

Please cite the original publication "Communion as Shared Experience in Early Modern Finland" in *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 55:1, January 2025, pp. 121-142

DOI 10.1215/10829636-11568685 <https://doi.org/10.1215/10829636-11568685>

Communion as Shared Experience in Early Modern Finland

Raisa Maria Toivo

Tampere University

Tampere, Finland

The Protestant Reformation and its Tridentine counterpart involved not just an effort to change theology and implement this in practice. It was an effort to change religious experience.¹ This was a holistic endeavor that embraced sensory elements, from church decoration to religious soundscapes, as well as liturgical practices that translated theology into parish life, with different aims and outcomes among churches.

Communion played a central role in the reformation of religious experience. The emergence of varying Protestant interpretations of the bread and wine and the Catholic codification of the Thomist view at the Council of Trent—from full presence of the body in Catholic transubstantiation to Lutheran consubstantiation, or the real presence, to a mere rite of remembrance in the more radical Protestant movements—reflected a profound change from the multiple perspectives of medieval Christian theology. The change was reflected also in the social meaning and experience of Communion as the act of

sharing the holy body of Christ. This, in turn, was mirrored in how relationships between God and believers and between church members themselves were understood.

Both Lutheran and Catholic reformers strove, at least on the theological level, for a more individualistic concept of Communion, one oriented toward the relationship between the individual and God. This orientation was the essence of the priesthood of all believers as well as Catholic obsession with frequent Communion and the Jansenist fear that its frequency would erode the individual's faith and pursuit of moral perfection. Nevertheless, for both Lutheran and Catholic theologians, the whole point of Communion was for the congregation to take part in sharing Christ's divine body. On the level of religious customs, studies of Protestant and Tridentine Catholic Communion have shown that laypeople were dedicated to the social and collective aspects of the rite.²

In early modern Finland—then part of Lutheran Sweden—the role of Communion was likewise closely essential in the changes in religious experience. Indeed, one of the first known appearances of the word experience (kokemus) in Finnish occurs in connection to Communion, in the first Finnish-language prayer book, Rucouskiria Bibliasta, compiled by Mikael Agricola in 1544. Here Agricola states that Holy Communion is the "experience of [Christ's] sacred body and blood."³ The essentialist connection Agricola makes between

Communion and experience is the starting point for this article, and it suggests why it would be profitable to explore Communion as an experience of early modern lived religion.

The task of this study is to look at tensions between personal convictions and the sharedness of the experience of Communion in early modern Finland from the time of Agricola's text to the late seventeenth century. I use as source material Agricola's liturgical works and later church ordinances from 1570 to 1686, as well as court records on religious offenses concerning Communion. The former show how the ideal Communion experience was shared, in the church's view, and the latter demonstrates how ideals were expressed and modified in practice. Despite a seeming dichotomy between types of source materials, my aim is not to create an opposition between learned and popular perspectives, but rather to understand how ideals conformed to actual conditions and local contingencies.

Agricola is often considered "the father" of the Finnish written language, since he was assigned the job of translating the necessary liturgical and other religious texts after the Reformation. His work, therefore, created the basis for the Reformation and the Lutheran Church's theology. Formally, early modern Sweden and Finland (at the time the eastern province of Sweden) adopted the Reformation swiftly following a royal decree in 1527, but in practical terms the parishes and the politics in the country took much longer to change.

Agricola's work was part of this phase, producing the first catechism in the Finnish language in 1543, the liturgical handbook Rucouskiria Bibliasta in 1544, and finally the New Testament in Finnish in 1548. The Swedish church searched for its confessional identity for the rest of the sixteenth century, until it settled on the Lutheran Augsburg Confession in the Uppsala Synod of 1593. During the next decades, a Lutheran middle-ground theology was forged to serve both the political and theological needs of a country that aspired to be a Lutheran leader during the Thirty Years' War and that had to distinguish itself from both Catholic and competing Protestant denominations. After the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, the Swedish church settled the practicalities of adopting a middle-ground Lutheran orthodoxy, only then to meet challenges posed by the arrival of Pietism at the end of the seventeenth century. In Finland religious challenges during this century also included coexistence and conflict with the Russian Orthodox Church in the east and the Sami indigenous religions in the north as the Swedish kingdom expanded.⁴

