Lifelong Religion as Habitus

Religious Practice among Displaced Karelian Orthodox Women in Finland

Helena Kupari

BRILL

Lifelong Religion as Habitus

Numen Book Series

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

Series Editors

Steven Engler (*Mount Royal University, Calgary, Canada*)
Richard King (*University of Kent, UK*)
Kocku von Stuckrad (*University of Groningen, The Netherlands*)
Gerard Wiegers (*University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands*)

VOLUME 153

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/nus*

Lifelong Religion as Habitus

Religious Practice among Displaced Karelian Orthodox Women in Finland

By

Helena Kupari

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

This is an open access title distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License, which permits any non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.

Cover illustration: Image designed by Anna-Kaisa Laine.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Kupari, Helena, author.
Title: Lifelong religion as habitus : religious practice among displaced Karelian Orthodox women in Finland / by Helena Kupari.
Description: Boston : Brill, 2016. | Series: Numen book series : studies in the history of religions : ISSN 0169-8834 ; Volume 153 | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2016031140| ISBN 9789004321427 (hardback : alk. paper) | ISBN 9789004326743 (e-book : alk. paper)
Subjects: LCSH: Women in the Orthodox Eastern Church—Finland. | Christian women—Spiritual life. | Orthodox Eastern Church—Finland. | Karelians—Finland.
Classification: LCC BX342 .K863 2016 | DDC 281.9/4897082—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2016031140

Want or need Open Access? Brill Open offers you the choice to make your research freely accessible online in exchange for a publication charge. Review your various options on brill.com/brill-open.

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: “Brill”. See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0169-8834
ISBN 978-90-04-32142-7 (hardback)
ISBN 978-90-04-32674-3 (e-book)

Copyright 2016 by Helena Kupari.
This work is published by Koninklijke Brill NV. Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.
Koninklijke Brill NV reserves the right to protect the publication against unauthorized use and to authorize dissemination by means of offprints, legitimate photocopies, microform editions, reprints, translations, and secondary information sources, such as abstracting and indexing services including databases. Requests for commercial re-use, use of parts of the publication, and/or translations must be addressed to Koninklijke Brill NV.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Acknowledgements VII
List of Illustrations and Tables VIII

1 **Introduction** 1

2 **Practice, Habitus, and Lived Religion** 10
Approaching Religion through Practice 10
The Religious Field 12
Religion as Habitus 17
Practice à la Bourdieu 17
A System of Socialized Senses 19
Habitus and Field – a Revisit 23
Habitual Agency? 25
Capturing Habitus 29

3 **Studying Displaced Karelian Orthodox Women** 34
The Interviewees 34
The Research Process 40
Locating Displaced Karelian Orthodox Women in Social Space 46
Religion, Gender, and Old Age in 20th and 21st Century Finland 46
Orthodoxy in Finland – Historical Developments 50
Orthodox-Lutheran Marriages in Post-Second World War Finland 55

4 **Everyday Religious Practice** 59
Religious Practice and Domestic Surroundings 59
Bodies Sensitized to the Sacred 63
Habitual and Intentional Practicing 67
Describing "Orthodox" Practice 71

5 **Childhood Religion, Minority Setting** 77
Childhood Religion – "Lived" Religion 77
Embodied Minority Experiences 81
Orthodox Christianity versus Evangelical Lutheranism 85
Childhood Religion versus Conversion 89
Childhood Religion, Pluralistic Setting, and Agency 93

6 Mothers Doing Religion 98
Gendered Habitus and Domestic Religion 98
Navigations between Orthodoxy and Lutheranism 103
Collective and Individual Practicing 107
Motherhood, Ethics, and Agency 111

7 The Practice of Belief 116
Prayer and Belief 116
Narrating God's Guidance 120
The Ethics of "Remembering God" 123
Performing Life after Death 128

8 Lifelong Religion and Change 134
Producing Continuums of Practice 134
Living Religion, Dying Tradition? 137
Religion versus the Secular World 142
On the Religion of Children and Grandchildren 145
A Grass-roots View on the Religious Field 149

9 Conclusions 154
The Religion of Displaced Karelian Orthodox Women 154
Lifelong Religious Habitus: A Sense of Religion 157
Habitual Religious Agency 161
Habitus and the Study of Lived Religion 165

Sources 169
Bibliography 170
Index 194

Acknowledgements

Above all, I want to thank all the Orthodox women who I interviewed and consulted over the course of my research. Without these wonderful ladies, who so generously shared with me their religious lives, this book would not have been possible, and I sincerely hope it does justice to their experiences.

I am grateful to Terhi Utriainen, Marja-Liisa Keinänen, Abby Day, Ruth Illman, Elina Vuola, Päivi Salmesvuori, and Salome Tuomaala for their invaluable help and advice during various phases of the research process. A particularly heartfelt thanks is due to Terhi, my academic instructor, mentor, colleague, and friend, for her wisdom and kindness. Furthermore, my colleagues at the study of religions unit in the University of Helsinki, as well as in the Academy of Finland research projects "Finnish Women Writing on Religion and Gender" and "Embodied Religion: Changing Meanings of Body and Gender in Contemporary Forms of Religious Identity in Finland," I thank for their friendship. Anna-Kaisa Laine and Tiina Aaltonen have my gratitude for designing the cover image and map of the book, and Steven Engler and Stephanie Paalvast for their assistance in the overall publishing process. I also want to acknowledge the two anonymous reviewers commissioned by Brill for their helpful comments and insights on the manuscript.

The research project on which this book is based was funded by the following institutions: Academy of Finland, Alfred Kordelin Foundation, Ella and Georg Ehrnrooth Foundation, Finnish Cultural Foundation, Finnish Graduate School of Theology, Foundation for the Advancement of Karelian Culture, Karelian Culture Fund, Oskar Öflund Foundation, and University of Helsinki. I heartily thank them all for their valuable contributions.

Chapter five of the book is derived in part from an article (titled "Lifelong Minority Religion: Routines and Reflexivity: A Bourdieuan Perspective on the Habitus of Elderly Finnish Orthodox Christian Women") published in *Religion*, Vol. 46 (2016) No. 2, available online at http://www.tandfonline.com/, DOI: 10.1080/0048721X.2015.1104397. Chapter six is derived in part from an article (titled "'I was Both Lutheran and Orthodox': Evacuee Karelian Orthodox Women, Bidenominational Families, and the Making of Religion") published in *Finnish Women Making Religion: Between Ancestors and Angels*, edited by Terhi Utriainen and Päivi Salmesvuori (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

List of Illustrations and Tables

Illustration

1 Map of Karelia 37

Table

1 List of interviewees and their decades of birth 35
2 List of interview themes 41

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

On a sunny, crisp morning in May 2008, I traveled by bus to Sipoo, a town east of Helsinki, to interview Anna. She lived in a middle-class residential area, in a large yellow duplex amid a yard with a number of trees and flower beds, as well as a gazebo. Slightly nervous, as always when meeting new interviewees, I rang her doorbell, and Anna came to the door. She was a diminutive woman in her mid-eighties with short gray hair, wearing stylish clothes, eye shadow, and quite a lot of jewelry – not your typical Finnish granny! She greeted me warmly, took my coat, and ushered me in.

Anna's apartment was impeccably tidy. The living room was dominated by beautiful antique furniture and a wall-to-wall bookshelf filled with books. In every room stood dressers and side tables with countless ornaments, flower arrangements, photos of loved ones, and small icons. More icons, photos, and paintings hung on the walls. After giving me a tour of the apartment, Anna brought me to the dining room where she had set the table for two. She served me coffee with salmon sandwiches and Karelian pasties, both delicious. She did not eat any herself, however; instead, she sipped her coffee and chatted about her life and family.

She told me how, the very next day after she was born, her father's mother had taken her to the sauna and washed her with water from nearby Lake Ladoga. This, she emphasized, was her grandmother's blessing, and it had carried her through life. She also spoke of the devout Orthodox Christian religion of her parents: how every time her father stepped out of the house he had paused to bless himself with the sign of the cross. She explained to me how, when the Winter War had begun, the front line had advanced rapidly to their village. A military policeman had given the family only two hours to pack before they had to be on their way. The first night as evacuees they had slept on the floor of the Lutheran church of the neighboring municipality. After helping her family reach the town in western Finland where their village's residents had been ordered to relocate, Anna had joined the women's auxiliary paramilitary organization Lotta Svärd. During the Continuation War, she had spent two years in occupied Russian Karelia as a canteen worker. Her older brother had died in the taking of Sortavala, and, ever since then, she had felt a responsibility for her parents and younger siblings.

© HELENA KUPARI, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004326743_002
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License.

After coffee, we moved to the living room for the actual interview. There, Anna continued her life story. She spoke very warmly of her deceased husband Kalevi, who was from southwestern Finland. Their wedding had been held in the Holy Trinity Church in Helsinki, the so-called "small church" (at that time, the Uspenski Cathedral was mostly reserved for Russian-language services), and Kalevi had been most impressed with the solemnity of the ritual, especially the crowns held above the bride and bridegroom's heads. Kalevi was an entrepreneur who had worked long hours to maintain and expand his business. But so had Anna, first as a shop clerk and later at a government agency. They had three children, daughters Outi and Eeva and son Petri; all were baptized into the Lutheran faith.

Anna praised Kalevi for always having been tolerant towards her religion. When her elderly mother moved close to where they lived, Kalevi used to drive them both to church and pick them up afterwards. And when the Soviet Union fell and it became easier to cross the eastern border, it was Kalevi who suggested that they go on a trip to visit Anna's childhood home. The house was no longer standing, but they found the ruins of an old cellar where Anna's family used to store potatoes.

Kalevi had passed away a decade ago. The cemetery where he was buried was not far from where Anna lived, and she often walked to his gravesite – to talk to him and to God. Anna herself was in good health. She was proud of the fact that she was not taking any medication; every morning she did a series of gymnastic exercises after her morning prayers. She also pointed out a spot in her living room where she prayed daily, kneeling on a small stool. In the evenings, she went over the collection of family members' photos in her bedroom, asking God to bless every one of her loved ones, especially her five grandchildren and two great-grandchildren.

During the course of the interview, Anna spoke highly of every single one of her offspring. Eeva's daughter, for instance, always brought her a souvenir when returning from a holiday abroad, often a small icon or religious painting. "These are tokens of love," she exclaimed, referring to memorabilia on a nearby shelf. With obvious pleasure she also recounted how she had recently taken her two great-grandchildren to an Orthodox church service. The little ones, she emphasized, had been awestruck by the beauty of the church.

Anna was touched by how well her children and grandchildren took care of her in her old age. Her eldest child phoned every day to make sure all was well. Furthermore, the children had arranged for a cleaning lady

> to come every week, and her son, son-in-law, and two grandsons mowed her lawn and did all the other heavy work in her garden. There was one thing, however, that she was slightly worried about. Because none of her children or grandchildren were Orthodox, she had put together instructions for them on how to organize an Orthodox funeral service. One item on her checklist was the epitaph. Kalevi was buried in the Lutheran cemetery and Anna was to be buried next to him; there was already a small Orthodox cross carved on the gravestone. With tears in her eyes, she explained to me how she wanted the gravestone to read: "Anna Mäkinen, daughter of Fjodor Kauris, born on the shore of Lake Ladoga."
>
> After about three hours, the interview was over. Anna saw me out and showed me her gazebo, then we parted ways. I never saw her again. A few years ago, I noticed her obituary in the local paper. Ever since then, I have wondered whether her epitaph now describes her in those very words she wanted.

I first learned of the Second World War history of the Finnish Karelian Orthodox community when doing research for my MA thesis. Having passed through the Finnish school system, I was naturally aware of the fate of many Finnish Karelians in the war. During the Second World War period, Finland and the Soviet Union fought two separate wars; these resulted in the displacement of over 400,000 people from their homes. What I did not know, however, was that among the people evacuated from Karelia were two-thirds of the Finnish Orthodox community. My ignorance was understandable, perhaps, in the light of the size of the community. Today, only one percent of Finns, approximately 60,000 people, are members of the Orthodox Church. In any case, at the time I was both touched and intrigued by what the Orthodox had gone through. Later, when planning my PhD research, I settled on a topic that combined my theoretical ambitions and interest in women's religion into an inquiry into the aftermath of these events.

A second discovery that further paved the way for my research project was the scarcity of existing research on the religion of the Orthodox evacuees of the Second World War.[1] After all, Karelian folk religion and the religious traditions of other Finno-Ugric peoples of northwestern Russia have historically been central topics of research in Finnish folkloristics, ethnology, and comparative religion. For instance, Uno Harva, one of the founders of the academic discipline

1 However, many other aspects of the identity and culture of displaced Karelians have been extensively studied (e.g., Armstrong 2004; Fingerroos 2006; Kuusisto-Arponen 2009; Raninen-Siiskonen 1999; Sallinen-Gimpl 2010).

of comparative religion in Finland, specialized in the religious practices and beliefs of the Finno-Ugric and Siberian peoples, which he studied using ethnographic fieldwork methods (Anttonen 1989; Gothóni and Sakaranaho 2016, 11–12). This research tradition was continued by Juha Pentikäinen (among others), who held the first professorship in comparative religion at the University of Helsinki, my alma mater. One of Pentikäinen's (1971; see also 1978) most important studies concerns the religiosity of Marina Takalo, an illiterate Orthodox Christian woman from the White Sea region in Karelia who had come to Finland as a refugee after the Russian revolution.

Since the 1980's, a focus on gender has constituted a substantial trend within Finnish research on Karelian Orthodox folk religion. This strand of scholarship has produced interpretations of the genderedness of belief and ritual systems, gender roles and conceptions, as well as women's practices and beliefs (e.g., Apo, Nenola, and Stark-Arola 1998). This research tradition leans primarily on archived folklore material gathered from Karelia around the turn of the 20th century, and to a lesser extent on fieldwork in contemporary Russia. Accordingly, the existing studies mostly target either the pre-modern Karelian or post-Soviet Russian contexts. In Russia, the suppression of institutional religion during the Soviet regime lent support to lay women's independent religious activities, which, after the fall of the Soviet Union, became the focus of interest of several Finnish scholars (e.g., Heikkinen 2000).

Compared to the richness of this research tradition, the post-Second World War and contemporary religiosity of lay Orthodox Finns has attracted only scant scholarly attention. A few existing studies, such as ethnologist Kaija Heikkinen's (1989) dissertation on the ethnic self-consciousness of evacuees from the Border Karelian municipality of Salmi, inquire into the changing religion of displaced Orthodox Karelians during the first post-war decades. A decade and a half earlier, theologian Voitto Huotari (1975; 1991) conducted a quantitative analysis of religion in Orthodox-Lutheran marriages. The topic of denominational intermarriage, moreover, has more recently been taken up by medical anthropologist Marja-Liisa Honkasalo (2015) as part of her wider ethnography on the life-world of elderly women in Finnish North Karelia (Honkasalo 2009; Honkasalo 2008a; Honkasalo 2008b). Finally, theologian Elina Vuola's (submitted) work on Finnish Orthodox women's relationship with the Virgin Mary constitutes another fresh, gender-sensitive contribution to the scholarly field.

When I was planning my project, Honkasalo's study was in progress and Vuola was yet to commence hers. There was, overall, virtually no research in existence on Orthodox Christianity as practiced in late 20th or early 21st century Finland. This proved to be slightly problematic in that while research on the religion of Orthodox women in 19th and early 20th century Karelia (for

example, scholar of religion Marja-Liisa Keinänen's (2012; 2003) analysis of domestic rituals) was one of my inspirations in coming up with a research theme, it could only help me to a limited degree with understanding the religion of contemporary women. Nevertheless, the lack of previous research also convinced me of the importance of my project. I would be the one to fill this peculiar lacuna, as I saw it at the time, in academic knowledge concerning women and Orthodoxy in Finland!

It was not until many years later that I came to view this state of affairs as more than a coincidence. The gap in the research, I realized, might also have something to do with the organization and development of the academic discipline of comparative religion – later, the study of religions – in Finland. This connection slowly dawned on me after familiarizing myself with the strand of scholarship known as the study of lived religion. Over the course of the past two decades, the concept of lived religion has spread into the "academic vernacular" (Ammerman 2014, 193) across many countries and continents from the discussions of scholars based in the United States and focusing on North American religion (e.g., Hall 1997b; McGuire 2008; Orsi 2010). In essence, it refers to a focus on religion as it is encountered, experienced, and practiced in real life, by actual people embedded in concrete social environments (McGuire 2008, 12).[2]

Within American sociology of religion and religious studies, the launching of the concept of lived religion reflected, in part, a new-found interest in ordinary people as religious subjects (Hall 1997a, vii–viii). In Finland, however, this is not exactly a new area of study. Due to the intimate relation that the Finnish study of religions has had with folklore studies and ethnology, it has always been geared towards the beliefs and practices of laymen (cf., Primiano 2012, 382–383). This has also led some Finnish scholars to question the value of the concept of lived religion, asking what exactly is novel about it.

The lived religion approach, however, signals more than a focus on ordinary people. The emergence of the paradigm also reflects growing disappointment with the conceptualization of the religion of nonprofessionals inherent in dominant definitions of religion. These definitions often include normative, hierarchical divisions between official religion and folk or popular religion, and conceive of the latter categories as somehow less proper in comparison to their counterpart (McGuire 2008, 45–46; Orsi 2010, xxxii–xxxvii; Primiano 1995, 38–40). In

---

2 Similar concepts made use of in current religious scholarship include vernacular religion (Primiano 1995; Bowman and Valk 2012) and everyday religion (Ammerman 2007; Keinänen 2010b). I prefer lived religion because it is the most theoretically developed concept of the three, and because its particular connotations describe my research interest most accurately.

fact, anthropologist and historian of religion Robert Orsi (2003, 174) describes the lived religion approach as "both a way of studying religion and a critique of the discipline of religious studies," an approach that is founded on a developing historical sensibility of how our academic discourses and theoretical apparatus have shaped and continue to shape our understanding of religious phenomena.

Now, Finnish scholars of religion have been increasingly aware of the problematic nature of the concept of folk religion since the 1980's. They have criticized, for instance, its vagueness (i.e., who are counted among folk?) and its connection with romantic nationalistic notions of the common people as carriers of authentic, proto-Finnish culture and religion (Anttonen 2004, 73–75). Nevertheless, the continued use of the concept may have helped to perpetuate dualistic categorizations of religion, and, further, to influence students' and scholars' choices of research topics. Thus, to researchers with a folkloristic or ethnological mindset, contemporary Finnish Orthodoxy may have seemed too tightly linked to institutional religion, and therefore not "folk" enough. Then again, to sociologically oriented scholars of religion it may have appeared "too folk," too marginal and exotic – and the same can be said of Lutheran theologians. Finnish Orthodox theologians, for their part, have usually favored inquiries into the beliefs and practices of religious specialists rather than laymen.

When setting up my research project on displaced Karelian Orthodox women, I, too, was affected by the hierarchical and boundary-setting rhetoric that has dominated academic conceptualizations of religion and is manifested in constructs such as folk religion (see Orsi 2010, xxxii–xxxvi). This became evident when, some way into the research, I found myself disappointed at how "normal" and "modern" my interviewees were. That is, they were not the "other" I had on some level hoped them to be: representatives of an archaic "Karelian Orthodox folk religion" who had miraculously remained unaffected by the tides of social change sweeping Finland during the course of the 20th century. Literature on lived religion, as well as recent Finnish discussions concerning the orientalist tendencies of scholarly interpretations of Karelia (e.g., Fingerroos 2012, 206–209; Loipponen 2010, 279–280), helped me to come to grips with this emotional reaction and the preconceptions behind it. During this process, I came to view the religion of my interviewees as fascinating and well deserving of scholarly attention in its own right.

In this book, the outcome of my PhD research, I discuss the religion of Finnish Orthodox Christian women having evacuee Karelian backgrounds. It is based on interviews that I conducted in 2007 and 2008 of 24 women born between 1920 and 1955. My investigation of the interviewees' religion focuses on everyday religious practice within the domestic and familial environment: concrete, small-scale religious customs and ways of thinking and speaking

about religion. It traces the ways in which these activities reflect the women's life trajectories, as well as some of the broad social changes that they had lived through, including, but not limited to, their displacement from Karelia. Overall, the book has two central and intertwining objectives: to describe the everyday lived religion of these evacuee Karelian Orthodox women, and to theoretically articulate their lifelong religion as habitus.

I approach the women's everyday lived religion from a practice-oriented perspective. This means that I conceive of religion as a conglomeration of meaningful activities: practices of world-making and self-making (see Morgan 1998, 3–4). When practicing religion, any individual always engages with various discourses and structures, producing negotiations and accommodations of them. At the same time, these discourses and structures come to influence his or her understanding of the world. Practice-oriented inquiries make this reciprocal dynamic evident. In so doing, they open up a view of the relationship that exists between religious action and the regulating conditions that give rise to it (see e.g., Bender 2012, 274, 281–282; Orsi 2010, xxxvii–xlii).

My understanding of practice is founded on Pierre Bourdieu's social theory, and specifically his theorization of habitus. Studying religion as habitus entails viewing individual religiosity as a system of embodied dispositions, which amounts to a practical worldview and way of life. For Bourdieu (1990b, 56), habitus is social position and life history incorporated and turned into a second nature. That is, the concept captures the long-term effects on the self of practicing religion in a particular sociohistorical context. In my analysis, I start from this premise. Through tracing the interrelations between religious life history and present-day religiosity, I investigate the Orthodox women's habitus as the result of a lifetime of religious practice.

A defining characteristic of the religious life histories of my interviewees was their enduring affiliation with the Orthodox religion. They had been socialized into Orthodox Christianity in childhood, and over the course of decades their religious activities had undergone many changes and adjustments to different surroundings and life situations. Nevertheless, throughout their lives they had remained more or less active Orthodox practitioners. Thus, I define their religion as "lifelong" religion. With this framing, I emphasize it as a form of contemporary religiosity.

In today's Finland, as elsewhere in the late-modern West, continued adherence to the religion one has been raised in no longer forms the only culturally sanctioned religious trajectory. Rather, as sociologist of religion Robert Wuthnow (1998, 3–11; see also 1999) has noted, many Western societies are in the midst of a religious reorientation in which a "spirituality of dwelling" is being replaced by "a spirituality of seeking." In these societies, experimenting

with different alternatives in order to find a lifestyle fit for oneself is increasingly valued over religious stability. Lifelong religion comes to describe a specific – sometimes even special – case of religious trajectory.

Surveys have shown that women born prior to the Second World War have for some time now formed the most active group of lay religious practitioners in many Western societies, including Finland. At a time when more and more people are leaving mainstream churches, continued affiliation has been more common for them than for their children or grandchildren, or for the men of their generation (Dillon 2007, 539–540; Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 134–135; Marler 2008, 32–36; Walter and Davie 1998, 640–641; Woodhead 2003, 73–74). However, scholarship on the religion of women in today's West rarely targets older women in mainstream Christian Churches. That is, even when the focus is on women, it is not commonly on elderly women and the type of religion characteristic to them (see, however, Day 2015; Eccles 2012). Here we have another example of how the alignment of academic discourses with power hierarchies in the wider society produces the experiences of certain groups of people as more relevant and worthy of research than those of others (see also Orsi 2003, 173; Woodhead 2013, 9–10).

In the Finnish study of religions influenced by folklore studies and ethnology, it is not rare for elderly women to feature as research subjects in the role of tradition-bearers and special informants of past religious practices and beliefs – similar to Marina Takalo in Pentikäinen's classic study. However, while conducting my PhD research I repeatedly questioned myself about what an analysis of the everyday religion of contemporary, elderly laywomen could contribute to the wider field of religious studies. Today, I can answer this question. Our view of the bigger picture, I have come to realize, is dependent on countless careful case studies that seek to understand how the world looks when seen through the eyes of particular people immersed in the circumstances of their daily lives. My inquiry into the religion of displaced Karelian Orthodox women constitutes one such snapshot. In the analysis, moreover, I also produce a theoretical articulation of the nature of small-scale, day-to-day religious practice. This articulation rests on my account of lifelong religion as habitus – and my overall reading of Bourdieuan social theory as an approach to the study of lived religion.

It is this reading that I turn to next. In the following chapter, I outline the theoretical-methodological approach of the research. Afterwards, I proceed as follows: chapter three introduces the interviewees and their relevant socio-historical contexts, in addition to describing the overall research process. From chapters four to eight I present my analysis. The book concludes with

chapter nine, where I revisit the objectives framed here and provide concluding remarks for the study.

As the paragraph above makes evident, the organization of the background chapters is somewhat unconventional in comparison to many qualitative studies. My decision to present the theoretical approach prior to introducing the case itself reflects the relatively central role of theory in the book. With the chapters in this order, the theoretical discussion guides the reader to view the case, from the very beginning, from a certain vantage point. The organization establishes the research, essentially, as a practice-oriented, Bourdieuan analysis of the religion of these Orthodox women. However, readers more interested in the case as such may also read chapter three first and turn to the chapter on theory afterwards, if at all.

In the analytical chapters, I discuss different aspects of the interviewees' religious practice in different life phases. Chapter four focuses on the women's descriptions of some of their present-day religious practices as expressions of their habitus. The ensuing chapter examines their religious trajectories as members of the Orthodox community in Finland. It identifies certain effects of their minority experiences in their present-day practices of doing and speaking about religion. Chapter six explores traces of the genderedness of the informants' habitus from their accounts concerning religion within the families they established as adults. Chapter seven discusses some of their present-day practices as productive of belief. Finally, chapter eight concerns the women's perceptions of contemporary religion, analyzing these accounts in light of their history of religious practice.

CHAPTER 2

Practice, Habitus, and Lived Religion

Approaching Religion through Practice

Practice theory is a strand of social scientific theorization which attributes to practice a particularly fundamental role in the formation and functioning of the social world (Ortner 1984). The concept of practice refers to human activity which simultaneously constructs both individuals as social beings and the social world that surrounds them (Ortner 2006, 129; Ortner 1989, 11–12; Sewell 1992, 5). Through their activities, individuals internalize cultural symbols and meanings. Through the same activities, they also reproduce and transform these symbols and meanings in the social world. This is the central premise of theories of practice.

The use of the term "practice" in contemporary religious scholarship often signals some form of alignment with practice theory. There is, for instance, a growing interest in the intertwinement of the self and the social world in daily religious activity (e.g., Bowman and Valk 2012; Giordan and Swatos 2011; Morgan 1998). The concern with the everyday, moreover, is often coupled with an emphasis on the body as the locus of religious practice and on embodied practices as the foundation of religious identities (e.g., Csordas 1994; Lester 2005; Trulsson 2010). Other scholars, for their part, have focused on the social structures informing religious practices, and on the struggles for their reproduction and reform (e.g., Asad 2003; Asad 1993; Ortner 1989; Tweed 2006; Wood 2007).

Since its development into a distinct research field, lived religion has been closely connected to practice theory (e.g., Hall 1997a, xi; Orsi 2003, 174; Orsi 1997, 7). In essence, it promotes a practice-oriented approach to religious phenomena. The concept of lived religion refers to religion as something that is continuously being made and remade by individuals engaging in religious activities and using religious idioms – laymen, religious specialists, and policy-makers alike. Within the lived religion paradigm, moreover, this conceptualization of religion as ongoing "cultural work" (Orsi 2003, 172) is expanded to include religious scholarship as well.

In recent years, scholars of religion have become increasingly aware of the historical baggage carried by conventional academic definitions of religion; that is to say, their intertwinement, for instance, with Reformation and colonialist discourses (Asad 1993, 27–54; McGuire 2008, 20–24, 39–41; Orsi 2012,

© HELENA KUPARI, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004326743_003
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License.

3–6; Riesebrodt 2010, 1–20). One of the reactions to this crisis of definition has been to promote the abandoning of normative interpretations of religion as a starting point of analysis in favor of emphasizing individuals' concrete practices and articulated beliefs that the individuals themselves consider to be religious (McGuire 2008, 4; Primiano 1995, 40). However, since individuals' views are always influenced by cultural meanings and valuations, it is equally important to focus on discourses concerning religion, on how the category of religion is being constructed in particular societies at particular times (Beckford 2003, 20–21; von Stuckrad 2010, 166). Furthermore, to acknowledge the role that academia plays and has played in this process, it is necessary to conceive of the scholarly enterprise as one endeavor among others concerning religion – one that affects, and is affected by, social structures and cultural categorizations. In the lived religion paradigm, the pursuit of this kind of historical self-consciousness is paramount (Orsi 2003, 171–172).

Nevertheless, analytic definitions of religion still have relevance. For instance, on them rests the possibility of reaching comparative understandings and general theorizations concerning phenomena that, within particular contexts, are understood to be religious (Konieczny, Lybarger, and Chong 2012, 399–402; Riesebrodt 2010, 15–19). However, it is important to conceive of academic definitions as tools that have been constructed for tackling particular research questions. They are never neutral, comprehensive, or conclusive, and are always in some respects situational and instrumental (Tweed 2006, 29–53).

In this book, I analyze evacuee Karelian Orthodox women's accounts of their own practices and beliefs which in their view are religious. However, my method has not been entirely inductive, as existing, normative discourses concerning religion also played a role in the interview situations. During the course of the analysis, moreover, I also formulate propositions about the women's religious habitus, religious agency, and the religious field they are embedded in. This necessitates an analytical take on religion.

In his practice-oriented theory of religion, sociologist of religion Martin Riesebrodt (2010, 74–76) defines religion as a "complex of practices that are based on the premise of the existence of superhuman powers, whether personal or impersonal." According to him, religious practices typically consist of establishing contact with these powers, or gaining access to them, through culturally prescribed means. The category of superhuman powers, as described by Riesebrodt, is not an unambiguous one. However, he argues that it provides a "content-based and widely accepted" premise for the religious, which constitutes a more appropriate basis for defining religion than, for instance, functional premises that overlook "the meaning of religion from the point of

view of religious practitioners and thus also from that of the theory of action" (Riesebrodt 2010, 72–75).

Leaning on Riesebrodt, I also espouse the idea that what is specific about religious practice is the postulation of non-empirical forces as part of the structures of social experience constructed through and constructive of this practice (see also Rubin, Smilde, and Junge 2014, 10, 14). This criterion is workable in that it provides the opportunity to differentiate between religious and non-religious practice, while, importantly, not contradicting the Orthodox women's self-understandings concerning religion. However, I want to make one clarification, below, to Riesebrodt's definition.

As part of the general re-appraisal of the basic concepts of the discipline, scholars of religion have increasingly begun to question the taken-for-granted use of binary categories such as sacred/profane and transcendent/mundane in research on religion (e.g., Day, Vincett, and Cotter 2013, 1–2). Lived religion, after all, can rarely be arranged into such neat dualisms. In this vein, anthropologist Martin Stringer (2008, 8–10, 63–64, 81–82) criticizes the idea of "transcendent" that is inherent in many classic definitions of religion. He argues that lay individuals, even in the Protestant West, do not necessarily experience religious entities as something "radically other." In his theory, Riesebrodt uses the term "superhuman" for the non-empirical; Bourdieu's chosen term, as discussed in the next section, is "supernatural." Against the overtones carried by these terms, I want to emphasize that I do not see the non-empirical as constituting only something radically separate from the mundane world. Instead of being something "super" compared to ordinary and normal, it is often a part of everyday life.

The Religious Field

The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1930–2002) was one of the most widely discussed social theorists of the latter half of the 20th century. Along with sociologist Anthony Giddens' (1984; 1979) structuration theory, his theory of practice (Bourdieu 1990b; Bourdieu 1977) constitutes the most well-known formulation of practice theory. The goal of the theory, according to Bourdieu, is to transcend dualistic conceptualizations of the social world that dominate in the social sciences. To him, that is, the apparently irreconcilable points of view in such dichotomies as objectivism/subjectivism, society/individual, and structure/action actually stand in a dialectical relationship. Their artificial opposition can be overcome by applying to the social world a way of thinking

which "identifies the real not with substances but with relations" (Bourdieu 1990a, 124–126; Wacquant 1992, 7–11).

The core trio of concepts in Bourdieu's theoretical apparatus – field, capital, and habitus – is geared to facilitate a relational analysis of social phenomena (Grenfell 2008b, 220–222). In Bourdieuan vocabulary, the concept of field refers to semi-autonomous configurations of relations in the social world, within which individuals, interest groups, and institutions are positioned (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 98–101; see also Postone, LiPuma, and Calhoun 1993, 4–6; Rey 2007, 44–45, 51, 53). In each field, individuals compete for power. Capital denotes the different kinds of resources, values, and wealth around which crystallize the power relations in any field. Thus, within each field, the competition for power translates into a struggle for the accumulation and control of capital as delineated by the logic of the field in question. Finally, Bourdieu (1990b, 53) defines habitus as systems of incorporated dispositions which inform individuals' actions within different fields.

Although Bourdieu's social theory is much indebted to social scientists of religion (such as Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, and Marcel Mauss), the sociology of religion was of marginal concern to him (Dianteill 2003, 529; Rey 2007, 8–9). Altogether, he wrote only a few texts that deal explicitly with religion. The most important of these are his two essays from 1971 (Bourdieu 1971a; Bourdieu 1971b) that theorize the "genesis and structure of the religious field" and the relations between different agents within this field.

In these articles, Bourdieu (1971a, 300–305, 318–320; 1971b, 7–11; 1991a, 5–9, 22–25) argues that the division of labor fostered by urbanization constitutes the necessary condition for the emergence of an independent religious field. This field extends between different religious specialists who control religious knowledge and are in competition for religious capital. In Bourdieu's (1971a, 311–316, 328–334; 1991a, 5, 14–19, 31–38) view, the first and foremost function of religion is to legitimize social classifications and inequalities, an effect created by the collective misrecognition of the economic and power relations behind the religious specialists' work of transfiguring "social relations into supernatural relations." However, in modern and differentiated societies, the state has assumed the role of the primary legitimizer of the social arbitrary, which to Bourdieu denotes an inevitable decline in the significance of religion (Dianteill 2003, 541–543, 546; Engler 2003, 450).

Bourdieu's writings on religion do not include a full-fledged definition of it. In fact, formulating such a definition would go against his theorizations, since his interpretation of the religious field presupposes that the power to define what constitutes religion is one of the issues at stake in the field's struggles

(see Bourdieu 2010, 6). However, in explicating the interest underlying all activities within the field, he follows a Weberian understanding of religion as connected to the organization of the relationship between man and supernatural powers, and, furthermore, the cultivation of this relationship into "goods of salvation": the means to deal with anxieties related to the existence of evil, injustice, suffering, and death (Bourdieu 1971a, 311–313; Bourdieu 1991a, 15–17; see also Rey and Stepick 2013, 14; Wood 2007, 66–68).[1] For Bourdieu, then, activity within the religious field hinges on the belief that supernatural entities and powers exist, and that they can influence the natural world. Importantly, this understanding of the religious field is compatible with Martin Riesebrodt's (2010) also essentially Weberian definition of religion, with which I sided in the previous section.

Bourdieuan social theory has not gained the kind of status within religious studies that it holds in many other fields of study. A central reason for this, evidently, is that Bourdieu's work concerning religion has often been deemed lacking in sophistication (e.g., Hervieu-Léger 2000, 110–111). Based on the historical case of French Catholicism, Bourdieu's account of the religious field focuses on a situation in which a particular institution holds a monopoly over the whole field. It cannot be applied, as such, to more religiously pluralistic societies.

However, Bourdieu never actually designed his concept of field for this kind of uncritical use. Rather, he emphasized the necessity of empirical research in determining the existence and the boundaries of any specific field in any given time and place (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 100–101). In this vein, Bourdieu's theorizations on religion have been used to successfully identify local religious fields and capital, and to analyze religious specialists' strategies for accumulating power and position, in various geographical and historical contexts (Fer 2010; Ladwig 2011; Maduro 2005; McKinnon, Trzebiatowska, and Brittain 2011; Rey 1998; Urban 2003). Several recent studies inquire specifically into the organization of the religious field under conditions of heightened pluralism (Wood 2007; Wood and Bunn 2009). Other contributions, for their part, discuss the intertwinement of the religious field with other fields, such as those of art and healing (Lindquist 2006; Malmisalo 2005; see also McCloud 2007; Verter 2003).

Overall, Bourdieuan social theory has been commended for its potential to discern and highlight power hierarchies and conflicts within religious fields (Maduro 2012, 35; Rey 2007, 5, 45). At the same time, Bourdieu's own account of the religious field has received much criticism for treating lay believers as mere

1 The reliance on Weber is not surprising, for Bourdieu's whole conceptualization of the religious field is heavily influenced by Weber's (1978) interpretation of religion (Bourdieu 1971a; Bourdieu 1971b; Rey 2007, 72–75; Swartz 1996).

pawns in the power games of specialists (e.g., Dillon 2001, 414–415; Verter 2003, 157). After all, Bourdieu (1971a, 304; 1991a, 9) explicitly speaks of the laity as "dispossessed of religious capital," and therefore dependent on religious specialists to satisfy their religious needs. This statement, however, actually describes only one possible configuration of the religious field. While Bourdieu's account focuses mostly on this particular structuring of the field, characterized by the specialists' monopoly over religious production, his theory also acknowledges the possibility of laymen's "religious self-sufficiency" (Bourdieu 1971a, 305; Bourdieu 1991a, 9–10; see also Kühle 2012a, 10–11). Nonprofessionals' possession and wielding of religious capital has also been demonstrated through studies on their participation in struggles within the religious field (Dillon 2001; Stone 2001; Verter 2003).[2]

Another criticism that many scholars of religion have leveled against Bourdieu is that in his theorizations concerning religion he focuses on issues not specific to it. Martin Riesebrodt, for example, notes that, in conceiving of the religious field as an arena of competition for religious capital homologous to other fields, Bourdieu "reduces religion to an instrument for pursuing this-worldly power interests and social advancement" (Riesebrodt 2010, 67; see also Hämmerli 2011, 199–203; Swartz 1996, 82–84). This accusation echoes a more general critique that disapproves of the prevalence of the "metaphor of economy" (Heiskala 2000, 183–184) in Bourdieuan social theory. Indeed, Bourdieu's discussions surrounding the concept of capital, especially, suggest that all meaningful human activity ultimately revolves around the self-interested pursuit of power and resources (e.g., Bourdieu 1990b, 122; Bourdieu 1977, 82; see also Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 117–120). Thus, his theory cannot fully account for activities that surpass the realms of instrumentality and exchange (Adkins 2004, 14; Fowler 2003, 475–476; Urban 2005, 169–173).

Nevertheless, in defense of Bourdieu's theory it is important to reiterate that the necessary catalyst for individuals' participation in the struggles of the religious field is religious interest (Bourdieu 1971a, 311–312; Bourdieu 1991a, 15–16). Laymen and specialists alike act religiously based on what they believe – know in their bodies – to be right, not open calculation. Moreover, belief in supernatural powers and the salvation goods connected to them can actually generate both altruistic and self-interested behavior. On the one hand, the religious field often rewards unselfish behavior, thus encouraging the formation of altruistic habitus, by, for instance, construing generosity and helpfulness

2 Moreover, several recent studies apply Bourdieu's concepts of capital and habitus to an analysis of the various secular resources that lay individuals, often members of dispossessed minorities, can gain access to through religious organizations (Barrett 2010; Karner and Parker 2008; Norman 2011).

as markers of piety (see Bourdieu 1998, 86–88). On the other, as scholar of religion Terry Rey and anthropologist Alex Stepick (2013, 14–15) have recently suggested, to fully account for individuals' behavior within the religious field it is important to also acknowledge the existence of salvation goods that advance health and prosperity in the here and now. In fact, the insistence that "proper" religion is only concerned with the hereafter, as well as the condemnation of religious activities aimed at this-worldly concerns and often engaged in by marginalized groups in dire material circumstances, constitute discursive strategies employed by dominant groups and religious elites to bolster their status within the field. Sometimes, these strategies have even been endorsed by scholars of religion (see Orsi 2003, 170; Rubin, Smilde, and Junge 2014, 14).

Bourdieu's theorizations concerning religion do not foreground the concept of habitus. According to him, religious specialists' struggles in the religious field are ultimately about the legitimate power to influence lay people by inculcating in them a particular religious habitus. Bourdieu (1971a, 318–319; 1971b, 11; 1991a, 22) thus acknowledges the existence of a religious habitus, the "generative basis of all thoughts, perceptions, and actions conforming with the norms of a religious representation of the natural and supernatural world." His interest in this religious habitus, however, does not seem to exceed its role as a stake in the competition for power between religious professionals (Verter 2003, 157).

Bourdieuan adaptations of the concept of habitus to research on religion have, regardless, become more common in recent years. In this scholarship, the concept is usually employed to denote a practical worldview that results from active participation in a particular religion (Collins 2009; Martin 2012, 87–91; Sutcliffe 2006; cf., Wood 2007, 71–75, 156–163). The use of the concept, in other words, implies that a common way of life, more than explicitly stated beliefs, is what members of a faith group share. Many studies that employ the concept discuss conversion or other kinds of self-willed changes in one's religious orientation. That is, they focus on processes in and through which a new habitus is acquired (Coleman 2000, 117–142; Csordas 1997; Csordas 1994; Trulsson 2010; Winchester 2008), and on the influence of the original habitus on the emerging one (Fer 2010; Shanneik 2011; Trzebiatowska 2008). Other contributions, for their part, examine various situations resulting from religious pluralism, such as the formation of minority habitus, the effects of cultural domination on the habitus of marginalized groups, and the collisions between different habitus more generally (Gray and O'Sullivan Lago 2011; Hornborg 2005; Kühle 2012b; Rey 2005). In practice-oriented research, moreover, the concept of habitus supports inquiries into religion-in-action: the generation of religious actions and perceptions in particular situations (Bell 1992; McNally 1997; Mitchell and Mitchell 2008; Morgan 1998).

Due to Bourdieu's cursory treatment of habitus in his writings on religion, scholars of religion working with the concept have often bypassed his explicit claims about religion and have focused instead on what he has to say about other dimensions of social life. Some have even opted to bracket Bourdieu's conceptual apparatus altogether, combining his understanding of habitus with, for instance, theories of embodiment or ritual theory (e.g., Bell 1992; Coleman 2000; Csordas 1997; Csordas 1994; Morgan 1998). According to Bourdieu, however, field, capital, and habitus acquire their meaning from the relations they have with each other, which is why it is important to take into account all three concepts when analyzing social phenomena (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 94–101). Nevertheless, this does not mean that one must rely in equal measure on all of them. In fact, many of Bourdieu's own studies foreground some concepts at the expense of others – such as his famous analysis of taste and social class in *Distinction* (Bourdieu 1984), which focuses on habitus and capital.

This book is about the daily, domestic religiosity of displaced Karelian Orthodox women – their basic religious activities, and their ways of thinking, speaking, and feeling about religion. I investigate the women's present-day religion essentially as an outcome of their past practices and experiences, with the concept of habitus as my primary analytical tool. My reading of Bourdieu is a "second-degree reading" (Hanks 2005, 69) in that I rely more on his overall theory of practice than on what he explicitly says about religion. However, in line with Bourdieu's relational vision, I examine the interviewees' religious habitus in connection with the notions of religious field and religious capital. I particularly make use of these two concepts when widening my analytical scope from the immediate context of the Orthodox women's domestic and familial lives to the broader social and religious currents influencing their behavior. Nevertheless, the focus always remains squarely on the women. My analysis does not therefore comprise a comprehensive portrait of the Finnish religious field, or even its Orthodox Christian subfield. Rather, it offers a partial and localized micro-level perspective on these fields. In other words, it provides a view of the Finnish religious field as seen from the relative position of the informants.

Religion as Habitus

Practice à la Bourdieu

According to Terry Rey (2007, 92), habitus is the "single most important concept in Bourdieuian theory for the study of religion chiefly because of its trenchant power for explaining the nature of human belief and practice, which are obviously so fundamental to religion at large." Judging from the growing amount

of discussions concerning Bourdieu's concept of habitus within religious studies, Rey's opinion is shared by many others – including myself. However, while habitus can be viewed as a most convincing place to locate religious belief (Rey 2007, 129), to grasp habitus one needs to turn from Bourdieu's work on religion to his theory of practice.

Bourdieu's theory of practice aims at identifying and accurately describing the practical understanding that people acutely enmeshed in certain social relations have of these relations (Bourdieu 1990a, 59–61; Bourdieu 1990b, 102–103; Bourdieu 1977, 1–2, 16–22, 37–38; see also King 2000, 419–422). According to Bourdieu, what spurred him to focus on practice was the realization that the traditional standpoint of the social scientist – the position of the impartial and uninvolved observer – invites him or her to succumb to a serious theoretical distortion: that of presenting as the source of people's practices an abstract model of these practices. "[T]here is an enormous difference between trying to understand the nature of matrimonial relations between two families so as to get your son or daughter married off (...) and trying to understand these relations so as to construct a theoretical model of them," he explicates (Bourdieu 1990a, 60).

Bourdieu argues that theoretical models constructed from an outsider's point of view miss out on several crucial features of practice. First, they fail to take into account the situationality of practice. Practice always occurs in a concrete and unique situation which is evolving and taking form in the present moment (Bell 1992, 81; Bourdieu 1990b, 81). It adjusts itself to the emerging dynamics of the event and participates in their constitution. Furthermore, these models also overlook the practical, instrumental, and strategic nature of the aims and motivations that guide practice (Bell 1992, 82; Lovell 2000, 27). This is to say, in their actions individuals, for the most part, do not adhere to explicit rules. Instead, their ability to act successfully in particular situations results from their practical command of the workings of the social world.

Practice, as characterized above, is prone to routinization. In day-to-day social life, activities tend to follow along familiar lines. Routinization is integral to the constitutive effects of practice, since it is responsible for social reproduction (Giddens 1984, 60, 64, 282; Heiskala 2000, 98). Nevertheless, alongside the repetitive tendencies of practice, it is important to acknowledge the creative capacities inherent in practice as well. Bourdieu ties these to temporality: the generation of practices is dependent on the individual's capacity to anticipate the imminent future of the emerging situation (Bourdieu 2000, 142–144; Bourdieu 1990b, 55–56; see also McNay 2000, 39–44; Postone, LiPuma, and Calhoun 1993, 4). This orientation towards the upcoming means that, although actors mostly act along familiar lines, they are also capable of improvisation and innovation.

This brief introduction alone illustrates why a focus on practice makes for a superb approach to studies of lived religion. The main benefit of practice-oriented perspectives is that they direct scholars' attention away from ready-made categories and towards religion-in-the-making (Bender 2012, 280–283; Bender 2003, 7–8; Hall 1997a, xi; Sutcliffe 2006, 298–299). In this vein, a focus on practice allows for inquiries into the logic behind the generation of religious activities, and into the oscillation between routines and improvisation that these activities demonstrate (McNally 1997, 147–148). Moreover, a focus on practice foregrounds the "practical coherence" characterizing lived religion (McGuire 2008, 15–16). From the point of view of the common believer, religion needs not constitute a logically coherent system as much as it needs to make sense in one's daily life, and to be effective in accomplishing desired ends. A focus on practice also brings to the fore the performative dimension of practices, establishing religious activities as world-making and self-making activities (Morgan 1998, 3–4, 204–205; see also Mitchell and Mitchell 2008, 83–85; Winchester 2008, 1753–1754). Finally, a focus on practice makes evident how lived religion unfolds within the interplay of structure and agency, bringing issues of power to the fore (Bender 2003, 6, 167–168n2; Orsi 2010, xxxvii–xlii; Orsi 1997, 14–16).

A System of Socialized Senses

The concept of habitus essentially constitutes Bourdieu's take on how practice should be understood (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 121).[3] In habitus, Bourdieu identifies and captures a complex, multilayered phenomenon: the generation of human actions and the constitution of the principle of their generation, as well as the construction of the social being and the social world, through these very same actions (Bourdieu 1990a, 12–13, 124–126; Bourdieu 1990b, 53; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 121; see also Maton 2008, 53–55). A higher-level objective that Bourdieu sets for the concept is to overcome the dualism between objectivism and subjectivism or, put another way, structure and action. In his most famous definition, Bourdieu (1990b, 53) describes habitus as

> systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious

3 Many thinkers prior to Bourdieu have included a concept of habitus in their work. Bourdieu (1990a, 12) himself makes mention of G. W. F. Hegel, Edmund Husserl, Weber, Durkheim, Mauss, and Erwin Panofsky. Moreover, the history of the concept actually dates back all the way to Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas (Mellor and Shilling 2010b, 207; see also Hanks 2005, 69–72; Maton 2008, 55–57).

> aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. Objectively 'regulated' and 'regular' without being in any way the product of obedience to rules, they can be collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor.

For Bourdieu (1977, 15), then, habitus designates a system of dispositions, which is first inculcated during childhood and afterwards regularly reinforced by "calls to order" from individuals endowed with similar dispositions. Dispositions are tastes and preferences concerning all aspects of life ranging from, say, aesthetics to parenting and to ideas concerning success (Bourdieu 1984, 170, 466–467; see also Martin 2012, 74–80). Because they are acquired in encounters with other people, various social divisions – such as class, gender, race, ethnicity, and religion – leave a mark on them (Bourdieu 1990b, 60; Bourdieu 1984, 101; see also Lawler 2004, 112; Reay 2004b, 434). Moreover, the system of dispositions endows individuals with a capacity to intuit what in each situation constitutes suitable behavior "for the likes of us," for people occupying the same position in social space (Bourdieu 1984, 466–467; see also Maton 2008, 57–60). This functioning of habitus as social orientation is responsible for the unconducted collective orchestration of practices.

Besides referring to them as tastes and preferences, Bourdieu (1977, 124) also speaks of dispositions as socially informed, embodied senses. "[T]he principle generating and unifying all practices," he states,

> is nothing other than the socially informed body, with its tastes and distastes, its compulsions and repulsions, with, in a word, all its senses, that is to say, not only the traditional five senses (...) but also the sense of necessity and the sense of duty, the sense of direction and the sense of reality, the sense of balance and the sense of beauty, common sense and the sense of the sacred, tactical sense and the sense of responsibility, business sense and the sense of propriety, the sense of humour and the sense of absurdity, moral sense and the sense of practicality, and so on.

This idea has appealed to many scholars of religion, for it makes possible the conceptualization of individuals' religious activities as the engagement and living through of their sense of the sacred (McNally 1997, 148; Trulsson 2010, 345–346), "sense of ritual" (Bell 1992, 80), or overall "religious senses" (McGuire 2008, 99–100).

Habitus, as a system of dispositions, can also be understood to imply socialized subjectivity (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 126; see also McCloud 2007,

168; Ortner 2006, 109–110). Subjectivity here refers to a non-articulated and non-reflected aspect of the self, which is realized in action and shows in our predispositions, orientations, tendencies, attachments, emotional judgments, style, and so on. It functions as the basis of identity: a reflective and articulated, continually evolving narrative conceptualization of "who I am" (e.g., Utriainen, Hovi, and Broo 2012, 188, 198–199). Furthermore, what Bourdieuan social theory accomplishes particularly well is explicating the role of embodiment in subject formation (Hollywood 2002, 95–96, 99–100; Krais 2006, 127–128; McNay 2000, 13–14, 25–26, 32–36).[4] According to Bourdieu (2000, 141; 1990b, 69–70, 72–73), both the acquisition and the reproduction of cultural schemes take place primarily on the level of the body. Habitus therefore actually refers to knowledge that has been learned by the body. It is not knowledge that one can necessarily apply at will, but a way of inhabiting a world, a part of what one is.

It is important to study practice from a long-term perspective, notes anthropologist Sherry Ortner (2006, 9; see also 1989, 12, 193), because the "playing out of the effects of culturally organized practices is essentially processual and often very slow." Bourdieu's account of habitus can be seen to answer Ortner's call, for it emphasizes the historical depth of dispositions. Since the individual's experiences are always structured based on his or her present habitus, which is the effect of past experiences, habitus includes a bias towards early experiences (Bourdieu 2000, 160–162; Bourdieu 1990b, 53–54, 56, 60; Bourdieu 1984, 109–110; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 130). This inertia of habitus ensures the relative stability of dispositions through time. For Bourdieu, then, habitus is embodied history, or the "active presence of the whole past of which it is the product" (Bourdieu 1990b, 53–56; see also Maton 2008, 52). However, at all times habitus is also modified by new experiences (Bourdieu and Wacquant

4 The notion of habitus is in many ways compatible with poststructuralist discussions concerning subject formation, particularly those of philosophers Michel Foucault and Judith Butler (Skeggs 2004b, 83–84). The basic idea in poststructuralist theories is that subjectivity is not something that exists prior to social influences. Instead, the subject is shaped in interactions with regulatory forces. However, in these same interactions, the subject ends up reproducing and reconfiguring the social world. A common tenet of the theorizations of Bourdieu, Foucault, and Butler is that they all conceive of subjectivity as formed through practice. Foucault highlights the importance of analyzing practices and technologies of power and truth, and their relationships with different conceptions of the self (Foucault 2000, 277, 290; Foucault 1985, 11; see also Skeggs 2004b, 78). For Butler, gender is continuously constituted as an effect of reiterative practices, which cite existing discourses and procedures and inscribe them on the body of the actor (Butler 2006, xv, 185, 192, 198–199; Butler 1993, 12, 15; see also Hollywood 2002, 94–96, 112–113; McNay 2000, 33–34).

1992, 133; Bourdieu 1990a, 116). As the individual accrues certain kinds of experiences, the influence of others slowly wears out.

Bourdieu's theory suggests that dispositions acquired during early learning commonly form the most compelling and stable elements of habitus. The earlier an individual enters into the "game" of a particular field, "and the less he is aware of the associated learning, the greater is (. . .) his unawareness of the unthought presuppositions that the game produces and endlessly reproduces, thereby reproducing the conditions of its own perpetuation" (Bourdieu 1990b, 67; see also Bourdieu 2000, 164–167). All in all, Bourdieu's descriptions concerning the acquisition of habitus resemble sociologists Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann's outline of primary socialization as something semi-automatic and semi-inevitable (Berger and Luckmann 1971, 154–155; see also Kühle 2012b, 118–119; Martin 2012, 49–51; Stone 2001, 14). According to Berger and Luckmann (1971, 151–157), the worldview into which the child is socialized in his or her primary group appears to the child as natural and self-evident for the simple reason that he or she lacks experience of other worldviews. Since the child forms his or her identity with respect to this particular worldview, the effects of primary socialization usually remain strong throughout life.

