time. Meeting him obviously aroused Forsberg’s interest, and contributed to the new religious and cultural disposition of “re-produced” or “newly-produced” icons, “nyproducerade ikoner”, the very expression used by Forsberg in the interview. His duty as a translator also offered Forsberg the opportunity of seeing an icon of the Mother of God of Konevitsa,\textsuperscript{124} painted by de Caluwé, and another work.\textsuperscript{125} Before

\textsuperscript{120} See e.g. Bourdieu 1979, 133, « …un capital social, capital de relation mondaines qui peuvent, le cas échéant, fournir d’utiles « appuis », capital d’honorabilité et de respectabilité qui est souvent indispensable pour s’attirer ou s’assurer la confiance de la bonne société et, par la, sa clientèle, et qui peut se monnayer par exemple dans une carrière politique. »; Bourdieu 1993, 68.

\textsuperscript{121} Interview I, 2000; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1965, 166; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1966, 159; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1967, 51, 129; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1968, 128; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1969, 103; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1970, 122.

\textsuperscript{122} Interview I, 2000; cf. Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1965, 166; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1966, 159; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1967, 51, 129; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1968, 128. Accordingly, Nyström was not at the time superintendent of the Institute founded in 1964. The director T. Nyström is mentioned for the first time as “artistic leader” of the Institute in Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1969, 103. In Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1970, 122, and further in Årsbok 1972, Nyström’s title is “consultant, artistic activities”, and from 1973 to 1978; “superintendent, artistic activities”.

\textsuperscript{123} Interview I, 2000. See also Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1965, 166; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1966, 159; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1967, 51, 129; Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1968, 128. Accordingly, the Institute was founded in 1964 and Olof Hartman is mentioned as a member of the Board. On Pastor Olov Hartman Th.D. H.C. (b. May 6, 1907) and his large literary production, see Hylander 1971, 28; Sandin 1986/87, 406-407. Forsberg’s respect for Hartman’s theology on the incarnation is also manifest in Interview II, 2000, Forsberg’s lecture in Gothenburg. On Hartman’s “church dramatics”, see Kotimaan, “Church dramatics”, “Kirko-vaatelmat – totuuden hekti”, August 7, 1970 p. 4 by Irja Lipsinen-Foss.

\textsuperscript{124} The historical icon of the Mother of God of Konevitsa could probably be regarded as the single most significant item within the Finnish Orthodox religious and cultural realm. The icon itself is considered a miraculous object with several stories and legends related to it. It also signifies the national and Karelian, Orthodox heritage. On the history and utilization of the icon, see Jääskinen 1971, 44-84; and Raivo 1997, 262-267, “The Konevitsa icon became the symbol of the Church living in the diaspora. The Acheiropoie-
It is also evident that his limited economic resources as a student limited the options available to Forsberg. He was interested in the subject and wanted to own an icon, but had no real chance of buying one. Then, in 1965 or 1966, he heard of an ecumenical center that had recently been founded at Myllyjärvi, Espoo, by Father Robert de Caluwé, whom Forsberg remembers as easy to approach and as a positive advisor. It took about five years for him to get into icon painting and, interestingly, as he said later, he originally had no real intention of becoming an icon painter. The home page of the Center states that it was founded in 1964, but according to Vaajakallio, it had previously operated in Rekola, Vantaa, where five art students met with de Caluwé in 1962. The meeting resulted in three of them becoming his students in icon painting. Forsberg was clearly not among his very first students.

Furthermore, it is evident, that it was de Caluwé as his mentor and educator who gave Forsberg the basic skills needed for the traditional painting process; the special dispositions and capabilities of the activity together with its basic ideological context (the Bourdieuian illusion typical of the activity). Because of his long-standing influence as a promoter and reviver of the tempera technique in icon painting, de Caluwé was evidently regarded as an agent with sufficient religious and cultural capital, and therefore fitting in the Bourdieuian sense to consecrate students such as Forsberg, offering them the opportunity of joining the activity.130

126 Interview I, 2000, “Så det var faktiskt en ärkeängel. Den var gjord av en finsk ortodox, vad hette hon? Marjaana… i alla fall hon tillhörde den... Men hon hade börjat på 60-talet som hon målade den…”  
127 Interview I, 2000, “…Där hade pater Robert då överträffat sig själv…”  
130 Interview I, 2001; Interview VI, 2001; E.g. Lönneby & Werkström 1984, 5-6.
Significantly, it was through these agents operating in their then current positions as intermediaries of religious and cultural influences and capitals that Forsberg became connected to the larger structures they made accessible: the realm of the Swedish Church and the Byzantine religious culture in the form of Uniat Catholicism. These relations were of crucial importance not only at the very beginning of his trajectory, but also later in 1974 when it was a question of his career. With the few options available to him, according to his narrative, once more the contacts and intermediary position of Tuve Nyström made it possible for him to become a teacher of icon painting, among other subjects, at the Oskarshamn Christian folk high school. At this special turning-point on the trajectory, it was the head of the school with his invitation and his interest in improving and developing the status and influence of the school by adding new subjects to the curriculum that made the choice possible.

With Tuve Nyström acting as intermediary, the school principle Stig Franzén offered Forsberg a job as a teacher in Oskarshamn in Southern Sweden, at the Vexsjö stifts folkhögskola Christian folk high school from the beginning of 1974. He was employed in 1974-75 as a part-time teacher with 17 hours a week, and as a subject teacher from 1975 to 1978, with 19.5, 22 and 12 hours respectively in the three years. He had only six hours in 1978-1979. He taught not only icon painting but also a large range of other subjects, such as Color and Form, Anatomy, Art Psychology, Art History, and Symbols of the Church. His icon-painting instruction included Icon Art and its History, Icon Painting, Icon Painting and the History of Icons, and Study Circles in icon painting. The idea was to create for a school giving general education (with no authorization to award degrees in art) a line of instruction providing incentives to study church art. Courses in church art started in 1977, and in this context Forsberg was mentioned as a teacher of icon painting. He was also member in a team of nine teachers representing various sectors of art education, including ceramics, textiles, sculpturing, painting, and religion. This suggests that, in the long run, icon painting was probably not accepted as the only form of church art to be promoted.


132 Interview I, 2000; Franzén & Thunberg [no year given], 29-40.

Figure 3. The Social and educational relations that influenced Forsberg’s early trajectory

As part of his educational capital, it is not only Forsberg’s various studies that have given form to his positions in the social space, his teaching activities have also marked the transformation of the consecrated into one that consecrates, that is to say, the agent has put into practice his acquired educational capital, thus becoming a producer capable of that action with enough capital that is suitable for the purpose. This transformation started at Oskarshamn, where his position as a teacher made it possible for him to perform as both a consecrated and a consecrating producer. It also provided him with audiences and general acknowledgement, at least to some extent, and it evidently meant increasing coverage in the printed media and, when he began lecturing, outside of the school environment. Complementing his teaching activities initiated at Oskarshamn, he gave annual summer courses in
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137 The power to consecrate, e.g., Bourdieu 1993, 42, 75, “For the author, the critic, the art dealer, the publisher or the theatre manager, the only legitimate accumulation consists in making a name for oneself, a known, recognized name, a capital of consecration implying a power to consecrate objects (with a trademark or signature) or persons (through publication, exhibition, etc.) and therefore to give value, and to appropriate the profits from this operation.” See also p. 121. « Le pouvoir de consécration » e.g. Bourdieu 1991b, 13.
138 E.g., the unidentified newspaper article, “Ikonmåleriet får nytt liv Fönnyrar kristna konsten”, September 4, 1975 by B-n, “… Men vid sidan av undervisningen fortsätter han själv att måla ikoner. Han behöver inte
icon painting until 1995, and continued with a monthly group of painting pupils in Gothenburg, which is close to rural Mölnlycke, where he moved in 1976. Although the move was later described as a sudden change, it evidently signified a gradual leave-taking from the Oskarshamn School, which he nevertheless continued to visit and where he gave summer courses. Evidently, the move to Mölnlycke meant drawing away from his more or less regular educational commitments at the folk high school, and probably also brought more independence, which could also be interpreted as the desire for increasing autonomy. Under certain conditions, isolation could well be considered a means of reversed social self-production and, as such, with certain dispositions, could signify the capability of increasing resources and influences.

Figure 4. A graphic presentation of the agent’s trajectory

Education: theology, art history: Master of Theology (Helsinki) / Master of Philosophy (Uppsala)

Figure 4. Is a simplified graphic representation of certain essential educational relations and crucial points of Forsberg the agent’s trajectory. The data are based on interviews with him, a brief biography, and some other source material and literature. The trajectory comprises a combination of different types of capital – academic-educational, social, religious, and educational in the sense of capital accrued through different relations and discourses. It is noteworthy that the suggested elements of the trajectory, although developed in the two neighboring countries in several cases were realized in southern Sweden, where most of his painting activities have been carried out. A key determinant of the trajectory was his first big official order for the Deisis Group for the church of the Laurentius-Stiftelse in Lund in 1978, publicly praised by Per Beskow, Th.D. (Docent) in 1981. The acquisition was an idea developed, promoted, and partially actualized by Bengt Holmberg as the then föreståndare, or manager, of the organization, together with other agents forming the council. The council also called upon two experts to evaluate the artistic merit of the intended works. From the late 1970s until today the trajectory has been in an upwards direction, given the demand for his icons: the flow of orders, which started at Oskarshamn, has gone on. Forsberg was awarded “Göteborgssamfällighetens kulturstipendium”, a local church award for his work for Christian culture, in 1992. Equally noteworthy was the positive publicity his works were given when Jonsered’s Franciscan monastery received a local architectural award. Finally, it would be tempting to relate the pictorial materials of Appendix 6.1. and the accessible, associated newspaper articles to the figure, but their fragmented and sample-like nature makes their utilization questionable. However, it is clear that the elements of religious, educational, and social capital accumulated by the producer were supplemented by the elements provided by the written media and local observers, the “consumers” of the works in different parishes.
vara arbetslös. Det droppar ständigt in beställningar. – Jag har åtminstone beställningsarbeten för ett år framåt, berättar Erland Forsberg;

Göteborgsposten, "Måla ikoner ett kall" December 5, 1980 by Karin Teghammer; the unidentified newspaper article, "Ikonmålare för och nu", [datum before 1979, writer unknown]; Vasabladet, "Evinnerligen sitter den där", October 26, 1986 by Pelle Kevin; Vasabladet, "I morgon invigs Alskat ikonerna", February 17, 1990 by an anonymous writer; the unidentified newspaper article, "Ikonmålaret har levtt vidare...", [pre-1979] by M.T., "Kring ikonens teologi och måleri kommer den finländske prästen och ikonmålaren Erland Forsberg att berätta nu på lördag eftermiddag i Dalarnas museum och på fredagskväll håller han samma föredrag på finska Hagaskyrkan i Borlänge. Han visar också hur han arbetar fram en ikon och talar om ideologin och tekniken kring ikonmålariet den här veckan i museets entréhall."


primarily a pastor who produces icons. The *hexis*,\(^{155}\) in other words the appearance, behavior (his somewhat relaxed and interested demeanor), and all the concomitant bodily and material expression of the agent implies the influential mental image of a religiously consecrated producer operating with consecrated pictorial religious objects.\(^{152}\) Obviously, the religious consecration of the agent in this case functions to enhance his position in the social space. It tends to increase the number of social contacts made available through the position, but also acts as a restriction. This is illustrated at a later stage.\(^{153}\)

Forsberg was ordained priest on June 1, 1970 by the Bishop of the Porvoo Swedish-language Diocese, and posted first to Helsinki (1970) and then to Espoo (1970-1971), where he worked in the parish of Kauniainen.\(^{154}\) His brief period as an active participant in the parish work of the Church, however, marked a beginning of a long-term position in the religious field. The consecration he received through and in the form of his ministry have him access to both Finnish and Swedish Lutheran religious practice. He has never given up his clerical status, and he remembers in the interview that it was parish work as a Finnish-speaking half-time immigrant pastor in Enköping, Sweden that made the move

---


\(^{146}\) See Holmberg, e-mail January 2, 2004.


\(^{148}\) See Fogelklou, e-mail June 1, 2001. The award was divided between two candidates. It was given to Forsberg for his “…traditionalist creative activity in icon painting aimed at the renewal of church interiors.” See also Stiftskrönikan, “Gudsmysteriets uttryck: Ikoner”, March 26, 1993 by Ann-Mari Fagerlund-Wiberg.

\(^{149}\) Göteborgs-Posten, “Kloster fick pris”, December 18, 1990 by Ingrid Wirsin.

\(^{150}\) At least 40 newspaper articles and/or pictures were published in various places in 1975-2001 concerning Forsberg’s different activities or the use of his paintings as decoration. Some of the pictures or articles appeared in minor local or parish publications, but many were published in newspapers with a big circulation. See Sources and Bibliography 7.1.2.2.

\(^{151}\) See Bourdieu 1998a, 552, “…Tout se passe comme si les conditionnements sociaux attachés à une condition sociale tendaient à inscrire le rapport au monde social dans un rapport durable et généralisé au corps propre, une manière de tenir son corps, de le présenter aux autres, de le mouvoir, de lui faire une place, qui donne au corps sa physionomie sociale. Dimension fondamentale du sens de l’orientation sociale, l’hexis corporelle est une manière pratique d’égouverner et d’exprimer le sens que l’on a, comme on dit, de sa propre valeur sociale… …la place que l’on occupe avec son corps dans l’espace physique… …et avec sa parole dans le temps…”

\(^{152}\) On the ecclesiastical expressions in the hexis, see Interview II, 2000, lecture in Gothenburg; the video recorded during a Mass, including the rite of consecrating an icon on December 17, 2000, St. Olaf church in Falköping; as an example of the various newspaper articles, see Hallands Nyheter, “Altarskåp invigt”, April 12, 1983 by an unknown writer; Sala-Allehanda, “Nya ikoner invigdes i Västerfärnebo kyrka”, May 21, 1997 by Arne Antonsson.

\(^{153}\) See ch. 4.2.

to Uppsala and his studies there financially easier. Interestingly, in both Finland and Sweden he experienced being a pastor in the service of the lingual minority (paradoxically, both Swedish- and Finnish-speaking minorities). Evidently, the lingual-cultural heritage of his family, the educational capital gained in his Swedish-language high school and the mainly Finnish-speaking university environment in Helsinki all contributed to this option.

156 Suomen teologit 1999, 118.

Picture 1a. Russian Orthodox manifestations or a tourist’s view of Russia with pertinent paraphernalia? Note that Forsberg is introduced as a Finnish pastor.

Forsberg interviewed for an unidentified newspaper published (in Oskarshamn, Sweden?) September 4, 1975 pp. 4- by B-n. Photograph by Håkan Rying.
2.2. Way of Life: Artistic and Religious Dispositions as Constructive Components of the Agent’s Habitus

Forberg’s way of life, especially after 1976, embodies special modern adaptations of the icon-painting tradition understood as the primarily ascetic way of life prevalent in twentieth-century Orthodox thinking.

One could, for example, refer to the laconic and idealized ideas expressed by Ouspensky: “The artist lived and thought in images and reduced forms to the limits of simplicity, the depth of whose inner content is accessible only to the spiritual eye. He cleansed his work of everything personal and remained anonymous; his essential concern was to transmit tradition.” “Only those who know from personal experience the state it [the icon] portrays can create images corresponding to it which are truly ‘a revelation and evidence of things hidden’, in other words, evidence of man’s participation in the life of the transfigured world he contemplates… …Only such an image can be authentic and convincing and can thus show us the way and direct us to God. No artistic fantasy, no perfection of tech-
Picture 2a. Painting pupil of Forsberg’s at work in Oskarshamn, Sweden. Note the text “…perhaps the most prominent icon painter in Sweden”.


Picture 2b. Painting pupil of Forsberg’s in Oskarshamn.

Oskarshamns Mönsterås Högsby Hultsfred Vimmerby Nyheterna September 13, 1977 by Håkan Isefjord. Front page picture, photographer unknown.
Picture 3a. Forsberg working in his atelier. The text suggests that icon painting had its origins in the catacombs.


Picture 3b. Forsberg painting the Ascension.

According to Ouspensky, the necessity of belonging to the Orthodox Church remains a condition for genuine icon painting and the true meaning of the ascetic life: “...Hence the necessity for continual participation in the sacramental life of the Church; hence also the moral demands the Church makes of iconographers. For a true iconographer, creation is a way of asceticism and prayer, that is essentially a monastic way.”

The humble, ascetic, and anonymous way of life as an ideal for icon painters is also advocated by Bishop Aleksi by his instructions for modern icon painters. “The icon painter of earlier times prepared himself in the struggle for self-negation... Persons who paint icons today should also have this basic approach, albeit the conditions and the time are not the same.”

Interestingly, the multitude of legends and stories presented by Aune

---

157 Ouspensky 1952, 29, 42-43.
158 Ouspensky 1952, 43.
159 “Entisajan ikonimaalari valmistui itsensäkieltämisen kilvoituksessan... Tämä perusasenne pitäisi olla tämänkin päivän ikoneja maalaavilla henkilöillä, vaikka olosuhteet ja aika eivät ole samat...” Piispa Aleksi 1980.
Picture 4. Forsberg presented in Svenska Kyrkans Tidning as “minister/pastor”, and “the most prominent icon painter in Sweden”, in the context of the celebration “A Thousand Years of the Orthodox Church”, non-Orthodox icon producer as the representative of the Eastern Church. Forsberg’s pose shows his relaxed, familiar, and homely attitude to the sacred image (the Ascension). Photograph by Christer Hallgren.
Jääskinen\textsuperscript{160} in “Ikonimaalari uskon ja mystiikan tulkki” (“The icon painter – the voice of faith and mysticism”),\textsuperscript{161} could also be understood as reiterating the very same ideals. A more extensive presentation of the subject, with historical referrals, is available in Florensky’s posthumously published “Iconostasis”\textsuperscript{162}

Isolation in a relative sense is evident in Forsberg’s rural living, although his recent move closer to Benareby village has slightly reduced it. There have been efforts in the printed media to interpret an isolated life in the woods as an internal part of the close-to-nature way of life of an icon painter.\textsuperscript{163} The central inclination towards a simple life and prayer\textsuperscript{164} is closely linked to the idea of withdrawal, but when speaking in public about personal prayer, Forsberg reaches beyond his entirely personal religious circle and publicly defines himself as a dedicated religious painter.\textsuperscript{165} Certainly, this is the opposite of, or supplementary to, a solely esthetic interest in icons. Striving for the simple life and being continuously linked to the prayer tradition and limited withdrawal manifest a disposition and part of a hexis understood by him as belonging to the genuine liturgical tradition, to be realized as a modern re-interpretation according to which one defines oneself as a truly represented, genuinely religious icon painter.\textsuperscript{166} To some extent, the use of the concept “apatheia” forms a connection with the Orthodox ascetic tradition and, in dialogue, Forsberg expressed it as a suitable goal for a painter of icons.\textsuperscript{167} The idea of anonymity, comparable to social withdrawal, is also important to this producer, who never signs his icons and regards them, after they have been religiously consecrated, not as his works – but as true icons.\textsuperscript{168} These withdrawal strategies could be seen as an internal part of the Orthodox icon tradition, and also as successful coping strategies given the paradoxically increasing public interest in Forsberg the agent in contemporary society.

\textsuperscript{160} On Jääskinen’s multiple activities, influence, etc. see the presentation in ch. 4.1.
\textsuperscript{161} Jääskinen 1984.
\textsuperscript{162} Florensky 1996 (1922), 70-98.
\textsuperscript{164} Forsberg uses the (Swedish Lutheran) breviary in his prayers, but he is also familiar with the tradition of the Prayer of Jesus and occasionally also uses it. Interview I, 2000; Stiftskronikan, “Gudsmysteriets uttryck: Ikoner”, March 26, 1993 by Ann-Mari Fagerlund-Wiberg.
\textsuperscript{166} Interview I, 2000.
\textsuperscript{167} See the brief allusion to the conversation in Interview I, 2000. A traditional Orthodox definition of the apatheia concept is presented e.g., in Arseni 1999, 104.
\textsuperscript{168} Interview I, 2000; Göteborgs-Posten, “En bild av Gud”, November 27, 1988 by Monnica Söderberg. On the idea of anonymity, see e.g., Pennanen 1987, 42; Jääskinen 1997, 11-12.
The paradoxical nature of withdrawal is nevertheless manifest in his life, and not only in his everyday family life but also in his lecturing and teaching, and his guiding of a multiconfessional group of icon painters. These educational activities form an internal part, a network of social relations, of his way of life as a publicly known icon painter, which, of course, could not exist without an audience consisting of pupils and buyers of his works. The relevance and paradoxicality of the withdrawal are also apparent in the printed media, in which isolation inevitably becomes public isolation, an exotic lifestyle to be peered at, and it marks the extraordinary nature of a “profession” that is rather unusual in the contemporary Scandinavian society: a religious and mystified lifestyle. Very probably, the strategy works in paradoxical ways: it tacitly attracts attention and positive recognition. Together, these aspects define something of the “natural” lifestyle that is necessary and functional in the ongoing struggle to gain access to cultural and religious capital in the fields of both artistic and esthetic culture, church life, and religious movements.

As mentioned earlier, several Orthodox sources have repeatedly presented in public the very ideals of the true icon painter, thus reiterating the dispositions integral to the shared doxa and, furthermore, maintaining and reproducing the doxa in its religious field. Interestingly, the ideal seems to prevail even if agents’ social conditions and contextual relations have changed. Obviously, these mental dispositions characterize ideals that are clearly unattainable for most contemporary icon painters, but which are nevertheless crucially important because they are understood as dogmatic and unchangeable parts of the tradition: the coherent totality defining the way of life of those producing true icons. Hence, mental structures of the dogma are maintained as guidelines for the practice and, additionally, embodied in social life.

2.3. Forsberg’s Literary Position-Takings and Dispositions in Public Debate

Forsberg’s position-takings and dispositions, publicly presented in the printed media and in his lectures, reveal his struggle for the formalization of practices and ideological interpretations within the sphere of church art. This struggle or polemic becomes transparent in its motivation in the statement that contemporary Swedish Lutheran church art

---

169 Forsberg’s cordial recognition of the significance of his family is evident in Interview I, 2000. Concerning the financial implications of working as a full-time icon painter he emphasized the significance his wife’s position in business life.

170 Interview I, 2000; Interview II, 2000, lecture in Gothenburg; Sala-Allehanda, “Förebilder i Roms katakomben”, May 21, 1997 by Arne Antonsson.

171 Interview II, 2000, the author’s observation (icon painting group).

172 That the agent has been publicly acknowledged from the 1970s until the present day becomes evident when a look is taken at the sources presenting all the newspaper articles and some other minor published writings referred to in the present study – together about 40 writings – from 1975 until 2000 in both Sweden and (to a minor extent) Finland.

173 Of the published writings on Forsberg and his production and influences that were found for and used in this study, only a few provide deeper and more specific information about the dispositions of the painter. In the following, I center my analysis on the writings of the agent himself and on some of the more extensive published interviews with valid and extensive content.

174 Interview I, 2000; Interview II, 2000, lecture in Gothenburg.
has largely lost its mission and its message. Even in the 1970s, while teaching at Oskarshamn, in an interview for a local newspaper, he emphasized the role of icon art as the foundation of all Christian art, and the need for Christian schooling in art, thus clearly aiming to generate alternatives to the prevalent ecclesiastical art, and also to enhance his own influence. He defined the Renaissance as a break in the Western tradition, while claiming that the Byzantine side of Christianity, Greek Orthodoxy, had kept the tradition alive. Strikingly, he posed for a photograph with icons, a hanging oil-lamp, and a samovar on the table. The first impression the picture gives is that of the tourist’s view of Russia, with the paraphernalia that advertisers employed within as well as outside of the USSR at that time.

The gently and amicably presented idea of the collapse of the Western church art tradition could be considered revivalist Byzantine, and even faintly echoes some tenets of art history. Thus, surprisingly, in this case, Forsberg the agent who presents such statements is a Lutheran teacher and pastor, a Scandinavian Lutheran of the modernist epoch in whose habitus earlier contradictory elements of religious culture are obviously combined, and who thus is able to transmit influences originating from the Orthodox form of religion to Lutheranism. However, this is not the first time that these contradictory elements, religious and cultural stakes, have been in evidence. As Kotkavaara has shown, earlier “French Catholic modernists” were also able to merge Byzantine visual elements into their religious and artistic interests.

An article written for the Yearbook of the Gothenburg Diocese in 1991 combines the ideas expressed in Forsberg’s later statements on the re-produced icon with more in-depth scrutiny. The Yearbook comprises essays on art and Christianity, and his statements give shape to a more multifaceted whole, in which the value and meaning of contemporary art in expressing disharmony is also recognized as meaningful in itself. However, he sees icon art (ikonkonsten) as a positive reaction essentially against the hopelessness of modernism. He depicts the dogmatic side so obviously manifest to him in Byzantine art as precious stones (värdefulla ädelstenar) full of inspiration. The classic connections between beau-
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176 The unidentified newspaper article, “Ikonmålareit får nytt liv Förnyar kristna konsten”, September 4, 1975 by B-n.
177 The unidentified newspaper article, “Ikonmålareit får nytt liv Förnyar kristna konsten”, September 4, 1975 by B-n, the 2nd photograph of the article.
178 See e.g., Ouspensky 1952, 49; Ouspensky 1979, footnote 63 on pp. 123-124: “…Toisin sanoen katolisuuden perusolemuksen tilalle tulee henkilökohtaisuuden, omaltautisuuden kultti, jommoisesta äärimäisenä esimerkkinä on äskettäin maalattu roomalaiskatolinen Assynt kirkko Ranskassa.” See also Florensky’s evaluation in the 1920s in Florensky 1996 (1922), 67, “From the Renaissance on, the religious art of the West has been based upon esthetic delusion.”, 101 “For in the Renaissance, the Roman Church survived a very grave illness wherein it gained certain immunities but suffered immense losses… the distortion of the whole of spiritual life… and all of modern Western European culture derives precisely from this post-Renaissance Catholicism.”
179 E.g., according to Jane Dillenberger, “From the death of Rembrandt in 1669 until the twentieth century a hiatus occurs in the creation of religious art.” Dillenberger 1986, 200.
180 On the former Protestant rejection of Orthodox church art and the change in its appreciation, see Michalski 1993, 166.
181 See Kotkavaara 1999, 244-251.
ty, goodness, and truth are also actualized (basically in a Platonic way182), and represent to
this writer the unity between ethics and esthetics. In his definition of the tradition – as
original and Old Church – he omits certain elements that are typical of Orthodox thinking.
The icon is explained as a sign of hope, a counter-image (motbild), presentation of beauty,
harmony and holiness, a manifestation of the Christian Faith: for “Ikonerna vill begrunda,
aktualisera och levandegöra det som alltid varit centralt i kyrkans lära…” (“Icons strive
to meditate upon, actualize, and give life to that which has always been pivotal in the
dogma of the Church…”).183

Obviously, these conclusions strongly correlate with the definition of Christian images as
expressed by Martin Luther by in his well-known words “…as a witness, for remem-
brance, as a sign…” (“…zum Ansehen, zum Zeugnis, zum Gedächtnis, zum Zeichen…”),
implying that Forsberg, in all probability, has internalized the value and purpose of the icon
tradition in a Lutheran sense despite the fact that they are expressed in an Eastern formula
and terms and thus represent a synthesis shaped in a habitus relevant to the peripheral
areas of religion and culture. Although the Lutheran and Orthodox doctrinal definitions
of religious images may not be fundamental opposites in every respect185 there are certain
differing perspectives as far as Forsberg’s position-takings are concerned. Compared
with the Orthodox definitions, the difference seems to lie specifically in the lack of the
miraculous – the power of the Grace of God present in icons in the same way as in holy
relics – and in the absence of the idea of the original image correlated with its earthly
representation.186

The neo-Platonic idea187 of a correspondence between the original image and its represent-
ative is rarely mentioned in connection with Forsberg: one example is an article in “Kyr-
kans Tidning” (The Church Magazine) entitled “A Thousand Years of the Orthodox Church”,

182 Interestingly, regarding the idea of matter as a lower principle of being, Forsberg expressed certain
sharp criticism of the Platonist philosophical tradition in Interview I, 2000.
183 Forsberg 1991, 58-62. His thinking in the 1990s (especially the polemics on modernist church art) is
evident in an embryonic form in some of the published interviews from the 1980s. See e.g. Svenska
Dagbladet, “En bra ikon skall man kunna titta på två timmar varje dag”, February 4, 1983 by Emily von
Sydow; Svenska Kyrkans Tidning, “Hoppets och ljusets bilder”, May 26, 1988 by Agneta Rudvall. Note
especially the rejection of both romantic sentimental (Den tidigare sentimentalta bilden) religious art and
brutal modernist expression (“Det finns en brutalitet i den moderna kyrkokonsten…”), both of which
should make room for the objective art of the icon with its “…rena linjor och mjuka färger och former…”
(“…pure lines and soft colors and shapes”), Kyrkpressen, “Kreativitet är Guds barns lek inför hans
ansikte”, May 18, 1989 by Ulla Hannus.
184 WA 18, 80; LW 40, 96. See also Rombold 1988, 43.
185 See the following examples in this chapter about the contemporary Scandinavian Lutheran discussion
on the significance of religious images, particularly in view of Luther’s theological thinking.
186 St. John Damascene [Johannes Damaskolainen] 1986, First speech, e.g., chs 9 and 19. See also St. John
241, “…They invite a face-to-face meeting with the holy persons depicted. And devotion was paid to such
icons as if they were themselves holy relics.” See also Collinder 1982, 36; Schmemann 1994, 147-148;
Florensky 1996, 65-74; Bergmann 2003, 44-45, 96. On man itself as the image of the Divine Archetype see
187 See e.g., Bjerg 1999, 77, 99, “Johannes [i.e. St. John Damascene] derimod udviklede i (aristotelisk og)
nyplatonsk ånd – han henviser til Dionysius Areopagita – en teologisk lære om at der ‘i Gud [er] billeder og
modeller af hans kommende handlinger’”. Meningen må være, at billederne i Gud er prototyper. En proto-
published on May 26, 1988, in which it is referred to in the Swedish words “avbild – urbild”. These expressions may even have been chosen by the reporter.

The theology of Martin Luther and its interpretations in contemporary Scandinavia in the light of Byzantine-Orthodox ideas require that certain conditions and requisitions be referred in order to clarify some of the complexity of the relations between these traditions. Svend Bjerg, for example, in his Danish interpretation, explains Luther’s comprehension of the subject of religious imagery as a series of position-takings comprising the “traditional [Catholic] view on the images” (in 1519), theological reflection as opposed to the Catholic “false usage” of the religious image emphasizing the idea of devotional pictures as an “adiafora”, a question of free choice or rejection (in 1522) – and, finally, in the context of the correct understanding of the Sacrament of the Eucharist as God’s words “close alliance with the image” (“Ordet indgik her til syvende og sidst i en tæt alliance med billedet”) in 1525. Interestingly, according to Bjerg, Luther’s conclusion seems to have been to emphasize the Christian doctrinal aspect of the incarnation in comprehending the significance and meaning of the image. As Bjerg appropriately notes, this outcome is conjoint with Byzantine ideas about the icon.

Hence, any inflexible characterizations of traditional Orthodox and contemporary Lutheran ideas about the subject as opposing in every respect could be regarded as questionable. It is entirely conceivable that later Lutheran religious fields and subfields not only reproduced Luther’s different statements (also produced during different stages of a trajectory), but also remodeled the then functional, suitable and adequate Lutheran understanding of the significance and usage of religious imagery. Contemporary Finnish theological and art-historical discussion could be considered the local equivalent of these processes in its search for relevant Lutheran solutions and understanding of church art.
Given all these discourses, one has to take into account the effect of the field of consumption. Clearly, the acquirers of icons, theologians with an interest in ecclesiastical art and icon enthusiasts, all are able to contribute dispositions in public, and thus to shape the space of possible position-takings. Moreover, the effect of the religious and cultural realm as a totality forming the dispositions of all its agents is evident. The field and its structure of power contribute the language, and appear to its agents as obvious and self-evident realities; as possibles and impossibles that are immediately internalized as the comprehension of reality, in other words as a social and mental structured and structuring structure.\textsuperscript{193}

A few years later in 1993 Forsberg criticized modern church art in the same terms, in an even sharper tone. He suggested that modern church art had collapsed and reflected the spirit of the times in terms of “disintegration, chaos, and hopelessness”. Again, he paints this unflattering picture in a publication of the Gothenburg Diocese, in which he also criticizes postmodernism for being incapable of communicating “the message of the liturgy and of the Church”.\textsuperscript{194} Of course, this statement was intended for use among the workers of the Diocese – and, in all likelihood, it was also expressed in order to define the Forsberg’s position and status in the field of church activities.

These polemics are understandable in view of Forsberg’s desire to take in public the position of a genuine and true Old-Church traditionalist icon painter in the social fields accessible to him. It was a fight for recognition since, according to him, contemporary church art had failed in its mission. He attempted to create new standards, to turn the positive and negative poles, the power structure of the field of contemporary Lutheran church art production, upside-down by maintaining that it was the revived icon – and not the individualism, “chaos”, and “hopelessness” of modernist church art\textsuperscript{195} – that represented true Christian Art: the positive, the hopeful, and the age-old. He also claimed that the dogmatic content was valuable,\textsuperscript{196} hence underlining the literary and representative in the picture, the heteronym or lack of self-sufficiency of the nonfigurative and purely esthetic. Thus, with each statement he strove to co-constitute a fraction of a field of church art with its own illusion, its differing (i.e. reversed) power-relations and producers, markets, and audiences. Inevitably, inherent in these polemics is the potentiality of producing theological and artistic debate and action among the various, specifically religious and artistic, agents of contemporary Scandinavian Lutheranism, but they could also be comprehended as actions of striving to co-form the dispositions of the potential public and customers of Forsberg the producer and his peers. In other words, in this context, opposition also inevitably implied a shared illusion in regard to the newly produced revivalist icon as authentic church art. Thus the public literary message of Forsberg the agent included theological and artistic aspects addressed as formative dispositions for different audiences.