In what follows, I first place Agricola's text in its contexts to examine what he meant by Communion and "experience" in different settings. I then look at the most important church ordinances, liturgies, and church laws to sketch how the intersection of Communion and experience evolved in early modern Finland and Sweden. This material

consists of a selection of the first liturgical materials of the Reformation in Finland (the catechism and the prayer book Rucouskiria Bibliasta) and a selection of ordinances from the Swedish Church Ordinance of 1571 to the Swedish Church Law of 1686. These materials show the development of how Communion was supposed to be treated and administered, how it was supposed to be experienced, and how that experience was to be shared. It is normative material describing ideal experience. While it may well be that no one reached that ideal, the church's teaching about Communion formed one set of norms for religious experience—a script that could be followed or adapted to fit other protocols that may have applied to the same people at the same time.

Alternative norms of experience will come to light as I move to variations of the script in other settings outside the church, where the way modes of sharing—or individualizing—the experience of Communion were appropriated for varying purposes by people of different social standings and situations. I use court record narratives of suspected religious crime or error that were related to Communion. These investigations into irregular religious practices sometimes began in church courts, but if the investigation revealed anything substantial, the matter was always referred to a secular court, since the secular court was the only judicial entity with the power to impose civil punishments. In the secular

court, church authorities, suspected wrongdoers, and various witnesses for and against any party were heard in public meetings. Pressure may have been applied, but there was no recourse to torture except in some political cases, and defendants as well as witnesses seem to have talked fairly freely, even naturally, with as much strategic choice as they could muster. Their testimonies were recorded meticulously, though usually not verbatim. As the purpose of court records was to record testimonies—that is, communication—it is in their nature to emphasize the communicative aspects of the process of creating and curating experience.⁵

I rely on definitions of “experience” and “lived religion” presented in the introduction to this special issue and in my previous work. Experience is a relational process in which individuals and communities make sense of cumulative encounters with the world they live in. As the process is repeated, structures and cultural norms develop that guide what people think there is to encounter in the world and how to experience it. Lived religion is the sphere of the world in which this experience takes place.⁶

Experiences are formed and constructed—and evaluated, approved, and sometimes dismissed—in relation to the experiences of other people. For that to be possible, people must communicate with others in order to share their understanding of what they are experiencing. If a shared sense

of experience can be successfully formed, a community of experience can be created, which then leads to new interpretations of experiences and the ways in which they are shared—this interactive dynamic establishes a common framework for how to experience.⁷

Few communities in history have ever been quite unanimous on anything, let alone on experience. Hence, any history of experience must also be a history of negotiation or struggle over the norms of experience and who has the power to set them. Those with the power to set the parameters of experience will more easily have their own experience serve as the basis for expectations about future experience in society, while those who are pushed to the sidelines may struggle to get their experience acknowledged at all. Experience, therefore, is not a matter to be taken at face value any more than any other historical construct. Rather, it must be questioned and its norms and social tensions analyzed.⁸ Such norms can be set in many ways, but when they are accepted, they form cultural and social scripts for experiencing the world. The most dominant of these scripts in early modern culture came from religion, often from the Bible or church teachings, but they were also influenced by other social expectations in local communities, by occupational or status groups, or within kin and family. Masters faced different expectations from laborers, men from women, clergy from the laity. Some people

encountered the same norms, but they may have differed for others. Placing the topic of my inquiry (experience of and in Communion) in the context of early modern Finland allows me to look at the effect of a changing cultural setting on experience.