In his discussions on the formation of habitus, Bourdieu does not pay much attention to the shaping of habitus in later life: to processes of secondary socialization and re-socialization. This weakness in Bourdieu's theory has been addressed by several critics and re-interpreters, including some scholars studying religious conversion and re-awakening, who have reprehended his account of habitus on the grounds that it neglects conscious processes of habituation (Mahmood 2005, 135–139; Noble and Watkins 2003, 523–525, 535–536; Trulsson 2010, 57–61). Bourdieu's lack of interest in intentional dimensions of learning, however, does not mean that such aspects of learning are incompatible with his theoretical apparatus. Indeed, his understanding of human action accounts also for situations that involve strategic cultivation of habitus (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 131). Nevertheless, in the last instance social action always contains also dimensions to which the actor remains blind (Bourdieu 1990b, 53–54, 67, 73–74; see also Akram 2013, 51, 55–56; Bell 1992, 82, 87, 108–109). This, in my reading, is the crux of Bourdieu's argument.

Bourdieu's inclination to picture habitus as an unconscious resource has also given rise to another accusation. In the view of many scholars, this emphasis renders his interpretation of habitus unrealistically unified and stable (e.g., Noble and Watkins 2003, 524–525, 529–530; Reay 2004b, 437–438; Sewell 1992, 15–16; Skeggs 2004a, 25, 27). It describes a world in which individuals are "fated to reproduce the conditions of their existence" (Mellor and Shilling 2010a, 30, 34). This, however, is an overstatement. Instead of being deterministic, Bourdieu's theory simply does not paint an optimistic picture about

the possibility for change (Fowler 2003, 486; Lovell 2000, 31; McCloud 2012, 4; McNay 2000, 36–39). As ethnohistorian Monique Scheer (2012, 204) explains, "habitus must be static and binding to a certain extent, if it is to be more than just a loose cloak that can be thrown off on a whim. At the same time, (…) it leaves space for behaviors not entirely and always predictable, which can also instantiate change and resistance rather than preprogrammed reproduction." Furthermore, when habitus is considered in connection with field, Bourdieu's account becomes more balanced. The relationship with field, in other words, brings dynamism and instability to habitus (Hardy 2008, 131–132; McNay 2000, 51, 53).

Habitus and Field – a Revisit

Practice does not result simply from the dispositions of habitus, but is generated in the interaction between habitus and field. To be more specific, practice reflects the relations between the individual's habitus, his or her accumulated capital within a particular field, as well as the current state of the field as a whole (Bourdieu 2000, 149–151; Maton 2008, 51–52). Bourdieu describes the relationship between habitus and field as "double and obscure" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 127–128). On the one hand, involvement in the "game" specific to a field influences the dispositions of habitus. On the other, these dispositions establish the field as a meaningful and valuable world. In Bourdieuan vocabulary, what makes people get together and compete with each other in a particular field is interest (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 116–117; Bourdieu 1990a, 87–88; see also Grenfell 2008a, 154). It is based on the tacit acceptance of, or practical belief in, the rules of the game and the stakes the game is concerned with. Interest is a precondition of the formation of any field.

"Practical sense," "feel for the game," and "strategy" are terms with which Bourdieu describes the generation of practices within a field. In the previous section, I mentioned socialized senses as one depiction of the dispositions of habitus. Practical sense, or the sense of practice, captures this idea in the most general form. It refers to the individual's capacity to recognize situations, to anticipate their progress, and to react to them through his or her actions: to act successfully in various social environments and events (Bourdieu 2000, 138–139; Bourdieu 1990a, 62–63; see also Lovell 2000, 27; McNay 2000, 39). Practical sense, that is, describes habitus actualized in the present moment and within the flow of time.

The feel for the game, for its part, describes practical sense as attuned with a particular field. It is a way of accounting for the actions of individuals supremely practiced at a particular game. The practices of these people are not executed as obedience to rules or calculated moves, but are the result of practical strategies and regulated improvisation (Bourdieu 2000, 142–144; Postone, LiPuma, and

Calhoun 1993, 4; Scheer 2012, 202). In fact, according to Bourdieu (1990a, 62–63), “[n]othing is simultaneously freer and more constrained than the action of the good player.” It “presupposes a permanent capacity for invention, indispensable if one is to be able to adapt to indefinitely varied and never completely identical situations.” However, this freedom of invention and improvisation is simultaneously regulated by the limits of the game (Bourdieu 1990b, 53–56, 66; Reay 2004b, 435). Some actions are simply impossible within its boundaries.

Bourdieu states that for virtuoso players, whose habitus is perfectly attuned to the surrounding field, the field constitutes a common-sense world to which they take like “ducks to water” (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 127–128; Bourdieu 1990b, 56–57, 68; McNay 2000, 38). This, however, describes an ideal situation only, since societies do not constitute homogeneous totalities. Instead, they include numerous fields which are in a constant process of internal change and external conflict. When habitus is formed through participation in several, more or less incompatible fields, it comes to harbor inherent conflicts and tensions (Bourdieu 2000, 160; see also McNay 2000, 51–72). It does not fit any one field smoothly. Furthermore, if the fields evolve, habitus may fall out of pace with them (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 129–130, 136; Bourdieu 1990b, 62). In a situation where there is considerable mismatch between habitus and the surrounding fields, the living through of habitus becomes more problematic. The social universe loses some of its common-sense character, which brings unpredictability to the individual’s actions.

According to Bourdieu, modern societies are characterized by growing differentiation of types of fields and capital (Calhoun 1993, 77; Engler 2003, 452). As a result, the habitus of individuals inhabiting the same society grow more different with respect to each other. However, while Bourdieu acknowledges the increasing external heterogeneity of habitus in modern societies, he does not make a similar statement with respect to their internal heterogeneity. This oversight has led some scholars to question the applicability of Bourdieu’s concept to modern and late-modern societies (e.g., Archer 2010, 286–288; Cantwell 1999, 225). Others, including myself, maintain that Bourdieu’s theorization of habitus, when properly thought through, is indeed able to account for practice in more complex societies as well.

The level of differentiation in the social world is directly commensurate with the level of intricacy, multidimensionality, and internal contradiction in the habitus of its inhabitants. This means that the complexity of modern societies precludes the emergence of a complete harmony between an individual’s habitus and the fields he or she participates in (Krais 2006, 123–124, 131; McNay 2000, 52). The modern individual, in other words, is bound to face

situations in which the habitus does not provide him or her with an unequivocal sense of how to proceed, but may even point towards several opposite courses of action. These experiences can result in the individual becoming more conscious of the arbitrary nature of his or her dispositions (Adkins 2003, 25–27; Krais 2006, 130; McNay 2000, 66, 68).

For Bourdieu, awareness and reflection commonly ensue only from the breakdown of the conventional social order (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 131; see also Reay 2004b, 437–438). However, when the characteristics of modern and late-modern societies are taken into account, it is possible to argue that the emergence of these capacities does not require any particular crisis (Adkins 2003, 25–27; see also Akram 2013, 57; Kühle 2012b, 118). Instead, partial and situated possibilities for reflection also arise within day-to-day life. Sociologist Lisa Adkins has argued that this kind of reflectiveness need not even be considered as standing in contrast with habitual action (Adkins 2003, 32–35; see also Krais 2006, 130; Reay 2004b, 437–438). On the contrary, if dissonances between habitus and field are constitutive of the individual's habitus, heightened awareness can become part of his or her habitual repertoire of responding to the social world.

Habitual Agency?

The question of agency has been an integral part of social scientific debates at least since Weber and Durkheim (Rapport and Overing 2000, 1–2). The notion of agency originates from Western philosophical discussions that emphasize an autonomous and rational individual who acts in the world following his or her best interests (Asad 2003, 73–75; Messer-Davidow 1995, 25–29; Meyer and Jepperson 2000). A central problem with these classic formulations of agency, however, is that they often downplay the cultural underpinnings of the intentions, motivations, and beliefs of individuals. Thus, anthropologist Talal Asad (2003, 72–73, 78; 1993, 13, 167), for instance, has convincingly argued that investigations into the local conditions of subject-formation are required to understand agency in any comprehensive manner. Practice theory, moreover, has been seen to answer this call for more situated accounts of agency; after all, it is founded on the premise that actors are always socially embedded. Based on practice theory, it is possible to argue that, whereas the capacity for agency is a universal human attribute, actual agency is a capacity of a culturally constituted subject (Ahearn 2001, 112; Emirbayer and Mische 1998, 974, 1003; Ortner 2006, 130–131, 135).

Historically, agency fueled by religion has been a problematic topic for social scientists. In so far as agency has been tied to the modern, liberal,

and rational ideal of the subject, focusing on religious agency has been difficult – for scholars have tended to view religion as something antithetical to modernity (Bracke 2008, 61–63; Braidotti 2008, 2; King 2005, 1–2; Mack 2003, 150, 159–160). Within mainstream feminist theory, moreover, religion has conventionally been understood as unequivocally oppressive to women, which has made an oxymoron out of the idea of religious women's agency.

Nevertheless, during recent decades, studies focusing on the agency of religious women have proliferated. These have commonly targeted gendered and women's agency within particular religious sub-cultures, especially conservative and patriarchal religions.[5] Originally, the question that seemed to haunt feminist scholars involved in this strand of research concerned the reasons why women would deliberately support or turn to religious ideologies that oppressed them. These early investigations have later been criticized on the count that they misattribute to religious women feminist aims and categories of thought, while, simultaneously, neglecting those aims and categories of thought (particularly concerning religious piety) that are important to the women themselves (Abu-Lughod 1990, 47; Mahmood 2005, 5–14; Woodhead 2003, 68–71).

At the turn of the third millennium, many scholars of gender and religion begun to stress inquiries into the particular contexts, discourses, structures, and powers that influence religious women's agency (Avishai 2008, 409–410; Bracke 2003, 336–337; Furey 2012, 17–20). The most influential single study that helped to turn the scholarly tide was anthropologist Saba Mahmood's (2005) investigation into Egyptian Muslim women. Mahmood (2005, 18, 23), leaning on the work of philosophers Michel Foucault and Judith Butler as well as on Asad, conceptualizes agency as a "capacity for action that specific relations of subordination create and enable," emphasizing that agency resides in the multiple ways in which subjects live norms, not only in actions that resist norms. She therefore advises scholars not to define the meanings and forms of agency prior to analysis, but to explore them within the context of action under study (Mahmood 2005, 14, 34). Since the publication of Mahmood's research, numerous scholars have taken heed of her instructions in their work (Avishai 2008; Bilge 2010; Bracke 2008; Isik 2008; Jacobson 2006; Kościańska 2009; Lindhardt 2010; Longman 2008; Parashar 2010; Plancke 2011; Smid 2010).

5 There is also a growing body of research into the agency of women involved in different post-secular spiritualities, such as various healing practices (e.g., Utriainen 2014). Inquiries into the agency of religious men, for their part, are still quite rare (see, however, van Klinken 2013).

Indeed, Mahmood's observations also constitute one starting point of my take on agency in this study.

Nevertheless, Mahmood's account of agency has also been criticized. Religious ethicist Elizabeth Bucar (2010, 669–670, 673–674), for instance, argues that it does not sufficiently admit to spontaneous and creative action. According to Bucar, historically and culturally specific skills can also be put to unorthodox use. Thus, she speaks of "creative compliance" and "complicit resistance" as possible ways of inhabiting religious traditions – ways that account for critical action as well (Bucar 2010, 678–680; see also Ahearn 2001, 119; Campbell 2005, 5–7).

My understanding of agency is based on sociologist Lois McNay's (2000; see also 2004; 2003; 1999) reading of Bourdieuan social theory. Bourdieu's theorizations have, heretofore, not been employed much in studies focusing on religious women's agency (see, however, Alayan and Yair 2010). This lack of Bourdieuan applications reflects the currency, within feminist theory, of the notion that Bourdieu's idea of habitus is excessively pessimistic when it comes to the possibility of dissent, resistance, and change (McNay 2004, 180–181, 185; McNay 2003, 142–143). I have already voiced my disagreement with this criticism; that is to say, I side with those interpreters of Bourdieu who consider his work a feasible basis for a theory of agency (Lawler 2004, 112; Reay 2004b, 433; see also Lindquist 2006; Winchester 2008).

In her account, Lois McNay (2003, 142–143) grounds agency on the temporality of Bourdieu's conceptualization of habitus: on Bourdieu's insistence that the formative effects of past experiences are always actualized in concrete situations. The anticipatory dimension that is part of the living through of habitus is captured in Bourdieu's term "practical sense." The sense of practice ensures that habitus is not guided solely by the past but involves interplay between different temporal orientations (Bourdieu 2000, 206–213). This dynamic, moreover, is where McNay situates agency. To her, agency is an "act of temporalization" where the individual acts in the present guided by his or her practical sense of the forthcoming, which builds on his or her past experiences of related situations (McNay 2000, 23, 38–40, 46–47; McNay 2003, 144).

Similar to Saba Mahmood, also Lois McNay emphasizes the complex relations between human activity and surrounding social formations. She suggests, moreover, that Bourdieu's concept of the field helps in perceiving the intricate relations between agentic action and social structure (McNay 2000, 51, 71). The idea that the individual's capacities of action are produced within a number of fields allows for a sophisticated perspective on the power relations surrounding the individual, and on the various resources at his or her disposal. Agency, from this outlook, is never about simple resistance to a

singular dominant order. Autonomy and subordination are realized in individuals' lives in a more nuanced way – and agency concerns the negotiation, through practice, of the "often discontinuous, overlapping or conflicting relations of power" within which individuals are enmeshed (McNay 2000, 16–17; McNay 2004, 175).

It is common for theories of agency to emphasize the future-orientation of agentic action. Often, this orientation takes the form of intentionality and projects; agency is seen to inform activities that clearly supersede mere habits (e.g., Ortner 2006, 134–136; Sewell 1992). For instance, in her description of religious agency, sociologist Laura Leming (2007, 74) understands agency "as a personal and collective claiming and enacting of dynamic religious identity," and emphasizes that "when religious agency is operative, religion (...) is consciously, rather than repetitively, enacted." Several scholars, however, have pointed out that coupling intentionality with agency is debatable, since the relationship between intentions and outcomes of action is, in reality, complex and problematic (Asad 1993, 15–16; Giddens 1984, 9; Ortner 2006, 131–136).

In her discussion of agency, McNay (2003, 143) explicitly distinguishes the anticipatory dimension that is part of the living through of habitus from the idea of the project. Orientation towards the future does not only characterize actions fueled by projects but is part of all action. This same point is emphasized also by sociologists Mustafa Emirbayer and Ann Mische in their theorization of agency. According to Emirbayer and Mische, agency is a "temporally embedded process of social engagement, informed by the past, but also oriented toward the future and toward the present" (Emirbayer and Mische 1998, 963–964, 1012; see also Bourdieu 2000, 221–223). It results in action that, depending on the situation, can be primarily aligned with the past, immersed in the present, or directed towards the future. Thus, for Emirbayer and Mische, all social action, even action primarily adjusted with the past, includes an agentic element (Emirbayer and Mische 1998, 976, 1004; see also Akram 2013, 47, 51–52).

In this book, I maintain that habitus informs the agentic capacities of the individual. It circumscribes the framework of possibilities, probabilities, improbabilities, and impossibilities within which he or she acts. Moreover, I also conceive of agency as actualized in the moment of action and as constitutive of all action. This Bourdieuan formulation of agency, I contend, makes it possible to also approach agency as it is realized in semi-conscious action. In fact, it is particularly suited for inquiries into the kind of agency that Marja-Liisa Honkasalo (2009, 61–64; 2008a, 498; 2008b, 83–85, 207–210) calls small agency: agency embedded in the routine, everyday practices of ordinary

people. As an account of agency it is inclusive, certainly too inclusive for those who want to separate intentional agency from routine action. For my purposes, however, it is appropriate, because my aim is in unveiling agentic possibilities embedded in habitual religious activities.

Capturing Habitus

My reasons for choosing Pierre Bourdieu's social theory as the theoretical-methodological foundation of the research are several. On the one hand, the promise shown by his concept of habitus with respect to the lived religion paradigm has either been implied or explicitly stated in many previous accounts (Edgell 2012, 251; McGuire 2008, 99–100; Orsi 1997, 16; Sutcliffe 2006, 298–299). Nevertheless, full-blown adaptations of habitus to empirical research remain "surprisingly" few (Edgell 2012, 251). On the other hand, Bourdieu's understanding of the religious field and emphasis on sociology as a reflective enterprise also benefit the study of lived religion. They facilitate the integration of questions concerning the construction of the category of religion within the research at hand, as well as within the academia in general, into analyses (Wacquant 1992, 36–40; see also Bourdieu 2010; Grenfell 2008b, 225–227).

With this book, I add to ongoing theoretical discussions concerning the study of religion-as-practiced by offering an interpretation of the religion of evacuee Karelian Orthodox women as habitus. Habitus, I argue, constitutes a particularly apt tool for approaching their kind of religion, because it accounts for the embodied, semi-conscious, and iterative yet generative nature of practice (see also Berzano 2011, 69–70). Combined with the concept of field, habitus also provides a perspective into dynamics of religious activity in the context of complex social changes. Both these points of view need to be taken into account when the aim is to understand lay practitioners' long-term involvement in religion.

But how does one study habitus? After all, it is not possible to see it directly, only its effects in practices and perceptions (Akram 2013, 46–47; Maton 2008, 62–63). The key is to look at habitus in connection to field, and to anchor this analysis both historically and contextually. To capture a particular habitus, in other words, it is necessary to reconstruct the social conditions that have produced it (Bourdieu 1984, 123–124; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 104–107; Grenfell 2008b, 222–225). This involves analyzing the social trajectory of the individual through his or her life: acquainting oneself with the organization and evolution of the fields he or she has participated in, with the positions he or

she has held within these fields, with the volume and composition of capital in his or her possession, as well as with the social trajectories of his or her parents.

I approach the habitus of the women I study by delving into their trajectories as religious practitioners in the sociohistorical context of 20th and 21st century Finland. In the course of the analysis, I focus on specific layers of their habitus and trace the effects of these layers in their religious activity (see Kauppi 2000, 125–126). Questions concerning the women's position in the religious field and the capital in their possession I address when necessary, mindful of the limits of my micro-level approach as regards the broader configurations of the Finnish religious field.

One fundamental methodological choice on my part has been to approach habitus through interview material. On the one hand, I read the interview accounts of the women I study to uncover their social trajectories. On the other, I also view the accounts as manifestations of their habitus. To explain how this works, it is necessary to look at what Bourdieu says about habitus in connection to language. According to Bourdieu (1990a, 131), "habitus is at once a system of models for the production of practices and a system of models for the perception and appreciation of practices." In other words, habitus creates practices, opinions concerning practices, as well as classifications concerning both practices and opinions. These opinions and classifications can be understood as second order practices: they are practices about other practices. Moreover, they often come in the form of linguistic practices.

As I have discussed above, habitus is primarily not a conscious resource. With respect to discursive practices, this means that even though individuals are able to produce verbal explanations of what they are doing and why, these accounts remain tied to their dispositions. The actions of individuals thus always contain also motives and enforce also meanings that the actors are not able to access (Bourdieu 1991b, 89; Bourdieu 1990b, 53–54). More specifically, whereas individuals often see their practices as responses to particular circumstances, what they do not see is how their practices come to generate or redefine these very circumstances (Bourdieu 1990b, 69; Bourdieu 1977, 79–80; see also Bell 1992, 82, 87, 108–109; Bronner 2012, 33). The preconditions and consequences of this blind aspect of practice Bourdieu explains using his account of symbolic power.

For Bourdieu (1990a, 134–138), linguistic practices are always connected to symbolic struggles. In these struggles, actors within a particular field or across different fields compete for power to produce legitimate perceptions and appreciations concerning the social world. This symbolic power, as Bourdieu names it, hinges on the complicity of those who submit to it. It is efficient only because individuals make use of discursive categories and classifications

genuinely believing, due to their involvement in the activities of a particular field, in the legitimacy of these discursive structures (Bourdieu 2000, 170–172, 177; Bourdieu 1991b, 164, 170; see also Hanks 2005, 77–78). In so doing, the individuals come to reinforce the vision of the world contained in them.

As to religion, what all this means is that Bourdieu's theory allows for the study of religious practices as well as practices "about" religion, including speech practices (Bender 2012, 278–279, 281; Bender 2003, 5, 90–116; see also Csordas 1997, 157–201). Originating from habitus, practices of speaking about religion follow particular senses, tastes, and life-styles. They commonly embrace particular religious interpretations of the world, recognizing their legitimacy. They, moreover, tap into differences between habitus to reinforce distinctions between social positions within the religious field. Practices of speaking about religion, in a word, are quite pregnant with the effects of habitus – hence making a good target for analysis.

However, to study habitus through interview material, I need not only account for the specifics of linguistic practice, but also for those of interview relationships. The most important characteristic of interview material, as research material, is that it is produced in interactions between the interviewer and the interviewees (Bourdieu 1999b, 608; Holstein and Gubrium 2003, 67–69; Kvale 1996, 42–44). This means that the researcher is an active participant in not just the processing and analysis of the research material but its creation as well (Utriainen 2010, 121–122; Utriainen 2002, 176–178).

The interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee is influenced by various factors, starting from overall conventions regarding conversation (Alldred and Gilles 2002, 155–157). As social scientist Eeva Jokinen (2005, 39) has noted, people generally take the role of research informant seriously: when being interviewed, they strive to describe their experiences sincerely and express their opinions accurately. However, various cultural norms still affect their accounts. For instance, it is commonly important for people to describe themselves in a positive light with respect to established notions of respectability and competence. In addition, while the interviewer has in mind a specific goal for the interview, interviewees often bring to the situation their own ideas and agendas concerning the process (Bourdieu 1999b, 609). For example, recollections of past practices and events, which my material largely consists of, reflect both the significance of the past for the interviewee at the time of the interview and the interview situation itself, since individuals always narrate the past taking note of the present audience (Climo and Cattell 2002, 13, 16–17; see also Bender 2003, 136–139).

Interview material, moreover, is grounded in dialogue on an even more fundamental level, for, in producing their verbal accounts, individuals are

dependent on collective discursive resources at their command (Gubrium and Holstein 2003, 43–45). Hence, the meanings established in these accounts are never completely private. For example, when describing the past, individuals always make use of, and position themselves in relation to, standard narratives concerning the past. In fact, the interview situation can be understood as an encounter and negotiation between two different interpretations of the social world: that of the interviewee and that of the interviewer (see Knott 1995, 206). With this being the case, it is important to analyze how these two relate to each other.

For the most part, individuals act in the social world following their socialized senses. Their bodies contain volumes of tacit knowledge that they cannot verbally articulate. Moreover, they often remain oblivious of core principles affecting their social position and particular perspective on the world. Nevertheless, when describing their actions, they often construct themselves as intentional, rational, and project-oriented actors (Altheide and Johnson 2011, 590–592; Bourdieu 1999b, 620–621). In the analysis, it is thus important to reach beyond the informants' interpretations, and to cast light on the conditions of their production: on the positional and situational nature of their knowledge and experiences concerning the social world (Gubrium and Holstein 2003, 39–41).

In his methodological reflections on the use of interview material in social research, Bourdieu (1999b, 609; see also 1991b, 54–56, 72–76) states that to properly take into account the particular characteristics of interview material requires two things: an analysis of the distance between the objective of the research as assigned by the researcher and as interpreted by the informant, as well as an analysis of the asymmetry between the social positions of the two parties. These measures help the researcher to decipher what the interviewee can legitimately know and say, and what he or she is likely to censor and what to emphasize, in the interview situation. Ultimately, the issue at stake is an effort to reduce the symbolic power exerted by the researcher over those researched.

My treatment of the interview material emphasizes it as a joint production and takes into account the specific conditions under which it is produced. In the course of the analysis, I interpret the material from several angles. In some sections, I look at what the women say about certain practices, beliefs, or events, and analyze these accounts as evidence of what they actually do, believe, and have experienced. At other times, I focus on their perceptions and appreciations concerning particular topics, which I analyze as examples of their practice "about" religion. And occasionally, I take under consideration the interaction between the interviewees and myself. All these layers are indicative

of the women's habitus. Together, they make it possible to trace, from the interview material, the women's social trajectories and the positions they occupy in social space (Bourdieu 1999b, 618; see also Holstein and Gubrium 2003, 78–79).

Epistemological discussions within social sciences nowadays emphasize the positioned, partial, and dialogical nature of all knowledge – including research knowledge. In consequence, the researcher is required, to the best of his or her ability, to reflect on his or her particular position in relation to the research (Altheide and Johnson 2011, 586–588; Doucet and Mauthner 2002, 134, 137–138; Utriainen 1998b, 292–294). For Bourdieu, reflexivity is ultimately about employing the same epistemological approach to the research process and the researcher than to those researched (Deer 2008b, 200–202; Grenfell 2008b, 225–227; Wacquant 1992, 36–46). The researcher is able to constitute the point of view of the object of research in social space only after conducting an auto-analysis of his or her own point of view in that space (Bourdieu 1999b, 625–626; see also Bourdieu 2010, 5–6; Wood and Altglas 2010, 10–16). This analysis has to concern the researcher's relationship to the field under study and take up his or her attachments within the academic field. The primary focus of reflection, Bourdieu notes, should be the researcher as social scientist, not as an individual (Bourdieu 2010; see also Wood and Altglas 2010, 11–12).

In this book, I strive for openness and reflexivity as advocated by Bourdieu. Most of my reflective work concerns epistemological and methodological issues: choices concerning concepts, theories, methods, and methodology. However, I also engage in self-reflection as regards my relationship with the interviewees and my positioning with respect to the overall research topic. I discuss these issues throughout the research, including the next chapter where I reconstruct the processes of producing, organizing, and analyzing the research material.

CHAPTER 3

Studying Displaced Karelian Orthodox Women

The Interviewees

My first attempt at getting into contact with displaced Karelian Orthodox women was through a call for written autobiographical submissions that I organized in collaboration with the Finnish Literature Society (FLS). The collection of submissions on the topic of the everyday religion of evacuee Karelian women took place during 2006 and 2007. Quite early on, however, it became clear that it was not going to yield sufficient material for the study.[1] Thus, when I composed handouts concerning the collection, I included a mention of the possibility of interviews. These handouts I sent to all 24 Finnish Orthodox parishes and to 73 member associations of the Finnish Karelian League.[2] The campaign resulted in just three people expressing their interest to be interviewed. I acquired two more interviewees from among the women who participated in the collection of written material.

At this point, I had to acknowledge that my approach was not working. There were simply too few potential informants, Orthodox women of evacuee Karelian background, alive for them to respond in great numbers to written announcements. What was required was face-to-face contact with possible participants. During the winter of 2007–2008, I thus made ten visits to meetings of three different Orthodox lay associations in southern Finland. This proved a better strategy; altogether I located 12 of the informants through these meetings. Furthermore, during the autumn of 2008, other researchers of Karelian culture put me in touch with seven more women, mostly from North Karelia. This final addition allowed me to correct the regional bias of the sample of informants so that they would not only represent the South of Finland.

1 The call was addressed to anyone of evacuee Karelian descent. It resulted in altogether 50 written submissions, mostly from individuals with a Lutheran background. All the submissions are archived in the Folklore Archives of the FLS.

2 After the Second World War, scores of Karelian associations sprung up to unite the evacuees (Raninen-Siiskonen 1999, 195–215). Several hundred remain active today.

© HELENA KUPARI, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004326743_004
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License.

TABLE 1 *List of interviewees and their decades of birth*

pseudonym	decade of birth
Anna	1920's
Esteri	1920's
Ilmi	1920's
Katri	1920's
Lempi	1920's
Lyyli	1920's
Martta	1920's
Natalia	1920's
Soja	1920's
Vieno	1920's
Elsa	1930's
Faina	1930's
Hilja	1930's
Rauha	1930's
Senja	1930's
Siiri	1930's
Toini	1930's
Auli	1940's
Elvi	1940's
Kirsti	1940's
Raili	1940's
Sinikka	1940's
Tarja	1940's
Maija-Liisa	1950's

Overall, I interviewed 24 women (see Table 1). The selection of informants does not accurately reproduce the demographics of Finnish Orthodox women aged 60 or older. However, the variation within the sample guarantees that it includes both more and less typical representatives of this particular group of people. I alternate between calling the interviewees displaced Karelian and evacuee Karelian Orthodox women, in reference to both their religious affiliation and historical background. All the interviewees had been baptized and socialized into the Orthodox Christian faith as children. In addition, their family history was tied to that of the people forced to leave Finnish Karelia

during or after the Second World War. While individuals with a connection to the evacuations from Karelia nowadays often speak of themselves simply as Karelians, I have opted to use more precise terms instead. The reason for this is that, even though the evacuations took place a long time ago, the informants' descriptions of their post-war experiences take up an important role in my analysis. Thus, I have wanted to distinguish them from people with other Karelian backgrounds and identities.

The Finnish language term referring to Finns who during or after the Second World War migrated permanently to other parts of Finland from what was to become Soviet Karelia is *siirtokarjalainen*, which literally translates as "transferred Karelian." Nonetheless, I employ the term "evacuee Karelian" instead, for it better captures the circumstances of the relocation in question.[3] The term "displaced Karelian," moreover, I use to emphasize the fact that the evacuees were, in actuality, internally displaced persons. In Finland, the term *Karjalan pakolainen*, which translates as "displaced Karelian" or "Karelian refugee," is commonly used of people who came from Russian Karelia to Finland in the aftermath of the Russian revolution. It is important not to confuse the two groups of migrant Karelians with each other. Here, however, this will not constitute an issue, since I am only discussing the evacuees of the Second World War.

The average age of the women at the time of the interviews was 75 years. Their mean birth year was 1933, with the eldest interviewees born in 1920 and the youngest informant in the mid-1950's. Prior to the Second World War, the families of 20 of the women lived in Border Karelia (see Illustration 1).[4] The family of one woman lived in the Karelian Isthmus. Furthermore, the parents of two women started their families only after the Second World War; each of these women had one parent from Border Karelia. One woman was the result of her Border Karelian mother's war-time romance and never knew her biological father.

3 Strictly speaking, war-time evacuations did not cover the exact area later ceded to the Soviet Union. Some of the Karelian evacuees could therefore actually return to their homes after the end of the war, whereas other people had to relocate from their homes only at that time; that is, when the peace treaty was put into force (Sallinen-Gimpl 1994, 12).

4 The Border Karelian home municipalities of the interviewees (or their parents) were as follows: Impilahti one, Korpiselkä one, Salmi seven, Soanlahti two, Suistamo three, and Suojärvi nine informants. On the eve of the Second World War, nine in ten inhabitants of Salmi were Orthodox, as were two in three inhabitants of Suojärvi, Suistamo, and Korpiselkä (Hämynen 1993, 237–341). In Soanlahti and Impilahti, Lutherans slightly outnumbered the Orthodox.

ILLUSTRATION 1 *Map of Karelia*
Karelia has never formed an independent nation-state. Instead, the geographical area of Karelia has been varyingly divided between Sweden/Finland and Novgorod/Russia/The Soviet Union since the 14th century. As the border has been redrawn, conceptions of Karelia and Karelians have changed as well. Map designed by Tiina Aaltonen.

The parents and grandparents of all the interviewees were Orthodox, save for one woman, whose mother and maternal grandparents were Lutheran. The women had between one and nine siblings, five on average. For half of the interviewees, their childhood families also included other members of their kin, commonly the father's parents or mother. At the same time, one interviewee lived as a foster child among childless relatives, and another was raised by her grandmother.

In pre-Second World War Karelia, the families of a great majority of the informants were smallholding farmers. Other occupations of their fathers included teacher of a village school, truck driver, gravedigger, and forest ranger. After the war, the parents of most of the interviewees set up a new farm on the land allocated to them by the government. The two sets of parents who established their families at this time also obtained their livelihood from smallholdings. In those families that had not owned a farm prior to the war the fathers found other employment. A few of the women, moreover, lost their fathers in the war. In these cases, the mother commonly initially moved to live with her parents and later remarried. In addition, one of the women was orphaned during the war and moved in with her sister's family.

In the course of the Second World War period, residents of Border Karelia and the Karelian Isthmus were twice (in the winter of 1939–40 and in the summer of 1944) evacuated from their homelands which had turned into war zones. 20 of the 24 women had personally experienced at least one of these evacuations. Ten of the informants had experienced both. The others were spared two evacuations for various reasons: some had not been born at the time of the first evacuation, for others their parents never returned to Karelia after the first evacuation, whereas the oldest interviewees no longer lived with their childhood families at the time of the second evacuation and had moved outside the evacuation zone. Of the four women who did not take part in the evacuations at all, three were born only after the second evacuation. One of the women was born after the first evacuation and her family did not return to Karelia so she was spared the second evacuation as well.

The basic education of 13 of the interviewees consisted of primary school (six years), whereas 11 of them had completed secondary school (five years). Four informants had also graduated from upper secondary school (three years), three of whom had achieved university degrees. In the interviews, several of the women noted that they had not been able to continue to secondary or upper secondary school due to the lack of money. Most of these women, however, had later continued their education in community colleges or evening classes.

Although most of the women came from farming families, only one of them became mistress of a farm in adulthood. The majority worked in the social and

service sectors, a few also in industry. The women's occupations included child-minder, cleaner, cooker, entrepreneur, factory worker, hairdresser, librarian, nurse, seamstress, secretary, shop clerk, teacher, and youth worker. Whereas some had lifelong careers, many had experience of various lines of work. Only a few of the informants had been housewives for the greater part of their adult lives. Several women also worked outside the home while their children were under school age, even though most of them had their children at a time when the Finnish system of public welfare services, such as the right to public day care, was not yet operative.

All the women were married to Finnish citizens, men from various parts of the country. The informants' marriages took place between the 1940's and 70's, the average age of marriage being 23 years. Twelve of the couples settled down within a hundred kilometers of the capital, whereas nine lived in North Karelia or North Savonia (the region to the west of North Karelia), and three lived elsewhere in Finland. One half of the couples lived in bigger cities, the other in smaller towns and rural communities. Furthermore, 22 of the 24 interviewees had children. The number of children to these women varied between one and five, the average being three. The children were born approximately between 1945 and 1985; the average age for giving birth to one's firstborn was 25.

The husbands of 20 interviewees were members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and those of four belonged to the Orthodox Church. In the course of the marriage, the Lutheran husbands of two informants left their Church and joined the civil registry. In addition, one Lutheran husband converted to Orthodoxy in old age. The children of the women with Orthodox husbands were all baptized into the Orthodox faith. However, of the 18 women who were married to Lutheran men and had children, 16 had all their children baptized into the Lutheran faith. In two families, the older children were baptized into the Lutheran faith and the younger children into the Orthodox faith. In one of these families, this was due to a change in the legislation concerning the freedom of religion (see discussion in the section on Orthodox-Lutheran marriages). In the other, it resulted from the fact that, by the time of their birth, the father had left the Lutheran Church. Incidentally, also in the second family where the father left the Lutheran Church, changes in the overall religious composition of the family ensued. Afterwards, the mother organized the conversion of all the children into the Orthodox faith.

The conversions mentioned above all took place when the interviewees' children were underage. Three of the women had witnessed one of their children converting to Orthodoxy as a personal choice in adulthood. One woman's Lutheran child had become a Pentecostalist. It is possible that some of the women had also children that had left the Lutheran or the Orthodox Church to join the civil registry, although this did not come up in the interviews.

At the time of the interviews, 15 of the 24 informants were widows. Four remained married to their original spouses, whereas five were divorced. In all cases the divorce had occurred only when the children were in their late teens or older. None of the widows had remarried, but one of the divorcées had recently gotten engaged. Furthermore, all the living children of all the informants had reached adulthood; the oldest women had children who had already retired. All the interviewees who had borne children had also become grandmothers.

Moreover, at the time of the interviews, all but two of the women were retired. Many had been so for over a decade, even two decades. All of them still lived at home, with the exception of one who lived in a retirement home. Most lived alone, although some continued to live with their husbands, and a few had one of their adult children living under the same roof. The women's physical condition and overall activity, however, varied quite a lot: while two women still worked full-time, three were practically house-bound due to their illnesses. Most interviewees fit somewhere between these two extremes. Some led quite busy lives with various hobbies, whereas for others one activity outside the home in a week was enough. Many suffered from a chronic illness or condition, or several.

The Research Process

The vignette of my visit to Anna's home, with which the book opens, describes the typical course of the interviews. I interviewed each informant once, and the interviews were conducted one-on-one at their homes. Excluding those interviewees who I met at Orthodox lay association meetings, my initial contact with all the women was by telephone. At the agreed date of the interview, I traveled to their home town or neighborhood; some of the women came to pick me up at a local railway station or bus stop. Often, the informant had prepared a snack or a meal, which we ate before the start of the interview. The women also showed me around their homes, pointing out photographs and memorabilia. As I got my papers arranged, we discussed the research project, the weather, how my trip had gone, their homes, health, and families, or possibly some topical news. After the interview was over, we again chatted casually and might have something to eat. I made an effort to end the meetings in an unhurried way. This gave the informant the chance to digest the interview a bit before my leaving, and to ask any question that came to her mind.

The average length of the interviews was two hours 20 minutes. They were recorded with an mp3 recorder, save for one where the recorder was accidentally not switched on. Before the start of every interview, I explained

to the interviewee how the interview material would be treated in the future: the archiving of the recordings into the Folklore Archives of the FLS, FLS policies concerning the storage and use of the recordings (see Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura 2010), and my own commitments. Three of the interviewees did not agree to the archiving of their recordings, but, nevertheless, gave me permission to hold on to and to make use of them. Overall, the study complies with the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity guidelines for responsible research conduct (see Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity 2013).

At the beginning of the interview process, many of the ideas I had concerning the research were not yet clearly formulated. I was interested in lay women's everyday religion, in how significant life events and developments in the overall surroundings were reflected in religious practice, and in remembering as a feature of religion. Thus, I started interviewing with the overall aim of eliciting information about the women's religious life histories. The greater part of my interview frame (see Table 2) proceeded chronologically, focusing on accounts of everyday religious practices, memories of special religious events, as well as interpretations of the significance of religion during different life phases. The last sections of the interview outline, however, contained questions that aimed to capture informants' perceptions and assessments concerning the Orthodox religion as well as Orthodoxy in Finland. All in all, the questions were not designed to establish an exhaustive picture of the religious practices and beliefs of the interviewees, but to provide a basic framework within which they could reflect on their religiosity.

TABLE 2 *List of interview themes*

Basic information checklist
Birth year and place, place of residence in childhood
Religion – general descriptions
How would you describe your Orthodox religiosity?
Religion in childhood
Was religion a part of the daily life of your childhood family? If yes, how did it show up during a typical day?
Evacuations and their effects
What happened to your family during the wars?
Religion in adult life
How did you and your husband take care of the religious upbringing of your children? Was there something about religion that you absolutely wanted to teach your children? If yes, what and why?

TABLE 2 *List of interview themes* (cont.)

Religion today
Has your religious practice changed during recent years? If yes, how and why?
Religion – reflections and interpretations
Is there an Orthodox custom or ritual that is particularly close to your heart? If yes, why this custom or ritual?
Displaced Karelians and the continuity of traditions
What does your Karelian heritage mean to you today?
Concluding questions
Why did you decide to take part in this interview?

THE LIST INCLUDES ONE OR TWO SAMPLE QUESTIONS ON EACH THEME.

The interviews varied a great deal in both form and content. Some of them quite closely followed a basic question-answer structure. In these interviews, the informants' speech was characterized by a conscious attempt to provide an answer to the very question that I had posed. I was able to quite closely follow the interview outline, since the women expected me to introduce themes for them to reflect on. Other interviewees, however, approached the interview situation with a different attitude. They answered to my questions with lengthy autobiographical narratives, moving independently from one topic to another. In these interviews, I usually let the informant take the lead, but tried to gently conduct the discussion towards themes of particular interest to me. Rather than providing the basis for the interview, the interview outline functioned as a checklist to keep track of the major themes I wanted to address during the discussion.

There were certain topics, such as childhood, war, and family, to which the women commonly responded with spontaneous and lengthy narratives. The chronological structure of the interview outline also guided the women to talk about these themes, often providing an orientation for the whole interview. By contrast, several informants were clearly uncomfortable with the more theologically oriented, evaluative questions introduced in the latter part of the interview. They tended to pass over these quickly, or even refrain from answering altogether. All in all, some women openly cited the opportunity of talking about their childhood experiences and the lives of their parents as their primary motive for taking part in the interview. Others, for their part, harbored a more general interest in Karelian and Orthodox culture, which they also wished to discuss with me.

In the interview situations, generally speaking, a warm and easy atmosphere prevailed. The interviewees seemed to relate to me as half researcher,

half young acquaintance or distant relative. The age difference between the interviewees and myself emphasized an epistemological relationship in which the former were the party in possession of knowledge. I appeared ignorant but eager to learn. This kind of an interviewee-interviewer relationship is often considered advantageous when it comes to the production of ethnographic descriptions and knowledge (e.g., Spradley 1979, 50). On occasion, however, the difference in our ages made the women doubtful over whether I could relate to their experiences. "The young people today have no idea," several of them began when speaking, for instance, of the poverty of the first post-war years.

For the majority of the women, it was important to learn of my religious and ethnic background. At some point, they commonly asked me whether I was Orthodox or Karelian. I am neither; instead, I come from a Lutheran Finnish family with no ties to Karelia. Hearing this, some of them appeared baffled at my interest in studying Karelian Orthodox people. I, for my part, was surprised that my background mattered so much to the women – a reaction that betrays my habitus as a member of the religious majority. Nevertheless, speaking about their religion to a non-Orthodox, particularly to a Lutheran, was a familiar situation to the women. Most of them had Lutheran relatives, including husbands, children, and grandchildren. This does not erase the fact that my background made me firmly an outsider in their eyes. Ultimately, the women's accounts constitute a performance of one's Orthodox identity in front of the Lutheran other.

In several previous interview-based studies on Karelians, researchers have reported how their own Karelian background created common ground between interviewer and interviewee (e.g., Loipponen 2010, 124–142; Raninen-Siiskonen 1999, 66–69). I had no such shared history with my informants. As far as I can tell, however, they spoke freely to me of their Karelian background. Naturally, it is also possible that my non-Karelianness affected the women's readiness to talk about their negative experiences concerning their displacement and resettlement. In this vein, both ethnologist Pirkko Sallinen-Gimpl and historian Heli Kaarina Kananen have made note of Karelian evacuees' overly positive and integration-oriented speech, connecting it to their need to fit into post-war Finnish society (Kananen 2010, 208–215; Sallinen-Gimpl 1994, 223–228).

Orthodoxy and Karelianness were the two social categorizations that, in the interview situations, mattered most to the women. They were loaded categories, packed with significance. Altogether, I listened to 24 women talk passionately about their religion and ethnicity; this resulted in me becoming increasingly aware of these layers of my own habitus as well. In the course of the interviews, that is, I became a conscious witness to the workings of my embodied dispositions regarding both religion and ethnicity. Here, I shall address the latter issue.

Although I have lived all my life in southern Finland, both my parents are from South Ostrobothnia (a region in western Finland), and my family has a strong Ostrobothnian identity. Initially, I thought that this would provide me and the informants with common ground: just like them, I, too, cherished an emotional connection to one of the "Finnish tribes." I soon realized, however, that Ostrobothnians did not have a good reputation among the women. South Ostrobothnia was the region where a lot of the Orthodox had initially been evacuated, and several women noted that the locals had treated them cruelly. To most of the women, then, I never mentioned my roots, fearing that doing so would distance me from them. Instead, I identified myself as a Southerner.

Throughout the research process, I had a sort of love-hate relationship with the women as Karelians. On the one hand, I could well relate to the pride they felt over their Karelian ancestry. On the other, I had to struggle with an irrational antipathy towards their Karelianness, with a part of me resenting "all these Karelians" for thinking that they are better than "us Ostrobothnians." My troubled relationship with Karelianness led me to decide, early on in the research, not to focus as much on the Karelian identity of the women as I had initially intended. In Bourdieuan vocabulary, I feared that I would not be able to separate myself sufficiently from the struggles within the "ethnic field" to produce a scientific analysis of it (see Bourdieu 2010). What further justified this decision was my realization that I was learning very little about evacuee Karelian identity that had not already been said in previous research on the topic (e.g., Raninen-Siiskonen 1999).

The interviews resulted in 55 recorded hours of conversation. The recordings were transcribed in their entirety to facilitate their systematic analysis. Four of the interviews I transcribed myself, whereas the other 18 recordings were transcribed by two research assistants. The transcripts were done verbatim, showing colloquial and dialect features and including repetitive words, intervening sounds, and pauses. Altogether, the interview transcripts amounted to 790 pages of writing with approximately 2,600 characters (no spaces) per page.[5]

Once the interviews were transcribed, I used the computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software ATLAS.ti to go through the transcripts. I organized the material into thematic codes based on topics of discussion, developed a more nuanced system of coding that classified the women's descriptions about their practices, beliefs, experiences, and opinions concerning religion, and

5 As auxiliary research material, I have used my field notes of the interviews and visits to Orthodox lay association meetings, answers of the 11 women somehow affiliated with Orthodoxy from the FLS collection of writings, and two additional interviews of women baptized into the Lutheran faith but with Orthodox, Border Karelian mothers.

created a layer of codes that focused on the dimensions of conversation and interaction. In addition, I tagged features of the interviewees' accounts that seemed to engage, in one way or another, with the theoretical notions that I had found intriguing. The total number of codes came to about 500. After the coding was completed to an adequate extent, I drew up analyses of about 150 of the codes. Little by little, I started working these into larger totalities: adding contextual information, theoretical and methodological discussions, perspectives I wanted to cover, and problems I wanted to address. To complete the process of analysis, I also returned to reading the entire interview transcripts. With this final task, I wanted to confirm that my code-based interpretations were reflective of the overall material.

While processing, coding, and analyzing the material, I developed the theoretical underpinnings of the research. Initially, I was to combine the approaches of oral history and social memory research to look into how sociologist of religion Danièle Hervieu-Léger's (2000) conception of religion as a chain of memory was realized in the displaced Karelian Orthodox women's meditation on religion. After a while, however, I grew dissatisfied with this plan. I felt that it tied me to going through the forms and contents of the women's explicit reminiscences in the interview situations, whereas I wanted to be able to approach the intertwinement of remembering with religiosity as such. Thus, I became attracted to accounts of social memory that emphasized its embodied aspects (e.g., Connerton 1989; Narvaez 2006), as well as to accounts of agency focusing on its temporal and embodied constitution (e.g., Emirbayer and Mische 1998; McNay 2000).

At some point, a researcher colleague introduced me to the work of Pierre Bourdieu; this became the determining moment as to the course of the whole research. I was particularly inspired by Bourdieuan theory of habitus, immediately feeling that it resonated well with the interview material. Habitus seemed to provide me with the link between religious practice and embodied memory that I had been looking for. Moreover, although I originally conceived of habitus as a theory of embodied social memory, gradually the role of social memory research in the study dwindled. Instead of understanding Bourdieu's theory as a "fruitful perspective from which to approach the topic of social memory" (Kupari 2011, 218), I came to see it as a fruitful perspective from which to approach lived religion.

Far into the research process, I felt myself oscillating between material and theory. I was torn between my loyalty towards the richness of the informants' accounts and my desire to be able to say something theoretically relevant about their case as a whole. It was not until I had written up most of the analysis that I was able to strike a balance in this issue. The crucial thing to do, I realized,

was to formulate the theoretically inspired research objectives in a way that they respected the nature and limits of the material. Thus, I decided to focus on the "lifelongness" of the religion of the women with the help of Bourdieu's concept of habitus.

I discuss the women's habitus as a type of class habitus, based on Bourdieu's (1990b, 60; 1984, 123–124) notion that the habitus of individuals will share similar qualities if their overall position in social space coincides in some respect. Ultimately, however, no two habitus are identical. Thus, when I speak of the women as displaced Karelian Orthodox women, the result is a generalization that does not apply with similar accuracy to all the informants (see also Doucet and Mauthner 2002, 131–132). In writing up the analysis, I have held in check the inevitable reduction of the women's accounts by doing two things. First, even though my emphasis is on locating common features of the women's habitus, I make note of differences and exceptions as well. Second, I keep a respectful distance with regard to the interviewees' individual life stories by not disclosing too much information of any of them, even in a thoroughly anonymized form.

While I have taken precautions not to invade the women's privacy, I have also strived to depict them as flesh-and-blood human beings. The ideal, following Bourdieu (1999b, 625), is to give readers the means to "situate themselves at the point in social space from which all the respondent's views over that space emanate, which is to say that place in which this particular worldview becomes self-evident, necessary, taken-for-granted." Inevitably, the picture I present of the women's life-worlds falls somewhat short of this ideal (see Alldred and Gilles 2002, 149). Nevertheless, it is a valuable picture, capturing an essential facet of their religiosity.

Locating Displaced Karelian Orthodox Women in Social Space

Religion, Gender, and Old Age in 20th and 21st Century Finland

In 1920, at the time of the birth of the oldest of my interviewees, Finland was a newly independent country (since 1917) which had just emerged from a civil war (fought in 1918). On the eve of the Second World War, the majority of the Finnish working population was still involved in agriculture and forestry. After the war, however, Finland went through an intensive structural change involving large-scale modernization, urbanization, industrialization, and expansion of the service sector (Jokinen and Saaristo 2006, 83–88). The "flight from the countryside" reached its peak in the 1960's and 70's, when baby boomer

children reached adulthood and moved to the centers of southern Finland, or to Sweden, to find a living (Jokinen and Saaristo 2006, 88–89, 93–97, 148–149).[6]

According to sociologist Jeja-Pekka Roos (1987, 51–59), what is characteristic of the life narratives of Finns born in the 1920's and 30's is the stark contrast between the poverty of their childhood years and the growing stability and prosperity of later life. The people of this generation were born in the countryside, but often later moved to towns where they worked hard to secure good living conditions for their children. Later on in life, they were able to enjoy the fruits of their labor themselves, for instance, in the form of different conveniences. Roos's account also applies to the life narratives of the Orthodox women. In my material, however, even the women born in the 1940's emphasized the poverty of their childhood homes in contrast to their later living conditions. After all, their families had often lost virtually everything when leaving Karelia.

The particular characteristics of the Finnish gender order reflect the living conditions of a small, poor, and agrarian population (Julkunen 1999, 86). In pre-modern, rural Finland, the family and the household were organized along a patriarchal order. However, in everyday life men and women often appeared primarily as partners in shared toil, both with their areas of responsibility (Löfström 1998, 241–243; Pylkkänen 1999, 26–30). Over the second half of the 19th century, the conception of men and women as polar opposites with separate but complementary life spheres began to gain ground among the Finnish bourgeoisie. During the inter-World War period, this ideal also spread among other social classes. Housewifery never became the norm for women of the peasantry or the working class, however, as their input as workers was essential to the survival of the family (Löfström 1998, 249–250; Pylkkänen 1999, 30–37).

In Finland, as in many other Western countries, the end of the Second World War brought the cult of domesticity briefly to the fore (Löfström 1998, 251; Olsson 2011, 61–67). This period, however, was swiftly over. In step with the modernization of the society, women's entry into paid workforce became more and more common. Starting from the 1960's, this move was spurred by the development of the social welfare system, including maternal (later parental) benefits and children's public daycare. Since that time, the conception of women as working mothers has been decisive in defining the position of women within Finnish society (Julkunen 1999, 79–80, 87–90; Tammelin 2009, 40–43). Nevertheless, even in contemporary Finland women shoulder more

6 In Finland, the term "baby boom generation" refers to the cohorts born between 1945 and 1950 (Savioja et al. 2000, 58–60).

responsibility than men when it comes to taking care of the home and the family, and consequently have more difficult time in fitting together the demands of their domestic and working lives (Julkunen 1999, 92, 94; Pylkkänen 1999, 37; Tammelin 2009, 109–110). Overall, the past five decades have been characterized by a reduction in the average number of children born to Finnish couples, a growth in the divorce rate, and the overall proliferation of different family models (Jokinen and Saaristo 2006, 147–148, 193–199). The role of the family in the lives of Finnish people has, nonetheless, remained central.

The population of Finland has aged rapidly in recent decades. In 2015, the number of Finnish people at least 65 years of age amounted to 20 percent of the population (Statistics Finland 2016). Behind this overall demographic trend is a decline in the mean birth rate after the baby boom cohorts, as well as an increase in the average life expectancy. Moreover, all through the past century, Finnish women have lived on average several years longer than Finnish men. Thus, in 2015 there were about 150,000 more women than men in the age group of the displaced Karelian Orthodox women: that is, aged 65 or older (Martelin, Pitkänen, and Koskinen 2000, 53–56; Statistics Finland 2016).

The aging population translates into a growing demographic ratio of dependency which has been seen to constitute a challenge to Finnish society, its public healthcare, welfare, and pension systems. On a different note, recent research has shown that both the physical and the material well-being of the elderly have continued to improve (Jyrkämä 2001, 268–269, 304–307, 312–313; Statistics Finland 2013, 1–2). The average Finnish life-span includes more years of good health than before, whereas the mean length of the so-called deep old age (the time of serious illness, frailty, and dependence on others) has not increased.

At the turn of the 20th century, the population of Finland was very homogeneous with regard to religious affiliation. In 1920, 98 percent of the people belonged to the Evangelical Lutheran Church (Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 82). The Finnish religious field, however, was not as unified as this statistic suggests. The strong influence of Pietistic revival movements in many parts of the country caused friction within the Lutheran Church simultaneously as it was losing its unquestioned status as the source of individuals' morals, beliefs, and lifestyles. Participation in church functions was declining, and Finns were increasingly divided up into those actively involved in congregational life and those alienated from the Church (Heininen and Heikkilä 1996, 209–210, 213–218; Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 49–59).

During the Second World War, this development was temporarily halted, to an extent. For instance, the number of people frequenting church functions grew (Heininen and Heikkilä 1996, 247). However, in the 1950's secularization

processes gained pace, and, particularly during the 60's social activity, the Lutheran Church became the target of open criticism (Heininen and Heikkilä 1996, 238–241; Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 60–61). Since these first post-war decades, the Church has slowly reformed its structures, often amid considerable debate. The ordination of women, for example, became possible in 1986, several decades later than in some other Nordic countries (Utriainen, Salmesvuori, and Kupari 2014, 6). Moreover, towards the turn of the 21st century the Church began to take a more active role in secular society, participating in current discussions and intensifying its contribution in the field of welfare work (Helander 1999, 70–73; Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 61; Moberg and Sjö 2012, 83).

