

**This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.**

Author(s): Hiljanen, Mikko

Title: Servants of the Crown or Trustees of the People? : Personal Agency Among the Local Clergy (1550-1610)

Year: 2017

Version:

Please cite the original version:

Hiljanen, M. (2017). Servants of the Crown or Trustees of the People? : Personal Agency Among the Local Clergy (1550-1610). In P. Karonen, & M. Hakanen (Eds.), Personal Agency at the Swedish Age of Greatness 1560-1720 (pp. 193-217). Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. Studia Fennica Historica, 23.
<https://oa.finlit.fi/site/books/10.21435/sfh.23>

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

Servants of the Crown or Trustees of the People? Personal Agency Among the Local Clergy (1550–1610)

During the early modern era, clerical appointment was neither a simple nor straightforward task in the Realm of Sweden. Any authorities who had the power to influence this process did so – the Crown, nobility, bishops and local parishioners² – all of them did their best to intervene. But as if the system of appointments was not already complicated enough, the significance of the appointments themselves was more so. The entire Reformation in Sweden, in fact revolved around the topic of clerical appointments. The Swedish Realm broke off from Rome started because King Gustavus Vasa (1496–1560) wanted to take the right to appoint bishops away from the Pope.³

The point of departure for this study lies in the fact that pastors (*kyrkoherde*)⁴ had an important, if somewhat complicated, part to play in state-building. This chapter approaches the state-building process in standpoint of clerical appointments. Clerical appointment process is seen as a two-folded procedure where on one hand, the authorities who had a lawful right to appoint pastors, contested with each other for who could use the right. As many previous studies have shown, the Crown held most of the powers to appoint – at least during Gustavus Vasa's reign and in some parishes – even if these laws and norms seemed to be in a constant state of flux during the sixteenth century.⁵

But though the Crown was the winner in this first part of the process (it could appoint pastors independently in at least some of the parishes), it was not the same who was appointed to the post; different pastor-candidates had different attributes and know-how that could benefit the authority on the local level. Thus at the second stage of the negotiating process, there were representatives of the Crown, local parishioners, and the pastor-candidates themselves who figuratively discussed who would eventually be appointed. Here the goal was to decide which of the candidates was most appealing to all the parties assembled.

This chapter concentrates on pastoral appointments at the local level (the second type of negotiating process). It asks what kind of people were eventually appointed pastor and why? The answer to this question shed light on a number of issues. Not only on whether the Crown varied its

appointments according to the political times, but also on the kind of pastors local parishioners preferred, as most pastors had worked in the same parish before their appointment (i.e., parishioners already knew them). And what happened in cases where the parishioners' and Crown's preferences differed? Also, did the Reformation change the relationship between parishioners and clergy in any way? By studying these situations up close like this, it is possible to find out how deals were struck to get a pastor that both parties could accept. Answers to these questions may not shed light on the personal agency of clergymen per se, but they certainly render it visible by revealing the boundaries of their actions. By understanding the boundaries of what actions they permitted themselves to carry out, we thereby get an idea of the extent of their personal agency.

The focus area of this study – the diocese of Turku – was spread over five different provinces during the latter part of the sixteenth century: Varsinais-Suomi, Satakunta, Uusimaa, Häme and Pohjanmaa (see map). This area covered both the oldest population centres of Finland (Turku), and areas where the population was growing during the century. In ecclesiastical terms, even though Finland was divided into two separate dioceses in 1554 – Turku in the West and Vyborg (Viborg) in the East – it was the former that was considered the “head-diocese”. This was not just because Turku was the oldest of the two dioceses, but also because there were periods when there was no appointed bishop in Vyborg (1563–1568 and 1578–1618), so the ecclesiastical responsibilities for the whole of Finland fell on the shoulders of the Bishop of Turku.⁶

The time frame of this chapter covers the reigns of the kings immediately after Gustavus Vasa: Eric XIV (1560–1568), John III (1568–1592), Sigismund (1592–1599), and Charles IX – both as regent (1599–1604) and king (1604–1611). The time frame is particularly interesting from the state-building point of view. During these years, the hegemony of the Crown was almost constantly being challenged by both nobles and dukes (brothers or uncles of the king). At the same time, the religious turmoil brought on by the Reformation was drawing to a conclusion. By the 1610s, Sweden was a Lutheran country, or the most important clergymen and office-holders were, at least on paper, Lutheran. In addition, due to the harsh war times, the clergy had to take part on the secular matters during the reign of Gustavus Adolphus (1611–1632) too, when pastors were burdened with the tough responsibility for population accounting and tax-collecting (together with bailiffs).⁷ Thus, the period studied in this chapter is particularly important in adding knowledge on the building of the Swedish governmental system at the local level on the early years of the era known as the Age of Greatness.

During the Middle Ages and early modern era, there were three types of parish one could be appointed to as a cleric: regal, consistorial, and patronal. In regal parishes, the Crown would appoint the pastor, while in consistorial parishes the job fell to the parishioners and the bishop and chapter of the diocese. Meanwhile, in patronal parishes this responsibility lay with a noble patron.⁸ Yet in all these cases, parishioners, or at least the head of each parish had some part to play in nominating the pastor they favoured and this had to be legally taken into account before making an appointment to the post.⁹

During the Middle Ages and first decades of sixteenth century, most parishes were consistorial. In consistorial parishes, parishioners chose and nominated the candidate they wanted, while the bishop's task was to check that the nominated person had the education and knowledge required.¹⁰ However, after the Reformation, King Gustavus Vasa claimed responsibility for all clerical appointments. He also limited the rights of bishops and the chapters of dioceses; and confiscated the land that used to belong to the church and monasteries. All this increased the Crown's influence over clerical appointments. Gustavus Vasa also claimed that any new parishes established should be regal ones.¹¹

After the death of Gustavus Vasa, the political struggle between his sons started almost immediately, also clerical appointments in the duchies, especially in Finland, became a flashpoint for conflict. At the same time, the Church tried to get back what it had lost in the Reformation. By the latter part of the sixteenth century, the Realm of Sweden felt the need to improve the way Finland was governed because of the ongoing war with Russia (1570–1595). This meant putting more power in the hands of the governor there, who now had great prerogatives – for example, he could intervene in the clerical appointing process.¹² So by the end of the 1500s, clerical appointments had become one more factor in a complicated ongoing game of power.

Usually the pastor was appointed in the form of a letter (collation).¹³ The structure of collations is quite technical and with little other information. It mentions the name of the appointee and the parish to which the pastor is to be posted; and there are instructions for the parishioners and the pastor from the authority that issued the collation. This was normally the King, and it would ask that the parishioners accept the nominated pastor to be their shepherd and that the pastor would promise to practice religion in pure way. It is notable that the form of collation would vary slightly depending on who was giving it. For example, Charles IX's collations underline the purity of the religion, which is understandable considering his religious convictions and the events of the late 1590s in Finland.¹⁴

Sources and methods

The results of this study are based on the clergy-database (CDB) that I have created. Information for the database has been collected from various sources. The main source is a compilation called *Turun hiippakunnan paimenmuisto 1554–1721* collected by Kyösti Väänänen.¹⁵ *Paimenmuisto* (herdaminne in Swedish, *Pfarrerbuch* in German) contains micro-biographies and registers of the clergy. The information has been collected from official documents, letters from the King to pastors (such as collations), histories of the parishes, and literature on the subject etc. The information contained in *Paimenmuisto* has been de-coded and enriched by adding new information from documents such as bailiffs' accounts¹⁶ that has not been used in *Paimenmuisto*. De-coding the information and constructing the database has helped for example to see the connections between clergies that would

have remained in the shadows if one just reads the original documents and information.

Because of the database and the analysis it has involved, the theoretical framework of this chapter leans towards prosopography. However the methods used are not purely prosopographic. Usually in the field prosopography, the database is created in a way that the researcher decides what kind of information he or she brings to it. Normally the information that turns out to be most pertinent, and is thus collected, is the kind of which is known for every person of the group studied (for example, the date and place of birth, name of father and mother, godparents and godchildren etc.).¹⁷

To offer a wealth of information, I have used a method that goes beyond the boundaries of prosopography: I have collected and used *all* available information from lives of the clergies not just the information that is pertinent to the questions of the chapter. To be more precise, my database includes information, not just about clerical appointments, but on the lives and careers of the clergymen from a broad perspective. As a consequence, I do not have the same kind of data on every clergyman.¹⁸ I believe, however, that this approach is a particularly fertile for this chapter as it sheds more light on the overall extent of personal agency among the clergy. By focusing on all aspects of clerical life, not just the information represented in their appointments per se, a deeper understanding can be gained of the structures and culture that determined the way clergymen lived and what they could and could not do.

The database has been analyzed first of all, to examine how many pastors were appointed and which kind of the authority appointed them to the post. Altogether there were 267 pastors appointed in the diocese of Turku between 1560 and 1611. Of these 267, 46 (roughly 17%) were appointed by the king, 19 (or 7%) by the Bishop of Turku, five (2%) by dukes (John and Charles), and four (1.5%) got their appointments via the nobility.¹⁹ It is these 74 clergymen that form the base-group for the study described in this chapter. It is unknown how the rest of the pastors were chosen and appointed, as in every case, the procedure was somewhat unofficial. Either there were no documents of the appointments in the first place, or they have not been preserved.