\textsuperscript{193} On the concepts and ideas, see e.g., Bourdieu 1979, 52, 55, 122, 230-231, 535-537.
\textsuperscript{195} See Forsberg 1991, 58-60. Critisim such as this had already appeared in Svenska Dagbladet, “En bra ikon skall man kunna titta på två timmar varje dag”, February 4, 1983 in Emily von Sydow’s interview; and in Göteborgs-Posten, “Erland drömmer om den perfekta ikonen”, June 23, 1993 by Kerstin Wallin.
Interestingly, and because of evident literary influences, Forsberg’s dispositions observable in this debate largely correlate with those expressed by Russian Orthodox icon painters and theorists living as emigrants in Paris. Evidently, in their context, it was expedient for these émigré Russians to present themselves as the true followers of the Russian Orthodox tradition. Certainly, it was a meaningful way to express their nostalgic longing for their lost homeland, and last but by no means least, it was important for them to create conceptual devices for self-legitimization as icon painters and theorists who liked to indulge in theological debate against degenerated Western religious thinking and church art in their new surroundings in Western metropolises. As Kotkavaara pointed out, this search for genuineness did not originate in an unchangeable tradition but was rather shaped in the process of emigration. How these attempts became characteristic of the new icon painting and its viewers within Nordic Lutheranism is a radical re-contextualization. I suggest that, in this new context, there was an effort to create a “partial revolution” in the practices of church art in the northern environment of the late 20th century; an attempt to challenge in an Ouspenskian, Losskian, and Evdokimovian manner modernist art in the sacred space; an endeavor to bring cultural capital of new quality to the battle for authenticity of the new form of church art. These efforts were by no means graciously accepted.

All in all, these dispositions would seem to reveal the actual core of the idea, the belief and the illusion typical of Protestant icon enthusiasts, for whom the central notion of the
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197 On Forsberg’s large icon library, see Göteborgs-Posten, “En bild av Gud”, November 27, 1988 by Monnica Söderberg, “Erland Forsberg lär ha det mest kompletta ikonbiblioteket i Sverige. Han ser lycklig ut då han talar om bokförd, resor och ikonutställningar…. …senast i Rom och London.”


199 Kotkavaara 1999, e.g. see the conclusion on pp. 342-344.

200 I.e. by presenting the Byzantine (pictorial) tradition as the true, significant, and original Christian expression. See e.g. ideas on subjectivity, artistic freedom, anonymity, and the meaning of technical capabilities in Ouspensky 1952, 43 “The iconographer transmits not his own ‘idea’ (νόημα), but a ‘description of what is contemplated’, that is factual knowledge, something seen if not by himself, by a trustworthy witness. … In order to receive and pass on the testimony, the iconographer must not only believe that it [the revealed truth] is genuine but must also share it in life, by which the witness of the revelation lived, must follow the same way, that is, be a member of the body of the Church.”… …“Although the beauty and content of an icon are perceived by each spectator subjectively, in accordance with his capacities, they are expressed by the iconographer objectively, through consciously surmounting his own ‘I’ and subjugating it to the revealed truth – the authority of the Tradition. The usual ‘I see it like that’, ‘I understand it like that’, is entirely excluded in this case. The iconographer works not for himself, not for his own glory, but the glory of God. Therefore an icon is never signed. The freedom of an iconographer consists not in an untrammelled expression of his personality, of his ‘I’, but in his ‘liberation from all passions and lusts of the world and the flesh’….”, p. 44 “An icon may be technically perfect but of a very slow spiritual level; and conversely, there are icons roughly and primitively painted which stand on a very high spiritual level.” See also Lossky 1967, 165-166, and Evdokimov’s extensive critique of esp. modern, Western art in Evdokimov 1996, 73-95, see also pp. 167-172. On Vladimir Lossky 1903-1958, and Paul (Pavel) Evdokimov 1901-1970, see Williams 2000, 531-532.

201 E.g. in Stengård 1984, 54-56 “…Än mindre är det en lycklig lösning att felplacera en stympad ikonostas utan de tre portarna platt längs österväggen…” “…Istället borde vi försöka hitta ett modernt konstnärligt sakralt språk, som talar direkt till vår egen tid…”
“undivided tradition” was not a matter of historical documentation. Although church history was used as a means of legitimization, it was not a matter of becoming a member of the Orthodox religious community, nor of the artistic expression of creative autonomy or skill, but something quite else: a disposition to define themselves as participants in the golden past of Old Christianity. It is a mental conceptual structure and, as such, a generated and generating principle combining theological and historical knowledge with artistic appreciation. Interestingly, this mental structure not only contributed to the polemics and efforts observable in the space of public (literary) position-takings, but also seemingly disposed the actual practices and, as becomes evident further on, the rules of entering the “game” (jeu) of the production as recognized in public.

2.4. The Structural Creation of Entrance and Consecration

His proposed role in the painting tradition defines Forsberg’s attempt to become a consecrated icon painter within Lutheranism and to bring new Byzantine pictorial forms and evaluations into Swedish and Finnish contemporary church art. It also, in a more profound way, defines his position of producer as part of an unbroken tradition – a conceptual creation originating in the Russian intelligentsia in exile, as Kotkavaara has shown in his studies. It would appear that the structure of discipleship is a guarantee of belonging to the tradition, in other words of being a legitimate participant in revivalist Byzantine icon production. When Forsberg’s teacher, Uniat Father de Caluwé, is understood as the

---


203 See e.g. Interview II, 2000, Forsberg’s lecture in Gothenburg, December 16, 2000.


205 Kotkavaara 1999, 245-253, “It has already been mentioned, that the 1952 edition of The Meaning of Icons contains four reproductions of new works. By bringing up this modern output Uspenskij may in fact have induced some readers to entertain the romantic idea that in Paris there were émigrés who represented a hallowed, thousand-year-old succession of anonymous masters…” p. 245.

inheritor of a tradition carried on by the Old Belief Confessors Gavriil Frolóv\textsuperscript{207} and Pimen Sofronov,\textsuperscript{208} it is evident that the chain, or more precisely the disposition, the mental and ideal structure of certain agents is under construction and moving towards consecration through the Old Belief Confessors, the keepers of the original tradition. It proceeds to the Uniat Father and on to the Lutheran Erland Forsberg, to Kjellaug Nordsjö,\textsuperscript{209} and to Lars Gerdmar,\textsuperscript{210} who uses Forsberg’s name as a means of legitimization.\textsuperscript{211}

Of course, this actual succession – a chain of names marking the presumed transmittal of the tradition from master to pupil,\textsuperscript{212} would seem to be an ideal Protestant creation of belonging, through time shared in teaching and being taught, to the ancient chain. It may be that no special continuity can be seen in the distinctive style of painting\textsuperscript{213} or in the social conditions of the production, but it reveals a disposition typical of the producers who define and understand themselves as inheritors of an ancient religious and liturgical tradition. Of lesser importance in this conceptual creation are questions about church membership, and about the socio-cultural or intellectual connections of the works realized by different painters. Of greater importance seems to be the link to the “undivided” Church.\textsuperscript{214}

Moreover, this double structure simultaneously functions both as an instrument of consecration and as a mental disposition. It is also absent in the context of several Finnish Orthodox icon painters who found teachers in Paris in the 1960s and 1970s. They sought to be accepted as pupils of the Orthodox teachers George Drobot\textsuperscript{215} and Leonid Ouspen-

\textsuperscript{207} Gavriil Efimovic Frolóv 1854-1930, Kotkavaara 1999, 119-120.
\textsuperscript{208} Pimen Maksimovic Sofrónov 1898-1973, Kotkavaara 1999, 4-5, 291-299, 319-327.
\textsuperscript{211} Also note Interview VI, 2001; and de Caluwé 1982, 5, also mentioning the Ukrainian monk Father Rafael’s influence on de Caluwé. See also Lönnebo & Werkström 1984, 5, 6; Recommendation given by Professor Bo Ossian Lindberg http://www.imagonova.com/sv/rekommendation.htm – February 27, 2001. Also, in a 	extit{commercial presentation} of Nordsjö on the Internet the meaningfulness of discipleship as a form of consecrating can clearly be seen in the short curriculum in which she is presented, among other things, as a pupil of de Caluwé’s, Forsberg’s, and George Drobot’s. See http://www.ikonostasion.se/nfi0897.html – November 4, 2000. On Gerdmar’s studies under Forsberg’s guidance at Oskarshamn, see the unidentified newspaper article, “Ikonmåleri förr och nu” [before 1979] by an unknown writer.
\textsuperscript{212} See Forsberg’s early opinion in the unidentified newspaper article, “Ikonmåleriet får nytt liv Förnyar kristna konsten”, September 4, 1975 by B-n, “Det finns inget annat sätt att lära sig måla ikoner än genom kombinationen möstare – lärling. Undervisning enligt den gamla hantverkst raditionen. … …Ikonmåleriet har en sådan speciell teknik som kräver en lärares handledning.”
\textsuperscript{213} Note the differences in the stylistic solutions of painting between de Caluwé and Forsberg, as presented by the latter in Interview I, 2000. A distinction like this is probably necessary for a former pupil as a way of developing a recognizable style of his own, and thus creating a certain autonomy in relation to the former teacher.
\textsuperscript{214} In Forsberg’s words: “Vår egen fornkyrka”, Interview II, 2000; The unidentified newspaper article, “Ikonmåleriet får nytt liv Förnyar kristna konsten”, September 4, 1975 by B-n; Göteborgsposten, “Måla ikoner ett kall”, December 5, 1980 by Karin Teghammar; Forsberg 1991, 58.
sky\textsuperscript{216} in particular, who were considered as the leading proponents of the genuine icon-painting tradition.\textsuperscript{217} Furthermore, the work and influence of Petros Sasaki, who arrived in Finland from Athens in 1968, has had an impact on the Finnish Orthodox religious-cultural realm,\textsuperscript{218} and at least one of the early Finnish Orthodox painters received instruction in the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{219}

Figure 5. The master-to-disciple transmittal of the icon-painting tradition

Figure 5. depicts the educational relationships in the transmittal of the icon-painting tradition. A comprehensive chart of the master-pupil relations of all contemporary icon painters in Sweden and Finland would be far too complex. \textit{I have chosen agents who are related, at least to some degree, to the influences of the one under scrutiny, or who are important in terms of understanding the missing relationships and the differences between him and the other, mainly contemporary, Swedish producers.} (One omission is a pupil of Forsberg’s whom he first mentioned in Interview I, 2000: this pupil is possibly now living in Germany and it is difficult to find accessible data.\textsuperscript{220}) Because of the fragmentary and varied quality of the source material and the available literature, the data may in some instances be inadequate in detail or even misleading.\textsuperscript{221} Firstly, I suspect that not all of the relationships have been brought out fully and accurately. Secondly, the figure does not entirely succeed in showing the actual form (of the activity) used as the method of teaching (e.g. the courses given by “Svenska kyrkans studieförbundet” and several other organizations or agents\textsuperscript{222}). Similarly, the relationships mentioned in various connections do not usually convey enough about the length or depth of the learning experience, or about the real and actual influences absorbed or rejected by the pupil. Indeed, at least the following aspects should be considered in any accurate representation of educational relations: 1) the \textit{duration} of the relation in question, 2) its \textit{intensity} (frequency and means of teaching and control, and 3) possible observable \textit{influences} (stylistic references, cognitive dispositions, means of consecration in use).

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{216} Leonid Aleksandrovic Ouspensky 1902-1987, Kotkavaara 1999, 2. On the trajectory of Leonid Ouspensky, see pp. 307-319.
  \item \textsuperscript{217} Uskon Viesti, “Ikonimaalauksen opiskelu Pariisissa”, October 7, 1965 by Kirill Gluschkoff; Nikkanen 1979, 6-7; Kotkavaara 1986, 95-96; Gluschkoff 1989, 3; Drobot & Flinckenberg, 1989; Flinckenberg-
A chain-like presentation of the discipleships is far too simplified to describe the actual network of sharing ideas and influences. Nordsjö, for example, would be presented in a commercial connection not only as Forsberg’s pupil, but also as one of de Caluwé’s and others’. Her schooling includes art studies “in the early years” (i unga år) in Oslo and Rotterdam.223 Gerdmar, in his brief autobiography, puts an especially high value on his contact with Leonid Ouspensky.224 Moreover, an open letter of recommendation introduces him as a student of art history at the University of Lund, and of icon painting at the New Valamo monastery in Heinävesi, and as an assistant in conservation work.225 Even the essential elements of Sofronov’s Old-Believer habitus were re-formed when he established connections with Catholics. It is also evident that his painting style was not at all unaffected in the diversifying socio-cultural connections of his life trajectory.226

As Kotkavaara has demonstrated, the émigré Orthodox were divided in their attitudes toward Sofronov, and some of them also interpreted him only as an epitome of the craftsmanship painting tradition, while others definitely regarded him as a carrier and personification of genuine knowledge of icon painting. Given these contradictions, it may seem paradoxical how the originally Russian-émigré ideal of continuous, true and traditional icon painting was adapted by some agents in the Protestant field of religious practice, especially regarding the central role given to the Old Belief Confessors as mediators. Evidently, in France the Byzantine influences had been accepted to some extent by the Catholics. However, the dialogue between them and the Orthodox emigrants (even comprising missionary-like tendencies) had also been heated in certain cases.227 It is of special interest that the intermingling of ideas had an impact on the Finnish and Swedish religious fields through certain agents, their dispositions and position-takings.


Apparently, in order to become genuine, accepted, and appreciated as a legitimate partaker of the new-icon production in the late-20th-century Scandinavian sphere, it was necessary to create relations with some or several agents capable of consecrating newcomers by means of their cultural and religious capitals. However, the contextual history and the forming of the succession of names, that is to say the structure of the discipleship, which was seemingly left unanalyzed by its utilizers as part of the doxa of the activity, was obviously by no means the only medium of entry into the publicly valued position in revivalist Byzantine icon production. As Figure 4 shows, a cluster of other (educational) relations was formed by several agents in order to reach their aim. Interestingly, it was not only agents, but also organizations and institutions that were used in the game. Moreover, in this evolving field or a fraction of a field that shared a common illusion to some extent, signs of an institutionalizing process were evident in the first organizations offering schooling for icon painters.

2.5. Genuineness and Acceptance

By the time Forsberg had achieved his new position as an independent, full-time icon painter, agents representing opposing ideas, almost all of them active in the first half of the 1980s (and some also later in the 1980s and 1990s), used a variety of arguments in calling into question the new pictorial formations and simultaneously their producers and promoters. The contexts of these arguments are, indeed, different, and the lingual and cultural backgrounds also vary. According to some, the quandary over icons in the Lutheran context is only a minor theme of the discourse, while others place it as centre of the dispute. Yet, these accessible writings inherently reflect the appearance of a new pictorial corpus of position-takings in contemporary Lutheran sacred spaces, and some of these singled-out, early opinions can thus be categorized according to the following critical notions, which also depict the criticism the producer and his promoters received:

- the lack of an Orthodox religious context,
- the lack of time spent in and competence gained through painting and teaching, especially the lack of experience in giving courses,

---

228 On the idea of the continuity of the tradition combined with the teaching and course work executed by consecrating agents such as de Caluwé and later Forsberg, see e.g. Interview I, 2000; The unidentified newspaper article, “Ikonmåleriet får nytt liv Fornyar kristna konsten”, September 4, 1975 by B-n; Göteborgsposten, ”Måla ikoner ett kall”, December 5, 1980 by Karin Teghammar.

229 See Figure 4. and its sources. One could also regard Forsberg’s first position as a teacher in Oskarshamn as a position essentially institutional in nature. See ch. 2.1.

230 In the interviews Forsberg underlined the extremely positive reception of his work, see Interview I, 2000; Interview II, 2000. However, several critical opinions against the production of the new icon were expressed, thus also involving Forsberg (as a teacher of icon courses), and in some of these writings the agent is even anonymously referred to. Eg. Stengård 1984, 54.


the lack of artistic competence, non-professionalism,

lacking spirituality,

commercialism,

the lack of artistic autonomy,

unauthorized borrowing from another religious-cultural tradition, changing or misunderstanding the context and the intent.

Almost symmetrically, the promoters' arguments can be presented as a contradictory list that demonstrates positive evaluations such as the following:

belonging to the genuine tradition (including the ecumenical quality of the icon as the pictorial presentation of the “Undivided Church”),

good artistic-esthetic quality in the works of some of the main producers,

good schooling in painting practices received by some of the main producers,

genuine spirituality of production,

didactic, liturgical, and meditative utilization of icon production,

dogmatic reasoning (e.g. “We must, in the name of the Incarnation, accept the bodily existence of a human being. Therefore, we need the picture”), which includes the perceived longing for an “objective Christianity” and the mystical,

the work of former Swedish artists characterized by their interest in the historical icon and cited as examples of producers who were influential in the emergence of the new phenomenon of icon production.

---


236 Stengård 1984, 56.

237 Stengård 1984, 54, 56; Stengård 1986, 255.

238 Regardless the critical opinions and views mentioned in this chapter, most of the newspaper articles referring to Forsberg usually express a hidden positive viewpoint (even in their titles) such as in the unidentified newspaper article, “Ikonmäleriet får nytt liv förnyar kristna konsten”, September 4, 1975 by B-n). In this chapter, however, I have opted for analyzing only argumentation (however brief) that exposes dispositions other than those of the agent and/or his interviewer.


242 Lönnebo & Werkström 1984, 6, 7.

243 Lönnebo & Werkström 1984, 6, 7.


Clearly, the arguments for and against icon production in this context lead to a discourse in which both sides are meant to negate one another and turn the understanding of the phenomenon on its head. Naturally, not all of the arguments expressed by individual agents are similar in polemic or total rejection: five of the six agents who expressed only slightly critical points of view in print have probably been willing to accept the new icon within certain margins of religion or quality. The exemplary nature of this sample of opinions also has to be kept in mind. Yet, interestingly, many of the informants seem to occupy a double position both as promoters of a “qualified” product and as critics of the “junk” produced by those attending the courses that have become wildly popular. One agent positioned in academic research in theology has neither expressed any straightforward criticism nor manifested any positive arguments, but seems to have tried to understand the phenomenon and to explain it as a symptom of the longing for High Church expressions and intents: this could also represent a strategy of hidden sympathies, and an attempt at influence through interpretation.

---


248 Bengt Kilström, Th.D. (Docent), has analyzed certain Byzantine and Romanesque influences in Swedish Church art in Kilström 1989, 165-168. He also anonymously mentions a corpus of works in “A long line of churches in our country that have been equipped with icons and even groups of works called iconostasis…” and according to Kilström’s evaluation there is a “precise reason” behind the phenomenon, the “sacramental renewal and the all the time in a stronger way posed demand of objective Christianity…”, and a longing for the mystique that he considers typical of the contemporary religious field.
Figure 6. Critics and promoters of the new icon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENT (and position)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 Beskow Per, Th.D., (Docent)</td>
<td>1984 Lönnebo Martin, Bishop</td>
<td>Werkström Bertil, Archbishop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984 Stengård Elisabeth Art Historian</td>
<td>86 Stengård</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984 Peterson Gunnar Bertil, Senior Pastor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983 Abel Ulf, Curator of the National Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984 Carleman Oloph, Artist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989 Klöström Bengt, Th.D., (Docent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985 Rekola Juhani, Second Pastor, Writer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985 Sarantola Tauno, Second Pastor, Chairman of the Christian Art Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preface of an icon book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication, <em>Dissertation</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svensk Pastoral Tidskrift 6:1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svenska Kyrkans Tidning December 2, 1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfarts-Tidning March 30, 1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book on Swedish church art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essays on church art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper article, Sydsvenska Dagbladet October 8, 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper article, Kotimaa October 11, 1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN ARGUMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness of the contemporary icon as a traditional, artistic, and theological phenomenon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-produced icon as a theft from another tradition, later polemics on the original context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning of the Orthodox religious context and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too brief schooling and lack of skill as a course giver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning against commercialism, importance of the Orthodox context and artistic talent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking a reason: a longing for “objective Christianity” and mysticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amateur-like, non-Orthodox contexts, lack of “sacred preparation”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction between the “junk” and the genuine tradition in icon painting (a positive evaluation of Forsberg’s first public work)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of the Orthodox context, with reference to Stengård’s ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. lists selected critics and promoters of the revivalist Byzantine icon production. The selection is based on the available discourses registered in some of the contemporary writings on Swedish church art.246 An earlier study by Katja Agugliaro as early as 1986 exposes many of the opponents.247 The self-evaluations and self-promotion of the icon painters are excluded from this study. The somewhat contradictory views published in the printed media probably mark the beginning of the argument in which the division seems to lie ultimately in the potential right to adapt the Orthodox tradition to the Lutheran realm.251 Obviously, the new form of pictorial presentation has occasionally aroused heated debate among agents who, interesting enough, have operated in various positions in church administration, theological research, art-historical research, and artistic production. Some agents have occupied different positions in the ecclesiastical field (mainly archbishop, bishop, senior pastor, and second pastors252), with very differing capitals, bishops evidently representing the most positive pole in the field of power. Of the ecclesiastical agents, Sarantola has had an influential position in the Finnish ecclesiastical field, in particular as chairman of the art committee of Helsinki Lutheran parishes.253 He has also been reiterating his criticism of the icons in Lutheran sacred spaces until recently, and has put
forward certain critical theological arguments against the potential Lutheran use of elements originating from traditional Catholic and Byzantine representations of church art. Three agents clearly represent positions in the artistic field (curator-cum-art historian, art historian, and artist – two of which represent the consecrating and discourse-generating structures, one of them that of the art producer). Moreover, of the ecclesiastical agents, mention should be made of those positioned in the theological scientific field (the two docents). Rekola could be regarded not only as an agent with an administrative position as a pastor, but also, given his religious-cultural literary production, as one with large cultural capital and, therefore, a position in the Finnish cultural field of discourse. Abel and Stengård, in particular could be considered agents interested in the religious dimension of art (Abel specifically in the icon). In sum, it is remarkable that the question of genuine tradition in one form or another is relevant to all these agents, notwithstanding their differing positions or modes and the various contexts of their argumentation.


250 Agugliaro 1986, 68-70.

251 Sydsvenska Dagbladet, “Döda och levande ikoner”, October 8, 1981 by Per Beskow; Svenska Kyrkans Tidning, “Envar sin egen ikonmålare?”, December 2, 1983 by Ulf Abel; Göteborgs handels- och sjöfartstidning, “Ikoner tradition eller hötorgskonst?”, March 30, 1984 by Oloph Carleman; Svensk Pastorl Tidskrift, “Om ikonmålariet” 6:1983 by Gunnar Bertil Peterson; Stengård 1984, 53-56; Lönnbe & Werkström 1984, 5-7; Rekola 1985, 88; Stengård 1986, 244-255; Kilström 1989, 168. To some extent all these writings deal with the question of the authorization to adapt ancient Orthodox art for Western use.


253 Sarantola was chairman of the art committee of the Helsinki Lutheran parishes in 1980-1985, and was also chairman of the Christian Art Society in 1971-1987. See Suomen teologit 1999, 730. E.g. Sarantola 1951, “… vilka icke icke icke icke icke icke icke icke icke icke icn
Because of the length and depth of their premises, the opposing views of the art historian and the two Lutheran bishops in the Swedish context are especially illustrative of the argumentation. Published simultaneously in 1984,259 they offer contradictory evaluations and clearly manifest beliefs and capitals that are typical of different fields: High Art and Lutheran ecclesiastical practices. While the art historian promotes artistic originality and autonomy,260 the two bishops praise the genuine theological-liturgical-artistic tradition.261 Whereas the former worries about the turning away from the modernist creative ideal,262 the two latter are troubled about the disappearance of the genuine didactical and meditative picture within the Christian religion.263 For the former, it is ultimately a question of the non-genuineness of a tradition illegitimately taken from another time and context:264 the highly polemical term “mutilated iconostasis” is especially directed towards producers like Forsberg and Svensson.265 and the icons produced (particularly in the icon-painting courses) are seen as “badly made” in general, not given with time, prayer, or fasting.266 The other two, occupying quite different positions, regard the re-produced icon as art of value,
belonging to and needed within Lutheranism, genuinely ecumenical and therefore altogether useful and beneficial: the icons are didactic, liturgical, dogmatic in a positive sense, and meditative.267

All these details constitute an ongoing argument – albeit restricted – concerning the adaptation and utilization of revivalist Byzantine icon production within the Swedish Lutheran realm. No similar phenomenon is to be found in the Finnish Lutheran Church although there are parallels in the premises and discussions concerning the acquisition of a single work of Forsberg by the parishes of Vaasa, a process that was mainly local and inter-administrative.268 The critical theological interpretations of Tauno Sarantola,269 and the dialogue on the placing of donated icons into Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces – were debated at the 1992 “Kirkkopäivät” (Church Days) meeting in Kuopio, and were reported in the media as three dissenting opinions expressed by two Lutheran theologians and one Orthodox priest. Of the three agents mentioned, Reverend Tauno Sarantola expressed total rejection of the “alien” religious-cultural object “transplanted” into the Lutheran realm, whereas Risto Cantell, Th.D. (Docent of Ecumenics), was willing to accept any place suited to the icon’s purpose as a means of prayer (“Esteena ei ole itse ikoni, vaan meidän kapea käsitkysemme rukouksesta.” “The icon itself is not the obstacle; it is our narrow concept of prayer.”) The Orthodox Priest Mitro Repo recommended side altars as suitable places for icons donated by friends in the Orthodox Church. The whole question of the setting, as reported in the media, was extraordinary, because it did not mention the fact that in Finland, too, several icons painted or acquired by Lutherans had found their place in Lutheran sacred spaces.270

A phenomenon with similar features was the earlier discussion in the 1970’s and in the beginning of the 1980’s on the development and expansion of neo-Orthodox icon painting in Finland. The Finnish public debate did not focus on the Lutheran utilization of the icon

267 Lönnebo & Werkström 1984, 5-7. In the preface to the book by the two bishops presenting these definitions, the question is of an icon acquisition: a large crucifix with several narrative pictorial details painted by de Caluwé, which was placed in the chapel of the bishopric residence in Söråker, Sweden (close to Sundsvall). This acquisition was promoted by Lönnebo and Werkström.


270 Kotimaa, “Alttarin taide”, October 11, 1985 by Tauno Sarantola:

“Usbysanttilaisuus ikoneina tai niiden jäljitelmänä ei ole myöskään mikään ratkaisu….se [ikoni] on syntynyt toisenlaisesta pyhyskäsityksestä….Jos omistamme ikonit….sen vuoksi, että ne kauniisti havainnollistavat perintöiä uskonkäsityksiä, meidän on oltava valmiit omaksumaan myös ortodoksinen usko, ajatelu ja elämänkäsitys kokonaisuudessaan niiden mukana…” See also Sarantola 1988, 51; Sarantola 1999, 36.

as church art, however. Instead, and typical of the context, it was mainly an Orthodox reaction against the widespread icon-painting courses, even against individual painters, and an attempt to establish ecclesiastical control over the new practices. Moreover, Leonid Ouspensky gave an interview, published widely in the Finnish national media in 1980, emphasizing the possibility that heterodox persons could function as icon painters if they identified themselves with the Orthodox dogma, a contradictory suggestion and probably unacceptable to many Lutherans painting icons as a hobby.

In the Swedish discussion on the authenticity of the re-produced icon within Lutheranism, it was necessary for the agents promoting the production and use of revivalist Byzantine icons to create ideological expressions for the consecration of the new religious-cultural works. The consecrating expressions were created on the basis of expertise in theology, church administration, art history, and art-museum work. Spirituality, dogma, and taste were intermingled in the definition of the newly discovered “objective” church art. The documents in question do not merely give an account of an attempt to form a field or a fraction of a field in which several icon enthusiasts have operated and taken positions, they also describe the special capital typical of the field formation in question, observed through the position-takings of the promoting agents. This capital is capital as a combination of the theological, liturgical, ecumenical, church-historical, and artistic evaluations, all centered around the Byzantine, Old-Church tradition, ultimately understood and expressed as the genuine one.

It was evidently the influence of Father de Caluwé in particular, through the courses organized in Sweden in the 1960’s and 1970’s, that signified for certain agents a period of preparation for the acceptance of their re-produced icons. Like previous and contemporary High Church and Orthodox influences, de Caluwé’s efforts could be regarded as

---

274 Interview IV, interview with Father Robert de Caluwé in Myllyjärvi January 26, 2001. For Lönebo painting icons has been a practical and experience-based activity because of his personal participation in de Caluwé’s teaching as his pupil. See http://www.imagonova.com/sv/rekommendation.htm – pp. 1-2, Febru-
effectual. The influences brought to Sweden in the first half of the 20th century by the Swedish icon researcher Helge Kjellin should also be kept in mind: Kjellin had met Sofronov in the 1920s while working as professor in Dorpat and Riga. It is also worth mentioning the several Swedish art collectors whose interest in icons had led to exhibitions and an important donation to the Swedish National Museum as early as in 1933.

In the final analysis, the discussion on genuineness and acceptance must be comprehended in the context of all the manifestations of the written media observed through the research material available to me. Although the nature of the press clippings I have used in my research prevents any more in-depth analysis and the drawing of clearly definable conclusions, I would like to emphasize the fact that at least 35 newspaper or other articles on the agent’s activities were published in Sweden in 1975-2000 and at least four in Finland. These writings seem to reveal a network of relations between Forsberg and the agents in the written media. Some of them were published in the major local and even national press, some in religious publications. Among the latter, the role of the official publications of the Swedish Lutheran Church and Gothenburg Diocese is significant: at least nine of these articles were based on wide-ranging interviews.

Any further analysis of the field in question would nevertheless demand a specific systematic and extensive examination of the published material. In any case, it is obvious that even the fragmented source material available implies a network of relationships: the different media and their agents supply positive publicity for Forsberg the producer and, by this very recognition, shape the dispositions of the recipient agents, promote Forsberg’s influences, and moreover create an open space of possibles for the Lutheran icon phenomenon.
Picture 5. Kumlinge church, Åland. Forsberg’s icon depicting St. Joachim and Anna before the Golden Gate stands on a narthex shelf. Hence, it is visible to all visitors entering the ancient shrine. In all likelihood, the shelf originally served as side altar in the medieval sanctuary dedicated to St. Anna. Photograph by the author.

Picture 6a. Postcard of the interior of Vetokannas church, Vaasa, Finland and the placement of Forsberg’s icon. The painting (the Resurrection/Descent into Hell) is implemented in a circular form on a panel carved as a Greek cross. Photograph by Ralf Storås. Published by Painotalo Värtева, Vaasa.
Picture 6b. This postcard sold in Vaasa parishes depicts Forsberg’s icon in Vetokannas church. Originally, the icon was a sketch for the one intended for the interior of Huutoniemi church. Its placement above the altar makes it equal to the traditional Lutheran altarpiece, except for the large *crux nuda* above it. The icon was donated in 1986. Photograph by Ralf Storås. Published by Painotalo Varteva, Vaasa.

Picture 7. Kauniainen church, Greater Helsinki. Forsberg’s set of icons depicts a selection of five festivals from the Orthodox iconostasis row of festivals: the Presentation of the Lord, the Epiphany, the Crucifixion, the Apostle St. Thomas Touching the Resurrected, and the Ascension. The works are placed on the wall of the Swedish-language parish meeting hall. They were placed on the altar temporarily one-by-one and used only in Swedish-language Masses. The local Orthodox community has also utilized these icons in some of their services held once or twice a year in the meeting hall. Photograph by the author.
Picture 8a. A large print of an icon by Erland Forsberg produced by his father, depicting the icon in the Alskathemmet recreation home chapel, Vaasa Swedish parish, Finland. The work serves as an altarpiece. As far as traditional works of church art are concerned, its retable-type structure and combination of variegating pictorial presentations together create an interesting mixture of both Eastern and Western structural properties and formal particularities.
Picture 8b. Forsberg’s icon in Alskathammet chapel. Photograph by the author.
3. The Production of the Producer as a Space of Pictorial Position-Takings

3.1. Implemented Public Works – An Introductory Analysis

The accessible icons executed by Forsberg, in their variety of types and motifs, comprise a collection of Biblical figures and events (most of which are derived from the New Testament), together with some medieval motifs. It is worth noting that most of the motifs and basic compositions, which are familiar from the Orthodox icon tradition, enable viewers with sufficient knowledge of Byzantine and/or revivalist Byzantine Orthodox icon painting to recognize several basic compositions: the Mother of God of Lovingkindness, Hodigitria, and the Mother of God of the Passion, the Passion of the Lord, the Crucifixion, the Transfiguration, the Deisis, and the Pantocrator to mention some of the most evident and familiar pictorial presentations.