Leaving the Evangelical Lutheran Church has become more and more common throughout the 20th century down to the present day. Whereas in 1950, 95 percent of Finns were members of the Lutheran Church, in 2000 the percentage was down to 85, and by 2014 it had fallen to 76 (Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 82, 88–92; Statistics Finland 2015b). However, and in line with the "believing in belonging" paradigm of the Nordic countries, membership in the Lutheran Church is often still considered a part of the national identity (Bäckström 2015, 158–159; Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 84–85).

According to surveys, Finns' belief in core Christian doctrines remained on the same level during the last decades of the 20th century. Participation in church functions, however, was low throughout the century and further diminished over the course of time (Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 98–120). All in all, sociologists of religion describe the religiosity of Finns at the turn of the 21st century as characterized by increasing individualism (Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 166–175; Ketola 2008, 347–349). Over the past three decades, religious plurality in Finland has increased markedly, a development that is only partly due to increased immigration (Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 62–80; Ketola 2008, 338–345; Utriainen, Salmesvuori, and Kupari 2014, 8–9).

In Western societies, modernization has been responsible for major reconfigurations concerning both gender and religion. Recently, several sociologists of religion have argued that the experience of modernization was very different for women compared to men, and that these differences had crucial consequences in the field of religion (Marler 2008, 4–7; Woodhead 2007, 577–580). In a word, while modernization had a secularizing effect on men, the same was not true with women. Rather, as men's interest in religion waned, women took charge of the religious life of the family and of passing on family traditions to the children (Vincett, Sharma, and Aune 2008, 4–5; Woodhead 2007, 578–579). The pattern in which women acted as preservers of religion and

upholders of traditional values remained in place, to a marked extent, until the Second World War. In fact, sociologist of religion Linda Woodhead (2007, 571–580) has argued that women felt the impact of secularization in a significant way only after they, too, entered the labor market in substantial numbers during the post-war decades.

As regards Finland, survey material shows that Finnish women continue to demonstrate more attachment to traditional religion than men. More women than men belong to the Evangelical Lutheran Church, consider religion an important aspect of their lives, believe in basic Christian teachings, and are active in both their public and private religious practice (Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 134–144; Statistics Finland 2015a). Moreover, the same statistics also indicate that increase in all these measures of religiosity correlates with age. Wartime acts as an important dividing line: those born before the Second World War clearly demonstrate more attachment to religion than the generations born after the war. These two trends combined effectively make women born before the Second World War – a group that includes the majority of the women of my study – as the most religious group of people in Finland today.

Orthodoxy in Finland – Historical Developments

Between 1809 and 1917, Finland was a Grand Duchy of the Russian Empire. A great majority of the Orthodox citizens of Finland were living in Ladoga Karelia, Border Karelia, and North Karelia. In Border Karelia, the generality of the population was Orthodox (Koukkunen 1981, 290–292; see also Martikainen and Laitila 2014, 155–157). Karelia had been under the influence of Orthodox Christianity since the beginning of the second millennium. During the time of the Grand Duchy, the religion of Orthodox Karelians was a fusion of Russian Orthodox and older ethnic traditions, with many pre-Christian features surviving even into the 20th century (Martikainen and Laitila 2014, 153–155; Stark 2002, 11–14, 34–39). The sustaining of this folk religion was facilitated, first and foremost, by the remoteness of the region. Well into late 19th century, priests' visits to many areas were rare, which encouraged people's initiative, self-directedness, and interpretative activity with respect to religion (Laitila 1998, 384, 388, 393–395; Stark 2002, 36–37).

The 19th century saw the rise of nationalism in Europe.[7] One front where the interests of the nationalistically minded Finnish and Russian administrations clashed openly was Border Karelia. From a nationalistic point

7 In Finland, a central catalyst for the process of carving out a distinct national identity was the publication of *Kalevala* (first edition 1835), a compilation of epic poetry collected mostly

of view, the identity of Border Karelians was contestable: their religion was seen to connect them to Russians, their language to Finns (Laitila 1998, 387–393; see also Hämynen 1995). Simultaneously, the idea of a Finnish Orthodoxy distinct from Russian Orthodoxy gained ground among the Finnish speaking Orthodox clergy. This propelled the founding, in 1885, of the Brotherhood of Ss. Sergius and Herman, a home mission dedicated to the education of the Finnish Karelian Orthodox (Laitila 2006, 159–160).

After the October Revolution, in December 1917, Finland declared independence. The administration of the newly independent republic considered it important to secure the allegiance of the Orthodox minority to the state. Thus, in 1918, the Orthodox Church received a standing similar to that of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. In 1923, moreover, the Church severed its ties with the Patriarchate of Moscow and joined the canonical jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople (Loima 2004, 159–162). During the 1920's and 30's, different aspects of Church life underwent a process of nationalization. Also the Julian calendar was abandoned in favor of the Gregorian one, as used by the Lutheran Church; a change that caused controversy in some Border Karelian parishes (Laitila 2006, 161–165; Loima 2004, 150–178).

In the first decades of independence, parish life in Border Karelia intensified. Furthermore, the Brotherhood of Ss. Sergius and Herman invested in Sunday schools, lay association gatherings, festivals, and publishing activity (Koukkunen 1982, 48–55; Laitila 1998, 402–404). These activities, however, proceeded hand in hand with the secularizing influences of modernization. In addition, after independence the eastern border was closed, which cut off Border Karelians' contacts with their Orthodox neighbors in Soviet Karelia. At the same time, Lutheran presence in the area grew due to increasing migration from other parts of Finland (Laitila 2006, 165; Laitila 1998, 395, 402–406).

The Winter War began on November 30th 1939, when the Red Army invaded Finland in the Karelian Isthmus, and lasted until March 1940. In the 1940 Peace of Moscow, Finland agreed to cede to the Soviet Union most of Finnish Karelia (Jutikkala and Pirinen 2003, 436–444). The Continuation War began in late June 1941, a few days after the German onslaught on the Soviet Union. Finnish troops quickly advanced beyond the pre-war borders and occupied large areas of Soviet Karelia. After almost three years of stagnated war, in June 1944, the Soviets began a heavy attack on the Karelian Isthmus and forced Finnish troops to retreat. In the Armistice of Moscow in September 1944 (the terms of which were confirmed in the Paris Peace Treaties in 1947), the border of the

---

from Russian Karelia. Karelia received a mythical status as a land where the ancient, authentically Finnish culture and religion could still be encountered (Sihvo 1999).

1940 treaty was mostly reconfirmed: Finland lost virtually all of the Karelian Isthmus, Ladoga Karelia, and Border Karelia, as well as the area of Petsamo in Lapland, and parts of the municipalities of Salla and Kuusamo in north eastern Finland (Jutikkala and Pirinen 2003, 444–456).

Immediately when the Winter War started, residents of Karelian borderlands had to leave their homes ahead of advancing Soviet troops. They were evacuated in chaotic circumstances to other parts of Finland. In parts of Border Karelia, for instance, people had only an hour to prepare – and the residents of some easternmost villages not even that much, as they were stranded behind enemy lines and spent half a year in internment in Soviet Karelia (Hämynen 2008, 28–29; Kirkinen, Nevalainen, and Sihvo 1994, 436–439). After the peace treaty was signed, the remaining residents of ceded areas were given a few weeks to relocate. However, the continuing warfare in Europe, and the tightening of cooperation between the Finnish and German governments, gave Karelians hope that their home areas could still be reclaimed (Hämynen 2008, 31–35; Raninen-Siiskonen 1999, 12–13).

For the Finnish Orthodox Church, the terms of the 1940 peace treaty were harsh. The Orthodox heartlands in Border Karelia were left on the wrong side of the border. Two-thirds of the Orthodox population, about 55,000 people in total, were among the displaced Karelians. 17 of the 28 Orthodox parishes had also been evacuated, as well as all four Orthodox monasteries. It has been calculated that the Church lost about 90 percent of its wealth in the Winter War (Koukkunen 1982, 34, 59; see also Husso 2011, 36–51). During 1940–41, the evacuated parishes continued to function in new circumstances as best they could. When Finnish Karelians began returning to their old homes in the autumn of 1941, Orthodox parishes were quick to follow (Koukkunen 1982, 62–64, 70–73; Laitila 2006, 165–167).

In June 1944, evacuations were necessary once again. This time around, they were permanent. In 1950, the evacuated Orthodox parishes were abolished, and new ones were established in the areas where Orthodox Karelians had resettled. Gradually, churches and other facilities essential for the functioning of the new parishes were constructed, funded by the state (Koukkunen 1982, 123–129; see also Husso 2011, 52–148). Nevertheless, throughout the first post-war decades the Orthodox Church had a hard time providing services for its members. There was a shortage of Orthodox infrastructure, priests, and qualified teachers of Orthodoxy as a school subject (Koukkunen 1982, 100–129; Laitila 1998, 412–413; see also Kananen 2010, 162–189). Overall, the hardships caused by the war took a severe toll on the Orthodox community and its self-esteem. During the first post-war decade, the Church lost almost ten

percent of its members (Huttunen 2002, 197–198; Kärkkäinen 1999, 204, 209; Laitila 2006, 168–169).

The evacuees from all ceded areas amounted to 430,000 people, about 11 percent of the country's total population. About 407,000 of these were Karelians (Sallinen-Gimpl 1994, 12). In 1945, the Finnish government enforced a land acquisition act that guaranteed arable land to those evacuees whose pre-war subsistence had come from agriculture. The resettlement plan took into account the ecological and social conditions of the evacuees' pre-war surroundings (Kirkinen, Nevalainen, and Sihvo 1994, 470–478). In the plan, Border Karelians were mainly placed in North Karelia and North Savonia. Although the resettlement area was geographically unified, it was so vast that the population was scattered very widely (Hämynen 2008, 39).

The evacuees experienced the full range of treatment from the local population. Initially, they were often assigned housing in private homes, which created a ground for conflicts as well as close bonding. Later on, strain was caused by the implementation of resettlement strategies: part of the land given to evacuees was confiscated from private owners (Hämynen 2008, 39–41; Kirkinen, Nevalainen, and Sihvo 1994, 473–474). Cultural differences between newcomers and locals were marveled at by both parties (Sallinen-Gimpl 1994). In the end, evacuees often had no choice but to adapt to the ways of their new home areas.

The greatest cultural rift was between the Orthodox evacuees and the Lutheran locals. The post-war atmosphere emphasized national homogeneity, and the Orthodox religion was often regarded with suspicion, as something Russian. For the Orthodox evacuees, the pressure to fit in with the majority was great. Consequently, many distinguishing features of Orthodoxy lost at least some of their importance during the first post-war decades (Hämynen 2011, 216–218; Heikkinen 1989, 326–334; Kananen 2010, 63–101, 190–196; Raninen-Siiskonen 1999, 162–165). Nevertheless, the dominant discourse concerning the resettlement emphasized how the whole process went smoothly. As Heli Kaarina Kananen (2010, 17–20, 66–68) has argued, the negative experiences of the Orthodox evacuees were not given due treatment at the time, because they did not fit together with the ideal of a unified and harmonious nation propagated in resettlement narratives. The issue of discrimination against the Orthodox has received serious attention in academic research only relatively recently (e.g., Kananen 2010; Raninen-Siiskonen 1999; see also Hämynen 2008).

In the 1960's, the public image of the Orthodox faith, as well as the self-esteem of the Orthodox community, began to ameliorate. The change was due to growing contacts with different cultures and the overall unravelling of the

homogeneous national culture (Laitila 2009, 343–347; Laitila 2006, 169–170; see also Kananen 2010, 215–254). Furthermore, by that time the Orthodox Church had mostly concluded its rebuilding process, and was thus able to direct energy from its core functions to other pursuits (Koukkunen 1982, 134, 140; Laitila 2006, 170–173). These included the promotion of knowledge of different features of Orthodox culture, such as iconography and pilgrimage, among the Church's membership and, to some extent, even the general public (Huttunen 2002, 198–199; Sidoroff 1984, 30–32). In the 1970's, moreover, the functioning of the New Valamo monastery (named after the original Valaam monastery situated on an island in Lake Ladoga, evacuated during the Winter War) was improved by the construction of a new main church. The monastery began to attract more visitors, and the brotherhood new members (Martikainen and Laitila 2014, 164).

During the first post-war decades, the Orthodox Church was still very much a Karelian Church. Over time, the connection between Orthodoxy and Karelianness has diminished. Since the 1970's, however, some features of ethnic Karelian Orthodoxy have become the target of projects of revivification. In addition, some Karelian Orthodox customs have been taken up by the tourism industry – particularly to represent North Karelia, the exotic east of present-day Finland (Martikainen and Laitila 2014, 172–173; Paasi 1995, 128–132; Petrisalo 2001, 64–106; Raivo 1996, 205–238).

Over the course of time, the standing of Orthodox Christianity in Finland has become more and more stable. For example, around and after the turn of the 21st century, the Church has enjoyed mostly (although not entirely) positive publicity in the media (see Laitila 2015).[8] In present-day Finland, Orthodoxy is commonly viewed as part and parcel of the increasingly multicultural, multivocal, and heterogeneous Finnish culture (see Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2003, 144–145; Martikainen and Laitila 2014, 170). At the same time, Lutheran influence is evident in the organization, functions, and policies of the Church (Laitila 2009, 342–343; Laitila 2006, 174–175; Sidoroff 1984, 29–30). In comparison with other Eastern Orthodox Churches, the Finnish Church thus appears more liberal and open to modern influences (e.g., Binns 2005, 23; McGuckin 2008, 74).

---

8 Unlike its Evangelical Lutheran counterpart, the Orthodox Church has not actively participated in public discussions concerning ethical issues (Jääskinen 2006, 271–274; Laitila 2006, 175). Thus, while the Lutheran Church has, in recent years, gotten tangled in several public debates concerning, for example, the rights of sexual minorities, the conservative views of the Orthodox Church have not received similar attention (see Laitila 2015; Moberg and Sjö 2012, 86–89).

Membership in the Finnish Orthodox Church decreased throughout the second half of the 20th century. Whereas in 1940 there had been 80,000 Orthodox, in 1960 Church membership was down to 69,000, and in 2000 to 57,000 (Hämynen 1996b, 27; Huttunen 2002, 198; Statistics Finland 2015b). However, since then, the Orthodox population has risen slightly. In 2014, the Church had 62,000 members, 1.1 percent of the total population (Statistics Finland 2015b). This increase is mainly due to two factors: migration and conversion to Orthodoxy. Ever since the 1970's, the number of individuals joining the Church has exceeded that of individuals leaving it (Nguyen 2007, 123–124; see also Ortodoksinen kirkko 2016). Moreover, since the 90's a crucial factor in keeping up this trend has been immigration from Russia and Eastern Europe. Thus, in 2009, already 11 percent of the Church's members were foreign-born (Martikainen and Laitila 2014, 166–167).

Finally, throughout the second half of the 20th century, the regional composition of the Orthodox Church was greatly affected by urbanization (Paukkunen 1989, 19, 23–25; Sallinen-Gimpl 1994, 25–26). In 2015, one-third of the Finnish Orthodox belonged to the parish of Helsinki (Ortodoksinen kirkko 2016). However, the provinces of North Karelia and North Savonia continue to boast the highest density of Orthodox, over two percent of the total population throughout the area (Hämynen 2011, 206–215; Kärkkäinen 1999, 199, 209; Raivo 1996, 170–174, 179–180).

Orthodox-Lutheran Marriages in Post-Second World War Finland

Marriages between Orthodox and Lutherans have occurred in Karelia for centuries. However, it was not until the first decades of the 20th century, as industrialization brought more and more Lutherans to Border Karelia, that their number grew to include a significant proportion of all Orthodox marriages (Hämynen 1996a, 105–109). After the resettlement of Karelians to other parts of Finland, the number of these so-called mixed marriages rose to unprecedented heights.[9] In the 1950's, almost 90 percent of all the marriages of Orthodox Finns

9 The term "mixed marriage" (*seka-avioliitto*) denotes a marriage between two people who differ from each other in some way considered meaningful in a given culture (Breger and Hill 1998, 7). I use it to refer to marriages between Orthodox and Lutheran Finns. The term can be criticized for its negative connotations and for being too vague. However, as it is generally used of Orthodox-Lutheran marriages within the Finnish Orthodox community, and did not receive criticism from the informants, I have decided to use it here.

In Orthodox Christianity, mixed marriages are a theologically problematic issue. According to Orthodox canon law, marriages between Orthodox and non-Orthodox Christians are prohibited (Patsavos and Joanides 2000, 434–437). Faced with the worldly reality of interchurch

were to Lutherans, and the percentage stayed essentially the same for the rest of the century (Hämynen 1996a, 95; Huotari 1975, 12; Merras 1993, 87).

The tight intertwinement of the Orthodox minority with the Lutheran majority has been an important factor in the life of the Finnish Orthodox community ever since the Second World War. Most crucially, mixed marriages have had major effects on the constitution of the community. They were the central reason behind the drop of Orthodox Church membership rates throughout the latter part of the 20th century, for most children born of mixed marriages were baptized into Lutheranism (Huotari 1975, 90, 225; Kananen 2010, 179–183; Makkonen 2011, 278–280, 298–305). In addition, marriage to a Lutheran led many Orthodox, especially women, to convert to the Lutheran faith.

According to the 1922 law on the freedom of religion, in place until 1970, a child was to follow the father's religious affiliation unless the parents agreed otherwise in a written statement (Uskonnonvapauslaki 1922). In many parts of the country, it was quite common to make such statements in favor of the Lutheran Church (Huotari 1975, 164; Kananen 2010, 202–204; Piiroinen 1978, 62–63). Children with Orthodox fathers were baptized into Lutheranism, because the Lutheran mother was adamant, or because the Orthodox father thought it better for the child to become a Lutheran. The all-time low point for Orthodox baptisms was right after the Second World War. In the 1940's, only about 17 percent of the children from Orthodox-Lutheran marriages were baptized into the Orthodox faith (Huotari 1991, 29; Huotari 1975, 158–165). By the 1970's, the percentage had risen to 30.

In 1969, the law on the freedom of religion was reversed so that, from 1970 onwards, a child was to follow the mother's religious affiliation unless otherwise decided by the parents (Laki uskonnonvapauslain muuttamisesta 1969). This did not significantly alter the statistics concerning the total percentage of Orthodox baptisms (Huotari 1975, 162, 171–172). The amendment was, in any case, significant. The previous practice had created a situation in which most Orthodox children grew up with Lutheran mothers, whereas Orthodox mothers had Lutheran children, and this had been seen to constitute a problem for the building of Orthodox consciousness among youth (e.g., Lehmuskoski 1979, 327; Merras 1993, 97–99; Piiroinen 1980, 25–26).[10]

marriages, the Finnish Orthodox Church has conceded to follow a non-categorical interpretation of the canon law as regards them (Hämynen 1996a, 95; Merras 1993, 88–93).

10 In the 1990s, choosing the Orthodox affiliation for children born in mixed marriages finally became as common as choosing Lutheranism (Huttunen 2002, 198). The current law concerning the freedom of religion, dating from 2003, reads that parents are to decide on the child's religious affiliation together (Uskonnonvapauslaki 2003).

In light of the above information, it is possible to compare the religious affiliations of the children of the Orthodox women of my study to the legislation in place at the time of their birth. Of the 18 informants with children with a Lutheran husband, 14 gave birth to all their children before 1970. In all these marriages, save for one (the exception mentioned in the section on the interviewees), the children were originally baptized into the Lutheran faith. Two of the women gave birth to all of their children after the law changed. The children of these two were, nevertheless, baptized into Lutheranism after the father. Finally, two women had their older children before and their younger children after the law reform. In one of these families, the younger children were also baptized into Lutheranism, whereas in the other they were baptized into Orthodoxy.

In his dissertation *Ortodoksin ja luterilaisen avioliitto* (Orthodox-Lutheran Intermarriage), theologian Voitto Huotari (1975; see also 1991) investigates Orthodox-Lutheran marriages in Finland. The study, based on the quantitative analysis of interviews of married couples, paints an interesting picture of the dynamics within mixed marriages during the first post-war decades. In Huotari's (1975, 9, 56, 132, 180–181) material, the co-existence of the Orthodox and Lutheran faiths in one family often resulted in a bias towards the majority tradition. The Orthodox spouses, that is, experienced a push to adapt to the customs of their Lutheran partners. Moreover, Huotari's analysis also shows that a large part of the religious activities of the families were usually dictated by the affiliation of the children. As Lutheranism was the affiliation of choice for the offspring of most couples, this trend further reinforced the bias towards Lutheranism.

Huotari's research includes also interesting observations concerning gender. According to his analysis, women in mixed marriages were both more prone to overall religious interest and more ready to adapt to their spouses' religion than men (Huotari 1975, 150–157). Huotari's sample includes, on the one hand, twice as many families that were oriented solely towards the husband's denomination than families oriented towards the wife's denomination. On the other, it was not infrequent for the wife to be the sole religiously active partner in a marriage, attuned to both religions. Of all the parties of these marriages, Orthodox women were particularly likely to resign their own practices in favor of Lutheran ones. They, in fact, appeared to be even more interested in Lutheranism than their Lutheran spouses (Huotari 1975, 138–140). Although Huotari does not make this explicit, it is clear that Orthodox women's special relationship with Lutheranism is related to the Lutheran affiliation of their children. This interpretation is further legitimated by yet another facet of Huotari's (1975, 112, 172–173) analysis: in his material, mothers were more active in the religious upbringing of children than fathers.

All in all, Huotari's (1975, 225) conclusion is that mixed marriages had a Lutherinizing effect on Orthodoxy in Finland. Marriage to a Lutheran loosened Orthodox individuals' ties to traditional Orthodox practices and beliefs (Huotari 1975, 112–125). This finding has recently been taken up by Marja-Liisa Honkasalo (2015) in her ethnographic study of North Karelian Orthodox Christian women in interfaith marriages. In this study, she argues that such marriages were particularly challenging for the belief system of Orthodox women, since their traditional religious role was so centered on the home as a sacred space. Not being able to perform this role fully could result in a chronic state of ambiguity and crisis, and a sense of being failed as an Orthodox practitioner (Honkasalo 2015, 86).

Above, I have produced a brief outline of the religious and social environment within which the women of my study had, over the course of their lives, practiced religion. This overview describes selected features of the Finnish religious field. In addition, it provides information concerning the social trajectories of particular groups of people in 20th and 21st century Finland: women of the inter-World War generation, Orthodox Christians, displaced Karelians, and women in Orthodox-Lutheran marriages. This background information is crucial to understanding the habitus of these groups of people – and, ultimately, that of my interviewees (see Bourdieu 1984, 123–124).

CHAPTER 4

Everyday Religious Practice

Religious Practice and Domestic Surroundings

Soja was a lively 80-year-old woman from Lahti, a large town about a hundred kilometers north of Helsinki. She lived in a slightly rundown wooden house, one of the so-called veterans' homes, detached houses of a standard model built by the thousands in the first years after the Second World War. She and her late husband had not built the house themselves, but had moved there in the 1950's. When I arrived, Soja served me warm vegetable soup and sandwiches, stating that it was typical Lenten food; it was February. She explained that when preparing food she always tried to take into account the great fast, but added that dietary restrictions did not, in fact, apply to old people. "I guess I have to concede, at this age, that I belong to that category," she laughed.

The furnishings of Soja's house were a cozy mixture from different decades. On the walls of her living room, kitchen, and bedroom she had hung numerous paintings, decorative plates, and photographs. There were home altars with icons in a corner of all three rooms. The living room was dominated by a massive bureau on top of which stood at least a dozen framed photographs of children and grandchildren. On several occasions during our interview, Soja got up from the living room couch and went over to one of the photographs or icons, showing me a picture of one family member or another, or perhaps an icon she had been talking about. The first such occasion came early in the interview, when I asked her to describe her religiosity. She responded by taking me to an icon that she had inherited from her parents.

Helena: Could you, to begin with, like... describe with your own words, what kind of Orthodox Christian you are? How would you define or describe yourself?

Soja: I'm an ordinary Orthodox [woman]. I've learned this Orthodoxy since I was a child. There, in my kitchen, is the icon we had in our home. It's a largish icon, (...) Saints Sergius and Herman of Valaam. It was placed in a corner like that, with a box where we had candles and other stuff. It was there in the corner of the main room. And in the

© HELENA KUPARI, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004326743_005
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License.

> other room we had another icon. Every morning when I woke up I saw my mother make the sign of the cross and pray in front of this icon, before she began her chores. I always woke up to that.[1]

When approaching or touching an icon, Soja made the sign of the cross. I asked her about it, and she noted: "You should always do it. Always. Well, I don't necessarily always remember, but anyway. The sign of the cross is important." Moreover, at one point in the interview, while she was showing me the icons in her bedroom, she suddenly turned to me and asked if I had an icon. I told her that I did, and she continued by asking whether I would like to have another, offering me a small travel icon of Sergius and Herman that she was holding in her hand. I thanked her and took it, surprised as well as touched.

Lived religion consists of practice. In this chapter, I discuss the present-day religious practices of the evacuee Karelian Orthodox women, analyzing their accounts concerning their religious activities to trace the effects of these activities on their habitus. There are several reasons for beginning the analysis with an examination of the interviewees' present-day practices. For one thing, the focus enables me to illustrate, in the different sections of this chapter, the reciprocal dynamic between practices and habitus. In theories of practice, this dynamic is considered central to the very formation of the social world; as a demonstration of its basic functioning, the chapter constitutes an apt of introduction to the overall analysis. Furthermore, the focus also emphasizes the primacy of the present in my discussion as a whole. This book is, essentially, about the religion and the habitus of the women at the time of the interviews. While I spend entire chapters on the past, the ultimate goal is always to disclose something related to the women's religion in the present. According to my theoretical approach, after all, reconstruction of history is necessary to understand present-day habitus. In light of this overall interest, the only appropriate place to start the analysis is in the present.

The interaction of individuals with the surrounding world imbues it with cultural significance. Human action symbolically constitutes the spatial and temporal environment, for instance, as secular or sacred (Bell 1992, 98–101; Munn 1992, 104, 106). The home is one environment layered with significance through religious practice. As anthropologist Thomas Tweed (2006, 81–82,

---

1 The translations of all interview quotations are mine. From them, I have omitted some repetition as well as any content jeopardizing the anonymity of the interviewees. Explanatory comments are placed in parentheses and missing words in square brackets. Ellipses are indicated with three dots in parenthesis.

93–98, 103–109) has noted, central to religion are practices of dwelling: practices of "housework" and "homemaking." Often, domestic religious activity has a particularly important role in the religion of women (e.g., Sered 1994, 4–5, 151–153).

The home was the primary setting for the everyday religion of the interviewees. At the time of the interviews, many of them were freer to attend activities outside the domestic realm compared to earlier life phases. Some women had reoriented their religious lives accordingly, participating in church functions more actively than before. For those with poor health, however, the home as a site for religious practice had gained in importance. The women's daily activities included such customs as burning candles, reading religious texts, and listening to spiritual music or radio broadcasts. By far the most common forms of everyday practice, however, were praying, making the sign of the cross, and interacting with icons.

Practices related to religious objects are one form of activity through which the home is transformed into a spiritually charged space. All the women had, at the time of the interviews, at least one icon on display in their homes. Often there were several, of different sizes and motifs, sometimes with an oil lamp hanging in front of the icon and a traditional Karelian *käspaikka* cloth (e.g., Arseni 1999, 171) covering the frame. The women, overall, considered icons a standard marker of an Orthodox home (see also Fortounatto and Cunningham 2008, 137). To have an icon was "important" and "self-evident"; it "belonged there like a clock on the wall."

During my visits to their homes, the interviewees took me around to see their icons. When presenting icons, they often focused on the icons' history. They recounted how a particular icon had first come into their family and into their possession. Sometimes, they also explained to whom they planned to bequeath the icon. Icons thus connected the women with loved ones and family history, as well as with the religious figure or event that they depicted. Soja, for instance, described her religiosity by referring to an icon that had followed her from her childhood home and now stood in her kitchen corner. It depicted the Saints Sergius and Herman, mythical founders of the Valaam monastery who are honored as "enlighteners of Karelia" in the Finnish Orthodox Church (Parppei 2011, 32–33, 121, 182). The icon linked together Soja's various homes, home areas, and life phases; in addition, it connected her religious practice to that of her mother.

The women regularly lit an oil lamp or burned a wax candle in front of their icons. Some informants prayed or crossed themselves before an icon daily, while others reverted to these practices on special occasions. The most basic interaction with icons, however, consisted of simply looking at, or "resting one's eyes" on them.

> Tarja: And when I come [home] I glance over; the icons have to be placed so that when you enter through the door there is one that you can immediately spot. So, the last thing before I close the door [in leaving], I look [at the icon]. Then, when I return, I always look [at it] first. It has, the habit has become a thing.

In the account above, Tarja describes her habit of looking at an icon when she is about to go out and when she comes home. Her practice echoes the Karelian custom of making the sign of the cross towards the icon(s) of the home altar whenever entering or leaving (e.g., Keinänen 2010a, 131–132). Through her gaze, Tarja accentuates the moment of entering and leaving home, creates a contrast between spaces, and gives a religious significance to the domestic environment and to her own movements with respect to it. More generally, Tarja's account opens up a view into the small and subtle practices that made up the women's everyday religion.

The interviewees described the impact of icons in their daily lives with interesting expressions. Icons "had power," "gave warmth," and "provided safety." They "guided," "reminded," and "spoke to" the women. These descriptions reflect the interaction between the women's socially informed bodies and artefacts symbolically constituted as able to imbue the surrounding space with otherworldly protection and blessing. Icons created a religious dimension within the women's homes. They oriented the informants' attention to spiritual matters. All in all, they evoked responses in the form of feelings, thoughts, and actions – but only because the women's bodies recognized them and were geared to respond to them.

In addition to creating spaces, religious practice can also create time. Religion, in other words, plays the role of both compass and watch (Tweed 2006, 85). Through religious activities, individuals incorporate and actualize particular conceptualizations of time: measurements, rhythms, sequences, and orientations towards past, present, and future (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 137–138; Munn 1992, 107, 116; Tweed 2006, 91–93). The customs of praying and making the sign of the cross provide examples of how the interviewees' religious practice generated temporal markers and organized their daily schedule.

Praying was the most common and regular practice mentioned by the women in the interviews. The women recounted reciting a prayer, or praying in their own words, before going to bed at night, after waking up, and at mealtimes. In addition, they also prayed whenever the situation called for it – giving thanks to God, "sighing towards the sky," or repeating the Jesus Prayer.[2]

---

2 The Jesus Prayer refers to the short invocation "Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, have mercy on me the sinner" (Kallistos 2011).

As to the sign of the cross, most women crossed themselves at home several times a day. It was especially common to make the sign of the cross as part of one's evening and morning prayers, but the informants could also cross themselves before mealtimes or when entering or leaving the home. Generally speaking, the women seemed to consider the sign of the cross the most basic religious act, a miniature prayer. Moreover, as a blessing it was actively used: one could bless oneself, the home, a trip or any kind of endeavor, food, children, and so on.[3]

The women often emphasized their regular observation of the practices of praying and making the sign of the cross: they were repeated "in the mornings," "in the evenings," "every day," "every time," or "always" come a specific time or place. While this may have been in part about presenting themselves as good Orthodox women in the interview situations, the focus on regularity still carries weight. When repeated throughout the day, religious practices give everyday life a spiritual contour, refocusing the practitioner's mindset according to religious frameworks. Simultaneously, they contribute to bringing about particular moments in time. If one recites a prayer every evening before going to bed, the prayer (along with other such procedures) comes to mark "evening" and "bedtime." In this vein, Anna, for instance, exclaimed: "I think that I couldn't start my daily life in the morning if I wasn't allowed to pray!" For Anna, then, prayer was an integral part of her mornings. Essentially, it made her mornings mornings.

Bodies Sensitized to the Sacred

The constitution of time, space, and whole social worlds relies on the emergence of bodies that can successfully navigate these environments. In and through practice, bodies learn to experience, feel, and act in particular ways. Lifelong participation in Orthodox worship had molded the displaced Karelian Orthodox women's bodies into trained bodies that had the capacity to do religion in Orthodox Christian contexts. One of these contexts was the church.

At the time of the interviews, the most active churchgoers among the women attended the Divine Liturgy of the Orthodox Church several times

3 In the Orthodox Church, the sign of the cross is made by touching the forehead, the waist, and the right and the left shoulders with the right hand, with the thumb and the first two fingers brought together and the remaining two fingers pressed to the palm. The gesture is considered a prayer in itself, as well as a credo, a blessing, and a sign to ward off evil. Often it is described as a threefold blessing: of thoughts, of feelings, and of the labors of the hands (Arseni 1999, 237; McGuckin 2011b).

a month. Other women, however, participated considerably less often, due to practical reasons (such as health and transportation) or personal preferences. In the interviews, participating in the Liturgy came up particularly often, when I asked direct questions about Orthodox practices important to the women. In answering these questions, the interviewees commonly listed going to church as an essential facet of their religiosity. Moreover, those who were not churchgoers often responded by rationalizing their non-attendance. In spontaneously comparing their own behavior with what they thought (I thought) was the norm, also these women acknowledged the central role of church services in Orthodox Christianity (see also Grdzelidze 2011, 127–129; McGuckin 2011c, 191).

An Orthodox church, especially during the Divine Liturgy and other prayer services, was a place where the interviewees felt particularly close to God and in the presence of the holy. In producing these assessments, they may have been influenced by their ideas of how they, as proper Orthodox Christians, were expected to think. Here, however, I take under analysis descriptions that allude to the social formation of their bodies. That is, I start from the premise that, through a history of attending Orthodox services, the women's bodies had become attuned to the church environment, recognizing it as sacred.

The interviewees, in describing the procedure of attending the Liturgy, emphasized its physical aspects: standing, kneeling, bowing, going forward to light candles, kissing the icons, and making the sign of the cross repeatedly. Standing during services makes them a strenuous physical exercise for those with ailing health. The women explained how standing is tiresome; nevertheless, they did not feel comfortable sitting down, even though chairs are provided in churches for those in need. The habit of standing, that is to say, was ingrained in their bodies.

> Elsa: Before, it was considered shameful if a younger person sat, but it's no longer so . . . sitting is allowed. At least I have to wear really comfortable shoes to be able to stand the whole time, it's very tiring . . . but you can sit as well. It's about revering God.

> Raili: [With the sign of the cross] I show deference to the church. When I go there, I salute that I have come. It's all part of respecting the church. You walk quietly, keep a scarf on, and act calm. The sign of the cross locks you to the reality that you're at church now.

In the above accounts, Elsa remarks on the physical side of standing during services, whereas Raili explains how church as an environment produces a change in her overall bearing: in her posture, in how she walks and talks, and

so on. The stances, gestures, and styles of movement described by the women are examples of "techniques of the body," learned capabilities that embody cultural standards and regulations (Mauss 1979, 101, 104; see also Asad 1993, 76–77). In the case of Elsa and Raili, the cultural standard consisted of the idea that God, and the house of God, should be venerated.

The visual stimuli of the icons, the smell of incense, and the sounds of recitations and the choir singing were among the various sensory experiences the women highlighted in their accounts. They commonly described these aspects of Orthodox services by referring to their capacity to arouse feeling. A choir singing could sound so wonderful that "you are chilled to the marrow of your bones," or that "you feel your heart go soft." A church could be so rich with atmosphere that "religion is almost palpable" there. More specifically, church services aroused in the women such feelings as "awe," "reverence," "solemnity," and "devotion." Different sensory stimuli all contribute to the constitution of the space of the church and the event of the Liturgy as separate and special. The expressions used by the women suggest that their bodies recognized these elements, reacting to them in the appropriate way.

The interviewees could also bring up the communal nature of attending the Liturgy as important to the overall experience. Senja, for example, explained: "You pray together the whole time. Maybe that's it. You identify with it, that you're one with the others." Alternatively, some informants noted that the hustle created by the crowd actually made it more difficult for them to concentrate on praying at church.

In addition to the crowd of worshippers, the church building and the progression of the service also manifest the existence of a religious community. Sometimes, the women connected their experiences of the holy to these aspects of the church environment. Auli, for example, described how the age of the church building, and the fact that people have worshipped there in the same way for a long time, give it an "aura of prayer." Moreover, the experience of a continuum of tradition was also enhanced by the personal memories that church visits awakened in the interviewees. In this vein, Raili described how the scent of incense at church always makes her remember childhood church visits: "[As a child, the Liturgy] sometimes felt long. But somehow, what stuck with me was I guess the scent of incense. When I go [to church], I find the scent of incense just wonderful. And it brings to my mind such a wonderful feeling." Also Robert Wuthnow (1999, 69–73) has made note of lifelong religious practitioners' vivid memories of the sights, sounds, and smells of their childhood places of worship.

The above examples show how, for the women, different aspects of the church environment (church architecture; visual, vocal, and olfactory stimuli; physical stances and activities; intersubjective encounters and the sense of

collectivity; as well as the rituals themselves) connoted the special nature of the Liturgy. They marked the occasion as sacred, evoking feelings of awe and respect. The interviewees, on the whole, explicitly commended the Orthodox Church for its capacity to differentiate sacred times, places, and situations from ordinary ones. However, from the perspective of practice theory, the women's ability to experience the holy in Orthodox church functions was a talent acquired through a history of churchgoing.

Embodied religious practices induce in practitioners the skill to perform actions, have experiences, and feel feelings appropriate for the situation in question (Asad 1993, 76–77; Bell 1992, 100). Respect for God, for instance, is not a naturally occurring inner state which you then express by standing in church. Instead, through practicing the act of standing in church the individual as a respectful and subordinated churchgoer is produced. Through such "sacralizing practices" (Martín 2009, 280–283; Trulsson 2010, 63), the women's bodies had sensitized to the event of the Liturgy. They had the ability to respond to the church environment and the rituals conducted with corresponding acts, sensations, and emotional reactions.

The interviewees' "practical mastery" (Bourdieu 1990b, 66, 102) of the practice of participating in the Liturgy is also reflected in their descriptions concerning its effects. They often emphasized going to church as an experience of being reinforced in one's faith. The Liturgy "deepened" one's spiritual knowledge, induced "development" as a person, and offered "nourishment," "strength," and "remedy" of self. These expressions, once again, adhere to common Orthodox discourse. Nevertheless, the women's descriptions may well reflect their genuine experiences. To the individual whose body is attuned to the specific context of Orthodox Christian church life, participating in the Liturgy can be a holistic experience of recognition. It engages and activates one's embodied memories, senses, and capacities as a religious practitioner, acting as a reminder of one's faith.

The preceding discussion, all in all, makes evident how the displaced Karelian Orthodox women's religious customs functioned as world-making activities. The women's actions, in their daily lives and in the church environment, transformed space and time, altering the symbolic structuring of their world. The self, however, is where this process actually takes place. The women's activities constituted "self-processes" (Csordas 1994, 5, 276–277), which organized their senses, predisposed them towards certain ways of feeling, knowing, and acting, and orientated their outlook on the world (see also Mellor and Shilling 2010a, 30; Mellor and Shilling 2010b, 202). In other words, the activities were about the embodied acquisition, reinforcement, and living through of their habitus.

Habitual and Intentional Practicing

In the interviews, the women emphasized the constancy of basic religious practices in their everyday lives. The unproblematic status of these customs was underlined by expressions such as "natural," "obvious," "self-evident," "automatic," and "routine." With these kinds of descriptions, the interviewees suggested that the observation of the practices did not require deliberation. They simply felt like the right thing to do. Indeed, it was not uncommon for the women to express an inherent sense of obligation, urgency, or inevitability accompanying these practices. Senja, for instance, explained that she was incapable of not crossing herself when she woke up and before going to bed: "It's been wedged into my head; I can't help doing it." Toini was on the same track: "You can't make a list of occasions for making [the sign of the cross]. When you need it, it comes naturally."

Senja and Toini describe their practice of making the sign of the cross as something that is not thought through on a discursive level, but depends on their embodied command of particular environments. Both women's accounts can be understood to depict the practical sense guiding their observance. When an individual comes into contact with a familiar environment or situation, he or she tends to experience certain actions as necessary and natural. The experience results from these practices having been a means of past structuring of the individual's habitus. The actions have a "claim to existence," because they are the very form through which the self takes his or her place in this particular environment (Bourdieu 1990b, 53–54). The interview material suggests that, in their basic religious activities, the women relied mostly on their sense of practice. Many of them described these practices happening as if of their own accord. Lived religion, overall, often builds on such routinized practice.

Routines change, however; and the women also spoke of basic religious practices losing relevance. Some customs that had earlier felt self-evident, were no longer so. Instead, these customs were "waning," "slipping," or "melting away." Faina, for example, noted that making the sign of the cross "has almost become an evening duty. Sometimes [I make it] at the beginning of a meal, but I don't always remember. Yes, these customs are slackening!" The expressions used by Faina and others also describe their sense of practice. Only, due to the evolution of their dispositions, this sense no longer signaled the necessity of observing certain customs. That is to say, the women did not necessarily consciously choose to discard a certain practice. After a long enough history of situations that did not support its use, their habitus no longer imbued it with the same urgency as before.

Studies on the religion of individuals whose religious involvement has, in one way or another, changed during adulthood often focus on the active cultivation of piety (e.g., Brahinsky 2012, 229–231; Mahmood 2005, 122–131; Winchester 2008). Through intentional practice, novices work on molding their dispositions to match their new vocation. The goal is to make the chosen way of life part of spontaneous and habitual behavior. The women of my study rarely spoke of this type of conscious devotions. Nevertheless, neither was intentional practice completely alien to them.

One of the main ways in which the women took up the topic of intentional practice was through speaking of remembering. Similar to Faina (above) and Soja (in the introductory vignette), they regularly applied the verbs "remember" and "forget" to describe their religious observation. Some customs they "always remembered" to follow, whereas others they "sometimes forgot" or had "recently started to forget." The interviewees also emphasized the importance of remembering to practice: to pray, to give thanks to God, to quiet down during Sundays, to remember one's deceased relatives, and so on. Through this kind of talk, they acknowledged that the observation of everyday practices did not actually always happen by itself. The emphasis on remembering suggests conscious effort in keeping up religious activities and a religious mindset.

Even the most stable of the evacuee Karelian Orthodox women's religious habits had undergone some changes over the course of their lives. Some customs had been subjected to particularly drastic changes. One such cluster of activities was related to the organization of time cycles longer than a single day. While the liturgical calendar is an important part of Christian worship, religious notions of time do not necessarily hold the monopoly on time-reckoning on a societal level. In pre-modern Orthodox Karelia, the agrarian lifestyle accommodated the major elements of the Orthodox liturgical calendar (Repo 1979).[4] Modern Finnish society, in contrast, is organized around temporal cycles reflecting the demands of industry. Only the biggest of the Christian feasts are included in the civil calendar.

At the time of the interviews, those women who were churchgoers often attended church on Sundays. The women might also follow broadcasts of (Orthodox or Lutheran) church services on TV or the radio, or consecrate church-time by burning a wax candle in front of an icon on Sunday mornings. The interviewees emphasized, moreover, that they were always mindful of

4 The Orthodox liturgical calendar revolves around the differentiation between ordinary time, feasts, and fasts (McGuckin 2011a). Wednesday and Friday are considered fast days, whereas Sunday constitutes a minor feast in itself. The most important annual cycle of feasts concentrates on the Easter mystery. The calendar includes four longer fasts, which all precede important feasts (Conomos 2011; McGuckin 2011e).

Sunday being a "special day." In contrast, when speaking of childhood Sundays, they commonly mentioned a number of concrete activities demarcating the special nature of the day. On Saturdays, the house was cleaned and the family went to sauna. On Sundays, people wore special clothing, ate special food, and suspended all non-essential work. In addition, the family either attended the Liturgy, listened to what was usually a Lutheran service from the radio, or at the very least behaved in a respectful manner during church hours.

The interviewees' descriptions of childhood customs, it must be noted, often conveyed a tone of nostalgia. In addition, for some of them the interview situation was mainly an opportunity to remember childhood religion – a starting point that created additional contrast between depictions of childhood and present-day practices. In any case, the women's accounts point to an important difference. Whereas childhood accounts revealed the regulative nature of concrete practices, in descriptions of the present the focus was more on the awareness of Sunday being a special day.

The diminishing significance of the religious organization of time was traceable also from the women's accounts concerning the annual cycle. While some of them emphasized that attending Divine Services regularly interviewed their lives with the Orthodox liturgical year, others kept an eye on the progress of the liturgical year more cursorily, for instance, with the help of a calendar or the parish bulletin. Overall, even though the interviewees recognized the value of different midweek holidays and commemoration days in creating variation to religious life, their observation was mostly considered an optional extra. The major church holidays, by contrast, continued to provide an annual rhythm to the women's lives.

Easter and the preceding Lent formed the focal point of the year in the women's religious lives. The interviewees stressed that during Lent they tried to go to church more frequently than during other times. Also other practices, such as fasting, demarcated the period as special. Fasting constitutes an embodied disciplinary activity par excellence. Moreover, it is an interesting practice also from a gender perspective, since food preparation in families often lies with women (e.g., Turner and Frese 1999, 346–347). The women's descriptions of the great fast reveal changes in their dispositions between childhood and today, suggesting the evolution of fasting from habitual to intentional practice.

In the childhood families of the women, the Easter fast was observed in different ways. Generally speaking, oldest family members were the strictest in their fasting. The interviewees' parents, however, did not necessarily observe a full-scale fast. While in some families children were required to fast for the whole seven weeks, in others they fasted for Great Week or Good Friday only, or did not participate in the fasting at all. Small children are exempted from the Orthodox fast (Paavola 2007, 29); nevertheless, the women's accounts allude

to fasting practices having already been in a process of change during their childhood. At the time of the interviews, the informants continued to observe Lent in one way or another, but few fasted in the traditional style. Furthermore, those who changed their eating habits might do so just for the duration of Great Week or Good Friday. Like children, the infirm are also spared from fasting, and a few of the women openly counted themselves among this category.

The women often noted that as a child fasting had not been difficult. It was simply about eating the same food as others. At the time of the interviews, however, the informants found fasting challenging. There were so many temptations around. In addition, they lamented that taking into account the eating habits of others – either as host or as a guest – easily made one break fasting regulations. Since childhood, the women had spent several decades preparing food for their mostly Lutheran husbands and children. In the Lutheran Church, fasting regulations are not emphasized in the same extent as in the Orthodox tradition (see Kirkkohallitus 2009, 51).

> Senja: This Easter I had visitors for the whole time, from the other [Church]. At these times, it recedes [to the background], you start slipping. (…) You must cook for those who know nothing about fasting … Then, you slip. But I remember when I was young and worked at a canteen, I spat it out. You have to taste everything [you cook], but it (fasting) was so firmly in the back of my head that I couldn't swallow [the food].

Senja's account illustrates well the evolution of fasting from a self-evident and habitual to a more intentional procedure. In Senja's youth, keeping the fast was what her sense of practice deemed necessary, so much so that she "couldn't swallow" food that went against the diet. At the time of the interview, the priority was being a good host. In the company of people who did not observe the fast, it was often forgotten. Similar to Senja, also other women noted how they nowadays made fewer changes in their diet, and how it required a conscious effort to comply with them – even though the awareness that Lent "was not just any time of the year" had stayed with them since childhood. Some of them, moreover, explained that their fasting consisted solely of a spiritual fast. By this the interviewees meant a quieter overall lifestyle, and particularly the aim of not causing others any harm or bad feelings.[5]

5 The dietary restrictions of the great fast involve meat, fish, eggs, and dairy products. In Karelia, dried fish was part of the diet also during this period (Merras 2006, 85–86). According to Orthodox thought, dietary fasting should always be combined with an overall orientation towards religion (Binns 2005, 137–138; Conomos 2011). The term "spiritual fast" refers to the

The examples discussed here depict the receding role of embodied practices in the women's religion. They describe situations in which the observation of practices was no longer automatic, but had to be consciously willed. Moreover, they indicate a shift of emphasis from practices themselves to an awareness of what the customs supposedly represented. Rather than making Sundays or Lent special times through concrete practices, the women focused on being mindful of the special nature of these times. This suggests that their activities had been affected by a process of metaphorization. Metaphorization, Talal Asad (1993, 78–79) explains, constitutes a development in which embodied religious rituals lose their function as practices geared to induce particular dispositions in the practitioners. Instead, the rituals become "representations of cultural metaphors." The process, Asad notes, makes religious customs more susceptible to displacement, since metaphors are always open to different interpretations, whereas dispositions are rooted in practicing bodies. According to Asad, metaphorization is a by-product of modernization. In the case of the Finnish Orthodox community, however, Lutheran influences have likely accelerated the process (see also Heikkinen 1989, 332–333).

All in all, the interviewees' descriptions of habitual and conscious practice, as well as awareness as a form of practice, betray changes in religious customs. These changes (from routine to intentional and from embodied to mental) can be understood as evidence of the long-term evolution of the women's embodied dispositions, of their habitus. The specifics of this evolution become clearer in the course of the next two chapters where I discuss the historical formation of the women's habitus; here, my aim has been to describe the intertwinement of their present-day practices and habitus. Moreover, when evaluating my interpretations, one must keep in mind that the interview material is a product of the informants' current habitus. Thus, it provides only one verbalized version of the women's past experiences of practice.

Describing "Orthodox" Practice

Previously in this chapter, I have occasionally remarked on the influence of the interview context on the women's accounts. Here, I take under analysis the interview situation as such. My starting point is the idea that the women's accounts bring out some of their practices of speaking about religion: practices that also reflect their habitus (see Bender 2012, 278–279).

---

abstaining from secular pursuits and past-times, and to the adoption of an altogether more austere lifestyle for the period of the fast (Serafim 2006, 11–22).

In the interviews, the displaced Karelian Orthodox women presented a somewhat varying take on doctrinal issues. While some interviewees spoke on the topic with confidence, many were not comfortable doing so. The women in the latter group may have felt that they lacked authority to address such themes face-to-face with a specialist of religion, even though I impressed on them that I was not a theologian (see Bourdieu 1991b, 54–56, 72–76). Sometimes, my questions also problematized issues that for the women were self-evident.

> Helena: Can you describe, what making the sign of the cross signifies or means to you?
>
> Lempi: Both that when you bow you show respect to Christ and to His gospel, suffering, [and] death. And that you kind of receive a blessing on your handiwork and on your human being, thoughts, [and] feelings. It has an immense symbolism.
>
> Katri: Well, what does it signify? What does pressing one's palms together signify for Lutherans? (. . .) I can't explain what it signifies.
>
> Rauha: Well, I don't know. I feel that it means all things. Like when you say "triune God," it [is] something that means all things, yes . . . This is my view.

Above, Lempi speaks confidently of the meanings of the sign of the cross. Katri is somewhat indignant at my question which she finds exoticizing and condescending. Rauha responds by a cryptic comment that the sign of the cross means "all things." In their interviews, both Katri and Rauha expressed an apprehension with regard to doctrinal issues; Katri even noted that an analytic approach to religion was "just like picking a daisy and [plucking] its petals." Lempi, for her part, was one of the more theologically articulate informants.

Verbal interpretations are only one form of knowledge about practices. In fact, practice inscribes the bodies of practitioners with cultural meanings directly, irrespective of conscious reflection taking place (Bourdieu 1977, 94–95). Robert Wuthnow (1999, 165) notes, of individuals who have grown up religious, that they usually have a practical understanding of spirituality. This applied to my interviewees as well. Katri's and Rauha's accounts convey well the difficulty experienced by many of them when asked to interpret customs that they understood first and foremost on the level of the body.

According to Bourdieu (1990b, 102–103; 1977, 17–19, 37–38), formal interpretations of practice cannot capture the actual logic behind the generation of practices. Individuals act following their sense of practice, not explicit

rules or abstract principles. Nevertheless, rules, principles, and grammars are typical ways for practitioners to conceptualize their actions. In this vein, also the Orthodox women explained their practices in the form of rules: "you must," "you have to," "you cannot," and so on. However, these kinds of expressions did not mean that they actually followed the rules they evoked. On the contrary, they often acknowledged that the rules did not govern their activities in the way they, in theory, should have. Elvi, for example, explained: "For instance, when you approach a grave, you make the sign of the cross. And you're supposed to make it when you come inside. But I don't always make it when I come home."

There exists, overall, a copious amount of more or less authoritative interpretations of Orthodox Christian practices. The interviewees have encountered such interpretations at home, in school, in church functions, and in the media. They have been taught them by relatives, teachers, peers, religious experts, and public figures. When explaining their customs in the form of rules the women drew from these different sources. They backed up their accounts, for instance, by stating "my mother taught me," "a priest has said," or, when evoking the authority of theological tradition on a general level, "it is said" or "it is the Orthodox way." Furthermore, reference to existing rules seemed to come instinctively to them. It was how one was supposed to respond to inquiries about customs.

Taken as such, the interviewees' tendency to speak of their activities as rule-governed can be viewed as evidence of their blindness regarding their practice (Bell 1992, 82, 87, 108–109). However, as I established above, the women often acknowledged that their customs were actually more flexible in character than the rules suggest. Moreover, besides citing existing sources they could also take a more reflective, or even questioning, stance towards rules. Toini, for instance, stated: "When I had children, I remember mother saying that I have to go to church to be blessed or something. That after giving birth one was unclean. Well, I rebelled against that, I said that it can't be so."[6] And Vieno reasoned: "I have to be honest and say that the previous home, it was just left, left and left, unconsecrated. But . . . we spoke about it with mother that, well . . . it surely becomes blessed if one attends church regularly and remembers to pray and the like."[7]

6 Toini is referring to the ritual of churching, traditionally held on the 40th day postpartum, in which the mother is cleansed of the ritual impurity caused by childbirth (Limberis 1999, 753; McDowell 2011, 572). According to church historian Ritva Saarikivi (1974, 94), the custom was already on the wane in inter-World War Border Karelia, at least in the region of Salmi.

7 Vieno is speaking of the ritual blessing of the home, conducted by a priest, commonly organized when moving into a new house or apartment (Merras 2006, 77–78; Pettis 2011).