However, in the 74 cases where the person who appointed the pastor *is* known, a more detailed analysis has been possible. But this is not due to any further information in the collations themselves. If one wants to find out why a particular clergyman got the post, one has to look elsewhere for the reason, as the collations had scant else but the names of places and people involved in the appointment. This challenge has been met here by analyzing information on the lives and careers of the clergymen in question. By studying their whole life and entire career, it is possible to find out the kind of clergymen that were most appreciated, and those that had a harder time. Within the 74 cases, I have chosen key cases to be presented below. These cases illustrate the different factors that affected clerical appointments. To summarize the main argument, the political and religious situation in the

realm affected the clerical appointments. In addition, pastors had to keep in mind the situation at their own parishes where they exercised their duties. Pastors had to balance between the riptides of these two due to the fact that the expectations towards the pastor were different at the central and local level of realm.

As always with case studies, the results of this chapter beg the question about generalization and coverage. Even though this chapter reveals some of the reasons behind clerical appointments, it does not provide fully comprehensive results. Due to the rather limited availability of historical sources on the lives and careers of sixteenth century clergy, the results here are more suggestive than normative. In addition, information on some clergymen is more extensive than on others, and it is fair to say that the key cases I have chosen are the examples where there is more information available. It should also be noted that the cases where the information is richer are for those appointments that were disputed, because these conflicts needed to be investigated and documented, which means more documentation and thus a greater chance of documents surviving to this day. So there is perhaps an inherent bias in the examples studied here against those clerical appointments and careers where all went well (as these would not have been so well documented). However it is impossible to say whether the clergymen who left historical sources behind them were the exceptions, or whether their lives and careers were typical of most.

Political power and the loyalty of pastors

Swedish history in the second half of sixteenth century was characterized by political turmoil. Later on, in the 1590s, political turmoil focused increasingly on the power struggle between the King Sigismund and his uncle Duke Charles.²⁰ But at first it centred around the competing claims of Gustavus Vasa's sons. Even though Gustavus's purpose had been to secure the dominant status of the Vasa family by enfeoffing critical parts of the realm to his sons (i.e., making the new king's brothers dukes), the reality proved quite different. The duchies became instead a means to challenge the hegemony of the king and an obstacle to national cohesion.

One aspect of the political struggle between the king and dukes was that dukes now also had the right to appoint people to various offices of political importance. Finnish historian Yrjö Blomstedt has noted, in his study concerning the chief and district judges of Finland, that especially during the 1560s, the rotation of judges accelerated. There were two incidents that caused this – the defeat of Duke John, in 1563, and then the deposition of King Eric five years later²¹. After the defeat of John, the Crown dismissed judges who had been loyal to the duke. In their place, the king appointed judges in whom he could trust²². A similar chain of events happened in 1568, but this time the change of judges went the other way. Now that John was king (John III), he replaced the judges in every corner of the eastern part of the realm – especially those judges who had once loyally served him when he was a duke, but had then changed allegiance under Eric.²³

As the case of the judges illustrates, political events affected the appointment of office-holders. And this applied to the office of clergyman too, as politics and religion were inextricably linked in the early modern era, especially in Sweden.²⁴ The political struggle was not so much at the individual level, but in terms of opposing networks with either the king or the dukes at the tip of each iceberg. The king and dukes tried to increase their influence by appointing skillful and capable agents to strengthen their power-base at the local level. In return, these local agents – such as pastors – could further their own careers by showing loyalty to the network.²⁵ In other words there was sufficient supply to meet the demand. As a local authority, pastors offered an important means of support to either the king or duke in their political struggles.

The conflict between Eric and John certainly had repercussions on the life of clergymen in the diocese of Turku.²⁶ By the end of the 1550s and beginning of the 1560s, Duke John had taken an oath of allegiance from the Finnish clergy in his duchy. Many of the Finnish pastors were fined because of the oath, but more radical action was to come. For example, the Chaplain of Pertteli Nicolaus (lifetime unknown) was executed because he had given information about the king's army to John.²⁷

The Pastor of Taivassalo, Matthias Michelis Carpelan (d. c. 1561), was sentenced to death too, but his sentence was never carried out as the parishioners of Taivassalo testified that he had not supported the duke. Due to their appeal, the king pardoned Carpelan and let him return to his old post. In addition to the testimony of the parishioners, there is evidence that Carpelan actually did not support John's policies, and this also helped tip the balance in his favour. This case suggests that the Crown purged persons who were loyal to Duke John, but the enemies of John were friends of new king and they could stay in their post. But this was a double-edged sword, as Carpelan was doomed to lose a major part of his property in 1580 for the very same reason that he did not approve of King John III's liturgy.²⁸

Even though the networks were built more or less on a foundation of politics and loyalty, in the case of the clergy, religion was of course a key factor in joining the network. This was particularly the case with the Swedish kings of the late sixteenth century, who often distinguished themselves from each other by their religious conviction. It was perhaps most acute under John III, who inclined towards Catholicism especially during the 1560s and 70s, while other kings (Sigismund is an exception) were more or less reformed Protestants. Religious conviction was particularly prominent in the power struggle between John and his younger brother Charles.²⁹

From the point of view of clerical appointments, it was not so much the accession of John III in 1568 that changed matters in Finland,³⁰ but the Church Ordinance of 1571 that was compiled during his reign and was perhaps the most important legislative reform of the sixteenth century. Even though, on paper, it sought to restore the Church's priority in making appointments, the reality was somewhat the opposite. Especially halfway through the 1570s, when John tried to carry through the liturgical reforms³¹ he wanted, he found himself using clerical appointments and discharges as leverage instead.³²

Pastors who accepted the new liturgy were helped with their careers. For example, Martinus Olai (c. 1510–1585), the Pastor of Rauma and born in the 1510s, had been originally ordained as a Catholic and was a stalwart supporter of the new liturgy. John so favoured him that in 1577, the king appointed him as preacher for the theological school in Stockholm, with a view to him completing the establishment of the new liturgical program. Later in the decade, the King also used Olai's knowledge to negotiate with Rome about restoring the Catholic religion to Sweden.³³

Within the diocese of Turku, pastors who supported the new liturgy were in the majority. The few clergymen, who did not support it, could expect a difficult career.³⁴ One of them was the Pastor for the Cathedral Parish of Turku,³⁵ Henricus Jacobi (d. c. 1582), who was excused from his post via a letter from the king in 1581³⁶. In his place, Thomas Laurentii (d. c. 1595) was appointed, who was an enthusiastic supporter of the new liturgy. John also sent him to study in University of Tübingen to learn Greek so that he could be used as a religious negotiator with Constantinople after negotiations with Rome had broken down.³⁷

As the cases above suggest, the clergymen's relationship with the Crown was important in many ways. The fact that those clergymen who accepted the new liturgy did well until the end of John's reign, but after his death ran into difficulties would seem to confirm this. In addition, there are cases which show that the clergymen were aware of the political situation in the realm and how they might have to react or adapt to its changes.

In the Uppsala Assembly of 1593, a church policy was announced to replace the one that John had started in 1570s.³⁸ Understandably, the changes meant problems for the clergymen who had previously enjoyed the favours of King John III. For example, Thomas Laurentii faced accusations in the Uppsala assembly from Karl Henriksson Horn, a supporter of Duke Charles. He was accused of scheming behind the back of the pastor who had preceded him in his post, and had used John's favoured liturgy to have him discharged. Laurentii denied this accusation to begin with, but later was made to apologize his conduct.³⁹

Even though Laurentii was allowed to hold on to his post, he only lived for a few more years after the Uppsala assembly. His successor – Gregorius Martintii Teet (c. 1560–1615) – was appointed by Duke Charles. During John III's reign, Teet had supported the red book, but had changed his mind after the king's death. Once he became Pastor of the Cathedral Parish of Turku, Teet avoided Catholic-style ceremonies and he enjoyed Charles' trust. For example, Charles nominated him twice to the bishopric of Turku, but he never got the post.⁴⁰ Teet's case not only illustrates both the shift in religious and domestic policy brought on by the death of John III and the Uppsala assembly, but also that pastors could take advantage of these shifts if willing to change their own opinions about religion.