As far as the characterization of the Christ figure of the Deisis and the icons of the Pantocrator are concerned, I utilize the classification presented by Louis Réau in his well-known work Iconographie de l’art chrétien. According to Réau, the Pantocrator is a distinct figure (always depicted as a bust situated in certain distinct locations) with its history of influence on Western church art. Correspondingly, the Christ figure of the Deisis – that is « Christ-Juge », Christ Judge in Réau’s definition, exists as a pictorial presentation that has also affected certain representations of Western Christian imagery. In sum it is clear that Ouspensky, for example, although distinguishing between the two

279 See Appendix 6.1.
280 See Appendix 6.1., Fallköping, St. Olof church; Gothenburg Mariakyrkan; Lerum, Lerum church; Rättvik, Stiftgården kapell. See Réau 1957, 71-73; Ouspensky 1999, 92-101.
283 Appendix 6.1., Vaasa, the chapel of Alskiahemmet. For an extensive presentation on the subject, see Réau 1957, 427-461.
284 Appendix 6.1., Lilla Edet, Fuxerna church; Oskarshamn, Kolbergakyrkan; Partille, Jonsered, Franciscan [Catholic] monastery; Vaasa, the chapel of Alskiahemmet. See Réau 1957, 462-503; Ouspensky 1999, 180-185.
286 Appendix 6.1., Lund, Sankt Laurentii kyrka; cf. Malmö, Bunkeflo Strandkyrka; Oskarshamn, Ceciliakapellet. Cf. other retablo-type objects with side panels, e.g: Gothenburg, Burås church; Gothenburg, Mariakyrkan; Rättvik, Stiftgårds kapell. See Réau 1957, 732, « La Déisis, d’un mot grec qui signifie Prière, Intercession, désigne le groupe trinitaire (Trimorphon) formé du Christ-Juge accosté à droite et à gauche pour la Theotokos et le Prodromos ou, en termes latins, la Vierge et le Précurseur qui intercèdent à genoux pour le pardon des pécheurs. »; Ouspensky 1999, 59-64.
287 Appendix 6.1., Linköping, Mikaelskyrkan; Partille Jonsered Franciscan monastery; Rättvik, St. Davidsgården; Uppsala, Anskarkskyrkan. See also the Deisis-type figure used in Fallköping, Mariakapellet or, possibly, in Gothenburg, Tyynered church. See Réau 1957, 39, 44, 45; Ouspensky 1999, 73-75.
288 See Réau 1956, 9-10; Réau 1957, 39, 45, 732.
distinct forms in his presentation of different types of icons, nonetheless designates both figures as Pantocrators. Furthermore, because of the fragmentary source material available for preliminary analysis, in one case there is not sufficient data available to assess which type of Christ figure is depicted in the Forsbergian icon in question.

290 See Ouspensky 1999, 71, 73-75.
291 Appendix 6.1., Linköping, Mikaelskyrkan.
The church festivals of the Ecclesiastical Year are also present in icons depicting well-known pictorial motifs such as the Annunciation, the Nativity of Christ, the Presentation of Christ, the Epiphany, the Transfiguration, the Raising of Lazarus, the Entry into Jerusalem, the Eucharist, the Passion of the Lord, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Apostle St. Thomas Meeting the Resurrected, and the Ascension. Biblical motifs such as “Our Lord Jesus Christ at the Age of Twelve Years in the Temple of Jerusalem”, and the Good Shepherd have had their equivalents in local Lutheran church calendars, too. In addition, even saints such as St. John the Forerunner, St. Michael, and some Ancient Roman and medieval saints are depicted in these icons.

295 Appendix 6.1., Kauniainen, Kauniainen church (the Baptism of the Lord); Lilla Edet, Fuxerna church (both the Baptism of the Lord, and the Adoration of the Magi); Oskarshamn, Kolbergakyrkan (the Baptism of the Lord). See Réau 1957, 236-255 (les Mages), and 293-304 (le Baptême); Ouspensky 1999, 164-167 (“the Baptism of the Lord, or Epiphany”).
296 Appendix 6.1., Oskarshamn, Kolbergakyrkan; Partille, Jonsder Franciscan monastery.
299 Appendix 6.1., Lilla Edet, Fuxerna church. See Réau 1957, 409-420, and esp. pp. 418-419, presenting the common Byzantine prototype not depicted by Forsberg in Fuxerna. Hence, the Forsbergian presentation in Fuxerna church with the Christ figure as a central element of the picture could be regarded to some extent as a westernized pictorial formation. See also Ouspensky 1999, 66-67.
300 Appendix 6.1., Vaasa, the chapel of Alskathammet.
301 Appendix 6.1., Gothenburg Chapter; Gothenburg, Mariakyrkan; Kauniainen, Kauniainen church; Lilla Edet, Fuxerna church; Malmö, Bunkeflo Strandkyrka; Oskarshamn, Kolbergakyrkan; Partille, Jonsder Franciscan monastery.
302 Appendix 6.1., Jönköping, Ekhagskyrkan (the Resurrection/ Descent into Hell ); Lilla Edet, Fuxerna church, (both the Myrrh Bearers, and the Resurrection/ Descent intoHell); Oskarshamn, Kolbergakyrkan (the Resurrection/ Descent into Hell ); Vaasa, the chapel of Alskathammet (both the Myrrh Bearers, and the Resurrection/ Descent into Hell); Vaasa, Vetokannas church (the Resurrection/ Descent into Hell ). See Réau 1957, 531-537; Ouspensky 1999, 185-192.
304 Appendix 6.1., Gothenburg, Burås church; Gothenburg, Mariakyrkan; Kauniainen, Kauniainen church; Lilla Edet, Fuxerna kyrka. See Réau 1957, 582-590; Ouspensky 1999, 194-199.
306 Appendix 6.1., Sala, Väster-Färnebo church, the Chapel of the Good Shepherd; Stensjö, Kikås funeral chapel. See Réau 1957, 32-34.
308 Appendix 6.1., The Deisis in Lund, Sankt Laurentii kyrka. Also, St. John the Forerunner is depicted in every icon with the subject of the Baptism of the Lord. Den Svenska Evangeliekoboken, 419-426; Kirkkokäsikirja I-IV 1993, Evankeliumikirja, 368-371. See also Réau 1956, 431-463; Farmer 1992, 258-259.
310 See the details in Appendix 6.1., Fallköping, St. Olaf church (St Bridget of Sweden, and St. Olaf); Malmö, Bunkeflo Strandkyrka (St. Bridget); Oskarshamn, Cecilia-kapellet (St. Bridge, St. Cecilia, and St. Sigfrid); Rättvik, Stiftgårdenkapell (St. Bridge and St. Anna of Novgorod); Varberg, Träslövskyrkan (St. Bridge, and St. Laurence). See also the festival days presented in Farmer 1992, 70-71, 91-92, 288-289, 365-366, 436.
Picture 10. Gothenburg, Sweden, Mariakyrkan church. The Forsbergian altarpiece is a miniature version of the retable-type structure joined to the radiant, golden crucifix. The combination presents the Marian image as the central visual element above the altar table. Evidently, the traditional scenes depicted in the four icons surrounding the Mother of God of Lovingkindness were chosen to emphasize the central role of the Virgin Mother in the history of salvation, which is also reflected in the name of the church. Photograph by Kurt Andersson, postcard by Lindenhags, Floda.
Their festival days are unofficial in the Lutheran context, but in all likelihood they are known to some extent and can be included in the icon types and motifs related to institutional religious comprehension and the organization of time in the Liturgical Year. Evidently, those pictorial motifs with properties pertaining to seasonally repeated Biblical texts signify a heedful adaptation to the Lutheran religious tradition. This is especially evident in the obvious absence of specifically analogous Orthodox types of icons and in the infusion of a motif like the Good Shepherd, a pictorial presentation commonly understood as Lutheran and not generally made use of in Orthodox churches, but obviously typical of Forsberg’s production.

Furthermore, it is important to apprehend certain aspects of the inscription texts of Forsbergian icons. In several cases, and in all Forsberg’s icons in Finland, there is no inscription disclosing the subject and theme of the painting: only some of the icons have been furnished with inscriptions in the composition in Fuxerna church, Lilla Edet, Sweden, for example. Whether or not there is a detectable pattern or idea behind these modifications remains questionable. However, in the light of certain Finnish Orthodox instructions on the significance of the inscriptions as essential parts of the icons, it is feasible to suppose that Forsberg’s free approach to the textual elements is essentially a Protestant feature. Moreover, it is evident that this free manner does not generally extend to all of the textual elements. The presence of the traditional, dogmatic expressions $\Omega\Omega\Omega$, $\mathrm{IC} \times \mathrm{XC}$, and $\mathrm{MP \Theta\Upsilon}$ is particularly notable, and the use of Swedish or any contemporary language in the inscription is a common feature of concurrent icon production.

This corpus of pictorial position-takings contains the iconic depiction of the Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, and other Biblical and medieval saints, and it inevitably signifies the re-appearance of the images of saints in Lutheran sacred spaces. The extensive set of works depicting the Mother of God marks a contrast to several modernist works of contemporary church art, especially in the displaying of a saint figure, which is relatively

311 Note the rank of festivals of the ecclesiastical year in a typical Russian Orthodox iconostasis: e.g. the Nativity, the Presentation, and the Dormition of the Mother of God, and the Elevation of the Cross. See Ouspensky 1999, 59-69. The absence of the Holy Trinity in Appendix 6.1. may well be a result of the fragmented nature of the source material.

312 See Appendix 6.1., Kauniainen, Kauniainen church; Kumlinge, Kumlinge church; Vaasa, Vetokannas church; Vaasa, the chapel of Alskathammet. See also Pictures 5-8. In Kumlinge, as an exception, the icon depicts only the names of the two saints.

313 See the pictures in Kyrkvägen Hösten 1999 [no page numbers]. See also Appendix 6.1., Lilla Edet, Fuxerna Kyrka.


315 The Marian image appears in the corpus of accessible Forsbergian works at least in the following locations/sacred spaces: Appendix 6.1., Fallköping, St. Olof church; Gothenburg Chapter; Gothenburg, Mariakyrkan; Lerum, Lerum church; Lund, Sankt Laurentii kyrka; Malmö, Bunkeflo Strandkyrka; Oskarshamn, Cecilia-kapellet; Oskarshamn, Kolbergakyrkan; Rättvik, Stiftgårdens kapell; Sala, Väster-Färnebo church; Varberg, Träslövskyrka. Note also all the icons of the festivals in which the figure of the Virgin Mary has been depicted e.g. the Annunciation, the Nativity of the Lord, the Presentation of the Lord, the Crucifixion, the Ascension, etc.
rare in Scandinavian Lutheran sacred spaces of the late 20th century. Hence, in these icons the saint is not primarily as an object of artistic and/or religious observation or perception, but is presented in traditional Byzantine manner, usually facing the beholder, looking with open eyes at the one who prays before the icon that manifests the Divine. The depicted saints are intercessors of prayer in the traditional Orthodox sense. “They invite a face-to-face meeting with the holy persons depicted.” This is also the tradition, the iconic intention, and the appearance of the Forsbergian icons.

Interestingly, it seems that it is through Forsberg that the image of the Mother of God, the Virgin Mary, in particular has entered several Lutheran churches. One might well categorize this “Marian phenomenon” as a reappearance, an addition to, or certainly an augmentation of the feminine in the Protestant sphere of church art in the late 20th century, a visual crescendo of the motherly, the sensitive, and the affective: the Mother of God of Lovingkindness, Hodigitria, and certain other types of icons, for example, in the highly rigorous, regulated, and doctrinaire pictorial tradition. As to local realizations of Finnish Lutheran church art, Marian pictures have been common throughout earlier decades and centuries, but her image specifically reaches beyond the conventional Lutheran illustrative figure in the icons. This transition is taking place because of the traditional Eastern appearance of the Virgin as a mediator of prayer, and because of the occasional use of Marian pictures as cult images. (Ritual practices are analyzed further on in this chapter.)

316 To my knowledge, during the past 40 years only a few works presenting the saints have been acquired for sacred spaces in Finland. This estimation is derived from a preliminary analysis of Database 2001. On the Finnish (revivalist) Byzantine depictions of the Mother of God in contemporary Lutheran sacred spaces, see Appendix 6.2. See also the pictorial materials presented in Kivirinta 2001, 184-187; Malmisalo 2001, 188-191; Siukonen 2001, 182-183.


318 The Marian image appears at least in the following icon types and motifs depicted in Appendix 6.1.: Fallköping, St. Olof church the Mother of God of Lovingkindness; Gothenburg Mariakyrkan the Mother of God of Lovingkindness; Lerum, Lerum church the Mother of God of Lovingkindness; Lund, Sankt Lauren- tii kyrka the Mother of God in Deisis; Malmö, Bunketlo Strandkyrka the Mother of God in Deisis; Oskarshamn, Kolbergakyrkan the Hodigitria Mother of God; Rättvik, Stiftgårdens kapell the Mother of God of Lovingkindness; Varberg, Träslövskyrka the Mother of God of the Passion. Most likely, the diversity of icon types would be more extensive if 1) the data regarding the works were more detailed in all cases, and 2) all of Forsbergian works were accessible.

319 See Lossky 1967, 165-166; Bergmann 2003, 97, “Grundläggande karakteriseras ikonbildens teologi av en dogmatisk symbolism, där bildens element uppfattas som fysiska tecken på andlig framställning av teologerna dogmatiskt formulerade budskapet.”

320 The notions “Finnish” and “Swedish” are resorted to in chapters 3.1. and 3.2. mainly in order to make references to the Scandinavian countries with their current geographical existence. For a closer examination of the lingual and cultural aspects, see ch. 4.1.

321 As local examples see e.g. Kari & Ruotsalainen 1989, 42, 44-45, 56-57, 60, 64-65, 67, 68, 99, 100, 104; Komulainen 1986, 226-252, esp. 228; Rusama 1993, 31, 33, Koskimies-Envall 1993, 74-75, 101. See also Hanka 1995, pictures on pp. 17, 18, 27, 56, 57, 60, 63, 66, 68, 69, 71, 77; Pfäffli 2001, 124. As a late example of the 1940s, see Malmisalo 2003, 122-125.

322 Interview II, 2000; the video recorded during a Mass, including the rite of consecrating an icon on December 17, 2000, St. Olaf church in Fallköping.
Picture 12. Gothenburg, Sweden, Västra Frölunda church. A stained-glass window depicting St. Jonah, the Angel of the Lord and the Great Fish by Forsberg. Fragment from an unidentified publication, photographer unknown.
Picture 13. A sketch depicting the Tree of Knowledge by Erland Forsberg. Photocopy from Erland Forsberg.
The (re-)appearance of the Marian image may reflect not only Byzantine influences, but also the familiar idea of a traditional Lutheran Christmas image representing a figure of the Christ child held to his mother’s bosom. The significance and variety of Marian images is substantial in traditional Orthodox icon painting.323 Hence it is reasonable to assume that the numerous Orthodox representations of the Mother of God as an essential part of the Eastern visual tradition324 have functioned as a space of possibles in allowing the images access to contemporary Lutheran sacred spaces as part of Forsberg’s production, and possibly also as a re-interpreted Christmas picture.325 The appearance of the icon of the Mother of God in Lutheran sacred spaces in Sweden may reflect the beliefs and religious practices of immigrants from Eastern Europe and the Middle East, or other areas with an Orthodox or other Oriental ecclesiastical heritage.326 Furthermore, there may be a moderate Westernization of the Mother of God in the image of the Virgin Mother who is depicted with a blue maphorion instead of the deep, soft red commonly used in these images.327

In the accessible corpus of the icons produced by Forsberg, some of the saints are presented in the side panels of the Deisis Groups and works of a similar design.328 Sometimes they appear together with the image of St. Mary as protectress in the Deisis in an infusion of new characteristics in contrast to the traditional Orthodox icon production and its canonical saints. These formal particularities could well be characterized as “local additions”, as they appear in the icons of native Swedish and Scandinavian saints such as

---

323 E.g. Réau 1957, 71-74. See also the early Finnish-language presentation by Aune Jääskinen in Jääskinen 1966, e.g. pictures (and texts) 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and the front page. See also Ilmonen & Pennanen 1987, Catalogue pp. 86-91.

324 E.g. the model books of de Caluwé, containing several traditional depictions of the differing types of the icon of the Mother of God, de Caluwé 1982, 4-11, 34-36; de Caluwé [no given year], Kokoelma Ikonimalleja; Kokoelma Ikonimalleja II; Kokoelma Ikonimalleja II; Kokoelma Ikonimalleja IV; Kokoelma Ikonimalleja V.

325 Correspondingly, Kouvola Orthodox church, after its “Lutheranization” in the early 20th century, was allowed at least to keep the images of the Kazan Mother of God, Christ Praying in Gethsemane, and the Resurrection in the re-formed sacred space. See Wartiainen 2002, 10-12, 22-31, 34. All these pictorial presentations can be related to the “main events” of the Lutheran Ecclesiastical Year.

326 Forsberg’s ideas of the icon as an ecumenical, amicable element for immigrants are evident in Interview II, 2000. See also Brander Johnsson’s concise account in Brander Johnsson 2000, 22.

327 E.g. Appendix 6.1., Lilla Edet, Fuxerna church. See Kyrkvägen 1999. Cf. the common red maphorion e.g. in Ouspensky 1999, 78, 79, 82 83, 86, 87, 90, 91, 95, 98, 99. See also Lempiäinen 2002, 386-388. However, it is obvious that the blue maphorion has also been used in several Byzantine presentations. Consequently, potential Westernization is a complex question.

328 See Appendix 6.1., Lund, Sankt Laurentii kyrka; cf. Malmö, Bunkeflo Strandkyrka; Oskarshamn, Cecilia-kapellet; and other retable-type objects with side panels, e.g. Gothenburg, Burås church; Gothenburg, Mariakyrkan; Rättvik, Stiftgårdens kapell.

329 See Réau 1957, 73 « La Vierge protectrice » …… « Enfin Byzance a créé avant l’Occident le type de la Vierge médiatrice intercédant pour le salut des hommes. La Panagia figure toujours dans le groupe trinitaire de la Deisis…. … Elle fait pendant au Prodrome où précurseur (saint Jean-Baptiste) et implore avec lui le Christ Juge. »
Polyptych by Erland Forsberg with the Christ Judge as the central piece, on the side panels (from left to right): the Tree of Knowledge, St. Moses and the Serpent of Bronze, the Entry into Jerusalem, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Myrrh Bearers, the Ascension, and St. Sigfrid (baptizing Swedes). Location unidentified (see Sources 7.1.1.4.). Photograph by Erland Forsberg.

St. Brigitte, St. Sigfrid, St. Olaf, and even St. Anna of Novgorod. They are shown as side figures in retable-type painted altar structures and in individual paintings (and even in a baptismal font), apparently objectifying provincial identity, history, and national and Scandinavian religious heritage, and also holiness; in other words, they are presented as idealized models incorporating the Christian Faith. Yet, no post-medieval Lutheran figures appear in this set of icons, ultimately characterized by Biblical and medieval figures obviously utilized to incorporate pictorially and personify religious and cultural ideas.
Picture 15a. Mother of God and St. Brigit in intercession before the Christ Judge.
Postcard depicting the altar screen in Bunkeflo Strandkyrka, Malmö, Sweden. Photograph by P-G Hansson. Published by E. Danielson AB Genevad.

Picture 15b. Exterior of the church and a glimpse of how the work is placed in the sacred space.
Postcard. Photograph by P-G Hansson. Published by E. Danielson AB Genevad.
Picture 16a. In front of the congregation: in Cecilia-kapellet the Deisis-type triptych depicting the Christ Judge, St. Brigit, and St. Cecilia.

Cecilia-kapellet, Oskarshamn, Sweden. Picture in a leaflet promoting Oskarshamn folk high school. Photographer and publisher unknown.

Picture 16b. A close-up of the altarpiece of Cecilia-kapellet. In the text introducing the painting, the appearance and habitat of the Christ Judge is, interestingly, described as *härlighetens tron*, “the throne of glory”.

Photographer unknown. Published by Ultra AB.
The idea of depicting figures such as St. Brigitte in icons in the revivalist Byzantine style was, interestingly enough, realized by de Caluwé as early as in 1967 (possibly much earlier). His work depicting St. Bridget of Sweden was given a surprised reception in a review of the 1967 icon display in Helsinki Taidehalli. Owing to its pictorial motif, Kotimaa described the painting as a rarity with the expression “nothing but a Roman Catholic saint in an icon!” Obviously, the idea of depicting Western figures in the Eastern manner and painting style was not new. In all likelihood, Forsberg had come across it along with other influences in his basic studies at the ecumenical center in Espoo in the early stages of his trajectory.

Thus, the most obvious structural characteristic of these icons probably lies in the use of the traditional, rigorous, Byzantine way of depicting the human body. Reflecting some of the ecclesiastical agents’ reasoning on the significance of the human likeness and representative figures in contemporary church art, Forsberg’s production is a large body of works in the revivalist Byzantine style specifically depicting the traditional saint figure: the human likeness or body as a symbol of religious and cultural ideas, emotions, practices, and local traditions.

Accordingly, the image of St. Cecilia in the Oskarshamn school chapel evidently alludes to the instruction in church music given at the school. The prophet Jonah as the symbol of God’s misericorde and resurrection appears in the Gothenburg Chapter’s retable-type object. The very choice of a Biblical motif such as the Apostle St. Thomas Meeting the Resurrected (by public opinion poll in the parish most likely pictures, personifies, and questions the reliability and significance of the Christian Faith in contemporary experience. Moreover, at least one Biblical motif has been used to interpret contemporary horizons related to a political question. For example, according to the producer’s interpretation, the icon in Tynnered church in the Gothenburg Diocese depicts, in the Byzantine style, the Biblical narrative of the Fall of Man, with a detail of the Tree of Knowledge in the shape of a cloud suggesting as association with the lethal cloud of a nuclear explosion.

Undeniably, these icons could be characterized as pictorial presentations related to religious ideas and ideals, questions and problems, to the comprehension of time, beliefs, cultural significance, and orientation. In its contemporary, revivalist Byzantine form and in

---

336 Note the painting by Ouspensky depicting St. Geneviève of Parish in Kotkavaara 1999, Appendix I, Figure XXIV.
337 See ch. 2.1.
338 See ch. 2.5.; Lönnebo & Werkström 1984, 7.
339 See the ideas presented in Lempiäinen 2002, 163-178.
340 Appendix 6.1., Oskarshamn, Cecilia Chapel. Cecilia as a third-century martyr and patron of musicians, see Réau 1958 I, 278-286. Note the absence of the harp as an attribute and the portable organ as the most typical musical attribute. See also Farmer 1992, 91-92.
342 See Appendix 6.1., Burås, Carolikyrkan.
343 See e.g. Maynell 2000, 830-837.
344 Appendix 6.1., Gothenburg, Tynnered church; Johnsén 1999, 11-12. See also Réau 1956, 85-86.
the novel Lutheran contexts, the icon could be regarded as an objectification of religious and cultural capitals, and hence also as a medium of power. The Pantocrators/Christ Judges in particular (a remarkable corpus of works realized by Forsberg in contemporary Lutheran churches as altarpieces), introduces the unavoidable question of this type of icon in particular being a presentation of that which is beyond earthly power. It is not only of Christ Himself, but also of the institution marking with this image of supreme authority the ritual space of the institution and the epicenter of the hierarchy of the space. In the contemporary Swedish Lutheran religious context with its specific emphasis on democratic government, this pictorial presentation of ultimate judging power has even been regarded as a question-raiser, an alien, reinterpreted or even misinterpreted pictorial statement. If we are to avoid the “short-circuit effect” of relating cultural works directly to social formations (or even to the idealized, publicized dispositions attached to them), albeit in an introductory study, the structure, history, and mutable effect of the field have to be taken into account as a hypothesis in view of the potential dispositions attached to the images and the potential utilizations of the imagery. Hence, as popular pictorial presentations, the Pantocrator/Christ Judge figures call for certain positively functional connotations, perhaps even as understandable and effortlessly recognizable presentations of the traditional figure of Christ. They could also be seen as pictorial position-takings depicting

345 See e.g. the ideas developed by Mondzain in the horizon of the iconoclastic period and the Orthodox Church in general; Mondzain 1996, 193 « À ce que Kantorowicz a repéré sous le titre de souveraineté de l’artiste à la Renaissance, s’oppose ici une pratique kénôtique de l’espace vierge où s’incarne le souveraineté d’une institution qui va faire de la chair un corps, corpus Ecclesiae. », and p. 198 « L’icône est symbole : ce qui revient à dire que, dans l’économie de son plan d’occupation de l’espace, elle a pour autre visée d’être un plan d’occupation de l’esprit. …L’icône est un dispositif d’inscription hic et nunc de la présence institutionnelle. Cette présence se désigne elle-même comme l’instance qui fait apparaître le corps comme incarnation du double. Désormais, le double est l’être même du sens. Au lendemain de la crise iconoclaste, l’Église pouvait enfin s’appuyer sur le principe de la dyarchie, c’est-à-dire du partage du pouvoir temporel avec l’empereur, et s’approprier l’hégémonie symbolique, en assumant sur terre le pouvoir de Dieu.»

346 Appendix 6.1., Gothenburg, Tynnered church; Linköping, Mikaelskyrkan; Lund, Sankt Laurentii kyrka; Malmö, Bunkeflo Strandkyrka; Öskarshamn, Cecilia-kapellet; Partille Franciscan monastery; Rättvik, St. Davidsgården; Uppsala, Anskarskyrkan. On the two main types of the Pantocrator, see Sasaki & Takala 1980, 79-83. See also Johnstone 1967, 28; Honour & Fleming 1982, 242-243; Ouspensky 1999, 73-75.


348 E.g. the discourses presented in Stengård 1986, 36, 254-255, “Det är emellertid anmärkningsvärt, att just den majestätiska Pantokratorbilden, som skapades under en helt annan religiös och politisk epok med ett starkt trosmässigt samband mellan den himmelska och jordiska makten, så villigt accepteras i en rad kyrkor idag… … Förmodligen skulle församlingar och präster inte hålla med om att det verkliga rör sig om framställningar av den dömande Kristus. … När form och innehåll inte längre överstämmer, vore det måhända lämpligare att acceptera en ny form med större täckning i nutida teologiska tankegångar.” p. 255. See also the ideas presented by Jan Brazda regarding the Byzantium-influenced Christ figure in Stengård 1986, 249, “Han är en brutal, sträng man framför allt för att han följer det bysantinska mönstret. Han står på en ond mänsklighet, som förstjänar att ruskas om. Han har heller ingen anledning att tycka att församlingen är så underbar, att han behöver stryka den medhår.”

349 See Bourdieu 1993, 181, 188; Bourdieu 1998a, 334-336, 408 « Ainsi, l’autonomie relative du champ s’affirme de plus en plus dans les œuvres qui doivent leurs propriétés formelles et leur valeur qu’à la structure, donc à l’histoire du champ, interdisant toujours davantage le « court-circuit », c’est-à-dire la possibilité de passer directement de ce qui produit dans le monde social à ce qui se produit dans le champ. »
a protective, absolute and ultimately benevolent power, and perhaps even, because of the visual enthronement and quest for splendor, exalting the tradition and significance of the Christian Faith objectified in the images. Very obviously, transformation is already prevalent in the Orthodox religious field in the dispositional, interpretative content as far as the serene, awesome exemplars of some of the historical paintings of the Pantocrator are concerned.

The Deisis has featured prominently in Forsbergian icon production as a pictorial structure. The large Deisis in St. Laurence church in Lund probably contributed significantly to the rising popularity of his public production. Evidently, the typical Eastern Christ Judge in these works also represents a parallel to traditional Western images of the central figure of the Last Judgment, and especially to the Romanesque Majestas Domini representations in certain churches of the Romanesque era in Southern Sweden. Moreover, as far as the history of Byzantine influences is concerned one has to keep in mind the existing Italian medieval realizations of Deisis-type retables as altarpieces. Indeed, it seems that Forsberg may have used these historical retables and the local Romanesque tradition of depicting the image of Majestas Domini upon the medieval altar in apse vaults by fusing together various influences and ancient prototypes, and hence realized the Deisis as a reference to history for contemporary Lutheran altars. The Christ-figure in this Forsbergian re-production of revived medieval imagery is surrounded by a gathering of chosen saints – primarily with the Mother of God and St. John the Forerunner – as intercessors of prayer before the Almighty. Certain modifications of the Deisis also depict saints such as St. Bridget of Sweden as intercessors. Ultimately, the Deisis-type in Forsberg’s production could be characterized as a re-contextualization and re-modification of several Byzantine and Western prototypes.

---

350 See e.g. the ideas expressed in an Orthodox religious context by Evdokimov in Evdokimov 1996, 155, “…at the center, we find the Deisis… This icon shows Christ as a bishop blessing mankind; he is also shown as Judge and Doctor. He holds the Gospel book symbolizing that he is the sole interpreter of his own word. This icon is thus a figure of tradition. Through all the elements provided by holy tradition, Christ explains his earthly words. …The Word judges, but the supreme Wisdom of Christ the bishop sets justice and mercy side by side and anticipates the second meaning of this same icon, that is, the marriage of the Lamb.”

351 See e.g. the well-known painting in Daphni, Greece, in Honour & Fleming 1982, 243, picture 7, 36. C.f. Ouspensky 1999, 73 “…However, on icons exposed to the veneration of the faithful, the type of Christ-Pantocrator, while still keeping the same majesty, lacks all fearfulness. The grave expression of His face is full of sweetness; it is the compassionate Lord, come to take on Himself the sins of the world.”

352 On Forsberg’s first public work, see ch. 2.1.

353 E.g. the known presentations of Romanesque sculpture, Honour & Fleming 1982, 284-285.

354 See Réau 1957, 44-45.

355 See Lindgren 1986, 45-47.


357 See the presentations in Farmer 1992, 258-259; and in Ouspensky 1999, 104-107.

358 See Ouspensky 1999, 63-64, “The Tehin [the Deisis] expresses the result of the Divine Incarnation, the fulfillment of the Church of the New Testament……what is represented here is the culmination of every type of service, of every separate path – a prayerful standing before the throne of God.”

359 Appendix. 6.1. Malmö, Bunkello Strandkyrka; Oskarshamn, Cecilia-kapellet. See also Réau 1957, 732, “Dans la peinture d’icônes russe et roumaine, saint Jean-Baptiste est parfois remplacé dans le rôle d’intercesseur par saint Nicolas qui était plus populaire.”
Furthermore, several structural properties and formal particularities in the available source material could be categorized in order to specify some of the structural and spatial solutions manifest in the corpus of accessible Forsbergian icons.

As a pictorial and material construction, the painted retable-type structure (a triptych or polyptych) bears a striking resemblance to traditional Orthodox portable triptychs and polyptychs, although hugely extended in size. Thus, both their similarity and dissimilarity with Orthodox tradition is depicted in this significant body of work. The setting of a modern retable-type altarpiece in Scandinavian sacred spaces could, indeed, be regarded as a reshaping of Byzantine elements on the one hand and as the use of traditional Western and Catholic ideas about medieval retables with sculptured and painted figures on the other hand. The known historical, medieval fusion of Eastern and Western elements in several Italian 12th-14th-century portable triptychs and altar retables is also a significant factor.

The previously referred-to polyptych in St. Laurence church in Lund was evidently a promotional factor at the beginning of Forsberg’s period of public production: the sculptor Ivar Lindekrantz had also used the solution of a medieval-style altar retable in the construction of several works in earlier structural equivalents in Swedish church art. These works depict Biblical scenes and figures in a primarily Western manner, and the pentameral altar polyptych of Carl Kylberg and also the altar triptych of Thor Fagerkvist could be regarded as early equivalents in terms of triptych or polyptych construction. Elisabeth Stengård’s presentation of 20th-century Swedish church art also shows that triptych-polyptych compositions were fairly common among the works included in her study. Consequently, it seems feasible to conclude that these earlier works could have functioned as a space of formerly realized position-takings for future efforts even for the producer and his peers. Thus it was not only through older, historical works that the retable form of sacred art was familiar in the Swedish context.

In conclusion, the medieval references to Byzantine archetypes referred to above, and the more or less distantly comparable realizations of 20th-century Swedish church art, and the placement of the Deisis icon in a triptych or polyptych behind a contemporary altar ultimately signify a fusion of Eastern and Western traditions. These works form an essen-

---

361 See examples of complete or partially preserved medieval sculpted retables in Finland in Pylkkänen 1960, 250-261. See also the Swedish historical materials in Lindgren 1986, 96-105.
363 See ch. 2.1.
366 Carl Kylberg 1878-1952, see Stengård 1986, 205, 208-209.
367 Thor Vilhelm Fagerkvist 1884-1960, see Månsson 1999, 135; and Stengård 1986, 135, 144-145.
369 See e.g. the works by Sven Bertil Svensson (b. 1937) depicted in Nilsson 1982, 20-23.
370 See also Réau 1957, 45 « Le Christ en gloire de l’art d’Occident est issu du pantocrator byzantin.»
tial corpus of Forsbergian icons with formal particularities typical of his work. Accord-
ingly, the Deisis (which, according to Ouspensky’s idealized and generalized presentation,
is placed in Orthodox church interiors above the Holy Door as a part of the iconostasis371) absorbs into these works the position of traditional Lutheran altar painting.372 Behind the Lutheran altar the Deisis depicts Christ in His Glory as the focal point of the sacred space, and creates a strong visual element behind and above the altar, the center of the hierarchy of the sacred space. Like several medieval retables, these works can also be opened and closed in accordance with the Liturgical Year, and as objects they also depict the ritual understanding of time, for example Lent, Christmas, and Easter.373

There are some examples of the Forsbergian synthesis of Byzantine and Western medieval pictorial and structural elements and the usage of obvious historical prototypes in Finland. The general idea behind and the construction of the triptych in Vaasa Alskathammet bears a striking resemblance to a 14th-century Byzantine/Venetian triptych. Despite differences in motifs and formal particularities, it is evident in comparison that Forsbergian icons and structural solutions such as this retable-type of work – even if in this case carrying certain Gothic features – find their prototypes in works of preceding historical eras.374 The Resurrection Icon in Vaasa realized in a circular form within a Greek cross (and several other Forsbergian icon panels carved in a similar fashion) could also be taken to allude to certain Byzantine pictorial representations in 14th-16th-century bishopric embroideries. Forsberg has used similar structural solutions, such as those in Anskarskyrkan, Uppsala, and the Jonsered Franciscan monastery, Partille. He has also repeated the motif of the Vetokannas church icon in the procession cross in Ekhagskyrkan, Jönköping.375 As an example of this corpus of icons, the painting in Vaasa is analogous to a 15th- or 16th-century Cross of an omophorion in many of its details.376

Moreover, the combination of several icons joined to the crucifix icon that has been depicted as the central piece of several works in Sweden, Fuxerna, Lilla Edet church,377 links revivalist Byzantine visual elements to a generally neo-classic interior. Interestingly, the crucifix with surrounding circular forms clearly resembles certain Gothic crucifixes of medieval Gothland, decorated with sculptured sets of pictures.378 These historical works undoubtedly functioned as models for the work in Lilla Edet church. Hence, a medieval structure has been re-shaped and re-produced in order to produce a novel object combining Eastern and Western structural elements and formal particularities that serve as a reference to the medieval past. Clearly, the prototypes of the Forsbergian works have been deliberately derived from several historical works of church art.