In addition, it was not uncommon for the women to label their interpretations as personal opinions, to distance them from any official discourse. The frequent use of expressions such as "in my opinion," "I find," and "to me" is a practice of speaking about religion that complies with the modern emphasis on individuality. That the focus is on the speaker's point of view does not automatically guarantee that what is stated is a product of thorough reflection. However, many of the women's spontaneous remarks, like Vieno's comment above, indeed testified to their capacity to reinterpret and modify existing grammars of religious practice.

Overall, the interviewees' use of language suggests that they were familiar and could engage with various discourses concerning religion. Their most profound knowledge of religion, however, seemed to have been more practical in nature. In place of all-encompassing, coherent explanations, they dispensed partial and provisional insights into their religious activities (see also Wuthnow 1999, 164–166). In fact, from the women's point of view it was not even possible to produce full-blown verbal accounts of religion, as religion was rather about embodied practice. Thus, many of them were uncomfortable with analyzing their religion overmuch; a wariness that shows, for instance, in Auli's, Martta's, and Sinikka's accounts, below. The three informants' replies to my question about a particularly important Orthodox custom underline how, for the women, religion was not a conglomeration of individual practices. It was a way of life.

> Helena: Well, is there some Orthodox custom or ritual that is particularly important or dear [to you]?
>
> Auli: No . . . Nothing is so terribly [special]. To me, it's a totality. It also always varies what you at any time [prefer] . . .
>
> Martta: It's all so obvious, because you've belonged to it (the Church) since a child. So you can't pinpoint anything.
>
> Sinikka: I can't really say anything to that. Somehow, this is everyday life.

Furthermore, the example above also brings up an important condition of production of the interviewees' accounts. Religious traditions such as Christianity or Islam are not empirically accessible objects (Beckford 2003, 21; Riesebrodt 2010, 19). In the study of lived religion, the realization that definitions of religion and religions are always partial has led to an emphasis on articulated beliefs and practices instead of abstract systems (McGuire 2008, 4; Orsi 1997, 7).

In the interviews, however, I repeatedly spoke of "Orthodoxy" and "Orthodox" practices. That I did not see a problem with this at the time bespeaks of my own majority position within the Finnish religious field. I instinctively viewed the women as representatives of Orthodoxy. Had I interviewed Lutheran women, I would likely not have underlined their affiliation in the same manner.

One way in which the interviewees reacted to my categorization of them as "Orthodox women" was by stressing their church-oriented activities. The focus conjured, in their minds, a normative idea of an Orthodox person against which they measured their behavior. In some ways, then, the setting may have led the women to answering questions as representatives of their religious community, instead of speaking from the basis of their personal experience. Moreover, it may also have discouraged them from mentioning some of their more eclectic practices and beliefs to me.

> Helena: I already told you, and you've probably heard it from N. N. as well, that I've been searching specifically for Orthodox women to interview. So, would you tell me first, or describe, what kind of an Orthodox are you? If you had to describe it somehow?
>
> Lyyli: I'm just a normal person. I don't think at all that [I am] Orthodox, I'm just a normal person . . . Like I said on the telephone, I'm not a believer, but still I don't dare do bad things (laughs). I always try to do good rather than bad.

For some women, my emphasis on their Orthodoxy was clearly baffling. After all, religious activity rarely focuses first and foremost on the conscious performance of a particular tradition. Lyyli's response, her emphasis on her normality, also highlights the orientalism inherent in my question. However, even as some interviewees shunned from my focus on the category of Orthodoxy, others (similar to Soja in the opening vignette) were fully at ease with it. The interviews of these latter women brought out their conscious Orthodox identity. It surfaced partly as reaction to my prompts, but also spontaneously, like with Hilja, below.

> Helena: Could you tell, here in the beginning, a little about your childhood home? And about the kind of family you were born into and the kind of situation?
>
> Hilja: I was born into an Orthodox family. I have an older sister and then there's me and then there are two younger brothers. The family was Orthodox and lived every day like the Orthodox Church had taught.

No single factor explains this variation in the women's accounts. Lyyli's and Hilja's life trajectories, for instance, were fairly similar in that they had been born less than five years apart and had both married Orthodox men. Nevertheless, emphasis on the category of Orthodoxy is a feature of the interview frame that is important to keep in mind throughout the analytical chapters. The interviewees have produced their descriptions and assessments, at least in some regard, in response to my labeling them as "Orthodox women."

In this chapter as a whole, I have analyzed the women's accounts concerning some of their individual religious customs, to illustrate the mutually constitutive relationship between their habitus, religious practices, practices of speaking about religion, and the surrounding environment. The discussion has produced a baseline account of the interviewees' religiosity upon which I build the following chapters. At the most basic level, the women's religion was precisely about their concrete, daily religious activities. These customs sustained also their more elaborate perceptions, appreciations, and experiences concerning religion.

CHAPTER 5

Childhood Religion, Minority Setting

Childhood Religion – "Lived" Religion

The displaced Karelian Orthodox women's present-day religion was a product of history: past practices and experiences. In this chapter, I approach the women's habitus by tracing their religious trajectories from the interview material. I focus on some of the contexts that had profoundly influenced their religious practice, starting with childhood. In the sociology of religion, the impact of the childhood family on the development of adulthood religiosity is often considered crucial (e.g., Hunt 2007, 614–615; McGuire 1997, 53–56). I treat the women's descriptions of childhood religion as evidence of their experiences, for the moment bracketing the possible impact of the interview situation on their interpretations.

The interviewees had been socialized into the Orthodox Christian religion since early childhood. In their childhood family lives, they stressed, religion had played a central role. Those informants who had spent most of their childhood in Karelia often pointed out the self-evident status of Orthodoxy in the overall environment. In this vein, Lyyli noted: "You couldn't think anything special about Orthodoxy; it was a part of life. There was no Lutheranism." Also those women whose childhood coincided with the period of resettlement, however, usually stated that Orthodoxy had had a strong presence within their homes, even if, elsewhere, Lutheranism was the norm.[1]

The women described the status of religion in their childhood environments by connecting it with the overall way of life. Religion was "everyday life," "a way of life," or "part of all action." To signal particular commitment to religion, they might even speak of the "living" of religion. Hilja, for example, remembered her grandmother's religiosity by noting how "she lived her religion so deeply." And Elvi stated, of her grandparents, how "religion lived strongly in their lives." As evidence of the unity of religion and life, the women provided examples testifying to the presence of Orthodoxy in their childhood surroundings: customs, norms, forms of conduct, and so on. According to them, daily religious

1 Maija-Liisa, who had an Orthodox father and a Lutheran mother, was an exception on this point. According to her, the domestic religious life of her childhood family was more tilted towards Lutheranism than Orthodoxy.

© HELENA KUPARI, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004326743_006
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License.

practices were unfailingly observed. Religion, moreover, also functioned as an overarching moral guideline. As the foundation of values and beliefs, it formed the background against which life as such and different life situations were interpreted.

In Bourdieuan vocabulary, doxa is a relationship constituted between the individual and the social world when the individual comes to embody a particular social position inadvertently, commonly through primary socialization (Bourdieu 1990b, 67–68; see also Deer 2008a, 119–120). It describes the unquestioned and taken-for-granted part of the individual's knowledge of the social world. The women's accounts summarized above closely resemble Bourdieu's description of doxa. They describe how religion had formed a self-evident element of the interviewees' childhood surroundings. It was ever-present; moreover, this presence was not challenged or even taken under conscious consideration. Religion was so ubiquitous that it was "nothing special."

Another issue that the women often addressed when speaking of their childhood religion was the process of religious socialization. It was common for them to stress how religion had not been explicitly taught or learned. Kirsti, for instance, described the adoption of "an Orthodox state of mind" as kind of osmosis. According to her, religion "was transferred through skin contact, through the surrounding atmosphere. Not everything in it can be read; a part is transferred to people unbeknownst to them." With these kinds of accounts, the women emphasized that their Orthodox practice was not something adopted through conscious study. Rather, it had been acquired through growing up in an Orthodox environment.

Overall, in describing their religiosity, the interviewees made use of corporeal metaphors. For example, they might note that their religion was "innate" or "in their genes," or that they were "Orthodox by birth." A related expression employed by the women was that they had received Orthodoxy "in their mother's milk." What all these descriptions imply is that their religion had originated before or soon after their birth. Moreover, the informants could also suggest that religion was ingrained in their bodies, an essential and irremovable part of their lives and selves. It resided "in the back of the head," was "part of the skin," or was "stuck to the scalp."

> Raili: Let's say that I've been Orthodox already since before birth. It's (. . .) almost like a gene; it's in you already. So, it feels so hard to imagine, I cannot even imagine being Lutheran. That I'd change to Lutheranism. I think that religion has to, it has to start with the child. That you

> experience having an Orthodox God, even if God is the same for everyone but still . . .

In the account above, Raili notes that her Orthodoxy predates her birth, comparing it "almost" to a gene. With this expression, she illustrates that Orthodoxy is fundamental to her very being. Raili connects this state of affairs to her having experienced an "Orthodox God" in childhood. Generally speaking, it was common for the women to tie their embodied experiences of religion to their childhood religious socialization. Through corporeal metaphors, they described the enduring effects of their childhood religion in their present-day lives.

Raili's description, in many ways, comes close to Bourdieu's understanding of native membership as a mode of partaking in a field. According to Bourdieu (1990b, 67), the individual's belief in the game of a particular field is the highest when he or she is "born into the game." The statement refers to the effects of primary socialization. In any sufficiently stable environment, primary socialization results in a doxic relationship with the surrounding world. It produces a worldview that, lacking options, appears self-evident and natural. The interviewees' accounts of their religious socialization, on the whole, can be read as descriptions of the process of being born into a game. They imply that the women had adopted a religious way of life automatically. They also depict childhood religion as a taken-for-granted part of life, thus suggesting an embodied experience of harmony between native habitus and native field. Furthermore, the corporeal metaphors used by the informants to describe their present-day religious practice can be seen to depict the continuing influence of this native layer of their habitus. The metaphors convey an experience of being in possession of deeply ingrained, embodied knowledge concerning religion that was hard to shake off.

The women also approached the native part of their present-day habitus through accounts that explicitly grounded their present religious practice in their childhood. Thus, Esteri, among others, insinuated that the experience of religion as a self-evident aspect of life, realized through habitual customs, had characterized her religiosity since childhood.

> Helena: I'd like to start with a general question: How would you describe yourself as an Orthodox woman? How might you describe it?
>
> Esteri: Well, we were Orthodox at home . . . Our daily rhythm went just like my parents had taught me. In the morning, the first thing was to say a

> prayer, when you had a wash. You crossed your eyes, that is, you made the sign of the cross. Always with the mealtime prayer and after you finished eating, you had to make the sign of the cross when leaving the table.[2] It was like thanks to Orthodoxy. (...) It stuck, the way of the parents. And it has followed me; I've observed [these customs] down to this day.

According to Bourdieu (1990b, 53–54, 60–61), habitus functions by transforming experiences into dispositions. In any situation, the individual's habitus guides his or her reactions based on his or her past experiences of such situations. This pattern creates a built-in tendency toward stability, and a partiality towards early experiences. In Esteri's case, for instance, every subsequent morning prayer was further support for her practical sense that the childhood custom truly was the proper way to start her day.

Judging from examples such as the one above, the women's present-day religiosity remained strongly shaped by their childhood socialization into religion. Often, the interviewees also described their present practices with phrases suggesting a doxic relationship towards the social world. They might note, for example, how morning and evening prayers came "naturally" to them. However, as I have already established, the women's present-day religious activity did not simply replicate childhood religion. On the contrary, many of their childhood customs were no longer part of their lives. The evolution of their practice points to changes in their embodied knowledge concerning the social world.

Memory material always reflects the present significance of the past to the individual in question. The interviewees' memories of childhood religion, produced in the interview context, carried both nostalgic and normative connotations. Through describing childhood religion, the women also outlined their view of proper religiosity. In their parlance, the expression "to live religion" referred to the ideal way of practicing Orthodoxy. When religion was lived, it was so fundamental to the individual's interactions with the social world that everything became part of religious practice. This type of practice acts out Bourdieu's concept of doxa in a profound sense. However, the women virtually never spoke of their own religiosity as the "living" of religion. Instead, they often admitted that their religious practice fell short of that of their devout parents or grandparents. In a more or less outright way, they lamented that the confluence of religion and life was not an easily attained state. One explanation as to why the "living of religion," as a modality of religious practice, was so hard for the women to attain is that their relationship towards religion was no

2 The custom of washing one's face and hands before saying one's prayers in the morning and before mealtimes was common in pre-Second World War Karelia (see e.g., Keinänen 2010a, 125, 129–131; Pentikäinen 1971, 149, 154).

longer simply doxic in character. During the course of their lives, that is to say, their habitus had come to include other layers beside the native one.

Embodied Minority Experiences

I met Faina at an Orthodox lay association meeting where she was one of the women in charge of the coffee service. She enthusiastically agreed to my request to interview her, and we settled on a date then and there. When I arrived at her home, a one-bedroom apartment in an Art Nouveau style building in Helsinki, the first thing that caught my attention was a large map of Suojärvi on the wall by the front door. Faina was eight years old when the Winter War began, and her family had been evacuated from Suojärvi to Alahärmä, in South Ostrobothnia. Unlike many Karelians, the family did not move back east during the Continuation War.

For Faina and her siblings, living as Orthodox Karelians in Alahärmä had not been easy. The local children had mocked both their dialect and their religion, by, for instance, calling them "Russians." Several summers in a row, Faina had participated in camps and festivals organized by the Orthodox Youth Association. "It was the high point of those years, when we got rid of Ostrobothians, and got to be with our own people," she exclaimed. "It reinforced our religion, too."

Faina left home at a young age and moved to the capital, Helsinki. She worked first as a nanny in an upper-class family and later at a hospital, where she remained for almost 50 years. She emphasized that she had never disguised her religious affiliation at work. Rather, she had even obtained special permission from the head of her ward to end her shift early to attend the Easter Vigil. That is to say, Faina had not been mistreated at work because of her background. The same was not quite the case at home, though, for her father-in-law had been heavily prejudiced against Karelians.

Faina's husband was a Lutheran from a village in southwestern Finland, where many had had to give up some of their land to create plots for evacuees. "We were all just damned Karelians to him," as Faina described her father-in-law's attitude towards displaced Karelians. Nevertheless, neither he nor the rest of her husband's family had been against her Orthodox religion per se: "They never demanded that I convert. That was never the case. Many converted because it was the only way to get along [with in-laws]." She paused for a moment, and continued: "Well. Even if they had tried, they could never have forced me to leave the Church."

In pre-war Karelia, some of the displaced Karelian Orthodox women had had virtually no contact with Lutherans, while others had lived in villages with a Lutheran presence. In either case, the evacuations from Karelia changed their religious environs permanently. The situation of the Finnish Orthodox community during the first post-war decade was characterized by material deprivation and the reservations of the majority population. Depending on the informant's age, this period coincided either with her childhood or young adulthood. While the family constitutes the primary source of socialization in early childhood, after reaching school-age children begin to have more and more contacts outside the familial sphere. Accordingly, the women's accounts reveal their growing awareness of the Lutheran mainstream culture during this period in their lives.

The interviewees' overall evaluations concerning the locals' treatment of Orthodox evacuees ranged from "open-hearted" and "respectful" to "disdainful" and "cruel." The appraisals reflect differences in both the women's experiences and their reactions to the interview situation. There was actual geographical variation in how well the evacuees fit into receiving communities. In their accounts, moreover, some informants emphasized positive incidents and others negative ones. Certain story-lines, however, recurred throughout the material.

In post-war Finland, the Orthodox Church and its members were often called *ryssä*, a pejorative for Russian. According to Heli Kaarina Kananen (2010, 84–91), *ryssä*-calling was an activity with which the local population strived to control the Orthodox refugees and to establish a social hierarchy that relegated them to a second-class status. In the interviews, the women often spontaneously recounted experiences of such name-calling, usually dating back to their school years. A few informants, for their part, wanted to clarify that they, unlike others, had not been called *ryssä*. Nevertheless, that practically all the women engaged with the theme demonstrates its importance. It was part of the collective experience of the Orthodox of their generation to have been called names by others.

When describing the post-war context, the interviewees also spoke of the overall mood of the Orthodox population. The women noted how, at the time, people did not necessarily show their Orthodoxy, and how they were sometimes downright ashamed of their religion. While some, similar to Faina, emphasized that they had not hidden their religion, others admitted that they had been affected by this general atmosphere. Martta, for instance, explained: "We had this belief that everyone else is better than us Orthodox, who are down-to-earth and like that. (…) We had to be silent about that *ryssä* faith. That's what pushed us down." Moreover, the informants might also describe how they had learned to suppress their Orthodox practices to suit the various environments in which they represented the minority, particularly at school.

> Toini: [The making of the sign of the cross] became less frequent when we were in evacuation. Perhaps there was some avoidance there, some shyness. When we stayed at a farmhouse living-room as evacuees. It was left to be done in secret; we like shunned a bit from making the sign of the cross. Just like at school. (. . .) It was something, not a thing to be ashamed of, but still we didn't want to show that we did it.

Toini's account describes the shyness and embarrassment accompanying the practice of making the sign of the cross publicly in the post-evacuation context. These kinds of bodily emotions often result from contradictions within habitus. They arise from the sense of being deeply involved in something that, in the eyes of others, places you squarely on the wrong side of the "magical frontier between the dominant and the dominated" (Bourdieu 2001, 38; see also Probyn 2004, 239; Scheer 2012, 204–209). In Toini's case, the contradiction was between the practical sense urging her to make the sign of the cross during, for instance, collective prayers at school, and the practical sense advising her that making the sign of the cross marginalized her within the community. All in all, Toini's account is an example of how the attention that Orthodox practices drew from the Lutheran population took root within the bodies of the informants. Her description does not depict the sign of the cross as doxa, as an unquestioned part of everyday life. Rather, it provides evidence of how experiences of practicing Orthodoxy amongst Lutherans had affected the women's dispositions, adding layers to their habitus.

In his theory, Bourdieu stresses the relative stability of habitus (Bourdieu 1990b, 53–54; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 133). Toini's account, however, shows that in the exceptional circumstances of the evacuations, some women's dispositions with respect to some of their religious activities evolved rapidly. When the surrounding environment is dramatically changed, new experiences cannot necessarily be interpreted in the light of earlier ones, in which case they can have more drastic effects on habitus. One central factor in the flexibility (or rigidity) of habitus is the amount of past experiences it has heretofore absorbed. For instance, as regards the Orthodox evacuees, previous research suggests that older evacuees commonly stayed more true to their pre-war customs in post-war Finland than younger ones (Heikkinen 1989, 326–336).

Besides experiences of being singled out from the Lutheran majority, the women's memories of the post-war years also included experiences of affinity among the Orthodox. Several informants in addition to Faina (in the vignette above) mentioned Orthodox Youth Association camps and festivals as particularly impressive experiences. Lempi, for example, reminisced: "There might be

even a couple hundred of us at one camp. (. . .) Maybe the greatest experience there for many was that we can be many too. That we aren't just lonely recluses (laughs)." Furthermore, the women had also participated in fundraising projects aimed at setting up new churches and chapels, which demonstrated the collective strength of the Orthodox community and reinforced the self-esteem of its members.

Since the Second World War period, the status of Orthodox Christianity in Finnish society has transformed from a stigmatized minority denomination to a respected minority denomination (e.g., Martikainen and Laitila 2014, 164, 172). The women of my study described the present situation of the Orthodox Church as much improved from earlier times, speaking of this change with relieved and amazed tones. Vieno, for instance, wondered: "You wouldn't have believed it! Everyone said that the Orthodox faith would die altogether. Today we're really at the top." Regardless, the interviewees might also imply that the extent of the change had left them baffled. The current popularity of the Church felt "alien," "over the top," even "slightly embarrassing." I interpret these comments to testify to the profound impact that the first post-war decades had made on the women. Habitus is first formed during childhood and youth, and early experiences commonly have a lifelong influence on the individual. As young people, whose socialization to the Orthodox religion was still under way, the women's habitus had been deeply affected by the marginalized status of Orthodoxy during the post-war years. Moreover, in spite of the changed relations between Orthodox and Lutheran Finns since those times, these original minority experiences continued to affect their dispositions even today. In some ways, their habitus remained geared to another kind of an environment.

The informants who admitted to having felt ashamed of their Orthodox practices before usually stressed that, nowadays, the situation was different. At present, they were proud of their Orthodoxy. This change from shame to pride parallels the evolution of the status of Orthodoxy in Finland. Both embodied emotions, however, can be seen to reflect the same state of affairs: namely, the rootedness of the minority status in the women's habitus. They stem from the interviewees' embodied knowledge of distinction and difference with respect to the Lutheran other.

> Helena: In what kinds of situations do you make the sign of the cross these days?
>
> Vieno: Of course at church and at these Orthodox functions at home. Still, at this age, what happens is, or maybe it's a common trend, that when you go out to eat at a restaurant you just make it quickly, [then]

> start to eat. Inconspicuously. However, somehow it feels that you can't start eating without [making it].
>
> Helena: Oh, has this started recently, this restaurant thing?
>
> Vieno: Well, not that recently, but as I got older anyway. And the grandchildren, though some of them may roll their eyes a bit, they're used to grandma doing it, yes.

This account constitutes a good example of the ways in which living in a Lutheran-dominated environment had molded the interviewees' habitus. In the excerpt, Vieno points out several subtle impulses affecting her making the sign of the cross in public. On the one hand, she notes that, as she becomes older, she has become more self-conscious about crossing herself at restaurants. This statement suggests a change in habitus due to long-term exposure to Lutheran culture, to nearly a lifetime of living amid Lutherans. On the other hand, Vieno also explains that, nevertheless, she "can't start eating without" doing the gesture, thus acknowledging the continuing influence of the dispositions she had developed in early childhood.

Additionally, Vieno's account also illustrates how the women sometimes did religion, more or less intentionally, in relation to the Lutheran other. In post-war Finland, actions such as making the sign of the cross publicly became statements of minority identity. In present-day Finland, they still are that, to some extent. This kind of a situation can instill a conscious dimension into practice (see Adkins 2003, 26–27; Akram 2013, 57). Vieno, above, recognizes that her Lutheran grandchildren take note of her making the sign of the cross before eating, and seems pleased that she has familiarized them with the custom. In other words: even as Vieno followed the dispositions ingrained in her habitus, she was also performing her Orthodoxy for the benefit of her grandchildren.

Orthodox Christianity versus Evangelical Lutheranism

So far in this chapter, I have investigated the conditions of production of the interviewees' habitus through a reconstruction of two distinct phases in their religious trajectories. As part of the discussion, I compared their childhood descriptions with Bourdieu's notion of doxa. Their post-war accounts, in contrast, can be seen to depict a situation in which religion has, to some extent, lost its doxic status. These accounts position Orthodoxy as secondary to the Lutheran version of Christianity, and describe the women's embodied reactions to this new hierarchy.

According to Bourdieu, the struggle between orthodoxy and heterodoxy constitutes the opposite of doxa. It informs behavior within any field in which different social actors have developed parallel interpretations of the world and compete over discursive dominance (Calhoun 1993, 79–80). In such situations, the individual's embodied knowledge concerning the social world is challenged by his or her awareness of the existence of alternatives. The individual comes to renounce, in part, his or her doxic attitude towards the social world, and to adopt an orthodox (the dominant discursive position) or heterodox (any contending position) attitude instead.

For the greater part of their lives, the interviewees had practiced their religion in an environment characterized by the existence of alternative interpretations of Christianity. Moreover, the position they occupied within the religious field was a heterodox one, compared to the orthodox Lutheran discourse. One possible expression of a heterodox attitude towards the social world is habitual reflection: an ability to contemplate, in a routine fashion, on the various experienced and articulated differences in one's social surroundings (Adkins 2003, 34–35; see also Bourdieu 2000, 163). The women's capacity and tendency to make comparisons between Orthodox Christianity and Evangelical Lutheranism can be regarded as an example of such reflection. It was a feature of their habitus, and an effect of their history as religious practitioners in Lutheran-dominated Finland.

The juxtaposition between Orthodoxy and Lutheranism was present in the interviews on many levels. My questions repeatedly positioned the women as representatives of Orthodoxy. I also explicitly asked them about the differences between Orthodoxy and Lutheranism. Furthermore, it was important to most informants to learn of my religious affiliation. They were thus conscious of producing their accounts to a Lutheran audience. Nevertheless, my overall impression was that the interviewees did not need to be coaxed into making comparisons between Orthodoxy and Lutheranism. On the contrary, such comparisons came easily to them.

In the interviews, it was common for the women to describe Orthodox Christianity by opposing it with Lutheranism. The women might, for instance, contrast the age and stability of Orthodox practices and teachings with what they viewed as Lutheran instability. Based on this difference, they deemed Orthodox traditions more authentic compared to Lutheran ones.[3] Senja, for example, noted: "[Orthodoxy] is such an old religion. It has held on to all those

3 When the women spoke of the traditionalism of Orthodoxy, they made use of an existing discourse within the Church. In the post-war context, the emphasis on the old age of Orthodox Christianity became one of the tactics with which Finnish Orthodox clergy countered challenges to the identity, beliefs, and practices of the Church (Kananen 2012, 47).

[teachings] since the early times. (…) When the Lutheran Church turns two thousand years old too, it probably doesn't lose its [way] anymore. Like an old person, it gains life experience."

Moreover, when describing Orthodoxy, the interviewees often also remarked on the tone of Orthodox services, rituals, and other functions. Orthodox ritual life was mentioned to be "rich" and "multiform," the message of Orthodox services was depicted as "tolerant," "forgiving," and "bright," and the overall atmosphere in church functions was described as "unreserved" and "free." When making these kinds of assessments, the women underlined their argument by stressing how different the atmosphere was in the Lutheran Church. Lutheran services and rituals were seen to be "boring," "plain," "stiff," and "bleak," and the tone of Lutheran church functions "glum," "severe," and even "cruel." However, often the interviewees made sure to note that the Lutheran Church was no longer as strict as it had been during their youth.[4]

The interviewees also used comparisons when describing specific Orthodox customs and beliefs. One way of establishing a comparative perspective was to remark on what the Lutherans thought of a certain Orthodox practice. In this vein, the women reflected on Lutherans' (former) disapproval of certain Orthodox practices. For instance, they might note how, in post-war Finland, the Orthodox were sometimes called image-worshippers (*kuvainpalvoja*) due to them keeping and revering icons (see Kananen 2010, 73–76). Alternatively, it was also common for the informants to remark how, nowadays, also Lutherans did this or that: made the sign of the cross, kept icons, or prayed for the dead as part of their church services.[5] For some of them, the reference to Lutherans "doing it too" functioned as an additional justification of a particular practice.

4 When speaking of the forgiving atmosphere of Orthodox services compared with the severity of Lutheran ones, the women were describing the message on the sinfulness of man communicated in these services. There are certainly differences between mainstream Lutheran and Orthodox interpretations of this topic (see e.g., Ware 1964, 224–229); however, the accounts also reflect the impact of Pietistic Revivalism on Finnish Lutheranism during the first half of the 20th century. Revivalist teachings emphasize the wickedness and incompleteness of all human beings, and the importance of repentance and reform (Heininen and Heikkilä 1996, 170–176; Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 50–53). In many of the areas where the Orthodox evacuees resettled, the presence of Revivalism was strong. Incidentally, one of the criticisms that the locals of these areas voiced against the Orthodox was that they lacked proper contrition and remorse: their Church's stance towards sinning, that is to say, was too lenient (Kananen 2010, 74–75).

5 During recent decades, the Evangelical Lutheran Church has taken up various practices that reflect its Catholic heritage and resemble those of the Orthodox Church (Kirkkohallitus 2009, 114–115; Laasonen 2011, 39–43). As a result, many customs that were, in the post-war period, seen as clearly non-Lutheran are no longer alien to Lutheran worship.

Since Lutherans approved of it, it could not be wrong. These women, that is, seemed to feel a need to defend their customs when faced with a Lutheran interviewer. Others, in contrast, pointed out changes in Lutheran ways to demonstrate the superiority of Orthodox practices. To them, these changes were evidence of Lutherans finally recognizing the value of Orthodox customs.

My concern here does not lie in the actual differences between the two Churches. With the above discussion I have, instead, wanted to illustrate the contrast with Lutheranism that characterized the women's accounts about the nature of the Orthodox religion. When discussing Orthodoxy, the interviewees were prone to address themes which established a distinction with Lutheranism. Their accounts regarding these themes were, moreover, often more verbose than their other descriptions of Orthodoxy. For instance, they produced theological reflections mainly concerning issues where the interpretations of the two Churches differ, such as icons. All in all, the comparative perspective offered by the Lutheran Church facilitated the women's being able to distinguish and to reflect upon particular characteristics of Orthodox Christianity. It was with respect to Lutheranism that they were able to consider their own religion as, for example, traditional. In this way, their view of Orthodoxy was affected by Lutheranism always being the other side of the story.

In all likelihood, the women's comparisons were partly triggered by my Lutheran background. Living in a Lutheran society had made them competent translators of their Orthodoxy to Lutherans, and contrasting Orthodox practices with Lutheran ones often provided an easy translation. The interviewees could, for example, explain the sign of the cross to their Lutheran interviewer by noting, like Elvi, that "it is something … something that you use to bless. The same as Lutherans pressing their hands together."[6] Nevertheless, such comparisons were not merely about adapting one's discourse to non-Orthodox ears. They also reflected the informants' more general tendency to view their religion in a comparative light. The women, I suggest, had come to comprehend some of their practices and beliefs in part through their contrast with Lutheran ones. They saw the practice of making the sign of the cross essentially also as something that differentiated the Orthodox from the Lutherans, that the Lutherans had recently commenced doing, and that corresponded in some ways with the Lutheran gesture denoting prayer. Therefore, reflecting on

6 When praying, Lutheran Finns press the palms of their hands together, with fingers bent and interlocked. This, however, is first and foremost a gesture of reverence and pleading. Thus, in the *Small Catechism*, Martin Luther (1529/1986, "Daily Prayers") distinguishes between "asking a blessing" with folded hands and "blessing" oneself with the sign of the cross.

the differences between Orthodox Christianity and Evangelical Lutheranism came easily to the women. It was one of their practices of speaking and thinking about religion.

As the examples above show, the interviewees judged certain aspects of Lutheranism quite harshly. While making these judgments, some of the women became aware of their negative tone, and downplayed their criticism by emphasizing their overall respect for the Lutheran Church. Nevertheless, from a Bourdieuan perspective, the women's outspoken comments make for a good illustration of tastes as part of habitus. Bourdieu (1984, 56) writes:

> Tastes (. . .) are the practical affirmation of an inevitable difference. It is no accident that, when they have to be justified, they are asserted purely negatively, by the refusal of other tastes. In matters of taste, more than anywhere else, all determination is negation, and tastes are perhaps first and foremost distastes[.] (. . .) [E]ach taste feels itself to be natural – and so it almost is, being a habitus – which amounts to rejecting others as unnatural and therefore vicious.

Habitus is the product of the individual's internalization of social divisions. In practices guided by the habitus, including classifying practices like the comparisons above, the individual usually comes to reproduce these divisions (Bourdieu 1984, 170, 246–249, 466–469). In some sense, then, the interviewees' tastes regarding religion were essentially about aversion towards Lutheran tastes. They were about reinforcing the distinction between Orthodox and Lutherans, since this difference constituted the most important social division in the women's religious environment. In fact, in the course of the research, I, too, experienced the effects of this same juxtaposition. When analyzing the interviewees' comments, a part of me was strangely offended by them. I found myself silently praising, for instance, the austere beauty of Lutheran churches compared to the forbidding murkiness of Orthodox ones. That is, I became briefly involved in the struggles of the religious field: in the contest, between religious groups, for power to define legitimate religious taste (Bourdieu 1984, 479–481). To me, this reaction came as a surprise. I am, after all, a lapsed Lutheran with merely a cultural connection to the Church.

Childhood Religion versus Conversion

The displaced Karelian Orthodox women's religious environment also included other social divisions besides that between Orthodoxy and Lutheranism.

One such division was brought about by the phenomenon of conversion from and to Orthodoxy. During the first post-war decades, conversion from Orthodoxy was not uncommon among evacuees. The most common reason for converting was marriage to a Lutheran (Kananen 2010, 199–202; Laitila 2009, 342). The frequency of the phenomenon also showed in the interviews, in the long lists of (mostly female) relatives, siblings, friends, and acquaintances who had converted to Lutheranism produced by the women. In addition, some informants recounted how their mothers-in-law had suggested in the early stages of the marriage that they convert, while others (including Faina, above) spontaneously stated that, had they been required to convert, they would not have gone through with the marriage at all.

Conversion was a theme that the women often took up of their own accord. They usually voiced a strictly negative attitude towards conversion as regarded themselves, declaring that conversion "had never crossed" their minds or that they had "never thought about" converting. Siiri, for example, stated: "I've been Orthodox the whole [time], I've never . . . Many people changed to Lutheranism after marrying, but it never crossed my mind. I've wanted to be Orthodox." With these kinds of expressions, the women put emphasis on how alien the thought of conversion was to them. Nevertheless, they often formulated their opinions in a way that took into account the fact that they personally knew people who had converted. In their anecdotes concerning conversion, they empathetically highlighted the overall plight of the Orthodox in post-war Finland.

When confronted with the topic of conversion, it was common for the informants to emphasize the inherent and non-negotiable nature of their religiosity. To do this, they turned to such corporeal metaphors as I discussed in the first section. Soja, for example, asserted: "My Orthodoxy has been sucked from mother's milk and it doesn't leave me. (. . .) In war-time, my cousins among others changed to Lutheranism when they got [married]. Well, I was married to a Lutheran, but it never crossed my mind that I'd change to Lutheranism." Otherwise, the women could also state, or imply, that they were against conversion because it was important to stay true to the religion that they had been baptized into and raised in. They might argue, for instance, that "everyone gets by with her own faith." In this way, the topic of conversion brought to light a crucial component of their overall conception of religion. To the interviewees religion was, ideally and properly, the childhood religion.

Interestingly, this notion of religion was also in evidence in the women's accounts concerning their family members' conversions to Orthodoxy. On the one hand, those interviewees with a child who had converted to Orthodoxy in adulthood usually indicated their satisfaction with this turn of events. On the other, only one woman explicitly stated her wish that her children would

convert. Moreover, some women actually recounted their negative reactions to a family member expressing an interest in converting. In this vein, Katri stated: "My husband was interested [in Orthodoxy], and suggested many times that we transfer our whole family into the Orthodox Church. But (...) I said that everyone can take care of that thing themselves. If someone wants to change his religion voluntarily, he can do that. But I don't [insist on it]." Katri, that is, did not view even her own family's conversion to Orthodoxy as a necessarily positive thing.

In the last quarter of the 20th century, the trends of conversion within the Finnish Orthodox community changed course. Simultaneously as the amount of conversions from Orthodoxy started to diminish, the number of conversions to Orthodoxy rose. According to Orthodox theologian Riina Nguyen (2007, 123–124), since then some tension has occasionally arisen within the community between converts and those baptized into Orthodoxy as infants. Also the interviewees considered the issue of converts versus "native Orthodox" a sensitive topic. It was common for them to make note of the increasing number of converts in the Church; however, whereas some spontaneously remarked on the religiosity of converts, others declined to answer even my direct question concerning the topic. The women could also emphasize that they were speaking of converts "with love," adding that the converts they personally knew were wonderful people.

> Faina: I'd almost say that they are holier than we are. For us, it's all so innate. It has been given to us in our mother's milk. And they have studied it in a whole other way, from books and from examples and such. Yes, their bows are deeper and signs of the cross more devout. When you watch them at church. And for sure they don't come there in trousers like I do, but they have skirts. And black clothes. It's not part of Karelianness to wear black clothes.

Here, Faina recounts her experiences concerning the behavior of converts at church. She makes an observation that recurred in many interviews: converts seemed more pious than people who had been raised to Orthodox Christianity. The women, that is to say, often described converts as more serious about religion, and stricter when it came to the observance of Orthodox customs. In addition, they could find converts to be less tolerant of difference than those socialized to Orthodoxy as children who, in their opinion, were more flexible and humble. Furthermore, Faina's description also identifies the behavior of converts, at least when it comes to the color of their church attire, as non-Karelian. Indeed, one major difference between converts and the women was

that the former did not necessarily express an interest in Karelian customs – even though a significant number of recent converts to Orthodoxy do have some kind of Karelian heritage (Martikainen and Laitila 2014, 172).

When speaking of converts, the interviewees also described conversion to Orthodoxy as an arduous process requiring much work and study. They noted how converts were often quite learned about the Orthodox religion, which was admirable. At the same time, they could reproach converts for their tendency to advise others on Orthodox doctrine and cult based on their studies. Moreover, the women also openly spoke of the limits of "book wisdom" and "abstract knowledge" concerning religion. They were quite skeptical towards the idea that one could ever form the right kind of emotional bond with religion through conscious effort. With these reflections, they expressed their view that religion should, ideally, be acquired during childhood, and not learned from books later on.[7]

According to Bourdieu, the major difference between primary and secondary socialization is that primary socialization always originally results in doxa (Bourdieu 1990b, 67; see also Berger and Luckmann 1971, 136–141). Because the child learns simultaneously to act and to think in the ways of a particular culture, he or she remains unaware of all that is tacitly granted within that culture. In secondary socialization, however, the foreign culture is perceived through an already constituted disposition. It is seen as an arbitrary construct; moreover, it is usually expressly studied. These differences are also evident in the interviewees' reflections describing the religion of converts.

The women's accounts present those who were natives to Orthodox culture as not very strict about the observance of practices. As one informant explained, practice came to them "from within"; in other words, it flowed from their sense of practice. The interviewees' emphasis on the rule-orientation of converts to Orthodoxy, in contrast, suggests that what especially caught their attention were relatively recent converts who were still undergoing a process of re-habituation. Lacking the proper dispositions, these converts were dependent on abstract principles and rules. In the course of time and through emotional commitment, it is possible also for cultures adopted through secondary socialization to become routinized and embodied, governed more by habit than by conscious adherence to rules (Berger and Luckmann 1971, 176–182).

7 Many of the women, nevertheless, had at some point during their adult lives studied Orthodoxy. Maija-Liisa, whose childhood home had not been fully Orthodox, spoke at length of her quest to learn of her "Orthodox roots." The women who had not had the possibility of attending Orthodox religion classes at school, moreover, commonly mentioned how they had later amended this gap in their education by reading on the Orthodox religion.

After reaching this point, the behavior of converts would probably no longer attract the women's attention to the same extent.

Finally, a particularly interesting aspect of the informants' accounts addressing the phenomenon of conversion is how they came to characterize their own religion when confronted with the issue. In the contrasting light created by the phenomenon, they were able to reflect on their religion as a particular type of religion: religion into which one has been socialized as a child. Early on in this chapter, I examined the interviewees' accounts of their childhood religion as evidence of their actual experiences pertaining to the native layer of their habitus. That they produced some of these accounts as part of their reflections concerning conversion does not undermine the validity of the analysis. The accounts discussed here suggest that the existence of alternatives had indeed made the women, to some extent, aware of the native layer of their habitus and of their doxic relationship towards religion. However, the accounts also show how their childhood experiences continued to function as the foundation of their religious tastes, and their classifications concerning proper religion.

In Bourdieuan theory, the existence of practical belief is a prerequisite for participation in any field (Deer 2008a, 121). However, as Mustafa Emirbayer and Ann Mische (1998, 973) note, reflective tendencies can fluctuate in either direction as a result of the increasing problematization or routinization of experience. The Orthodox women's capacities for actively reflecting on their religion, my material suggests, were activated particularly in environments in which they came face to face with different religiosities and ways of life. All in all, their ability to engage with religion with varying levels of awareness speaks of the layered composition of their habitus (see also Bender 2012, 284–288).

Childhood Religion, Pluralistic Setting, and Agency

I conceptualize agency as a product of habitus and a built-in feature of all action (see Emirbayer and Mische 1998, 976, 1004; McNay 2000, 23, 40, 46–47). In this and the previous chapter, I have analyzed the evacuee Karelian Orthodox women's interview accounts for information on the formation of their habitus, and on the outcome of this formation as reflected in their present-day religious activity. Below, I shall identify some of the agentic capacities entailed in the dispositions I have uncovered thus far.

In her research on the life-world of elderly North Karelian women, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo (2015, 69; 2009, 61–64; 2008b, 83–85, 207–210) calls attention to agency embedded in habitual everyday practice. By the term "small agency," she refers to agency as it is realized in women's everyday activities: cooking,

cleaning, gardening, doing handicrafts, socializing with neighbors, and so on. Relying, for instance, on Pierre Bourdieu and the anthropologist Ernesto di Martino, Honkasalo (2008b, 207–210, 216; see also 2015, 70–73) views routine practices as constitutive of basic ontological security. Routinization establishes stable spatiotemporalities which are experienced as protective and safe. In this sense, routine action is crucially important in the life of every individual.

Honkasalo's conceptualization of small agency also provides an incisive interpretation of the everyday religious activities of the women in my research. With their daily, small-scale religious practices, the interviewees achieved quite significant things with respect to their lives as a whole. They constituted an everyday domestic environment in which religion was continually present. Furthermore, the observation of simple and private customs such as praying was one aspect of their religion that had been preserved more or less intact throughout their lives. Although none of them followed childhood practices to the letter, they had been able to adapt at least some of these customs to their different life situations. The practices established continuums with respect to the past, forming layers upon layers of reiterated tradition. To the women, they connoted stability, continuity, predictability, and security in a most potent manner (see also Honkasalo 2015, 77–81).

In her account of agency, Honkasalo (2008b, 212–213) emphasizes that routine action also forms the foundation for more creative activities. One way to view routines as conducive to innovation is through a focus on how the habitus is imbued with capacities for action that are transferrable between contexts.

> Helena: What was that trip (to visit her childhood home in present-day Russian Karelia) like then?
>
> Hilja: Well, since I'm a spiritual person, it meant a great deal to me. I had wax candles with me and I put them and burned them at that corner where we had an icon. (…) All the other villagers wondered how I came up with that. I said to them that this is no invention. This is part of our life, the Orthodox life. To have candles with you when you visit those childhood places and the ruins of your home. I burned those candles there at the ruins. Like … in the memory of my parents and of the home.

In this excerpt, Hilja describes how, when she was on her first visit to her family's pre-war home area in present-day Russia, she performed a small ritual of remembering by lighting candles at the ruins of her childhood home.[8]

8 These trips became popular after the fall of the Soviet Union, when travelling to Russia became easier (see e.g., Fingerroos 2006).

The account is a good example of how habitus, as the effect of past action, generates future capacities for action. For Hilja, it had come naturally to burn candles in the icon-corner of the ruins of her childhood home. For the co-travelers questioning Hilja about her actions, it obviously had not occurred to do the same. I maintain that Hilja's capacity to perform this makeshift ritual stemmed from her active, habitual Orthodox practice which included ritual occasions for the remembering of ancestors and the burning of wax candles in front of icons to mark special occasions. For her, the ritual was daily religiosity, only brought to another environment. Ultimately, Hilja's narrative is an account of the living-through of her pre-formed capacities for action in a particular, singular situation. As such, it fully demonstrates the agentic dimension of routine action.

Besides taken-for-granted routines, the interviewees' everyday religion also included more conscious elements, practices that were about the claiming and acting out of their religious identities (see Leming 2007, 74). I approach the agentic capacities realized in these activities through anthropologist Orit Avishai's description of agency. For Avishai (2008, 413), religious agency is realized in the observance of religious customs. Relying, for instance, on Judith Butler and Saba Mahmood, she speaks of the doing of religion as a "semi-conscious, self-authoring project," as well as a "mode of conduct and being, a performance of identity." Avishai (2008, 423, 427–428) implies that the semi-conscious nature of "doing religion" is due to the heterogeneity of the surrounding social world. From her own research on the purity rituals of Israeli Orthodox Jewish women, she extracts the idea that religious agency can be pitted against the image of the secular other.

Avishai's conceptualization of religious agency as an activity in which religiosity is semi-consciously performed against cultural others fits well with the case of the Orthodox women. The comparisons that the interviewees were in the habit of making are one example of the ways in which this modality of religious practice surfaced in the interview situations. Moreover, against a backdrop of religious pluralism even routine religious customs can become problematized and more of a conscious enterprise, a project of affirming one's cultural self which is experienced as being under threat (see also Orsi 2010, 195; Ortner 2006, 147; Snajdr 2005, 306).

On the basis of interview material, it is hard to say to what extent the women, while conducting their religious routines, were also performing their Orthodoxy, practicing it in relation to others. Naturally, this aspect of their religiosity became operative when they were face to face with those representing an alternative way of doing religion. In these situations, their religious activities could become identity statements of, for instance, their Orthodoxy or their childhood religion. However, I am inclined to think that at least in some cases

the established Orthodoxy of a practice, or its established childhood connection, was important to them also on a personal level.

> Siiri: To end my evening prayer, I always recite: "Surround me, O Lord, with the power of your honorable and life-giving cross, and preserve me from every evil." And I find it so well put, the "with the power of your life-giving cross!" I've said this prayer for a long time . . . I know a lot of evening prayers, but this is one that is connected with Orthodoxy specifically.

In the account above, Siiri speaks of her habitual evening prayer, noting that the particular prayer with which she ends her session reminds her of Orthodox Christianity. Indeed, the prayer in question is recommended as an evening prayer in the Orthodox prayer book (McGuckin 2008, 346; Nyström 2001, 12). Siiri belongs to the majority of my informants who have lived their adult lives as the only Orthodox members of otherwise Lutheran nuclear families. Thus, it is not hard to imagine her evening prayer as a routinized practice through which she connected herself with the Orthodox community. Her evening prayer, in other words, was not just a practice of establishing communication with God; it was also a way of re-establishing her Orthodox identity.

I consider Siiri's account one small example of how the women could direct also their routine religious performances against cultural others. Through their practices of thinking and speaking of as well as doing religion, the women secured their place and position in the social world, reinforcing their ties with particular communities and cultivating a sense of belonging. This is something that happens, to some extent, with all kinds of action. However, the process inevitably gains intensity in highly pluralistic or minority contexts. Overall, I regard this semi-conscious, performative aspect of the women's religious practice as the central agentic capacity brought on by the minority layer of their habitus.

Based on her research, Avishai (2008, 422–423, 428) views religiosity as a continuous project of "becoming" an authentic religious subject through practice. When doing religion, the Orthodox Jewish women of Avishai's study both separated themselves from the secular other and aspired to religious ideals, although never fully attaining them. For the women of my study, such becoming, as an intentional project of cultivating one's subjectivity through pious conduct, was not central to the same extent. Nevertheless, the interviewees did sometimes also reflect on their religiosity with respect to their ideals of Orthodox Christian practice, and not only with respect to religiously different others. One such ideal consisted of the "living" of religion. This idiom, which I

have interpreted as a reference to a thoroughly doxic relation towards religion, captured the women's take on the essence of proper Orthodox practice.

In addition to constituting an expression of the women's religious tastes, the notion "to live religion" is also indicative of their perspective on the particular challenges that their present-day surroundings posed to religious observance. In a pluralistic environment, the capacities of distinguishing between and reflecting on discourses, as well as affiliating with and distancing from them, become crucial to any individual. In the wake of these capacities, however, the individual's relationship towards the social world is unavoidably changed. This was also the case with the displaced Karelian Orthodox women. The surrounding religious heterodoxy had seeped into their habitus, turning into an awareness of their religious activities as only one possibility among others. Such knowledge can become a taken-for-granted part of practices – leading to routinized reflections, performances, and the like. Nonetheless, it often rules out the possibility for actually "living" religion. In the least, harboring a thoroughly doxic relation towards religion becomes an ideal that is much harder to attain.

CHAPTER 6

Mothers Doing Religion

Gendered Habitus and Domestic Religion

Gender is one of the most fundamental social classifications. Bourdieuan readings of gender proceed from the premise that the gendered division of labor is embodied in habitus (Bourdieu 2001, 8–9; see also Krais 2006, 120–121; McNay 2000, 38–39). As part of habitus, gender identity is acquired and enacted largely at a pre-reflective level. It is therefore relatively stable. At the same time, participation in multiple fields subjects the individual to various symbolic formations of masculinity and femininity, for gender is differently entwined into the organization of different social fields (Krais 2006, 128, 131; McNay 2000, 53–57; McNay 1999, 107–108). As a result, gendered habitus is infused with a degree of ambiguity.

The family forms a central site for the production of gendered habitus. Virtually every individual internalizes a certain understanding of the family and the dynamics between family members during their primary socialization (Bourdieu 1996, 21–25). In his work, Bourdieu (e.g., 2001, 85; 1996, 23–24) sometimes speaks of the family as a field, acknowledging the role of the gender classification as its central organizing principle. However, as Lois McNay (2000, 70–71; 1999, 112–113) has suggested, gender can actually be seen to figure in at least two distinct struggles situated within the sphere of the family. First, it affects struggles pertaining to the domestic division of labor. Second, it also influences struggles focusing on the emotional bonds between family members.

Religion as a social phenomenon takes place within the gender order of any given society. Often, religion helps to define and legitimate power relations between the sexes. In most (but not all) cases, official religious discourses and structures constitute women as somehow inferior to men.[1] The lived religion

1 The pan-Christian conceptualization of the relationship between the sexes oscillates between two ideas: equivalence and hierarchy (e.g., Ruether 1987, 207–215). On the one hand, both man and woman are considered to have been created as images of God. On the other, women are often portrayed as inferior to men and even as evil beings, particularly as regards their sexuality. In Orthodox Christian thought, the relationship between husband and wife is seen to be based on the different but complementary roles of the sexes (Kollontai 2000, 166–168). Following Apostle Paul's formulation, the role of man is to be the head, and the role

© HELENA KUPARI, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004326743_007
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License.

of individuals does not necessarily comply with prescribed gender classifications; nevertheless, the religious lives of women and men are intertwined with their socioculturally formed roles, desires, and life trajectories. Women's religious activities have traditionally paralleled women's interpersonal concerns within the context of the family (Cozad 1999, 679–680; Sered 1994, 5, 71–72; Woodhead 2002, 333). They have emphasized women's responsibilities as mothers and as caretakers of the home. During the past 50 years, the distribution of power between men and women in Western societies has gone through marked changes. However, even the so-called gender revolution has not been able to obliterate women's ties to their traditional gender roles (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 55–56; McNay 1999, 103).

In this chapter, I analyze the evacuee Karelian Orthodox women's interview accounts with regard to religion in the adult family (i.e., the family established as an adult) environment. From these accounts, I identify ways in which the women's religious activities structured domestic and personal relations within their families. The accounts depict the women doing religion as mothers and wives; hence, they illustrate particularly well the influence of the interviewees' gendered habitus on their religion. Religiosity in adulthood is built on childhood socialization into religion and gender roles. Nevertheless, habitus continues to develop even during adulthood. In the course of the chapter, I alternate between approaching the women's accounts as evidence of their past practices and social trajectories and as suggestive of their current habitus.

In their adult families, the interviewees seem to have shouldered the primary responsibility for taking care of the home and the children. In the interviews, they spontaneously described juggling between work and domestic duties when their children had been underage. This double burden had taken a toll on their personal religious lives as well. Tarja, for instance, explained: "Marriage and work dominated then. And later on, I traveled a lot at work and . . . Religion receded to the background. I just didn't have the capacity." And Katri stated: "You had no time to think of anything else besides earning your daily bread and taking care of the family." In statements such as these, the women gave to understand that their religious practice had been crippled by external circumstances that they could not overcome.

That childcare fell mainly to the women was also implied in accounts concerning religious practice. Soja, for instance, stated: "When the children were small, I couldn't always go [to church]. I was just here at home . . . and sometimes I took the children with me. But it was difficult." Soja, that is, does not

of woman is to be man's helper. Motherhood and motherliness are seen as intrinsic to being a woman (Limberis 1999, 752; Raunistola-Juutinen 2012, 127–133, 198).

even entertain the possibility that her husband could have looked after the children. Lempi, for her part, remembered: "When the children were home, and I had the chance [to go to Orthodox service] only once a month, my husband was nice enough to stay at home with the bunch." The noteworthy thing about her description is that she does not view her husband's willingness to stay at home with the kids as something self-evident, but as something he was "nice enough" to do. The expression reveals Lempi's gratitude to her husband for doing something that, in their domestic division of labor, was not exactly his responsibility (see also Hochschild with Machung 2003, 19).

The examples above convey the general tone with which the women spoke of their religious practice within their adult families. They, in a word, placed their responsibilities as caretakers of their loved ones before their personal lives. According to previous research, the prevalence of such an altruistic ethos is typical of the life narratives of Finnish women of the inter-World War generation (Kortteinen 1992, 47–48, 63–72; Olsson 2011, 121–125; Strandell 1984, 223–224).

In the interviews, I did not systematically question the women about their domestic responsibilities. The interviewees, moreover, rarely problematized the gendered division of labor within their families. They did not produce comparisons between their workload and that of their spouses, other parents, or other women, or even describe taking on specific tasks as a result of spouse-to-spouse negotiations. Instead, they mostly spoke of their roles as caregivers as a fact that needed no explanation. It therefore seems that with respect to the gendered division of labor the women were not as acutely aware of alternatives as when it came to their religiosity. The matter-of-fact nature of the women's descriptions of their domestic responsibilities reflects the internalization of these responsibilities in their gendered habitus.

Bourdieu (2001, 33–42; see also 2000, 170–172, 177) considers the gendered division of labor a paradigmatic example of symbolic power. According to him, women's practical belief in established symbolic classifications constitutes a crucial feature of their subordination. Since they have internalized the prevalent social order, they cannot but conceive of their position in terms that affirm the hierarchy between the sexes. Many feminist scholars have argued that Bourdieu's theorization of the gender order is overly pessimistic as regards the possibility of change (Fowler 2003, 473–474, 477–478; Krais 2006, 122–124; Lovell 2000, 30–31; McNay 2004, 180–183). Nevertheless, his notion of symbolic power provides a persuasive explanation as to why individuals – including the women of my study – often adhere to symbolic structures that disadvantage them.