The pastorate of the Cathedral Parish of Turku was not the only post that was contested during the 1590s. Another was the post of Cathedral Dean, which became vacant in 1594 when Henricus Canuti (c. 1520s–1595) resigned due to his old age. Canuti had had the trust of King John during his lifetime, for example, working as a substitute bishop from 1576 to

1583 when the king did not appoint a new bishop to Turku in place of the dead one. Also from 1578 onwards, Canuti was made the Superintendent of Vyborg (Viborg) when Ericus Matthiae Härkääpää (c. 1520s–1578), the Bishop of Vyborg, died; effectively making him in charge of the Church in the entire eastern part of the Swedish Realm.⁴¹ But when the post of Cathedral Dean became vacant, Duke Charles appointed a clergyman called Petrus Henrici Melartopaeus (c. 1550–1610). If the old Cathedral Dean had been John's trusted man, the new one was quite the opposite. Melartopaeus was born in Finland, but after he had finished his studies abroad, he did not return to his home diocese, but instead sought his way to Charles' duchy. During his years in Sweden, he had taken part in meetings of the clergy, which had decided to oppose John's liturgy, pledging themselves instead to the Augsburg Confession and Lutheranism. As Cathedral Dean it was thus perhaps not surprising that Melartopaeus tried to extirpate all Catholic convention from religious services.⁴²

With the decline in careers of clergymen that Duke Charles did not approve of – such as Thomas Laurentii, came the rise of those that he did. For example Melartopaeus became the substitute Bishop of Turku when Bishop Ericus Eriki Sorolainen was imprisoned and suspended in 1600. And in 1604, when Charles broke down the chapter institution, Melartopaeus moved back to Sweden where he worked as a superintendent in Mariestad. He enjoyed Charles' trust to the end of his life: for example he was one of the clergymen who amended Charles' proposal of the Church Code.⁴³

These cases illustrates that, due the fact that the power- and religion politics intermingled, the power struggle of the latter part of sixteenth century affected to the lives of ecclesiastical agents as well. By supporting and sharing the religious ideas of the Crown, clergymen could promote their career. However, this was winning tactic only as far as the Crown lived and reigned. After his death, these kinds of tendencies became burden especially if the successor had different kinds of religious thoughts.⁴⁴ It is notable that although politics and religion was still merged in seventeenth century and later, the phenomenon where the religious conviction of the King affected his subjects is strongly tied to the sixteenth century. After the reign of Charles IX the religion played much more insignificant role.⁴⁵

The above examples of the kinds of administrative post that were hotly contested, because by having one of their men in such a post, the king or duke could control the whole diocese.⁴⁶ However, the Crown did not only appoint the head of the Church. Another group of clergymen that were appointed by the king because of their relationships with the king were those who had served in the royal court or as a chaplain in army.⁴⁷ Appointing them to a post that was more profitable from an economic point of view or more respected professionally was one way for the king to reward the clergymen who had served well.⁴⁸ But it was also in the Crown's interest to appoint loyal pastors who were leaders of the parishes and representatives of its authority at the local level⁴⁹ as they could secure the support of the entire parish. Clergymen who had got their post this way (as a gift), also owed a debt of gratitude to the person who had appointed them.⁵⁰

Finally, economic reasons and personal material capital affected clerical appointments as well. Clergymen could bribe the Crown for a pastorate. This was particularly usual during the reign of Gustavus Vasa and illustrates the notorious avarice of the King.⁵¹ For example in 1556, the pastor's post of Eura was vacant and two candidates were competing for it. The first was Matthias Henrici Raucka (d. c. 1589), whose election was supported by the Bishop of Turku, Mikael Agricola. However the King neglected the support and appointed his competitor Johannes Jacobi Wenne (1510s–1572) to the post after Wenne had donated estate that he had inherited to the Crown.⁵²

After the reign of Gustavus Vasa however, the situation went somewhat the other way. In the latter part of the sixteenth century, rather than asking to be paid for making appointments, those who wanted greater political power actively sought pastoral loyalty by promising economic benefits or relief from taxation to loyal clergymen instead.⁵³ For example, during the 1590's, Duke Charles promised part of the Crown's fishing profits from the river Lammaistenkoski to the Pastor of Kokemäki (Johannes Michaelis (d. c. 1612)) in return for his loyalty against King Sigismund. And later when Michaelis supplied at least two horsemen to the king's army, Claes Fleming (the royal regent of Finland) granted Michaelis tax-revenue from four farms.⁵⁴ This would seem to suggest that during the latter part of the sixteenth century, when the political struggle heated up, the Crown (or Duke Charles) needed the help of pastors more than pastors perhaps needed them. Indeed, they were now willing to pay pastors for their loyalty in the struggle for power.

Persons of trust and reputation – a template for future officeholders of the realm?

Although – as pointed out above – politics, loyalty and religion played a meaningful part in the clerical appointment process, the reason for appointment in most cases was that pastors had worked previously as a chaplain or assistant-pastor; or else the appointee was directly related to the previous pastor of the parish (e.g., his son).⁵⁵ In fact, the Reformation made possible that the son of a pastor could inherit his father's old post.⁵⁶

Since we have no way of proving whether these appointments may also have been the Crown attempting to spread its power networks, because most of them concerned 'normal' parishes (i.e., they were not significant administrative posts in the Church) and occurred at times when there were no significant political upheavals like regime change or liturgical reform – like the cases in former subsection – it is reasonable to look elsewhere for an explanation. One could, for example, look more closely at pastors' relationship with their parishioners to get a better idea of the expertise valued by the authorities that clergymen got earlier in their career as a chaplain or assistant clergy; and to examine what it means in broader, state-building, perspective.

Studies of the sixteenth and seventeenth century clergy emphasize the trust and loyalty that existed between parishioners and pastors. Parishioners

clearly valued those pastor-candidates they knew, who lived like everybody else in the parish, and who knew the local area. And although to inherit a pastorate was forbidden by the Church Ordinance of 1571, in practice it was not long after the Reformation that offices began to run in the family. The parishioners, in particular, seemed to encourage the inheritance of posts, usually giving their support to the pastor's sons and sons-in-law, when a new pastor was to be chosen.⁵⁷ But this was not always the case. For example, in 1589, the parishioners of Karkku supported a pastor-candidate called Henricus Petri, preferring him over Matthaëus Matthiae (d. c. 1639), the son of the previous incumbent, who had worked as a chaplain under his father.⁵⁸ If parishioners usually preferred those candidates they already knew, why was this not the case here?

There were of course other criteria than just familiarity for parishioners' choice. Having a decent reputation was important for the pastor as well. In this case, the previous pastor, Matthias Martini (d. c. 1596), was discharged in 1588 and his relatively large property confiscated. The dismissal probably came down to the liturgical reforms of King John III. The clergymen in the Swedish parts of the realm particularly resisted the reforms and fought it out until the end of the king's reign. But by the end of the 1570s and beginning of the 1580s, the struggle intensified and more extreme methods were used to implement the reforms. One such method was to discharge pastors who did not accept them and to confiscate their property.⁵⁹ The case suggests that Matthias Martini not only lost his pastorate and property, but his reputation as well. Since in the early modern era it the reputation of an individual was tied to the reputation of one's kin, this would perhaps explain why Martini's son lost the support of local parishioners.⁶⁰

Reputation was the measure of a pastor's social status and social status helped clergymen into office. So if someone wanted to replace the pastor, he could try to slander the pastor's reputation. There is one example of this from 1599, when Duke Charles and parishioners of Kokemäki accused the pastor, Johannes Michaelis, of being a witch and called for his dismissal.⁶¹ The power of accusations lay in the fact that simply being accused was enough to damage one's reputation. The motives for making such accusations were usually competitive, as this case perfectly illustrates. During the civil war of the 1590s, Michaelis supported the legal ruler (Sigismund) and his companion, and was therefore against Duke Charles, who evidently felt the need to slender his opponent. The accusation seemed to work as, in 1600, Bishop Sorolainen told the Diet (Riksdag) of Linköping that the parishioners of Kokemäki had complained that their shepherd mismanaged his job, and he had been dismissed.⁶²

Simply being rich could be enough to ruin a clergyman's reputation as well; especially if it was felt that the wealth had been gained through preying on the weakness of parishioners. Gunnar Suolahti and Esko M. Laine note in their research that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, clergy purchased property by occupying the deserted homesteads that had formerly belonged to those who could no longer afford to pay taxes, and often the issue would end up having to be resolved in court.⁶³ Material disputes could thus also have been behind the accusations made against

Johannes Michaelis by the parishioners of Kokemäki. He was paying taxes on two houses which suggest that he might well have one of the clergy who had occupied a deserted homestead. To make matters worse for himself, he demanded that if parishioners did not pay their taxes in time, they should settle their debt by doing extra work.⁶⁴ This clearly did not make him very popular among the poorer parishioners.

However, personal wealth could also work in a pastor's favour. One example of this comes, funnily enough, from Kokemäki again. Around year 1600 the parishioners of Kokemäki asked the chaplain of Kaarina, Jacobus Eriki (d. c. 1603), to become their new pastor. Eriki was also a relatively wealthy man, but unlike Michaelis, his material wealth did not anger the parishioners. In hard times, rather than get the poor to repay their debts in kind, he had lent money to the peasants so that they could pay their taxes and, in this way, he actually improved his social status and reputation.⁶⁵

Pastors could of course ruin their reputation quite by themselves as well. For example, they would be directly dismissed for committing a felony⁶⁶ (such as adultery or manslaughter), but this also applied to crimes related to their office. For example, if a pastor married a couple for who did not have lawful permission to do so, the punishment could be that he be discharged (at least partially).⁶⁷

Reputation and trust were understandably important qualities for a pastor to have. Kyösti Kiuasmaa has studied office-holding in the central and local government of late sixteenth century Finland. He has noticed that the nature of offices changed somewhat in the 1560s. During the Middle Ages, and the first part of the sixteenth century, secular offices (such as bailiffs and clerks) relied on a system trust and loyalty between the office-holders and people. But from the 1560s onwards this loyalty started to break down and office-holders became more responsible for the legality of their actions. This led to more intensive supervision by the central government, and the increasing professionalization of administrative posts.⁶⁸

The cases above suggest that the relationship between pastors and parishioners remained to be based on trust and reputation while the role of secular office-holders changed. Unlike secular office-holders, they did not simply depend on the goodwill of the king for their post. However, this was not for any lack of trying on the part of the Crown.⁶⁹ There were even some cases when the parishioners and the Crown had quite different people in mind for a pastorate.