371 See Ouspensky 1999, 59-64.
374 See Appendix 6.1., e.g. the object in Rättvik, Stiftsgården’s kapell.
375 See Appendix 6.1., Jönköping, Ekhagskyrkan; Uppsala, Anskarskyrkan. See also the Pantocrator in Partille, Jonsered monastery.
376 See Johnstone 1967, Pictures 11, 12, 13, 14, 49, 50.
377 See Appendix 6.1., Fuxerna, Lilla Edet.
378 See Lindgren 1986, 74-76.
The placement of these icons in the sacred space is especially meaningful in understanding the intended significance and possible utilization of these objects. In several cases the icon has specifically been produced for a certain location in the sacred space, although the source material also includes examples of works acquired as later addenda. Consequently, its location may contain visual elements distinctly intended to “function” and to be conceivable and accessible for that position.

Several Forsbergian icons thus reflect the quest to place the image of the Savior at the back of and above the altar: the Deisis triptychs/polyptychs are but a part of these works. This structural and spatial property could probably be considered a Lutheran intonation in the sacred space in contrast with the contemporary Orthodox ideal of placing an icon of the Mother of God into the altar at the center of the back wall of the secluded apsis. However, as far as the Orthodox icon tradition (particularly in the 19th and early 20th centuries) is concerned, the actual placement of these icons is by no means unequivocal. Furthermore, on the subject of the “original” Orthodox placement of the icon of the Pantocrator, contemporary ideal discourse depicts it: 1. above the entrance, 2. up in the central dome, and 3. in the iconostasis on the right side of the Holy Door. In the Lutheran context in Vaasa, the Crucifixion and the Passion of the Lord have been used as an altarpiece, and the Resurrection/the Descent into Hell has also been placed directly above the altar: a definitively Orthodox revivalist Byzantine presentation of the Liturgical Year indeed, differing in detail from traditional Western presentations of the Resurrection.

Evidently, the placement of these Forsbergian icons above Lutheran altars indicates their high status in the spatial hierarchy. The positioning of a revivalist Byzantine icon at the
ritual center, in other words at the altar (even if temporarily in Kauniainen, Finland, for Swedish-language Masses\textsuperscript{389}), evidently signifies the gravity of the objectified religious, cultural and social capital invested in the object in the hierarchy of the space.\textsuperscript{390} Any revivalist Byzantine icons placed centrally in the sacred space become a statement, in other words a new fraction of pictorial position-takings, and illustrate the producer’s inclination to obtain and reshape the space. Thus, in most exemplifications the icon becomes a pictorial position-taking visible in constant public display and, moreover, an image present at the crucial moments of the parishioners’ lives (weddings, baptisms, funerals, and other momentous or common events celebrated in the church interior). The significance of these works, with their central position in the spatial hierarchy, is manifest in contrast to the icons placed further from the altar area (in naves, on balustrades, and on side walls).\textsuperscript{391} There also appears to be a clear demarcation line in relation to the geographical placement of these icons: in Finland, it is only in the Swedish-language cultural realm that Forsbergian icons have been produced for sacred spaces.\textsuperscript{392}

Evidently the earlier use of Byzantine ideas in church art has had an impact on the Swedish religious field. In particular, the works of the surrealist painter Erik Olson\textsuperscript{393} (although associated with the Catholic context in Sweden), with their obvious Byzantium- and/or Romanesque-inspired formal particularities (e.g. the Acheiropoieton as a theme),\textsuperscript{394} are an indication of the acceptance, adoption, and utilization of Eastern ideas, an effort at combining varying religious-cultural elements, and also a quest presumably shaping church art in the future. Stengård also characterized a relatively large corpus of works as “nybysantiska”, in other words “neo-Byzantine”,\textsuperscript{395} namely works by Bo Beskow,\textsuperscript{396} Jan Brazda,\textsuperscript{397} Olle Nyman,\textsuperscript{398} and Sven Ljungberg.\textsuperscript{399} In her view, the painting by Julius Kronberg in Strängnäzs Cathedral (1910)\textsuperscript{400} clearly reflects the image of a Byzantine-Romanesque Pantocrator, and the works of Joakim Skovgaard in Viborg Cathedral, Denmark (1901-1913) and Lund Cathedral (1925-1927),\textsuperscript{401} the work of Albert Eldh in Gothenburg, Vasa church,\textsuperscript{402}

\textsuperscript{389} Appendix 6.2., Kauniainen church.
\textsuperscript{390} See the details of the acquisition in ch. 4. and Appendix 6.1.
\textsuperscript{391} E.g. Appendix 6.1., Falköping, St. Olof church; Lerum, Lerum church; Jönköping, Bymarkskyrkan; and Borås, Carolikyrkan in which the existing side altar probably creates a novel, additional element in the hierarchy of the space by emphasizing the icon and its placement and creating possible ritual utilizations. See also Appendix 6.2., the Pantocrator in Uusikaupunki parish church with its large side altar. Moreover, because of the special structural properties of the narthex (i.e. a possible medieval side altar) and the entire church as a totality, Forsberg’s work in Kumlinge church’s narthex may be understood as a side altar or, additionally, as a significant placement in a historical space. See Appendix 6.2., Kumlinge, St. Anna church.
\textsuperscript{392} Cf. Appendix 6.1. to Appendix 6.2.
\textsuperscript{393} Erik Olsson 1901-1986, Stengård 1986, 121.
\textsuperscript{394} Stengård 1986, 121-132.
\textsuperscript{395} See Stengård 1984, 52-53; Stengård 1986, 36, 245-255.
\textsuperscript{397} Jan Brazda 1917-, see Stengård 1986, 248-249; Kilström 1989, 167; Svenska Konstnärer 1999, 73.
\textsuperscript{398} Olle Nyman 1909-, see Stengård 1986, 250-252; Lyberg 1986, 449-450.
\textsuperscript{399} Sven Ljungberg 1913-, Stengård 1986, 252-254; Lyberg 1986, 313.
\textsuperscript{400} Julius Kronberg 1850-1921, Stengård 1986, 27, 35, 37.
\textsuperscript{401} Joakim Skovgaard 1865-1933, Lundberg 1984, 106; Stengård 1986, 35-36, 245.
\textsuperscript{402} Albert Eldh 1878-1955, Stengård 1986, 244.
and the altarpiece by Henrik Sörensen in Linköping Cathedral from the early 20th century show certain Byzantine influences. Interestingly, Mabel Lundberg, in as far as she analyzes Skovgaard’s art, mentions certain local Grundtvigian and Giottan influences, but depicts no Byzantine prototypes. She also mentions Olle Hjortzberg as a Swedish producer of church art affected by Byzantine pictorial presentations in the early 20th century. Bengt Kilström also made some critical and analytical comments on the notion of “neo-Byzantism” with reference to the productions of Eldh, Skovgaard, Nils Aron Berge, Beskow, and Brazda, and Ulf Abel refers to some contemporary artists as having been influenced by icons in his article in 1988. More recently, Hedvig Brander Jonsson emphasized Hjortzberg’s significance in the enhancement of Byzantine influences in Swedish 20th-century church art. In short, what has been regarded and interpreted as neo-Byzantine (in the 1980s) or influential on the emergence of Byzantine visual elements in local culture seems to some extent to alter from case to case depending on the beliefs and dispositions of the reviewers in question.

In and apart from the spatial hierarchy, Forsbergian icons visually re-form essential functional elements in the Lutheran sacred space. A Lutheran pulpit has been decorated with icons in Västra Frölunda church. Similarly, the baptismal font of the school chapel in Oskarshamn carries a large assembly of saints and the Presentation of Christ depicted in several separate icon panels and a circular stained-glass window in Västra Frölunda church in Gothenburg is Byzantine in its design. Sometimes the icon is in the form of a picture on the lectern, a procession cross, a door in a sacrament case, or a panel above a side altar. It may be a triptych or polyptych, a singular painting (in some cases shaped as a cross), or a large structural composition in the sacred space. These formal particularities also ultimately signify a profound fusion of Eastern and Western pictorial traditions in the ritual practices of utilizing the icons.
The ritual practices described in the accessible data give an indication of the Eastern Orthodox religious dispositions and practices commonly in use in the familiar forms of prayer and the lighting of candles in front of the icons. The specifically Russian Orthodox tradition of consecrating the icon in a religious ceremony also seems to have been adopted and adapted when several icons produced by Forsberg were taken into use, but in a non-Orthodox ritual manner and in connection with the Lutheran Mass. The present source material also contains an account of an incidence of the traditional Orthodox kissing of the icons, but mostly the common ritual practices related to them have been as previously mentioned: the spatial and visual connections with the rituals of Baptism and the Eucharist. The use of an icon in a like manner (e.g. the above-mentioned retable-type altarpieces, the side altar, the pulpit, the baptismal font) signifies a transformation of purpose expanding to decoration and adornment, with the icon as a visual element, and probably also an emphasis on the enhanced educational usage of the religious image. Hence, the essential traditional ritual use of the icon specifically as a medium for prayer is possibly weakened in these Lutheran solutions and formal particularities. Indeed, one could ask whether or not, in the Lutheran context, the act of personal prayer in public sacred spaces is socially (and psychologically) possible when the people praying face an icon placed on a pulpit, a balustrade, or a baptismal font. Evidently, the traditional Orthodox ritual of touching/kissing/carrying the icons as an act of adoration, and also reaching devoutly out to the Divine understood as being present in the icon, identifies a major difference that prevails in the ritual understanding of these objects. By way of contrast, the Lutheran ritual practices involving the Forsbergian icons seem merely to be visual ritual usages of the image, and in certain cases they also appear in the form of its ritual

419 E.g. Interview III, 2000, observation in Fallköping, St. Olaf church.
421 E.g. the video recorded during a Mass, including the consecration of an icon on December 17, 2000 in St. Olaf church in Fallköping. See also Appendix 6.1., the details in the cases of Lerum, Lerum church; Sala, Väster-Färnebo church; Uppsala, Anskarskyrkan, consecration by the Swedish Lutheran Archbishop in 1984; and Varberg, Bua church.
423 E.g. Appendix 6.1., Oskarshamn, Cecilia-kapellet, the baptismal font covered with icons; and Jönköping, Ekhagskyrkan.
424 E.g. all the icons placed above or close to the (main) altar of the church, see Appendix 6.1., Gothenburg, Mariakyrkan; Gothenburg, Tynnered church; Gothenburg, Västra Frölunda parish home; Kauniainen, Kauniainen church; Lilla Edet, Fuxerna church; Linköping, Mikaelskyrkan; Lund, Sankt Laurentii kyrka; Malmö, Bunkfö Strandkyrka; Oskarshamn, Cecilia-kapellet; Oskarshamn, Kolbergakyrkan; Rättvik, Stifsgårdens kapell; Sala, Väster-Färnebo church; Svenshögen, Svenshögen parish home; Uppsala, Anskarskyrkan; Vaasa, the chapel of Alskathemmet; Vaasa, Vetokannas church; Varberg, Apelvikshöjd church; Varberg, Bua church; Varberg, Träslövskyrka.
425 See e.g. Evdokimov’s divisions on the Western and Eastern utilizations of the sacred image in Evdokimov 1996, 177-181. Cf. Luther’s theological thinking regarding the religious image, as presented briefly in ch. 2.3.
426 This idea originally came up in the author’s private discussion with Kari Kotkavaara. See Kotkavaara 1991, 28, “Finally, we should also bear in mind the emphasis on the tangible rather than the visual properties of the image, which derived from the cult of relics.” See also Evdokimov, 1996, 178-179, “In a nutshell, the icon is a sacrament for the Christian East; more precisely, it is the vehicle of a personal presence.” … “An image, which has been verified for dogmatic correctness by a priest, which conforms
carrying. In all likelihood, the common Lutheran use of the Eastern visual tradition is characterized by parishioners’ habits of “reading” sacred art in churches and chapels, in other words approaching the icon as “text” or narrative rather than as a manifestation of the Divine.

Generally and structurally, the painting style of the Forsbergian icons could be considered to represent influences derived from medieval Byzantine and Russian icon traditions mediated and formed by the revivalist Byzantine painting ideals of the late 20th century. These showed many Byzantine and Russian medieval influences in their drawing, coloring and egg-tempera technique, with the limited scope for variation or personal touches. In one of his interviews, Forsberg defined his painting style in relation to the Russian medieval icon tradition, preferring the Central Russian conventions of the medieval era to the Novgorodian tradition. These non-pictorial self-definitions could nevertheless be regarded as mental dispositions connected to a large set of various pictorial objects, but it is evident that some stylistic details in Forsberg’s icons echo his Central Russian prototypes. Moreover, there remains an obvious distinction between his production and that of de Caluwé: the pupil and his former teacher deal differently with stylistic aspects of color, light and darkness, graphic detailing, icon size and structure (often realized in differing contexts), and specifically with the use of gold (used richly and often by Forsberg, and absent in the public Finnish production of de Caluwé). Some of Forsberg’s former pupils (e.g. Gerdmar and Nordsjö) have also established their own distinctive style in the same manner.

to the Holy Tradition, and which attains a sufficient level of artistic expression becomes a ‘miraculous icon’ by the divine response to the epiclesis in the rite. ‘Miraculous’ here means exactly that the icon is charged with a presence. The icon is sure witness of this presence and the ‘channel of grace and sanctifying virtue.’" p. 178; and Mondzain 1996, 200-201 « La Glycophilousa, Vierge du contact, est celle dont le corps manifeste la sacralisation du contact, de la contagion…. …L’icône ne se contente pas de montrer le contact, elle le suscite dans la thaumaturgie de sa présence même. La vue et le toucher ne cessent de se relayer et de se limiter mutuellement. La plupart des mosaïques ne peuvent être touchées, mais les icônes sont souvent près du regard, transportées, portées sur soi. Le développement des icônes portatives ne fait que développer cet espace du contact et de la contagion. »

427 See Appendix 6.1., Jönköping, Ekhagskyrkan; Lilla Edet, Fuxerna kyrka; Malmö, Bunkeflo Strandkyrka; Rättvik, St. Davidsgården. This idea originally came up in the author’s discussion with David Morgan.


430 E.g. Forsberg’s icon in the chapel of Alskathemmet, a Print acquired by John Forsberg; Erland Forsberg’s Photographs.

431 This assessment is based on the few icons by de Caluwé in the accessible source material and the author’s interview in the ecumenical center, Espoo. See also the pictures representing de Caluwé’s work in Lönnebo & Werkström 1984, front page, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, and 46.

Evidently, Forsberg’s materials, colors, and painting technique echo the general ideals of contemporary reviver Byzantine icon painting as represented in de Caluwe’s methodical guide books435 and in Ouspenky’s instruction, for example.436 These material, technical, and pictorial teachings co-constitute the space of possible position-takings formed by the pictorial works of the same painting instructors and of all the agents involved in contemporary icon production. Obviously, with its conventions and regulations, the restricted space of stylistic and material possibilities has been arduously used by Forsberg in mastering the formal particularities that are suitable and “functional” in the space of possible position-takings in the new Lutheran context.

It is very likely that an icon such as those produced by Forsberg placed in modernist church interiors and sacred spaces with minimal decorative and pictorial elements and objects inevitably carries a decorative, narrative, and somehow familiar element from history and, simultaneously, a pictorial component reduced to a strictly regulated simplification. One could with reason ask whether the modernist void of an austere church interior has created the space of possibles for these icons in the form of a new space of pictorial position-takings that, almost like an antagonism, has reshaped modernist sacred spaces. Moreover, modernist austerity could be understood as a framework within which the original and genuine Old Church image is displayed in an analogous fashion to the counter-reformist idea of displaying old, miraculous icons in a 17th-century Baroque frame.437

A few, but nevertheless interesting, antiquarian icons were brought to Sweden in the 16th century,438 and even some Finnish Orthodox churches were transformed into Lutheran parish churches in the 20th century,439 but it is the reviver Byzantine icons in their abundance that have re-formed their contemporary Scandinavian sacred spaces with their new formal and pictorial elements. Consequently, they have appeared as a space of pictorial position-takings striving to question contemporary church art. Is it a “counter-image”?440 a contemporized revivification of the past, or a reproduced originality in adherence to the attractive otherness of Eastern spirituality? As such, this pictorial space of position-takings reveals a symmetry with the space of positions occupied by Forsberg and, furthermore, with his public literary position-takings. In this sense, his rather uniform trajectory has been formed in relation to the continuous production of centrally placed, reviver Byzantine icons featuring several formal particularities adapted to their new contexts in the Lutheran religious realm.

437 Belting 1994, 484-490.
439 See Hanka 1994, 64; and Wartiainen 2002, 9-12.
440 See ch. 2.3.
3.2. Icons in Finnish Lutheran Sacred Spaces – A Comparative Contextual Inquiry

An icon could, indeed, be considered as an exceptional piece of church decoration in the Finnish Lutheran context. Yet, icons and icon-type objects have been placed in at least twenty sacred spaces in different parts of the country from the 1970s up to the present day. Together, these objects comprise a set of works ultimately mixed and varied in their structural properties and formal particularities, classified as follows in terms of formal characteristics.

3.2.1. Antiquarian Icons

This study uses the concept “antiquarian icon” to characterize the icons produced before the late 20th century. Accordingly, because of their estimated age range, dating from the 17th to the late 19th centuries, some of those in Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces are categorized as antique objects. The western influences detectable in various formal particularities, and even in the structural properties of this set of objects, indeed, mark fundamental differences from the revivalist Byzantine works produced between 1970 and 2000. Accordingly, the set or “sample” of the four works placed in sacred spaces in Houtskär, Lappvik and Savonlinna features various aspects of the Western pictorial models and ideas used in their production that are clearly related to the different historical eras the works represent. Given the specific art-sociological orientation of this study, however, I will deliberately postpone any attempt at accurate historical dating.

Three of these icons were acquired as donations, and in one case it was loaned to its Lutheran users by Orthodox ecclesiastical agents. Three have their origins in Russia, and presumably were previously used by Orthodox religious agents. Exceptionally, the possibly 17th- to 18th-century Nativity depiction, a thoroughly Western-style painting in Savonlinna, features various aspects of the Western pictorial models and ideas used in their production that are clearly related to the different historical eras the works represent. Given the specific art-sociological orientation of this study, however, I will deliberately postpone any attempt at accurate historical dating.

441 See Appendix 6.2., Houtskär, Houtskär church (Christ with a crown of thorns and cane, probably a 19th-century Russian work after the famous picture by Guido Reni: for more details see Appendix 6.2.); Lappvik, Snoan retreat center (the Kazan Mother of God, and the Great Martyr St. George and the Dragon: for more details see Appendix 6.2.); Savonlinna, Pikkukirkko (the Nativity of Christ, a Western-origin painting that formerly functioned as an icon in Käkisalmi Orthodox church: for more details see Appendix 6.2.).

442 E.g. the linear perspective and how light and shade materialize in these works: in the thoroughly Western depiction of the Nativity in Savonlinna (possibly a 17th- or 18th-century work), in the Kazan Mother of God in Snoan chapel, (probably a 19th-century work), and in the evidently late-19th-century work in Houtskär church. Compared with these icons, the Great Martyr St. George and the Dragon in Snoan chapel (possibly a 19th-century work) have certain unrefined formal particularities (e.g. the lack of sophistication in the human figures, rigid and with minimal details).

443 A donation may also be understood as an acquisition, at least to some degree, because of the mutual agreement about the shift of ownership, the relation making the action possible, and even the possible agreement or permission concerning the placement of the donated object. The change in ownership could also be considered an exchange of capital, a semi-commercial act in which the economic price is substituted by social and symbolic capital.

444 See the data regarding the modes of acquisition in Appendix 6.2., Houtskär; Lappvik; Savonlinna.
Picture 17a. Antiquarian icon on loan from the Finnish Orthodox Church in Savonlinna Pikkukirkko, 2000. The painting could be considered as a rare object with its origins in Central or Southern Europe. It is possibly from the 17th or 18th century. Painter unknown. Photograph by the author.
Picture 17b. Savonlinna Pikkukirkko, Finland. The antiquarian icon serving today as a Lutheran altarpiece in the former Orthodox church was earlier part of the interior of the pre-World War II Karelian Orthodox church in Käkisalmi. Photograph by the author.
Picture 18. Antiquarian icon in Houtskär church, in Finland’s southern archipelago, an example of Russian late-19th-century icon production. It was donated in 1992. Parish members going to the altar to receive Communion see the icon in the choir area behind the pulpit. Photograph by the author.
The Snoan retreat center, Lappvik, Finland, two donated antiquarian icons in the chapel. In all likelihood, they are of Russian origin and were produced in the 19th century. They were discovered in the estate of the donor’s husband who died in action in 1944. In the sacred space, a small chapel with an informal and home-like look, icons of the Kazan Mother of God and St. George form a three-part pictorial scene with the Crucifix at the center. Photograph by the author.

linna Pikkukirkko, was most likely not originally painted to function as an icon in Käkisalmi Orthodox church in Karelia. The work in Houtskär, a Russian icon presumably dating from the late 19th century, contains evident Western features in its style, method of production, and decorative details, intriguingly mixed with Eastern formal particularities such as in the clothing of the figure. The fairly unrefined icon of St. George and the Dragon in Snoan chapel could probably be regarded as a Russian 19th-century mass-produced object. Two icons depict the Mother of God as a central figure, and three of them depict the figure of Christ as a central pictorial element: the icon of St. George, in which the Christ figure appears only in the nimbus on the upper left-hand side, is an exception. All four works are placed in the sacred spaces either as altarpieces or close to the altar in the choir area of the church or chapel – a placement presumably related to the high degree of cultural and religious capital objectified in them.

445 See Appendix 6.2., Savonlinna, Pikkukirkko.
446 See Appendix 6.2., Houtskär, Houtskär church.
447 See Réau 1958 II, 571-579.
448 See Appendix 6.2., Lappvik, Snoan retreat center.
449 I.e. the Kazan Mother of God, and the Nativity of Christ.
3.2.2. Revivalist Byzantine Icons

The largest set of icons produced by different agents and placed in Lutheran church interiors in different parts of the country in the second half of the 20th century comprise 27 icons in 15 sacred spaces that typify Byzantine revivalism: they were painted using the egg-tempera technique and are structurally homogeneous in terms of color, composition, formation of light and shade, and the lack of a linear perspective, and also in the use of medieval Byzantine prototypes in the composition.

The data were mainly acquired, with difficulty, on visits (one to each site with a relatively limited time schedule). Scrutiny, especially of the revivalist Byzantine icons, revealed the complex, fragmented and peripheral nature of the acquisitions in question. This made the basic data relatively difficult to collect in some cases, or even impossible to construct. Sometimes the records were missing, or the author was gently refused permission to search for them by himself. In several cases, too, the available data were incomplete in some way and fragmented. Some icon painters were known by name and origin, but no other information was accessible. One painter wanted to remain absolutely anonymous despite my intensive entreaties. I strove to unravel the data in relatively accessible detail (see Appendix 6.2.), leaving aside certain details (and sometimes even essential data) or leaving them “open” when scrutiny became particularly difficult (e.g. agents missing, currently unknown, or inaccessible, or when certain pictorial objects were difficult to define). It also became evident that the actual historical value of the different narratives in the interviews varied greatly as far as the present and past positions and dispositions of the interviewees were concerned. Hence, the data in both Appendix 6.2. and Chapters 3. and 4. should be understood as introductory and incomplete, perhaps even erroneous in some details. Despite the obstacles, however, it was possible to formulate the following characterizations.

450 See Appendix 6.2., The icons in Föglö, St. Mary Magdalene church (one icon); Helsinki, Alppila church (three icons); Joensuu, Hukanhauta parish home (one icon); Jyväskylä, Keljo church (one icon); Kauniainen, Kauniainen church (five icons); Kittilä, chapel of St. Mary (one icon); Kuopio, Riistavesi church (one icon); Lahti, The Church of The Cross (one icon); Savonlinna, Pikkukirkko (one icon); Tuusula, Jokela church (one icon); Uusikaupunki, New church (one icon); Uusikapunki, parish center (one icon); Vaasa, the chapel of Alskathammet (one combined set of icons); Vaasa Vetokannas church (one icon); Värö, St. Mattias church (seven icons).

451 Exceptionally the Kittilä icon in the Chapel of St. Mary was painted on papyrus leaves rather than on the traditional wooden panel. See Appendix 6.2., Kittilä, Chapel of St. Mary.

452 Interview IX, 2001, Föglö church.

453 See Appendix 6.2., Föglö, Mary Magdalene church (this painter wanted to remain anonymous in every sense). As examples of the impartial and laborious-to-obtain data, see also the details in Helsinki, Huopalahti church (the Mother of God of Lovingkindness); Joensuu, Hukanhauta parish home; and Värö, St. Mattias church.
The works of a painter born in a nearby village are placed on the balcony balustrade as a reminder of the earlier Lutheran custom of depicting Apostles and other Biblical figures similarly placed. Hence, as a reference to the historical practice, the set of icons depicts Apostles and Evangelists as new visual elements, thus giving a new shape to the historical milieu. Photograph by the author.

Donations featured strongly in the acquisitions of revivalist Byzantine icons, although some works were commissioned, or were bought for the sacred space in question, and one work was acquired from a local Orthodox store selling religious literature and objects used in religious practices. In some cases, purchase and donation appear to have been intrinsic in the acquisition. Orthodox religious agents sometimes played a part.

---

454 See Appendix 6.2, Föglö, Mary Magdalene church, donated by the painter; Helsinki, Alppila church, donated by the painter; Helsinki, Huopalahti church, donated by de Caluwé; Joensuu, Hukanhauta parish home, a probable donation; Kauniainen, Kauniainen church, donated by relatives of Heinz Stude; Küttilä, St. Mary chapel, donated by Orthodox Archbishop Johannes; Lahti, Church of the Cross, donated by the painter; Savonlinna, Pikkukirkko, donated by Varkaus Orthodox parish; Uusikaupunki, New Church and parish center, chapel of officiates, donated by the painter; Vaasa, Vetokannas church, donated by John and Hildegard Forsberg; Vårdö, St. Mattias church, one icon donated by the painter, three icons bought and donated by the parish sewing circle.

455 E.g. Appendix 6.2, Kauniainen, Kauniainen church; Tuusula, Jokela church. See also the complex process in Vaasa in ch. 4.1.

456 E.g. Appendix 6.2, Jyväskylä, Keljo church; Kumlinge, St. Anna church; Vaasa, the chapel of Alskathammet; Vårdö, St. Mattias church.

457 See Appendix 6.2, Kuopio, Riistavesi church.

458 E.g. in Kauniainen and Vårdö.
in the acquisition process. This was the case in Kuopio, Savonlinna, and Alppila, the agent in question being the painter, a salesperson, or the donor: it could also be a layperson, a high-ranking church official, or an institutionalized organization such as the parish. In one case, the painter of the work was an agent with a position in the Catholic religious field. In certain cases, the producers of the objects were part of the Lutheran religious field (typically in the western part of the country), and four of these works or sets of

Picture 21a. Robert de Caluwé’s icon crucifix in Jokela church, Tuusula, Finland, is an early 1976 acquisition, purchased in connection with the construction of the church. It was a substitute for the bird figures that the architect proposed for an altarpiece. Furthermore, this icon objectifies the relations of the local pastor with de Caluwé in the 1960’s. Photograph by the author.
Picture 21b. The Crucifix as part of the austere, yet warm, modernist church interior with its brick wall. Interestingly, this icon is probably the only painting by de Caluwê to be placed in a Lutheran sacred space in Finland. As a combination of distinct, traditional formal particularities, the painting brings two images of the Saints to the ritual space: the Mother of God and St. John the Evangelist. Photograph by the author.

works were generated by Erland Forsberg as the painter (and also in Vaasa and Kumlinge as the promoter). 463 In all cases, the acceptance, placement, and utilization of the objects were of particular interest (or disinterest) to the local Lutheran organizations and agents. Furthermore, the acquisitions on which there was scarce source material or unavailable records were placed in the sacred space by permission, and perhaps with the silent approval of Lutheran organizations and agents. Some acquisitions have raised debate, espe-

---

461 E.g. Appendix 6.2., Helsinki, Alppila church; Kittilä, St. Mary chapel (an icon painted in Greece); Kuopio, Riistavesi church.
460 E.g. Appendix 6.2., Kuopio, Riistavesi church.
463 E.g. Appendix 6.2., Helsinki, Alppila church, the layperson as donor; Kittilä, St. Mary chapel, the Orthodox Archbishop as donor; Savonlinna, Pikkukirkko. It should be also noted that the characterizations utilized to define the agents’ functions overlap in several cases.
462 See Appendix 6.2., Kökar, Kökar church; Tuusula, Jokela church. In these cases the agents involved were a Franciscan monk and a Uniate Catholic priest.
463 See Appendix 6.2., Jyväskylä, Keljo church; Kauniainen, Kauniainen church; Kumlinge, St Anna church; Lahti, Church of the Cross; Uusikaupunki, New Church; Uusikaupunki, parish center, chapel of officiates; Vaasa, the chapel of Alskathemmet; Vaasa, Vetokannas church.
cially those Huutoniemi church in Vaasa, and Jokela church in Tuusula. In Jokela the matter was addressed in a local newspaper, and the process was instigated and promoted by the then pastor in his position as the administrative official.

Compared to the Forsbergian corpus of icons presented in the previous Chapter, these works depict a corresponding, yet more exceptional Marian image in Lutheran sacred

---

464 See the analysis in ch. 4.
Indeed, in five of them (the Mother of God of Lovingkindness, the Mother of God of Don, the Mother of God of Tolga, the Mother of God of the Passion, and the Mother of God of Konevitsa) it is the traditional Orthodox Marian image that is in a Lutheran sacred space, although not as an altarpiece. It is placed very close to the altar, to the south side on a pilaster, in Swedish-language parish of Föglö. Correspondingly, the antiquarian icon of the Kazan Mother of God in Snoan chapel has traditionally been placed on the north side close to the altar. See Appendix 6.2., Lappvik, Snoan chapel.

See the introductory analysis of the Marian images in ch. 3.1.

On the iconographic history and composition of the Konevitsa icon, see Jääskinen 1971, 86-217.

Correspondingly, the antiquarian icon of the Kazan Mother of God in Snoan chapel has traditionally been placed on the north side close to the altar. See Appendix 6.2., Lappvik, Snoan chapel.
and Riistavesi churches the Lovingkindness and Tolga types/variants are sited on the south and north side walls of the church interior, and in Hukanhauta parish home the Passion-type Marian icon has been placed on the side wall of an extended space for different gatherings, yet with an open but somewhat distant view of the altar area. In the chapel of the Uusikaupunki parish center the Konevitsa Mother of God is placed in the front corner of a small room on a specially constructed shelf right above the baptismal font – clearly a prominent position in view of the Sacrament of the Baptism.\footnote{See Appendix 6.2., Föglö, Maria Magdalene church; Helsinki, Huopalahti church; Joensuu, Hukanhauta parish home; Kuopio, Riistavesi church; Uusikaupunki, parish center, chapel of officiates.} It is only in

Picture 24. The icon of the Mother of God of Lovingkindness in Huopalahti church, Helsinki, Finland, is a small painting placed far from the altar area on the south sidewall. It is one of the oldest revivalist Byzantine pictures in Lutheran sacred spaces in Finland, painted in 1975 by Maija Puustinen and donated by Robert de Caluwé in connection with an icon exhibition. Because of its motif, the icon signifies the (re)appearance of the Marian image in Lutheran sacred spaces. Photograph by the author.
the Finnish icons made by Forsberg and his former tutor de Caluwé that the Marian image appears as an essential side figure, or an essential part of the composition of the Crucifix, or of the icons of the festivals depicting the ecclesiastical year.\footnote{See the icons in Appendix 6.2., Kauniainen, Kauniainen church; Tuusula, Jokela church; Vaasa, the chapel of Alskathemmet.}

Other saints, especially post- or non-Biblical ones, rarely feature in these revivalist Byzantine icons: only in Kumlinge church is there a Forsbergian icon depicting saints Joachim and Anne placed on the narthex shelf, evidently alluding to the medieval name of the church dedicated to St. Anna.\footnote{See Appendix 6.2., Kumlinge, Church of St. Anna. On St. Anna, see Réau, 1958 I, 90-96.} However, the popular figures of the New Testament, the

Picture 25. The Mother of God of the Passion in Hukanhauta parish home, Joensuu, Finland, is placed far from the altar on the sidewall of a parish meeting hall opening into the sacred space. The accessible data regarding painter and the acquisition are unreliable and fragmentary. Photograph by the author.
chosen Apostles and the four Evangelists, are depicted in the Vårdö set of seven icons and placed on the balcony balustrade in line with the earlier Lutheran tradition of similarly placing painted figures in the sacred space. Furthermore, the icons depicting the festival days of the (Lutheran) ecclesiastical year – Christmas, Easter in including the Passion and the Resurrection, and the Ascension – in accordance with their traditional Biblical

---

472 See Appendix 6.2., Vårdö, church of St. Mattias.
473 See e.g. Komulainen 1986, the catalogue on pp. 281-286, esp. pp. 283-284, as a geographically limited example.
474 See Appendix 6.2., Helsinki, Alppila church; Kauniainen, Kauniainen church.
475 See Appendix 6.2., Helsinki, Alppila church; Kauniainen, Kauniainen church; Tuusula, Jokela church; Vaasa, the chapel of Aakathemmet. The icon utilized as a processional cross in the Church of the Cross in Lahti, is an exception in this set because of its depiction of the Crucified without any side figures.
476 See Appendix 6.2., Helsinki, Alppila church; Kauniainen, Kauniainen church; Vaasa, Vetokannas church.
477 See Appendix 6.2., Kauniainen, Kauniainen church.
references, feature certain figures related to the depicted narrations. These six works (except for the temporarily placed icons in Kauniainen) have been placed either as altar-pieces or at the very front of the sacred space close to the altar although the Biblical saints they depict are, in the main not there as intercessors of prayer, but are rather primarily pictorial narrators that make the story recognizable and comprehensible. It therefore seems likely that, in the context of Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces, the saint figures (excluding the icons of the Mother of God) are merely illustrations of periodically repeated Biblical texts. Moreover, compared with the Forsbergian production for sacred spaces in Sweden, the absence of specifically Finnish local medieval saints is evident. Indeed, the

478 E.g., the figure of the Mother of God appears in the crucifixes primarily as calling for contemplation of the redeeming act of the Savior. See e.g. Ouspensky 1999, 181.
479 On the local saints in the Forsbergian corpus of icons see ch. 3.1. On the only known exception, see in this chapter the miscellaneous Lutheran sacred spaces containing icons in the ecumenical chapel in Kökar.
480 See the analysis in ch. 3.1.
Picture 28a. Keljo church, Jyväskylä, Finland. The Mother of God of Lovingkindness is a relatively small but visible object rather close to the altar area. It was realized by a local Lutheran painter who participated in an icon-painting circle, and acquired by the district pastor in 1997. Photograph by the author.
Picture 28b. Keljo church, Jyväskylä, Finland. The large sand-filled candlestand was placed prior to the icon, thus its ritual function, according to one interviewee, called for a picture as a necessary element. Photograph by the author.
Mother of God icons could also be interpreted in Protestant terms as illustrations depicting the Nativity of the Savior.  