In the modern Western division of labor between the sexes, everyday responsibility over religion has, to a certain extent, been assigned to women (Woodhead 2007, 578–579). In the interviews, I asked the informants about their roles with regard to the religious lives of their adult families. The answers established the women as the ones running collective religious practice. Whereas some interviewees mentioned agreeing on matters of religion with their spouses, others noted that there had been no need for negotiation in the first place. Commonly, the women underlined that, as to religion, their family lives were characterized by an atmosphere of "mutual understanding." This consensus was emphasized by women in all-Orthodox and mixed marriages alike. Rauha, for instance, stated: "We, in our family, we had no disagreements as to religion." And Esteri remembered: "Whatever I did, it was ok [by my husband]. There were no difficulties."

The modern Western gender order also construes women as responsible for the inter-personal relations within the family (Bourdieu 2001, 97; Bourdieu 1996, 22; di Leonardo 1987, 442–443; Reay 2004a, 59–61). This responsibility was manifested also in the interviewees' descriptions of the tolerant religious atmosphere of their families.

> Maija-Liisa: After a while, I became fascinated by icons. I wanted to put an icon in our home; we lacked one. (…) I didn't manage to talk about it with my husband; what he thought about [having an icon]. In all quietness, I put an icon on the bedside table, made it just slightly visible. If it was acceptable, I moved it a little higher up, placed it on a bookshelf. And from there, again, a little higher up … Little by little, and always listening to his reactions.

In the excerpt above, Maija-Liisa describes in a particularly forthcoming way how she maneuvered to make Orthodoxy more visible in her home without arousing disagreements with her husband. Her account sheds light on how avoiding conflicts could form a central guiding principle of the interviewees' doing of religion within the adult family context. Since concord between spouses was important to them, they did not risk disrupting it. Quite the contrary, they nurtured peaceful relations with family members even as part of their religious practice. In the same vein, anthropologist Susan Starr Sered (1994, 83–84) has argued that women tend to praise harmonious interpersonal relationships in their religious activities, and to demonstrate religious flexibility in order to avoid religion-based conflicts within their immediate social circle.

Overall, there was a lot of variation in how the women spoke about religious activities within their adult families. A few interviewees described this theme eagerly, emphasizing the strong presence of religion within their homes. Many, however, did not want to dwell on the topic. Some kept their answers short and non-specific to protect their family members' privacy. Others, for their part, seemed to evade the topic for fear that religion had not figured in the lives of their families to the extent that that they thought (I thought) was proper. On the whole, the adult family was clearly one of the more delicate themes of the interview frame. The fact that I did not have children of my own created an asymmetry between the informants and myself that was not easy to overcome over the course of a single interview (cf., Honkasalo 2015, 66–67, 86).

Throughout the interviews, the women spoke of their marriages in a favorable way. With few exceptions, the only women who made any negative remarks were those who had at some point divorced their spouses. These interviewees might spontaneously take up, for instance, the alcoholism or infidelity of their husbands to justify the break-up of their marriages. Nevertheless, generally speaking the women took care to build a positive picture of their families, including their (deceased) husbands. The informants' stress on familial concord showed, among other things, in their treatment of the Lutheran affiliation of their husbands and children. Whereas the women commonly expressed their outlook towards Lutheranism by remarking on how it differed from Orthodoxy, when speaking of the co-existence of the denominations within their homes they tended to stress the commonalities between the two faiths. For this purpose, they used phrases emphasizing the fundamental unity of the denominations – noting, for instance, that Orthodox and Lutherans "had the same God." These phrases were employed to establish the point that, as to religion, the Lutheran and Orthodox members of the family were ultimately on the same side.

Virtually all the interviewees also described their husbands' attitudes towards Orthodox Christianity in positive or neutral tones.[2] The women's

2 The only informant who gave a clearly negative account of her husband in this respect had married an Orthodox man. However, the husband's mother having been Lutheran, he had not been accustomed to Orthodox customs. Thus, the woman in question stated, for instance, that he "didn't respect icons, or tolerate them." I find it interesting that, in all of the material, the most outspoken husband's criticism of Orthodoxy is reported by a woman with an Orthodox husband. Maybe it was somehow easier for this woman to bring up a negative issue since she wasn't talking about a mixed marriage? At any rate, she did not have a point to prove about her marriage as a ground for harmonious religious life: in theory, a marriage of two people of the same denominational affiliation is, after all, an ideal match.

stress on the tolerance that their Lutheran spouses showed towards Orthodoxy makes sense in the light of the low status of the Church during the post-war period. Nevertheless, my overall impression was that some of the women actually censored their accounts when it came to familial discord. This behavior was yet another expression of the women's loyalty towards their adult families. It showed them acting as protectors of the family, including the family image, even in the interview situations.

Navigations between Orthodoxy and Lutheranism

> When I interviewed Vieno, an 80-year-old from Kuopio, in North Savonia, she offered me leftover biscuits and cake from a family celebration that she had organized the previous weekend. She had recently moved into an apartment building for senior citizens in the center of town, and had invited a priest to consecrate her home. During the same visit, the priest had also conducted a memorial service for her husband, deceased for five years. Vieno expressed to me her deep satisfaction that her three children and four grandchildren had all attended the event. After all, occasions for such collective Orthodox practice were not common in her family.
>
> Vieno's husband had been Lutheran and so were all her offspring. When her children were growing up, she had been very respectful of their religious affiliation. She noted, for instance, that she had not been able to teach them the sign of the cross "because they were Lutherans." Vieno's husband, moreover, had not been a churchgoer, and so it had been left to her to familiarize the children with Lutheran church life. "I tried to take them to the Lutheran church," she recounted, "it was always . . . I was like 'oh, it isn't nice in here' (laughs). But [I did it] for the children. They had to be reared in their religion as much as possible." During the course of the interview, I also asked Vieno if her children's Lutheranism bothered her. Her answer was ambiguous. First, she stated that it did not, but then admitted that, had they been Orthodox, she could naturally have taught them so much more about religion. "But all three turned out fine Lutheran children anyway," as she ended her rumination on the topic.

Altogether 20 of the 24 interviewees had married Lutheran men. The women's descriptions of how they had combined their Orthodoxy with their roles as mothers of Lutheran families varied a great deal. Whereas some claimed to have continued to observe all their childhood practices in their adult families, others explained that they had advocated the minimal exposure of family

members to Orthodoxy. Ilmi, for example, stated: "I didn't want the children to get conflicting ideas about religion. I tried to live according to the common way. (...) I didn't emphasize my side in any way." Between the lines of Ilmi's account shines the stigmatized status of Orthodoxy in post-war Finland.

Generally speaking, the women's basic tenet concerning Orthodox practice seems to have been to tailor their religious activity to fit the limited space at their disposal. The performance of personal practices such as making the sign of the cross and praying they described as the least governed by the family members' Lutheranism. The small-scale nature of these customs was a significant factor in the women's being able to continue their observance relatively undisturbed. Practices that required spare time, exemption from familial obligations, the invasion of domestic space, financial expenditure, or the presence of a religious specialist, were more problematic to follow. Some of the interviewees, for instance, conveyed that they had not arranged for their homes to be consecrated to avoid possible disagreements with their spouses.

The women's efforts to manage the collective religious lives of their families were characterized by alternation between Lutheran and Orthodox elements. Religious holidays were one instance that called for them to find a balance between the preferences of family members. Compared to everyday practices, religious celebrations require preparations: cleaning and decorating the home, cooking, organizing get-togethers, and so on. These preparations are integral to the celebrations themselves; they bring about the proper spatiotemporality within the sphere of the home (see Keinänen 2012; Keinänen 2010a). Judging from the interviews, the women were commonly in charge of holiday preparations as part of their domestic duties. This assignment gave them relative authority over the celebrations. Nevertheless, it did not translate into them following only Orthodox ways in preparing for the feasts. According to the interviewees, the possibility to observe at least some Orthodox traditions as part of the holidays was important to them. In the end, however, they had catered first and foremost to their Lutheran families.

In the previous chapter, I argued that the women's routinized religious practices should be understood as agentic actions with which they constituted their everyday life-world. The same thing can be said of their religious practices within the adult family context. Religion does not become a part of family life automatically but through concrete actions. Hence, the women's organizing activities were crucial in making religion into what it was for the family. Moreover, through their efforts to take into account the preferences of different family members, and to include the whole family in collective occasions of worship, the interviewees wove religion to the fabric of domestic life, attended to the continuance of family religious traditions – and did

"kin work," constructed ties of emotion and intimacy between family members (di Leonardo 1987, 442–443; see also Bourdieu 2001, 97; Bourdieu 1996, 22). They often took charge of the continuance of the Lutheran traditions of their husband's kin as well as their own.

The interviewees' familial responsibilities included being in charge of the religious socialization of children. That the children's affiliation differed from theirs did not essentially affect this arrangement. In raising their Lutheran children, the women seem to have emphasized the common Christian base of Lutheran and Orthodox Churches. Lempi, for instance, stated: "I don't remember [teaching the children] any [Orthodox customs] but the sign of the cross, which they've adopted according their way (i.e., the Catholic/Protestant style). Everything else was probably pan-Christian." In some families, like Sinikka's, the focus was more specifically on Lutheran customs: "I did tell my child about my faith. (…) But he received a Lutheran upbringing." Yet another tactic was to refrain, more or less, from explicit religious teaching. This is exemplified by Esteri's account: "Well, we didn't really [teach the children about religion]. They all went to Sunday school and received those Sunday school badges, it was part of Lutheranism. I guess I didn't [teach them] about Orthodoxy either, since they were already Lutheran."

The women usually implied that the children's Lutheranism had limited the extent to which they had been introduced to the Orthodox ways. The informants' descriptions of specific practices betray their oscillation between a common Christian base and customs marked as Orthodox or Lutheran. The most often mentioned form of collective worship was praying. Praying was a custom easily shared with Lutheran children; even the women who hesitated to "confuse" their children's religious identity mentioned the teaching of prayers. However, when it came to the embodied gestures that are part of Lutheran and Orthodox practices of praying, things already got more complicated. Toini, for instance, stated: "I did [bless] my children, when they were younger, [before going] to school. In the mornings. But we pressed the palms of our hands together; there was no making of the sign of the cross." That is, she preferred to use the Lutheran gesture of prayer when praying with her children. A few interviewees, such as Vieno in the introductory vignette, also explicitly noted that they had refrained from teaching the sign of the cross to their Lutheran children.

On the whole, the women's accommodation to the Lutheranism of the rest of the family, their responsibilities concerning the religious life of that family, and the dominant status of Lutheranism in the surrounding society resulted in a kind of Lutheranization of their overall religious practice. The informants took part in Lutheran rituals, observed Lutheran customs, and were acquainted

with the Lutheran ways. In this vein, Soja even remarked that as the mother of Lutheran children she "was both Lutheran and Orthodox" herself. On occasion, the women also described Lutheran customs as enriching their personal religiosity, mentioning, for instance, that hymns were a Lutheran tradition they cherished. Some practices, however, could feel alien to the informants even after a thorough exposure to them. Such was the case, for example, with Vieno and Lutheran church services.

In contrast, it was common for the women to note that, today, they were more able to practice religion on their own terms than before. Their religious activities, plain and simple, were no longer as tightly linked with their responsibilities as mothers and wives of Lutheran families. Furthermore, the informants could also maintain that since their children had reached adulthood more space had opened up for Orthodoxy in family get-togethers and celebrations. In some cases, the tables had turned in that priority was no longer given to the children's (Lutheran) traditions, but to those of the elderly mother. A good example were family celebrations such as the one described in the opening vignette. In addition, three of the interviewees had children who had converted to Orthodoxy in adult life. These convert children, and their children, made Orthodoxy figure in family traditions in a whole new way.

Individuals' actions are the result of practical strategizing that abides by the contours prescribed by the habitus. According to Bourdieu, habitus guides practice by providing the individual "conditioned and conditional freedom" of action (Bourdieu 1990b, 55; see also McNay 2000, 58; McNay 2003, 144). While it always positions some acts outside the realm of possibility, innumerable variations of action remain within the individual's grasp. Practices related to family religious life reflect wider social currents, but are always implemented within concrete family environments. Within their adult families, the Orthodox women seem to have decided on different courses of action relatively independently.[3] However, judging from the interviews there was little actual decision-making going on. Rather, the women followed what they instinctively felt was the appropriate course of action in particular situations. It is therefore possible to read their accounts as descriptions of their practical strategizing as circumscribed by their gendered habitus.

In having to combine and navigate between Lutheran and Orthodox customs to manage the religious lives of their families, the women faced a situation that was, originally, not familiar to them. They had no previous experience

3 During the first post-war decades, both Orthodox and Lutheran clergy did, in fact, strive to influence people in mixed marriages, particularly in decisions concerning the baptism and religious socialization of children (Kananen 2010, 116, 179–183; Laitila 2009, 342, 345–346).

of how these things were done; instead, they had to form new courses of action. In the last instance, there were as many different ways of organizing family religious life as there were informants. At the same time, the women were heavily restricted in their options by their embodied adherence to a gendered division of labor. The accounts show how they placed their responsibilities as mothers and wives (of Lutheran families) ahead of their responsibilities as (Orthodox) religious practitioners. Their descriptions of more recent events, for their part, suggest an increase in maneuverability. Due to changes in family dynamics and overall social surroundings, the interviewees had acquired more freedom to introduce Orthodox elements into the collective religious lives of their families.

Collective and Individual Practicing

One theme that the displaced Karelian Orthodox women often took up when speaking of religion within their adult families was how the family members had practiced religion together. When describing, for instance, religious holidays and churchgoing, they commonly designated the actor in question as "we," referring to the nuclear family. The pronoun was used slightly more often by the informants with all-Orthodox families, but it also recurred in the narratives of the women with Lutheran families.

In the women's accounts, the family "we" foregrounded shared religious life. This is evident, for instance, in Auli's depiction of her all-Orthodox family's practice of going to church: "Since we've lived close by to a church, we've gone to church, for instance, on Christmas Eve and during Easter, and so on. (…) We've always gone together, (…) it's such a wonderful thing; nowadays with the grandchildren always [we go] to church." Siiri described her and her Lutheran husband's churchgoing more modestly: "We both valued each other's [religion]; we had an ecumenical marriage. (…) We went to both churches, when we went. Neither of us was an avid churchgoer." Nevertheless, she, too, constructed an image of both spouses respecting the religion of the other and participating in religious activities on equal terms. On the whole, while possibilities for collective worship varied from family to family, the informants positively cherished all occasions and ways of doing religion together with their family members.

Generally speaking, in mixed marriages to make the "we" work required more compromises than in all-Orthodox families. For the benefit of the "we," some of the women had, at least at some point of their lives, adapted to the practices of the Lutheran parties, renouncing their own in the process. Sinikka,

for example, reminisced: "At that point (when her child was young), I took part in Lutheran activities quite a lot. In a way, my Orthodox practice went down. I went less to our church and more to Lutheran church; we went there as a family." Sinikka's account is yet another example of the interviewees' tendency to conduct their religious lives with the family in mind. Although the account obviously carries a tone of regret, it also suggests that, for Sinikka, there was a certain value in going to church "as a family." For the sake of comparison, in Hilja's account the same emphasis on practicing religion as a family is combined, not with regret over the hegemony of Lutheranism, but with pride over the family's all-Orthodox traditions: "We had an Orthodox home, as they say. We had icons and we went to church. And we raised our children into Orthodoxy, starting from when they were small."

In the women's accounts, the nuclear family was not the only possible composition of collective familial religious practice. Rather, the family "we" could also include all the close kin: parents, siblings, and their families. One interviewee, for example, described a tradition of visiting graves together with the extended family on Christmas Eve. Moreover, the women might also note how they had, at some point, started taking their elderly parents to church regularly. Especially to the informants with Lutheran adult families, the mother's influence could be essential in rekindling their own Orthodox practice. The wish to please one's mother came up with respect to various customs, the women explaining, for instance, that they had had their current homes consecrated because "it was important to mother."

Furthermore, yet another "we" consisted of the informant and a religiously active sibling or in-law. In the account below, Maija-Liisa explains how she enjoyed taking part in church life with her Lutheran mother, Lutheran mother-in-law, and Orthodox sister. She places great value on collective religious practice, suggesting that the experience of acting as a "we" is preferred to acting alone. That it is mostly Lutheran church life that the family members participate in is deemed ultimately immaterial.

> Our women, the women in both our families, have always been more spiritual as such, and more active in spiritual life and church life. I've gone everywhere with my mother-in-law and also with my mother and . . . I've always enjoyed being able to participate in church life together, whether in Lutheran or . . . Well, we seldom went to Orthodox church since none of the women belonged to the Orthodox Church except my sister.

Maija-Liisa's account, incidentally, is also a good example of the importance of female lineages to the women and their religious practice. Outside the nuclear

family, the interviewees' collective familial religious practice commonly took place between female relatives: grandmothers, mothers, mothers-in-law, sisters, sisters-in-law, daughters, and so on.

The significance of the family collective is also evident in those descriptions that do not have "we" as subject. For example, it was common for the interviewees with Lutheran families to note how their spouse and children "came along" with them to the Orthodox Liturgy. This kind of phrasing treats church worship as more of a personal than a family affair. It takes seriously the fact that in an Orthodox service, the Lutheran family members were in some way outsiders – as were the women themselves in a Lutheran one.[4] Nevertheless, the presence of others was considered a positive and important matter, for it testified to their religiosity and broad-mindedness. In the same vein, when describing their personal religious practice, the women often took note of the family members' tolerant and encouraging attitudes towards it. Anna, for example, stressed: "There were no obstructions [to my practices] of any kind." And Kirsti expressed praise: "I've been allowed unlimited freedom (...) to practice my religion." With these kinds of expressions, the interviewees gave their family members credit as facilitators of their religious practice. Had they opposed it, this would have made the women's activities much more difficult.

In a similar fashion, Lutheran family members could also be cast in the role of interested observers. The women noted with delight their husbands' curiosity towards Orthodox ways, and took satisfaction in their children's and grandchildren's knowledge of Orthodox practices. Faina, for instance, explained: "I've always had a small icon like that. And my children have known the thing about it, that it's an icon. And then I've always had candles to burn. For instance, the children got used to me burning candles on my parents' days of death. (...) They know all this." With these kinds of accounts, the women emphasized that, while the children's Lutheranism had prevented their active socialization into the Orthodox way of life, they were at least familiar with many Orthodox customs, having witnessed their mother's religious practice and religious celebrations of their maternal kin.

All in all, then, it seems that the women interpreted acknowledging, observing, and being accustomed to their religious customs as minimal ways of participating in them. What this suggests is that many of the interviewees were actually quite alone with their religious activities within their adult homes – even if they rarely brought this up in the interviews. Maija-Liisa (who, above,

4 Lutherans cannot participate in the Eucharist, the Orthodox Holy Communion. This is often seen to constitute a problem for collective religious practice in mixed families (Huotari 1975, 102; Merras 1993, 98).

noted that she enjoyed participating in Lutheran functions together with family members) was perhaps most candid of the women on the topic, mentioning how she "misses her family and her relatives" at Orthodox church services.

On a contrary note, when speaking of the evolution of their religious practice after their children had grown up, the women often mentioned a newfound freedom to practice religion by themselves and for themselves. The informants, in other words, rejoiced in the transformation of doing religion into a thing of their own, a time and an activity for themselves. Elvi, for instance, noted: "With increasing age, already when my husband was still alive, I started to take more part [in church life]. Now I'm so content that I have time. And that I can do whatever I want without anyone [interfering]." The women's descriptions concerning their changing religious activities in later life bring forth the individualistic aspect of their religion: their contentment over being able to practice religion on their own terms, even if this meant doing it alone.

The Orthodox women's descriptions concerning different combinations of familial religious activity can be treated as testimonies of their past conditions of religious practice. Alternatively, they can be analyzed as manners of speaking about religion, in which case they are suggestive of the women's habitus-generated appreciations of religion.

Most of the women, as I established above, did not spontaneously reflect on the gendered division of labor between themselves and their husbands. The few exceptions to this trend often explicated their opinions by referring to Christian family discourses. Thus Raili, for example, stated: "Men and women have to have different roles, because otherwise they'd be the same. Otherwise, God would have made us similar." The accounts discussed here suggest that even those women who did not voice their views held similar ideas. They considered practicing religion "as a family" important, often more important than their personal spiritual pursuits. Moreover, the interviewees' childhood experiences of religion also established the family as the place in and the group with which to do religion. Seeking out every occasion for collective familial religious practice could thus constitute an effort to recreate, at least temporarily, this ideal state of affairs.

Finally, it is also worth considering whether the women conceived of religious agency as, to some extent, collective agency. Agentic capacities always emerge in social interaction; moreover, they can also depend on concrete collaboration between individuals (Emirbayer and Mische 1998, 973; see also Ortner 2006, 130–131; Utriainen, Hovi, and Broo 2012, 204–205). Judging from the interviews, the women understood doing religion as a "we," at least on some occasions, to be more rewarding and more effective than doing religion alone. This is why they found practicing religion together worthwhile, even at the cost of some of their personal religious preferences.

Motherhood, Ethics, and Agency

In the interviews, I explicitly asked the displaced Karelian Orthodox women about the central guidelines in life that they had obtained from Orthodox Christianity. They usually answered by referring to one common saying or another, or by bringing up basic Christian doctrine, such as the Ten Commandments. None of them, however, included in their responses any elaborations on Orthodox theology, or even mentioned the theme of deification, the ultimate life objective according to Orthodox thought. (Actually, when I brought up the notion, they often considered it a far-off idea with respect to the lives of lay Orthodox.[5]) By contrast, the women could frame their talk on the proper Orthodox way of life by noting how they lived by their mother's or grandmother's teachings. On the whole, it was typical for them to underline the exemplary piety of some of their older relatives (usually mothers, grandmothers, or godmothers) in their accounts. These examples locate the foundation of the interviewees' understanding of ethics in their childhood environment.

The informants described their tenets of a good life in modest and practical terms. Their life principles were geared towards the everyday life, and concerned questions such as how to get through different troubles and how to keep bad influences and impulses at bay. The women's logic stemmed from the (Pan-Christian) idea that individuals' actions cause them either to move closer to God or to drift away from Him (see Harrison 2008, 81–82). It was therefore important to monitor your actions: to "live decently," to "do more good than evil," to "not do things that felt wrong," and to live in a way that you could "die with a good conscience." In addition, the interviewees stressed that human beings are bound to make mistakes, which is why they are required to practice piety only "according to their abilities."

By far the most central theme in the women's accounts of ethics was their relationship with other people (see also Gilligan 1982). They often stressed values such as love, caring, respect, tolerance, acceptance, honesty, and forgiveness as the cornerstones of a good life. The women might also mention the negative form of the Golden Rule ("don't do to others what you don't want to be done to yourself") and the second part of the Commandment of Love

5 According to Orthodox theology, every human being is endowed with the image of God: a state that refers, among other things, to such human faculties as consciousness, reason, creativity, and perception. Moreover, through virtuous behavior human beings can approach and, in rare cases, acquire the likeness of God (Hamalis 2011b; Harrison 2008, 78–81; Ware 1964, 224–226). This process is known as deification.

("love your neighbor as you love yourself") as important tenets to follow. All in all, principles related to harmonious relationships were understood to be, first and foremost, religious principles. In fact, several women maintained that love formed the core of the Orthodox message (see also McGuckin 2011f): "The central principle is love as such. Love is at the center of everything." Sometimes, values such as tolerance and hospitality were also connected to the "Karelian way of life" of one's childhood.

Verbalized ethical principles do not incorporate the premises of individuals' actions in a straightforward way. Just like rules, they are a practice of speaking about one's actions. Nevertheless, they reflect individuals' appreciations concerning practices, and, through them, the constitution of their habitus. In the case of the Orthodox women, the parallels between their notions of ethics and their descriptions of adult family life are evident. Their care-centered values and interpersonal orientation supported their prioritizing the family over individualistic pursuits. In fact, their understanding of a good and pious life made it possible to interpret taking care of the family as a form of religious practice. This point was stressed, for instance, by Kirsti:

> I've felt, with having this kind of a family (i.e., large) and all, that there's striving (*kilvoittelu*) in it. (…) You have to see to your lot, and I've tried to do it, and it has been enough. A person cannot be everything, follow arduous prayer schedules and go on pilgrimages and such. You have to see to your lot.

Whereas family was the first and foremost target of their care, the interviewees had also cared for other people in the course of their lives. For example, many had participated in or financed volunteer work organized by the Orthodox Church, or by some other faith group operating in their home town. In addition, the women also helped by visiting and running errands for ailing friends and neighbors. In this vein, Lyyli, for instance, stated: "I help people. I don't go to church much, but that's (i.e., helping is) something that I've known how to do. I always have someone that I help."

Official Christian discourses assign to women the responsibility for the physical and emotional care for others (McGuire 1997, 131–133; Woodhead 2007, 569–573). They discipline women to put the needs and preferences of others before their own – something that was also inherent in the interviewees' accounts discussed above. Concern over the well-being of loved-ones, however, is often also at the core of women-centered religious practices, translating into a practical and this-worldly orientation that informs women's religious and ethical lives as a whole (Sered 1994, 5, 145, 149–156; Walter and

Davie 1998, 650–651; see also Gilligan 1982). Judging from the interviews, a focus on concrete relations with specific people within the context of everyday life also characterized the Orthodox women's sense of ethics.

The formation of the habitus of dominated social groups, Pierre Bourdieu states, is a process that turns necessities into virtues (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 127–128; Bourdieu 1990b, 53–54; Bourdieu 1984, 177–183, 372–384). Members of these groups commonly have few resources at their disposal and few courses of action to choose from. In their habitus, the compulsions and prohibitions that follow from their social position translate into matching dispositions. When generating future practice, these dispositions guide individuals to immediately exclude those options that have, in the past, been impossible, and to embrace ones that have been inevitable. This process can also be seen to inform the perceptions and values of the women of my study. Their advocacy of altruism as the basis of virtuous behavior demonstrates their "taste for the necessary" (Bourdieu 1984, 178), so well did it parallel the socially prescribed contours of their lives.

The interviewees were saddled with the obligation to look after their families by the society around them, by the religious community, and by their family members and in-laws. It was a responsibility they had acquired already as children; many of them noted how their upbringing and status within the childhood family had differed from that of their brothers. All in all, to "see to this lot," as Kirsti put it, was a necessity for the women. To fail to do so would have induced such harsh sanctions that it was, in practice, impossible. Nevertheless, in the women's parlance, to put the family first was also a highly valued virtue. It was a necessity their habitus imbued with worth and significance, to such an extent that it justified their less active religious practice – even in an interview that focused on religion. The women's habitus, in this sense, was very much a "caring habitus," imbued with a heightened will and a pronounced capacity to provide care for diverse others (Hirvonen 2014, 39–41).

The modern Western conceptualization of agency ties the possibility of agentic action with freedom and power (e.g., Meyer and Jepperson 2000, 100–101). During recent years, however, this liberalist understanding of agency has been increasingly criticized within social sciences. One of these critics is Talal Asad, who has pointed out that various religious traditions involve culturally meaningful approaches to disempowerment and suffering, which can transform these experiences from passive states to agentic action (Asad 2003, 70–72, 79, 84, 91–92). In her account of agency, Marja-Liisa Honkasalo (2015, 69–73; 2008a, 499–500; 2008b, 216–221) suggests that activities such as tolerating, enduring, and refraining from action can be understood as minimal forms of agency. In particular, these activities constitute agentic action when their

observation involves a realization of the ethical valuations that the subject has internalized. In other words, they are agentic in so far as they comprise what Michel Foucault (2000) has called "techniques of the self": practices through which the individual hones his or her skills for performing ethical actions, whilst fulfilling his or her ideals of a good life.

My interviewees were also sometimes called to disempowerment and passivity to act in accordance with their notions of a good life. The women's deep-seated understanding of how to cultivate virtuous behavior made it possible for them to view the sacrifice of one's personal religious life as pious, at least to some extent. This sense of ethics is often evident, for instance, in their accounts concerning religious activity in the context of their adult families. In these accounts, the women often described their overall circumstances as highly restrictive, resulting in limited capacities for action.

> Vieno: Many [Christmases] we celebrated with his (the husband's) family. I baked something to bring along, (. . .) pasties and casseroles and such. And then *mummi* always turned, we used to call mother-in-law *mummi*, she turned the radio up really loud to hear those (Lutheran) Christmas hymns and such. And I just can't, having small children, go to church. I have to stay there, with the children. You can also live Christmas in your mind.

In her account, Vieno laments that it was not possible for her to attend Orthodox church at Christmas when her children were small. However, the phrasing of the account implies that it was also Vieno herself who felt that she must prioritize her children, and spend the whole Christmas with them rather than go to church. The force of this moral judgment is enhanced by her switching to the present tense when speaking of how she "has" to stay at home with the children. Vieno's account, then, is an example of how the women's notions of a good life and good motherhood restricted their agentic possibilities in a very concrete sense. In this case, they created a situation in which the only ethical choice available was to refrain from going to church. Nevertheless, for Vieno, abiding by this choice was ultimately a way of enacting her understanding of virtuous behavior. According to the women's moral compass, after all, doing motherhood came first and doing religion second – and doing motherhood could sometimes encompass the doing of religion.

Yet another interesting element in Vieno's account is her statement that it is possible to "live Christmas in your mind." This remark effectively reveals that, in Vieno's opinion, a Christmas spent listening to Lutheran hymns and lacking a visit to church was not quite properly celebrated. I would think that

similar ambiguity often characterized the women's choices concerning religious practice. These choices induced a conflict within the interviewees' habitus, a clash between their dispositions related to the religious field and to the family field. This is implied, for example, in the women's open expressions of joy and satisfaction over the fact that they nowadays had more time and freedom to practice religion than before, when their children had been small.

Throughout this chapter, I have emphasized how the interviewees' religious activity in their adult families took into account their family members and loved ones. The analysis can be read to suggest that the women were performing their actions with simply altruistic motives. However, it must also be kept in mind that the informants did not wholly resign their personal spiritual practices even as mothers of underage (Lutheran) children. Instead, they carved a space for religion in their everyday lives, often showing resilience in holding on to customs experienced as personally important. Furthermore, it is also possible to look at their altruistic activities from an individualistic perspective: to ask what they gained from these activities.

According to many feminist scholars, one problem with Bourdieu's view on the gendered division of labor is his understanding of women as "capital-bearing objects" (Lovell 2000, 37), whose actions are reducible to the transfer of resources (for instance, social skills and cultural know-how) from one generation to the next within the family. Bourdieu, in other words, neglects the possibility that women could also be accumulating power for themselves at the same time as they act (and are being used) as altruistic vessels of capital within the family field (Fowler 2003, 480–482; Lovell 2000, 37–38, 41; Reay 2004a; Skeggs 2004a, 28–29). I consider it important to acknowledge the possible intertwinement of altruistic motives with individualistic ones in the interviewees' actions. Thus, I argue that while the Orthodox women labored to sustain the collective religious lives of their Lutheran or Orthodox families, they also bolstered their own status within these families. They established themselves as organizers and authorities with regard to the structuring of domestic life, family religious affairs, matters of familial tradition, the raising of children, and the cultivation of kinship relations. This is a good example of how agency is created contextually: of how the formation of the habitus both subjects the individual to particular power relations and imbues him or her with agentic capacities. In the adult family context, the women's responsibilities as workers, mothers, and wives took priority over their personal religious practice. Nevertheless, these same responsibilities also placed them in a pivotal position within the domestic and personal lives of their families (see also di Leonardo 1987, 443, 451). In other words, they facilitated the interviewees' accrual of certain power and resources on the family front.

CHAPTER 7

The Practice of Belief

Prayer and Belief

In the modern West, religions are commonly conceived of as belief systems. This understanding of religion is modeled on Christianity, particularly Protestantism. As a definition of religion, it is problematic, for instance, in that it postulates that institutionalized religious beliefs form coherent systems and that believing is central to all religions (Asad 2012, 40–42, 47; Beckford 2003, 20; McGuire 2008, 20–24, 39–41). Moreover, it also takes the concept of belief for granted. As anthropologist Malcolm Ruel (2005, 260–263) has shown, the term "belief" involves many Christian connotations that are difficult to shed, including the notions that belief is an interior state, that belief explains behavior, and that belief as such is more important than the object of believing. These connotations make belief a controversial concept within the study of religions (see Cassaniti 2012; Day 2011, 4–27, 191; Stringer 2008, 39–40).

The word "belief" (*usko*) was not a part of my interview frame. However, the women mentioned it occasionally, in contexts that corresponded with conventional Christian uses of the word. They spoke of belief to convey their acceptance of particular Christian doctrines; moreover, they also made use of it to signal trust and conviction, expressing "belief in" rather than "belief that" (see Ruel 2005, 246). That is to say, they focused mostly on believing over the object of belief – a usage that conforms to Ruel's (2005, 262) point about the priority given to belief as such in Christianity.

> Helena: Well, what do you think, what could it (deification) mean in the life of an ordinary Orthodox or an ordinary person? What could it involve? How does one strive for it?
>
> Ilmi: Well, you just have to really really believe in everything . . . what you do in prayer and in the fast. And observe all church instructions. And believe all the time in the things you do.

Ilmi's answer to my question illustrates the women's general emphasis on the act of believing. In the account, moreover, Ilmi also connects belief with practice. She seems to consider belief a state of mind that accompanies pious prayer and other customs. In this chapter, I analyze belief as part of the

© HELENA KUPARI, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004326743_008
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License.

women's religious practice. However, my take on belief views it as a property of habitus, not a psychological quality.

One approach towards belief within social sciences has been to focus on belief-in-action. According to this approach, belief is produced through and performed in practices which instill particular orientations towards the world in the bodies of participants (Day 2011, 9–15, 193–196; Mitchell and Mitchell 2008, 80–85). Pierre Bourdieu's outline of practical belief forms one such account of belief. For Bourdieu (1990b, 67–68), belief is a precondition of any investment in any field. It is a "state of the body" that involves an instinctive recognition of the game played in a particular field. It results from a history of participation in the field, and receives its fullest form when the relationship between the individual and the field is characterized by doxa. Speaking of the religious field, Bourdieu also distinguishes between belief in the field and belief as a field-specific practice. Investment in the religious field, he specifies, is not the same thing as "religious faith in the ordinary sense," meaning belief as promoted by religious institutions (Bourdieu 2010, 2–3; Bourdieu 1991a, 20; see also Wood and Altglas 2010, 15).

In what follows, I analyze the women's accounts revolving around two propositions central to Christian doctrine: the existence of God and life after death. However, in keeping with Bourdieu's distinction described above, my focus is more on the women's practical belief than on their "religious faith." In this vein, I consider their accounts to be expressions of belief as a disposition of their habitus. Moreover, I also view them as evidence of how the women's past and present doing of religion has produced and continues to produce belief, through shaping their dispositions concerning the supernatural. I begin by analyzing the women's descriptions of their relationship with God.

God was by far the most often mentioned religious entity in the interviews. This is partly explained by my interview frame; I asked the women one question in which I mentioned God. However, God was also the entity they most often brought up spontaneously. The informants spoke of God approximately twice as often as Jesus and Jesus about twice as often as the Mother of God. The Holy Spirit and the Holy Trinity were mentioned only a few times in the whole material.

Incidentally, given the relatively central status of the Mother of God in Orthodox Christian theology (e.g., Atanassova 2011; FitzGerald 2001, 232–237), and in the lived religion of Orthodox and Catholic lay women as reported in previous ethnographic research (e.g., Dubisch 1995, 230–240; Gemzöe 2000, 53–96; Orsi 2005, 48–72; Vuola 2012), it is surprising that the women of my study did not mention her more often in the interviews. One possible explanation for this is that my Lutheran background affected their readiness to talk about Mary, particularly since I did not specifically encourage them to do so.

Alternatively, the women's relative neglect of Mary can also be a reflection of the overall Lutheranization of their religion. The role of Mary in Lutheranism is, after all, much less prominent than in Orthodoxy.

Whatever the reason for Mary's minor role in the interviews, the women's accounts clearly designated God as the most important religious entity in their lives. God was inherent to their understanding of the world; in addition, God was also the entity with whom they primarily sought contact and whose presence they most often experienced. The women mainly spoke of God as the all-powerful, all-seeing Creator of the world and as the loving Father of the humankind. A few of them mentioned that in their childhood God was also seen as a punishing force, should you cross Him. The interviewees did not seem to subscribe to this view personally, however. Instead, many stressed the forgiving aspect of God.

On the whole, the women's relationship with God hinged on an experience of being dependent on God: needing God and trusting in His support. Often, they addressed this topic spontaneously and in passing – evidently considering it such a self-evident part of their lives that it did not require any clarification. Some women mentioned that their need for God was especially great during difficult times, whereas others noted that God was necessary in their everyday lives as well. The interviewees conveyed, moreover, that they depended on God for strength, support, and safety. Sinikka, for example, stated: "If I hadn't trusted God, I'd have had it so hard. Since I'm divorced and all. I've received so much help. And God has guided me so well. I can't not believe [in Him]."

It was not uncommon for the women to be emotional in acknowledging their dependence on God. Anna was one of the interviewees who spoke of God with great affection: "I've said, now I feel like crying (sobs), (...) that God has always helped me, through sorrows and tears. He has always helped me. Without God's help I wouldn't have been able to carry on." Such emotional accounts tell of the salience of the experience of God in the lives of the women. They reveal the deep-seated and intimate nature of the interviewees' knowledge of God (see Bourdieu 2001, 38; Scheer 2012, 204–209; Stringer 2008, 63–64, 66). Overall, the interviewees' accounts of their relationship with God can be seen to convey a state of practical belief. For them, the existence of God was not about arbitrary adherence to a set of doctrines; it was something they knew and felt in their bodies (Bourdieu 1990b, 67–68). In other words, the women's particular way of being in the world presupposed the existence of a loving God. He was part of their habitus.

The informants often traced the origin of their dependence on God back to their childhood. Their parents and grandparents, the women noted, had constantly asked God for help in their everyday lives, encouraging their children

to do the same. I agree that the women's relationship with God was founded on their primary socialization into religion, as is with the formation of habitus more generally. Nevertheless, their reliance on God was also continually fueled by their religious practice. As part of their socialization, the informants had learned concrete, embodied skills for interacting with God and asking for His help (see Asad 1993, 76–77; Bell 1992, 79–81; Bourdieu 1977, 124). Even at present, their sense of practice regularly called forth the use of these skills, and every successful instance reinforced their underlying practical belief in God.

The most important skill through which the women acted out and reinforced their relationship with God was prayer.[1] They had daily prayer routines; furthermore, they also tended to respond to different exceptional circumstances with prayer. Many explained how their practice of praying intensified at times of hardship: how they prayed in front of the icon, on their knees, using a prayer book, or together with family members or a priest. In their prayers, the women commonly asked for guidance, protection, and help for themselves and their loved ones. In their accounts, they also emphasized the "power of prayer," thus conveying that through praying they often enough attained the relief they were asking for.

Generally speaking, religious worldviews are characterized by the notion that the universe contains other entities besides humans capable of agentic action: deities, demons, angels, spirits, and so on (Riesebrodt 2010, 74–75). In relation to human beings, these non-human agents can take the role of helpers or adversaries. They can contribute positively to the agency of the individual, or hinder and subvert his or her actions (see e.g., Lindhardt 2010, 247–251; Utriainen 2014, 241–243; Weaver 2011, 397, 408–409). Sometimes, non-empirical agents are understood as the ultimate carriers of agentic responsibility instead of the acting individual. This is the case, for example, in such interpretations of the monotheistic traditions that consider God as the originator of all human accomplishments.

Recently, several scholars inquiring into the agency of religious women in monotheistic traditions have considered the notion, present within these traditions, that individuals' capacities to act in the world are produced through submission to God (see also Chryssavgis 2008, 152–154; Harrison 2008, 82). From this perspective, agency involves placing limits on one's possibilities

1 Most public prayer in the Orthodox Church is addressed to Jesus or the Trinity. Orthodox teaching also encourages individuals to pray to the Mother of God, saints, and angels, and to ask for their intercessions. However, God as the Father represents the ultimate recipient of all prayers (Bobrinskoy 2008, 51–54; McGuckin 2011d, 248; Ware 1964, 258–261). The women of my study commonly named the addressee of their prayers as simply "God."

for action (Bilge 2010, 20–21; Hollywood 2004; Mahmood 2005, 148). However, leaning on empirical data these scholars have illustrated that discipline and obedience can also result in relatively empowered actions with respect to the surrounding social world (Bracke 2008, 63; Mack 2003, 155–157; Orsi 1996, 189–190). The evacuee Karelian Orthodox women, as I have established here, conceived of God as the most powerful agent within the social universe. In their accounts, they emphasized their dependence on God. They saw God as an important influence behind their overall capacities for action, their "energy to act in the world" (Mack 2003, 156). Moreover, the women felt that through acknowledging their dependence on God and asking for His help they received critical leverage with respect to their lives. For them, praying was collaboration with God accomplished through submission. In other words, it was an agentic capacity facilitated by the women's practical belief.

Narrating God's Guidance

The one question explicitly mentioning God that I asked the women in the interviews was: What situations make you feel that you are in the presence of God or the holy? In their responses, the women often highlighted the Orthodox Divine Liturgy as such a situation. Other answers included, for example, participating in Easter celebrations and visiting graves and monasteries. However, according to the interviewees, God also manifested in nature and in their own lives. In fact, when spontaneously describing their experiences of God, they usually recounted incidents taking place within the context of everyday life.

An experience of the benevolent presence of God could sometimes overtake the women in their daily lives. Commonly, these experiences coincided with situations in which they felt satisfaction over the course their lives had taken. Katri, for instance, answered my question about the presence of God by explaining: "For instance, at the summer cottage on a beautiful day, you may suddenly realize that everything is well just at that moment." And Toini reflected: "When you feel that your prayer has been answered. When you've prayed and hoped so much for something, and then you notice that 'oh, there it was.' Then you know. If only you remembered to give thanks! (. . .) Oh, there has been so much guidance and such [in my life]."

All in all, the women interpreted various felicitous happenings from over the years as manifestations of God's influence over their lives. Moreover, some of them also described specific, extraordinary incidents of divine intervention. One woman, for example, explained how her severely ill child had regained

consciousness after she had asked a priest to administer the mystery of the anointing of the sick on her behalf; she spoke of this as a miracle.[2] Another informant, for her part, spoke of how her child had regained the ability to walk after an accident. She credited this recovery to the Mother of God, to whom she had been praying. Both narratives show the women's experience of God's potential in a particularly clear light: the difference between God's influence and the lack of it could mean the difference between life and death for a loved one. In addition, the accounts also testify to the power of prayer within the women's worldview. After all, they involved the women turning to God and the Mother of God, asking their help with the problem at hand.

In the material as a whole, narratives of such special recoveries or near escapes were rare. Nevertheless, it is not necessarily the case that the women who spoke about such things were the only ones to have faced them. For one thing, I did not ask the interviewees directly about such incidents; those who described them did so spontaneously. Moreover, it also became clear to me during the process that not all the informants were comfortable with discussing highly intimate and emotional topics in their interviews. Some of them wanted, instead, to stick to relatively neutral themes. They were not inclined to share with me their personal experiences of divine intervention – at least not of their own accord, over the limited span of a single meeting.

Besides happy events, the women's lives had included sorrows as well. God, they commonly maintained, had also guided them through various difficulties: deaths, losses, divorces, and so on. Some of these negative events, however, had originally made them feel angry towards God. Elvi, for instance, stated, of the untimely death of her husband: "Man commands and God ordains. That's the truth. (...) I was so bitter, when [my husband] died. (...) But now I've calmly thought that maybe it was better for him [to die] than to remain here seriously ill. He was released from suffering pains." The account is an example of how the interviewees made an effort to accommodate even bad experiences to their idea of a benevolent God. It shows them wrestling with the problem of theodicy.

When coming to grips with her husband's death, Elvi found comfort in the idea of the omnipotence of God: "It's not up to man. It's not up to your actions. There's a greater force which orders the pace of your life. Of course, you can pray and such ... try to help someone or yourself through prayer. I find this idea liberating somehow." Elvi was not the only interviewee who described

2 The anointing of the sick is one of the sacraments of the Orthodox Church, designated to heal a person from both spiritual and physical ailments through prayers and anointing with oil (Arseni 1999, 243–244; see also Melling 1999).

the realization of one's own powerlessness in relation to God as a liberating experience. Moreover, Elvi's remark concerning prayer is also significant as it indicates that she was quite aware that praying did not always work: God did not answer all prayers. In any case, praying constituted an active attempt to make a difference. It gave Elvi some means of managing situations that were ultimately beyond her control. In other interviews, too, praying came across as a capacity for action that could help the women navigate experiences of ambivalence and disappointment without damage to their belief.

The personal themes and the chronological progress of the interview outline gave the interviews an autobiographical overtone. In their accounts, the women took stock of various episodes of their lives. Often, they pieced together parts of their life stories leaning on the idea of divine guidance. Looking at different events and life phases, they saw evidence of God's influence and even miracles. The interviewees also mostly interpreted negative events as manifestations of God's agency. This religious reading that the women gave their lives made it possible to incorporate even unfortunate experiences into one's overall life story: to give pain and suffering significance.

In his classic research on the autobiographical narratives of Finns, Jeja-Pekka Roos (1987, 64–68) notes that their overall tone is determined by an inner experience of life management. The existence of some feeling of control over one's life commonly gives these narratives a positive ring, whereas the lack of such a feeling accompanies more pessimistic interpretations. From this perspective, the Orthodox women's ability to make sense even of negative life events appears crucially important to their general outlook towards life. Their ability to accept different hardships as God's will constituted an important coping mechanism at their disposal, a capacity provided by their embodied adherence to an idea of God.

According to scholar of religion Courtney Bender (2007, 214), religious experience and its interpretation are not separate "but tied together in complex relation to each other, and to the embodied cultural and social worlds in which they are experienced and expressed." That is to say, both experience and the interpretation of experience are mediated by the dispositions of habitus. Moreover, due to the intertwinement of experience and expression, the recounting of a religious experience often serves to reinforce the experience, and the underlying dispositions. The informants' accounts concerning their experiences of God's influence over their lives cited pan-Christian discourses. Christian manners of speaking oriented the women's terminology, which contained concepts like "guidance," "blessing," and "miracle." Nevertheless, their practices of speaking about their experiences of God were also a reflection of their habitus. Furthermore, these practices of speaking constituted

"performative belief rituals," processes through which the women reinforced their practical belief in God (Day 2011, 110–114).

One effect of post-Reformation religious discourses on social scientific theories of religion is the emphasis on Christianity as a religion of transcendence, characterized by the absence of the supernatural from the world. However, anthropologists of religion Jon and Hildi Mitchell (2008, 87, 91) argue that practice-oriented notions of belief, which focus on the performative production of religious knowledge through concrete activities, make it possible to investigate the immanence of the non-empirical in Christianity. The accounts discussed here make evident that, for the women of my study, a central experience of the presence of God concerned God's impact in one's life: both in specific events and in the overall course one's life had taken. The women spontaneously interpreted various life events as manifestations of God's presence and guidance. With this interpretative activity, they also continuously reproduced their embodied knowledge of God's presence and guidance.

The Ethics of "Remembering God"

The displaced Karelian Orthodox women did not promote an idea of religion as a systematic project of cultivating piety. In fact, they rarely even used the term "piety" (*hartaus*, *hurskaus*) in connection with their own religious lives. For the women, Orthodoxy seemed to be more about "being" than "becoming": it was as much about not drifting further away from God as it was about moving closer to God. In their religious activities, the interviewees thus aimed for stability rather than change. Nevertheless, in their accounts, some of the women also explicitly acknowledged that religious practices were a means of cultivating one's relationship with God, and that for this purpose they could be undertaken as more of a conscious activity.[3]

Modern secular society was one of the topics that sometimes spurred the women into conveying their opinions on the effects of religious activity. The interviewees reflected on how, in today's world, the pull of earthly

3 Orthodox thought recognizes the formative influence of practice on embodied human subjectivity. In the Orthodox Church, the observation of concrete customs is seen as an important aspect of a religious way of life. Many theologians emphasize worship as the primary channel of Orthodox religiosity (e.g., Conomos 2011, 243; Ware 1964, 271). Moreover, ascetic practices such as prayer and fasting constitute an essential feature of Orthodox piety, and are considered methods of approaching God (Chryssavgis 2008, 160–162; Steenberg 2011).

attractions was strong. Often, they described religious practices as a much needed counterbalance to secular pastimes, and as a way to develop the spiritual dimension in one's life. In this vein, Lempi stated: "Sometimes I feel that this fussing about and all the daily chores and superficial hobbies take too much space. (...) I have this aspiration that I could get a bit deeper. That I wouldn't only scratch the surface." And Kirsti explained: "I feel a great need to, it's not a habit but I feel that I've got to get to go to church and to the Liturgy. (...) At this age I feel that I get so much out of it. I have to go there to remedy myself, to be fixed up, let's put it this way."

An interesting detail in Kirsti's account is that she explicitly denies that her need to go to church regularly could be described as a habit. On occasion, also the other women voiced opinions distancing their activities from routine practice. For instance, while making the sign of the cross was often described as a habitual custom in the material as a whole, not all interviewees were satisfied with this description. They stressed that the sign consists of a mental dimension as well. Lempi, for example, stated: "I wouldn't say that you need to reflect on making the sign of the cross every time. But I don't like for it to be done negligently, in passing; it's not that kind of a thing. (...) In a way [you need] to know that it's not just any kind of symbol. Because it's simultaneously a credo. You don't cross yourself if you don't believe at all."

In this account, Lempi defends the sign of the cross against common-sense understandings of rituals and routines as void of significance. She emphasizes that although the sign of the cross is a bodily gesture it is not a mechanical formality. The account can also be viewed as a reaction against those negative interpretations of Orthodox Christianity that consider it a ceremony-centered religion (*muotomenot, muotokirkko*) in contrast with belief-oriented Lutheranism. This was one of the critiques often raised against the Orthodox faith in the post-war period (Kananen 2010, 73–74).

The crux of Lempi's account is that the practice of making the sign of the cross should be observed with a proper frame of mind. It should be accompanied by belief. This opinion is similar to Ilmi's reflection (quoted in the beginning of this chapter) about the importance of "really believing" in what one is doing in order to do it properly. Both women's accounts replicate the common Christian understanding that belief forms the ground of pious behavior (Ruel 2005, 261). Outlines that posit a unidirectional relationship between belief and practice, however, remain blind to the generative aspect of practice: to practice as productive of belief (Bourdieu 1990b, 69; Bourdieu 1977, 79–80; see also Bell 1992, 82, 87, 108–109).

In their interviews, the women did not speak of religious practice explicitly as productive of belief. However, they did mention effects that particular

customs had on their bodies. They spoke, for instance, of the "nurturing" influence of the Divine Liturgy or the "warmth" of home icons. In addition, to describe the generative aspects of daily religious activity, one interviewee employed an idiom that lends itself very well to my analysis. Although this expression did not circulate widely in the material, it describes the women's general views on religious practice well. Therefore, it is worthy of closer scrutiny. The expression is that of "remembering God."

> When I interviewed Kirsti she was in her early sixties, a farm mistress from Ilomantsi, the easternmost town of present-day Finland. The farm was her childhood home, which she and her husband had taken over when her parents retired. Kirsti's childhood had coincided with the first post-war decade. At the time, the family's Orthodoxy had not been particularly featured. For instance, as a child Kirsti had never seen her parents make the sign of the cross. "Maybe it was because they had to become so Finnish," she stated. Nevertheless, Orthodoxy had been passed on to Kirsti and her siblings as an unquestioned worldview, which included such principles as respect for God, life, and one's elders.
>
> In adulthood, Kirsti had embraced many of the religious customs that her parents had given up. A particularly active period in her religious practice ensued when her two youngest children were born and baptized into Orthodoxy. "I had the courage to teach them [Orthodox] religion," Kirsti said as she reflected on the change in the status of Orthodoxy between her own childhood and that of her children. Nevertheless, even when describing her current religiosity, she prioritized her frame of mind over rigorous practice:
>
>> Praying is the hardest thing in the world. It's the hardest thing. And, if I'm being honest, often what happens is that depending on the things that are burning in your life you may need God sometimes more and sometimes less. And if He is farther away, you don't pray so actively. (…) Although you do remember God every day, He comes up in different ways. However, nothing is more difficult than taking up and following regular prayers, in the mornings and evenings. It requires an immense amount of self-discipline. Remembering God and small prayers, they are easy, but … Sometimes, the only thing I do is make the sign of the cross.

In her interview, Kirsti spoke repeatedly about "remembering God." On the one hand, she stated that daily religious habits had the effect of bringing God to mind. Icons, for instance, acted as reminders of religion during busy everyday

life: "[Icons] have a very important function in that, if a person does not have the time to pray or to practice piety much, glancing at them reminds you of these things." On the other hand, she also repeatedly stressed that recalling God did not necessarily have to include elaborate rituals: "It's a part of everyday life, and in your haste, you don't have to get into a rut, to stop and to pose, then make the sign of the cross. The mere attitude, remembering God with love, crossing oneself somewhere like [when] you pass [an icon]; to my mind it's also a moment that touches eternity." Raili, among others, spoke of the same thing, noting how every time she passed by her icons she "thought of religion." In their accounts, both women implied that seeing icons helped them to cultivate the proper religious state of mind in the course of their daily lives.

Kirsti's and Raili's accounts are good illustrations of the small "acts of recognition" that, according to Bourdieu (1990b, 67–68), constitute and sustain practical belief. When the women noticed an icon, they intuitively and immediately identified various cultural significations pertaining to it, which in turn reinforced their embodied adherence to this underlying symbolic system. In the interviewees' everyday lives, countless similar acts of recognition took place; as one of them remarked, "anything" could remind you of God. However, the example of icons alone sufficiently establishes why I consider the idiom of "remembering God" such a happy one. Religious practice per se, as well as encounters with artifacts, symbols, environments, and situations that the women's bodies recognized as religious, made them remember God. They renewed the women's investment in the religious game and their practical belief in God as its central element.

The expression of "remembering God," however, does not only describe what ideally happened in the course of religious practice. In Kirsti's parlance, "remembering God" also referred to a disposition that involved thinking about God in a loving manner. According to Kirsti, it was important to remember God in one's actions and everyday life.[4] This normative usage of the idiom captures the women's general idea of the proper Orthodox Christian outlook on life, to which every believer should aim. It depicts a religious mindset that should govern everyday life but can also be put aside, forgotten, in which case the spiritual dimension of life is in danger of slipping from focus.