While the focus of my inquiry may look like a peripheral view of European religious change, it in fact affords a viewpoint on one of the central agents in European politics at the time. Concentrating on the areas of Sweden east of the Gulf of Bothnia—what we today call Finland—also shows how cultural and social conditions influenced experience. While the western region of Finland occupied part of the geographical core of Sweden and was culturally similar to it, the eastern region of Finland was enmeshed in cultural exchange—in terms of both coexistence and conflict—with people of different religious backgrounds in Russia, Poland, and Lithuania. While this geographical context may be atypical for modern European historians, it should be familiar to historians of the early modern period, and it resonates with some religio-political challenges faced in Europe today.

The script of an experience: Personally shared Communion

Agricola describes Communion in terms of experience in one of the first printed texts in Finnish, Rucouskiria Bibliasta in

1544. He refers to experience (kokemus) to account for the holistic effect of Communion:

Take, therefore, most Merciful Lord Father, all my wrongs and sins from me so that I might be cleansed in my mind and my heart and might taste the most sacred loan, that the experience of your sacred body and blood, which I intend to take though I am unworthy, would be the forgiveness of my sins and the perfect cleansing away of all my crimes, the scaring away of all my evil thoughts, and the rebirth of my good conscience.⁹

Rucouskiria was an extensive collection of translated prayers for various moments of the day and liturgical needs, as well as for private devotion. Primarily, it was meant to help the clergy perform the liturgy in the vernacular. It includes a calendar, advice for both liturgical and more mundane situations, and almost seven hundred prayers that were collected and translated from some thirty sources—medieval Catholic, Reformed, and Lutheran.¹⁰ Some of the prayers were meant to be sung, some orated. Around eighty of the liturgical prayers were intended to be used in connection with Communion. Experience is mentioned around ten times, not just in connection to Communion.

Rucouskiria is generally thought of as a conservative endeavor: by the time Agricola published it, plenty of Lutheran prayer books had appeared, yet only a few of the

prayers in Rucouskiria came from Lutheran sources, even though Agricola had studied in Wittenberg and considered Melanchthon his tutor.¹¹ The section on Communion features more alterations than most of the other sections of Rucouskiria, perhaps because the theological and doctrinal differences on the topic were the clearest and perhaps quickest to develop between Catholicism and Lutheranism.

This particular prayer was adapted and translated from Hortulus Anime, a widely circulating Catholic prayer book in Latin and German. Where Agricola's Finnish text speaks of the experience of the sacred body and blood of Christ ("se Pyhe sinun Rumis ja weres cokemus"), the Latin version only mentions taking the elements of Communion. Kokemus or "experience" is, in this context, Agricola's own addition to the text, presumably to clarify the text. Agricola therefore postulates that Communion does not just involve the consumption of the bread and the wine, or the body and the blood, but a more holistic experience of borrowing and lending divine grace, goodness, and justification from God. Agricola's idea is purposefully ambiguous: he simultaneously evokes the Finnish words "kokemus", experience as a holistic and somewhat unverbalizable first-hand knowledge and "laina", which means a loan, emphasizing that the sacred body and blood, or the grace that is given through them do not belong to believers on their

own merits, but are only extended to him or her by God, subject to His will.¹²

Communion is not the only type of experience addressed in Rucouskiria; nevertheless, the sense of a holistic knowledge of salvation is most often connected to Communion. In the preface's exhortation, Agricola recommends that believers should both publicly and privately repeat their prayers so that they can "experience mercy" on Judgment Day.¹³ Often this means knowledge that believers gain of the divine and the Lord's good will and intentions.¹⁴ Agricola also uses the verb experience in the sense of testing and gaining true knowledge of the human condition: men testing if they could gain justification by following the law and experiencing the resulting failure.¹⁵ Or again in a prayer before Communion, it is said that the light of the Father the Lord "tests [experiences] my innermost kidneys from the outside and inside." In the literal sense, the word used, munaskuut, means "kidneys," similar to the King James Version of Jer. 17:10 ("I the Lord search the heart, try the reins [kidneys]"), but it is most often translated as "the innermost," sometimes as "innermost secrets" or "innermost thoughts." However, God knows the human's munaskuut can be known "from the outside and inside" separately, which seems to point to something at least partly material and corporeal. What Agricola means is that God, too, tests a human and finds out his true state - bodily

and spiritually.¹⁶ Several passages discuss similarly God either testing, trying or refraining from testing humans through experience.¹⁷

None of these passages discuss Communion, but they show what Agricola thought of experience and how he used the word kokemus: In both cases experience and experiencing mean gaining knowledge about humanity through experimenting, though the active party experimenting gaining the knowledge changes from humans to the Divine. The knowledge gained through experience is holistic: both material and spiritual, personal and generalizable at the same time.