Conflicts between parishioners and the authorities over pastoral appointments

The motives behind parishioners' and the authorities' nominations for appointments often differed. In some cases the authorities appointed the person they wanted to the post, irrespective of the parishioners' will. For example, in the case of Matthaeus Matthiae, Bishop Sorolainen appointed him pastor in 1588 anyway, even though parishioners supported another candidate.⁷⁰ In other cases, parishioners did not just passively stand by and

accept the decision made by authorities.⁷¹ For example, in 1581 the clergyman Martinus Olai⁷² received a collation from the Crown that awarded him the pastorate of Laitila, after the Cathedral Dean of Turku (Henricus Canuti) had recommended him to the post. But even though Olai was the lawful pastor, parishioners would not accept him, and instead gave their support to the clergyman Henricus Petri, who had worked previously as the substitute-pastor of the parish. With the help of the parishioners, Petri eventually chased Olai off even though Olai appealed against this to the chapter of Turku and the secular court. Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that Petri and the parishioners had violated the king's order, Petri stayed in the post.⁷³

So even though pastors were often appointed by central government, they still needed a form of confirmation on the local level from parishioners. This begs at least two further questions:

1. Why did the support that parishioners showed sometimes lead to appointments, while other times it did not?
2. If the pastor had to gain the acceptance of parishioners, even after he had been legally appointed to the post by the authorities, how does this reflect on the state-building process?

Swedish historian Mats Hallenberg has noted that the social networks that pastors had cultivated, played a significant role in deciding the outcome of conflicts on a local level. Their links with parishioners, other local authorities (pastors of neighbouring parishes or the bailiff), and the Crown meant they had to carefully pick which of these three sides to ally themselves with, if a conflict arose, if they were to gain anything from it.⁷⁴ In this way, Hallenberg's notions may provide an answer to our first question regarding clerical appointments. In the examples of Matthiae and Olai, both had powerful local authority supporters – Matthiae was the son of the last pastor and his brother-in-law was the head of Turku castle, while Olai's patron was Cathedral Dean. But whereas Matthiae's network supported him to the very end of the controversy, Olai's diocese deputed his appeal to the secular court which found in favour of Petri.⁷⁵ In this case, the network of parishioners was stronger than the network of local authority, and Olai had chosen the weaker allies.

The second question takes us to a deeper level of local society. Göran Malmstedt has noted in his study on the seventeenth century religious mentality of Swedish peasants and clergy, that pastors were not always undebatable the head of a parish; and that parishioners would in fact often challenge his authority. Pastors had to first earn their authority and respect by interacting on a day-to-day basis with parishioners to gain the right to be the head of the parish.⁷⁶ The cases above support Malmstedt's notions, but suggest further that, not just parishioners and pastor, but all three parties – pastor, parishioners and higher authorities (e.g., the Crown) – were involved in the interaction that determined how the pastor earned his authority. The higher authority provided the official authorization by giving the collation, while parishioners granted the unofficial authorization that was

important on a day-to-day basis. It is clear that it was in everybody's interest that the pastor who was appointed was accepted by both the authorities and parishioners. However in reality, persons who fulfilled the requirements of both did hardly always exist. But by negotiating, the demands of all parties were met and a pastor that everyone could accept was chosen. Thus, from the state-building point of view, the clerical appointment process was an important event where the authorities and the people could meet and build the state at the local level.

There is one more case that supports this hypothesis. In year 1562, the Chaplain of Pori, Marcus Gregorii, was awarded the pastorate of Närpiö in a collation from the Crown. The Bishop of Turku and Duke John, however, had not considered Gregorii as a candidate for this post at all. Instead, they had nominated the Chaplain of Mustasaari, Olaus Nicolai, who was also supported by the parishioners. The result was an ongoing dispute between the candidates. In the middle of this, the Crown advised Gregorii to withdraw his candidature and let Nicolai have the post, but this never happened. Nicolai had to eventually return to his old post in Mustasaari.⁷⁷ Gregorii's war of attrition seemed to have worked and he remained in the post for the next decade. However, the parishioners had not forgotten, and in 1574 and 1575 they appealed to the Crown that Gregorii had collected too much tax and the tax-goods he had claimed were the kind that he could then sell on at a profit. Even if these accusations might have been exaggerated (it was quite normal for the people to appeal to the Crown about, for example, corrupt bailiffs),⁷⁸ he was discharged by the diocese of Turku in 1575.⁷⁹ The result suggests that the authorities were also looking for a reason to get rid of him. Furthermore, this suggests that sooner or later the pastor who did not have the support of parishioners or the Crown was discharged.

Appealing to the Crown was not the only way for parishioners to show their dissatisfaction with a pastor. For example, there was also the more radical practice of literally throwing the pastor over the church fence, which was an age-old tradition for removing unwanted clergy. Even though this kind of behaviour was one that the authorities were trying to weed out after the Reformation, there are still examples from the sixteenth century that show the habit had not yet fully died out.⁸⁰ Parishioners therefore had more than one way to remove an unwanted pastor.

Conclusion

Politics and religion intermingled in sixteenth century Sweden and, as we have seen in this chapter, different kings and dukes had different ideas about what constituted the one true religion. This chapter goes on to suggest that the most important posts in the diocese of Turku were appointed on such a political and religious basis. John III favoured those who accepted his liturgy, but after his death, these same people incurred the wrath of especially Duke Charles, who was a steady Lutheran and more inclined towards Calvinism. Later, after the death of John III, Charles was also opposed to the Catholic King Sigismund. When he competed to the throne with Sigismund,

Charles filled the major posts of the diocese of Turku with men he trusted that were stalwart Lutherans. During the reign of John, most of these men had already served Charles in his duchy.

In addition, the authorities – especially the Crown – would reward some of the men who had served in his court or in the army by appointing them to a pastorate, which was normally financially and socially rewarding. In these men, the king got loyal and trustworthy servants, who could promote the king's business at a local level. This kind of help and support was important especially in times when the king was competing, for example, with dukes (who were also trying to spread their networks at the local level).

The second major point this chapter makes is that, even if politics and religion played an important part in clerical appointments, the clergy-database reveals most appointments were made to those who had worked in the same parish beforehand or were relatives to the previous pastor (i.e., parishioners already knew that person and trusted him). As mentioned above, Kyösti Kiuasmaa has pointed out that the nature of office-holding changed in the latter part of the sixteenth century. The fact that trust and loyalty, which had played such a significant part in the relationship between clergy and parishioners since the Middle Ages, were still important, suggests that role of office-holder of the clergy did not change much when the rules of secular office-holders changed.⁸¹ During the studied period, the authorities would appoint those persons they wanted, but the pastors also had to have the trust of people if they wanted to stay in the post. Speaking of clergymen's personal agency, they had to adapt to the new rules and ever-changing environment of the sixteenth century. In this respect, it is important to emphasize that the clergy were not passive players between the authorities and parishioners, but could very much choose whether or not to further their careers by picking the right allies among parishioners, other local authorities, and the Crown.

Because the Swedish state became more centred around the Crown during the sixteenth century, the pastors who supported the Crown were thereby participating in the state-building process. By supporting the king, promoting his cause, and spreading it at the local level, through the channels of ecclesiastical administration, the clergy acted as an important and unique builder of the state – there was no other group of office-holders who could offer the Crown the same kind of local building blocks as the clergy. The point here is that it was not just secular agents of the Crown that helped build the Swedish state, but also pastors with their particular kind of personal agency and privileged position of trust among parishioners.

However, the pastors who gave their loyalty to the other authorities besides the Crown, acted also as builders of the state. By opposing the religious conviction of the Crown and leaning on to other authorities (such as the pastors who seek to the duchy of Charles during the reign of John III did), pastors forced the state to act and to strengthen its capacity to uphold policy and religion. Thus, the question concerns much about whose state it was to be built: was it Crown's or other authorities, such as Dukes'?

The question centers on the personal agency of the clergy. The political and religious upheavals in studied period offered possibilities for the clergy to

use their personal agency. In practice pastors could choose to support either the king or his opponents. The choice was a rational one: pastors weighted the situation in the realm and at the local level in their own parishes, took account their personal values, ideals, norms, emotions and opportunities and acted as they thought it was the best. I want to emphasize the fact that the religion was also flexible: in a way, pastors were able to balance between different types of Christian belief (Catholic or Reformed) and could change their opinions with the changing religious environment of the realm and according to their own thoughts about those changes.