4 In the Finnish language, remembering (*muistaminen*) signifies, besides recollection, active deeds with which one shows consideration for another person (Grönfors 2006, 250). This connotation is present also in Kirsti's use of the expression "remembering God." Moreover, the concept is present also in the Bible, for instance, in the well-known verse from Ecclesiastes (12:1) which begins: "Remember your Creator in the days of your youth."

Whereas, of all the informants, only Kirsti explicitly spoke of the importance of "remembering God," other women also alluded to similar notions of piety. As I have previously established, to speak of remembering was a central way in which the interviewees approached the theme of intentional practice. Thus, they stressed the importance of remembering to observe particular customs: to pray, give thanks to God, quiet down on Sundays, light candles for deceased relatives, and so on. The emphasis on remembering, in a sense, was their way of speaking of religious practice as an ethical activity. On the whole, in their accounts, the women did not view religion as a project with change as its goal. Only a few of them even mentioned the possibility of methodical cultivation of piety – only to marvel, alongside Kirsti, at the amount of self-discipline such conscious devotions must require. The interviewees' own goal was, rather, to maintain a steady religious mindset. This ideal of stability is present in their focus on remembering to practice, and is aptly represented by the expression "remembering God."

So far in this chapter, I have produced a rather straightforward picture of how the interviewees' practical belief in God was constituted. My argument has been that practices have the capacity to produce subjects that subscribe to the message inherent in the practices: performing the sign of the cross, for instance, constitutes the individual as a believer (Asad 1993, 76–77; Bell 1992, 100; Bourdieu 1990b, 67–68). However, Lisa Adkins, among others, has criticized Bourdieuan social theory for its tendency to assume that incorporation (for example, in the form of such acts of recognition that I have discussed here) always works. Adkins (2003, 37) stresses that, since habitus is produced in interactions with multiple social environments, it does not fit effortlessly to any one of them. This causes ambivalence within practice.

Scholar of religion Catherine Bell (1992, 207–209) speaks of the social structuring that happens in ritual activities as a negotiated appropriation. The participant, she remarks, brings to practice his or her whole history of experiences, by virtue of which he or she comes to seize the symbolic order reconstituted in practice, and to shape it into a personal and provisional understanding of the social world. According to Bell, ritualized practices actually tolerate a lot of internal heterodoxy and even resistance from the part of participants who commonly do not need to verbalize their views of what the ritual is about. On the basis of Adkins' and Bell's remarks, it is important to acknowledge that my discussion leaves open the evacuee Karelian Orthodox women's particular personal understandings of the social world constituted through their religious activities. The specifics of their views on God and the social world are not attainable through my analysis, and are certain to contain an amount of variation.

I end this section by making note of some of the women's spontaneous reflections concerning the topic of religious practice not working properly. Above, I took up Lempi's account in which she noted that she did not like for the sign of the cross to be done "negligently, in passing." A few other women also made parallel remarks in their interviews. Vieno, for example, stated that it is not right to make the sign of the cross for show: "It can't be that [one makes the sign of the cross thinking] 'now I show how I make the sign of the cross, look at me.' It's a gesture to bless the food and to bless yourself." In their accounts, both Lempi and Vieno imply that the sign of the cross is not always made with the right state of mind, with proper belief. Simultaneously, they reveal their awareness that practice is not always what it seems: that external uniformity can mask heterogeneous motives as well as dissimulation. The talk of negligent routines and inauthentic customs can be understood as the women's way of engaging with the issue of the ambivalence of practice, and the question of what constitutes authentic religious practice in the first place.

Performing Life after Death

Old age does not bring about radical changes in religiosity. Existing research suggests that the one factor that most effectively predicts religiosity in old age is childhood socialization into religion (Dillon and Wink 2003, 181–183). It is not uncommon for religious activity to increase in old age, but this increase is often connected with practical matters such as free time gained after retirement, not with newfound interest in religion as such (Dillon 2007, 531–534; Hunt 2002, 78–79). Religion had also become more significant to the displaced Karelian Orthodox women as they had aged. Usually, they explained the escalation of their religious activity with reference to the quieting down of their lives. Alternatively, the women could also give to understand that their present-day lives were afflicted by feelings of frailty and powerlessness that also contributed to the growing importance of religion. In this vein, previous research has shown that religion can help those who are already religious in coping with age-related anxieties and sorrows (Dillon and Wink 2003, 185–187; McFadden 1996, 167–168).

The women reported the ardency of their praying having increased as they had gotten older. At the time of the interviews, the women prayed first and foremost for the well-being of their children and grandchildren. They often stressed that, at present, an important way for them to affect the lives of their loved ones was through prayer. Toini, for instance, stated: "I've thought that I have to pray [for my children and grandchildren] so much beforehand that it

will carry them even after my death." Praying, moreover, was seen as a special duty of old people. In fact, the women seemed to give a religious significance to grandmotherhood far more openly and often than to motherhood. Whereas motherhood was described through the practical aspects of caretaking, in accounts of grandmotherhood these responsibilities gave way to the spiritual task of protecting family members through prayer.

A second major concern in the women's prayers was their health. The informants prayed for increasing health, or that their health would, at least, not deteriorate further. Furthermore, some of them specifically asked for a good death. For example, Esteri, who had many health problems, spoke of her hopes for the future: "[I pray that] God would give me strength for as long as I live. That I could remain just as I am, old. You can't help it if you get sick for a long time, you can only pray. (...) I hope that the Heavenly Father won't leave me in bed for a long time. That'd be so hard for the family." As the excerpt shows, even when speaking of her health Esteri was concerned for her family, hoping that the process of her dying would not be too burdensome for them.

Otherwise, the interviewees also emphasized how their praying was very much about giving thanks to God. The women were thanking God for answering their prayers and for their share in life. Siiri, for instance, reflected: "I'm at that age now that I've begun to give thanks for everything that is. When I go on my walks, they're all about morning prayer, as I walk in the mornings. They're discussions with God. And I've noticed that I rarely ask for anything, I just give thanks." All in all, the contents of the women's prayers reflected their concerns and priorities at the time of the interviews. They were concerned about their loved ones, wondering what would happen to them after the women had died. They needed God's help due to their own health problems, and worried about how their mortal lives would end. In addition, they were looking backward at their lives, wanting to thank God for all that they had received from Him. Thus, in a good part of their prayers, the women seemed to process the issue of their approaching deaths.

Especially in the earliest interviews, death was a difficult topic for me to approach. I had included the theme in the interview frame, but found it hard to bring it up, fearing the women's reactions. Soon, however, I realized that it was me, and not the informants, for whom death and loss were terrifying subjects. Many of the women, in fact, took up the topic on their own, speaking at length on various issues related to death. Particularly the older interviewees spoke of their own deaths as being already quite close at hand. Moreover, the women also recounted deaths of loved ones from over the years. Some related detailed accounts of deaths that had been particularly affecting, whereas others lamented in a more general way how so many around them had died.

Elsa, for instance, noted: "It makes you feel so bad when they go, one after the other, to the bosom of the earth, and there's no one left." The women might also spontaneously recount to me premonitions that they had received, in the form of dreams, visions, and scents, concerning the death of a loved one, often a parent or grandparent.

Nevertheless, the women also made clear their belief in death not being the end. According to Christian doctrine, Jesus died on the cross so that man would be redeemed from death; this teaching had not been lost on the women. On the contrary, many of them mentioned the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, or the "Easter message," as a cornerstone of the Orthodox faith. Often, they took up the Christian promise of life after death when considering their own approaching deaths. Furthermore, the idea of an afterlife was also reflected in the way in which the women spoke of their deceased relatives. Dead loved ones were warmly described as, for instance, being "at the home of the Heavenly Father" or "in the other world," or looking at the women "from above." A few interviewees even told of their experiences of being in contact with departed relatives, usually through dreams.

The issue of how death was regarded in pre-war Karelia was spontaneously taken up by many women who spoke with approving tones of how, in their childhood homes, death was accepted as part of life, not pushed out of sight. It was common for them to note how this way – the "Karelian" or the "Orthodox" way – of relating to death emphasized continued connection with the deceased. The informants could, for instance, remember how as children they had gone to visit graves with their grandmother, bringing with them food for the dead.[5] Through these remarks, they described the environment in and the practices through which their dispositions regarding death had originally been formed. A lot had changed between their childhood and today. However, even in their present-day lives the women engaged in many customs through which they cultivated their belief in life continuing after death.

To begin with, the interviewees often explained that Orthodox funeral rites regard death with a focus on the continuance of existence, and how this creates an undertone of hope and brightness that characterizes the Orthodox "culture of death" as a whole (see also Hamalis 2011a). Siiri, for instance, noted:

---

5 *Kalmoilla käyminen* was an ethnic Karelian Orthodox ritual in which the deceased was remembered by bringing food to his or her grave, for him or her to eat, although the food was often subsequently distributed to the poor (Keinänen 2014, 30–36; Stark 2002, 66–68, 142–146). It was still operative in inter-World War Border Karelia, but waned away rapidly in post-war Finland, due to old family graves being out of reach and negative reactions from the part of the locals (Makkonen 1989, 218–223, 251–252).

"[An Orthodox funeral] is such a comforting ceremony. It's so comforting, it doesn't make death hard to grasp." Moreover, the women also described the various customs that they observed to remember their deceased loved-ones. They lit candles for their dead as part of every church visit, attended Liturgies to honor the dead on special memorial days of the Church, and organized *panikhida* services held in the memory of a particular family member. Martta, for example, explained: "Every time I go to church, I light wax candles to them (deceased relatives), and remember them. And ask them for relief in life."[6] In addition, the women also remembered their dead by visiting grave sites, and by burning candles at home. Tarja listed the days: "I always remember my husband's day of death, mother's day of death, their burial days . . . Father's birthday. But I seem to have forgotten his burial date. Or, I'm not quite sure . . . Anyhow, if I remember, I always light a candle for them [on those days]."

In their commemorative customs, the interviewees also employed Orthodox traditions to remember Lutheran relatives. This suggests that when the women targeted particular people with religious practices, their non-Orthodoxy was not a hindering factor. Some of them, however, actually took up this issue in their accounts. Esteri, for instance, explained: "I always remember to light a wax candle at the days of death and birth. You have to remember the Orthodox during their days of death. (. . .) You can even remember those who weren't Orthodox." Remarks such as this are yet another example of how the women managed the existence of two religious affiliations within their families. These accounts show awareness of difference, yet conclude that, when it came to remembrance, this difference was ultimately meaningless.

Sometimes, the women mentioned that they had already taken care of various practical issues in preparation for their own deaths. They might have acquired a gravesite from a particular cemetery, making sure that they were satisfied with the spot that will one day host their remains. In particular, the women wanted to ensure that their graves would be visited – that they would be remembered like they had remembered those who had already passed away. Other preparatory measures included deciding what was to be written on the gravestone, as well as choosing a burial outfit and the icon that was to be placed in the coffin with them. All in all, the interviewees spoke of making

6 According to Orthodox teaching, the living and the dead are part of the same community of believers (Ware 1964, 258–259). This notion is manifested in the practice of praying both to and for the departed. Nevertheless, Martta's description also echoes the ethnic Karelian conception of the dead as agents that can be asked for help with all kinds of endeavors (Stark 2002, 140–142). In Orthodox prayer, the deceased are not asked for relief directly; they are asked for intercessions (Nyström 2001, 18–19).

concrete arrangements regarding one's death as one example of the practical and accepting attitude towards death that they had learned during childhood.

At the time of the interviews, the displaced Karelian Orthodox women were, on average, 75 years old. In the interviews, many of them reported how their practices of praying and remembering the departed had intensified in recent years, in response to their ailing health and the growing number of deaths around them. The women, it seems, had taken to managing illness and death through methods familiar to them, practices their habitus instinctively recognized and was geared to respond to. This familiarity also ensured the comforting function of these practices in the lives of the women. The women's observance of these customs, however, was not merely reactive in nature. For one thing, the practices can also be understood to constitute "performatives of age" (see Vakimo 2001, 36–38). Contemporary social gerontological scholarship emphasizes the socially constructed nature of all conceptualizations of age. Viewed from this perspective, the interviewees' activities related to the dead and to their grandchildren were actions through which they constructed and acted out their identity as old women, "grannies." Furthermore, through the same practices the interviewees also continuously generated their practical belief in life after death, and in God's guidance in the face of death. The women's belief in life after death was concretely actualized in customs that established a connection with deceased loved ones. It was this experience of a sustained connection that, to them, testified to the continuance of life.

In fact, the women often seemed to treat the interview situation itself as an opportunity to work on their belief. Although death was not a prominent theme in the interview frame, many of the women made it more so by taking up the issue spontaneously. Commonly, their anecdotes and reflections concerning death constituted performances of belief through which they reinforced their trust in life after death. Nevertheless, I do not mean to suggest that the women did not harbor any qualms concerning death. Certainly, the material does not contain accounts in which the interviewees doubted Orthodox teachings concerning death. However, their non-existence can also reflect the women's reluctance to express such opinions to me. Overall, what I argue is that, through observing customs and producing interview accounts that hinged on the idea of life after death, the informants cemented their belief in this notion, in spite of the doubts they might also harbor.

All in all, the analysis above demonstrates how the women's habitus, as a believing habitus, expanded their capacity to act in the world beyond limits difficult to surpass with other means. Praying was a way to influence the lives of loved ones even when they were beyond the women's more concrete aid – as in the case, for instance, of grown-up children. Moreover, through

commemorative practices the women took care of and kept in touch with deceased relatives, transcending the barrier separating the living from the dead. Both customs, in this sense, significantly enhanced the informants' agentic capacities, facilitating their coping with feelings of powerlessness caused by events like children leaving home, illness, and death. Thus, they are a good example of how the women's embodied adherence to the Orthodox symbolic system contributed to their understanding of agency.

CHAPTER 8

Lifelong Religion and Change

Producing Continuums of Practice

Many existing applications of the concept of habitus within religious scholarship focus on processes of conscious habituation (e.g., Coleman 2000; Csordas 1994; Fer 2010; Shanneik 2011; Winchester 2008). In these processes, a new habitus is more or less intentionally learned in connection with some kind of religious realignment. Habitus, however, can evolve in adult life irrespective of conscious effort (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 136; Bourdieu 1990b, 56). In this chapter, I examine some of the later evolutions of my interviewees' habitus, caused by changes in their overall social surroundings. While the Orthodox women had not actively changed their own affinities, most of them had married a member of another Christian domination. Moreover, in the course of their lives, the Finnish society had gone through radical realignments. The interview accounts do not contain many explicit descriptions of the effects of societal developments like secularization on domestic religious practice. This is understandable, since the grass-roots influences of such phenomena are not unequivocal or easily grasped. Hence, I approach the topic by taking a closer look at the informants' perceptions of contemporary religion, which convey their experiences as members of an increasingly differentiated society. I begin by discussing their depictions of their present-day religion.

It was common for the displaced Karelian Orthodox women to emphasize the historical continuity of Orthodox practices. They regularly made note of the old age of particular customs to argue for their authenticity. Senja, for example, described the daily prayers of her childhood home by explaining: "They've all gone around for hundreds of years. Prayers that are part of evenings and mornings and mealtime prayers, they're all straight from the Bible." Senja's reference to the Bible functions as a rhetorical strategy to legitimate her childhood prayer practices and to argue for the general invariance of Orthodox Christianity. Orthodox prayers do often quote scripture; however, they are not "all straight" from the Bible (Binns 2005, 49–51; Lash 2008, 35–36).

The legitimating effect of the rhetoric of continuity is especially clear in the women's accounts concerning more controversial issues within Orthodox doctrine. The ban on female ordination was one aspect of Orthodox Christianity that often triggered references to the constancy of Orthodoxy. In this vein, Raili, for instance, stated: "I don't approve of women priests. In my workplace

© HELENA KUPARI, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004326743_009
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License.

I was a real advocate of women's rights. But I want something to remain the same even for my great-grandchildren. [I want] this Orthodox religion to have traditions, like in the olden days." About a third of the women responded positively to female ordination; nevertheless, even for many of these informants the emphasis on the continuum of traditions counted against women's priesthood. It was an argument they could understand and accept.[1]

According to Danièle Hervieu-Léger (2000, 81–82), religious belief revolves around the idea of a chain of memory connecting together past, present, and future believers. Individual religions, for their part, constitute systems through which this idea is "constituted, maintained, developed and controlled." In their accounts concerning the stability of Orthodox practices across time, also the women of my study evoked the notion of an Orthodox Christian chain of memory. However, they also established chains of religious memory of a more personal nature. These continuums usually stretched between their childhood and today. Thus, it was not uncommon for the women to refer to their religion as "childhood religion." Furthermore, when describing their present-day religious activities, they frequently linked these to similar practices and beliefs in their childhood homes. They often explained their observation of a particular practice, for instance, by noting how they had been doing so "ever since childhood," how they had "learned it when little," or how it was what their mothers had done. In the women's parlance, that is to say, reference to childhood legitimated religious activities. Allusion to a custom either having or having not been part of one's childhood religion sufficed to explain its importance or irrelevance in later life.

> Helena: The Virgin Mary, or the Mother of God, is also a figure that is central in Orthodoxy. Does she have a special meaning to you?
>
> Lyyli: No, no.
>
> Helena: Right . . . You haven't found her, like, particularly important?

---

1 In the Finnish Orthodox Church, the issue of women's ordination has not been widely discussed. However, some of the Church's highest officials have recently expressed somewhat differing views on the topic. While Archbishop Leo of Karelia and all Finland has stated that women's priesthood in the Orthodox Church is an impossibility, Metropolitan Ambrosius of Helsinki maintains that the question remains open within the Church (Hiiro 2015; Vihavainen 2015). The Evangelical Lutheran Church's decision to allow women to become priests was strongly criticized by the leading Orthodox clergy at the time (Laitila 2006, 174). In the long run, it has not markedly affected ecumenical relations between the Churches.

> Lyyli: No, no. (. . .) And neither did we at home. It stems from there. But they (her parents) were Orthodox. It was just ordinary family life without anything special.

In the above question, I define the veneration of Mary as an "Orthodox" practice. This prompts Lyyli to defend her own religiosity, in which Mary did not play a central role, by noting that it stemmed from her Orthodox childhood family. Lyyli's answer, in other words, seizes on the notion that it is natural for childhood customs to endure. The account is a good example of how the women stressed, besides the stability of Orthodox Christianity, the stability of their religion. In fact, judging from the interview material, childhood religion acted as the starting point of most of the religious lineages that they envisaged. The informants seemed to embrace the idea of a religious chain of memory primarily through concrete ties with actual people. This notion they reinforced, for instance, through emphasizing the length and stability of Orthodox "roots" within their families. Thus, they might note how their family was "fully Orthodox," how it had "lived as Orthodox for centuries," or how they had "a strong Orthodox background."

On the whole, the women regarded the religion of their grandparents as the ideal form of Orthodoxy, and considered themselves lucky for having been able to witness this way of doing religion as children. Commonly, grandparents' religion represents something into which the individual has not been fully socialized; it stands at a suitable distance from him or her to be marked as authentic and special. In their studies, both Robert Wuthnow (1999, xxxvii–xxxviii, 51–53) and Kaija Heikkinen (1989, 334–335, 363–364; 1984, 102–103) have also noted on the tendency of people with a lifelong religious vocation to view the religion of their grandparents' generation as unique and exemplary in its piety.

Here, I have discussed the interviewees' practice of legitimating their religious customs by placing them into a continuum of religious tradition. Although my focus has been on manners of speaking about religion, it is important to remember that one constitutive element of the lineages built by the women was their embodied history. Their bodies retained knowledge of innumerable reiterative customs and rituals that they had performed in the course of their lives. In their basic religious activities, the women often tapped into these memories, establishing lived continuums of practice. Nevertheless, chains of religious memory are often, to some extent, constructed. They are ultimately not about actual continuums but about symbolic lineages (Hervieu-Léger 2000, 81). The constructed nature of the continuums established by the women was revealed, for instance, in that their experience of a lineage of

tradition was not cancelled out by breaks in its particularities. It was possible for the women to insist on a connection with childhood religion simultaneously as they recognized that, during their lifetimes, their customs had gone through significant changes.

Many religious customs that had been standard practice in the women's childhood had transformed markedly or faded away entirely in post-war Finland. These changes had also seeped into their habitus. Their bodies, in other words, also hosted knowledge of ruptures of practice. In light of all the 20th century mutations of Orthodox culture that the interviewees had lived through, their emphasis on the stability of their religion appears to be in part a performative strategy. The description of continuums constituted a practice of speaking through which the interviewees reproduced their belief in the chain of religious memory, even in the interview situations. Moreover, it is not stretching the point to suggest that highlighting continuums was important to the women precisely because of all the changes that had gone on around them. The threat of breaks and ruptures made constant reference to the lineage all the more necessary.

According to Hervieu-Léger (2000, 75–76, 81), religion constitutes a way of believing characterized by legitimating reference to a chain of memory. In evoking the authority of this tradition, the individual expressly positions himself or herself within a community of believers. Anthropologist of religion Abby Day (2011, 48–55, 156–158, 167–169), for her part, argues that one central form of mainstream belief in the contemporary West is belief in social relationships and communities. This "belief in belonging" is performed through various kinds of acts of adherence, inclusion, and exclusion: for instance, the act of claiming a particular ethnic or religious identity. In a similar manner, constructing continuums of religious memory was a way for the women of my study to claim membership in particular communities, as well as to generate belief in them. The women's primary context of belonging was their kinship group; however, they made sure to embed this group also within wider "Orthodox" and "Karelian" communities.

Living Religion, Dying Tradition?

> I met Siiri, a former librarian in her mid-seventies, at an Orthodox lay association meeting. She frequented the meetings, she explained to me, because people there sang the same songs her mother used to sing to her when she was little, and it made her "feel like home." Overall, she did not consider herself a very pious person. She did not go to church regularly;

moreover, her domestic religious practice did not compare with that of her parents:

> I feel that if we could've remained in Salmi, the whole culture would have passed on well to our generation. But, as it was, it didn't. Luckily, my elder sister and I were at an age where [later as adults] we could remember everything that they did back then. Of course, the sign of the cross was something that we were taught already when we were very small.

After she had retired, Siiri had been an active member in several Karelian associations. In one of them, she had organized a collection of proverbs and stories in the local dialect of Salmi, her Border Karelian home municipality. The collection had subsequently been archived in the Folklore Archives of the Finnish Literature Society. Nevertheless, Siiri was quite pessimistic about the future of the Karelian language in Finland. She pointed out that there were so few people still alive who had learned it as a child and could really speak it, adding: "I find it nice that the Archbishop Leo (of Karelia and all Finland) is interested in Karelian. But you can tell that he hasn't spoken it as a child. He spoke the dialect of Savonia instead, since he was born there." In the interview, Siiri also commented on the revivification project of the Karelian language currently underway in Finland, noting that, to her, the version of Karelian promoted by the Karelian Language Association sounded like a "made-up language."[2] It was different from the dialect spoken in her childhood environment. "But maybe they founded the association so that the Karelian language would stay alive at least in some form," she pondered. "I can understand that."

Ethnic cultures are problematic entities. The definitions of the term "Karelian," for example, vary along historical, local, and political lines (Heikkinen 1996, 20, 30; Virtanen 1987, 185). The collective Karelian identity of Second World War evacuees took shape only in post-war Finland, in contact with non-Karelians. The gradual development of this identity is documented, for instance, in Kaija Heikkinen's work on the self-consciousness of evacuees from Salmi. In her research, Heikkinen (1996, 23–24, 28; 1989, 363–367; 1984, 84–87, 99–104)

---

2 The Karelian Language Association (*Karjalan Kielen Seura*) was founded in 1995 (Lampi 2016). A potential explanation as to why Siiri found the language promoted by the association peculiar is that the inhabitants of pre-war Salmi spoke Olonets Karelian, a dialect different from the one spoken in most parts of Border Karelia (Järvinen 2004, 26–27).

notes that, for first-generation adult evacuees, the term “Karelian” received its meaning with respect to personally known locales such as the home village. In the minds of second-generation evacuees, it was connected to a much vaguer and more generic notion of “Karelian culture”: a conglomeration of customs, artifacts, and cultural traits.

This kind of variation in ethnic consciousness is, to an extent, visible also in my material. The oldest of the women often spoke of Karelia on the basis of their own childhood experiences. On occasion, these informants also commented on the ethnic labels given to elements of their pre-war surroundings, stating, for instance, that Karelian roast (*karjalanpaisti*) or Karelian pasties (*karjalanpiirakat*) actually had an altogether different name in their childhood. The youngest interviewees, for their part, were more prone to basing their accounts on generalizing discourses. Nevertheless, irrespective of age the women spoke of “Karelian” practices also when referring to religious, and specifically Orthodox, customs. In their understanding, Karelian culture and Orthodoxy were intertwined, even though they were aware that not all of pre-war Finnish Karelia was Orthodox in its religious affiliation.

The women’s reactions to contemporary discussions concerning Karelian culture are evident, for instance, in how they employed the term “tradition” in connection with their religious practice. In the interviews, I asked the women a few questions built around the term. The dictionary definition of “tradition” (*perinne*) is inherited custom, practice, or knowledge (Grönfors 2006, 472). In their answers, the interviewees usually brought up an additional connotation: past custom that is no longer part of mainstream culture. All in all, they did not use the word very often. Moreover, they used it particularly infrequently when describing their religious practices. It was rare for them to label as traditions those religious customs that they actively observed, even though they were keen to emphasize the continuums established through these customs. The women, in other words, tended to distinguish traditions from continuums of religious practice.

Whereas most of the women spoke of traditions, if at all, as concrete customs, some of them made spontaneous use of the term as referring to an abstract body of knowledge. To speak of tradition in this sense, particularly when it is a tradition in which one participates, requires a certain amount of critical distance (see also Heikkinen 1984, 102; Riesebrodt 2010, 16). Consider, for example, Auli’s statement: “You can look at tradition from different angles: poetic tradition, costume tradition, culinary tradition, religious tradition, everything. I like to combine these together. They make a person a totality, all this tradition.” Auli was one of the youngest of my interviewees; her approach

differs greatly from the intuitive distance-taking from "tradition" exhibited by the older women.

As regards the continuum of cultural customs, the informants conveyed a strict ideal according to which customs survive only through active practice. They have to be observed in everyday life to stay alive. Furthermore, what this implies is that to be able to keep customs alive, the individual has had to be acclimated into using them, preferably within the childhood family. In the women's opinion, socialization into a culture was thus ultimately the only successful way of transferring it on. This notion is evident, for instance, in Siiri's above laments on how evacuation from Karelia hindered the passing on of Karelian culture, religion, and language.

Now, in their accounts, the interviewees usually connected the term "tradition" with customs that were no longer kept alive in this way. Hence, they did not often speak of Orthodox practices as traditions. When they did use the term, they referred to childhood religious customs that had later waned away. Furthermore, the women also spontaneously defined certain religious practices as "Karelian." Commonly, these were also practices that did not feature in mainstream Finnish Orthodox culture any longer. In the women's parlance, overall, the term "tradition" was most often linked to religious practices also described as "Karelian."

The women were quite unanimous in that Karelian culture will go through major changes after those who have personally experienced pre-war Karelia have passed away. It "fades away," "transforms," "ends," "is buried along with us," "becomes Finlandized," "becomes confused," or "merges" with the dominant culture were some of the expressions they used. The Orthodox Easter practice of symbolically birching (*virpoa*) family members, relatives, and livestock on Palm Sunday provided one negative example of the mutation of Karelian customs in post-war Finland.[3] In most parts of the country, this practice has merged with the western Finnish custom that involves children dressing up as Easter witches (*trullit*) on Great Saturday, and the women did not think well of the resulting hybrid. Siiri, for example, mentioned: "I'm so sad that birching has lost, has changed entirely. It has blended into this Ostrobothnian tradition. For I remember how we [as children] started off early in the morning, and ran in the snow [to bless our aunt next door]."

3 Birching involves waving a decorated willow branch that has been blessed at church in front of a person whilst reciting a short rhyme. Afterwards, the willow branch is given to the person in question in exchange for a payment in the form of a treat or money (Korjonen-Kuusipuro and Niinisalo 2005, 53–55; Sarmela 2009, 268–269).

Moreover, one cause of sorrow that the women brought up was the diminishing role of Karelianness in the Orthodox Church. The interviewees recounted how Orthodox lay association meetings used to be gatherings where participants spoke Karelian, remembered Karelian customs, and sang Karelian songs. Nowadays, this emphasis on Karelia had, to some extent, faded away. The women could also note how, in the past, the majority of priests were Karelian evacuees, while today many of them had no connection with Karelia. All in all, the community included an increasing number of people in whose minds Orthodoxy was not linked with Karelia. In consequence, the Finnish Orthodox Church seemed no longer to represent quite the same lineage of religious memory with which the interviewees identified. It had too little to do with Karelia.

Starting from the 1960's, some elements of Karelian folk religion have become the target of rekindled popular interest. Karelian associations, cultural heritage foundations, and the tourism industry have organized projects of revivification of various Karelian traditions (Petrisalo 2001, 64–106; Raivo 1996, 205–238). In the process, they have given rise to folklorized practices to represent "exotic" and "authentic" Karelian culture. At some point in their lives, most of my interviewees had also participated in the activities of some Karelian association or other. Nevertheless, at least some of the recent revivification efforts appeared "artificial" and "forced" to them.

The practice of ritual lamenting (*äänellä itkentä*) is one Orthodox Karelian tradition that has gone through a kind of revival in present-day Finland.[4] When asked to give their opinion on this development, most of the women noted that they accepted the active resuscitation of customs, if the custom in question had completely died out. However, they often also noted that the result was something quite different from the original practice. The lamenters of the past, after all, learned the skill through growing up within a culture of lament-singing, not through express study. Furthermore, some of the interviewees even expressed the opinion that the custom should rather be allowed to vanish than transform into something that was not true to the spirit of the original.

4 In pre-modern Karelia, lament-singing was women's tradition. Lamenting was part of rites of passage; in addition, women sang laments about their personal sorrows (Keinänen 2014, 25–30; Nenola 2002; Utriainen 1998a). In inter-World War Border Karelia, the practice of lamenting was already waning, and in post-war Finland it all but died down (Tenhunen 2006, 181–184). In the 1960s, however, lament-singing started to attract attention as part of a newfound interest in folk music, folk traditions, and Karelian culture. Courses of lament-singing have been organized since 1998, and *Äänellä Itkijät*, the association of lamenters, was founded in 2001 (Tenhunen 2006, 188–196, 293–310).

Above, I have traced descriptions concerning ruptured continuums of practice from the displaced Karelian Orthodox women's accounts regarding the present and future of Karelian culture in Finland. All in all, the interviewees' descriptions showed a discrepancy between how customs ideally stay alive, and how Karelian culture was currently being sustained in Finland. Their reactions concerning the mutation of individual practices, moreover, seemed to reflect their embodied history with respect to these practices. If the women had past experiences of a particular practice as part of the overall way of life, they often held reservations regarding later changes. Lacking such personal experiences, they were commonly more ready to accept the evolution of the practice. This explains why the younger informants were generally more open to projects of active revivification than the older ones. Ultimately, then, the crux of the matter was not the mutation of practices as such. It was their changing in ways that, in the embodied experience of the women, broke the continuum with the earlier form. In the informants' understanding, ruptures in the lineage made "traditions" out of religious practices. Hence, their stress on the continuums inherent in their religious customs: continuums testified to their religion remaining alive.

Religion versus the Secular World

A defining feature of what can be understood as the late-modern condition is that there is no longer a single truth or way of life to follow. Present-day Western societies are characterized by an unprecedented proliferation of morals, religiosities, and lifestyles. This backdrop of pluralism, moreover, affects every individual, even those who remain drawn to more traditional understandings of, for instance, religion and gender (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2002, 1–8; Vincett, Sharma, and Aune 2008, 8). According to the interviewees, the overall status of religion in Finland had deteriorated during their lifetimes. This they saw as a clearly negative, even alarming, development. Often, the women stated that people seemed to need religion less than they had during the Second World War and in the post-war period. Furthermore, what diverted their attention away from the church was secular pastimes and material pursuits. Thus, Rauha, for example, stated: "People are in an awful hurry, that's what does it. They cannot quiet down. Is it a lust for money or what? Everything has to be perfect in their lives, perfect. People should be content; we have a really good life."

In connection with the diminished role of religion in today's Finland, the women took up the theme of changing morals. They could state, in worried tones, that human life was no longer respected in the same way as before:

suicides, domestic violence, bad manners, and abandoned children and old people were all proof of this. Moreover, the informants also reflected that people today "live only for themselves" and do not care enough about others, a development directly commensurate with marriages having become much weaker and divorces more common than before. In addition, they might imply that the pursuit of gender equality had gone too far, and was corrupting the morals of young women, in particular. All of these things, the women conveyed, were ultimately connected to people turning away from religion.

These opinions parallel the results of previous studies on the values of Finns of the same generation (Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2005, 153–163; Ketola, Kääriäinen, and Niemelä 2007, 61–62, 67–69). To an extent, the interviewees' accounts also replicate Abby Day's (2011, 144–150, 198–201) observation that many Westerners connect moral decline with the changing status of women. In this vein, the informants seemed, on some level, to put a lot of the blame for the corrosion of values on women. At least, many of their examples concerning the morals of the "olden days" involved women complying with their traditional roles as self-sacrificing caretakers of their loved ones.

On a contrary note, when speaking of contemporary religiosity, the interviewees could also note that, at present, many people were actively searching for a spiritual alternative fit for them. If they found one, they made a conscious decision to have religion as part of their lives. Elsa, for instance, observed: "I have this feeling that today people seek a lot, at least in Finland. It's clearly visible." And Kirsti contemplated: "To the people of the war-time, religion was self-evident. They had been on the front, they had gone through evacuations, all that. But for the people of today it's a conscious choice. Either you need the Church and God, and you pray, [or not]. It's a whole different mentality compared to when everyone believed." These kinds of reflections reveal the women's awareness of the contemporary notion of religion as an individual choice reflecting one's authentic self (see e.g., Beckford 2003, 209–213).

In a previous chapter, I discussed the informants' capacity to reflect on the differences between their religion and the religion of Lutherans and converts to Orthodoxy. The accounts discussed above also show the women comparing their religion to that of others. In Elsa and Kirsti's case, for example, the other in question was a style of doing religion that placed less importance on family tradition than on finding a lifestyle that spoke of one's individuality. However, the primary other in contemporary Finland against which the women positioned themselves was not, in the last instance, any religious way of life. It was secular society.

Perhaps as a reaction to being interviewed by a member of the academic community, some of the informants spontaneously rose to defend their beliefs

and practices against hypothetical secular opposition. They voiced different skeptical arguments concerning religion, such as the point that religious assertions cannot be scientifically proven, and the notion of religion as the opium of the masses. Elsa, for example, pondered: “Sometimes people say that belief and God are crutches for the weak. Well, what if this is true? What does it matter? It’s a good thing, right? Although, when it’s said by a person who doesn’t believe in God, the whole statement receives a completely different meaning.” In taking up these kinds of arguments, the women recognized the existence of secular and anti-religious worldviews, positioning themselves in relation to them.

When speaking of the religion of Lutherans and converts to Orthodoxy, the women often appeared convinced of the validity of their own position with respect to the alternatives under consideration. In comparisons between religious and secular discourses, they did not sound so confident. On the contrary, they seemed to acknowledge the dominant status of scientific arguments and the weakness of their own stance with respect to these discourses. In this vein, Elsa reflects that the interpretation given to the notion of God as a crutch depends on the person’s belief in God. What she alludes to is that, ultimately, her own position comes down to belief. The act of placing one’s trust in God strikes those who do not believe, but look for scientific verification, as completely irrational.

Overall, in their reflections concerning contemporary Finnish society, the Orthodox women commonly distanced themselves from the present, siding rather with the past. Nevertheless, the accounts also reveal the influence of contemporary currents of discourse on their views on religion – even if they did not advocate these discourses themselves. That Elsa, for instance, would spontaneously launch into the kind of rumination quoted above is a reflection of her being affected by secular ways of thinking, discourses that bring into question the soundness of her belief in God. Furthermore, when describing modern lifestyles, the women sometimes admitted that the changes they spoke of affected them as well, to some extent. They could note, for example, that their lives had gotten somewhat hectic too: they were spending too much time on various secular pastimes. In addition, they also pointed out changes for the better, such as increased equality and tolerance. Through such comments, the women conveyed that they did not downright reject the contemporary way of life. They were both outsiders and insiders to it.

> Auli: I’ve tried those more secular ones (lifestyles) too, at some point. But I never succeeded in them that well; this (Orthodoxy) has suited me better. If I’ve started thinking that ‘I have the right’ and that ‘I can do that as well,’ I’ve become miserable. (…) Nowadays a woman is considered

> old-fashioned if she doesn't follow all these things. You should be somehow different, but it doesn't work out for everyone. For me, it didn't bring that; I always had to get back in line.

The above account is a beautiful illustration of the complex relations that the interviewees could harbor with particular discourses topical in present-day Finland. Auli makes insightful observations concerning what is expected of women in today's society, acknowledging her shortcomings with respect to the norm. Nevertheless, she also notes how, to her, a more traditional gender role has simply felt the right way to be. Auli's account, in a sense, reflects the layered constitution of her gendered habitus. It shows how she had been affected by contemporary standards (she was aware of them, and had even tried to adopt them), but also reveals the impact of her embodied history. Ultimately, Auli felt most comfortable in acknowledging the pull of the native layer of her habitus, the dispositions set deepest within her.

In the above excerpt, Auli explains how experimenting with individualistic lifestyles made her "miserable." However, in the course of their religious lives the women had also made individualistic choices, even though they did not advertise them as such. One such choice was their standing by their religious heritages even when marrying Lutheran men and becoming mothers of Lutheran children. In the women's parlance, this course of action was founded on their strong bond with the Orthodox religion. It was impossible for them to give up something that was "in their genes." From the perspective of the adult family, however, this can be seen to constitute an individualistic decision. Even though resigning one's childhood religion was not uncommon among members of the Orthodox Church during the first post-war decades, the interviewees had not done so. In contrast to those who had converted, and to those who had adopted secular lifestyles, they had made a conscious choice to remain Orthodox.

On the Religion of Children and Grandchildren

The women's interview accounts concerning the baptism of their children into the Lutheran faith mirrored the post-war mentality of keeping a low profile about one's Orthodox affiliation. They usually commented on the issue by stating how it was the "custom of those days" or the "letter of the law." These expressions treat the baptism of children into the father's faith as standard policy that was not challenged by any parties involved. Some interviewees, moreover, implied that Lutheranism had appeared the superior alternative because

of the low status of Orthodox Christianity during the first post-war decades. Martta, for instance, stated, of her children: "They're Lutheran. At that time you weren't. At that time, you had to be careful, or were careful not to tell others of your Orthodoxy."

Regretting the religious affiliation of their Lutheran children was something that most of the informants did not admit to. When asked about it outright, they instantly denied such feelings. According to the women, the Lutheranism of their children was "natural"; after all, "we all believe in the same God." Moreover, it reflected the "spirit of the time." Elsewhere in the interviews, some of them implied that the issue had not actually been quite that simple, mentioning, for instance, that it would have been nice to socialize the children into the religion they themselves practiced. Nevertheless, the only woman who expressed open regret was Maija-Liisa whose children had been born after the reform in the law concerning baptism. She was deeply sorry that she had "let" her children become Lutherans, thus "severing the Orthodox roots" of her family.

The women's descriptions of the religious socialization of their Lutheran grandchildren exhibited a similar logic to their accounts of the religious upbringing of their children. The interviewees seemed to think that it was acceptable to explain Orthodox practices to Lutheran descendants, but inappropriate to actively lead them towards an Orthodox lifestyle. However, since the women did not consider themselves primarily responsible for the religious education of their grandchildren, they were, in some sense, more free to introduce them to the Orthodox heritage of the family. Over the decades, the general attitude towards Orthodoxy had also become more approving, which may have encouraged them in this task.

Compared to the women with Lutheran children, those with all-Orthodox adult families depicted the religious socialization of their offspring as a less problematic affair. As to the transfer of Karelian customs, however, all of the interviewees were more or less facing the same situation. In the interviews, they spoke about remembering the Karelian way of life for the benefit of their children and grandchildren, and about teaching their children and grandchildren individual customs: the baking of Karelian pasties, words or nursery rhymes in the Karelian language, and so on. These measures, however, were in obvious contrast with their own experiences of being socialized into Orthodox and Karelian culture.

> Helena: How do you see your role, if you think of a lineage of generations, for instance, from you grandparents to your grandchildren? What's your place there?

> Sinikka: Well it has surely changed from the time of my grandparents and parents. In any case, I try to tell these little ones of my life and my traditions, what they did in Karelia and . . . But I don't know whether they'll be interested in these things later.

When evaluating their own contribution to the passing on of Orthodox and Karelian customs within their adult families, the tone of the women varied. Whereas some lamented on not having taught their children enough, others, similar to Sinikka, implied that they had done what they could under the circumstances. These reflections show the women judging their activities based on contemporary criteria, knowledgeable of the changing possibilities for passing on religious and ethnic customs compared to earlier times.

An important characteristic of the interviewees' descriptions was an emphasis on not forcing their ways on their descendants. Martta, for example, noted: "I've told [of Orthodox and Karelian practices] in passing. But I've never imposed them on the grandchildren in any way." And Anna stressed: "I've not pressed anything on them (the grandchildren). I've only told of how much they (Orthodox customs) mean to me." These kinds of remarks reflect the women's adaptation to the individualistic ethos of the surrounding society. Moreover, they also allude to a crucial change in conditions of religious and ethnic socialization compared to the women's childhood. As children, the interviewees learned the lifestyle of their parents more or less automatically. In contrast, their own work on this front was more of a conscious effort. Due to their minority status and overall social changes, the women's lifestyle differed, in some important ways, from that of their spouses and the surrounding society. Hence, they were not able to present it to their descendants as doxa, but only as one possibility among others.

Overall, the women spoke of the religion of their children and grandchildren with reflective tones. They pondered on the effects of home upbringing, schooling, the church, the surrounding society, and specific life events on their descendants' religiosity. It was common for the women with Orthodox children to produce more straightforward judgments, either positive or negative. Thus, while some of these women spoke of their children as "conscious" or "true" Orthodox, others lamented that their children were not sufficiently interested in religion. The interviewees with Lutheran children, for their part, used a milder, cautiously positive tone. They rarely offered general evaluations, but approached the topic through mentioning particular religious customs that some of their descendants had adopted. It is possible that these women knew, on average, less about their children's religious activity than the women

with Orthodox children. Alternatively, they may also have been less comfortable with discussing the topic in the interviews.

Generally speaking, the women with Lutheran children and grandchildren spoke more of their offspring's interest in Orthodox and Karelian culture than of their religiosity. These descriptions, moreover, varied a great deal between informants. Some of the women proudly explained, for example, how their children and grandchildren "knew everything" about their background, or how they were "extremely interested" in Orthodox and Karelian customs. At the same time, others were less optimistic in their statements, noting, for instance, how their descendants had a "positive attitude towards traditions but didn't continue them," how they "didn't know enough" about their roots, or how they "didn't want to talk about the past at all." In all likelihood, the range of these comments corresponds with actual differences in the religiosity and ethnic consciousness of the informants' children and grandchildren. However, the variation also reflects their chosen perspectives. When the women compared their offspring's activities with their own practices, their judgments were often negative in tone. Whereas, if they evaluated their descendants against the background set by present-day society, their estimates were characterized by a more positive outlook.

On the whole, the women acknowledged that their descendants' religion was of a different order compared to their own. This shows, for example, in their remarks treating the religion of their children and grandchildren as a personal choice. In this vein, Soja stated: "I taught my children all the prayers. Even to these *bunukat* (grandchildren) I taught mealtime prayers and bedtime prayers, among other things. But it's their own business, whether they remember them or not." Such interpretations differ greatly from how the women talked about their religiosity. This capacity to fluently switch to an individualistic discourse when speaking of children and grandchildren shows the interviewees' awareness of how religiosity is commonly thought about today. It is an expression of the multi-layered constitution of their habitus: of the influence of today's pluralistic and individualistic social climate on their embodied knowledge concerning religion.

I end this section on a personal note. As has been extensively discussed in the course of the book, a central anchor of the interviewees' religiosity was their family heritage. Alas, the majority of them had not been able to pass this heritage on as an active lifestyle to younger generations. During the research process, I often found myself moved by this, in my opinion, tragic state of affairs. In part, this emotional reaction resulted from my earlier experiences. In the early stages of the research, my idea had been to gather information from women of different ages. In this scenario, the research would have

discussed variations in Orthodox religiosity and Karelian identity between generations. However, I soon abandoned this plan due to the lack of interest from the part of younger women towards my project. I was simply not able to attract the attention of people younger than, say, 60 with my presentations or letters. Later, I realized that my failure was symptomatic of a more general development, one that the interviewees experienced also within their families.

According to Robert Orsi (2005, 77), children "signal the vulnerability and contingency of a particular religious world," which is why "discussions of children's religious lives are fraught with such great fear, sometimes sorrow, and sometimes ferocity, (...) especially in times of social change or dislocation." Orsi is obviously right in emphasizing the crucial value of children to the future of most religions. The Orthodox women, however, commonly spoke of their children's and grandchildren's religion calmly and laconically. Early on in the analysis, I found their accounts baffling. Why did they not express more regret, sadness, or anger over not having been able to secure the continuum of their practices across generations? After some consideration, I came up with several potential explanations to their remarks.

First of all, the descendants' religion was one of those themes that clearly suffered from my decision to interview each informant only once. Several women were hesitant to dwell on the topic so as not to violate their children's privacy. Secondly, the women may also have found it difficult to integrate the issue to the autobiographical narratives they were producing. On some level, after all, it challenged their overall emphasis on lineages of religious practice. In light of this, it is possible that the interviewees hid at least some of their disappointment regarding the religion of their children and grandchildren from me. Finally, it is also important to remember that the key event for the intergenerational continuance of most women's religious heritage, the baptism of their first child, had taken place several decades, even over half a century, ago. The informants had had ample time to process the consequences of this event, and subsume them into their life stories. As for my emotional reaction to their narratives, it was immediate and spontaneous.

A Grass-roots View on the Religious Field

Practices are generated in the encounter of habitus and field, of history incorporated in bodies and history objectified in social structures (Bourdieu 2000, 150–151). My inquiry into the religious practice and habitus of the evacuee Karelian Orthodox women in the course of this and the previous chapters has therefore also opened up a view into the Finnish religious field. In this

concluding section of the analysis, I discuss the interviewees' perceptions of contemporary religion as self-positionings within the religious field. That is to say, I treat these reflections as a grass-roots account of the religious field, mirroring the field's network of positions as it appears from the place occupied by the women.

In the interviews, I did not ask the women specifically about Orthodox priests or the hierarchy of the Church. Their spontaneous mentions of priests were mostly positive in tone. The informants could, for instance, speak of a certain priest when describing rituals that he had conducted. Moreover, they sometimes also sought to legitimize their claims by noting how a particular priest had originated or sanctioned them. Some interviewees produced critical remarks concerning, for example, priests' negative attitudes towards female priesthood, their convert backgrounds or bad parish management. These comments were made in a veiled form, or only after I had turned off the recorder, which suggests that, in all likelihood, the women refrained altogether from expressing some of their negative opinions to me. Nevertheless, the majority of their accounts signaled their recognition of the power of Orthodox religious specialists, and their partial misrecognition of the arbitrariness of this power (see Bourdieu 1971a, 304–305; Bourdieu 1991a, 9).

In their accounts, on the whole, the interviewees constructed relations primarily between different religious groups and classes of religious practitioners, while observations on the relationship between laymen and religious specialists were less common. This, I suggest, reflects their perspective on the configurations of the religious field. From where the women stood, the most important demarcation lines stretched, indeed, between various types of lay practitioners, and not between laymen and priests.

From the interviewees' point of view, Lutherans occupied a central rival position within the religious field. Even though increasing immigration and religious pluralization were topical questions in Finland already in 2007 and 2008, only a minority of the women spoke to me of any other Churches or religions. Tarja's account, below, provides a global perspective on the religious field, rare in the material as a whole. In fact, many of the interviewees seemed to still feel, of the Lutheran Church, somewhat like Tarja had when she was young: "When you think of how many Muslims and others there are in the world, you come to realize the size of the Lutheran community. (...) Of course, they're the mainstream here. It (the Lutheran Church) felt so big when I was little, and then it just got smaller and smaller in my eyes. It came to feel like a needle in a haystack when compared to all these other religions." Furthermore, within the Orthodox subfield of the Finnish religious field, the women outlined positions for Karelians, non-Karelians, converts, and non-converts. They could also

mention the growing number of Russian immigrants in the Church. Often, however, they had had little actual contact with these congregants.

The women's perceptions of all these groups paralleled the groups' relative status with respect to each other. The changing power dynamics within the religious field were visible, for instance, in the interviewees' expressions of superiority with respect to Lutherans, and in their somewhat defensive remarks concerning various factions gaining ground within the Orthodox community. Thus, the women's comparisons between their religion and that of others actually revealed their investment in struggles of the religious field. For example, in emphasizing the continuums of memory sustained in their religious practice, they made use of the symbolic resources of the Orthodox Church to promote a particular definition of proper Orthodoxy. In so doing, they also strived to augment their status within the field.

The individual's habitus does not automatically stay attuned to a particular field. Due to the evolution of either habitus or field, the two may fall out of pace with each other (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 130–131; Bourdieu 2000, 160–162). The women's interview accounts suggest that this is what had happened to them: their habitus lagged behind some of the recent evolutions of the Finnish religious field and its Orthodox subfield. Concerning the prominent role of converts in today's Orthodox community, Rauha, for example, stated: "There are a lot of [converts here]; even our priest is a convert. But, I don't know. I've begun to think that I believe in the old ways. There's so much that's new; I don't believe in all of it. Like these converts ordering us around at church, to do this and that. It hurts me so." Rauha's talk of belief is symptomatic in that mismatch between habitus and field is prone to undermine practical belief in the field in question, at least on some level.

Overall, the interviewees' balancing acts between the past and the present constituted efforts to secure for oneself a comfortable enough position in the contemporary religious field, considering the massive changes that the field had undergone. For instance, the instinctive aversion that the women harbored towards the term "tradition" in connection with their religious practice can be seen to reflect their deep awareness of the changes that had taken place in standard everyday Orthodoxy during their lifetimes. The women no longer represented mainstream Finnish Orthodoxy. In some ways, their religion had more in common with the past than with the present of Finnish Orthodox Christianity. By emphasizing the difference between their religion and tradition, the interviewees reacted against the threat of being relegated squarely to the past, amidst other relics of "Karelian Orthodox tradition." They fought for the enduring relevance of their type of religion within the Orthodox field (see also Bourdieu 2000, 212–213).

The disparity between the informants' habitus and the contemporary religious field was also evident in their interpretations of religious capital. The individual's religious capital is closely tied to his or her dispositions, competences, and knowledge concerning matters of religion (Verter 2003, 162). In other words, it is a product of his or her religious trajectory, like habitus. At any given moment of time, dominant conceptualizations of religious capital reflect the state of the religious field (Bourdieu 1971a, 318–319: Bourdieu 1991a, 22). They are influenced by the power relations between different actors inhabiting the field, the articulated distinctions between their habitus, and the supply and demand of religious resources.

The women appreciated such forms of piety as continuing family religious traditions, staying true to one's childhood religion, the "living" of religion, and the "remembering" of God. For them, the religion of their grandparents' generation commonly represented the ideal form of lay Orthodox practice. In a sense, the women described their understanding of religious capital and of meritorious religious behavior precisely through describing the religiosity of their grandparents. Nevertheless, they were also aware that this understanding of religious capital was not universally shared within the Finnish religious field. In the course of their lives, the dominant currencies within the field had changed. The doxic religiosity valued by the women had been contested, and in many cases overcome, by styles of spirituality that did not emphasize the importance of following the ways of one's ancestors. The interviewees' embodied knowledge concerning these changing values within the field was evident, for example, in their comments concerning the religion of their children and grandchildren.

> Helena: Well, how do you see your position within, if one thinks of, like, a chain of traditions? Your father was the one primarily teaching you these things . . .
>
> Ilmi: Of course, it isn't like it was [before]. It'd be nice to pass on these traditions to the grandchildren. But they all live so far away. It's, in practice, impossible.
>
> Helena: Have all your grandchildren been baptized into Lutheranism?
>
> Ilmi: Yes, they are all Lutherans.
>
> Helena: Well, does it bother you that they are Lutherans? Or, does it matter what Church they belong to?

> Ilmi: Regrets don't, they don't accomplish anything. You have to act on the basis of what you're given. Empty fantasies get you nowhere.

The above excerpt demonstrates the laconic tone often adopted by the women when speaking about their offspring's religion. Ilmi does not seize on my invitations to mourn for the discontinuation of her Orthodox heritage in the younger generations; instead, she stresses her powerlessness in the matter. According to Ilmi, she had not been able to participate much in the religious and ethnic socialization of her grandchildren due to practical reasons. Behind such practicalities, however, often lie values. Today, the passing on of cultural knowledge and skills from grandparents to grandchildren is a less appreciated mode of socialization than it was at the time of the women's childhood. The capital value, in Bourdieuan terms, of such inherited knowledge has decreased (see also Calhoun 1993, 79–80). Moreover, that Ilmi did not possess the authority to (or did not want to) press for the baptism of her children into the Orthodox faith can also be regarded as a question of capital. At the time of the children's birth, an Orthodox affiliation and an Orthodox habitus did not translate into positive resources within the religious field.

Ilmi's account, all in all, echoes her embodied knowledge of her limited leverage as to the religion of her children and grandchildren. She seems to have contented herself with the idea that the matter had not been within her sphere of influence to begin with. The same resigned attitude is discernible also from the accounts of many other women. Nevertheless, Ilmi's rather dismissive talk of "empty fantasies" also speaks of disappointment. In an ideal world, things would have been different.