Every time Agricola uses experience, it seems to mean a firm, profound, and holistic type of knowledge gained by personal testing of (experimenting with) a matter. This is in line with how Finnish-language corpuses reveal the word kokemus was used in early modern Finnish, apart from the religious sphere, to mean knowledge gained by personal experimenting. In the first Finnish dictionary of 1787, kokemus (noun) and kokea (verb) refer to experimenting, attempting, and endeavoring, or to the knowledge gained by such efforts. Consequently, the word kokea was also used, for example, for checking if one's fishnets or snares had caught anything. Several eighteenth-century texts on agriculture also talk about kokemus as the experience of cultivating rhubarb or certain types of grain. While the information gained by

checking snares may be fairly straightforward, there is often a sense that experiential knowledge includes aspects that cannot easily be taught by (written) word. One text even exhorts "one who wants to know this, and has the power over his fields, must gain the same experience."¹⁸

It is evident, too, that Agricola meant the experience of Communion should produce knowledge of the sacrament's content and meaning. To see how that experience was to be shared or personalized, I will next look at teaching on Communion in early modern Finnish sources. Two distinctive developments pull the ideal Communion experience in different directions during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: one further emphasizing the shared nature of the sacrament, the other emphasizing its corporeality and materiality.

Like other reformers, Agricola, in his catechism and more lengthily in Rucouskiria, discussed the Communion experience as being deeply personal. By connecting this experience to terms such as munaskuut (kidneys), he located it in the innermost, private self hidden within the body so that it was secret from everyone except God. Yet, the experience was generalizable. Agricola addresses his readers and listeners as a group as "you" (in Finnish "te," the second person plural) or "we" (in Finnish "me"). These plural forms imply that the experience was always shared, as Communion itself was essentially about sharing the body of Christ within a

congregation. Individual relationships with God were at the forefront of Agricola's teaching, but relationships among all true Christians were equally present in Agricola's understanding of shared and communal Communion.

The importance of the congregation sharing Communion became a programmatic desideratum in the 1571 Church Ordinance, when it was decreed that the eucharistic liturgy must never be celebrated without the congregation present. The same ordinance was reiterated even more forcibly in the 1686 Church Law. This law decreed that Communion should be offered at least every three weeks and more often if parishioners so desired—Communion should not be reserved for major annual festivals such as Easter. This was probably due to general Lutheran opposition to private masses, but problems had also emerged in local parishes. In practice, Communion every three weeks was rare, though variation in frequency seems to have been great. In some of the more sparsely populated and remote parishes, it could happen that only one or two households were present on a given Sunday.¹⁹ Private masses either in church or in the home were forbidden by both the 1571 Church Ordinance and the 1686 Church Law. Only for the gravely ill and those in mortal danger should the Eucharist be served in the home. This was not only meant to stop private confessions but also to prevent religious dissenters—be it Calvinist or Catholic in the sixteenth century or Pietist in the late seventeenth—from developing their own

Communion communities.²⁰

The communal nature of Communion was also emphasized by preaching on the proper conditions for taking the sacrament: one should be prepared not only in personal spiritual terms, but also by making peace with fellow parishioners that one had offended or hurt, and by clarifying any suspicions of crime about oneself. The Ordinance of 1571 contains quite a long paragraph on how the priest is responsible for following up on criminal suspicions before administering Communion, but it also states that being kept or voluntarily staying away from Communion must not be used as testimony in a court trial for anyone's bad reputation or guilty conscience. The Church Law of 1686 also makes clear that Communion should be received only after suitable preparation. A formal confession with absolution by the priest—both as part of the public church service and beforehand when the priest also examined parishioners' knowledge of Christianity—were necessary. The law also states that one should apologize and make amends with neighbors who have been wronged.²¹