The image of Christ has probably often been depicted in several Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces as the most “suitable” and “correct” Protestant image, and a similar phenomenon could, to a minor extent, feature in the Forsbergian corpus of icons in Sweden. Accordingly, the icons depicting the Christ figure appear as realizations of several prototypes: the Pantocrator in Kittilä, Savonlinna, and Uusikaupunki; the Resurrected in Vaasa, Vetokannas church, the suffering, crucified, and resurrected Christ in the chapel of Alskathammet in Vaasa, the Crucifix in Lahti and Jokela, and the infant/pre-existing Christ in icons of the Mother of God. The Christ Judge of the Deisis group, unlike the Forsbergian set of Pantocrators, is completely absent from the Finnish Lutheran realm. Moreover, only three revivalist Byzantine icons have been placed as altar pieces, and all three depict either the crucified or the resurrected Christ in terms of the central figure: in de Caluwé’s icon at Jokela and Forsberg’s two icons in Vaasa.

All in all, the “Christ icons” occupy the complete matrix of the sacred space. In Uusikaupunki New Church, the Pantocrator is placed above an extensive side altar with a bench for kneeling for private prayer or meditation. It is on the northern side wall in the front part of the chapel in the Kittilä chapel of St. Mary, and on the south side wall relatively close to the choir area in Savonlinna Pikkukirkko. Finally, the Nativity and Crucifixion with their Christ figures occupy the front wall of Alppila church, on the north side of the altar. The figure of Christ in these icons has evidently been considered the most appropriate to occupy almost any position in Protestant sacred spaces; this perception is also probably in tune with the mental image and disposition of the Lutheran doctrine emphasizing Christ as the sole mediator of God’s grace.

Certain comments must be added on some of the items from the complete corpus of revivalist Byzantine icons placed in Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces.

Firstly, pictorial fragmentation has affected some of them. The formal particularities of the texts and details of the figures in two Vårdö icons make the depicted saints hard to

---

480 E.g. Telephone conversation with Tuula Ahonen lecturer in Fine Arts, Savonlinna, September 26, 2001.
481 See the analysis in ch. 3.1.
482 Forsberg has also used the cross shape in Uppsala, Anskarskyrkan and in Jonsered Franciscan monastery. See Appendix 6.1.
483 See e.g. Ouspensky 1999, 81, 92.
484 See Appendix 6.2., Fögö, Maria Magdalene church; Helsinki, Huopalahti church; Joensuu, Hukanhauta parish home; Kuopio, Riiastavesi church; Uusikaupunki, parish center, chapel of officiates.
485 See Appendix 6.2., Tuusula, Jokela church, Vaasa, the chapel of Alskathammet; Vaasa, Vetokannas church.
486 See Appendix 6.2., Uusikaupunki, New Church.
487 See Appendix 6.2., Kittilä, the chapel of St. Mary.
488 See Appendix 6.2., Savonlinna, Pikkukirkko.
489 See Appendix 6.2., Helsinki, Alppila church.
recognize – otherwise they have obviously been produced with a view to following or copying the ancient models of their depicted prototypes.

Secondly, the icons have been part of certain ritual practices. In at least two locations they have been used by local Orthodox parish members and priests in Orthodox services outside of official ecclesiastical buildings. Furthermore, in the Lutheran religious context the lighting of candles has been allowed for parish members in two locations, Jyväskylä and Uusikaupunki, where a complete side altar has been erected with an open Bible, candle, sandbox for lighted candles, flowers, a Crucifix, and a specially constructed kneeler for personal meditation and prayer. Interestingly, the construction of a ritual place for lighting candles in Keljo preceded the acquisition of the icon. In Föglö the icon is equipped with a candle stand, and in Riistavesi with an oil lamp. Its placement above the altar table in four sacred spaces inevitably makes it a visual participant in all ritual activities taking place by the altar or the baptismal font, and the painting in the chapel of Alskathemmet, with its retable-type structure, can be closed and opened in accordance with the liturgical year. In Alppila church too, the three icons have been placed close to the altar or inside the altar space (although on the north side of the altar table), making them visible to most parish members kneeling in front of the altar to receive Communion. Hence, in certain Lutheran contexts the setting of the icon calls for kneeling in front of the religious image. Obviously, the icons are understood in their new surroundings as equivalent to traditional Lutheran altarpieces, and consequently the (revivalist) Byzantine pictorial material turns into a visual image, a “visual background” or the image of visual piety in its contemporary Western utilization. The placement of the icon in Keljo Church, Jyväskylä “once or twice” led to discourses from the pulpit elucidating its meaning.

---

493 See Appendix 6.2., Jyväskylä, Keljo church.
494 See Appendix 6.2., Uusikaupunki, New parish church.
495 See Appendix 6.2., Jyväskylä, Keljo church.
496 See Appendix 6.2., Föglö, Mary Magdalene church; Kuopio, Riistavesi church.
497 Appendix 6.2., Uusikaupunki, parish center, chapel of officiates.
498 I.e. in Tuusula, Jokela church; Vaasa, the chapel of Alskathemmet and Vetokannas church; on the temporary placements in Kauniainen church, see Appendix 6.2.
499 Appendix 6.2., Helsinki, Alppila church.
500 The act of kneeling before the icon is, indeed, untypical of Orthodox religious practice, in which the person usually stands in prayer before the sacred image. Hence, a kneeler may be regarded as a strongly Western element in the ritual utilization of these pictures. The idea of the difference in prayer posture in front of icons was mentioned by Kari Kotkavaara in a private conversation with the author.
501 On the notion of visual piety, see Morgan 1998, 2, “Conventional wisdom takes one of two polarized views regarding the relation of art and religion: either art is the handmaiden of religion, or else the artist is an autonomous agent working out of his or her own inspiration, which may or may not parallel the specific concerns of religion. But surely the relationship is much more complex than this simplistic opposition suggests. Visual piety offers a different way of thinking about art and religion. As the set of practices, attitudes, and ideas invested in images that structure the experience of the sacred, visual piety cancels the dualistic separation of mind and matter, thought and behavior, that plagues a great deal of work on art and religion.” See also pp. 4-12.
Brief comparison between revivalist Byzantine icons in the Finnish Lutheran context and Forsbergian icons in Sweden reveals certain major differences. The first is in the quantity of products: the Forsbergian corpus alone exceeds the complete corpus of all accessible icons in the Finnish Lutheran context. The second concerns the motifs: the roughly corresponding appearance of the Marian image contrasts with the absence of the Deisis and its central Christ Judge in the Finnish works, and of local, medieval saints as depicted figures. The structures and placements of these works should also be taken into account; there is only one work in Finland by Forsberg with a retable-type structure, and there are no special, structural solutions in the placement of the icons. Only three works are permanent altarpieces, two of which were made by Forsberg and one by de Caluwé. The analysis revealed that local Orthodox religious agents in Finland practice certain rituals, but the data is incomplete and far too fragmented to enable any comparison with the Forsbergian Swedish icons to be made. However, one could assume that the ritual practices differ from the above-mentioned consecration rituals in the Swedish context which, as the author observed in Fallköping, Sweden, are less common in the Finnish Lutheran realm and seldom as resplendent.

3.2.3. Icon-type/Iconic Objects and Related Phenomena

In their structural properties and formal particularities certain rare objects in Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces are so equivocal that their characterization as either “icons” or “non-icons” is practically unrealizable. Definitions are hard to come by, and I would designate them as icon-type or iconic objects, concurrently emphasizing both the structural and pictorial properties common to the Byzantine icon tradition and the formal particularities contrasting or alien to the conventions of the pictorial tradition of mainstream Eastern Orthodox Christianity. Although these works could be considered as exceptional and even marginal objects in the sacred space, they can still be included among the Byzantine pictorial materials in contemporary Scandinavian Lutheran sacred spaces.

The intriguing commixture of structural elements is evident in the large Crucifixes donated to Kökar and Huopalahti churches. The one in Kökar is a replica of a Franciscan sacred object, the San Damiano Crucifix in Assisi, Italy. It was donated to the church by Centro Ecomenico Nordico and Nils Lundin, a Franciscan father, who wanted to be buried in Kökar church, where the iconic Crucifix was placed on the south wall in connection with the consecration of the ecumenical chapel in 1979. Hence, the work (most probably designed in Italy) could be considered an objectification of the religious and social capital.

503 Cf. appendices 6.1., and 6.2.
504 Cf. the subjects depicted in this section with the structural properties and formal particularities remarked upon in ch. 3.1.
505 See the structural solutions and placements in ch. 3.1.
506 See the data regarding the cases in Kauniainen and Uusikaupunki Parish Center, chapel of officiates in Appendix 6.2.
507 See the consecration rituals in ch. 3.1. and the data on St. Olof church, Fallköping in Appendix 6.1.
508 On the history, composition, figures, and production of the “original” San Damiano Crucifix, see e.g. Raittila 2002, 32-33. Interestingly, Raittila characterizes the object as a “Crucifix icon” (krusifiksi-ikoni) to her Finnish readers.
Picture 29. Huopalahti church, Helsinki, Finland. This large icon-type painting, the “Taizé-Crucifix”, on the north sidewall, could be regarded as an intriguing mixture of iconic, Western, and naive or archaic formal particularities. The picture is a thanksgiving donation to the parish on the occasion of the ordination of the donor to the ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland. Hence, it could be regarded as objectifying ecumenical relations (the icon print was acquired in Taizé, France), and the donor’s desire to be ordained. The donor prepared the carpentry. Photograph by the author.
accumulated through ecumenical relations in Kökar. Whether or not this Romanesque reproduction could be considered as an iconic object remains questionable, but nevertheless, it bears a resemblance to icon Crucifixes such as one in Jokela, in its side figures, general composition, and pictorial motifs. Replicas of the “original object” in Assisi have been sold on numerous occasions for use in devotional practices in Scandinavia.

The iconic object in Huopalahti church could be denoted as a replica of the “Taizé Crucifix”, a work produced in accordance with a distinctively ecumenical religious structure, the Taizé community. The Crucifix, with its simultaneously modernized and traditional formal particularities, is widely used as a symbol of religious ecumenical and spiritual goals by various agents and collective organs.

As far as the appearance of the Taizé Crucifix in the Finnish context is concerned, the St. Thomas Mass could be considered as a significant space of possibilities, and also an enhancing element in the emergence of the icon in Lutheran sacred spaces. The Mass could be described as a revivalist or re-formed Lutheran Mass combining certain elements of the Eastern Orthodox tradition. For example, icon prints, incense, and beeswax (“tuohus”) candles are used as symbols of prayer, and Western traditions are incorporated, including the (already intermingled) ecumenical influences from Taizé, France. Interestingly, it is difficult to find direct literary references to the use of icon prints as symbols on the side altars in these Masses. However, I can conclude from my personal observations (as a private participant in or as a pastor on duty at several St. Thomas Masses from 1989 to the present day) that the original Coptic Icon of Friendship in particular has been brought forward as a symbol on several occasions. In my view, the Mass has formed a space of possibilities for the advance of Byzantine visual elements into the Finnish Lutheran realm, not only in the capital but also in several areas around the country. As a phenomenon of the 1980s, 1990s (and of the present day), the Mass was visually characterized in Kotimaa by the Taizé Crucifix, and in the 1990s also by a few other procession crosses. These objects were evidently presented in Kotimaa and in a book on the Mass as symbols of

---

509 See Appendix 6.2., Kökar church.
510 An interesting example of the utilization of this iconic replica was its display as a public, visual memorial on a ferry on which the author traveled to Åland in the early spring of 2001. See the author’s photographs from Kumlinge, Värö, Föglö, and Kökar.
511 See Appendix 6.2., Helsinki, Huopalahti church.
512 See the order of the Taizé Brotherhood in Raittila 1983, 9-27. See also Gonzáles-Balado, 1987.
515 On the icon depicting Christ and St. Menas, see Raittila 2002, 80-81; St. Menas d. c. 300, see Farmer 1992, 337 and Belting 1994, 96-97. See also the pictures e.g. in Fabrin & Holopainen & Malmberg & Paakkanen & Peura 2003, front page and p. 1.
516 On the history, extent, and popularity of the Mass, see Kauppinen 1992, 7-10.
518 Kotila (ed.) 1993, the cover picture depicting the reverse side of the Crucifix.
the phenomenon, and were hence utilized as objects materializing and visualizing the ideas and goals of this religious endeavor. Accordingly, a Taizé Crucifix has occasionally been used as a symbol of an individual agent’s adherence to the St. Thomas Mass.519 An article in Kotimaa in 1994 characterized the Taizé movement by its primary visual symbol, the icon-type Crucifix.520

Furthermore, the donated replica print pasted on cardboard in the sacred space of Huopalahti church in Helsinki, on the north wall of the church interior, is a picture that a local student of theology and parish activist wanted to offer as a personal thanksgiving when he was ordained pastor. This agent personally prepared the woodwork and used his direct contacts with the Taizé movement in France in his acquisition of the picture.521 Hence, the pictorial product could also be regarded as a rare example of an individual agent’s relations with his local parish and the Taizé movement in France, his ecumenical dispositions, and his ambition to be admitted to the ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland.

Phenomena such as St. Thomas Mass and the Taizé-movement are, of course, by no means the only explicatory factors of the appearance of the revivalist icon in Finland. In addition to the preceding characterizations of icons and icon-type objects, certain sacred spaces should be typified not as essentially Lutheran (with typical and ongoing Lutheran ritual activities), but as miscellaneous or ecumenical/shared sacred spaces containing icons and icon-type objects. Given their establishment and/or use these spaces and their pictorial objects will henceforth, in accordance with my objective,522 either be comprehended border phenomena, or will be excluded from the further scrutiny. I will therefore only briefly mention some of them in the following as exemplary phenomena concurrent with the appearance of the icon in Lutheran sacred spaces.

1) The Ecumenical chapel or chapel-like multi-activity room in the Karelian League building in Käpylä, Helsinki, consecrated by local Orthodox and Lutheran bishops in two succeeding ceremonies in connection with the inauguration of the new building in 1974. The chapel is equipped with an icon of the Pantocrator as an altarpiece, painted by Irene Schütz and donated by Helsinki Orthodox parish, an altar Crucifix from the estate of the late Ilmari Salomies, the last Finnish Lutheran Bishop of Viipuri, and several other objects.523

2) The Ecumenical chapel of the Morbacka ecumenical community in Morbacka, Kaarina, containing a large number of icons and icon prints, including the Taizé Crucifix as an altarpiece.524

522 See ch. 1.1.
3) The Ecumenical chapel in Kökar, Åland, constructed on the site of the ruins of a medieval Franciscan monastery on the island. The building also houses a space for an exhibition of the history of the island. Icons and icon-type objects in the chapel include three icons: 1. “Peter the Deacon”, by Robert de Caluwé (about 1983), donated by the painter, 2. “St. Francis” (Italian reproduction), donated (in 1979) by the teacher and secretary of the Franciscus Society Betty Björkqvist, and 3. the “Crucifix of San Damiano” (photocopy, central picture of a mosaic on the chapel altar wall, 1979.)

4) The Ecumenical chapel in Hammaslahti, Pyhäselkä prison, in North Karelia, consecrated by the Lutheran Bishop of Kuopio and the Orthodox Archbishop of Karelia and of Finland in 1991, containing a large corpus of icons.526

5) Kirkkonummi parish, the “Hut church” (kotakirkko) on Räfsö island. Its designation as a Lutheran sacred space is questionable: although officially and publicly consecrated by the Lutheran Bishop of Helsinki in 1996, it is a building with an open fireplace and could, indeed, be considered suitable for various gatherings in a highly untypical and publicly inaccessible sacred space. The interior contains an icon of St. Nicolas, painted by Liisa Mäkelä (?) (the name of the painter was not unequivocally recalled), who offered to sell it to the parish.527

6) The Ecumenical chapel in Saariselkä, a tourist area in Finnish Lappland, containing an icon of St. Paul realized by an anonymous/unknown painter, placed on the northern chapel wall close to the altar, and consecrated by Orthodox Metropolitan Leo in connection with the consecrating rituals of the chapel in an ecumenical service on November 16, 1996.528

7) Kouvola Orthodox church of the Elevation of the Cross. A former Orthodox military church consecrated in 1903, it functioned as a Lutheran parish church in 1919-1981 and was re-consecrated as an Orthodox parish church in 1982. During the Lutheran period the altarpiece was a painting from the Orthodox era, Christ in Gethsemane, and two icons were placed on the back wall symmetrically to the addition certain icons printed on metal: the Mother of God of Lovingkindness, the Entombment of the Lord. Also, two icon-type objects: the Baptistism of the Lord (print) and the Taizé Crucifix, painted by Fr. Leon (Taizé) who donated the painting to Finnish Taizé friends in 1977, first placement in Omenapuu-kylä community chapel, removed to the then new Morbacka ecumenical chapel in October 1984.

---


527 Telephone conversation with Heikki Oksanen, a real estate manager in Kirkkonummi, November 27, 2003; Suni, e-mail November 30, 2003.

main entrance in their traditional *kiotas*, but with roughly over-painted texts and nimbuses.\(^{529}\)

8) The Multi-religious meditation space in Jyväskylä University, containing a temporarily placed icon of the Pantocrator painted by Kerttu Piekka, acquired on the initiative of the former University Pastor Päivi Jussila.\(^{530}\)

In addition, the crypt chapel in the basement of Lahti Church of the Cross contains a cluster of paper prints glued on cardboard and placed on the back wall.\(^{531}\) This pictorial formation is, in my opinion, a set of objects far too obscure, untypical, and probably also transient for any comparative analysis. All in all, they could be mentioned as contributors of some kind to the emergence and utilization of the icon in the Lutheran religious context.

In my opinion, all of the miscellaneous or shared sacred spaces and their pictorial objects contribute to and participate in the emergence of the Eastern Christian pictorial heritage to a greater or lesser extent, not as unequivocal and primarily Lutheran examples of sacred spaces with icons or iconic objects, but certainly as sacred spaces often visited by Lutherans (in the present or in the past). It is of special interest that all these ecumenical or ideologically and/or practically conjoint sacred spaces house many or only a few Eastern pictorial works.

### 3.2.4. Concluding Remarks

In general, unlike Forsberg’s icons in Finland and, in particular those in Sweden, all of these other icons and icon-type objects with their varying designs and structural solutions could be characterized as singular paintings or panels. They have none of the additional or applied structural properties that feature in several retable-type and other works of Forsberg presented in detail in Chapter 3.1. In other words, all of the icons and icon-type objects in Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces except Forsberg’s works are generally identifiable as singular objects designed as a “traditional icon” in the form of a painting (or print) on a panel.

The geographical positioning of the corpus of accessible revivalist icons and iconic objects situated in Finland happens to cover all the main areas of the country, representing individual, mainly unconnected cases,\(^{532}\) from the tourist areas in Lapland (Levi and Saariselkä areas) to the southernmost island of Kökar, Åland. North-Karelia, Savo, Central Finland, the Vaasa district in Ostrobothnia, Varsinais-Suomi, the autonomous region of Åland, and the South, including Greater Helsinki, have all been touched by representations of this phenomenon. It could thus be said that it affects almost the whole country, relatively

---

\(^{529}\) Huurinainen, Nieminen & Wartiainen 2002, 8, 10-12, 31-36; Interview XV, 2003, Father Leo Huurinainen.

\(^{530}\) Jussila, e-mail January 12, 2004.

\(^{531}\) See Appendix 6.2., Lahti, Church of the Cross.

\(^{532}\) As exceptions, note the two Forsberghian icons in Vaasa and the icons in Uusikaupunki (three icons executed by the same painter in different locations).
concurrently but not very deeply, but the limited amount of available data makes any further pursuit of more accurate conclusions pointless. Nevertheless, in terms of cultural and lingual demarcation, it is obvious that a remarkable corpus of revivalist Byzantine works, all the Forsbergian icons in Finland included, has been acquired in areas with a Swedish-language culture. In particular, the number of icons in Swedish-language Åland is remarkable. Hence, as pictorial position-taking, the Forsbergian works in Finnish contexts could be regarded as “demarcation-line cases” revealing the (until now) borders of his influences. Among other individual objects, these works appear as a small but structurally coherent set, executed to occupy sacred spaces as central and visible visual statements in the same way as their Swedish equivalents.

In the Finnish context, the icon seems to function as a “joint object”, materializing religious and cultural capitals and opening a passage for Byzantine visual elements from Orthodox to Lutheran sacred spaces. This, in turn, reciprocates the use and placement of these objects, and hence probably also contributes to the understanding of these works in relation to their new adherences.

Clearly, observable transitions in religious-cultural relations in contemporary Finland have taken new forms and directions. If one of the earlier 20th-century trends was aimed at enhancing Western religious forms in Finnish Orthodoxy by bringing in Lutheran or Western elements, and moreover, if 19th-century and earlier icon production was, indeed, deeply affected by Western models and ideas, then the diffusion of Eastern religious imagery in the late-20th-century Finnish Lutheran realm could be understood as a fundamental change in the transition of ideas and influences: as a relationship of acceptance and permissibility, perhaps even one of esteem and homage to Byzantine imagery.

Among the icon painters presented in Kotimaa was at least one Lutheran painter with distinctively Orthodox connections: Elli Tiittanen in 1995. She was depicted in the article “An icon painter’s work” (“Ikonimaalarin työ”) as a Lutheran parishioner painting particularly for Orthodox sacred spaces. The article was probably intended to present one icon painter as a model example of good ecumenical relations between the two Finnish historical churches, but it also apparently contributed to the understanding of the icon as a conjoint or ecumenical object in which multiple religious and cultural capital materialize. Obviously, this understanding was a significant component in the production and appearance of the new eastern religious imagery.

533 This conclusion was derived from a comparison of the materials in Appendix 6.2. and the data in Database 2001.
534 See the data collected in Appendix 6.2., regarding Föglö, Kumlinge, Kökar, and Vårdö. Note also the icons in the “ecumenical chapel” in Kökar, Åland.
535 E.g. understanding the icon as an ecumenical pictorial object. See e.g. the idea of “ecumenical tendencies” related to the icon of the Mother of God of Lovingkindness in Helsinki, Huopalahti church, in Appendix 6.2.
536 On the limited tolerance and endeavors to remove traditional Orthodox visual expressions from the landscape, architecture, and even interior design and paraments of Orthodox churches in the Finnish religious realm in the early 20th century, see Raivo 1997, 107-133.
537 See e.g. Kotkavaara 1999, 101-112.
4. Formative Structures

4.1. Language and Nationality

Chapter 3 described the locations and/or placements of some of Forsberg’s known works, thus showing how the Swedish language has affected the evolvement of Forsberg’s commercial relations. The language must be understood as a structure working simultaneously as both a promotional and a restrictive element, and also as a lingual-cultural network, in other words a field of relations accessible both via language and as language. The number of Forsberg’s icons, and their features and acquisition processes in the Finnish Lutheran realm, are another indication of this restrictive and promotional double formation. Interestingly, the eight works (four different acquisitions altogether) have found their places in the cities of Vaasa and Kauniainen, where the acquirers, donors, and promoting agents in particular represent the Swedish-speaking lingual-cultural minority. The icon located in rural Kumlinge in the autonomous region of Åland is in the only area in which Swedish is the only official language.539

Thus, all the Finnish acquisitions of Forsberg’s icons are illustrative of how the Swedish lingual-cultural field – “Svenskfinland”, a Swedish expression which in Finland signifies this cultural sphere – functions as both a transmitting and a restrictive structure. This functioning is remarkable in itself, as Forsberg is, in fact, bilingual, and his trajectory includes work in Sweden as a part-time pastor for the Finnish-speaking minority.540 Basically, this duality leads to the question of the intermingling of lingual, national, and cultural structures, which are not only interconnected but also hierarchically organized in that the lingual-cultural influence encloses and exceeds the national influence as far as Forsberg the producer is concerned. Obviously, the sphere of his Swedish lingual-cultural connections in Finland, where he was born and educated,541 has continuously functioned as a


541 Interview I, 2001; Suomen teologi 1999, 118.
network of relationships transmitting and enhancing his influence in the country through radio programs,\textsuperscript{542} the written media,\textsuperscript{543} and everyday social connections: domestic, ecclesiastical, and academic.\textsuperscript{544} The common language made Forsberg the agent recognizable as familiar, as belonging to the sub-cultural group, and it has been through the language that he has been able to promote his activities by lecturing – as he has done in both Kumlinge and Kauniainen.\textsuperscript{545}

There are some complicating factors to do with Forsberg’s nationality: he has frequently been introduced in Swedish-language magazines as a Finnish icon painter,\textsuperscript{546} and in a lecture he gave in Gothenburg he introduced himself by telling his audience about his Finnish origins probably implying that he originally came from a country with a living Byzantine heritage.\textsuperscript{547} He is clearly regarded in Swedish-speaking Finland as “our boy”, as “one of us”, and simultaneously as a person who has forged a successful career in Sweden\textsuperscript{548} – an obviously positive aspect, which enhances his social and cultural capital. The significance of the several newspaper articles published in Sweden and his religious broadcasts in Swedish on radio in Finland should not be underestimated either.\textsuperscript{549} Because of his decades-long residence in Sweden, to the Finnish-speaking majority he clearly represents a Swede, a person who, owing to the lingual division, is almost completely unknown among the Finnish-speaking population. As stated previously, Forsberg is obviously known

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{542} Finlands Radio 96; and Finlands Radio 99, manuscripts for radio devotionals, copies in the author’s digital archives; http://www.freenet.hut.fi/ohjelmatiedot/r56/99/50/5.html – March 14, 2001.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{543} E.g. the articles in Kyrkpressen, “Kreativitet är Guds barns lek inför hans ansikte”, May 18, 1989 by Ulla Hannus; Svenska Dagbladet, “En bra ikon skall man kunna titta på två timmar varje dag”, February 4, 1983 by Emily von Sydow, was first discovered as a copy and addendum to the VSPA, Konstkommittén Taidetoimikunta 1983 II; Julglädje, “En glädje på djupet”, 1990 by Erland Forsberg, photo (see also p. 20) Erland Forsberg; Kyrkpressen, “Gud kommer i det enkla i ett litet barn, i dopet”. 17.12.1992 no. 51-52 by Kerstin Haldin-Rönn. See the caption (detail of Forsberg’s painting at Alskathemmet, Vaasa) mentioning his place of residence and the recently received church art award in Gothenburg.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{544} E.g. the pastors of Kauniainen and Kumlinge knew the agent from previous social connections. Interview IX, 2001 (Kent Danielsson); Telephone conversation with Pastor Lars-Henrik Höglund, Kauniainen Swedish parish, March 28, 2001and March 29, 2001. It should also be borne in mind that his father John Forsberg (1917-) occupied several positions in the local, national, ecclesiastical, and political fields of activities. Suomen teologit 1999, 118-119; Ekberg 2000, 130; Interview IV, 2000.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{545} Interview I, 2000; Interview VII, 2001; Interview IX, 2001, mentioning his lectures in both Kumlinge and Kauniainen.}


\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{547} Interview II, 2000, lecture in Gothenburg. On the estimated living Byzantine heritage in Finland, see e.g. Svenska Kyrkans Tidning, “Envar sin egen ikonnämare?”, December 2, 1983 by Ulf Abel.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{548} See especially Vasabladet, “Juvelen i Kronan” and “Evinnerligen sitter den där”, October 26, 1986 by Pelle Kevin; Vasabladet, “Imorgen invigs Alskat-ikonerna”, February 17, 1990 by an anonymous writer.}

in the Swedish-speaking cultural area through the media and his social connections. The only piece of writing in Finnish mentioning and briefly introducing him is a piece in the bilingual publication of Vaasa parishes written by Koskimies-Envall in 1993. Accordingly, there are no observable relations between Forsberg and “Suomen ikonimaalarit ry.”, a Finnish icon painters’ organization founded in 1976 (when he was already expanding his horizons in Sweden).

The divided position-takings of several agents, representing a demarcation line based on lingual-cultural borders are an example of the varying attitudes to the acquisition of one of Forsberg’s paintings by Huutoniemi church in Vaasa in 1983-1988. The project fell through, but nevertheless resulted in the donation of the sketch to the Swedish-language Vetokan-nas church. Moreover, there is no doubt that the process gave an impetus for the acquisition of an altarpiece for the chapel of Alskathamnet. This lengthy process with its various twists and turns, alternative proposals, and ideas of visually transforming the minimalist church interior, was one in which the major public position-takings of the collective and individual agents in regard to Forsberg’s icon were divided principally according to lingual origin: most of the promoters were among the Swedish-speaking agents. In the Huutoniemi case, it was not only the artistic tastes but also the important issues of familiarity, local origins, family ties, and ecclesiastical connections through the

---

551 Vaajakallio 1997, 125.
553 Because of the quality and nature of the sources (esp. the minutes) available, it is in many cases impossible to present accurately and separately the position-takings of the agents forming the collective organs. However, as far as this study is concerned, there are certain exceptions (e.g. the dissenting opinions noted in the minutes or in the addenda). Also, both the Finnish- and Swedish-language parishes were represented by some of the (joint) collective organs.
Porvoo Swedish Diocese that comprised the common lingual-cultural field\textsuperscript{555} in which for decades the icon had been understood as an object of art of valued antiquity,\textsuperscript{556} not to mention the absorbed Byzantine elements of church art used and displayed in Sweden over several decades.\textsuperscript{557} In what looked like antagonism, there was little appreciation of the intended acquisition in the Finnish-speaking realm and the plan met with clear opposition in Finnish-speaking Lutheran circles in Vaasa and among other Finnish-language ecclesiastical institutional organs and their agents. Furthermore, according to the Vaasa source material, the reasoning behind the intended acquisition of the icon for the space in question seemed to center around the esthetical.\textsuperscript{558}

Nevertheless, it is evident that the whole question-raising and reasoning, the argument concerning the suitability of the work, was also fundamentally a question of aptitude, of qualification, and of cultural origins, even if these issues remain absent from or hidden, that is unspoken or even unrecognized or misrecognized, in the sources. In all likelihood, this rejection is understandable in the Finnish lingual-cultural context if we assume that the icon (i.e. both the historical and the revivalist Byzantine icon) was probably understood at the time mostly as a pictorial expression inseparably bonded to the Orthodox Faith, and the Byzantine and Russian culture, and hence was alien both culturally and religiously. Thus, one has to take into account the history, the earlier opposition to the Russian-Orthodox heritage of the historical icon in the Finnish-speaking cultural field, which could be described as a comparative and explanatory space of possibles. One of Kotkavaara’s earlier observations is worth mentioning in this context: “Just the idea of acquiring Russian works of art provoked continuous resistance and the Atheneum [the State Art Muse-

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\item[556] Abel 1970; Abel 1988, 18-21; Kotkavaara 1986, 50, 64, 66; Kotkavaara 1999, 293. On the early icon exhibitions in Finland and their Swedish-speaking promoters, see also Jääskinen 1987, 7.
\item[557] E.g. Stengård 1986, 35-37, 121-132, 244-255. See also ch. 3.1.
\item[558] Interview V, 2000, interview with the artist Veikko Takala (1923-), who had his dissenting opinion recorded in the minutes of Vaasa Parish Art Committee: he maintained that the intended icon was unsuitable in terms of the architectonic totality, and suggested that the architect, Professor Aarno Ruusuvuori (1925-1992) be consulted. Ruusuvuori also opposed the work in his statement dated October 10, 1984. SeeVFCA, Art Committee records II Cda H8/III 27.7.1984 § 6; addendum in the Art Committee’s minutes 1/24.10.1984. On the negative statement Bishop Yrjö Sariola of Lapua Diocese, 1932- (1974-1995 Bishop of Lapua, member of the Committee for Liturgy and Music of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, the KJMK, 1969, and chairman 1975-1989, see Suomen Teologit 1999, 731-732). On the intended icon acquisition for Huutoniemi church, see VFPA, Records of Visitations, II Cd1. YA. H7/I record of visitation 25.11.-12.12.1984, p. 7; and the statement of the collective organ, the KJMK (with the said Lapua bishop as chairman of the board), see VFPA, Art Committee records II Cda H8/III, addendum to minutes 1/12.11.1985.
um] remained closed to icons.\textsuperscript{559} The early-20\textsuperscript{th}-century re-formation of the Alexander Nevsky Cathedral in Suomenlinna, Helsinki, into a Lutheran military and parish church should also be mentioned,\textsuperscript{560} – an act that involved removing essential Byzantine cultural visual elements and which gave a new look to the Finnish national landscape in the capital. Petri Raivo gave further examples of how Byzantine visual elements in the landscape were erased or re-formed in order to “nationalize” these alienated visual phenomena, especially the confiscated Russian military churches.\textsuperscript{561} A committee was even set up in 1925 with the aim of nationalizing or westernizing Orthodox visual expressions in the landscape, in the interior design, and in the priestly garments.\textsuperscript{562} In Kouvolan, Eastern Finland, too, a former Orthodox Russian military church was modified and re-consecrated as a Lutheran parish church in 1919: it was again re-consecrated as an Orthodox sacred space as late as in 1982.\textsuperscript{563}

The above examples of the destruction or re-modification of Byzantine visual elements in the Finnish national cultural field are not the only phenomena defining the acceptance or rejection of Eastern religious-cultural elements because there was increasing evidence of contrary dispositions and actions that were favorable to Byzantine pictorial presentations. In particular, the Finnish Lutheran church newspaper Kotimaa (annual volumes January 1, 1960 – December 31, 2000) featured a gradually increasing number of Byzantine visual elements, reaching (until now) its zenith in a multitude of material in the late 1980s and 1990s.\textsuperscript{564} The first favorable reference to the icon is of special interest: in a review of an icon exhibition in Helsinki Taidehalli, the writer made the following comment: “Indeed, the kitsch print pictures of Lutheran homes, representing Biblical history, are still used to decorate our homes; they strike me as utterly feeble and unimportant. The icon is something quite different.”\textsuperscript{565}

The influence of the Association of Finnish Icon Painters, “Suomen ikonimaalarit ry”, should not be underestimated as a major promotive element in this respect, opening spaces of possibilities for the emergence of Eastern sacred images in the form of the revivalist Byzantine icon into the Lutheran religious realm. The association was founded by a large group of icon painters in 1976.\textsuperscript{566} To what extent this non-denominational collective agent was apt, able, or employed to propagate the icon in the Lutheran confessional arena remains uncertain. Nevertheless, its educational, exhibition, and traveling activities were

\textsuperscript{559} “Bara tanken att avskaffa ryska konstverk väckte så konsekvent motstånd att Ateneum i decennier förblev stängt för ikoner.” Kotkavaara 1986, (60-) 61. See also p. 66, “Av allt att döma var ikonintresset i 30-talets Finland ett fenomen, som endast berörde de svenskspråkiga kulturkretsarna.” E.g. also Paavolainen 1982, 133, 134, 156, 158, 240-241.