In the end, the literature on state-building in sixteenth century Sweden generally emphasizes the importance of those who participated in tax-collecting and were able to read and write for this process (skills also useful in warfare).⁸² These were also skills the clergy of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries possessed. My purpose is not to deny that these skills were important in state-building, but to add that the clergy was, more often than not, trusted by local parishioners and this made him a powerful link for the state. He could not only relay information, but appease local areas. During the sixteenth century, the Crown may have tried to bend the clergy to its will, but did not really succeed, as in most cases the clergy's relationship with parishioners remained based on trust. This cannot have been irrelevant from the state-building point of view. For common people, it was supposedly important that they had a literate person, who was not entirely dependent on the central authority but was also servant of the people as well. All this emphasizes the clergy's key role as arbitrator between the authorities and the people, and in the state-building process as a whole.

The research on which this publication is based was funded by the Academy of Finland (grant no. 137741).

NOTES

- 1 Acknowledges: The Academy of Finland, Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland, The Finnish Cultural Foundation, Jalmari Finne's foundation and Alfred Kordelin foundation had endowed making of this chapter.
- 2 In this chapter term *authority/authorities* refers to the Crown, bishop and chapter of diocese and nobility (noble office-holders as well). However, when it is important to show who appointed the pastor, the quarter is named (if it is known). Local parishioners, even they had role in appointment process, are not concluded to the group of authority, but parishioners are seen partly as an opposite to the authority. However, it is noteworthy to remind that the parishioners were not always a uniform group in their decisions and there could have been small interest groups in the parishes or individuals who acted as a spokesman of the whole parish as Lindström points out. Peter Lindström, *Prästval och politisk kultur 1650–1800*. Skrifter från institutionen för historiska studier 4 (Umeå: Umeå universitet, 2003), 112. See also Mats Hallenberg & Johan Holm, *Man ur huse. Hur krig, upplopp och förhandlingar påverkade svensk statsbildning I tidigmodern tid* (Lund: Nordic Academic Press: 2016).
- 3 Michael Roberts, *The Early Vasas. A History of Sweden, 1521–1611* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 64.

- 4 Pastors were in charge of religious life in parishes. They held services, taught and supervised the parishioners. In addition, among other things, pastors acted as the chairmen of the meeting of the parishes (*sockenstämma*) and held judicial power at some level too. They also worked sometimes also as parish scribes (*sockenskrivare*), and could for example to write petition letters to the King at parishioners request. It is important to notice how the role of the pastors changed after the Reformation and especially at the seventeenth century.
- 5 Hjalmar Holmquist, *Tillsättningar av gäll i Sverige under reformationårhundradet*. Historisk tidskrift (1933), pp. 97–100; Tore Heldtander, *Prästtillsättningar i Sverige under stormaktstiden. Tiden före kyrkolagen 1686* (Uppsala: Svenska Kyrkohistoriska föreningen, 1955), pp. 15–16; Martin Sandahl, *Prästval i Sverige mot kulturell och social bakgrund* (Stockholm: Gummesson, 1966), p. 39; Roberts, *The Early*, p. 273; Kauko Pirinen, “Papinvaalilainsäädännön kehitys Suomessa vuoteen 1964”. In: Hannu Mustakallio (ed.), *Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran vuosikirja 79* (Helsinki: The Finnish Society of Church History, 1989), p. 34; Tuula Hockman, “Kuninkaan valvonnan alle”. In: Lahtinen, Anu, Ijäs, Miia (toim.), *Risti ja lounatuuli. Rauman seurakunnan historia keskiajalta vuoteen 1640* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 2015), p. 105; Cp. Mikko Hiljanen, “Limits of Power: Clerical appointment as part of domestic policy in Sweden after the Reformation, 1560–1611”, *Perichoresis*, Vol. 13 (2) (2015), pp. 35–55.
- 6 For example Jukka Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto Suomessa 1554–1604. Hiippakuntahallinto Suomessa 1554–1604*. Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran toimituksia 116 (Helsinki: The Finnish Society of Church History, 1980), pp. 115–138.
- 7 Roberts, *The Early*; Petri Karonen, *Pohjoisen suurvalta. Ruotsi ja Suomi 1521–1809* (Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society, 2014); Sven A. Nilsson, *De Stora krigens tid. Om Sverige som militärstat och bondesamhälle*. Studia Historica Upsaliensia 161 (Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, 1990), pp. 64–66; Mats Hallenberg, Johan Holm and Dan Johansson, “Organization, Legitimation, Participation. State formation as a dynamic process. Swedish example, c. 1523–1680”, *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 33, 2008, pp. 259.
- 8 However in Diocese of Turku, the nobles did not take advantage of this privilege. Instead they tried to get the pastor they wanted by sending letters of recommendation. K. A. Appelberg, *Bidrag till belysning af sättet för prästtjänsternas besättande i Finland från reformationen till medlet af 17:de seklet* (Helsingfors, 1896), p. 128.
- 9 For example Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, pp. 363–364. The peasantry’s role was not only a significant player in ecclesiastical matters, but also in national politics right from the beginning of the Swedish Realm. Hallenberg, Holm and Johansson, “Organization”, pp. 253–254.
- 10 During the Middle Ages some of the posts were appointed by the Pope. Some officials of the Pope’s court tried to take advantage of this and get themselves appointed to the pastorates. Sometimes this led to the situation where the Pope nominated some of these sharks to an open post even though the shark had no plans to actually take care of it. These situations then led to conflict between the appointee and chapter of the local diocese, who had planned to appoint some other clergyman. Clerical appointments were the most common kind of disagreement brought before the Pope’s tribunal (*Sacra Romana Rota*). Kirsi Salonen, *Kirkollisen oikeuden päälähteillä. Sacra Romana Rotan toiminta ja sen oikeudellinen tausta myöhäiskeskiajalla ja uuden ajan taitteessa*. Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran toimituksia 221 (Helsinki: The Finnish Society of Church History, 2012).
- 11 For example Appelberg, *Prästtjänsternas*, pp. 2–3, 48–49; Gunnar Suolahti, *Suomen pappisto 1600- ja 1700-luvuilla* (Porvoo: WSOY, 1919), pp. 121, 124; Sandahl, *Prästval*, pp. 39–40, 42; Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, pp. 363–365. Conditions in clerical appointments during the reign of Gustavus Vasa in some sense reminds

- later the era of autocracy (1680–1718): The King was, or wanted to be, in charge of the clerical appointments. Lindström, *Prästval*, pp. 65–66.
- 12 Appelberg, *Prästtjänsternas*, pp. 62–63; Holmquist, *Tillsättningar*, pp. 116–118; Heldtander, *Prästtillsättningar*, p. 20; Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, pp. 366–379.
 - 13 Especially the collations that the king gave have been preserved fairly well. However there are no collations that have been given by other authority. Nevertheless there are sources that reveal that other authority than the King appointed pastor. For example there is confirmation letters where the King confirms the collation that for example bishop had given. HFKP 1, pp. 88, 67–68; also Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, p. 389.
 - 14 Example of Charles' collation, for example HFKP 3, pp. 278, 209–210. The form and phrasing of a mandate that the King gave to the bailiffs reminds lot of collations. However the bailiffs' mandate did not changed during sixteenth century. Mats Hallenberg, *Kungen, fogdarna och riket. Lokalförvaltningen och statsbyggande under tidigt Vasatid* (Stockholm: Symposium, 2001), pp. 97–98.
 - 15 Kyösti Väänänen, Turun hiippakunnan paimenmuisto 1554–1721 (electronic publication). Studia Biographica 9. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2011. On line at: <http://www.finlit.fi/henkilohistoria/paimenmuisto>.
 - 16 On bailiff's accounts for instance Petri Karonens and Marko Hakanens article in this anthology.
 - 17 See for example the introduction of this book and chapter of Marko Hakanen and Ulla Koskinen about councillors of the realm. Also Merja Uotila, *Käsityöläinen kyläyhteisönsä jäsenenä. Prosopografinen analyysi Hollolan käsityöläisistä 1810–1840*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 237 (Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2014), pp. 31–43.
 - 18 Most extensive is the information about pastors' names and length of their careers; when they started in some post and when they moved to somewhere else (in every case the years are not perfectly known). I have this information from all the persons who worked as a pastor in 1560–1611.
 - 19 CDB 2014. For detailed information about the numbers, see Hiljanen, *Limits*.
 - 20 For example Roberts, *The Early*, pp. 296–300; Karonen, *Pohjoinen suurvalta*, pp. 92–96, 103–106.
 - 21 As soon as King Eric XIV inherited the crown, controversy between him and his younger brother John, the Duke of Finland, began. The conflict came to a conclusion in 1563 when the Diet (the Riksdag, meeting of the estates) doomed John to treachery and his duchy was struck off. With the support of the Diet, the king then marched a huge army to Finland Proper, imprisoned the duke and decapitated men who were loyal to John. In 1568 however, Duke John managed to depose Eric with the help of Councillors of the Realm and his younger brother Duke Charles (of Södermanland). Eric was sentenced to prison and John acceded to the throne. Roberts, *The Early*, pp. 206–211; Karonen, *Pohjoinen suurvalta*, pp. 96–100; Lars Ericson Wolke, *Johan III. En biografi* (Lund: Historiska media, 2006), pp. 75–81.
 - 22 Helge Pohjolan-Pirhonen points out that Eric XIV secured his hegemony in the eastern part of the kingdom by trying to keep Duke John apart from the Finnish nobility. He did this by giving judges' posts as a reward to those who switched sides and became loyal to the Crown. In addition, Eric knighted some people and a few of them became members of the Council of the Realm. These rewards impressed Finnish nobles and many consequently left Duke John to become the servant of the king. Helge Pohjolan-Pirhonen, *Suomen historia 1523–1617* (Porvoo: WSOY, 1960), pp. 255–259.
 - 23 Yrjö Blomstedt, *Laamannin- ja kihlakunnantuomarinvirkojen läänittäminen ja hoito Suomessa 1500- ja 1600-luvuilla (1523–1680). Oikeushistoriallinen tutkimus*.