It was the duty of the parish priest to make sure that partakers in Communion were eligible, and it is not an uncommon occurrence in court records that people step forth to confess to a crime like premarital sexual relations or bearing an illegitimate child in order to regain access to Communion. For the same reason, quite a few parishioners wanted the court to clear them from suspicions of crimes such as using magic or

witchcraft. Some parishioners even took the parish priest to court to regain access to Communion, like an elderly woman did in the parish of Huittinen in 1624. The priest in question explained that the woman had "used a rosary string and other old papist fallacies," and since her husband admitted that such a rumor existed, the priest was deemed right in denying her Communion until the matter was cleared up. Sometimes skirmishes and fights took place when parishioners who had disagreements tried to hold each other back from taking part.²² The exclusion of some individuals was implicit in the pastoral emphasis on Christian community, and it could be evinced in the local experience of Communion.

It can be concluded that greater emphasis was placed on the shared nature of the Communion experience during the early modern period in Lutheran Sweden and Finland. Private masses were frowned upon, and private Communion was reserved only for the purpose of last rites. That parishioners were present and took part in Communion (in both kinds) was important both for the theological distinction this provided from Catholicism and for the practical unity of a congregation. But this did not concern merely the congregation that was physically present. It implied the sharedness of the experience with the Christian community (understood from the Lutheran standpoint as mostly Lutherans) as a whole, regardless of time and place. Most importantly, engagement in Communion drew forth an experience

between humans and the divine, where each gained thorough knowledge of the other.

Limited group experiences: Household and village meals

Communion was to be served only in church—with the last rites as the exception—and any other practices were potentially punishable as blasphemy. Therefore, there should not in theory be much variation in how Communion was experienced or in what ways and how widely that experience was shared. In practice, however, plenty of such variation existed. Next, I look at how this variation manifested itself in local court records. They reveal other types of sacrificial meals celebrated in rural early modern Finland that were not referred to as Communion but made use of a Communion-like ritual or even sacrificial meals. They, too, served to strengthen community coherence, but these communities were more limited in nature.

A 1686 set of cases from the rural district court of Jääski and Ruokolahti in southeastern Finland (currently mostly in Russia) serves as an example. The recent appointment of the vicar, Magister Pähl Heinricus, in connection to the publication of the Church Law the same year, led the vicar to pursue a project to clean up his parish. At first, Heinricus had inquired after parishioners' religious habits during a pastoral visitation. Having become concerned enough to take

action, he took various matters to the secular court. Most of the individual complaints related to the selling and buying of beer during church services. Nevertheless, the ways in which a few parishioners celebrated various officially non-Lutheran holy days—especially St. Catherine's Day, the Feast of Corpus Christi, St. George's Day, and St. Olaf's Day—took up more time and pages in the records than any other matter at the session.²³ The saints' days obviously served as systematic calendar markers in the cycle of the year: The dates coincide with important moments in the annual cycle of agriculture and cattle rearing, but they had multiple purposes that certainly included religious and social cohesion.

Toasting in honor of the Virgin Mary or the saints had been an important part of convivial piety throughout Europe, including the late medieval Baltic region, but in Finland ritual toasts were also offered to non-Christian deities such as Ukko, the God of rain, crops, and thunder.²⁴ Court cases mention these rituals in the late seventeenth century, and folklorists have collected evidence until the nineteenth century. Toasting was seldom described as being limited to one toast; the amount of drink consumed was thought to procure a corresponding amount of good luck and protection.²⁵ These are all features that also emerge in other types of magic and could be considered suspicious under certain circumstances. These features also likened the celebration in various ways—by

dress, singing, and prayer—to the celebration of church holy days. The emphasis on the meal and toasts (with wine substituted by ale as a more accessible drink for the northern peasantry) can be viewed as an appropriation of Communion by the peasant household. These traditions never sought to distinguish the sacred or the sacramental from the secular and mundane in the way theologians insisted.²⁶