\textsuperscript{560} Hanka 1994, 64.

\textsuperscript{561} See Raivo 1997, 110-133.

\textsuperscript{562} Raivo 1997, 130-131.

\textsuperscript{563} See Huurinainen & Nieminen & Wartiainen 2002, 35-36.


\textsuperscript{565} “Perin vaisuina ja mitätöminä käviäiset vielessä ne luterilaisten kotien kiiltokuvamaiset painotuotteet raamatunhistoriasta, joilla yhä kotejamme kaunistamme. Ikoni on aivan muuta.” Kotimaa, Kuvia Pyhistä, November 17, 1967 p. 5 by Heikki Aurell.

\textsuperscript{566} See Jääskinen 1998, 295-299.
referred to at least occasionally, in Kotimaa for example.567 Some of Aune Jääskinen’s568 activities in icon instruction were reported in the newspaper as early as 1975,569 and her promotive discourse presenting the icon as surmounting national demarcation lines and as an ecumenical object, was published in Kotimaa in 1978.570 Furthermore, her lecture at Kuopio “Kirkkopäivät” (the Lutheran church assembly) was published in Kotimaa in 1991.571 A powerful agent in the Finnish Icon Painters’ Association, she has clearly had a substantial impact on the Finnish religious-cultural realm, not least through her doctoral dissertation on the Dove Icon of Konevitsa, published in 1971.572

Obviously, the stakes in the Huutoniemi acquisition were very high for the producer. Had the process led to an extensive Byzantine-style altarpiece in a well-known modernist church interior, it would inevitably have heralded (along with an icon of de Caluwé’s in Jokela, Tuusula, painted in 1976573) a new pictorial position-taking in the field of Finnish Lutheran church art, the acquisition would probably have facilitated and encouraged similar efforts. In fact, this unrealized possibility, a nonexistent space of possibles, functioned in reverse: it constrained further similar efforts within the Finnish-speaking religious-cultural realm, which has been left without Forsberg’s icons in its sacred places until today.574 Forsberg also entered the controversial altarpiece competition arranged in Pietarsaari (reported in Hufvudstadsbladet in 1990-1991), but without success, as the proposed icon composition was not chosen by the competition committee to replace the former historical altarpiece destroyed by fire in 1985.575

573 See Appendix 6.2. Tuusula.
574 See ch. 3.2.
4.2. Religious Distinctions

The multiplicity of the religious distinctions is evident if we look at the different educational relations that have featured on Forsberg’s trajectory. He has produced his religious-cultural capital – among other factors – through his relations with the structure of discipleship, the “great names” utilized in the construction of the value and heritage of the activity. This structure, of course, is fundamentally a mental disposition used for consecration, but, interestingly, through his former mentor and teacher, it also presents de facto a remarkable network of religious contacts ranging from Old Believers to Uniate Catholicism. Furthermore, his painting disciples represent various religious relations ranging from Orthodox to Catholic and Lutheran. The absence of the reformed and revivalist religious elements that are prevalent in Scandinavia is obvious, but even these movements would seem to be at least faintly connected to Forsberg through his lecturing activities and also through his relations with several individual customers. Because these relations reach beyond the boundaries of the Lutheran religious field, his educational work and influences could well be described as ecumenical, although he has never been a member of any ecumenical organization.

Nevertheless, it is evident that the ecumenical movement has been among the structural religious elements forming the space of possibilities for the Lutheran icon production of that time. Among the ecumenical organizations opening up these spaces of possibles, the Taizé movement in particular has left a pictorial mark on one Lutheran sacred space in Finland in the form of a reproduction of the icon that is essential to the rituals of this collective and its adherents. Actions like these could be understood as opened spaces of possibles

576 I use the expression *educational* in an effort to contextualize activities of the agent characterized both by a striving for disposition-forming (interference of the necessary ideal context for the comprehension of the pictorial in question, the forming of the essential beliefs for the activity, and the value of the necessary, sometimes painstaking actions) and the development of the handicraft skills needed in icon-painting. Both of these aspects are interconnected in his influences, as is the religious ritual aspect. See Interview II, 2000, the author’s observation (icon-painting group).

577 See ch. 2.4.

578 Interview I, 2000; Interview II, 2000; Interview III, 2000; Interview IV, 2001; Lönnhebo & Werkström 1984, 5,6; the unidentified newspaper article, “Ikonmålaren har levit vidare…”, [before 1979?] by M.T.


580 In this context at least one lecture was discovered: “Ikonkonsten från katakomberna till våra dagar Erland Forsberg, ikonmålare och präst” in the Credo Organization (“Sveriges Evangeliska Student och Gymnasiströrelse”) http://www.gfs.gu.se/seqg/index.html – March 14, 2001; http://www.gfs.gu.se/seqg/om_credo.html – March 14, 2001; http://www.gfs.gu.se/seqg/program.html – March 14, 2001; Ekström 1999, 186 “Credo… grundades år 1924 och har vuxit fram i samverkan med väckelserörelser inom Svenska kyrkan. I organisationen finns emellertid också många frikyrkliga medlemmar, varför det knappast är oriktigt att hävda att den har en ekumenisk inriktning.” See also Interview I, 2000. Evidently, in Sweden public acquisitions of icons by Free Church congregations may have taken place. However, in the accessible data no such acquisitions were accessible.

581 See ch. 3.2.3. and appendix 6.2., Helsinki, Huopalahti church. On the Taizé pictorial presentations, the utilization of icons essential to the community, see Sichov 1990, 37, 38, 42, 53, 55, 68, 69, 76-77, 79.
capable of forming the dispositions of parish agents and also offering pictorial comparisons of visual piety in the form of icons in sacred spaces. However, no direct relation exists between Forsberg the producer and the Taizé movement. Forsberg’s brief comment on this movement is to be found in Stiftskrönikan, “Gudsmysteriets uttryck: Ikoner” (“An expression of divine mystery: icons”), from 1993.582

---

Evidently, the Lutheran religious field is the field – or to be more accurate, the fields and fractions of fields\(^{583}\) – in which Forsberg the agent has operated and to which he has been connected through his positions that have opened up commercial relations\(^{584}\) and educational relations.\(^{585}\) This effect has been realized through the previous social relations he established as pastor,\(^{586}\) through his teaching in a Christian folk high school,\(^{587}\) through the relations he gained within the administrative structure of the Lutheran Churches in Finland.

---

\(^{583}\) See e.g. the many interecclesiastical organizations representing variegated ideological dispositions from Low through High Church, from Evangelical Revivalist through Pietistic Movements, Young Church, and Liberal Movements, all mentioned in the Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1960-1978, see the introductions of the ecclesiastical organizations in each publication. See also Ekström 1999, 22, 154, 155, 161-163, 167, 170, 172.

\(^{584}\) See the cases presented in ch. 3.1., showing that the majority of Forsberg’s public works have been sold to Swedish Lutheran parishes and other Lutheran collectives.

\(^{585}\) This is the case for many of Forsberg’s public works have been sold to Swedish Lutheran parishes and other Lutheran collectives.


\(^{587}\) The Oskarshamn Christian folk high school (in which Forsberg worked as teacher in the 1970s) is a Lutheran school administered by the Växjö Diocese. Franzén & Thunberg [no year given], 3-12. Many of his painting pupils are and have been Lutherans, Interview I, 2000; Interview II, 2000, the author’s observation (icon-painting group).
and in Sweden, and through the relations made available to him in connection with his occasional performance of church ceremonies, sacraments and rites. Together, these relations have evidently had an impact on his ability to produce icons, and moreover on his production as a qualified icon painter. They represent the fields of production and con-  

588 Although a pastor himself, Forsberg has not been a permanent member of any ecclesiastical administrative structure since 1979 (after leaving his position as teacher in the Växjö diocesan school). However, the accessible data indicates a network of ecclesiastical relations, in particular with other ordained ministers in their positions as senior pastors. Interview IX, 2001, interview with Pastor Kent Danielsson; Telephone conversations with Pastor Lars-Henrik Höglund, Kauniainen Swedish parish, March 28 and 29, 2001. See also the video recorded during a Mass, including the rite of consecrating an icon on December 17, 2001, St. Olaf church in Falkköping; and Interview II, 2000, a lecture in Gothenburg, showing the welcome he received as both pastor and icon painter.  

sumption, and could be categorized in the form of relations between producer and promoter\textsuperscript{590}, seller and buyer, lecturer and audience, painter and critic,\textsuperscript{591} for example.

With a few exceptions, these relations almost inclusively signify Forsberg’s belonging to the Lutheran religious realm in its different forms. The rare non-Lutheran examples include: six paintings forming a Deisis-type work centered around the Crucifix, the Transfiguration placed on the north wall, and the Pantocrator within a Greek cross at the west

\textsuperscript{590} On agents promoting revivalist Byzantine icon-painting, see ch. 2.5. See also Figure 2. and comments on the agents with an impact on Forsberg’s trajectory and an analysis of the consecrating structure. Clearly, the promoting agents represented several central positions in the Lutheran religious field (e.g. the two bishops), positions that made the promotion possible and noticeable.

\textsuperscript{591} On the criticism of revivalist icon production by the several agents evidently operating within the Lutheran religious field and arguing about the justification of Lutheran icon utilization, see Figure 5 and comments.
end of the sacred space (cardinal points liturgically) in the Franciscan monastery of Partille, Jonsered, close to Gothenburg. The cloister was a Lutheran fraternity until 1983, when the Brothers joined the Catholic Church. (The move was probably influenced by the disputed revival of the Swedish Lutheran Synod in 1982, and the government’s church politics may have attracted comment by Forsberg in Svenska Dagbladet at February 4, 1983.) Moreover, the only discovered Orthodox-Catholic acquisition of the Christian school of St. Catherine in Uppsala from 1994 is an icon consecrated in St. Nicholas Orthodox Church, Stockholm.692

Yet, the overwhelmingly Lutheran context of Forsberg’s production is indicative of a major difficulty that is most revealing. In the religious fields and subfields in Finland and Sweden, the restrictive and exclusive structures were manifold and the accessible and encouraging structures scarce considering Forsberg’s efforts in the 1970s. I assume that his trajectory would not have successfully evolved within the Finnish Lutheran religious realm alone – witness the long battle in Huutoniemi (Chapter 4.1.). Even in Sweden the

options were probably few in the 1970s. In Finland too, at this crucial time, some influential revivalist and neo-Pietistic religious structures with their distinctive anti-ecumenical dispositions were developing.

The options open to Forsberg within Swedish Lutheranism, in other words all the strictly hypothetical spaces of possibles within that religious-cultural formation, included inside movements such as the pietistic, revivalist, Low-Church and Young-Church movements. Clearly, within this very matrix of spaces of possibles, the varying Old-Church- and High-Church-oriented social formations could provide the impetus needed for the new practices. This support primarily labels the formed dispositions, and Forsberg’s High Church relations have incorporated several commercial and educational interests from 1978 until the present day. The lack of a similar structure in Finland may partly explain why this phenomenon is largely manifest in Sweden. The observed liturgical practices and statements of Forsberg the producer support this interpretation.

Interestingly, when interviewed about his ecclesiastical origins, Forsberg described his connection with his theological heritage as meaningful and genuine, and still present in the Church of Sweden despite the Calvinist influences. He then implied that, were he living in the United States, for example, the Orthodox, Catholic, or Episcopal Churches could offer clear possibilities for potential membership. In this context, his ideas about the saints are particularly interesting: “We pray with them… a dialogue, anyway; you get on well with a saint

593 On the discussion on the genuineness and acceptance of the revivalist icon in the next decade (1980s), see ch. 2.5.


599 Note especially the significance of the Prayer of the Hours to Forsberg’s dispositions and self-definition, Interview I, 2000; Stiftskronikan, “Gudsmysteriets uttryck: Ikoner”, March 26, 1993 by Ann-Mari Fagerlund-Wiberg. Note the central meaning given to the Prayer of the Hours within the High Church movement in Kilström 1990, 151-164. On the icon as a means of devotion, as a means of prayer and meditation, and as the consecrating ritual, see the video recorded during a Mass, including the rite of consecrating an icon on December 17, 2000, St. Olaf church in Falköping, showing a bishop consecrating Forsberg’s icon in Solemn Mass. See also Interview II, the author’s observation (in Falköping); Leaflet of Falköping parish, December 17, 2000, “Högmässa och invigning av ikon”; Falköpings kyrkoblad, “Invigning av ikon i S:t Olof’s kyrka”, 1/2001 by an unknown writer. Note the pictures presenting the consecration and devotional practice with the lighting of candles in front of the icon. See also Oskarshamns Tidning, “Ny Mariaikon till Kolbergakyrkan”, November 20, 2000 by Häkan Carlsson.

600 Interview I, 2000.
and you can chat with him or her… It’s possible that… if you’re living so close to them, in
dialogue with them, so that when you are desperate you’re convinced that things are, in
 deed, bad and, that you need to pray and… you, St. Bridget, couldn’t you… Ok, so I can see
that purely theologically, no big problem… So, I say no greater need for that, for me…”601

The High Church section, in particular, that was formed in a complex process as a protest
against the modernistic tendencies within Swedish Lutheranism,602 promoted specific ec-
umenical objectives, and fought to preserve the theological and liturgical heritage that it
understood as the original tradition.603 It was inclined to give support to producers such as
Forsberg and strove at the same time to utilize icon production in order to revive the
liturgy, to visually label its activities, and to serve as advertisement.604 Of course, as dem-
onstrated earlier,605 this does not exclude the expansion of Forsberg’s commercial, educa-
tive, and other relations in the 1980s and 1990s, forged through his accumulated capital
and works presented by the media.

Evidently, the emergence of the High Church movement in the Swedish religious realm
has contributed significantly to the understanding of the icon as an ecumenical or shared
object. Interview XVI 2003 with Pastor Peltonen606 in particular reveals a network of
relations accessible to the interviewee in the Swedish and Finnish religious fields in
the 1960s, 1970s, and later through a network of agents and collective organs in con-
nection with organizations such as the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, origin-
ally an Anglican-Orthodox religious collective organ,607 and the Swedish Kyrklig För-

601 “Vi ber med dom… …en dialog i alla fall, det kan man småprata med helgon om man trivs med ett
helgon… …Jag kan tänka mig att, att, att, om liksom man lever så nära med en dialog med dom, så att man
liksom i förtvivlan tycker att nu är jag illa ute och nu behöver jag be och, och, du, Birgitta kan inte du…
ookay, så kan jag tänka mig att rent teologiskt har inget stort problem… alltså jag säger, inget större behov

602 Kilström 1990, 93-104.


604 See Kilström 1990, 160, 190, 200, 206, 252, presenting some of the icons in use within the High Church
movement (especially note the connections to the Mass and the Prayers of the Hours). On the icon as
a means of promotion see http://www.kyrligfornyelse.org/ – May 11, 2001, the Greek-Orthodox Resurrec-
Forsberg’s book illustration in Berglund in 1996, written by a former director of the Laurentius-Stiftelse,
and the cover illustration of a CD “Öppna min mun till ditt lov, Gregoriansk sång på svenska, Ad Domi-

605 See ch. 2.1.

606 See Interview XVI, 2003 tape A, an interview with Pastor Kalervo Peltonen, Morbacka ecumenical
center, November 17, 2003.

607 See http://www.sobornost.org/index.htm used on January 27, 2004, and the extensive history of the
Sweden, see pp. 11-12 of the history: “Conferences were also held outside England… [years 1946-1958]
…The new Fellowship branches in Sweden and Denmark also held their conferences, at which Anglicans,
Lutherans, and Orthodox discussed their theological problems. Fellowship branches were also in the
U.S.A. and Canada.” See also pp. 13-14, “…In 1968 the Minchins resigned after 8 years of valiant work,
when Fr. Basil was appointed temporary chaplain at Gothenburg in Sweden and subsequently Vicar of
Lynsted in Kent.” p. 14. See also Cross & Livingstone 1997, 33; and Wybrew 2002, 30-31, who interest-
ingly omits the fellowship in his presentation on Anglican-Orthodox dialogue.
The same interview data points to the specifically Orthodox-Lutheran relations established in connection with the former Estonian Orthodox Church in Exile, particularly in Gothenburg, and to the influence of Metropolitan Anthony Bloom. In Finland, too, within the High-Church-oriented theological circle ("Turun liturgiset veljet", or, "Liturgiset veljet") with relations to the family of the then Lutheran Archbishop in Turku), the icon was offered at least once to Lutheran participants as a medium for devotion and prayer in the late 1940s or early 1950s. All in all, the different collective and singular agents interrelated to and through the High Church movement opened spaces of possibles for the emergence of Forsbergian enterprises.

This promotional effect or space of possibles formed by these relations is evident in the interviewee’s personal accounts of a church meeting organized by Kyrklig Förenelse and the Brotherhood of Sts Alban and Sergius, possibly in 1973 in Sweden. “…and in that gathering Erland Forsberg painted this kind of not made by hands, that is, an icon of Christ. He painted the icon and at the same time explained what was happening: about the theological context, the interpretation of the tradition, and how it was possible to attain such an atmosphere of prayer in which he was able to do the work…”

Forsberg’s production could also be understood in connection with the retreat movement that grew up concurrently with the Lutheran icon phenomenon. A retreat center in Sweden ("St. Davidsgården" at Rättvik) has acquired at least two of his icons and he also

---


609 See Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1965, 191, after a hiatus of several years giving a presentation under the title “Ortodoxa kyrkor i Sverige” and for the first time mentioning the Estonian Orthodox church with e.g. the following description: "Estniska ortodoxa kyrkan med en synod som centralorgan har församlingar i Stockholm, Göteborg, Norrköping, Borås, Västerås och Halmstad med ca 3000 medlemmar…” Interestingly, the text also mentions and characterizes for the first time organizations including "Finska ortodoxa församlingar i Sverige", and "Grekisk-ortodoxa Kristi Förklarings församling". In a similar manner, the following yearbooks of the Swedish Lutheran church describe the existing Orthodox ecclesiastical organizations and give an estimation of the total number of adherents. See e.g. Svenska Kyrkans Årsbok 1966, 172, “I Sverige beräknas antalet grekisk-ortodoxa trosbekännare till ca 20 000-25 000, varav ca hälften av från öststaterna inflyttade flyktingar.”


611 Koivula 2002, 19 (see also footnote 68), 31-41.

612 See Interview XVI, 2003 tape A.

613 See Interview XVI, 2003 tape A.

614 On the evolvement of the movement observed through the history of Snoan, see Forssell 1994, 6-17, 19-30. Note also the absorption of influences from and keen relations with the Swedish St. Davidsgård retreat center, pp. 11-12, 14, 16. On the Scandinavian influences and the evolvement of the movement in Finland, see Rissanen 1998, 310-317.

615 Johnsén 1999, 10, pictures 6 and 9.
gave instruction in icon painting there in 1993. Of interest, too, are his different relations with the acquiring and promoting agents connected to the retreat movement, one of whom in Åland was as a keen participant and a retreat organizer. Further, the practice of using icons as devotional pictures in the movement’s spiritual rituals should also be mentioned. This practice is manifest in the first Finnish retreat center, Snoan, at Lappvik, where practically all of the rooms are decorated with icon prints or revivalist Byzantine hand-painted icons: there are even two antique icons in the chapel. Without doubt, through its contacts with the Porvoo Diocese, Snoan has been the pioneer of the retreat movement in Finland, particularly among the Swedish-speaking Lutherans. The movement also crossed lingual borders when it spread among the Finnish-speaking population. Some Finnish-language retreats also use Byzantine icons in their devotions and silence, solitude, and retreat ideals (specifically related to the Morbacka ecumenical retreat center) were illustrated in Kotimaa with a display of Byzantine visual elements or the icon-type Taizé Crucifix in several articles in the late 1980s and in the 1990s.

Apparently, these noticeable relations influence the religious structures that comprise the Forsbergian fraction of Protestant icon production and usage. The emergence and use of Forsbergian icons may have little to do with the “freely blossoming new religious seeking”, but may rather be primarily connected to the familiar structures of contemporary Lutheranism: this in itself is a complex structural combination of various new and traditional elements combined in several subfields of various movements implemented and affected by the strategies of their agents.

---

617 Among the agents situated in the Lutheran religious field and involved in the acquisition, the pastor of Kumlinge in particular promoted the icon as a device suitable for meditation purposes. Interview IX, 2001, interview with Pastor Kent Danielsson.
618 Forsell 1994, 26, “Ikonerna i kapellet och i brasrummet är en pämnellse om den ortodoxa kyrkans rika traditioner.”; Kuparinen 1998, 175, 176, “Katsoin Snoanin kappelin ikonat eikä se sanonut minulle mitään.” See also Interview VIII, 2001, and the author’s observation indicating that there were icons and reproductions in practically all public rooms at the center, many of them having been donated by Lutherans, or in some cases painted by them.
619 Interview XIII, 2001; Forsell 1994, 6-17, 19-30.
622 See Bergmann 2003, 97, “ett fritt bloommande nyandligt sökande”. 
4.3. Parish Administration

Within the formative and restrictive structures, local parish administrations in particular, with their organs and agents\(^{623}\) and varying forms of practice, have functioned as a central form-giving sub-field in the ecclesiastical realm in Finland.\(^{624}\) These differing practices can be anticipated only when the nature of the field as a field of position-takings and the constant exercise of power are taken into account.\(^{625}\) The lack of clearly formulated theological or other rules for acquiring church art is another crucial element.\(^{626}\) Furthermore, because of local variations within the church administration, the groups and organs participating in the processes have differed,\(^{627}\) to say nothing of the agents positioned in the ecclesiastical administrative structure or acting as non-contingent advisors. In these processes only two of the agents represented had specific artistic expertise through education, one artist and one architect. Most of them clearly represented Lutheran ecclesiastical realm and its local or central structures. This is illustrated in more detail in Figure 7 and in the explanations attached to it.

---

623 The importance of the agents in parish administration to Forsberg as a painter of church art is self-evident: an icon painter bonded with his viewers not only through promotion, critique, and public interest in the media, but primarily through his commercial relations, his customers, without whom he could not exist as a qualified producer in public. Obviously, the role of the Lutheran parishes as customers is crucial. See ch. 3.1. and 3.2.


625 Representative democracy, adopted in parish administration in both Finland and Sweden, has naturally opened up a field of position-taking not only for the agents positioned through the episcopal administrative structure with its hierarchy, but also for those elected by ballot and thus representing various political or ecclesiastical-political groups. See Mäkeläinen 1974, 8-10, 17, 198; Kansanaho 1976, (114-120), 120-127; Palmu 1990, 40-42; Göransson 1993, 71-72, 74-77; Ekström 2000, 39, 41. See also the definition emphasizing the democratic structure of the Church of Sweden in Kyrklig Administration (1992:300) §1, 2 kap. “Svenska kyrkans demokratiska uppgång”. 2§ "Genom sina församlingar upprätthåller Svenska kyrkan en på demokratisk grund uppgydd riksomfattande verksamhet.”


627 There is considerable variation in administrative structure between the bilingual urban parishes of Vaasa and Kauniainen (representing parish complexes formed from two separate parish units with joint organs – in Vaasa a separate Joint Art Committee), and the rural one-pastor parish of Kumlinge. See Rusama 1993, 48-49; Erävuori 1995, 16-22.
Figure 7. Central active agents and their positions in the acquisition cases in Finland


Figure 7. shows all the known public acquisitions of Forsberg’s production in Finland. The idea is to list and depict the different agents and collective organs related to these cases through the administrative structure of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland.628 The Huutoniemi case represents a process that led to the acquisition of the Vetokannas altarpiece donated by one agent.629 Color has been used in order to emphasize the special features of the case: its lengthy duration and, primarily, how it permeated virtually all levels of the administrative structure, involving agents in prime positions, such as the bishop, the professor, and the theologian-cum-art connoisseur. This process also revealed the opposition on all levels from the local art committee during the visitation, and in a carefully-worded statement issued by the Church Council.630 It exposed the then prevalent opposition to the Byzantine icon as a Lutheran altarpiece. Thus, the major antagonists represented artistic, architectural, and theological-administrative positions, while the chief promoters were the agents involved in Swedish-language parish administration in Vaasa. Moreover, the agents included Forsberg’s father who, as vice chairman of the Vaasa Joint Parish Board – although he disqualified himself from each crucial decision – could nevertheless, through his several political and social positions, be regarded as an agent closer to the positive pole in the field of power. Of significance, too, was his position as a co-donor (together with his wife) of the icon to Vetokannas church, in the planning and building of which he had been involved decades previously.631 If anything can be concluded from the Finnish source material concerning the agents positioned mainly in the artistic field and their use as consultants in the Huutoniemi-Vetokannas process, it is that their influence was crucial in the final decision-making.

The role of the pastor (leader of the parish) in Kauniainen and Kumlinge was even more crucial in the acquisition decisions. Unlike in Vaasa, the administrative organs of the parish were only informed about the dealings of the pastor, in a lengthy process in Kauniainen, with the donors in order to acquire the icons. In Kumlinge it was the pastor who directly contacted the painter and consulted with him. In these two parishes – one suburban and the other rural and peripheral – it was the senior pastor who, in a multiple constellation of positions, functioned as both the decision-making and informing agent, and, with the power of institutional consecration, as the local official leader, theological expert, and practical promoter of pastoral and liturgical functions: in the Vaasa acquisitions in particular, he also acted as one of the agents involved in the administrative organs participating in the process. It was not only his official administrative position, however, but also his social relations and capital that were crucial, since he could utilize the latter in the Swedish cultural context to the benefit of Forsberg who, as a known person, was considered an available and valid option in the space of possibles.


The painting was donated by John and Hildegard Forsberg in 1986, Interview IV, 2000; Koskimies-Envall 1993, 127.

On the structure and duties of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, see Murtorinne 1995, 393-394.


On the wide scale of potential positions of a senior pastor (leader of the parish) in the Finnish Lutheran Church, see Mäkeläinen 1974, 8-9, 134, 198; Palmu 1990, 39-46.


4.4. Artistic and Cultural Currents

Icon painters within Lutheranism, represented by Forsberg, can be analyzed in relation to several cultural phenomena that could also be referred to as interpretative possibilities,635 and which in turn open up explanatory horizons on the revivalist Byzantine icon phenomena. Accordingly, as extensive cultural currents, these phenomena could also be seen as parts of the prevailing formative structures.636 Offered here as interpretive elements, they could be considered cultural preconditions for cultural production, spaces of possibles for the dispositions, beliefs, and actions of the interpreting agents.637 There are also certain categorized stylistic features that relate, even if in a complex way, to recent artistic epochs, and which are obviously infused with the tension and intermingling between modernism and postmodernism.638 Issues related to artistic autonomy are also relevant here.639 It is not claimed that Forsberg’s icon production should be understood as highly artistic in nature, or solely as belonging to popular religious culture. In my opinion, it is a complex issue: a striving for the highly artistic, or its historical imitation, while remaining in touch with the popular and religious circles of life at home and in the Church.640

The research field is huge, but some brief and general comments can be made.

635 Bourdieu 1998a, 340-341, « Il est certain que, comme le rappelle le structuralisme symbolique… …, l’orientation du changement dépend de l’état du système des possibilités (conceptuelles, stylistiques, etc.) héritées de l’histoire : ce sont elles qui définissent ce qu’il est possible et impossible de penser ou de faire à un moment donné dans un champ déterminé ; mais il n’est pas moins certain qu’elle dépend aussi des intérêts… …qui orientent les agents, en fonction de leur position dans la structure sociale du champ de production, vers tel ou tel des possibles proposés ou, plus exactement, vers une région de l’espace des possibles homologue de celle qu’ils occupent dans l’espace des positions artistiques. »

636 This chapter gives only a few and transitory proposals concerning these cultural streams and the revivalist Byzantine icon-painting in question. Proper analysis calls for further study with far more extensive research material.

637 See Bourdieu 1993, 257 “Given that the work of art exists as such (i.e. as a symbolic object endowed with meaning and value) only if it is apprehended by spectators possessing the disposition and the esthetic competence which are tacitly required, one could say that this is possible only to the extent that aesthetes themselves are the product of a long exposure to artworks. This circle which is one of belief and of the sacred, is shared by every institution which can function only if it is instituted simultaneously within the objectivity of a social game and with the dispositions which induce interest and participation in the game.”


639 The possible lack of artistic autonomy mainly divided the opinions of Stengård and Beskow in the 1980s. See ch. 2.4. On the modernist idea of artistic autonomy, see Taylor 1992, 2-4. On Bourdieu’s analysis of the development of the “pure gaze” as a “…movement of the field towards autonomy”, see Bourdieu 1993, 264-266.

640 Forsberg has constantly defined his painting as art, as “icon art”, see e.g. Forsberg 1991, 58-62. However, ch. 2.4. shows that his specifically artistic capital as the producer has not only been confirmed but also denied in the ongoing argumentation (as has the new icon phenomenon as a whole). The assessment of the location of the phenomenon in the cultural space originates in Forsberg’s production being divided into the public works in churches – implemented smaller and larger works – and the individual icons sold to individual customers in varying contexts. See Interview I, 2000; Interview VII, 2001. Examination of the extensive and unorganized collection of photographs (unfortunately, no data on the paintings is available) also clearly shows this division. See the author’s observation in Benareby, Mölnlycke, Sweden, December 15, 2000.
Interestingly, the new icon production began concurrently with the stylistic turn from non-presentational modernism to the re-emergence of the pictorial, the presentational, and the narrative in the field of the Fine Arts. Yet, one has to keep in mind that its historical foundations lie in Western Europe decades before in other socio-cultural contexts. Very possibly, the modernist idea of folkloristic authenticity and appreciation of the naïve did not create an open space of possibles in Sweden and Finland until the 1960s and 1970s.


The modern and ambivalent idea of originality\textsuperscript{644} probably also gave form to this fraction of church art endeavors, and hence contributed to the rise of the icon phenomenon. In this context, one of the several modernist strategies defined by Terry Smith is of particular interest. He refers to a striving “to reclaim the distant and even ancient past as a generalized precedent, a repository of essential values that transcended the style-bound historicisms of the 19th century”.\textsuperscript{645} This interpretation of the characteristics of modernist practices could also be a fitting general characterization of icon enthusiasts’ strategies. Accordingly, in the modernist ideology the “primitive otherness”\textsuperscript{646} of the incorporated non-European influences could be regarded as an interesting parallel to the Byzantine otherness of the Eastern religious image. Forsberg’s claim of portraying “icon art” as the original and genuine Christian art is also worthy of note.\textsuperscript{647} In my opinion, the continuous emphasis on the genuinely traditional, “oldest form of Ecclesiastical art”\textsuperscript{648} is meaningful not only in the religious-liturgical interpretative context,\textsuperscript{649} but also as a manifestation of a phenom-
eon possessive of both modernist and postmodernist characteristics. Indeed, we can see that the revivalist Byzantine icons represented for their producers and promoters an attempt to look for “original” naive features in connection with folk art, while the same time emphasizing the presence of the literary and the representative – that is, the logos, the historical reflection of the local, medieval Scandinavian influences fused into the works. Clearly, the borrowing and combining of the “original” and added pictorial elements could be interpreted as a postmodernist phenomenon, although typical ironic elements are absent in these re-combinations. There is also a link to the historical tradition of representative church art with its literary motifs, a tradition which, although it has grown weaker in the modernist era in Finland, has continued in the last few decades.