- Historiallisia Tutkimuksia 51 (Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society, 1958), pp. 77–80.
- 24 Ingun Montgomery, *Värjostånd och lärostånd. Religion och politik i meningsutbytet mellan kungamakt och prästerskap i Sverige 1593–1608*. *Studia historico-ecclesiastica Upsaliensia* 22 (Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, 1972), pp. 28, 403.
- 25 From the form of the networks of the early modern period, for example Marko Hakanen, *Vallan verkostoissa. Per Brahe ja hänen klienttinsä 1600-luvun Ruotsin valtakunnassa*. *Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities* 157 (Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 2011).
- 26 Diocese of Turku was the part of John's duchy. The city of Turku was the headquarters of both the bishop and duke.
- 27 CDB 2014: Nicolaus. Also Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, pp. 417–419; Hockman, "Kuninkaan", pp. 115–116.
- 28 CDB 2014: Matthias Michelis Carpelan. Pohjolan-Pirhonen claims that Carpelan was loyal to John and he was pardoned because of the parishioners' appeal (especially those who spoke Finnish). Pohjolan-Pirhonen, *Suomen*, p. 280–281.
- 29 Ericson Wolke, *Johan III*, pp. 191–193; Erik Pettersson, *Den skoningslöse. En biografi över Karl IX* (Stockholm: Natur & kultur, 2008), pp. 79–80, 83–86; Lennart Hedberg, *Karl IX. Företagfursten och enväldhärskaren* (Stockholm: Prisma, 2009), pp. 221–222, 228–229.
- 30 Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, p. 419.
- 31 John's liturgical reform began in 1575 when he established the *Nova Ordinantia* (New Ordinance). It was not entirely "Catholic", but differed in two respects from the preceding Lutheran order: firstly the texts of the old church-fathers were recommended as reading, and secondly there was a warning about the polemic of Lutheran reformers. A year later, the new liturgy appeared (commonly known as the Red Book, due the colour of its cover). It was a mixture of the Swedish Protestant service and Catholic Mass. For example, Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, pp. 224–225; Ericson Wolke, *Johan III*, pp. 196–197.
- 32 Appelberg, *Prästtjänsternas*, pp. 68, 84–85; Holmquist, *Tillsättningar*, pp. 110–112; Heldtander, *Prästtillsättningar*, p. 18; Roberts, *The Early*, p. 412; Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, pp. 371–375; Hiljanen *Limits*, pp. 44–46, 51.
- 33 CDB 2014: Martinus Olai. Also Hockman, "Kuninkaan", pp. 113–115.
- 34 There were more pastors who did not accept the John's liturgy in the western part of the realm, as they had had to flee or move to Charles' duchy as it was a haven to clergymen who held the Lutheran faith. For example, Ericsson, *Johan III*, p. 201; Hedberg, *Karl IX*, pp. 221–222.
- 35 The Pastor for the Cathedral Parish was also a member of the diocese administration and was thus a more important clergyman than pastors of "normal" parishes.
- 36 CDB 2014: Henricus Jacobi.
- 37 CDB 2014: Thomas Laurentii. Also Appelberg, *Prästtjänsternas*, p. 90; Jussi Nuorteva, *Suomalaisten ulkomainen opinkäynti ennen Turun akatemian perustamista 1640*. *Bibliotheca historica* 27 (Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society, 1997), pp. 274–275.
- 38 For example Ericson Wolke, *Johan III*, pp. 210–211.
- 39 CDB 2014: Thomas Laurentii.
- 40 CDB 2014: Gregorius Martini Teet.
- 41 CDB 2014: Henricus Canuti & Ericus Matthiae Härkäpää.
- 42 CDB 2014: Petrus Henrici Melartopaeus.
- 43 CDB 2014: Petrus Henrici Melartopaeus. In addition, when Duke Charles occupied Finland in 1599, Bishop Ericus Erici Sorolainen was imprisoned, but Melartopaeus and Teet were not; Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, p. 432. This illustrates the fact that both were part of Charles' network.
- 44 Tuula Hockman gives other examples of this same phenomenon by studying several well-educated men from town of Rauma which did not end up in pastoral

- career in the diocese of Turku. For this reason, these men are not included in my database. Hockman, “Kuninkaan”, pp. 121–122.
- 45 Nilsson, *De stora*, pp. 64–66; Hallenberg, Holm and Johansson, “Organization”, p. 259. During the first part of the seventeenth century, people in Sweden feared that Catholics especially from Poland would try to get administrative posts in secret; which in turn might help Sigismund back to the Swedish throne. After all, he was the lawful heir to the Swedish throne. Mirkka Lappalainen, *Pohjolan leijona. Kustaa II Aadolf ja Suomi 1611–1632* (Helsinki: Siltala, 2014).
- 46 We have to keep in mind that the chapter of each diocese could also appoint pastors. By taking control of the diocese’s administration, Duke Charles could trust that the chapter would appoint only those clergymen who resist John’s liturgy, or later, the hegemony of Sigismund.
- 47 For example, John appointed Andreas Andreae (d. c. 1601), from his own court, to the pastorate of Kemiö in 1587. In addition, Christianus Henrici Winter (d. c. 1586 or 1587), who had served as a chaplain in John’s court was appointed the first Pastor of Pori in 1584. CDB 2014: Andreas Andreae & Christianu Henrici Winter.
- 48 For example Suolahti, *Suomen*, p. 122; Hélène Millet, Peter Morraw, “Clerics in the State”. In: Reinhard, Wolfgang (ed.), *Power Elites and State Building*. European Science Foundation, The Origins of the Modern State in Europe, 13th–18th Centuries, Theme D. General Editors: Wim Blockmans & Jean-Philippe Genet (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 187.
- 49 Roberts, *The Early*, pp. 179–180; Göran Malmstedt, *Bondetro och kyrkoro. Religiös mentalitet i stormaktstiden Sverige* (Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2002), p. 73; Mats Hallenberg, “Församlingspräst i det Svenska riket under 1500-talet. Traditionell auktoritet under omförhandling”. In: Eva-Marie Letzter (ed.), *Auktoritet i förvandling. Omförhandling av fromhet, lojalitet och makt i reformationens Sverige*. Opuscula Historica Upsaliensia 49 (Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, 2012), p. 113.
- 50 For example, Gustavus Vasa rewarded men who had served in his court during their youth by appointing them later to judge in different districts of the realm. Kaarlo Blomstedt has assumed that these men had become close to the King during their service. Later on they were also usable in situations where the King needed trusted people. Blomstedt, *Laamannin*, p. 76.
- 51 Holmquist, *Tillsättningar*, p. 96. Hallenberg has noticed that some of the bailiffs that were charged with misconduct when in office during the reigns of Gustavus Vasa and Eric XIV could remain in their post by simply paying the Crown; Hallenberg, *Kungen*, pp. 382–383, 388.
- 52 CDB 2014: Matthias Henrici Raucka & Johannes Jacobi Wenne. Also Hockman, “Kuninkaan”, pp. 105–107. For more on the value of the goods, chattels and estates that clergymen in general donated to the Crown, Aarre Läntinen, *Kuninkaan “perintöä ja omaa” (arv och eget). Kameraalihistoriallinen tutkimus Kustaa Vaasan maaomaisuudesta Suomessa vuosina 1531–1560* (Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 1981), pp. 122–126. On clericy’s economic situation at the sixteenth century in general Mikko Hiljanen, *Kirkkoherrojen taloudellinen asema ja siinä tapahtuneet muutokset 1500-luvulla* (Helsinki: The Finnish Society of Church History, 2016).
- 53 For example Appelberg, *Prästtjänsternas*, p. 34; Suolahti, *Suomen*, p. 122.
- 54 CDB 2014: Johannes Michaelis. On Johannes Michaelis, see the next subchapter.
- 55 CDB 2014.
- 56 For example, Lena Huldén points out that the social status of the people where the pastors were recruited changed after the Reformation; for example higher nobility was not interested in the clerical career as much as during the Middle Ages. In addition, the position of female (nobles) changed too, because it was impossible to seek to the monasteries after the Reformation. Lena Huldén, “Maktstrukturer i det tidiga finska 1500-talssamhälle”, *Genos*, 1998, pp. 111, 117.