Ultimately, the interviewees' accounts concerning both contemporary religion and the religion of their offspring convey positional suffering. According to Bourdieu (1999a, 4), this type of suffering can be caused by low status within a field, outdated habitus, or lack of capital. Positional suffering does not necessarily involve material destitution; it is about marginalization with respect to the game played in a particular field. From accounts such as Ilmi's, one can trace the women's experiences of displacement within the Finnish religious field. They illustrate what it means to be in possession of an Orthodox habitus in a Lutheran world, and the habitus of a "religious dweller" in a world increasingly dominated by "religious seekers" (see Wuthnow 1998, 3–11).

CHAPTER 9

Conclusions

The Religion of Displaced Karelian Orthodox Women

In the most general sense, my aim in this book has been to answer one simple question: What is the everyday lived religion of displaced Karelian Orthodox women like? In the preceding analysis, I have described the interviewees' religious customs, focusing on the domestic context of their religious practice during different life phases. My inquiry paid particular attention to basic daily habits such as praying and making the sign of the cross. Nevertheless, it also observed other constellations of practices, like commemoration, fasting and feasting, and attending church services. I have approached the women's religion as lifelong religion: actively practiced religion into which one has been socialized as a child. The intertwining of enduring religion with displacement history and minority status was the pivot of the analysis. The interviewees' religion, however, also reflected the conjoined effects of their other social attachments, including gender and age.

Based on my analysis, the informants' religion complied with many characteristics of women's religion established in previous research (e.g., Sered 1994; Woodhead 2007). More specifically, it mirrored a style of religion common to lay adult women with families, that is to say, to mothers. In many respects the interviewees' religion was "domestic religion" in the sense defined by Susan Starr Sered (1992, 32). It was religion in which the "ultimate concerns of life, suffering, and death" received their meaning in connection to particular, well-loved individuals. The Orthodox women's religious activities were interwoven with their familial roles as mothers, grandmothers, and wives. Their descriptions of their religiosity also exhibited an orientation towards inter-personal relationships that was evident, for instance, in their emphasis on harmonious family relationships. Particularly when their children were young, the informants had carefully balanced themselves between their responsibilities as caretakers of their families and as believers. However, even their personal religious practice was characterized by a focus on worldly, concrete concerns. Overall, their religion can also be viewed as a form of "coping religion," as understood by Martin Stringer (2008, 81). It did not aim at radical transformations, but rather enabled the interviewees to manage the "stresses and strains of life" as they lived it.

The preceding analysis also constitutes a description of the religion of elderly women. Judging from the material, the interviewees' increasing age,

© HELENA KUPARI, 2016 | DOI 10.1163/9789004326743_010
This is an open access chapter distributed under the terms of the CC-BY-NC License.

as such, had not markedly affected their religiousness. Nevertheless, changing life circumstances had added to their freedom to practice religion on their own terms. In addition, the women seemed to increasingly make use of familiar religious means in order to cope with age-related troubles. Through their religious practices, they also managed and performed their changing social roles as elderly women, "grannies." These findings are in line with existing research concerning religion and old age (e.g., Dillon and Wink 2003).

Focusing on particular cohorts of people brings to light how lived religion is shaped, in different life phases, by sociohistorical context – significant events, social conditions, cultural discourses, and so on (Dillon 2007, 527, 534, 536). In this vein, my investigation approaches religion from the vantage point of Western women born between the First and Second World Wars as well as during the Second World War. The accounts of the informants reflected a relative stability of religious activity, loyalty towards institutional religion, and suspicion of new forms of religiosity, all typical of the religious mind-set of those born prior to the Second World War (e.g., Dillon 2007, 540; Kääriäinen, Niemelä, and Ketola 2003, 192, 195, 197; Marler 2008, 37). However, it must be kept in mind that I only interviewed women who remained relatively active Orthodox practitioners at the time of the interviews. The selection of interviewees does not therefore provide a realistic picture of the overall variety of present-day religious activity among displaced Karelian women originally baptized into Orthodox Christianity.

Despite this bias within the sample of informants, the research does produce a partial account of the religion of a particular generation of Finnish Karelian Orthodox women. The events and reverberations of the Second World War – the evacuations, the loss of Karelia, and post-war resettlement and rebuilding – profoundly affected the Finnish Orthodox community's conditions of religious practice. This period coincided with the interviewees' childhood or young adulthood, and left its mark on their religious practice and identity. My discussion of the theme parallels previous studies on the religion of Karelian Orthodox evacuees during the first post-war decades (e.g., Heikkinen 1989; Kananen 2010; Raninen-Siiskonen 1999).

The Orthodox evacuees' experiences during wartime and the immediate post-war years were radical to the extent that they form the foundation of a "social generation," in sociologist Karl Mannheim's sense of the term (Mannheim 1997, 45–47; see also Hardy and Waite 1997, 3–5). In other words, these experiences could function as the basis of a shared awareness of a common destiny. The parlance of some of the interviewees suggested the existence of this kind of generational consciousness. These women used the pronoun "we" to speak, for example, about Orthodox evacuees, or "war-time children."

However, an important ingredient of Mannheim's (1997, 42) theory is that the people of a given social generation have experienced the same events at roughly the same, young age. Youth, after all, is a crucial period when it comes to the formation of life-long orientations to the world. The age difference between my informants was 35 years at the most – far too great for them all to be part of any one such generation.

The oldest and youngest of the women had been socialized into the Orthodox religion under very different circumstances, the former in Orthodox Border Karelia and the latter mostly in Lutheran North Savonia. The oldest women, furthermore, had practically reached adulthood before the exile of the Finnish Karelian Orthodox from their homelands. The resulting differences in the interviewees' formative experiences resonated in both their religious identities and activities. For instance, the Orthodox identity of the oldest interviewees had, generally speaking, remained the most doxic (unquestioned, self-evident) in nature. The youngest informants, for their part, were more prone to making conscious efforts to reinforce their religious identity: reflections, performances, reading, and so on.

As social gerontologist Sinikka Vakimo (2001, 31–33) has noted, the culture of the elderly is not a vestige of a past way of life, but an integral part of contemporary culture. Orientation towards the past is just one dimension of old age, even though in many social scientific studies it is the main focus of attention. From this perspective, the preceding analysis constitutes an interpretation of a particular style of present-day religiosity. It opens up a view into how the Orthodox women's religious practice and ways of speaking about religion had been affected by the overall evolution of Finnish society during the latter half of the 20th century. In a sense, the research actually produces an account of the modernization of Finland during this period of time as viewed from the perspective of a group of minority women who lived through the process. Moreover, it makes evident the complexity of the contemporary religious reality by highlighting the braided presence of many historical layers and phenomena within it: the simultaneous existence of various religious interpretations and experiences of modernity (Orsi 2005, 8–10).

In this book, I have approached questions concerning age, cohort, and period influences (see Hardy and Waite 1997, 14–16) on religion under the overall rubric of "enduring" religion. The Orthodox women's particular life trajectories ensured that their religion was a specific form of lifelong religion. Even in the most unified and static of societies, individuals' religious activity evolves during the life cycle, in line with their changing roles in the family and community. The religion of my interviewees, however, had undergone particularly dramatic changes. The preceding analysis thus documents

both actual continuums of customs reaching from the women's childhood to the present day, and the women's more or less conscious, rhetorical, and embodied performance of such continuums. Overall, in addition to "lifelong" religion, the women's religiosity was also an example of minority religion, migrant religion, and, generally speaking, modern religion. In some ways, it had more in common with the religion of, say, Somali refugee women in today's Finland (Tiilikainen 2003) than with the religion of the interviewees' own grandparents.

Historically, research that makes use of folklore studies to investigate premodern Karelian folk religion has constituted an important strand of scholarship in the Finnish discipline of the study of religions. This book expands the scope of this research tradition to present-day Finland. When planning my PhD project, I was surprised to learn that no one had yet conducted this kind of investigation, and envisioned that my study would closely intertwine with the previous studies targeting Karelian Orthodox women: women of my interviewees' parents', grandparents', and great-grandparents' generations. I soon realized, however, that my informants had much less in common with the women of these previous studies than I had originally – and naively – thought. To put it in a word, my interviewees were the children of a much less stable and more complex world, which also reflected in their religion. For that reason, an analysis of their religion would require the adoption of a different, and more sociological, approach.

Lifelong Religious Habitus: A Sense of Religion

In this study, I approached my interviewees' religion through Bourdieuan practice theory. Bourdieu's concept of habitus has been my primary analytical tool. In the analysis, I have accordingly investigated from various angles both the form and content of the informants' interview accounts in order to uncover the dispositions informing their actions. That is, from these accounts I have traced the interrelations between the women's religious life history and their present-day religiosity.

The displaced Karelian Orthodox women's religious activities and their habitus are in a reciprocal relationship. On the one hand, habitus generates practice. On the other, practice affects habitus, and through habitus, the generation of future practice. During the course of the research, I examined two contexts where this dynamic was evident: the church and the home. I found that the women had become sensitized to various elements of their domestic and church environments. Their bodies recognized various objects, sights,

sounds, smells, and events within both of these surroundings as religious. Afterwards, their sense of practice guided them to respond to the stimuli with appropriate actions and emotions. One of the dimensions of their habitus that was reinforced in the process was their practical belief in God and life after death. They performed their belief in these cultural perceptions of the cosmic order through practices such as praying and commemorating the deceased. At the same time, it was their habitus that called them to observe these practices, that made the practices appear worthwhile.

The women's descriptions concerning their religious activities suggested that, for the most part, they did religion in a habitual fashion, following their practical sense. In particular, their daily religious customs were, even at the time of the interviews, guided by dispositions acquired early on in life. That is to say, these customs reflected the bias towards stability that is inherent in habitus. Due to the reciprocal relationship between habitus and practice, childhood experiences often exert lifelong power over the make-up of the habitus. The women's religious routines, nevertheless, were not governed by a rigid reiteration of past customs. Rather, their religious practice was also characterized by flexibility and creativity in the face of changes.

In addition to descriptions of religious habits, the women's interview accounts also contained depictions of more intentional religious practice, particularly in connection to waning customs, such as fasting. These revealed the slow evolution of their dispositions throughout adult life. However, what the women did not do in the interviews was speak of religious practice as a systematic project of cultivating piety. The closest they came to such talk was through idioms, such as "remembering God," that acknowledged the formative influence of religious customs on their state of mind. Overall, the use of religious practice as a means of conscious re-habituation seemed a relatively alien concept to the interviewees, as far as their own lives were concerned.

The Orthodox women's religion reflected their past experiences and life trajectories. In the preceding analysis, I have treated the women's interview accounts as evidence of certain events and phases in their life histories that were crucial to the formation of their dispositions. These accounts revealed an evolution in the environment of their religious practice, a movement from religious homogeneity to ever-increasing religious pluralism. The informants emphasized the doxic, or self-evident, status of religion in their childhood. These early experiences of religion remained fundamental to their habitus even at the time of the interviews. Nevertheless, beginning from a young age, the women had practiced their religion amidst a Lutheran society. Their experiences as members of the Orthodox community in post-war Finland constituted the foundation of what I have called their minority habitus: their

awareness of their marginal position in a religious field characterized by the dominance of Lutheranism.

The adult family formed a specific arena of religious practice within which power relations between the women and other invested groups played a central role. The interviewees' accounts concerning religion within their families reflected the adaptation of their habitus to the limitations ingrained in their social position as women, mothers, and Orthodox practitioners. The accounts also showed the transformation of these limitations, within the women's habitus, into valued virtues and guidelines of practice. All in all, the analysis illustrates the complex intertwinement of the women's religious and gendered dispositions, for instance, in their descriptions of collective religious practice. Both these dimensions of the women's habitus had their origins in primary socialization; nevertheless, they sometimes reinforced quite different, even conflicting, courses of action.

In the analysis, I also investigated the informants' practices of speaking about religion. In particular, I have described at length their reflections on the differences between their religion and that of various others: Lutherans, converts to Orthodoxy, and younger people generally. The women's capacity to produce such comparisons was an outcome of their long history of occupying a heterodox position within the increasingly heterogeneous religious field. These comparisons, moreover, were expressions of their religious tastes. They affirmed a distinction between the interviewees' habitus and the habitus of others, a distinction founded ultimately on their embodied experiences of religion in childhood and later. As part of their reflections, the interviewees also came to formulate outlines of their own religion. In these accounts, they emphasized an unquestioning and unintellectual stance towards religion, which was captured in their expression "to live religion," and the stability and continuity of religious practice from childhood to the present day. These two maxims, together with that of "remembering God," essentially constituted the women's understanding of proper religious practice.

According to Bourdieu, religious habitus develops within the religious field. The religious field is organized around relations between man and supernatural powers (Bourdieu 1971a, 311–313; Bourdieu 1991a, 15–17). Actors within the religious field create, promote, perform, and observe practices that involve interaction with supernatural powers (see also Riesebrodt 2010, 74–76). Participation and interest in these practices is what brings about a religious habitus. In line with this, the specifically religious habitus of the women in my study was the result of their lifelong investment in practices that hinged on the existence of non-empirical forces. What is specific about their case is that it opens up a view on enduring religious practice situated in a radically evolving

environment. In other words, it illustrates what happens to native religious habitus over the course of a lifetime.

In my outline of Bourdieuan theory earlier in this book, I made note of Bourdieu's (1977, 124) conceptualization of the dispositions of habitus as socially informed senses. In light of the analysis, the lifelong religious habitus of the displaced Karelian Orthodox women can well be understood to have formed one such sense. The women's "sense of religion," a crystallization of their past experiences of religion, consisted of practical, embodied knowledge concerning the non-empirical dimension of the social world. It informed their reactions with respect to different emerging events, generating both their routine religious practices and more conscious and creative religious actions.

This notion of a sense of religion is interlinked with other socially informed senses postulated in existing research. For one thing, the women's embodied knowledge concerning religion included a sense of the sacred: an ability to distinguish sacred places, times, and events from ordinary ones (Bourdieu 1977, 124; see also McNally 1997, 148; Trulsson 2010, 345–346). It also included a practical understanding of what constitutes good and righteous behavior: a sense of ethics (Bourdieu 1977, 124). Furthermore, the interviewees' sense of religion entailed a sense of ritual as theorized by Catharine Bell (1992, 80, 90, 98). That is to say, the women possessed an intuitive capacity to recognize, establish, and partake in activities that installed a privileged contrast between themselves and other types of action. These activities ranged from simple ones like glancing at an icon before leaving home to grand ones like participating in the Eucharist.

According to Bell (1992, 98–99), the sense of ritual (as well as other socially informed senses) generates actions that are commonly "lodged beyond the grasp of consciousness and articulation." Because the principles underlying these actions are rooted in the actors' bodies, the actors can explicate them only with difficulty. Some of my interviewees also had problems with verbalizing their knowledge of their most basic religious practices. Nevertheless, in contrast to Bell, I argue that these women's sense of religion was manifested not only in their habitual doing of religion, but permeated their reflective capacities concerning religion as well. In particular, the women's sense of religion animated their reflections by providing them with a grip on the elements of proper religion. Moreover, it also encompassed an understanding of religion as an organized system of beliefs and practices related to the cosmic order.

My notion of lifelong religious habitus as a sense of religion is a theoretical representation of one particular style of contemporary religiosity. In approaching the interviewees' religion as habitus, I have been able to highlight features of their socialization, subjectivities, and surroundings that have brought

about the permanence of their religious interest and activity. Here, Bourdieu's practice theory accounts for the relative stability of the informants' religious dispositions, but also their metamorphosis over the course of time. It illustrates the long-term effects of religious practice on the women, showing religion as deeply ingrained in their bodies. Finally, it also enables the depiction of religion-in-action. In the preceding analysis, I do not produce an abstract model of the women's religion. Rather, I conceive of their religion as a constellation of embodied tastes, preferences, skills, and orientations that helped them to manage the various events and life situations they encountered.

A central goal of this research has been to capture something of the essential nature of small-scale, day-to-day religious practice. The gist of my approach was to investigate this basic layer of lived religion from a long-term perspective. Even though many scholars of religion (e.g., McGuire 2008, 99–100; Orsi 1997, 16; Ray 2007, 92) have alluded to the importance of Bourdieu's theorization of habitus to the study of lived religion, the concept has not, heretofore, been capitalized on in many analyses of enduring religion. Generally speaking, a large proportion of recent practice-oriented studies on religion have targeted various kinds of conscious endeavors to reconstruct one's religious identity. The usefulness of Bourdieu's theory to these kinds of studies is a debated issue (see e.g., Mahmood 2005; Trulsson 2010; Winchester 2008). By applying Bourdieu's theory to an analysis of lifelong religious practice, the present work complements this on-going discussion concerning the relevance of Bourdieuan practice theory to religious scholarship. It demonstrates the explanatory potential that a Bourdieuan approach can bring to an analysis of relatively stable religion, and the enduring effects of childhood religious socialization in later life.

Habitual Religious Agency

In the preceding analysis, I also made use of the concept of agency to interpret the religious activities of the evacuee Karelian Orthodox women. My investigation into the agency of the interviewees brought to the fore the same interplay of routine and reflection that, on the whole, characterized their religion. The women's habitual religious customs were integral in constructing their everyday life-world as predictable and safe. Through these practices, the women imbued their domestic environment with religious significance. Through them, the women reinforced kin ties between spouses, siblings, parents, and children, establishing their families as tightly-knit collectivities. Through them as well, the interviewees also constructed an account of the cosmic order and their own place within it, one that provided them with a sense of basic life

management. All in all, the women's routine, everyday religiosity significantly contributed to their particular way of being-in-the-world. It supported capacities of action also applicable to non-routine situations: crises, surprises, and "once in a lifetime" events.

In addition to engaging in habitual religious activities, the interviewees also had the capacity to conduct their religion in a more conscious fashion. They could direct their religious practice and practices of speaking about religion towards various others. With these actions, they sought to reinforce their religious identities and enhance their social positions in a mildly hostile environment: a society characterized by the dominance of Lutheranism, increasing religious diversity, as well as the growing influence of secular discourses. In the process, they negotiated their place as religious individuals and Orthodox practitioners in contemporary Finnish society. Overall, this dimension of their religious practice mirrors Sherry Ortner's (2006, 147) outline of agency as being about people "trying to play (...) their own serious games even as more powerful parties seek to devalue and even destroy them." In addition to Ortner, several other scholars have noted the influence of non-religious and differently religious others on constructions of religious agency (e.g., Avishai 2008; Bucar 2010; Snajdr 2005).

As with the research as a whole, my understanding of agency is grounded on Bourdieuan social theory. More specifically, it rests on Lois McNay's (2000) Bourdieuan account of agency. According to my chosen perspective, agency originates in habitus, and is part of all action. The living through of habitus in concrete situations always involves the realization of individuals' agentic capacities. Above, I established that what guided the Orthodox women's religious actions was their religious habitus. Based on my interpretation of agency, I suggest that the women's religious habitus also encompassed their agentic capacities concerning religion. In other words, the women's sense of religion was the catalyst for their religious agency.

The agency of conservatively religious women has become a popular topic in feminist scholarship on religion. This strand of research has increasingly focused on the cultural and historical underpinnings of women's capacities for action. Nevertheless, it has sometimes been criticized for being mostly concerned with relatively young, active, educated, elite urban women (Bucar 2010, 673; Smid 2010, 38). In providing a view into the everyday religious agency of ordinary, elderly lay women, the present contribution diverges from this trend. My aim, overall, has been to add to the ongoing discussion concerning agency and religion by introducing a Bourdieuan perspective. The Bourdieuan account of agency that I have applied includes a compelling articulation of the mutually constitutive relations between structure and

agency; furthermore, it also brings to the fore the agentic components inherent in routine religiosity.

According to many scholars of agency, habitual action does not fulfill the criteria of agency. My perspective on agency, however, does not differentiate between routines and agentic action. In fact, the preceding analysis can be viewed as an account of the informants' habitual religious agency. This type of agency, obviously, constitutes just one possible modality of action. In any case, it can provide an illuminating focus of analysis, particularly as a part of investigations into the religious activities of ordinary practitioners within the context of their immediate surroundings. Moreover, as Marja-Liisa Honkasalo (2008b, 215–222) has emphasized, habitual agency also forms the foundation of other agentic modalities. While habitual agency characteristically informs world-sustaining activities, it also retains the potential to bring about world-changing actions.

Several scholars of religion have recently emphasized the ambiguity inherent in religious practice. They claim that religious activity is not compatible with the conventional Western ideal of agency, because it often posits the giving up of one's autonomy as a prerequisite for effective action (e.g., Asad 2003, 70–72; Hollywood 2004, 516–517, 524, 527–528; Mack 2003, 156–159; Mahmood 2005, 5–14). Hence, these researchers have stressed the importance, when inquiring into religious agency, of taking into account the aims and motivations that religious practitioners themselves have with regard to their actions. In this book, I have complied with this imperative. For example, the Orthodox women considered praying to be a powerful form of agency. From a secularist perspective, such an idea can appear irrational (see also Orsi 1996, 193–207). However, in the analysis I show how praying provided a source of additional strength for the women, a resource that could support endeavors and activities of all kinds. Recourse to prayer did not guarantee successful outcomes, but it gave the women a chance to try to affect matters that were beyond the reach of their other means of influence. From this perspective, it did constitute an actual enhancement of their agency.

Thus, the interviewees' religious habitus can, on the one hand, be seen to have provided them with special capacities for action; on the other, their religious and gendered dispositions also restricted their actions. This became particularly clear in the women's accounts concerning religious practice within their adult families. As respectable wives, mothers, and religious individuals, certain courses of action had simply been closed to them, especially when their children had been young. Nevertheless, by putting the needs of their families before their own, the women also acted out their practical understanding of piety. By complying with the cultural limits posed on their

actions, they cultivated their sense of self, which is an agentic activity in its own right.

As with habitus, also agency is produced in the individual's interactions with a number of different fields (McNay 2000, 16–17, 51, 71). My analysis of the interviewees' religious practice has focused on the fields of religion and family. Bourdieu, however, does not offer many guidelines on how to analyze the relations between fields. According to him, these relations vary too much, depending on the historical context, to be translated into universal principles (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 109–110; see also Kauppi 2000, 40; Thomson 2008, 68, 72–73). Bourdieu is certainly right in emphasizing the complexity of the issue, since relations between fields can, in theory, take innumerable forms. Nevertheless, the fuzziness of this aspect of his theory has wider reverberations. It makes it difficult in empirical analysis to specify the actual weight and potency of various dimensions of habitus: to break down the effects of dispositions related to different, yet intertwining fields on practice in concrete situations. Therefore, also my interpretations concerning the combined impact of the fields of religion and family on the women's agentic possibilities have been tentative at best.

The analysis illustrates how the women's familial and religious dispositions often reinforced each other but could also conflict. However, based on the women's interview accounts, I cannot say which particular combination of dispositions had informed their actions in certain crucial situations. For example, informants in mixed marriages may have settled for the baptism of their children into the Lutheran faith simply due to their lack of agentic capacities. Because of the dubious status of Orthodoxy at the time of the birth of their children, they had no religious capital to use as leverage in the matter. The women may also have accepted the primary claim of the father's family over the children's religious affiliation without much question, guided by their gendered dispositions. Finally, in some cases they may even have encouraged the children's baptism into the dominant faith, aiming to ensure them the best possible starting-point in life – as well as, maybe, to better secure their own position within the husband's family and society at large.

Overall, I concur with sociologist Terri Lovell's (2000, 38, 41) statement that when inquiring into women's actions within the familial sphere, distinguishing between their altruistic and individualistic strategies is a challenge. The present analysis demonstrates some of the complex relations between the interviewees' religious agency and various structures of power. Nevertheless, the ultimate motivations behind particular informants' choices and actions remain beyond its scope.

Habitus and the Study of Lived Religion

This book documents a practice-oriented inquiry into the lived religion of displaced Karelian Orthodox women. Indeed, it is precisely about the interviewees' lived religion: religion they have lived – lived through and lived with – throughout their long lives. Furthermore, it also constitutes an attempt to approach the very grass-roots of lived religion. These grass-roots, in my interpretation, consist of people's day-to-day religious activities – the daily toil of religion, if you like. In this study, I have offered one theoretical articulation of what religion, as realized in the everyday lives of ordinary people, boils down to. In the process, I have also produced a reading of Bourdieu's concept of habitus as an approach to the study of lived religion.

My investigation into the religion of the informants has benefited in many ways from being grounded, theoretically and methodologically, in Bourdieuan practice theory. Nevertheless, I have not only applied Bourdieu's insights, but also thought "with Bourdieu against Bourdieu," making use of Bourdieu's theorizations concerning practice and habitus in order to deepen and enrich his observations on religion (see Bourdieu 1990a, 49). To do this, I have taken heed of many existing critical readings of his theory by both scholars of religion and feminist theorists. These readings have treated, for instance, the notion of socialized senses (Bell 1992), the implications of field theory on the understanding of habitus (McNay 1999), the relationship between habitual and reflective action (Adkins 2003), and the concept of agency (Honkasalo 2008b; McNay 2000). Therefore, my account of religion is not a direct derivative of Bourdieu's discussions on the topic. Whereas Bourdieu's analysis of the religious field is relatively top-heavy, focusing on religious institutions and specialists, I instead regard religion as an embodied dimension of subjectivity.

Habitus is a challenging topic of analysis, since it cannot be directly observed. According to Bourdieu (1984, 123–124), to understand a particular habitus one needs to reconstruct the conditions of its production within certain social fields. What is called for is an analysis that is both relational and historical (Bourdieu 1990a, 126; see also Grenfell 2008b, 220–222). I have approached the habitus of the informants in this study through interview material, treating their accounts both as evidence of their social trajectories and as manifestations of their dispositions. That is, my investigation has targeted their practices and perceptions, as well as the environment that gave rise to them. The primary focus of the analysis was on the internal structuring of the women's habitus. Hence, even though the analysis is relational by nature, it does not include a thorough dissection of any of the social fields surrounding the women.

A cornerstone of any research based on interview material is the process of reflecting on the relationship between the interviewer and interviewees. In the preceding analysis, I have discussed from various angles the interview accounts' conditions of production: the women's interpretations of the objectives of the research, their agendas for the interviews, the discursive resources at their and my disposal, and so on. In the interview situations, the women seemed to take the task of passing on their perceptions and experiences of the Orthodox Christian religion seriously. Nevertheless, their accounts are also a performance and a validation of their particular style of religiosity when faced with a Lutheran, non-Karelian, academic, childless, young female interviewer. Within my theoretical framework, however, the positional and invested nature of the interview material does not constitute a fundamental weakness. It merely shows the women's dispositions at work in a particular, concrete situation.

Robert Orsi (2003, 174) emphasizes the study of lived religion as an intersubjective and critical enterprise that acknowledges the impact of the "lives and stories" of the researchers, as well as the history and discourses of the academic discipline of religious studies, on the interpretations produced. Bourdieu's (1999b, 625–626) understanding of reflexivity as part of scientific practice contains the related idea that the researcher is able to constitute the point of view of the object of research in social space only if he or she takes into account his or her own position in this space. In accordance with these tenets, I have, at different stages of the research process of this study, strived for awareness and openness as regards my own position with respect to my object of research. Most of my reflective work has concerned the research as an academic endeavor: the construction of the research problem, the production and processing of the research material, and choices concerning methods, theories, and concepts. Nevertheless, a consideration of the differences and similarities between the interviewees and myself has also constituted an aspect of the overall reflection.

The foundation of my relationship with the informants was laid already at the very beginning of my PhD project. The research was set in motion by my becoming aware of the 20th century history of the Finnish Orthodox community and developing an interest in the religion of the Orthodox evacuees. Until then, I had been oblivious of the dramatic events that this particular group had lived through. For my interviewees, it was the contrary: remaining unconcerned about Lutherans had not been an option. Lutheranism is everywhere in Finland, and most of the women's adult families were members of the majority denomination. The women were thus more than used to accounting to Lutherans for their practices and beliefs. In some respects, they had

also come to understand their own religion in the contrasting light provided by Lutheranism. In the eyes of the informants, then, I was firmly an "other." However, as a representative of Lutheranism, I was a special type of other: an important and most familiar one.

For me, the research process opened up a particular view on Finnish society and history as seen from an Orthodox Karelian minority perspective. My emotional responses to the women's interview narratives ranged from a sense of solidarity to perplexity, from deep-felt empathy to opposition. I experienced particularly difficult reactions when analyzing accounts that constructed the interviewees' and my positions in social space as antithetical. At such times, as I came to understand, my own investments within certain social fields were activated. Although this activation caused some rather awkward emotions – emotions too irrational and negative, I feared, for any scholar involved in qualitative research – it ultimately proved helpful. It gave me a first-hand understanding of the workings of habitus.

In analyzing the women's accounts, I have implemented Bourdieu's (1999b, 609) strategy of "active and methodical listening." It combines the emphatic acknowledgement of the singularity of each interviewee's life history with an emphasis on their shared features: features that are a reflection of the social trajectory common to all of them. Moreover, in writing up the analysis, I strove to describe the women's actions in a way that would transmit their sense and rationality to the women themselves (Bourdieu 1999b, 625). This goal becomes particularly clear in discussions that show the informants in a less than favorable light. For instance, I have dwelled at length on the interviewees' negative appraisals of other groups of people. However, during these investigations I have repeatedly stressed that the crux of the matter was not their critical remarks as such, but rather the social and historical context in relation to which they produced their accounts. From the women's particular position in social space, even their critical views about that space appear altogether understandable.

Overall, the analysis treats the interviewees' dispositions as a type of collective habitus (Bourdieu 1984, 101). It does not display the whole range of their experiences and opinions concerning particular matters, focusing, rather, on the majority perspective. The resulting interpretations inevitably reflect the religiosity of some informants more accurately than others. Nevertheless, I believe that my discussion on the "lifelongness" of the women's religion has outlined a dimension of their religiosity that was of considerable importance to most, if not all, of them.

Linda Woodhead (2013, 9–11) has noted that the unarticulated, unexamined, and, hence, "silent areas of human life are socially inflected;

their fault lines often run along those of social stratification and inequality." According to her, the study of everyday lived religion is inspired by an awareness of this "skewed, partial and variable articulation of social experience," encouraging a widening of perspective and an adjustment of gaze. The enduring religion of elderly women is an area of contemporary religion that has often remained unexamined in recent scholarship. Ultimately, the justification for the present research lies in making visible – through description and theoretical articulation – the lived religion of one group of such women: the displaced Karelian Orthodox women.

Sources

The interview recordings are preserved in the Folklore Archives of the Finnish Literature Society under the identifiers:

SKSÄ 162 – SKSÄ 163. 2007.
SKSÄ 81 – SKSÄ 91. 2008.
SKSÄ 111 – SKSÄ 117. 2008.

The recordings of the three interviewees who did not want their interviews archived are in the possession of the researcher.

The answers to the collection of autobiographical writings are preserved in the Folklore Archives of the Finnish Literature Society under the identifier:

SKS KRA Karjalaisuus. 2006–2007.

Bibliography

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1990. "The Romance of Resistance: Tracing Transformations of Power through Bedouin Women." *American Ethnologist* 17 (1): 41–59.

Adkins, Lisa. 2004. "Introduction: Feminism, Bourdieu and After." In *Feminism after Bourdieu*, edited by Lisa Adkins and Beverley Skeggs, 3–18. Oxford: Blackwell.

———. 2003. "Reflexivity: Freedom or Habit of Gender?" *Theory, Culture & Society* 20 (6): 21–42.

Ahearn, Laura M. 2001. "Language and Agency." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 109–137.

Akram, Sadiya. 2013. "Fully Unconscious and Prone to Habit: The Characteristics of Agency in the Structure and Agency Dialectic." *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 43 (1): 45–65.

Alayan, Samira, and Gad Yair. 2010. "The Cultural Inertia of the Habitus: Gendered Narrations of Agency amongst Educated Female Palestinians in Israel." *British Educational Research Journal* 36 (5): 831–850.

Alldred, Pam, and Val Gilles. 2002. "Eliciting Research Accounts: Re/producing Modern Subjects?" In *Ethics in Qualitative Research*, edited by Melanie Mauthner, Maxine Birch, Julie Jessop, and Tina Miller, 146–165. London: Sage.

Altheide, David L., and John M. Johnson. 2011. "Reflections on Interpretive Adequacy in Qualitative Research." In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 581–594. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

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

———, ed. 2007. *Everyday Religion: Observing Modern Religious Lives.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Anttonen, Veikko. 2004. "Theory and Method in the Study of 'Folk Religion.'" *Temenos: Nordic Journal of Comparative Religion* 39/40: 73–79.

———. 1989. "Uno (Holmberg) Harva as Field-Ethnographer." In *Uralic Mythology and Folklore*, edited by Mihaly Hoppál and Juha Pentikäinen, 33–48. Budapest and Helsinki: Ethnographic Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and Finnish Literature Society.

Apo, Satu, Aili Nenola, and Laura Stark-Arola, ed. 1998. *Gender and Folklore: Perspectives on Finnish and Karelian Culture*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Archer, Margaret S. 2010. "Routine, Reflexivity, and Realism." *Sociological Theory* 28 (3): 272–303.

Armstrong, Karen. 2004. *Remembering Karelia: A Family's Story of Displacement During and After the Finnish Wars.* Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Arseni, archmandrite. 1999. *Ortodoksinen sanasto*. Helsinki: Otava.

Asad, Talal. 2012. "Thinking about Religion, Belief, and Politics." In *The Cambridge Companion to Religious Studies*, edited by Robert A. Orsi, 36–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2003. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

———. 1993. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Atanassova, Antonia. 2011. "Theotokos, the Blessed Virgin." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 2, edited by John A. McGuckin, 594–599. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Avishai, Orit. 2008. "'Doing Religion' in a Secular World: Women in Conservative Religions and the Question of Agency." *Gender & Society* 22 (4): 409–433.

Bäckström, Anders. 2015. "Welfare, Society and Secularization." In *Modernities, Memory and Mutations: Grace Davie and the Study of Religion*, edited by Abby Day and Mia Lövheim, 147–162. Farnham: Ashgate.

Barrett, Brian. 2010. "Religion and Habitus: Exploring the Relationship between Religious Involvement and Educational Outcomes and Orientations among Urban African American Students." *Urban Education* 45 (4): 448–479.

Beck, Ulrich, and Elisabeth Beck-Gernsheim. 2002. *Individualization: Institutionalized Individualism and Its Social and Political Consequences*. London: Sage.

Beckford, James A. 2003. *Social Theory and Religion.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bell, Catherine. 1992. *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice.* New York: Oxford University Press.

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

———. 2007. "Touching the Transcendent: Rethinking Religious Experience in the Sociological Study of Religion." In *Everyday Religion: Observing Modern Religious Lives*, edited by Nancy T. Ammerman, 201–218. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 2003. *Heaven's Kitchen. Living Religion at God's Love We Deliver.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. 1971. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge.* London: Allen Lane.

Berzano, Luigi. 2011. "Religious Lifestyles." In *Religion, Spirituality and Everyday Practice*, edited by Giuseppe Giordan and William H. Swatos Jr., 57–73. Dordrecht: Springer.

Bilge, Sirma. 2010. "Beyond Subordination vs. Resistance: An Intersectional Approach to the Agency of Veiled Muslim Women." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 31 (1): 9–28.

Binns, John. 2005. *An Introduction to the Christian Orthodox Churches.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bobrinskoy, Boris. 2008. "God in Trinity." In *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*, edited by Mary B. Cunningham and Elizabeth Theokritoff, 49–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2010. "Sociologists of Belief and Beliefs of Sociologists." *Nordic Journal of Religion & Society* 23 (1): 1–7.

———. 2001. *Masculine Domination.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

———. 2000. *Pascalian Meditations.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 1999a. "The Space of Points of View." In *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*, by Pierre Bourdieu et al., 3–5. Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 1999b. "Understanding." In *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society*, by Pierre Bourdieu et al., 607–626. Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 1998. *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

———. 1996. "On the Family as a Realized Category." *Theory, Culture & Society* 13 (3): 19–26.

———. 1991a. "Genesis and Structure of the Religious Field." *Comparative Social Research* 13: 1–44.

———. 1991b. *Language and Symbolic Power.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 1990a. *In Other Words: Essays towards a Reflexive Sociology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 1990b. *The Logic of Practice.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

———. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1971a. "Genèse et structure du champ religieux." *Revue française de Sociologie* XII (3): 295–334.

———. 1971b. "Une interprétation de la théorie de la religion selon Max Weber." *Archives européennes de Sociologie* XII (1): 3–21.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loïc J. D. Wacquant. 1992. "The Purpose of Reflexive Sociology (The Chicago Workshop)." In *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, by Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, 61–215. Cambridge: Polity Press.

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

Bracke, Sarah. 2008. "Conjugating the Modern/Religious, Conceptualizing Female Religious Agency: Contours of a 'Post-secular' Conjuncture." *Theory, Culture & Society* 25 (6): 51–67.

———. 2003. "Author(iz)ing Agency: Feminist Scholars Making Sense of Women's Involvement in Religious 'Fundamentalist' Movements." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 10 (3): 335–346.

Brahinsky, Josh. 2012. “Pentecostal Body Logics: Cultivating a Modern Sensorium.” *Cultural Anthropology* 27 (2): 215–238.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2008. “In Spite of the Times: The Postsecular Turn in Feminism.” *Theory, Culture & Society* 25 (6): 1–24.

Breger, Rosemary, and Rosanna Hill. 1998. “Introducing Mixed Marriages.” In *Cross-Cultural Marriage: Identity and Choice*, edited by Rosemary Breger and Rosanna Hill, 1–32. Oxford: Berg.

Bronner, Simon J. 2012. “Practice Theory in Folklore and Folklife Studies.” *Folklore* 123 (1): 23–47.

Bucar, Elizabeth M. 2010. “Dianomy: Understanding Religious Women’s Moral Agency as Creative Conformity.” *Journal of the American Association of Religion* 78 (3): 662–686.

Butler, Judith. 2006. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York: Routledge Classics.

———. 1993. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of “Sex.”* New York: Routledge.

Calhoun, Craig. 1993. “Habitus, Field, and Capital: The Question of Historical Specificity.” In *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, edited by Craig Calhoun, Edward LiPuma, and Moishe Postone, 61–88. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. 2005. “Agency: Promiscuous and Protean.” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 2 (1): 1–19.

Cantwell, Robert. 1999. “Habitus, Ethnomimesis: A Note on the Logic of Practice.” *Journal of Folklore Research* 36 (2/3): 219–234.

Cassaniti, Julia. 2012. “Agency and the Other: The Role of Agency for the Importance of Belief in Buddhist and Christian Traditions.” *Ethos: Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology* 40 (3): 297–316.

Chryssavgis, John. 2008. “The Spiritual Way.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*, edited by Mary B. Cunningham and Elizabeth Theokritoff, 150–163. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Climo, Jacob J., and Maria G. Cattell. 2002. “Introduction: Meaning in Social Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives.” In *Social Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives*, edited by Jacob J. Climo and Maria G. Cattell, 1–36. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Coleman, Simon. 2000. *The Globalisation of Charismatic Christianity: Spreading the Gospel of Prosperity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, Peter. 2009. “The Problem of Quaker Identity.” *Quaker Studies* 13 (2): 205–219.

Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How Societies Remember.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conomos, Dimitri. 2011. “Fasting.” In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 242–243. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Cozad, Laurie. 1999. "Motherhood and Grandmotherhood." In *Encyclopedia of Women and World Religion*, edited by Serinity Young, 679–681. New York: Macmillan Reference.

Csordas, Thomas J. 1997. *Language, Charisma, and Creativity: The Ritual Life of a Religious Movement.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1994. *The Sacred Self: A Cultural Phenomenology of Charismatic Healing.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Day, Abby. 2015. "Farewell to Generation A: The Final 'Active Generation' in the Anglican Communion." In *Contemporary Issues in the Worldwide Anglican Communion: Powers and Pieties*, edited by Abby Day. Farnham: Ashgate.

———. 2011. *Believing in Belonging: Belief and Social Identity in the Modern World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Day, Abby, Giselle Vincett, and Christopher R. Cotter. 2013. "Introduction: What Lies Between: Exploring the Depths of Social Identities between the Sacred and the Secular." In *Social Identities between the Sacred and the Secular*, edited by Abby Day, Giselle Vincett, and Christopher R. Cotter, 1–4. Farnham: Ashgate.

Deer, Cécile. 2008a. "Doxa." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, edited by Michael Grenfell, 119–130. Stocksfield: Acumen.

———. 2008b. "Reflexivity." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, edited by Michael Grenfell, 199–212. Stocksfield: Acumen.

Dianteill, Erwan. 2003. "Pierre Bourdieu and the Sociology of Religion: A Central and Peripheral Concern." *Theory and Society* 32 (5/6): 529–549.

Dillon, Michele. 2007. "Age, Generation, and Cohort in American Religion and Spirituality." In *The Sage Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, edited by James A. Beckford and N. J. Demerath III, 526–546. Los Angeles: Sage.

———. 2001. "Pierre Bourdieu, Religion, and Cultural Production." *Cultural Studies/Critical Methodologies* 1 (4): 411–429.

Dillon, Michele, and Paul Wink. 2003. "Religiousness and Spirituality: Trajectories and Vital Involvement in Late Adulthood." In *Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, edited by Michele Dillon, 179–189. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doucet, Andrea, and Natasha Mauthner. 2002. "Knowing Responsibly: Linking Ethics, Research Practice and Epistemology." In *Ethics in Qualitative Research*, edited by Melanie Mauthner, Maxine Birch, Julie Jessop, and Tina Miller, 123–145. London: Sage.

Dubisch, Jill. 1995. *In a Different Place: Pilgrimage, Gender, and Politics at a Greek Island Shrine.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Eccles, Janet. 2012. "The Religious and Non-Religious Commitments of Older Women in the UK: Towards a New Typology." *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 27 (3): 469–484.

Edgell, Penny. 2012. "A Cultural Sociology of Religion: New Directions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 38: 247–265.

Emirbayer, Mustafa, and Ann Mische. 1998. "What is Agency?" *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (4): 962–1023.

Engler, Steven. 2003. "Modern Times: Religion, Consecration and the State in Bourdieu." *Cultural Studies* 17 (3/4): 445–467.

Fer, Yannick. 2010. "The Holy Spirit and the Pentecostal Habitus: Elements for a Sociology of Institution in Classical Pentecostalism." *Nordic Journal of Religion and Society* 23 (2): 157–176.

Fingerroos, Outi. 2012. "Ylirajainen karjalainen kulttuuriperintö." In *Takaisin Karjalaan*, edited by Outi Fingerroos and Maunu Häyrynen, 202–218. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

———. 2006. "The Karelia of Memories – Utopias of a Place." *Folklore* 33: 95–108. Accessed April 25, 2016. DOI: 10.7592/FEJF2006.33.fingerroos.

Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity. 2013. *Responsible Conduct of Research and Procedures for Handling Allegations of Misconduct in Finland: Guidelines of the Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity 2012.* Helsinki: Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity. Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.tenk.fi/sites/tenk.fi/files/HTK_ohje_2012.pdf.

FitzGerald, Kyriaki Karidoyanes. 2001. "A Person in Communion: The Witness of Mary, the Mother of God." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 46 (3/4): 229–253.

Fortounatto, Mariamna, and Mary B. Cunningham. 2008. "Theology of the Icon." In *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*, edited by Mary B. Cunningham and Elizabeth Theokritoff, 136–149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, Michel. 2000. "On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress." In *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*, vol. 1 of *Essential Works of Foucault 1954–1984*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 253–280. London: Penguin.

———. 1985. *The Use of Pleasure.* Vol. 2 of *The History of Sexuality.* London: Penguin.

Fowler, Bridget. 2003. "Reading Pierre Bourdieu's *Masculine Domination*: Notes towards an Intersectional Analysis of Gender, Culture and Class." *Cultural Studies* 17 (3/4): 468–494.

Furey, Constance M. 2012. "Body, Society, and Subjectivity in Religious Studies." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 80 (1): 7–33.

Gemzöe, Lena. 2000. *Feminine Matters: Women's Religious Practices in a Portuguese Town.* Södertälje: Almqvist and Wiksell International.

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 1979. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis.* London: Macmillan Press.

Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Giordan, Giuseppe, and William H. Swatos Jr., ed. 2011. *Religion, Spirituality and Everyday Practice.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Gothóni, René, and Tuula Sakaranaho. 2016. "Introduction." In *Helsinki Study of Religions: A Reader*, edited by Riku Hämäläinen, Heikki Pesonen, and Terhi Utriainen, 10–15. Helsinki: Study of Religions, Department of World Cultures, University of Helsinki.

Gray, Breda, and Ria O'Sullivan Lago. 2011. "Migrant Chaplains: Mediators of Catholic Church Transnationalism or Guests in Nationally Shaped Religious Fields?" *Irish Journal of Sociology* 19 (2): 94–110.

Grdzelidze, Tamara. 2011. "Church (Orthodox Ecclesiology)." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 124–132. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Grenfell, Michael. 2008a. "Interest." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, edited by Michael Grenfell, 153–170. Stocksfield: Acumen.

———. 2008b. "Postscript: Methodological Principles." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, edited by Michael Grenfell, 219–227. Stocksfield: Acumen.

Grönfors, Eija-Riitta, ed. 2006. *Kielitoimiston sanakirja.* Vol. 2. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.

Gubrium, Jaber F., and James A. Holstein. 2003. "From the Individual Interview to the Interview Society." In *Postmodern Interviewing*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein, 21–49. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

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

———, ed. 1997b. *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hamalis, Perry T. 2011a. "Death (and Funeral)." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 180–182. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

———. 2011b. "Ethics." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 229–230. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hämmerli, Maria. 2011. "Religion and Spirituality between Capital and Gift." *Religion & Theology* 18 (1/2): 195–210.

Hämynen, Tapio. 2011. "'Suomea ne puhui, mutta kyllä ne ryssiä olivat' – ortodoksis-karjalaisen kulttuurin murros Suomessa 1944–2009." In *Rajalla halkaistu kansa: Karjalaisten kansallisidentiteetin, uskonnon ja kielen kehitys 1800-luvun alusta nykypäiviin*, edited by Yury Shikalov, Jukka Kokkonen, Tapio Hämynen, and Aleksandr Pashkov, 203–225. Joensuu: Itä-Suomen yliopisto.

———. 2008. "Talvi- ja jatkosodan väestönsiirrot Suomessa." In *Hyvinvoinnin Suomi*, vol. 4 of *Suomalaisen arjen historia*, edited by Anssi Mäkinen, Liisa Honkala, Kirsti Kujanen, and Joni Strandberg, 27–43. Porvoo: Weilin+Göös.

———. 1996a. "Ongelmallinen ortodoksiavioliitto – ortodoksisen kirkon opetus ja käytäntö." In *Praxis et theoria: Juhlakirja Heikki Makkosen täyttäessä 60 vuotta*,

edited by Gunnar af Hällström and Eeva Raunistola, 91–121. Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto.

———. 1996b. "'Ortodoksi, se oli ryssä ilman muuta': Suomen ortodoksien identiteetti 1200-luvulta nykypäiviin." *Aamun Koitto* 90 (20): 24–28.

———. 1995. *Suomalaistajat, venäläistäjät ja rajakarjalaiset: Kirkko- ja koulukysymys Raja-Karjalassa 1900–1923.* Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto.

———. 1993. *Liikkeellä leivän tähden: Raja-Karjalan väestö ja sen toimeentulo 1880–1940.* Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura.

Hanks, William F. 2005. "Pierre Bourdieu and the Practices of Language." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 67–83.

Hardy, Cheryl. 2008. "Hysteresis." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, edited by Michael Grenfell, 131–148. Stocksfield: Acumen.

Hardy, Melissa A., and Linda Waite. 1997. "Doing Time: Reconciling Biography with History in the Study of Social Change." In *Studying Aging and Social Change: Conceptual and Methodological Issues*, edited by Melissa A. Hardy, 1–21. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Harrison, Nonna Verna. 2008. "The Human Person as Image and Likeness of God." In *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*, edited by Mary B. Cunningham and Elizabeth Theokritoff, 78–92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heikkinen, Kaija. 2000. "Women's Traditions Transforming the Institutionalized Culture in Russia." In *Traditions of Belief in Everyday Life*, edited by Tuija Hovi and Anne Puuronen, 139–159. Åbo: Åbo Akademi.

———. 1996. "Suomen karjalaisten identiteetti ja sen alueellinen konteksti." In *Näkökulmia karjalaiseen perinteeseen*, edited by Pekka Hakamies, 13–35. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

———. 1989. *Karjalaisuus ja etninen itsetajunta: Salmin siirtokarjalaisia koskeva tutkimus.* Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto.

———. 1984. "Karjalaisuus Rasimäessä tänään." In *Yhteiskunta kylässä: Tutkimuksia Sivakasta ja Rasimäestä*, by Pertti Rannikko, Jukka Oksa, Matti Kuikka, Seppo Knuuttila, Kaija Heikkinen, and Heikki Eskelinen, 79–105. Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto.

Heininen, Simo, and Markku Heikkilä. 1996. *Suomen kirkkohistoria*. Helsinki: Edita.

Heiskala, Risto. 2000. *Toiminta, tapa ja rakenne: Kohti konstruktionistista synteesiä yhteiskuntateoriassa.* Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Helander, Eila. 1999. "Uskonto ja arvojen murros." In *Uskonto ja nykyaika: Yksilö ja eurooppalaisen yhteiskunnan murros*, edited by Markku Heikkilä, 54–87. Jyväskylä: Atena.

Hervieu-Léger, Danièle. 2000. *Religion as a Chain of Memory.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Hiiro, Jukka. 2015. "Luterilaisen naispiispan vierailu käynnisti oppiriidan Suomen ortodoksikirkossa." *Helsingin Sanomat*, March 3. Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.hs.fi/kotimaa/a1305933994329?ref=a-artikkeli.

Hirvonen, Helena. 2014. *Habitus and Care: Investigating Welfare Service Workers' Agency.* Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. Accessed April 25, 2016. https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/handle/123456789/43315/978-951-39-5663-9.pdf?sequence=1.

Hochschild, Arlie R., with Anne Machung. 2003. *The Second Shift.* New York: Penguin.

Hollywood, Amy. 2004. "Gender, Agency, and the Divine in Religious Historiography." *Journal of Religion* 84 (4): 514–528.

———. 2002. "Performativity, Citationality, Ritualization." *History of Religions* 42 (2): 93–115.

Holstein, James A., and Jaber F. Gubrium. 2003. "Active Interviewing." In *Postmodern Interviewing*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein, 67–80. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Honkasalo, Marja-Liisa. 2015. "If the Mother of God Does Not Listen: Women's Contested Agency and the Lived Meaning of the Orthodox Religion in North Karelia." *Journal of American Folklore* 128 (507): 65–92.

———. 2009. "Grips and Ties: Agency, Uncertainty, and the Problem of Suffering in North Karelia." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 23 (1): 51–69.

———. 2008a. "Enduring as a Mode of Living with Uncertainty." *Health, Risk & Society* 10 (5): 491–503.

———. 2008b. *Reikä sydämessä: Sairaus pohjoiskarjalaisessa maisemassa.* Tampere: Vastapaino.

Hornborg, Anne-Christine. 2005. "Eloquent Bodies: Rituals in the Contexts of Alleviating Suffering." *Numen: International Review for the History of Religions* 52 (3): 356–394.

Hunt, Stephen J. 2007. "Religion as a Factor in Life and Death through the Life-Course." In *The Sage Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, edited by James A. Beckford and N. J. Demerath III, 609–629. Los Angeles: Sage.

———. 2002. *Religion in Western Society.* New York: Palgrave.

Huotari, Voitto. 1991. "Orthodox-Lutheran Intermarriage in Finland." *Social Compass* 38 (1): 25–31.

———. 1975. *Ortodoksin ja luterilaisen avioliitto: Tutkimus uskonto- ja perhetekijöiden vuorovaikutuksesta seka-avioliitoissa Ilomantsissa, Pohjois-Savossa ja Helsingissä.* Helsinki: Suomalainen Teologinen Kirjallisuusseura.

Husso, Katariina. 2011. *Ikkunoita ikonien ja kirkkoesineiden historiaan: Suomen autonomisen ortodoksisen kirkon esineellinen kulttuuriperintö 1920–1980-luvuilla.* Helsinki: Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistys.

Huttunen, Heikki. 2002. "Witnessing in a Secular Situation: Reflections on the Orthodox Church of Finland." *Ortodoksia* 49: 194–207.

Isik, Damla. 2008. "On Sabir and Agency: The Politics of Pious Practice in Konya's Carpet Weaving Industry." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 10 (4): 518–541.

Jääskinen, Aune. 2006. "Tulkintoja seksistä ja selibaatista Suomen ortodoksisessa kirkossa." In *Taivaallista seksiä: Kristinusko ja seksuaalisuus*, edited by Minna Ahola, Marjo-Riitta Antikainen, and Päivi Salmesvuori, 261–278. Helsinki: Tammi.

Jacobson, Shari. 2006. "Modernity, Conservative Religious Movements, and the Female Subject: Newly Ultraorthodox Sephardi Women in Buenos Aires." *American Anthropologist* 108 (2): 336–346.

Järvinen, Irma-Riitta. 2004. *Karjalan pyhät kertomukset: Tutkimus livvinkielisen alueen legendaperinteestä ja kansanuskon muutoksista.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Jokinen, Eeva. 2005. *Aikuisten arki.* Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Jokinen, Kimmo, and Kimmo Saaristo. 2006. *Suomalainen yhteiskunta*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Julkunen, Raija. 1999. "Gender, Work, Welfare State." In *Women in Finland*, by Satu Apo, Katarina Eskola, Raija Julkunen, Jaana Kuusipalo, Anna-Maija Lehto, Maria Lähteenmäki, Aili Nenola, Paavo Nikula, and Anu Pylkkänen, 79–100. Helsinki: Otava.

Jutikkala, Eino, and Kauko Pirinen. 2003. *A History of Finland.* 6th ed. Helsinki: WSOY.

Jyrkämä, Jyrki. 2001. "Vanheneminen ja vanhuus." In *Lapsuudesta vanhuuteen: Iän sosiologiaa*, edited by Anne Sankari and Jyrki Jyrkämä, 267–323. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Kääriäinen, Kimmo, Kati Niemelä, and Kimmo Ketola. 2005. *Religion in Finland: Decline, Change and Transformation of Finnish Religiosity.* Tampere: Church Research Institute.