As far as his icon production is concerned, Forsberg’s artistic autonomy is especially difficult to assess. What appears to be a total lack of artistic autonomy (i.e. the “purity” and “self-determination” so important in the modernist field of art in comparison with the repetition and modification in traditional icon models) could be understood as complete self-sufficiency, depending on the producer’s artistic handicraft skills. These skills,
autonomous with special norms, rules, and symbolic expressions permitting a valued and larger production, can only be comprehended and successfully utilized by those who have been consecrated, in the Bourdieusian connotation of the concept, in order to participate in the enterprise.\textsuperscript{657} Plainly, the phenomenon could be described as handicraft production interconnected with theological and esthetic ideas and liturgical practice.\textsuperscript{658}

Finally, some major cultural preconditions were created by the consecration of the collective interest of several art-lovers and artists (e.g. Matisse) who, with their public interests, exhibitions, and donations, established the historical icon as an artistic object.\textsuperscript{659} Related to this is the vast issue of cultural reception, the cultural goodwill\textsuperscript{660} of the petit bourgeois willing to follow and imitate within their limited capabilities the artistic tastes of the upper-classes – possessive of far larger cultural and economic capital. One could ask whether it was specifically the bourgeois, the middle-classes of 20\textsuperscript{th}-century Scandinavia that started to buy revivalist Byzantine icons and icon prints\textsuperscript{661} – a major phenomenon of cultural consumption in which Forsberg obviously participated, contributing to the new understanding, use, and acceptance of the pictorial expression of Eastern Christianity within the Northern Lutheran realm.\textsuperscript{662}

\textsuperscript{657} For a closer analysis see ch. 2.4 and ch. 2.5.


\textsuperscript{660} On the interpretative possibilities that this particular conceptualization provides, see Bourdieu 1979, 365-431, and especially 367-377, « Tout le rapport à la culture de la petite bourgeoisie peut en quelque sorte se déduire de l’écart, très marqué, entre la connaissance et la reconnaissance, principe de la bonne volonté culturelle qui prend des formes différentes selon le degré de familiarité avec la culture légitime, c’est-à-dire selon l’origine sociale et le mode d’acquisition de la culture qui en est corrélatif : la petite bourgeoisie ascendante investit sa bonne volonté désarmée dans les formes mineures des pratiques et des biens culturels légitimes… » p. 367, « Cette bonne volonté pure mais vide qui, dépourvue des repères ou des principes indispensables à son application, ne sait à quel objet se vouer, fait du petit-bourgeois la victime désignée de l’allodoxa culturelle, c’est-à-dire de toutes les erreurs d’identification et de toutes les formes de fausse-reconnaissance où se trahit l’écart entre la connaissance et la reconnaissance… » à trouver dans cette fausse-identification à la fois inquiète et trop assurée, le principe d’une satisfaction qui doit encore quelque chose au sentiment de la distinction. » p. 370.

\textsuperscript{661} The use and mass production of icon prints is, of course, nothing new in itself. Such prints were common especially in 19\textsuperscript{th}-century Russia, and known of before. See Kotkavaara 1991, 36; Kotkavaara 1999, 132-136. Note also Forsberg’s illustrations carried out in Berglund 1996; and a CD “Öppna min mun till ditt lov, Gregorianisk sång på svenska, Ad Dominum”, Verbum, Naxos 2000. See also Forsberg’s icon in the chapel of Alskaphemmet, Print acquired by John Forsberg. On the multiple trade in revivalist Byzantine icons sold either as hand-painted, “partly hand-painted”, or as prints, see http://www.ikonostasion.se/nfi0897.html – November 4, 2000; http://www.ikonostasion.se/Jesus2.html – February 27, 2001; and especially http://www.ikonostasion.se/retail.html – February 27, 2001 showing a large network of retail dealers.

\textsuperscript{662} One could also mention the increased traveling to Eastern Europe where Scandinavians tourists came in contact with Orthodox Christianity as the local dominant form of religion, and especially their interest in Russian culture in the form of food, traveling, and literature. See Abel 1988, 21. These forms of popular culture could be regarded as relevant within the margins of language and nationality. See e.g. Rekola’s comments on Leskov, Tolstoi, and Dostojevsky in Rekola 1985, 86-87, 125-133.
5. Conclusion: the Production of the Producer and the Space of Possibles

“The reason it is sometimes so difficult to communicate the results of truly reflexive research is because readers must be persuaded not to see as an ‘attack’ or a ‘criticism’ (in an ordinary sense) what is intended to be an analysis; they must accept that they have to turn to their own viewpoints that objectifying point of view which is fundamental to the analysis, and associate themselves, notably by submitting to a critique founded on the acceptance of premises, with a liberating effort to objectify all objectifications, instead of challenging its fundamentals by reducing them to an attempt to give the appearance of scientific universality to a particular point of view.”

In conclusion, in comparison with other efforts of pictorial production for Lutheran sacred spaces in Sweden and Finland in the late 20th century, the Forsbergian icon production distinguishes itself in its magnitude, in the sheer number of executed public works produced during the past three decades – not to mention the religious and cultural implications.

To gain the position of an esteemed icon painter within Lutheranism, and especially to be regarded as a famous icon painter in Swedish-speaking ecclesiastical circles, a producer who is Finnish-Swedish in origin must necessarily experience a long lineage of trajectory evolvement in his efforts to establish a network of relations that would facilitate successful production and a recognized position. The first stages of Forsberg’s trajectory evolvement (including his crucial period as a teacher in a Christian folk high school in Sweden), took over ten years before his first public work was placed in a sacred space and attracted positive public attention. Obviously, at issue was not only the production of pictorial objects, and finding markets and recognition for them, but also and simultaneously, the production of himself or, more correctly, being produced as a legitimate producer, whose religious, cultural, and social capital was utilized and accumulated in his trajectory evolvement. His areas of influence as an agent, mainly teaching painting and lecturing, brought him recognition. The increasing interest of the media enabled him as a producer to present his works, dispositions, and practices in public, and thus to expand his influences. The dispositions typical of the agent reveal a fight for recognition that is in deep contrast to the contemporary mainstream of church art production, which Forsberg assessed as “hopeless” and incapable of functioning in the liturgical, didactic, and meditative practices (ceremonies, rites and rituals) of the Christian Church – the “Old Church” of the golden patristic era of which the Swedish Lutheran Church is a descendant.

These polemics are understandable as a part of a field-constituting project. Obviously, the structural formation of consecrating the agent and through him newcomers can be seen as part of the phenomenon. The consecration comes to pass through a lineage of tradition

663 Bourdieu 1996, 207.
transmittals, which have their origins in the Russian Old-Belief Confessors. This ideal structure, a late-Protestant composition, was developed by certain promoters of the contemporary Lutheran icon phenomenon. The field constitution is also evident in the public discussion on the authenticity of revivalist Byzantine icon production within the Lutheran realm. While the promoters’ artistic tastes, theology, and art-historical expertise were intermingled in their public position-takings, the critics mainly questioned the estrangement of the production from the traditional Orthodox religious context.

Ultimately, to be able to represent a medieval Scandinavian saint in a revivalist Byzantine style in an icon placed in a Lutheran sacred space undeniably constitutes a new fraction of position-taking in contemporary church art, which signifies the fusion of traditions as well as the obvious infusion of Byzantine cultural influences. Seemingly, in a parallel with the literary statements of Forsberg, the icons concurrently objectify the operational religious and cultural dispositions: the aim is to re-establish and display the image understood as genuinely Christian and, accordingly, to re-form the field of production of Christian pictorial presentations by introducing the reproduced, modernist originality of the Eastern religious image.

Moreover, the ability to append new pictorial position-takings to contemporary Scandinavian sacred spaces in the form of these icons indicates the power to imprint and affect a sacred space, to remodel its visual appearance, and to add to it the image of objectified sainthood, Christian Faith and local tradition: in other words, the objectified and idealized self-image of the Church as a pictorial position-taking. Remarkably and typically, the Forsbergian icons as pictorial position-takings display in several Lutheran sacred spaces the traditional (Eastern) Christian heritage, Biblical motifs, sainthood, and the importance of local saints, and specifically the significance of the Mother of God, the Virgin Mary and Christ as the Pantocrator/Christ Judge. It is obvious that this corpus of works, although not without contemporary comparison with other icon painters’ works in Lutheran sacred spaces and with the Byzantine elements utilized earlier by several artists, otherwise largely bypasses and ignores contemporary (modernist) church art production. This phenomenon even represents itself as a counterpart, creates its own pictorial space and, in consequence, re-forms and reshapes several both ancient and modern church interiors. In this respect, these icons could indeed be regarded as “counter-images”, with the power to affect or even to assault several spheres by remodeling both the space of position-takings and, concurrently, the visual appearance of a sacred space in order to re-establish the sacred image in it by objectifying cultural and religious capital and making ritual practices possible.

Hence, the Forsbergian icon phenomenon, materializing particularly in Lutheran sacred spaces, could be regarded as a space of position-takings radically uniform in realization and containing new religious visual elements of revivalist Byzantine style, and also placing them often as a traditional altarpiece in the hierarchy of the space. Yet, in many cases these works generate new and unexpected combinations of traditional and new elements. Traditional Byzantine pictorial ideas are adapted and utilized in structural combinations that enable ritual usage and practice by following traditional Orthodox manners (lighting candles and praying in front of an icon), and also by implementing Byzantine pictorial elements in traditional Western religious objects (the baptismal font, the pulpit, side altars, retables).
Among Lutheran icon producers, the agent Forsberg could be seen as the central element of a larger continuum, for it is the production of the icon producer that necessarily involves co-producers, propagators, markets, audiences, antagonists, and formative and restrictive structural forms of culture and religion. In Forsberg’s case, there are several forms of “producing structures”. In this explanatory perspective, these structures manifest the universe of possibilities prevailing at different moments in the history of the fields in which the agent has operated, forming his trajectory and enabling him to establish several relations and connections. The Swedish lingual field and all the relations that it opened were of great significance, especially in Finland where language marked the boundaries of Forsberg’s influences. Of significance, too, were the relations with agents and collective organs in the important sphere of parish administration (representing all levels of Finnish church administration and a number of outside artistic advisors and donors). Finally, the relations with agents and collective organs represented various religious distinctions from Orthodox and Catholic to Lutheran movements. These relations also mark Forsberg’s ecumenical dispositions typical of painting and teaching activities, whereas his commercial relations were almost wholly implemented through Lutheran agents.

The production of revivalist Byzantine icons could also be conceptualized in relation to the exceedingly extensive contexts of recent cultural streams, in turn related to the modernist and postmodernist currents that form the genesis and manifestation of the phenomenon through the central ideas of creative originality and historical reflection. Consequently, one may well ask whether Forsberg’s icon production could also be understood as being related to the vast phenomenon of cultural reception by the middle-classes, and the “cultural goodwill” labeling of the choices of the petit bourgeois, who had less cultural and economic capital in their attempts to follow the tastes and practices of the upper-classes possessive of far more extensive resources.

Finally, is this phenomenon essentially Lutheran, or is it simply an unacceptable effort to borrow a religious-cultural heritage originally belonging to another context and era? In order to characterize Forsbergian, or any other corresponding contemporary icon production, as either “Lutheran” or “non-Lutheran”, one needs to take into account the multiplicity of the varying interpretations of the significance of this complex theological-cultural-social concept – in other words, contemporary Lutheranism. Hence, in my opinion, whether or not any cultural phenomena could be characterized as Lutheran is not only a question of theological analysis or “original” cultural adherence, nor is it purely a matter of certain social relations, it is also a combination and mixture of all of the agents’ dispositions and relations contributing to the rise of the various phenomena in a field (or a fraction of a field) of socio-cultural relations within the field of power. In this regard, “Lutheranism” appears as a wide and many-faceted structure, quite obviously taking in and fusing new religious-cultural formations in different contexts: it is a process in which questions regarding the elements that have been integrated and rejected ultimately appear controversial in the exercise of power. The pursuit of the genuine Christian image is, essentially, an intriguing aspect of this enduring dispute.
6. Appendix

6.1. A Preliminary List of Implemented Public Works

I hope that the following list covering over 30 cases of acquisitions of icons painted by Erland Forsberg will be understood as a first attempt to establish some of the geographical limitations of the phenomenon, and simultaneously to characterize certain structural properties, formal particularities, and details in their placement, usage, and acquisition. Because of the fairly scarce information available, the list is incomplete. The obstacles to compiling a complete corpus of these works are explained in Chapter 1.3. Hence, very possibly, some of the icons listed can no longer be found at the given location (or may even never have existed there), and the information provided by the various sources and fragments of literature and pictures could even be found misleading in detail. Unfortunately, in several cases the pictures presented in different sources are so fragmentary or incomplete that closer observation and analysis are unrealizable. Naturally, in these cases only the available data is supplied in the list.

**Borås, Sweden, Skara Diocese, Carolikyrkan church, Mariakoret, acquisition January 1, 1987**

**Borås, Sweden, Skara Diocese, Carolikyrkan church, Tomaskapellet, the Apostle St. Thomas Meeting the Resurrected, on a pillar above a side altar, consecrated in September 1997, subject matter selected by public poll**

**Falköping, Sweden, Skara Diocese, Mariakapellet chapel, icon with a detail of the Tree of Knowledge, 1992**

**Falköping, Sweden, Skara Diocese, Mariakapellet chapel, icon with a detail of the Tree of Knowledge, 1992**

**Gothenburg, Sweden, Johanneberg parish, Burås church, the Ascension**

**Gothenburg, Sweden, Gothenburg Chapter, Gothenburg, retable-type object, St. Jonah, side pictures: St. Peter, St. Paul also: the Crucifix, with side pictures: the Mother of God and St. John, symbols of the Evangelists**

**Gothenburg, Sweden, Gothenburg Chapter, Gothenburg, Mariakyrkan church, triptych/retable-type work, in the middle: the Mother of God**

---

665 Mårtensson, e-mail August 31, 2001.


669 Johnsén 1999, 9, and picture 4. According to Johnsén, a central picture of an icon triptych originally painted for the devotional room of the Gothenburg Book and Library Fair, was acquired for Burås church in 1997 to be time-tested in the interior.

of Lovingkindness, side panels: the Annunciation, the Presentation of Christ, the Crucifixion, the Ascension\(^{671}\); *Gothenburg, Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese*, Tynnered church, icon with a detail of the Tree of Knowledge\(^{672}\), (see also sources 7.1.1.4. Erland Forsberg’s photographs of the Pantocrator/Christ Judge with side panels); *Gothenburg, Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese*, Västra Frölunda church, circular stained-glass picture in a window depicting the Prophet Jonah, Angel of the Lord and the Great Fish\(^{673}\) also: icons painted on a pulpit\(^{674}\); *Gothenburg, Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese*, Västra Frölunda parish home, retable-type object in the form of a triptych\(^{675}\); *(Gothenburg, Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese, Örgryte parish, icon removed \(^{676}\);)* *Högsby, Sweden, Växjö Diocese*, Fagerhult church, sacristy, icon donated by Mrs. Ester Adolfsson, Bösehäll, Grönskåra in 1977\(^{677}\); *Jönköping, Sweden, Växjö Diocese*, Ekahgskyrkan church, the Presentation of Christ, in the choir over the baptismal font\(^{678}\) and Procession Cross, the Resurrection/Descent into Hell\(^{679}\); *Jönköping, Sweden, Växjö Diocese* Bymarkskyrkan church, icon, north wall, acquisition in 1977\(^{680}\); *Kauniainen, Porvoo Diocese*, Kauniainen church, Swedish meeting hall, five icons by Erland Forsberg, 1. the Presentation of Christ 2. the Epiphany/Baptism of the Lord 3. the Crucifixion 4. the Resurrected Meeting Apostle Thomas 5. the Ascension, donated by the relatives of Heinz Stude, acquisition initiated by Pastor (leader of the parish) Lars-Henrik Höglund, placement of these five icons temporary – one by one – in the sacred space on the altar: the icons have also been used once or twice a year by the local Orthodox community\(^{681}\); *Kullavik, Gothenburg Diocese, Vallda and Slåps parish*, Kullavik church, stained-glass picture/pictures, no specified information\(^{682}\); *Kumlinge, Åland, Porvoo Diocese*, St Anna church, on a shelf in the narthex, St Anna and St Joachim in Front of the Golden Gate by Erland Forsberg, acquired by Pastor (leader of the parish) Kent Danielsson in 1984-85 in connection with a seminar on the Theology of the Icon\(^{683}\); *Lerum, Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese*, Lerum church, the Mother of God of Lovingkindness, placed in the middle of the front of the organ lectern, consecrated at

---

\(^{671}\) Johnsén 1999, 10; Forsberg’s icon printed on a postcard: Göteborg, Mariakyrkan, interiör. Photo by Kurt Andersson. Lindenhags, Floda.

\(^{672}\) Johnsén 1999,11-12.

\(^{673}\) Svenska Kyrkans Tidning, “Hoppets och ljusets bilder”, May 26, 1988 by Agneta Rudvall; Kyrkpressen, “Kreativitet är Guds barns lek inför hans ansikte”, May 18, 1989 by Ulla Hannus; Johnsén 1999, 4. See also part of a picture presenting Västra Frölunda church; Forsberg, e-mail March 17, 2004.

\(^{674}\) Johnsén 1999, 4.


\(^{677}\) Oskarshamns Mönsterås Högsby Hultsfred Vimmerby Nyheterna. “Vacker konstgåva till Fagerhults församling” September 13, 1977 by an anonymous writer; Sjöstrand, e-mail August 17, 2001.


\(^{679}\) Svenska Kyrkans Tidning, “Församling först, kyrka sedan – en lyckad modell i Jönköping”, “Stiftsida” no. 21/96 by Siwert Petersson.


\(^{682}\) Johnsén 1999, 4.

\(^{683}\) Interview IX, 2001, interview with Pastor Kent Danielsson on April 18, 2001 in Kumlinge – the author’s observation.
Candlemas in 1994\textsuperscript{684}; \textbf{Lilla Edet, Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese}, Fuxerna church, several works: a crucifix with a circular structure with four icons presenting \textit{at the four edges of the Crucifix}: the Nativity of Christ, the Baptism of Our Lord, the Myrrh Bearers, and the Ascension, \textit{inside the circular structure}: the Adoration of the Magi, Christ and the Samaritan Woman at the Well, Christ and the Woman III with Hemophilia, St. Mary Magdalene and the Resurrected, \textit{below the Crucifix}: sacrament case with three icons forming a triptych: the Eucharist in the middle of the case door, the Entry into Jerusalem, and the Resurrection/Descent into Hell on the sides – these two side icons are removable for use in processions\textsuperscript{685}; \textbf{Linköping, Sweden, Linköping Diocese}, Mikaelskyrkan church, the Pantocrator, placed above the altar\textsuperscript{686}; \textbf{Lund, Sweden, Lund Diocese}, Sankt Laurentii kyrka church, Deisis group, seven icons in the form of a polyptych/retable-type object: the Pantocrator/Christ Judge, the Mother of God, St. John the Forerunner, Arch Angels Michael and Gabriel, Apostles Peter and Paul, acquired by the Foundation of St. Laurence\textsuperscript{687}; \textbf{Malmö, Sweden, Lund Diocese}, Bunkeflo parish, Bunkeflo Strandkyrka church, altar painting, right side the Mother of God, middle the Pantocrator/Christ Judge, and left St. Brigit, acquired by the parish and “introduced” on March 11, 1990, procession cross the Suffering Christ, donated by the Lions Club\textsuperscript{688}; \textbf{Mölndal, Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese}, Apelgårds småkyrka church, no specified data\textsuperscript{689}; \textbf{Oskarshamn, Sweden, Växjö Diocese}, Oskarshamn Christian folk high school, Cecilia-kapellet chapel, in the choir, Deisis group: the Pantocrator/Christ Judge, St. Brigit and St. Cecilia, donated by Anne-Marie and Stig Fränzén in 1992; baptismal font with the following motifs: St. Peter, St. Paul, St. Simeon, St. Hannah, St. Joseph, and the Mother of God in the Presentation of Christ, St. Anna with the Mother of God, St. Sigfrid\textsuperscript{690}; \textbf{Oskarshamn, Sweden, Växjö Diocese} Kolbergakyrkan church, retable-type object with five icons, the Transfiguration.

\textsuperscript{684} Lerums tidning, “Första Maria-bilden i Lerums kyrka”, February 9, 1994 p. 7 by Ulla Alvermalm, front page: “Den första Maria-bilden invigd i Lerums kyrka”, “Vi fick en förfrågan från en polsk kvinna varför vi inte hade någon Mariabild i kyrkan, och när vi funderat inom kyrkokommittén beslöt vi skaffa en, säger Barbro Swedberg.”


\textsuperscript{688} Interview III, 2000; Hansson, e-mail August 14, 2001; Hansson, e-mail August 16, 2001; Forsberg’s icon printed on a postcard: Ikon i Bunkeflo Strandkyrka. Målad av Erland Forsberg. Photo: P-G Hansson; Forsberg’s icon printed on a postcard: Bunkeflo Strandkyrka. Photo: P-G Hansson; Forsberg’s icon printed on a postcard: Bunkeflo Strandkyrka. Ikon “Kristus på tronen” Uppb 4. Målad av Erland Forsberg.

\textsuperscript{689} Svenska Kyrkans Tidning, “Hoppets och ljusets bilder”, May 26, 1988 by Agneta Rudvall.

\textsuperscript{690} Forsberg’s icon printed on leaflet: Skolans alla linjer, reverse side: interior of Cecilia-kapellet with altar and students; Forsberg’s icon printed on a postcard: Oskarshamns Folkhögskola. Ikon av Erland Forsberg. Fr v: Den Heliga Brigitta, Kristus på sin härlighets tron, den heliga Cecilia; Erland Forsberg’s photographs (7.1.1.4.), baptismal font in Oskarshamn; Oskarshamns Tidning, “Ny altartavlermycket i Cecilia kapellet Ikonvigning trots bilolycka”, March 16, 1991 by an unknown writer; the unidentified newspaper article, “Mannen bakom ceciliakapellets dopfunt”, unknown date [after 1979] by an unknown writer, front page article; Johnsen 1999, 4-5.
in the side panels: the Baptism of the Lord, one undetectable icon [not completely visible in the photograph], the Crucifixion, and the Resurrection/Descent into Hell, acquisition in 1994, also: the Hodigitria Mother of God, acquisition in 2000 in connection with the 33rd anniversary of the church; Partille, Sweden, Catholic, Jonsered Franciscan monastery, chapel, nine icons: in the choir the Crucifix and six saintly figures on the north wall: the Transfiguration, on the west wall the Pantocrator within a Greek cross; Rättvik, Sweden, Västerås Diocese, Stiftsgårdens kapell, St. Davidsgården retreat center, retable-type object, triptych: St. Brigit, the Mother of God of Lovingkindness, St. Anna of Novgorod, and when the side pictures are closed: the Crown of Thorns; Rättvik, Sweden, St. Davidsgården retreat center, procession cross with the Pantocrator; Sala, Sweden, Västerås Diocese, Väster-Färnebo church, the Good Shepherd, acquisition through a fund-raising project in memory of Mary Johansson in 1995, acquisition of two icons in 1997: the Mother of God and St. Peter, which were placed on either side of the central figure and together form a triptych/retable-type object, the two icons were donated in memory of Anna-Lisa Andersson, consecrated in the Pentecost Mass in 1997, and placed in the Chapel of the Good Shepherd; Skellefteå, Sweden, Luleå Diocese, Anderstorps kyrka church, no specified data; Sollefteå, Sverige, Härnösand Diocese, Sollefteå gravkapell funeral chapel, no specified data; Stensjö, Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese, Kikås funeral chapel, the Good Shepherd in a retable-type object with six side pictures; Svenshögen, Spekeröd-Ucklums parish (Pastorat) Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese, Svenshögen parish home, retable-type object, donated by Anders Karlsson; Uppsala, Sweden, Uppsala Archdiocese, Anskarskyrkan student church, the Pantocrator, above the altar, donated in 1984 by Mrs. Anna Tamm from Fånöö, acquired in connection with the reparation and redecoration of the church in 1984, consecrated by Archbishop Bertil Wijkström during the Second Advent Sunday Mass in 1984; Vaasa, Finland, Porvoo Diocese, the chapel of Alskathemmet recreation center, the Passion History, retable-type object of the history of the Crucifixion and Passion by Erland Forsberg depicting in the middle the Crucifixion, and below the Resurrection/Descent into Hell, and the Myrrh Bearers, side panels Christ Washing the Feet of His Disciples, Christ Praying in Gethsemane, Judas Kissing the Lord, Christ Mocked by

695 Sala-Allechanda, “Nya ikoner invigdes i Väster-Färnebo kyrka” May 21, 1997 by Arne Antonsson.
Soldiers, the Entombment of the Lord, and the Apostle St. Thomas Touching the Resurrected, acquired by the Vaasa Swedish parochial church council as result of an icon exhibition in 1990\textsuperscript{702}; \textit{Vaasa, Finland, Porvoo Diocese}, Vetokannas church, the Resurrection/Descent into Hell, altarpiece, donated by John and Hildegarð Forsberg in 1986\textsuperscript{703}; \textit{Varberg, Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese}, Apelvikshöjd church, retable-type object with several panels\textsuperscript{704}; \textit{Varberg, Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese}, Vårö, Bua church, retable-type object with five icons with motifs from the life of Christ, the Raising of Lazarus [icon shown in part in the photograph], the Crucifixion, the Myrrh Bearers, [and Christ Calling St. Peter?, the icon shown only in part in the photograph, and one icon is not at all visible] consecrated by Per-Olof Sjögren in 1983\textsuperscript{705}; \textit{Varberg, Sweden, Gothenburg Diocese}, Träslövskyrka church, retable-type object, St. Brigit, the Mother of God of the Passion, St. Laurence\textsuperscript{706}.

6.2. A Preliminary List of Icons and Icon-type Objects in Finnish Lutheran Sacred Spaces

The chart comprises a mixed body of different objects – all characterized as antiquarian, revivalist Byzantine icons or icon-type/iconic objects – composed on the basis of Database 2001 (a combination of observed and collected material representing over 200 cases of church art acquisitions placed into Finnish Lutheran sacred spaces). \textit{The data on the structural properties, the formal particularities, the acquisition, placement and ritual utilization, and other details are preliminary and subject to alteration and more detailed description. Other icons may well exist in other consecrated Lutheran sacred spaces in Finland. Moreover, because of the artsociological emphasis in this work, any attempts at even an approximate dating of the antique objects are merely the author’s preliminary estimations, and are subject to alteration in a more detailed art-historical analysis.}

\textit{Föglö, Åland, Porvoo Diocese}, Mary Magdalene church, in the choir south pillar, equipped with a candle stand, the Mother of God of Don, painted in 1986 by an anonymous painter, donation by the painter\textsuperscript{707}; \textit{Helsinki, Helsinki Diocese}, Alppila church, choir wall, north side of the altar, 1. the Nativity 2. the Crucifixion 3. the Myrrh Bearers by Raili Toivanen.

(retired teacher of Fine Arts) 1. 1993, 2. 1995, 3. 1996, donated by the painter\(^{708}\); Helsinki, Helsinki Diocese, Huopalahti church, 1. The Mother of God of Lovingkindness, south wall, painted by Maija Puustinen in 1975, donated to the parish by Robert de Caluwé in connection with an icon exhibition in the upper hall, according to the informant a sign of the ecumenical tendencies of the 1970s\(^{709}\), 2. Taizé Crucifix, north wall, donated by the former youth pastor Jyrki Koivikko, who acquired the print in Taizé, France and prepared its carpentry in 1995 in Helsinki as a thanksgiving gift on his ordination\(^{710}\); Houtskär, Porvoo Diocese, Houtskär church, Christ with a crown of thorns and cane, westernized style icon from late-19th-century Russia, motif a reproduction of Ecce Homo by Guido Reni\(^{711}\), south wall close to the choir, donated by Kuno Eriksson in September 1992, originally placed on the choir wall beside the altar by donor, and later re-placed by the senior pastor\(^{712}\); Joensuu, Kuopio Diocese, Hukanhauta parish home, on the sidewall of the meeting hall opening to the sacred space, The Mother of God of Sorrows, painter Eeva Riitakangas?, probably donated by the painter in 1987, when the parish was consecrated and in connection with an icon exhibition\(^{713}\); Jyväskylä, Lapua Diocese, Keljo church, The Mother of God of Lovingkindness, painter the pensioner Kerttu Piekka, acquired by former district pastor Päivi Jussila in 1997\(^{714}\); Kauniainen, Porvoo Diocese,

\(^{708}\) The author’s observation and brief interviews in Huopalahti and Alppila parishes/churches on September 4, 2001; Raili Toivanen, letter to Juha Malmisalo on September 17, 2001; Interview X, 2001. According to her, she was introduced to icon-painting when invited to paint the portrait of the former Finnish Orthodox Archbishop Paavali. She was taught by Mother Macaria (in the 1980s) and Petros Sasaki. On Sasaki, see Arseni 1995, 84-85, and Flinckenberg-Gluschkoff 2000, 106. The icons in Alppila church were, according to the informant, temporarily placed in the church before their acquisition, see Raili Toivanen, letter to Juha Malmisalo on September 17, 2001; and Personal communication, Olli Laine, 26.9.2001. According to Laine, the icons could be considered a sign of the ecumenical nature of the Church. See also Suomen Teologit 1990, 315-316, 654.

\(^{709}\) See the author’s observation and brief interviews in Huopalahti and Alppila parishes/churches on September 4, 2001. According to the informants, the painter was educated in the Myllyjärvi ecumenical center. See the telephone conversation with retired pastor (leader of the parish) Matti Hakkarainen on September 19, 2001, according to whom the Lutheran-Orthodox inter-marriages and the friendship-parish relations with the North-Karelian Tuupovaara parish also influenced the placement of the icon.

\(^{710}\) The author’s observation and brief interviews in Huopalahti and Alppila parishes/churches on September 4, 2001; Telephone conversation with Pastor Jyrki Koivikko, 30.8.2001.

\(^{711}\) Hanka 2003, 20-21.


\(^{713}\) The author’s observation, the churches of Joensuu and Kerimäki, 1999; Personal communication, Samuli Ranta on September 20, 2001; Personal communication, Ulla Väätänen on September 21, 2001.

Kauniainen church, Swedish meeting hall, five icons by Erland Forsberg:
1. the Presentation of Christ
2. the Epiphany/Baptism of the Lord
3. the Crucifixion
4. the Resurrected Meeting Apostle Thomas
5. the Ascension
For more information see Appendix 6.1.

Kittilä, Levi, Oulu Diocese:
St. Mary chapel, north sidewall, the Pantocrator, donated on August 27, 1999 by Orthodox Archbishop Johannes, Greek, painted on papyrus leaves.

Kumlinge, Åland, Porvoo Diocese:
St. Anna church, on a shelf in the narthex, the Pantocrator, donated on September 3, 1996, from the Lampukka Orthodox store in Kuopio.

Kuopio, Kuopio Diocese:
Riistavesi church, south wall, the Mother of God of Tolga by Sirkka Merisalo, equipped with oil lamp, acquisition of Pastor (leader of the parish) Hannu Savinainen, on September 3, 1996, from the Lampukka Orthodox store in Kuopio.

Kökar, Åland, Porvoo Diocese:
Kökar church, the Crucifix of San Damiano (hand-painted replica), gift from Centro Ecomenico Nordico and Father Agustino (Nils Lundin) in 1979 in connection with the consecration of the ecumenical chapel.

Lahti, Tampere Diocese:
Church of the Cross, crypt, 1. crucifix/procession crucifix (Christ on the Cross and the Grave of Adam) by Sirkku Muhli, painted in 1998, donated by the painter to the Church of the Cross to be used as a procession cross in St. Thomas Masses (removed to the waiting-room wall in 2003, icon partially damaged), five paper prints glued on cardboard on the back wall (from top to bottom): 2. the Annunciation 3. Three Church Fathers 4. the Nativity of the Lord and Two Arch Angels 5. and 6. on both sides of the Christmas Icon (on objects 2,-6, see the presentation of certain miscellaneous sacred spaces and objects in ch. 3.2.3.), 7. a photocopy of the crypt altar-piece, used as a procession cross in St. Thomas Masses.

Lappvik, Porvoo Diocese:
Chapel of Snoan retreat center 1. Choir, north side, the Kazan Mother of God, 19th century Russian production, donated by Marga Ahlqvist (1914-1991), founder and promoter of the center, 2. choir, south side, St George, 19th-century Russian, donated by Marga Ahlqvist, (originally discovered in the estate of Mrs. Ahlqvist’s husband, who died in action in 1944)

(Mikkeli, Mikkeli Diocese:
Mikkeli Cathedral, sacristry wall, St. Archangel Michael, painted by the Orthodox priest candidate Jyrki Puhta, donated by Mikkeli Ortho-

---

715 The author’s observation and interviews in Enontekiö, Hetta church and Kittilä, the chapel of St. Mary, on September 30, 2001 and October 2, 2001; Kotimaa, “Tunturikappelissa kohdataan vieraat ja oman kylän väki” September 5, 2003 by an anonymous writer.