- 57 For example Suolahti, *Suomen*, pp. 67, 85–86; Eero Matinelli, *Turun hiippakunnan papinvaalit ja papinvirkojen täyttäminen aikakautena 1721–1808. Sosiaalishistoriallinen tutkimus*. Turun yliopiston julkaisuja. Humaniora 51 (Turku: Turun yliopisto, 1955), p. 150; Malmstedt, *Bondetro*, p. 171.
- 58 CDB 2014: Henricus Petri & Mattheus Matthiae. It is notable that studies have not confirmed that Matthaëus Matthiae was son of Matthias Martini. The only thing that refers to father-son relationship is the patronym of Matthaëus.
- 59 CDB 201: Matthias Martini. Also Roberts, *The Early*, pp. 281, 290; Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, pp. 223–237, 374–375; Ericson Wolke, *Johan III*, pp. 206–210.
- 60 For example Mika Jokiaho, “Miehen kunnia ja maine 1600-luvun pohjalaisessa maalaisyhteisössä”. In: Einonen, Piia, Karonen, Petri (toim.), *Arjen valta. Suomalaisen yhteiskunnan patriarkaalista järjestyksestä myöhäiskeskiajalta teollistumisen kynnykselle (v. 1450–1860)*. Historiallinen Arkisto 116 (Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society, 2002), p. 205; Jari Eilola, *Rajapinnoilla. Sallitun ja kielletyn määrittäminen 1600-luvun noituus- ja taikuustapauksissa* (Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society, 2003), pp. 262–267; Karonen, *Pohjoinen suurvalta*, p. 50.
- 61 CDB 2014: Johannes Michaelis.
- 62 CDB 2014: Johannes Michaelis. Olli Matikainen, *Verenperijät. Väkivalta ja yhteisön murros itäisessä Suomessa 1500-1600-luvulla* (Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society, 2002), pp. 98–101; Eilola, *Rajapinnoilla*, pp. 259–263, 273–275. The Diet of Linköping marked the final stage in the dispute between Duke Charles and the Finnish clergy that had started after the death of John III. In Linköping, Charles accused that the Finnish clergy of supporting Sigismund at the end of the 1590s. In addition, he accused the clergy of not following the resolutions agreed in Uppsala and the Diet of Söderköping. Although the clerical estate investigated this and concluded that the pastors of Finland (in general) did not do anything wrong, the Diet finally decided to fine the Finnish clergy. For example Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, pp. 433–437.
- 63 Suolahti, *Suomen*, p. 201; Esko M. Laine, “Papisto ja yhteiskunta Suomessa 1600-luvulla”. In: Merja Lahtinen (ed.) *Historiallinen arkisto 105* (Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society, 1995), p. 159.
- 64 CDB 2014: Johannes Michealis.
- 65 CDB 2014: Jacobus Eri.
- 66 For example, the Pastor of Kemi was dismissed in 1578 because he committed manslaughter. Meanwhile, the Pastor of Liminka (Thomas Ingonis (d. 1574)) was accused by a local trader of stealing the seal of the preceding pastor to get appointed to the post. But this backfired, and Ingonis was accused of having sinful life and sentenced to death. CDB 2014: Jacobus Olai & Thomas Ingonis.
- 67 Paarma, *Hiippakuntahallinto*, pp. 402–403. These crimes did not only affect the reputations of pastors, but of all office-holders, such as bailiffs. For example Hallenberg, *Kungen*, p. 388; Matikainen, *Verenperijät*, p. 99.
- 68 Kyösti Kiuasmaa, *Suomen yleis- ja paikallishallinnon toimet ja niiden hoito 1500-luvun jälkipuoliskolla (vv.1560–1600)*. *Hallinto- ja yhteiskuntahistoriallinen tutkimus*. Historiallisia Tutkimuksia 63 (Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society, 1962), pp. 463–465. Also Suolahti, *Suomen*, pp. 53–55. Mats Hallenberg points out in his dissertation that even though bailiffs were first and foremost the trusted men of the king, they lived and worked at the local level, and the Crown could not supervise every office-holder. There were thus some cases where bailiffs could act in their own self-interest, but they could not ignore the local population for long, especially as there was usually an ongoing dispute between the people and bailiff about taxes. In this situation, there was a need to negotiate. Hallenberg, *Kungen*, pp. 399–401, 419.
- 69 As already mentioned, in the Church Ordinance of 1571 the inheritance of pastorates was restricted. The son of the old pastor could be appointed to the post only if he was the best of available candidates. In practice though, this did not make much difference, but law could be interpreted also as an attempt to break

- the loyalty-based relationship between the clergy and parishioners, for example Suolahti, *Suomen*, p. 72.
- 70 CDB 2014: The appointment of Matthaëus Matthiæ suggests that the reputation of the pastor's family was not so important in the eyes of the authorities. In fact, it seems that Matthiæ's father settled his differences with the authorities three years after being discharged, and he got back the property that the Crown had confiscated. CDB 2014: Matthias Martini.
- 71 Note Hallenberg's (*Kungen*, p. 401) notion about conflicts between bailiffs and local people.
- 72 This is a different Olai from the one mentioned earlier.
- 73 CDB 2014: Martinus Olai & Henricus Petri.
- 74 Hallenberg, *Församlingspräst*, pp. 129–130. For alliances in the Diet from the peasant's perspective, Johan Holm, "Att välja sin fiende. Allmogens konflikter och allianser i riksdagen 1595–1635", *Historisk tidskrift* 123:1, 2002; Johan Holm, *Konstruktionen av en stormakt. Kungamakt, skattebönder och statsbildning 1595–1640*. Stockholm Studies in History 90 (Stockholm: Stockholms universitet, 2007); Joakim Scherp, *De ofrälse och makten. En institutionell studie av riksdagen och de ofrälse ständens politik i maktodelningsfrågor 1660–1682*. Stockholm Studies in History 96 (Stockholm: Stockholms universitet, 2013). In clergy's perspective, Cecilia Ihse, *Präst, stånd och stat. Kung och kyrka i förhandling 1642–1686*. Stockholm studies in history 78 (Stockholm: Stockholms universitet, 2005).
- 75 CDB 2014: Matthaëus Matthiæ, Martinus Olai & Henricus Petri.
- 76 Malmstedt, *Bondetro*, pp. 170–172.
- 77 CDB 2014: Marcus Gregorii & Olaus Nicolai.
- 78 Kiuasmaa, *Suomen*, pp. 421–428. Kiuasmaa claims that there might have not been much illegality in tax-collecting, but bailiffs might have collected extra-taxes that the Crown had claimed, or back taxes. People might have thought that these kinds of collections were illegal and thus appealed to the Crown. For more on appeals to the Crown during the sixteenth century also Pentti Renvall, "Kuninkaanmiehiä ja kapinoitsijoita Vaasa-kauden Suomessa" (Helsinki: Tammi, 1949), pp. 143–144; Nilsson, *De stora*, pp. 81–91.
- 79 CDB 2014: Marcus Gregorii. Dismissal of a pastor was not a common practice during this period and only a dozen cases have been found. Most dismissals were tied to the political struggle or on going liturgical reforms. Only a few pastors lost their post for other reasons, such as committing a felony. CDB 2014.
- 80 For example, in 1558, the parishioners of Lempäälä threw their pastor Olaus Martini Krook over the church fence before the service. CDB 2014: Olaus Martini Krook. Later in 1596, Claes Fleming, who was the biggest enemy of Duke Charles in Finland, urged those loyal to the Crown in Turku to throw all the clergymen over the church fence who had accepted the decision of Uppsala meeting. Heikki Ylikangas, *Nuijasota* (Helsinki: Otava, 1977), p. 68. For more on the habit of throwing the clergyman over the church fence also Asko Vilkkuna, *Tavan takaa. Kansatieteellisiä tutkimuksia tapojemme historiasta*. Etnologian laitoksen tutkimuksia 24 (Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 1989).
- 81 According to Peter Lindström (*Prästval*, 191), the pragmatic appointing policy which favoured the local parishes' will – i.e. authorities (especially the bishops and the head of dioceses) appointed pastors who parishioners wanted – was normal at least until the end of the seventeenth century. Thus it seems that the trust and loyalty remained in the core of clergies' role at the local societies at least to the end of the seventeenth century.
- 82 For example: Nilsson, *De stora*; Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital and European States, AD 990–1990* (Cambridge: Blackwell, 1990); Jan Glete, *War and the state in early modern Europe. Spain, the Dutch Republic and Sweden as fiscal-military states, 1500–1660* (London: Routledge, 2002); Hallenberg, Holm and Johansson, "Organization".