———. 2003. *Moderni kirkkokansa: Suomalaisten uskonnollisuus uudella vuosituhannella.* Tampere: Kirkon tutkimuskeskus.

Kallistos, metropolitan. 2011. "Jesus Prayer." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 352–355. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kananen, Heli Kaarina. 2012. "Ortodoksisen siirtoväen kontrolloitu sopeutuminen: Sosiaalinen kontrolli sopeuttamisen välineenä." *Elore* 19 (1): 37–55. Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.elore.fi/arkisto/1_12/kananen.pdf.

———. 2010. *Kontrolloitu sopeutuminen: Ortodoksinen siirtoväki sotien jälkeisessä Ylä-Savossa (1946–1959)*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.

Kärkkäinen, Tapani. 1999. *Kirkon historia: Ortodoksin käsikirja*. Joensuu: Ortodoksisen kirjallisuuden julkaisuneuvosto.

Karner, Christian, and David Parker. 2008. "Religion versus Rubbish: Deprivation and Social Capital in Inner-City Birmingham." *Social Compass* 55 (4): 517–531.

Kauppi, Niilo. 2000. *The Politics of Embodiment: Habits, Power, and Pierre Bourdieu's Theory*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Keinänen, Marja-Liisa. 2014. "'Feeding the Dead': Women 'Doing' Kinship and Religion in the Early Twentieth Century Russian Orthodox Karelia." In *Finnish Women*

Making Religion: Between Ancestors and Angels, edited by Terhi Utriainen and Päivi Salmesvuori, 21–42. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2012. "Everyday, Fast and Feast: Household Work and the Production of Time in Pre-modern Russian Orthodox Karelia." In *Vernacular Religion in Everyday Life: Expressions of Belief*, edited by Marion Bowman and Ülo Valk, 22–41. Sheffield: Equinox.

———. 2010a. "The Home, the Sacred Order and Domestic Chores in Premodern Russian Orthodox Karelia." In *Perspectives on Women's Everyday Religion*, edited by Marja-Liisa Keinänen, 119–153. Stockholm: Stockholm University.

———, ed. 2010b. *Perspectives on Women's Everyday Religion.* Stockholm: Stockholm University.

———. 2003. *Creating Bodies: Childbirth Practices in Pre-Modern Karelia.* Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Ketola, Kimmo. 2008. *Uskonnot Suomessa: Käsikirja uskontoihin ja uskonnollistaustaisiin liikkeisiin.* Tampere: Kirkon tutkimuskeskus.

Ketola, Kimmo, Kimmo Kääriäinen, and Kati Niemelä. 2007. "Näkyykö usko elämässä? – Uskonnollisuuden vaikutus suomalaisten asenteisiin, arvomaailmaan ja moraalikäsityksiin." In *Uskonto, arvot ja instituutiot: Suomalaiset World Values – tutkimuksissa 1981–2005*, edited by Sami Borg, Kimmo Ketola, Kimmo Kääriäinen, Kati Niemelä, and Pertti Suhonen, 60–85. Tampere: Yhteiskuntatieteellinen tietoarkisto.

King, Anthony. 2000. "Thinking with Bourdieu against Bourdieu: A 'Practical' Critique of the Habitus." *Sociological Theory* 18 (3): 417–433.

King, Ursula. 2005. "General Introduction: Gender-Critical Turns in the Study of Religion." In *Gender, Religion and Diversity: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, edited by Ursula King and Tina Beattie, 1–10. London: Continuum.

Kirkinen, Heikki, Pekka Nevalainen, and Hannes Sihvo. 1994. *Karjalan kansan historia*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Kirkkohallitus. 2009. *Palvelkaa Herraa iloiten: Jumalanpalveluksen opas.* 3rd ed. Helsinki: Kirkkohallitus. Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.evl.fi/kirkkokasikirja/jp-opas.pdf.

van Klinken, Adriaan S. 2013. *Transforming Masculinities in African Christianity: Gender Controversies in Times of AIDS.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Knott, Kim. 1995. "Women Researching, Women Researched: Gender as an Issue in the Empirical Study of Religion." In *Religion and Gender*, edited by Ursula King, 199–218. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kollontai, Pauline. 2000. "Contemporary Thinking on the Role and Ministry of Women in the Orthodox Church." *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 15 (2): 165–179.

Konieczny, Mary Ellen, Loren D. Lybarger, and Kelly H. Chong. 2012. "Theory as a Tool in the Social Scientific Study of Religion and Martin Riesebrodt's *The Promise of Salvation*." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 51 (3): 397–411.

Korjonen-Kuusipuro, Kristiina, and Suvi Niinisalo. 2005. "Sekoittuneet pääsiäisperinteet." In *Epäluuloista ekumeniaan: Ortodoksisen ja luterilaisen kirkon vuoropuhelu*, edited by Suvi Niinisalo, 51–61. Lappeenranta: Etelä-Karjala-instituutti and Lappeenrannan teknillinen yliopisto.

Kortteinen, Matti. 1992. *Kunnian kenttä: Suomalainen palkkatyö kulttuurisena muotona.* Helsinki: Hanki ja Jää.

Kościańska, Agnieszka. 2009. "The 'Power of Silence': Spirituality and Women's Agency beyond the Catholic Church in Poland." *Focaal – European Journal of Anthropology* 53: 56–71.

Koukkunen, Heikki. 1982. *Tuiskua ja tyventä: Suomen ortodoksinen kirkko 1918–1978.* Heinävesi: Valamon luostari.

———. 1981. "Ortodoksinen Karjala." In *Portti itään ja länteen*, vol. 1 of *Karjala*, edited by Yrjö-Pekka Mäkinen and Ilmari Lehmusvaara, 281–305. Hämeenlinna: Karisto.

Krais, Beate. 2006. "Gender, Sociological Theory and Bourdieu's Sociology of Practice." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23 (6): 119–134.

Kühle, Lene. 2012a. "Bourdieu, Religion, and Pluralistic Societies." *Bulletin for the Study of Religion* 41 (1): 8–14.

———. 2012b. "In the Faith of Our Fathers? Religious Minority Socialization in Pluralistic Societies." *Nordic Journal of Religion and Society* 25 (2): 113–130.

Kupari, Helena. 2011. "'Remembering God' through Religious Habits: The Daily Religious Practices of Evacuee Karelian Orthodox Women." *Temenos: Nordic Journal of Comparative Religion* 47 (2): 197–222.

Kuusisto-Arponen, Anna-Kaisa. 2009. "The Mobilities of Forced Displacement: Commemorating Karelian Evacuation in Finland." *Social and Cultural Geography* 10 (5): 545–563.

Kvale, Steinar. 1996. *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Laasonen, Pentti. 2011. *Yhteisellä tiellä: Luterilainen kirkko jakamattoman perinteen kantajana.* Helsinki: Kirjapaja.

Ladwig, Patrice. 2011. "The Genesis and Demarcation of the Religious Field: Monasteries, State Schools, and the Secular Sphere in Lao Buddhism (1893–1975)." *SOJOURN: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia* 26 (2): 196–223.

Laitila, Teuvo. 2015. "'Ryssä', toinen kansankirkko, ekumeeninen kumppani, hengellisyyden julistaja, arvokonservatiivi? – Suomen ortodoksisen kirkon monet julkisuuskuvat." *Teologia.fi*, May 25. Accessed April 25, 2016. https://www.teologia.fi/artikkelit/1203-ryssae-toinen-kansankirkko-ekumeeninen-kumppani-hengellisyyden-julistaja-arvokonservatiivi-suomen-ortodoksisen-kirkon-monet-julkisuuskuvat.

———. 2009. "Epäluuloja, välinpitämättömyyttä ja arvostusta: Ortodoksis-luterilaiset suhteet Suomessa toisen maailmansodan jälkeen ortodoksisesta näkökulmasta."

In *Terve sielu terveessä ruumiissa: Juhlakirja professori Paavo Kettusen täyttäessä 60 vuotta 27.11.2009*, edited by Hannu Mustakallio, 339–348. Joensuu: Karjalan Teologinen Seura.

———. 2006. "History of the Finnish Orthodox Church in the 20th Century." In *A Short History of the Orthodox Church in Western Europe in the 20th Century*, edited by Christine Chaillot, 155–176. Paris: Inter-Orthodox Dialogue.

———. 1998. "Kansanomainen ja kirkollinen ortodoksisuus Raja-Karjalassa." In *Karjala: Historia, kansa, kulttuuri*, edited by Pekka Nevalainen and Hannes Sihvo, 383–415. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Laki uskonnonvapauslain muuttamisesta. 1969. L 767/1969. Valtion säädöstietopankki Finlex. Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/1969/19690767.

Lampi, Pertti. 2016. "Karjalan Kielen Seura." Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.karjal.fi/kks/.

Lash, Ephrem. 2008. "Biblical Interpretation in Worship." In *The Cambridge Companion to Orthodox Christian Theology*, edited by Mary B. Cunningham and Elizabeth Theokritoff, 35–48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lawler, Steph. 2004. "Rules of Engagement: Habitus, Power and Resistance." In *Feminism after Bourdieu*, edited by Lisa Adkins and Beverley Skeggs, 110–128. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lehmuskoski, Timo. 1979. "Kodin hengellinen elämä." In *Ortodoksinen kirkko Suomessa*, edited by father Ambrosius and Markku Haapio, 326–335. Lieto: Etelä-Suomen kustannus.

Leming, Laura M. 2007. "Sociological Explorations: What Is Religious Agency?" *Sociological Quarterly* 48 (1): 73–92.

di Leonardo, Micaela. 1987. "The Female World of Cards and Holidays: Women, Families, and the Work of Kinship." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* 12 (3): 440–453.

Lester, Rebecca J. 2005. *Jesus in Our Wombs: Embodying Modernity in a Mexican Convent.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Limberis, Vasiliki. 1999. "Orthodox Christianity." In *Encyclopedia of Women and World Religion*, edited by Serinity Young, 751–753. New York: Macmillan Reference.

Lindhardt, Martin. 2010. "'If You Are Saved You Cannot Forget Your Parents': Agency, Power, and Social Repositioning in Tanzanian Born-again Christianity." *Journal of Religion in Africa* 40 (3): 240–272.

Lindquist, Galina. 2006. *Conjuring Hope: Magic and Healing in Contemporary Russia.* New York: Berghahn Books.

Löfström, Jan. 1998. "Changing Conceptions of Gender Polarity in Finland: From Rural to Urban Culture." In *Gender and Folklore: Perspectives on Finnish and Karelian Culture*, edited by Satu Apo, Aili Nenola, and Laura Stark-Arola, 239–259. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Loima, Jyrki. 2004. “Nationalism and the Orthodox Church in Finland 1895–1958.” In *Nationalism and Orthodoxy: Two Thematic Studies on National Ideologies and Their Interaction with the Church*, by Teuvo Laitila and Jyrki Loima, 93–203. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Loipponen, Jaana. 2010. *Telling Absence: War Widows, Loss and Memory.* Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Longman, Chia. 2008. “Sacrificing the Career or the Family? Orthodox Jewish Women between Secular Work and the Sacred Home.” *European Journal of Women's Studies* 15 (3): 223–239.

Lovell, Terry. 2000. “Thinking Feminism with and against Bourdieu.” In *Reading Bourdieu on Society and Culture*, edited by Bridget Fowler, 27–48. Oxford: Blackwell.

Luther, Martin. 1529/1986. *The Small Cathecism*. Reprint, Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House. Accessed April 25, 2016. http://bookofconcord.org/small catechism.php.

Mack, Phyllis. 2003. “Religion, Feminism, and the Problem of Agency: Reflections on Eighteenth-Century Quakerism.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* 29 (1): 149–177.

Maduro, Otto. 2012. “Teaching Bourdieu on and in the Study of Religion(s).” *Bulletin for the Study of Religion* 41 (1): 32–37.

———. 2005. *Religion and Social Conflicts.* Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Mahmood, Saba. 2005. *Politics of Piety: The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Makkonen, Heikki. 2011. “Sielunhoidon seitsemän vuosikymmentä 1940–2009.” In *Omal mual – vierahal mual*, vol. 4 of *Suojärven historia*, edited by Tapio Hämynen, 264–305. Nurmes: Suojärven pitäjäseura.

———. 1989. *Kuolema ortodoksisessa perinteessä: Tutkimus kuolemaan liittyvän perinteen elinvoimaisuudesta entisen Aunuksen kaupungin ja Suojärven pitäjän alueella syntyneiden ortodoksien elämässä synnyinseuduilla ja Keski-Suomessa vuosina 1930–1985.* Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto.

Malmisalo, Juha. 2005. “In Pursuit of the Genuine Christian Image: Erland Forsberg as a Lutheran Producer of Icons in the Fields of Culture and Religion.” ThD diss., University of Helsinki.

Mannheim, Karl. 1997. “The Problem of Generations.” In *Studying Aging and Social Change: Conceptual and Methodological Issues*, edited by Melissa A. Hardy, 22–65. Thousand Oaks: Sage. Originally published in Karl Mannheim, *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952).

Marler, Penny L. 2008. “Religious Change in the West: Watch the Women.” In *Women and Religion in the West: Challenging Secularization*, edited by Kristin Aune, Sonya Sharma, and Giselle Vincett, 23–56. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Martelin, Tuija, Kari Pitkänen, and Seppo Koskinen. 2000. "Suomalaisten väestöllinen elämänkulku: Tilastoja ja tarinoita." In *Suomalainen elämänkulku*, edited by Eino Heikkinen and Jouni Tuomi, 38–57. Helsinki: Tammi.

Martikainen, Tuomas, and Teuvo Laitila. 2014. "Population Movements and Orthodox Christianity in Finland: Dislocations, Resettlements, Migrations and Identities." In *Orthodox Identities in Western Europe: Migration, Settlement and Innovation*, edited by Maria Hämmerli and Jean-François Mayer, 151–178. Farnham: Ashgate.

Martin, Craig. 2012. *A Critical Introduction to the Study of Religion.* Sheffield: Equinox.

Martín, Eloísa. 2009. "From Popular Religion to Practices of Sacralization: Approaches for a Conceptual Discussion." *Social Compass* 56 (2): 273–285.

Maton, Karl. 2008. "Habitus." In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, edited by Michael Grenfell, 49–65. Stocksfield: Acumen.

Mauss, Marcel. 1979. *Sociology and Psychology: Essays.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

McCloud, Sean. 2012. "The Possibilities of Change in a World of Constraint: Individual and Social Transformation in the Work of Pierre Bourdieu." *Bulletin for the Study of Religion* 41 (1): 2–8.

———. 2007. *Divine Hierarchies: Class in American Religion and Religious Studies.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

McDowell, Maria Gwyn. 2011. "Sexual Ethics." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 2, edited by John A. McGuckin, 570–572. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

McFadden, Susan H. 1996. "Religion, Spirituality and Aging." In *Handbook of the Psychology of Aging*, edited by James E. Birren and K. Warner Schaie, 162–177. San Diego: Academic Press.

McGuckin, John A. 2011a. "Calendar." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 95–97. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

———. 2011b. "Cross." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 168–171. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

———. 2011c. "Divine Liturgy, Orthodox." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 190–196. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

———. 2011d. "Fatherhood of God." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 244–248. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

———. 2011e. "Feasts." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 248–251. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

———. 2011f. "Love." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 374. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

———. 2008. *The Orthodox Church: An Introduction to Its History, Doctrine and Spiritual Culture.* Oxford: Blackwell.

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

———. 1997. *Religion: The Social Context.* 4th ed. Belmont: Wadsworth.

McKinnon, Andrew M., Marta Trzebiatowska, and Christopher Craig Brittain. 2011. "Bourdieu, Capital, and Conflict in a Religious Field: The Case of the 'Homosexuality' Conflict in the Anglican Communion." *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 26 (3): 355–370.

McNally, Michael. 1997. "The Uses of Ojibwa Hymn-singing at White Earth: Toward a History of Practice." In *Lived Religion in America: Toward a History of Practice*, edited by David D. Hall, 133–159. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

McNay, Lois. 2004. "Agency and Experience: Gender as a Lived Relation." In *Feminism after Bourdieu*, edited by Lisa Adkins and Beverley Skeggs, 175–190. Oxford: Blackwell.

———. 2003. "Agency, Anticipation and Indeterminacy in Feminist Theory." *Feminist Theory* 4 (2): 139–148.

———. 2000. *Gender and Agency: Reconfiguring the Subject in Feminist and Social Theory.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

———. 1999. "Gender, Habitus and the Field: Pierre Bourdieu and the Limits of Reflexivity." *Theory, Culture & Society* 16 (1): 95–117.

Melling, David J. 1999. "Mysteries." In *The Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity*, edited by Ken Parry, David J. Melling, Dimitri Brady, Sidney H. Griffith, and John F. Healey, 332–333. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mellor, Philip A., and Chris Shilling. 2010a. "Body Pedagogics and the Religious Habitus: A New Direction for the Sociological Study of Religion." *Religion* 40 (1): 27–38.

———. 2010b. "The Religious Habitus: Embodiment, Religion, and Sociological Theory." In *The New Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Religion*, edited by Bryan S. Turner, 201–220. Oxford: Blackwell.

Merras, Merja. 2006. *Ortodoksinen elämäntapa*. Heinävesi: Valamon luostari.

Merras, Olavi. 1993. "Marriage between Orthodox and Lutherans as a Pastoral Issue." In *The Finnish Lutheran-Orthodox Dialogue 1989 and 1990*, 87–101. Helsinki: Church Council for Foreign Affairs.

Messer-Davidow, Ellen. 1995. "Acting Otherwise." In *Provoking Agents: Gender and Agency in Theory and Practice*, edited by Judith Kegan Gardiner, 24–51. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Meyer, John W., and Ronald L. Jepperson. 2000. "The 'Actors' of Modern Society: The Cultural Construction of Social Agency." *Sociological Theory* 18 (1): 100–120.

Mitchell, Jon P., and Hildi J. Mitchell. 2008. "For Belief: Embodiment and Immanence in Catholicism and Mormonism." *Social Analysis* 52 (1): 79–94.

Moberg, Marcus, and Sofia Sjö. 2012. "The Evangelical Lutheran Church and the Media in Post-Secular Finland." In *Mediatization and Religion: Nordic Perspectives*, edited by Stig Hjarvard and Mia Lövheim, 79–91. Göteborg: Nordicom.

Morgan, David. 1998. *Visual Piety: A History and Theory of Popular Religious Images.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Munn, Nancy D. 1992. "The Cultural Anthropology of Time: A Critical Essay." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21: 93–123.

Narvaez, Rafael F. 2006. "Embodiment, Collective Memory and Time." *Body & Society* 12 (3): 51–73.

Nenola, Aili. 2002. *Inkerin itkuvirret – Ingrian Laments*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Nguyen, Riina. 2007. "Converts – A Challenge and a Resource for the Church." In *Orthodox Tradition and the 21st Century: Experiences of the Past, Realities of Today, Challenges of Tomorrow*, edited by Grant S. White and Teuvo Laitila, 123–127. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.

Noble, Greg, and Megan Watkins. 2003. "So, How Did Bourdieu Learn to Play Tennis? Habitus, Consciousness, and Habituation." *Cultural Studies* 17 (3/4): 520–538.

Norman, Jon. 2011. "The Fluidity of Human Capital: Theorizing the Relationship between Religion and Immigration." *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 23 (1): 48–63.

Nyström, Aleksander, ed. 2001. *Rukouskirja*. Helsinki: Ortodoksisen kirjallisuuden julkaisuneuvosto.

Olsson, Pia. 2011. *Women in Distress: Self-understanding among 20th-Century Finnish Rural Women.* Berlin: LIT Verlag.

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

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

———. 2005. *Between Heaven and Earth: The Religious Worlds People Make and the Scholars Who Study Them.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

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

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

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

Ortner, Sherry B. 2006. *Anthropology and Social Theory: Culture, Power, and the Acting Subject.* Durham: Duke University Press.

———. 1989. *High Religion: A Cultural and Political History of Sherpa Buddhism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1984. “Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26 (1): 126–166.

Ortodoksinen kirkko. 2016. “Väestötilasto 2015.” Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.ort.fi/sites/default/files/liitteet/Jaana%20Mikkonen/v%C3%A4est%C3%B6tilasto2015.pdf.

Paasi, Anssi. 1995. *Territories, Boundaries and Consciousness: The Changing Geographies of the Finnish-Russian Border.* Chichester: Wiley.

Paavola, Markus. 2007. *Ortodoksisessa kodissa*. Joensuu: Ortodoksisten Nuorten Liitto.

Parashar, Swati. 2010. “The Sacred and the Sacrilegious: Exploring Women’s ‘Politics’ and ‘Agency’ in Radical Religious Movements in South Asia.” *Totalitarian Movements and Political Religions* 11 (3/4): 435–455.

Parppei, Kati. 2011. *“The Oldest One in Russia”: The Formation of the Historiographical Image of Valaam Monastery*. Leiden: Brill.

Patsavos, Lewis J., and Charles J. Joanides. 2000. “Interchurch Marriages: An Orthodox Perspective.” *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 45 (1/4): 433–442.

Paukkunen, Leo. 1989. *Siirtokarjalaiset nyky-Suomessa*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.

Pentikäinen, Juha. 1978. *Oral Repertoire and World View: An Anthropological Study of Marina Takalo’s Life History.* Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Science and Letters.

———. 1971. *Marina Takalon uskonto: Uskontoantropologinen tutkimus*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Petrisalo, Katriina. 2001. *Menneisyys matkakohteena: Kulttuuriantropologinen ja historiatieteellinen tutkimus perinnekulttuurien hyödyntämisestä matkailuteollisuudessa.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Pettis, Jeffrey B. 2011. “Blessing Rituals.” In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 74–75. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Piiroinen, Erkki. 1980. *Ortodoksinen usko Suomessa*. Helsinki: Ortodoksisen kirjallisuuden julkaisuneuvosto.

———. 1978. *Ortodoksisuus on elämää: Puheita ja esitelmiä vuosilta 1945–1978*. Joensuu: Ortodoksisen kirjallisuuden julkaisuneuvosto.

Plancke, Carine. 2011. “The Spirit’s Wish: Possession Trance and Female Power among the Punu of Congo-Brazzaville.” *Journal of Religion in Africa* 41 (4): 366–395.

Postone, Moishe, Edward LiPuma, and Craig Calhoun. 1993. “Introduction: Bourdieu and Social Theory.” In *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, edited by Craig Calhoun, Edward LiPuma, and Moishe Postone, 1–13. Cambridge: Polity Press.

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

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

Probyn, Elspeth. 2004. "Shame in the Habitus." In *Feminism after Bourdieu*, edited by Lisa Adkins and Beverley Skeggs, 224–248. Oxford: Blackwell.

Pylkkänen, Anu. 1999. "Finnish Understandings of Equality." In *Women in Finland*, by Satu Apo, Katarina Eskola, Raija Julkunen, Jaana Kuusipalo, Anna-Maija Lehto, Maria Lähteenmäki, Aili Nenola, Paavo Nikula, and Anu Pylkkänen, 24–38. Helsinki: Otava.

Raivo, Petri. 1996. *Maiseman kulttuurinen transformaatio: Ortodoksinen kirkko suomalaisessa kulttuurimaisemassa.* Oulu: Oulun yliopisto.

Raninen-Siiskonen, Tarja. 1999. *Vieraana omalla maalla.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Rapport, Nigel, and Joanna Overing. 2000. *Social and Cultural Anthropology: The Key Concepts.* London: Routledge.

Raunistola-Juutinen, Eeva. 2012. *Äiti ja nunna: Kirkkojen maailmanneuvoston naisten vuosikymmenen ortodoksiset naiskuvat*. Joensuu: Itä-Suomen yliopisto.

Reay, Diane. 2004a. "Gendering Bourdieu's Concept of Capitals? Emotional Capital, Women and Social Class." In *Feminism after Bourdieu*, edited by Lisa Adkins and Beverley Skeggs, 57–74. Oxford: Blackwell.

———. 2004b. "'It's All Becoming a Habitus': Beyond the Habitual Use of Habitus in Educational Research." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 25 (4): 431–444.

Repo, Tapani. 1979. "Ortodoksinen juhlakalenteri." In *Juhlakirja: Suomalaiset merkkipäivät*, edited by Urpo Vento, 29–33. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Rey, Terry. 2007. *Bourdieu on Religion: Imposing Faith and Legitimacy.* London: Equinox.

———. 2005. "Habitus et hybridité: Une interprétation du syncrétisme dans la religion afro-catholique d'après Bourdieu." *Social Compass* 52 (4): 453–462.

———. 1998. "The Virgin Mary and Revolution in Saint-Domingue: The Charisma of Romaine-la-Prophétesse." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 11 (3): 341–369.

Rey, Terry, and Alex Stepick. 2013. *Crossing the Water and Keeping the Faith: Haitian Religion in Miami.* New York: New York University Press.

Riesebrodt, Martin. 2010. *The Promise of Salvation: A Theory of Religion.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Roos, Jeja-Pekka. 1987. *Suomalainen elämä: Tutkimus tavallisten suomalaisten elämäkerroista.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

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

Ruel, Malcolm. 2005. "Christians as Believers." In *Ritual and Religious Belief: A Reader*, edited by Graham Harvey, 242–264. London: Equinox. Originally published in

Malcolm Ruel, *Belief, Ritual and the Securing of Life: Reflexive Essays on a Bantu Religion* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

Ruether, Rosemary Radford. 1987. "Christianity." In *Women in World Religions*, edited by Arvind Sharma, 207–233. New York: State University of New York Press.

Saarikivi, Ritva. 1974. "Naisen asema ja tehtävät Salmin ortodoksisessa seurakuntaelämässä 1917–1939." MTh thesis, University of Helsinki.

Sallinen-Gimpl, Pirkko. 2010. "The Encounter of the Orthodox and Lutheran Original Population with the Evacuees in North Karelia." *Ethnologia Fennica* 37: 86–101.

———. 1994. *Siirtokarjalainen identiteetti ja kulttuurien kohtaaminen*. Helsinki: Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistys.

Sarmela, Matti. 2009. *Finnish Folklore Atlas*. Vol. 2 of *Ethnic Culture of Finland*. 4th ed. Helsinki: Matti Sarmela. Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.kotikone.fi/matti.sarmela/folkloreatlas.pdf.

Savioja, Hannele, Antti Karisto, Ossi Rahkonen, and Katri Hellsten. 2000. "Suurten ikäluokkien elämänkulku." In *Suomalainen elämänkulku*, edited by Eino Heikkinen and Jouni Tuomi, 58–73. Helsinki: Tammi.

Scheer, Monique. 2012. "Are Emotions a Kind of Practice (and Is That What Makes Them Have a History)? Bourdieuian Approach to Understanding Emotion." *History & Theory* 51 (2): 193–220.

Serafim, monk. 2006. *Tie ylösnousemukseen: Suuren paaston ja pääsiäisen sanoma.* Helsinki: Kirjapaja.

Sered, Susan Starr. 1994. *Priestess, Mother, Sacred Sister: Religions Dominated by Women.* New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 1992. *Women as Ritual Experts: The Religious Lives of Elderly Jewish Women in Jerusalem.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Sewell, William H. Jr. 1992. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (1): 1–29.

Shanneik, Yafa. 2011. "Conversion and Religious Habitus: The Experiences of Irish Women Converts to Islam in the Pre-Celtic Tiger Era." *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs* 31 (4): 503–517.

Sidoroff, Matti. 1984. "Living Orthodoxy in Finland." In *Orthodoxy in Finland: Past and Present*, edited by Veikko Purmonen, 27–33. Kuopio: Orthodox Clergy Association.

Sihvo, Hannes. 1999. "Karelia: A Source of Finnish National History." In *National History and Identity: Approaches to the Writing of National History in the North-east Baltic Region – Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, edited by Michael Branch, 181–201. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Skeggs, Beverly. 2004a. "Context and Background: Pierre Bourdieu's Analysis of Class, Gender and Sexuality." In *Feminism after Bourdieu*, edited by Lisa Adkins and Beverley Skeggs, 19–33. Oxford: Blackwell.

———. 2004b. "Exchange, Value and Affect: Bourdieu and 'the Self.' " In *Feminism after Bourdieu*, edited by Lisa Adkins and Beverley Skeggs, 75–95. Oxford: Blackwell.

Smid, Karen. 2010. "Resting at Creation and Afterlife: Distant Times in the Ordinary Strategies of Muslim Women in the Rural Fouta Djallon, Guinea." *American Ethnologist* 37 (1): 36–52.

Snajdr, Edward. 2005. "Gender, Power, and the Performance of Justice: Muslim Women's Responses to Domestic Violence in Kazakhstan." *American Ethnologist* 32 (2): 294–311.

Spradley, James P. 1979. *The Ethnographic Interview.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stark, Laura. 2002. *Peasants, Pilgrims, and Sacred Promises: Ritual and the Supernatural in Orthodox Karelian Folk Religion.* Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Statistics Finland. 2016. "Statistics Finland's PX-Web Databases: Population Structure. Database 28: Population According to Age (1-Year) and Sex 1970–2015." Accessed April 25, 2016. http://pxnet2.stat.fi/PXWeb/pxweb/en/StatFin/StatFin__vrm__vaerak/?tablelist=true&rxid=e6412fa6-a74a-4e45-9251-f0168b22fc90.

———. 2015a. "Official Statistics of Finland: Population Structure. Annual Review 2014, Appendix Figure 2: Share of Persons Not Belonging to Religious Communities by Gender 1990–2014." Helsinki: Statistics Finland. Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2014/01/vaerak_2014_01_2015-12-10_kuv_002_en.html.

———. 2015b. "Official Statistics of Finland: Population Structure. Annual Review 2014, Appendix Table 7: Population by Religious Community in 2000 to 2014." Helsinki: Statistics Finland. Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2014/01/vaerak_2014_01_2015-12-10_tau_007_en.html.

———. 2013. *Official Statistics of Finland: Population Structure 2012*. Helsinki: Statistics Finland. Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.tilastokeskus.fi/til/vaerak/2012/vaerak_2012_2013-03-22_en.pdf.

Steenberg, M. C. 2011. "Ascetism." In *The Encyclopedia of Eastern Orthodox Christianity*, vol. 1, edited by John A. McGuckin, 54–55. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Stone, Lora. 2001. "'Misrecognition of the Limits': Bourdieu's *Religious Capital* and Social Transformation." *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory* 3 (1): 1–14. Accessed April 25, 2016. http://www.jcrt.org/archives/03.1/stone.shtml.

Strandell, Harriet. 1984. "Kolmen naissukupolven kokemuksia työstä ja perheestä." In *Perhe, työ ja tunteet: Ristiriitoja ja ratkaisuja*, edited by Elina Haavio-Mannila, Riitta Jallinoja, and Harriet Strandell, 203–294. Porvoo: WSOY.

Stringer, Martin D. 2008. *Contemporary Western Ethnography and the Definition of Religion.* London: Continuum.

von Stuckrad, Kocku. 2010. "Reflections on the Limits of Reflection: An Invitation to the Discursive Study of Religion." *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 22 (2/3): 156–169.

Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 2010. “SKS:n arkistojen käyttösääntö.” Accessed July 15, 2016. http://www.finlit.fi/fi/arkisto-ja-kirjastopalvelut/arkiston-ja-kirjaston-kaytto/arkistoaineistojen-kaytto/sksn-arkistojen#.V4iOP3rl8wN.

Sutcliffe, Steven J. 2006. “Re-Thinking ‘New Age’ as a Popular Religious Habitus: A Review Essay on the Spiritual Revolution.” *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 18 (3): 294–314.

Swartz, David. 1996. “Bridging the Study of Culture and Religion: Pierre Bourdieu’s Political Economy of Symbolic Power.” *Sociology of Religion* 57 (1): 71–85.

Tammelin, Mia. 2009. *Working Time and Family Time: Experiences of the Work and Family Interface among Dual-Earning Couples in Finland.* Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Tenhunen, Anna-Liisa. 2006. *Itkuvirren kolme elämää.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Thomson, Patricia. 2008. “Field.” In *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, edited by Michael Grenfell, 67–86. Stocksfield: Acumen.

Tiilikainen, Marja. 2003. *Arjen islam: Somalinaisten elämää Suomessa.* Tampere: Vastapaino.

Trulsson, Åsa. 2010. *Cultivating the Sacred: Ritual Creativity and Practice among Women in Contemporary Europe.* Lund: Lund University.

Trzebiatowska, Marta. 2008. “Vocational Habit(us): Catholic Nuns in Contemporary Poland.” In *Women and Religion in the West: Challenging Secularization*, edited by Kristin Aune, Sonya Sharma, and Giselle Vincett, 82–96. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Turner, Edith, and Pamela Frese. 1999. “Food.” In *Encyclopedia of Women and World Religion*, edited by Serinity Young, 346–348. New York: Macmillan Reference.

Tweed, Thomas. 2006. *Crossing and Dwelling: A Theory of Religion.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Urban, Hugh B. 2005. “Spiritual Capital, Academic Capital and the Politics of Scholarship: A Response to Bradford Verter.” *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 17 (2): 166–175.

———. 2003. “Sacred Capital: Pierre Bourdieu and the Study of Religion.” *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 15 (4): 354–389.

Uskonnonvapauslaki. 2003. L 6.6.2003/453. Valtion säädöstietopankki Finlex. Accessed April 26, 2016. http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/2003/20030453.

———. 1922. L 267/1922. Valtion säädöstietopankki Finlex. Accessed April 26, 2016. http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/alkup/1922/19220267.

Utriainen, Terhi. 2014. “Angels, Agency, and Emotions: Global Religion for Women in Finland?” In *Finnish Women Making Religion: Between Ancestors and Angels*, edited by Terhi Utriainen and Päivi Salmesvuori, 237–254. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2010. “Ethics and Embodiment in Ethnographic Interactions.” In *Pilgrimage of Life: Studies in Honour of Professor René Gothóni*, edited by Riku Hämäläinen, Heikki Pesonen, Mari Rahkala, and Tuula Sakaranaho, 120–132. Helsinki: Maahenki.

———. 2002. "In Word and Deed: Textual Analysis and Embodied Ethnography in the Frame of Women's Studies." In *Styles and Positions: Ethnographic Perspectives in Comparative Religion*, edited by Heikki Pesonen, Tuula Sakaranaho, Tom Sjöblom, and Terhi Utriainen, 176–193. Helsinki: Department of Comparative Religion, University of Helsinki.

———. 1998a. "Feminine and Masculine in the Study of Balto-Finnic Laments." In *Gender and Folklore: Perspectives on Finnish and Karelian Culture*, edited by Satu Apo, Aili Nenola, and Laura Stark-Arola, 175–200. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

———. 1998b. "Occupying a Space as Eyes and Body: Comments on the Diversity of Fieldwork, Postures of Knowledge, and Summer Experiences in an Elderly Women's Village in Olonets Karelia." In *Gender and Folklore: Perspectives on Finnish and Karelian Culture*, edited by Satu Apo, Aili Nenola, and Laura Stark-Arola, 292–304. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Utriainen, Terhi, Tuija Hovi, and Måns Broo. 2012. "Combining Choice and Destiny: Identity and Agency within Post-Secular Well-being Practices." In *Post-Secular Society*, edited by Peter Nynäs, Mika Lassander, and Terhi Utriainen, 187–216. New Brunswick: Transaction.

Utriainen, Terhi, Päivi Salmesvuori, and Helena Kupari. 2014. "Introduction: Critical and Creative Turns." In *Finnish Women Making Religion: Between Ancestors and Angels*, edited by Terhi Utriainen and Päivi Salmesvuori, 1–17. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vakimo, Sinikka. 2001. *Paljon kokeva, vähän näkyvä: Tutkimus vanhaa naista koskevista kulttuurisista käsityksistä ja vanhan naisen elämänkäytännöistä*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Verter, Bradford. 2003. "Spiritual Capital: Theorizing Religion with Bourdieu against Bourdieu." *Sociological Theory* 21 (2): 150–174.

Vihavainen, Suvi. 2015. "Helsingin metropoliitta sai naispiispan kutsumisesta alttariin varoituksen – Tutkija: täysin poikkeuksellista." *Helsingin Sanomat*, June 17. Accessed April 26, 2016. http://www.hs.fi/kotimaa/a1434506237398?ref=a-lukupaketti-2.

Vincett, Giselle, Sonya Sharma, and Kristin Aune. 2008. "Introduction: Women, Religion and Secularization: One Size Does Not Fit All." In *Women and Religion in the West: Challenging Secularization*, edited by Kristin Aune, Sonya Sharma, and Giselle Vincett, 1–19. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Virtanen, Leea. 1987. "Monta Karjalaa." In *Carelia rediviva: Juhlakirja professori Heikki Kirkiselle 22.9.1987*, edited by Kyösti Pulliainen and Hannes Sihvo, 179–186. Joensuu: Joensuu yliopisto.

Vuola, Elina. Submitted. "Women´s Devotion of the Virgin Mary across Cultures: Case Studies from Catholic Costa Rica and Eastern Orthodox Finland." *Journal of Contemporary Religion*.

———. 2012. "La Morenita on Skis: Women's Popular Marian Piety and Feminist Research on Religion." In *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theology*, edited by Sheila Briggs and Mary McClintock Fulkerson. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Accessed April 26, 2016. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199273881.003.0025.

Wacquant, Loïc J. D. 1992. "Toward a Social Praxeology: The Structure and Logic of Bourdieu's Sociology." In *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, by Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, 1–59. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Walter, Tony, and Grace Davie. 1998. "The Religiosity of Women in the Modern West." *The British Journal of Sociology* 49 (4): 640–660.

Ware, Timothy. 1964. *The Orthodox Church.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Weaver, Dorothy C. 2011. "Shifting Agency: Male Clergy, Female Believers, and the Role of Icons." *Material Religion* 7 (3): 394–419.

Weber, Max. 1978. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Winchester, Daniel. 2008. "Embodying the Faith: Religious Practice and the Making of a Muslim Moral Habitus." *Social Forces* 86 (4): 1753–1780.

Wood, Matthew. 2007. *Possession, Power and the New Age: Ambiguities of Authority in Neoliberal Societies.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Wood, Matthew, and Véronique Altglas. 2010. "Reflexivity, Scientificity and the Sociology of Religion: Pierre Bourdieu in Debate." *Nordic Journal of Religion & Society* 23 (1): 9–26.

Wood, Matthew, and Christopher Bunn. 2009. "Strategy in a Religious Network: A Bourdieuian Critique of the Sociology of Spirituality." *Sociology* 43 (2): 286–303.

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

———. 2007. "Gender Differences in Religious Practice and Significance." In *The Sage Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, edited by James A. Beckford and N. J. Demerath III, 566–586. Los Angeles: Sage.

———. 2003. "Feminism and the Sociology of Religion: From Gender-blindness to Gendered Difference." In *The Blackwell Companion to Sociology of Religion*, edited by Richard K. Fenn, 67–84. Oxford: Blackwell.

———. 2002. "Women and Religion." In *Religions in the Modern World: Traditions and Transformations*, edited by Linda Woodhead, Paul Fletcher, Hiroko Kawanami, and David Smith, 332–356. London: Routledge.

Wuthnow, Robert. 1999. *Growing up Religious: Christians and Jews and Their Journeys of Faith.* Boston: Beacon Press.

———. 1998. *After Heaven: Spirituality in America Since the 1950s.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Index

Äänellä Itkijät 141n
Adkins, Lisa 25, 127
agency 25–26, 113, 115, 162
  Avishai's theorizations of 95–96
  collective 110
  Honkasalo's theorizations of 28–29, 93–94, 113–114, 163
  intentionality and 28–29, 93–96, 163
  Mahmood's theorizations of 26–27
  McNay's theorizations of 27–28, 162
  of non-human agents 119–120
  religious 25–28, 95–96, 104–105, 110, 113, 119–120, 132–133, 161–164
  see also ethics and agency; field and agency; God, agency of; habitus and agency; prayer as agentic action
age, social construction of 132, 155–156
anointing of the sick 121
Apostle Paul 98n
Aquinas, Thomas 19
Archbishop Leo of Karelia and all Finland 135n, 138
Aristotle 19
Asad, Talal 25–26, 71, 113
ATLAS.ti 44
Avishai, Orit 95–96

belief
  Christian conception of 116–117, 124
  in belonging 49, 137
  practical 15, 23, 79, 93, 117–119, 122–123, 126–127, 151, 158
  religious 117, 135, 137
  see also habitus and religious belief; linguistic practice, performative belief rituals; practice and belief
Bell, Catherine 127, 160
Bender, Courtney 122
Berger, Peter 22
Bible 126n, 134
birching 140
Bourdieu, Pierre 12
  Bourdieuan methodology 29–30, 32–33, 44, 46, 166–167
  Bourdieuan theorizing on gender 98, 100, 115
  Bourdieuan theorizing on religion 13–17, 165
  Bourdieuan theory of practice *see* practice theory, Bourdieuan
  see also individual concepts; lived religion and Bourdieuan theory; religious studies and Bourdieuan theory
Brotherhood of Ss. Sergius and Herman 51
Bucar, Elizabeth 27
burial *see* funeral
Butler, Judith 21, 26, 95

capital 13, 15, 115, 152–153, 164
Christmas 107–108, 114
churching 73n
commemorative practices 94–95, 109, 131, 133
comparative religion *see* religious studies
consecration of the home 73, 104, 108
conversion *see* habitus, re-habituation; Orthodox Christianity in Finland and conversion
coping religion 154

Day, Abby 137, 143
death 129–132, *see also* funeral
definitions of religion
  belief-based 116
  critique of 5–6, 10–12, 74, 116, 123
  practice-based 11–12, 161
  Riesebrodt's 11–12, 14
  Weberian 14
displaced Karelians 36, 53
  identity of 36, 94, 138–139
  prejudice against 43, 53, 81
  research on 3–4
  see also Karelia, Karelian culture
displaced Orthodox Karelians 52–53, 155–156
  prejudice against 44, 53, 81–82, 87
  research on 3, 53
displacement from Karelia during WW2 3, 36, 38, 52

dispositions 19–20
Distinction 17
Divine Liturgy *see* Orthodox church services
domestic religion 154
doxa 78–81, 85–86, 92–93, 97, 117, 156
Durkheim, Emile 13, 19, 25

Easter 68n, 69, 107, 140, *see also* fasting
elderly women's religion *see* religion of women of the inter-WW generation
Emirbayer, Mustafa 28, 93
emotions 65–66, 82–84, 118, 148–149, 153, 167
ethics
  agency and 113–114, 163–164
  altruism 15–16, 100–101, 112–115, 163–164
  individualism 49, 74, 110, 115, 145, 147–148, 164
  relational 111–112, 154
  religious 111–113, 125–127, 152, 163–164
  see also sense of ethics
Eucharist 109n, 160
evacuations from Karelia *see* displacement from Karelia during WW2
evacuee Karelians *see* displaced Karelians
Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland 48–49, 54n, 87n, 135n
Evangelical Lutheranism 70, 86–88
everyday religion 5n

family as context of women's religious practice 99–101, 104–110, 112–115, 128–129, 131, 146, 154, 159, 163–164
fasting 59, 68n, 69–70, 123n
field 13–14, 23, 117, 164
  agency and 27–28, 164
  family 98, 115, 164
  native membership in 79
  religious 13–16, 89, 117, 150–152, 159
  see also habitus and field
Finland 46–48, 50–51
  Finnish gender order 47–48, 99
  Finnish national identity 49, 50–51n, 53–54
  see also religion in Finland; Second World War, Finland in
Finnish Advisory Board on Research Integrity 41
Finnish Karelian League 34
Finnish Literature Society 34, 41, 44, 138
Finnish Orthodox Church *see* Orthodox Church of Finland
folklorization 54, 141
folk religion 5–6
Foucault, Michel 21, 26, 114
funeral 3, 130–131

gender 21n, 98, 144–145
  gendered division of labor 98–101, 107, 110
  see also Finland, Finnish gender order; Bourdieu, Pierre, Bourdieuan theorizing on gender; habitus, gendered; Orthodox Christianity and gender; religion and gender
Giddens, Anthony 12
God 64, 118–123, 125–126, 129, 144
  agency of 119–122

habitus 7, 13, 19–21, 45
  agency and 27–28, 94–96, 106–107, 115, 132–133, 162–164
  change and 22–25, 27, 67, 69–71, 80–85, 134, 137, 144–145, 148, 152–153, 158–159
  collective 20, 46, 89, 167
  conflict within 24–25, 115, 127, 159, 164
  consciousness and 22, 24–25, 30, 67–71, 75, 83–86, 91–93, 95–97, 160
  embodiment and 20–21, 78–79, 83–84, 118, 127, 136–137, 157–158, 160–161
  ethnic 43–44
  field and 23–25, 29–30, 79, 86, 98, 115, 149, 151–153, 164
  formation of 20–22, 78–80, 84, 113, 158
  gendered 98–100, 106–107, 113, 145, 159, 164
  inertia of 21–22, 24, 79–80, 84–85, 145, 151–153, 158
  in feminist theory 27, 100
  language and 30–32, 71–75, 86–89, 93, 110, 112, 122–123, 134, 159
  majority 43, 75
  minority 84–86, 95–97, 158–159
  native 79, 91–93, 145, 158
  of dominated groups 113, 153, 158

habitus (cont.)
  re-habituation 16, 22, 68, 91–93, 134, 161
  religious belief and 18, 117–118, 132
  taste as 89, 97, 159
  temporality and 18, 21–22, 27–28, 158, 161
  religious 7, 16, 159–161, 163
  study of 29–33, 60, 164–165, 167
  see also practice and habitus
Harva, Uno 3
Hegel, G. W. F. 19
Heikkinen, Kaija 4, 136, 138
Hervieu-Léger, Danièle 45, 135, 137
heterodoxy 86, 97, 159
Honkasalo, Marja-Liisa 4, 28, 58, 93–94, 113, 163
Huotari, Voitto 4, 57–58
Husserl, Edmund 19

icons, veneration of 59–62, 125–126
identity 21, 75, 95–96, 156
interest 14–15, 23, 159
interviewer-interviewee relationship 32, 42–44, 72, 75–76, 86, 88, 102, 117–118, 121, 132, 143–144, 146, 149–150, 166–167
interview frame 41–42, 76, 102, 122, 129
interview material, characteristics of 31–32, 80

Jokinen, Eeva 31

Kalevala 50–51n
Kananen, Heli Kaarina 43, 53, 82
Karelia 37, 138
  Border Karelia 36–37, 50–52, 55, 138n, 141n
  Karelian culture 138–142
  Karelian Isthmus 37
  North Karelia 37, 53–55
Karelian evacuees of WW2 *see* displaced Karelians
Karelian folk religion *see* Orthodox Christianity in Finland, pre-WW2
Karelian Language Association 138
Karelian refugees of the Russian revolution 4, 36
käspaikka 61
Keinänen, Marja-Liisa 5
kin work 105, 161

legislation on the freedom of religion 56
Leming, Laura 28
lifelong religion 7–8, 154, 156–157, 159–161, 167–168
linguistic practice 30–32, 86–89, 93, 159
  adopting contemporary discourses 143–145, 147–148
  autobiographical narratives of Finns 47, 100, 122
  comparing “us” and others 86–89, 91–93, 95, 100, 102, 142–144, 147–148, 150–151, 159, 166–167
  constructing continuums of practice 79–80, 86–87, 134–137, 139–142, 149, 151, 157, 159
  family speech 102–103, 107, 109–110, 147–149
  habitual reflection 25, 86, 93, 97
  interpreting religious experiences 122–123
  interpreting religious ideals 74, 80, 90–93, 96–97, 111–113, 123–127, 136, 152
  interpreting religious practices 72–74, 80, 124–126, 128, 134, 136
  name-calling 82, 87, 124
  narratives of divine guidance 120–123
  performative belief rituals 123, 129, 132, 137
  tradition speech 139–140, 142, 151
lived religion 5–6, 10–11, 74, 166–168
  Bourdieuan theory and 29, 161, 165
  practice theory and 10, 19, 60, 161, 165
Lovell, Terri 164
Luckmann, Thomas 22
Lutheran Church *see* Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland
Lutheranism *see* Evangelical Lutheranism
Luther, Martin 88n

Mahmood, Saba 26–27, 95
Mannheim, Karl 155–156
di Martino, Ernesto 94
Mauss, Marcel 13, 19
McNay, Lois 27–28, 98, 162
Metropolitan Ambrosius of Helsinki 135n
Mische, Ann 28, 93
Mitchell, Hildi and Jon 123

mixed marriages 55n, *see also* Orthodox-Lutheran marriages in Finland
Mother of God 117–118, 121, 135–136

New Valamo monastery 54
Nguyen, Riina 91
North Savonia 39, 53, 55
nostalgia 69, 80

ordination of women 49, 134–135, 150
orientalism 6, 75
Orsi, Robert 6, 149, 166
Orthodox anthropology 98–99n, 111n, 130–131
  deification 111, 116
Orthodox Christianity and gender 58, 98–99n, 110, 112–113
Orthodox Christianity in Finland
  contemporary 54, 56n, 84–85, 91–92, 141, 150–151
  conversion and 39, 55–56, 81, 90–92, 106, 145, 151
  Lutheranization of 56, 58, 71, 105–106, 118
  nationalism and 50–51, 53–54, 82
  post-WW2 52–54, 56–57, 82–85, 86n, 87–88, 102–103, 106n, 124–125, 138, 140, 145–146, 153, 155–156
  pre-WW2 36, 50–51, 68–70, 73, 77–78, 80n, 82, 130, 131n, 139, 141
  research on 3–6, 8, 57–58, 157
  see also displaced Orthodox Karelians; Orthodox-Lutheran marriages in Finland
Orthodox Church of Finland 3, 51–56, 135n
Orthodox church services 63–66, 68–69, 87, 107–110, 120
Orthodox evacuees of WW2 *see* displaced Orthodox Karelians
Orthodox liturgical calendar 68–69, *see also* Christmas; Easter; fasting; Sunday activities
Orthodox-Lutheran marriages in Finland 55–56, 90
  baptism of children in 39, 56–57, 106n, 145–146, 153, 164
  religion of Orthodox women in 57–58, 103–109, 145
  religious socialization of children in 57, 102n, 103, 105, 106n, 109, 125, 146–147
orthodoxy (Bourdieuan concept) 86
Orthodox Youth Association 81, 83–84
Ortner, Sherry 21, 162
Ortodoksin ja luterilaisen avioliitto 57

Panofsky, Erwin 19
Pentikäinen, Juha 4, 8
Pietism 48, 87n
popular religion 5
positional suffering 153
poststructuralism 21n
practical belief *see* belief, practical
practical sense *see* sense of practice
practice 18, 21
  belief and 116–117, 119, 122–128, 130–132
  collective 65, 107–110
  constitutive effects of 7, 10, 19, 21n, 60–66, 94–96, 117, 122–123, 125–127, 132, 158, 161–162
  creativity in 18, 24, 27, 94–95
  embodiment and 21n, 63–66, 71, 72, 74, 136–137
  habitus and 16, 19, 23–24, 60, 66, 106, 113, 132, 149, 157–158, 160
  intentional 68–71, 85, 92, 95–96, 123–124, 126–127, 156, 158, 162
  metaphorization of 71
  routine 18, 67, 79–80, 94–96, 125–126, 158, 160–162
  see also linguistic practice
practice theory 7, 10, 12, 25, 60, 66
  Bourdieuan 12–13, 18
  see also lived religion and practice theory
prayer 62–63, 96, 105, 119, 123n, 125, 131n
  as agentic action 120–122, 132–133, 163
  contents of 119, 128–129
  Jesus Prayer 62n

reflexivity and research methodology 33, 44, 89, 129, 148–149, 166–167
relational analysis 13, 17, 165
religion
  age and 50, 61, 128, 155

religion (cont.)
as a chain of memory 45, 135–137
gender and 49–50, 61, 69, 98–99, 101, 112, 154
in Finland 48–50, 142–143, 150, 152–153, 166–167
in Western societies 7–8, 49–50, 68, 71, 142, 147–148, 153, 156–157
of women of the inter-WW generation 8, 49–50, 57, 143, 154–155, 157
of women, research on 4–5, 8, 26–27, 162, 168
see also individual concepts and practices; family as a context for women's religious practice; Orthodox-Lutheran marriages in Finland, religion of Orthodox women in
religious studies
American 5
Bourdieuan theory and 14–18, 20, 22, 161
Finnish 3–6, 8, 157
Rey, Terry 16–18
Riesebrodt, Martin 11–12, 14–15
ritual lamenting 141
Roos, Jeja-Pekka 47, 122
Ruel, Malcolm 116

Saarikivi, Ritva 73
sacred, social construction of 60, 64–66, 160
Saints Sergius and Herman of Valaam 59–61
Sallinen-Gimpl, Pirkko 43
Savonia *see* North Savonia
Scheer, Monique 23
Second World War, Finland in 3, 38, 48, 51–52, *see also* displacement from Karelia during WW2
sense of ethics 113–114, 160
sense of practice 18, 23–24, 27, 67, 83, 91–92, 95, 106, 119, 158
sense of religion 160–162
Sered, Susan Starr 101, 154
sign of the cross 63, 72, 88, 105, 124
modalities of making 67, 83–85, 124, 128
Small Catechism 88n
social generation 155–156
socialization
ethnic 138–140, 146–148
primary 22, 78–79, 92, 156, 159
religious 77–80, 118–119, 128, 136, 146–148, 152–153, 156
secondary 82, 92
see also habitus, formation of; habitus, re-habituation; Orthodox-Lutheran marriages in Finland, religious socialization of children in
socialized senses 20, 32, 160, *see also* sense of practice
space, social construction of 60–62, 64–66, 104
Stepick, Alex 16
Stringer, Martin 12, 154
study of religions *see* religious studies
subjectivity 21
Sunday activities 68–69
supernatural 11–12, 14–15, 117, 123, 159–160
experiences 120–121, 130
see also God
symbolic power 30–32, 100

techniques of the body 65
techniques of the self 114
theory of practice *see* practice theory
time, social construction of 62–63, 68–69, 104
transcendent *see* supernatural
Tweed, Thomas 60

Vakimo, Sinikka 156
Valaam monastery 54, 61
vernacular religion 5n
Virgin Mary *see* Mother of God
visiting graves 108, 130–131
Vuola, Elina 4

Weber, Max 13–14, 19, 25
Woodhead, Linda 50, 167
Wuthnow, Robert 7, 65, 72, 136