717 Savinainen, e-mail August 16, 2001; The author’s observation and brief interviews in Riistavesi, 2001; Telephone conversation with managing director Sirkka Merisalo, Pukkila, January 13, 2004. The placement of an icon as an issue pertaining to the renovation of the church was decided in the parish Congregational Board on August 8, 1996. See RSA, Minutes of the Riistavesi Congregational Board, no 1/1995-5/1997Cd, August 8, 1996.


720 Interview VIII, 2001, interview with Åsa Westerlund, the author’s observation; Forssell 1994, 5-9, 27.
dox parish to the Lutheran parish of Mikkeli Cathedral in 1986\(^{721}\); Savonlinna, Mikkeli Diocese, Pikkukirkko church (former Orthodox church) 1. the Nativity of Christ, as altarpiece, antiquarian work, painted probably in the 17th-18th centuries?, painter unknown, on loan from the Orthodox Church of Finland on the initiative of Bishop Panteleimon, ecumenical consecration by local Orthodox and Lutheran bishops on December 9, 2000, 2. the Pantocrator, south wall, a gift of Varkaus Orthodox parish in connection with the 150th anniversary of the church, painted by Tuula Ahonen in 1996\(^{722}\); Tuusula, Helsinki Diocese, Jokela church, altar crucifix by Robert de Caluwé, in 1976, the Savior, the Mother of God, St. John the Evangelist, Christ in His Glory, Four Angels, and the Grave of Adam, placed on February 10, 1976, price FIM 5000, acquired in connection with the building of the church, on the initiative of local Pastor Heikki Hämäläinen, who knew de Caluwé in the 1960s and who asked him to paint an icon cross as a substitute for the architect’s original idea of bird figures; the icon was criticized in the local newspaper in 1976 [in addition, in the sacristy, the Apostle and Evangelist St. John, and in the meeting hall a sketch of the altarpiece, both by de Caluwé]\(^{723}\); Uusikaupunki, Turku Arch-Dioese, New Church, 1. the Pantocrator, the back wall on side altar with kneeler, on side altar: the Crucifix, flowers, opened Bible, a candle, a sandbox for lighted candles, commissioned by a church official in the 1990s, painter a local businesswoman Satu Varjus, a pupil of de Caluwé’s, parish center, chapel of officiates 2. the Mother of God of Konevitsa on the chapel altar, in the 1990s, donated by Satu Varjus (In addition, in Saarnisto parish home, meeting hall, an antique cabinet with the Pantocrator by Satu Varjus)\(^{724}\); Vaasa,

\(^{721}\) See Kotimaa, “Ylienkelin ikoni Mikkelin tuomiokirkkoon”, June 3, 1986 p. 6 by an anonymous writer.

\(^{722}\) Interview XII, 2001; Telephone conversation with Tuula Ahonen, September 26, 2001, according to whom the acquisition was the idea of the Varkaus Orthodox clergy and the subject selected by the painter herself, considered relevant to the future Lutheran context of worship. See the author’s observation, archives material and inquiries in Savonlinna parish on August 23-24, 2001; Seurakuntautuutiset, “Huikaa löyös ortodoksikirkon varastosta Pikkukirkkoon jouluaiheinen alttaritaulu”, no. 5, p. 4 November 2000 by an anonymous writer, front page: “Joulukuva valmistuu Pikkukirkkoon”; Kotimaa, “Savonlinnan Pikkukirkko sai arvokkaan alttaritaulun”, December 21, 2000 by Niilo Niskanen. See also the leaflet “Kristuksen syntymä”, 2000.

\(^{723}\) Interview VI, 2001; Interview XI, 2001 and the author’s observation; telephone conversation with Pastor Heikki Hämäläinen on September 19, 2001; Hyvinkää Sanomat, “Seurakuntatalo Vihittii: ‘Joke-laa voi onnitella’”, February 24, 1976 by SL. On the debate, see Jokelan seutu, “Ihmetylyä”, February 27, 1976 by “seurakuntalainen”; Jokelan seutu, “Ihmetylyyn jatkoa”, March 12, 1976 by “ sama seurakuntalainen”; Jokelan seutu, “Rakas nimim. Seurakuntalainen”, March 5, 1976 by Pastor Heikki Hämäläinen; a graph presenting the symbolic and art-historical prototypes of the icon composed by Heikki Hämäläinen based on information given by Father de Caluwé. The informant Pastor Hämäläinen specifically wanted to challenge with Byzantine imagery, both the absence of art in contemporary Lutheran churches and the modernist art alienated from the Christian pictorial tradition. See telephone conversation with Pastor Heikki Hämäläinen on September 19, 2001 expressing all aspects important to the informant, i.e. the theological argumentation on a common tradition, the reasonable price, the importance of the Salvation history in illustrations, and the above-mentioned reaction against the assessed developments in contemporary church art.

\(^{724}\) Telephone conversation with Satu Varjus, May 15, 2001; Interview XVI, 2003 tape B; The author’s photographs from Uusikaupunki.
Porvoo Diocese, the chapel of Alskathemmet, the Passion History\textsuperscript{725} (see details in Appendix 6.1.); Vaasa, Porvoo Diocese, Vetokannans church, the Resurrection/Descent into Hell by Erland Forsberg\textsuperscript{726} (See Details in Appendix 6.1.); Vårdö, Åland, Porvoo Diocese, St Matthias Church, seven icons, placed on the balcony balustrade (from left to right) the Evangelist St. Luke, the Evangelist St. Mark, the Apostle St. Peter, the Apostle St. Paul, the Apostle and Evangelist St. John, the Apostle St. Matthias?, and the Evangelist St. Matthew?, painted by Per-Erik Karmela, possibly in Helsinki?, born in nearby Vargata village, the St. Matthew icon donated by the painter, the next three bought and donated to the church by the parish sewing circle, all acquired in the early 1990s.\textsuperscript{727}


The following list presents writings and pictures in Kotimaa illustrating and/or mentioning, and furthermore utilizing Byzantine pictorial material in various ways, produced by several agents over a period of 33 years. The chart was compiled primarily in order to identify certain basic qualities: 1) frequency of appearance, 2) possible pictorial motifs, 3) the agents attached to pictorial materials and/or their utilization. Full details are not available of the icons depicted in the often fragmented photographs. The Taizé Crucifixes that appeared in the newspaper are excluded from this Appendix because of their ambivalent quality: these icon-type objects are, however, described in ch. 3.2. (and as regards Huopalahti church in Appendix 6.2.). The list is undoubtedly incomplete: other pictures and published articles may well exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Writer/Photographer</th>
<th>Data on the depicted icon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kuvia Pyhistä, November 17, 1967 p. 5</td>
<td>by Heikki Aurell [St. Sofia].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsen rukous on kun polun alku, 1970</td>
<td>by Seppo Viikari [missing date, an icon present in a photograph depicting Antti, Maija and Kari Paavilainen’s family] [the Pantocrator].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silakkaa ja ikoneja, October 27, 1972 p. 2</td>
<td>by Reppuri.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikoiniayttely Hivträskissä Jo ihmenevät värit kertovat vuositasaisesta hartaudesta, June 15, 1973 p. 4 by Heikki Aurell [the Mother of God of Lovingkindness].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptiläisiä ikonimaalareita tapaamassa, July 18, 1975 p. 4-5 by Maija Paavilainen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalaiset ikonimaalariit opissa Moskovassa, October 17, 1975 p. 4 by an anonymous writer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumalan Äiti, January 4, 1977 p. 16 by Irma Hakamies [the Mother of God? – part of a Deisis?].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{725} Interview IV, 2000; Vasabladet, “I morgon invigs Alskathemmet”, February 17, 1990 p. 4 by an anonymous writer, front page: “Juudskyss i altarskåp i Alskaatt”; Koskimies-Envall 1993, 135; Forsberg’s icon in the chapel of Alskathemmet, print acquired by John Forsberg.


\textsuperscript{727} Interviews IX, interview of Pastor Peter Karlsson on April 18, 2001 in Vårdö – the author’s observation. Cf. interview with Pastor Kent Danielsson on April 18, 2001 in Kumlinge, according to whom the pastor and writer Valdemar Nyman (1904-) was influential in the acquisitions of the icons in Vårdö. See also the author’s photographs taken in Vårdo church on April 18, 2001; Suomen teologit 1990, 444-445; Remmer 1993.
Aitoja ikoneja Neuvostoliitosta, April 25, 1978 p. 4 by Heikki Aurell [St. John the Forerunner].


Kotimaa tänään, April 24, 1979 p. 1 [on the front page] by Heikki Tervonen [Our Lady of the Sign by Liisa Kuningas].

Ikoni on ikkuna uskon maailmaan, April 24, 1979 p. 4 by Heikki Tervonen, photograph by Ritva Neuvonen [the Saints of Karelia, Our Lady of the Sign, and the Resurrection by Liisa Kuningas].

Temppelissä tuoksui tuohus, December 20, 1979 p. 7 by Uuno Poikonen [the Mother of God of Konevitsa, a graphic presentation].

Risti – uskomme keskeisin merkki, April 3, 1980 p. 6 by Risto Ahti, photograph by Tapani Erämaja [several icons].


Minusta on syntynyt jotain, October 23, 1981 p. 1 by Lahja Pyykkönen, photograph by Ritva Neuvonen [several icons].

Ikoni on rukouksen väline, April 8, 1982 p. 7 by Heikki Tervonen [St. John the Forerunner, the Crucifixion, the Pantocrator, St. John the Evangelist].

Aasi, härkä, leijona, kaarne Eläimet ikoneissa, October 19, 1982 p. 4 by an anonymous writer, photographs by Erkki Talvila [the Nativity of Our Lord Jesus Christ by Aura Jylhii-Vuorio, the Entry into Jerusalem by Mirjam Laine, St. Patriarch Modestos by Hannu Lahtinen].

Ikoni Jumalan ja ihmisen välisistä yhteydestä, February 18, 1983 p. 6 by Irmeli Sutinen, photograph by Maritta Laaksonen [icon undetectable].


Ikoni vie lähemmäs evankeliumia, November 8, 1984 p. 2 by Päivi Taussi.

Heleitä ikoneita, January 15, 1985 p. 5 by Maija Paavilainen.


Ikoniäyttely Kotkassa, April 11, 1985 p. 3 by an anonymous writer [several icons].

Pyhä Henki Kuivissa, May 17, 1985 p. 9 by Pentti Lempiäinen [the Mother of God of Konevitsa].

Syty meihin, valo, December 20, 1985 p. 16 by Liisa Suurla [the Pantocrator by Petra Sasaki].

Ylenkelin ikoni Mikkelin tuomiokirkkoon, June 3, 1986 p. 6 by an anonymous writer [St. Michael].

Ikoni, June 3, 1986 p. 8 by Anna-Liisa Laamanen [the Mother of God of Lovingkindness].

Bysantin pitkä varjo, January 29, 1988 p. 10 by Heikki Tervonen [several icons in the Orthodox church interior].

Luovuus on lapsen sielun säilyttämistä, April 15, 1988 p. 17 by Maija Paavilainen.

Tuhvatuotisen kirkon tervehdys, June, 10, 1988 p. 3 by an anonymous writer [the Mother of God of Lovingkindness].

Ikonimaalauksen perinne elää, June, 10, 1988 p. 3 by an anonymous writer.


Ikonitaiteen vuosinäyttely todistaa lason nousun, July 28, 1988 p. 1 by an anonymous writer [several icons on a home wall].

Vuosinäyttely Lieksassa Ikonimaalauksen taso nousussa, July 28, 1988 p. 3 by Jaakko Pikkarainen [the Mother of God of Konevitsa].


Arkkipispa Paavali haudataan tänään Valamo, December 8, 1988 p. 1 by an anonymous writer [several icons in the Orthodox context].

Maalauismaaari ikonimaalareilille, February 23, 1989 p. 3 by an anonymous writer.
Morbackan hiljaisuudessa koetaan kärsimystia ja pääsiäisen riemua, March 23, 1989 pp. 2-3 by Kylliikki Krapinoja, photographs by Ari Rapo [several icons: the Resurrection and (in the chapel), the Pantocrator and other unrecognizable icons or icon prints].

Kirkkoherro Mikko Kärki: Asiat voi sivuuttaa – ihmisä ei, March 23, 1989 p. 24 by Lahja Pykkönen, photograph by Olli Horto [several icons in an Orthodox sacred space].

Aiwar Sarapik vihitään ensi viikonvaihteessa pienien kirkon diakoniksi “Kristillinen työ on rauhan etsimistä”, April 11, 1989 p. 8 by Lea Lappalainen, photograph by Matti Karppinen [several icons in an Orthodox sacred space].

Ihmiset hätistelemällä kirkcoon Tsasouna herää talviunestaan, April 21, 1989 p. 7 by Riitta Rynänen [the Mother of God, Christ, and several saints in Orthodox sacred space].

Hiljaisuus ja rukous puhuttelevat nykyihmisistä, June 8, 1989 p. 5 by Risto Krogerus [portable triptych: St Nicolas, the Savior Acheiropoietos, two angel figures, depictions of the saint’s life].

Usko on elämän luonnollinen asia, July 28, 1989 p. 11 by Heikki Tervonen [St Paul, part of the iconostasis].

“Kirkkojen väliset muurit ovat ihmisten tekoa”, sanoo isä Robert de Caluwé, Ekumeenisessa keskuksessa on rajana vain taivas, pp. 2-3 by Hanne Hokkanen, photograph by Matti Karppinen [several icons, church interior].

Jalkapuussa Ostaja Kirsi-Marja Suutarinen Ikoneja saa tavaratalosta ympäri vuoden, August 10, 1989 p. 3 by an anonymous writer.

Eina Karjalaiselle kirkon kirjallisuuspaikointo, December 15, 1989 pp. 2-3 by Pekka Ritolahti [the Pantocrator and two partially depicted icons].

“Risti saa ihmiset hiljentymään”, February 9, 1990 p. 6 by an anonymous writer [procession cross with several figures].

Kotialttareita monessa kodissa, February 23, 1990 p. 6 by an anonymous writer.

Hiljaisuus täysimmillään: Maria laulaa!, March 20, 1990 p. 16 text and photograph by Heikki Tervonen [the Black Madonna of Czestohova, Poland].

Piispa Olavi Rimpiläinen iloitsee pyhäinpäivän elpymisestä: Pyhien ja vainajien muistaminen on aitoa luterilaisuutta, December 7, 1990 p. 13 by Tuomo Korteniemi, photograph by Matti Karppinen [Our Lady of the Sign].

Kotitaloja on monessa kodissa, February 23, 1990 p. 6 by an anonymous writer.

Paavali on protestanttien pyhimmä Uskon Esikuvia, January 24, 1992 p. 18 by Heikki Tervonen [St. Gregory of Nazianzus (Theologian), St. John Chrysostom, and St. Basil the Great].
Ehyeksi minä teen kaikki Läsnä, January 31, 1992 p 17 by Helvi Pulla, photograph by Jukka Granström [angel figure].

Ikoni sijoitettava taitavasti kirkkoon, February 4, 1992 p. 12 by Maija Paavilainen [the Mother of God of Lovingkindness and an additional unidentifiable saint (a hermit?)].


Mustan vyön mestari toivoo valkoista pantaan, February 11, 1992 p. 20 by Ari Tammi [several icons and other religious pictorial objects].

Tie paratiisiin on rauvattu auki Sana Kantaa, March 3, 1992 p. 16 by Heikki Tervonen [the Creation of Man, a drawing by Petros Sasaki].

Vankilan kappeli palvelee kaikkia, March 31, 1992 p. 20 by Vesa Korhonen, photograph by Kauko Varis [two unrecognizable icons in an ecumenical prison chapel].

Ypäjän pappilassa Suomen suurin yksityinen ristikokoelma "Evankeliumia Kaikille Aisteille", August 18, 1992 pp. 11–12 by an anonymous writer [three icons crosses in metal, the Kazan Mother of God].

Saarna Ovatko messiashahmot korvanneet Messiaan? November 6, 1992 p. 17 by Tapio Sempäla [westernized Christ figure with traditional Orthodox text elements].

Saarna Ovatko messiashahmot korvanneet Messiaan? November 6, 1992 p. 17 by Tapio Sempäla [westernized Christ figure with traditional Orthodox text elements].

Messu Taivas ja maa ylistävät Jumalaa, February 19, 1993 p. 17 by Heikki Tervonen [St. Gabriel].

Muistilista Uuskon silmä kantaa yli elämän myrskyjen, June 18, 1993 p. 37 by Heikki Kotila [the Pantocrator].

Näyttely Pääsiäismunia kesähelteessä, July 16–22, 1993 p. 36 by Risto Kormilainen [the Resurrection (and the same type of icon on an Easter egg?)].

SEN:n pääsihteeri Jan Edström haluaa muistuttaa vähemmistökirkojen olemassaoloa “Kaikki tunnustuskunnat samalle viivalle”, September 10, 1993 p. 23 by Ritva Rasila [an Archangel (St. Michael?)].

Heikki Tervonen Näkökulma Idän kirkon “ikivanhaa” viisautta, December 10, 1993 p. 31 by Heikki Tervonen. [Christ and a monk figure?].

Tavattavissa Kirjaneliön uusi kustannusjohtaja Heikki Kotila Kirja voi olla kanava keskustelulle, April 22, 1994 p. 16 by Heikki Tervonen [the Pantocrator and two other unrecognizable, partly depicted, icons].

Kotimaan Matkaklubi Kesämatkat Konevitsaan, Gotlantiin ja Itävaltaan, May 20, 1994 p. 35 by Heikki Tervonen [the Mother of God of Konevitsa].

Heikki Tervonen Näkökulma Uskomme syvin salaisuus, May 27, 1994 p. 26 by Heikki Tervonen [the Holy Trinity].

Jeesus-lapsesta kertovat lapsenomaiset legendat toivat joulun tupaan “Rukki surisi, äiti lauloi, kehdossa lapsonen makasi”, December 23, 1994 pp. 1, 24-25 by Marjo Nevala [several Byzantine-style pictures illustrating Christmas legends, illustration by Ulla Vaajakallio].

Ekumeeninen kappeli Joensuun asuntomessuilla, July 21, 1995 p. 22 by Kari Tanskanen [icon unrecognizable].


“Vastuuta koko elämää”, October 27, 1995 p. 30 by Heikki Hantula [icon unrecognizable].

Kristus ja kaikki pyhät, January 5, 1996 p. 33 by Pertti Repo [several saints on the same panel].

Morbackan Hiljaisuudenkodissa Paasto on osa arjen ja juhlan rytiä, February 16, 1996 p. 26 by Kyllikki Krapinoja [several unrecognizable icons in Morbacka chapel].

Viikon valiot Kirkko kokoaa ulkosuomalaiset Saar olla suomalainen, April 19, 1996 p. 22 Eeva Haapakoski [?] [the Holy Trinity].

Keidas keskellä kaupunkia, June 14, 1996 p. 21 by Marjo Nevala [the Pantocrator on a prayer altar].
Ikonitek. Helvi Koivusalo, July 12, 1996 p. 21 by an anonymous writer.
Rakkaudella tehty Räfsjön saaren kotakirkko syntyi talkoovoimin, September 6, 1996 pp. 20-21 by Taneli Kylätasku [St. Nicholas and four unrecognizable saints].
Kovanyrkkien pyhimys hyvää sana, December 20, 1996 p. 25 by Jaakko Elenius [St. Nicholas].
Hyvän paimenen ääni Saarna, April 11, 1997 p. 26 by Jukka Lehtinen [portable triptych: St Nicholas, Savior Acheiropoietos, two angel figures, depictions of the saint’s life].
Oikeusteologian tutkija Mikko Reijonen: Uskonnonvapaus kuuluu perustaviin ihmisoikeuksiin, April 3, 1998 pp. 6-7 by Juliska Lehtinen [the Holy Trinity, part].
Kristus nousi kuolleista Saarna, April 9, 1998 p. 28 by Osmo Alaja [the Savior Acheiropoietos with Two Angels (a church facade?)].
Rikkiammuttu Kristus julistaa vammoillaan, April 9, 1998 p. 44 by Liisa Maria Piila [the Pantocrator in Tampere Orthodox church, detail].
Tapio Luoma väitteli professori Thomas Torranceen ajattelusta: Tiede pohjautuu kristinuskoon, January 29, 1999 p. 13 by Heikki Tervonen [a Hodigitria-type icon of the Mother of God, and other unrecognizable icons].
Mummon Kammarin perustaja Maarit Tammisto: Avunpyynnöt ovat vain lisääntyneet, April 30, 1999 p. 7 by Juliska Lehtinen [the Pantocrator].
Idän suuret kirkkoisät, June 11, 1999 p. 32 by Heikki Tervonen [St. Basil, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. John Chrysostom].
Tuhon vai toivon ilmestyskirja? October 8, 1999 p. 35 by an anonymous writer [St. John the Evangelist, detail].
Etelän Joulupukin mailla Nikolaos, December 17, 1999 pp. 8-9 by Heikki Tervonen, photograph by Heikki Tervonen [St. Nicholas].
Anna-Maija Raittilan joulu Morbackan hiljaisuuden yhteisössä “Lahjaksi toivon tuoksuvaa lepoon”, December 17, 1999 pp. 16–17 by Mari Teinilä, photographs by Matti Karppinen and Anna-Maija Raittila [several icons in Morbacka chapel].
Ikoneita Riihimäellä, April 14, 2000 p. 9 by an anonymous writer [an icon (hodigitria-type) of the Mother of God, detail].
Neljän vuosisadan ikonit, April 14, 2000 p. 25 by Marjo Nevala [the Great Martyr St. George and the Dragon].
Ikonostaasi lisälleen, April 14, 2000 p. 25 by an anonymous writer.
Tapioluuma vuoden papiksi, October 27, 2000 p. 5 by an anonymous writer, photograph by Benjamin Pöntinen [a Hodigitria-type icon of the Mother of God and other unrecognizable icons].
Savonlinnan Pikkukirkko sai arvokkaan alttaritaulun, December 21, 2000 p. 14 by Niilo Niskanen [the Nativity of Christ, a Western-style oil painting (Italian 17th-18th century origins?) earlier used as an icon in the Orthodox context, re-placed as a altar painting in Lutheran Savonlinna Pikkukirkko church].
7. Sources and Bibliography

7.1. Primary Sources

7.1.1. Unpublished sources

7.1.1.1. Archives

ACLM Kirkon Jumalanpalvelus- ja musiikkitoinimikunnan arkisto [Archives of the Committee for Liturgy and Music of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland]
   File: Lausuntoja kirkon käytöstä ja kirkkotaitteesta
   Komitean lausunto [Committee’s Statement] 1.11.1985 “Huutoniemen kirkon taide-
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   Irtaimistoluettelo [Catalogue of Properties], 1217, 22.11.2000. Irtaimistoluettelo tarkennu-

Jyväskylä parish
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   Keljon seurakuntakeskuksen irtaimistoluettelo [Catalogue of Properties] 1997,
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Laurentiistiftelsen
   Överenskommelse mellan konstnären Erland Forsberg och Laurentiistiftelsen angående
   utförande av konstverk för S:t Laurentii kyrka. Lund den 7 December 1978. [Acquisition
   contract regarding the paintings in Laurentiikyrkan]
   Protokoll fört vid sammanträde med Laurentiistiftelsens styrelse i Lund [Minutes of the
   Council of the Organization in Lund].
   Minutes April 21, 1980.

RSA Riistaveden seurakunnan arkisto [Riistavesi Parish Archives]
   Seurakuntaneuvoston pöytäkirjat [Minutes of the Congregational Board]
   No 1/1995-5/1997 Cd

VELPA Vaasan Evankelis-luterilaisten seurakuntien arkistot [Vaasa Evangelical Lutheran
Parishes: Parish Archives]

VFPA Vaasan suomalaisen seurakunnan arkisto [Vaasa Finnish Parish Archives]
   II Cda H 8 / III
   Seurakuntaneuvoston pöytäkirjat [Minutes of the Finnish-Language Congregational
   Yhteisten kirkkoneuvoston pöytäkirjat Gemensamma kyrkorådets protokoll [Minutes of the


Konstkommittén Taidetoimikunta [Parish Art Committee] 1983-. II C. H /
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7.1.1.3. Interviews and the Author’s Observations (in the author’s possession)

(Tape-recorded)


The author’s observation, the churches of Joensuu and Kerimäki, 1999.


The author’s observation and brief interviews in Riistavesi, August 21, 2001.


The author’s observation and brief interviews in Huopalahti and Alppila parishes/churches, September 4, 2001.

The author’s observation and interviews in Enontekiö, Hetta church and Kittilä, the chapel of St. Mary, September 30 and October 2, 2001.

(Written notes)


Personal communication, Pastor Samuli Ranta (retired), Kuopio. September 20, 2001.
Personal communication, Ulla Väätänen, Administrative Secretary, Joensuu. September 21, 2001.
Personal communication, Bishop Erik Vikström, Porvoo. April 7, 2004.


A photocopy of Erland Forsberg’s sketch on “The Tree of Knowledge”, in the author’s possession.

Bevis Filosofie kandidatexamen
Uppsala Universitetet Rektorsämbetet. Bevis Filosofie kandidatexamen 1975-04-08. Photocopy posted to Juha Malmisalo by Erland Forsberg. In the author’s possession.
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A graph presenting the symbolic and art-historical prototypes of the icon in Jokela church in Tuusula parish. Composed by Heikki Hämäläinen based on information given by Father de Caluwé.


Author’s photographs taken in Savonlinna, Huhanhauta parish home, 1999.
Author’s photographs taken in Kumlinge church, April 18, 2001.
Author’s photographs taken in Vårdö church, April 18, 2001.
Author’s photographs taken in Föglö church, April 18, 2001.
Author’s photographs taken in the chapel of Lappvik retreat center, April 21, 2001.
Author’s photographs taken in Riistavesi church, August 21, 2001.
Author’s photographs taken in Savonlinna Pikkukirkko, August 23, 2001.
Author’s photographs taken in Huopalahti church, September 4, 2001.
Author’s photographs taken in Jokela church, September 13, 2001.
Author’s photographs taken in Morbacka, November 17, 2003.
Author’s photographs taken in Houtskär church, November 18, 2003.
Author’s photographs taken in Uusikaupunki church and the parish center, chapel of officiates, November 19, 2003.
Author’s photographs taken in the chapel of Alskahtemmet, Vaasa, December 13, 2004.

Erland Forsberg’s photographs containing no record of the date and no reference to the type of icon, currently in the author’s possession:
– The baptismal font in Oskarshamn “Cecilia-kapellet” chapel (see details in Appendix 6.1.), date on the reverse side of the picture: December 1993.
– The baptismal font in Oskarshamn “Cecilia-kapellet” chapel. The church is crowded, and a bishop is partly visible standing next to the font in his ceremonial robes. Date on the reverse side of the picture: December 1993.
– St. Brigit, “Den Heliga Birgitta”.
– The Mother of God of Lovingkindness with side panels depicting (as counterparts): the Tree of Knowledge, the Crucifixion, St. Jonah and the Great Fish, the Resurrection.
– The Mother of God of Lovingkindness…, identical picture in dim lighting.
– The Pantocrator/Christ Judge with side panels depicting the Tree of Knowledge, St. Moses and the Serpent of Bronze, the Entry into Jerusalem, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Myrrh bearers, the Ascension, and St. Sigfrid (baptizing Swedes) (possibly located in Tennered church or “Mariakapellet” in Falköping).
– The Pantocrator/Christ Judge with side panels..., identical object in a black and white picture upon the same altar table.


Video recorded during a Mass, including the rite of consecrating an icon, December 17, 2000, St. Olaf church in Falköping. In the author’s possession.
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Ahrent, Emil

Andrén, Carl-Gustaf

Berglund, Sven Ö

Bibeln
1986 Bibeln. Helsingfors: Församlingsförbundets Förlags Ab. de Caluwé, Robert


Cantell, Risto

Damaskolainen, Johannes
Damaskolainen, Johannes

Drobot G & Flinckenberg Marianna

Fabrin, Vesa & Holoainen, Jussi & Malmberg, Marjatta & Paakkanen, Kaarina & Peura, Mikko
2003 Matkalla. Hengellisestä Ohjauksesta Ja Matkakumppanuudesta. Tampere: Tampereen hiippakunnan vuosikirja LV.

Forsberg, Erland

Franzén, Stig & Thunberg, Anders

Gudstjänster under kyrkoåret

Göransson, Göran

Göransson, Göran & Schött, Robert

Heilimo, Olli

Karjalan Liiton Vuosikertomus

Katekismus

Katekismus

Kilström, Bengt Ingmar

Kirkkokäsikirja

Kotila, Heikki ed.

Kotila, Heikki
Kyrklig Administration

Kyrklig Administration

Kyrkoordning

Luther's Works

Lönnroth, Martin & Werckström, Bertil

Paavolainen, Olavi

Piispanen, P. P. & Saloheimo, Mauno

Raittila, Anna-Maija (ed.)

Rekola, Juhani
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Saloheimo, Mauno & Halttunen, Matti

Sarantola, Tauno
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7.1.2.2. Articles and Other Writings in Newspapers and Leaflets

Several of the newspaper articles used in the present study come from two collections of newspaper cuttings: firstly, Oskarshamn folk high school, copies sent by Birgitta Ekvall on March 14, 2001, and secondly, Forsberg’s personal collection in his Benareby atelier home, (the author’s observations, December 15, 2000). Mr. Forsberg’s large collection of newspaper articles is unorganized and also includes various other materials, such as studies carried out by students of art history and illustrated material published in various minor publications. The articles were cho-
sen from Forsberg’s collection because of their valid content and special points of view, and are marked * in the following list with. The material from Oskarshamn is marked **. Other articles were discovered in archives, interviews, and earlier studies. The list also contains some articles or minor writings without adequate or full information concerning their origin. Even if they were regarded as fragmented pieces of data, they (copies in the author’s possession) were used in some parts of the present study.

The annual volumes of Kotimaa January 1, 1960 - December 31, 2000 were also used, especially in order to construct Appendix 6.3. From that corpus of articles only those separately referred to are listed below. Other articles are referred to only in Appendix 6.3.

* Arbetet. “Konstnär i skenet av Guds ljus”. [February 23, 1991 Date probably erroneous: despite his attempts, the author was incapable of regaining the article for further, detailed investigation.] by Ulrika Jannert. Front page “Erland trivs bäst med sina ikoner”.


* Göteborgs-Posten. “Erland trivs bäst med sina ikoner”. [February 23, 1991 Date probably erroneous: despite his attempts, the author was incapable of regaining the article for further, detailed investigation.] by Ulrika Jannert.


Jokelanehdutus. “Ihmetyyjä”. February 24, 1976 by SL.


*Kyrkpresse* “Kreativitet är Guds barns lek inför hans ansikte”. May 18, 1989 n. 20 by Ulla Hannus. Front page “Ikonen är tidlös liksom kyrkans budskap”.
*Kyrkpresse* “Gud kommer i det enkla i ett litet barn, i dopet”. December 17, 1992 n. 51-52 by Kerstin Haldin-Rönn. Caption.
*Kyrkpresse* “Gud kommer i det enkla i ett litet barn, i dopet”. December 17, 1992 n. 51-52 by Kerstin Haldin-Rönn. Caption.
*Kyrkpresse* “Kreativitet är Guds barns lek inför hans ansikte”. May 18, 1989 n. 20 by Ulla Hannus. Front page “Ikonen är tidlös liksom kyrkans budskap”.
*Kyrkpresse* “Kreativitet är Guds barns lek inför hans ansikte”. May 18, 1989 n. 20 by Ulla Hannus. Front page “Ikonen är tidlös liksom kyrkans budskap”.
*Kyrkpresse* “Gud kommer i det enkla i ett litet barn, i dopet”. December 17, 1992 n. 51-52 by Kerstin Haldin-Rönn. Caption.
**Leaflet in Falköping.** S:t Olofs kyrka 3 advent 17 December 2000 Högmässa och Invigning Av Ikon.


Seurakunta Viestti. “Sveriges ortodoxa firade minnet av Sveriges kristnande”. Syyskuu/September 2000 Nr 3 by MS.


** Unidentified newspaper, [published around Borlänge] “Ikonmåleriets har levit vidare…” Unknown date [before 1979] by M.T.
arbetsgemenskapen Kyrklig Förnyelse i Göteborgs stift inviderar till. Rundbrev 1 Advent 2000.


Remmer, Christina

S:t Olofs kyrka 3 advent 17 December 2000. Högmässä och Invigning Av Ikon. [Program presenting the liturgy and the actors]. In the author’s possession.

Tervetuloa Huopalahden Kirkkoon! – Huopalahti parish leaflet. In the author’s possession.

7.1.2.3. Postcards, Prints, and Miscellaneous Published Pictures

Part of a picture showing the exterior of Västra Frölunda church [in the picture a circular stained-glass window depicting the Prophet Jonah, the Angel of the Lord, and the Great Fish]. Text by Per Walter Törnqvist, sent to the author by Erland Forsberg. In the author’s possession.

Forsberg’s icon in the chapel of Alskathemmet. Print acquired by John Forsberg. One copy in the author’s possession.

Forsberg’s icon printed on leaflet: Skolans alla linjer. Reverse side: interior of the St. Cecilia chapel with altar and students.

Forsberg’s icon printed on a postcard: Ikon i Bunkeflo Strandkyrka. Målad av Erland Forsberg. Photograph by P-G Hansson. E. Danielsson AB Genevad.

Forsberg’s icon printed on a postcard: Bunkeflo Strandkyrka. Photograph by P-G Hansson. E. Danielsson AB Genevad.


7.1.2.4. Internet Pages

Because of the unique nature of the data, some of which is now unavailable on the Internet, the following internet pages were used as source material. Many pages were used only to locate as many of Forsberg’s public works as possible, and only a few choice examples were used as sources in the analysis of his relations and other important connections (e.g. the recommendations on Lars Gerdmar’s www-pages).
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