Sources

CLERGY DATABASE 2014 (CDB)

Sources:

- Kyösti Väänänen, Turun hiippakunnan paimenmuisto 1554–1721 -verkkojulkaisu. *Studia Biographica* 9. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2011. <http://www.finlit.fi/henkilohistoria/paimenmuisto>
- HFKP I–II 1892–1907: Handlingar rörande finska kyrkan och presterskapet. Utgifven af K. G. Leinberg. Jyväskylä.
- Kansallisarkisto, Helsinki (Finnish National Archive), Bailiffs' accounts (*fogderäkenskaper*). Used digital archive at <http://digi.narc.fi/digi/>

Literature

- Appelberg, K. A. 1896: *Bidrag till belysning af sättet för prästtjänsternas besättande i Finland från reformationen till medlet af 17:de seklet*. Helsingfors.
- Blomstedt, Yrjö 1958: *Laamannin- ja kihlakunnantuomarinvirkojen läänittäminen ja hoito Suomessa 1500- ja 1600-luvuilla (1523–1680). Oikeushistoriallinen tutkimus. Historiallisia Tutkimuksia* 51. Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.
- Eilola, Jari 2003: *Rajapinnoilla. Sallitun ja kielletyn määrittelemisen 1600-luvun jälki-puoliskon noituus ja taikuustapauksissa*. *Bibliotheca Historica* 81. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society.
- Ericson Wolke, Lars 2006: *Johan III. En biografi*. Lund: Historiska Media.
- Glete, Jan 2002: *War and the state in early modern Europe. Spain, the Dutch Republic and Sweden as fiscal-military states, 1500–1660*. London: Routledge.
- Hakanen, Marko 2011: *Vallan verkostoissa. Per Brahe ja hänen klienttinsä 1600-luvun Ruotsin valtakunnassa*. *Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities* 157. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Hallenberg, Mats 2001: *Kungen, fogdarna och riket. Lokalförvaltning och statsbyggande under tidig Vasatid*. Stockholm: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposion.
- Hallenberg, Mats 2012: "Församlingspräst i det Svenska riket under 1500-talet. Traditionell auktoritet under omförhandling". In: Eva-Marie Letzter (red.), *Auktoritet i förvandling. Omförhandling av fromhet, lojalitet och makt i reformationens Sverige*. *Opuscula Historica Upsaliensia* 49. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Hallenberg, Mats, Holm, Johan, Johansson, Dan 2008: "Organization, Legitimation, Participation. State formation as a dynamic process – The Swedish example, c. 1523–1680", *Scandinavian Journal of History* 33: 3.
- Hallenberg, Mats, Holm, Johan 2016: *Man ur huse. Hur krig, upplopp och förhandlingar påverkade svensk statsbildning I tidigmodern tid*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Hedberg Lennart 2009: *Karl IX. Företagarfursten och enväldshärskaren*. Stockholm: Prisma.
- Heldtander, Tore 1955: *Prästtillsättningar i Sverige under stormaktstiden. Tiden före kyrkolagen 1686*. Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Kyrkohistoriska föreningen 2. Ny följd 10. Uppsala: Svenska Kyrkohistoriska föreningen.
- Hiljanen, Mikko 2015: "Limits of Power. Clerical appointment as part of domestic policy in Sweden after the Reformation, 1560–1611", *Perichoresis* 13(2).
- Hiljanen, Mikko 2016: *Kirkkoherrojen taloudellinen asema ja siinä tapahtuneet muutokset 1500-luvulla*. Helsinki: The Finnish Society of Church History.

- Hockman, Tuula 2015: "Kuninkaan valvonnan alle". In: Lahtinen, Anu and Ijäs, Miia (toim.), *Risti ja lounatuuli. Rauman seurakunnan historia keskiajalta vuoteen 1640*. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society.
- Holm, Johan 2003: Att välja sin fiende. Allmogens konflikter och allianser i riksdagen 1595–1635", *Historisk tidskrift* 123(1).
- Holm, Johan 2007: *Konstruktionen av en stormakt. Kungamakt, skattebönder och statsbildning 1595–1640*. Stockholm Studies in History 90. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet.
- Holmquist, Hjalmar 1933: "Tillsättningar av gäll i Sverige under reformations- århundradet", *Historisk tidskrift*.
- Huldén, Lena 1998: "Maktstrukturer i det tidiga finska 1500-talssamhälle", *Genos*, 1998.
- Ihse, Cecilia 2005: *Präst, stånd och stat. Kung och kyrka i förhandling 1642–1686*. Stockholm Studies in History 78. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet.
- Jokiaho, Mika 2002: "Miehen kunnia ja maine 1600-luvun pohjalaisessa maalaisyhteisössä". In: Einonen, Piia, Karonen, Petri (toim.), *Arjen valta. Suomalaisen yhteiskunnan patriarkaalisesta järjestyksestä myöhäiskeskiajalta teollistumisen kynnykselle (v. 1450–1860)*. Historiallinen arkisto 116. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society.
- Karonen, Petri 2014: *Pohjoinen suurvalta. Ruotsi ja Suomi 1521–1809*. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society.
- Kiuasmaa, Kyösti 1962: *Suomen yleis- ja paikallishallinnon toimet ja niiden hoito 1500-luvun jälkipuoliskolla (v. 1560–1600). Hallinto- ja yhteiskuntahistoriallinen tutkimus*. Historiallisia Tutkimuksia 63. Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.
- Laine, Esko M. 1995: "Papisto ja yhteiskunta Suomessa 1600-luvulla". In: Merja Lahtinen (ed.) *Historiallinen arkisto 105*. Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.
- Lappalainen, Mirkka 2014: *Pohjolan leijona. Kustaa II Adolf ja Suomi 1611–1632*. Helsinki: Siltala.
- Lindström, Peter 2003: *Prästval och politisk kultur 1650–1800*. Skrifter från institutionen för historiska studier 4. Umeå: Umeå universitet.
- Läntinen, Aarre 1981: *Kuninkaan "perintöä ja omaa" (arv och eget). Kameraalhistoriallinen tutkimus Kustaa Vaasan maaomaisuudesta Suomessa vuosina 1531–1560*. Studia Historica Jyväskylänensia 21. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Malmstedt, Göran 2002: *Bondetro och kyrkoro. Religiös mentalitet i stormaktstiden Sverige*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Matikainen, Olli 2002: *Verenperijät: väkivalta ja yhteisön murros itäisessä Suomessa 1500–1600-luvulla*. Bibliotheca historica 78. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society.
- Matinelli, Eero 1955: *Turun hiippakunnan papinvaalit ja papinvirkojen täyttäminen aikakautena 1721–1808. Sosiaalhistoriallinen tutkimus*. Turun yliopiston julkaisuja. Humaniora 51. Turku: Turun yliopisto.
- Millet, Héléne and Moraw, Peter 1996: "Clerics in the State". In: Wolfgang Reinhard (ed.), *Power Elites and State Building*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Montgomery, Ingun 1972: *Värjostånd och lärostånd. Religion och politik i meningsutbytet mellan kungamakt och prästerskap i Sverige 1593–1608*. Studia historico-ecclesiastica Upsaliensia 22. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Nilsson, Sven A. 1990: *De stora krigens tid. Om Sverige som militärstat och bondesamhälle*. Studia Historica Upsaliensia 161. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.
- Nuorteva, Jussi 1997: *Suomalaisten ulkomainen opinkäynti ennen Turun akatemian perustamista 1640*. Bibliotheca historica 27. Helsinki: Finnish Historical Society.
- Paarma, Jukka 1980: *Hiippakuntahallinto Suomessa 1554–1604*. Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran toimituksia 116. Helsinki: The Finnish Society of Church History.
- Pohjolan-Pirhonen, Helge 1960: *Suomen historia 1523–1617. Suomen historia VII*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Pettersson, Erik 2008: *Den skoningslöse. En biografi över Karl IX*. Stockholm: Natur & kultur.

- Pirinen Kauko 1989: "Papinvaalilainsäädännön kehitys Suomessa vuoteen 1964". In: Hannu Mustakallio (ed.), *Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran vuosikirja* 79. Helsinki: The Finnish Society of Church History.
- Renvall, Pentti 1949: *Kuninkaanmiehiä ja kapinoitsijoita Vaasakauden Suomessa*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Roberts, Michael 1968: *The Early Vasas. A History of Sweden, 1525–1611*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salonen, Kirsi 2012: *Kirkollisen oikeuden päälähteillä. Sacra Romana Rotan toiminta ja sen oikeudellinen tausta myöhäiskeskiajalla ja uuden ajan alun taitteessa*. Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran Toimituksia 221. Helsinki: The Finnish Society of Church History.
- Sandahl, Martin 1966: *Prästval i Sverige mot kulturell och social bakgrund*. Stockholm: Gummesson.
- Scherp, Joakim 2013: *De ofrälse och makten. En institutionell studie av riksdagen och de ofrälse ståndens politik i maktodelningsfrågor 1660–1682*. Stockholm Studies in History 96. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet.
- Suolahti, Gunnar 1919: *Suomen papisto 1600- ja 1700-luvuilla*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Tilly, Charles 1990: *Coercion, capital and European states, AD 990–1990*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Uotila, Merja 2014: *Käsityöläinen kyläyhteisönsä jäsenenä. Prosopografinen analyysi Hollolan käsityöläisistä 1810–1840*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 237. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Vilkuna, Asko 1989: *Tavan takaa. Kansatieteellisiä tutkimuksia tapojemme historiasta*. Etnologian laitoksen tutkimuksia 24. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.
- Ylikangas, Heikki 1977: *Nuijasota*. Helsinki: Otava.