Because the celebrations were considered inappropriate for the dominant Lutheran calendar, the cohesion they brought was limited to groups that were considerably smaller than the whole of Lutheran or Swedish Christendom. The celebration on St. Catherine's Day, for example, included the slaughtering of a lamb and cooking a special meal of it as a dedication to God.²⁷ Usually the celebrations included psalm singing and prayers. According to various testimonies in the cases in Jääski and Ruokolahti, several villagers celebrated the said saints' days by putting on their best church clothes and drinking special ale toasts with "no strangers or servants but only those born in the house."²⁸ The feast, and consequently, the cohesion, was shared only within the household with blood relations.

A different kind of example comes from the 1646 court records of the parish of Huittinen, concerning the rather remote village of Punkalaidun in western Finland. A group of women were indicted for having held a rosary prayer meeting—or

a "Rosolia"—at a home with the intention of helping a fellow woman in the village whose eyesight was failing. The women had slaughtered a calf and prepared a meal of it with beer on the table. They drank the beer and ate the calf, and they knelt down together to read a sequence of prayers.²⁹ Although clearly different from the Eucharist and again taking place secretly in private farmhouses, this celebration drew on Lutheran teaching on the concept and experience of the meal as a religious integration of humans with the divine and of humans with each other. The communal and shared nature was enhanced by the preparations for the meal, which took days, from slaughtering the sacrificial calf or lamb and brewing the special ale for the feast to cooking the meal in a group. The rituals, as reported by the women in Huittinen, emphasized togetherness, as they sang together, ate together, drank together, and held each other's hands as they knelt for the prayers they recited together. The village women took action as a community to help a woman of their group. This communal nature survived in the court hearings: the women were indicted as a group, and their testimony is recorded as a group, with no names attached to confessions. The record even states that "all the women" thought that their prayers had been answered and that the eyesight of the woman going blind was now better.³⁰

Prayer meals in households and villages were forbidden and investigated by authorities, though punishments were often not as strict as the law would have recommended. The women in Huittinen were cautioned, and the villagers in Jääski and Ruokolahti were sentenced to fines. Nevertheless, such rituals are not wholly outside Lutheran teaching of the time; rather, they can be seen as an extension of the various social and communal aspects of Lutheran teaching on the Lord's Supper. The many forms of Communion in the late medieval church and its lay extensions, such as serving blessed but not consecrated bread to outsiders and the less-spiritually-prepared, or even church ales that were common in northern Europe, persisted through the Lutheran Reformation.³¹ However, the contexts in which lay rituals were shared shifted to smaller and more eclectic communities in contrast to Communion in church. Only certain members of a community took part in Communion-like meals, be it in a household as happened in Jääski or in a village ritual as occurred in Huittinen. This division can be likened to that between clerics who handled and received the eucharistic host and lay nonpartakers who witnessed the elevated host, described by Robert Scribner as participating with a "sacramental gaze."³² These distinctions served to organize the relationship between humans and the divine, but also between an "us" and "them" dichotomy based on family, kin, gender, and status. They also created a hierarchical tension between participants and onlookers. Lay

Communion rituals thus delimited an inner circle of those worthy of sharing the meal and gaining a participatory knowledge from inclusion. Outsiders were kept strangers.

The importance of bloodline and household group to the shared experience of ritual meals may have been especially emphasized because of two specific local features that existed in eastern Finland. First, this was an area of slash-and-burn-agriculture that both needed and could maintain a larger workforce than for field culture, which was dominant in western parts of Finland and Sweden. This generally meant that several generations of brothers with their families resided in one household. The household's success was, to a large extent, dependent on its ability to maintain stable relationships within the family hierarchy, taking into account the division of work within the family and its assets. In this sense, the importance of bloodlines is remarkable: the family was comprised of generations of parents and offspring, but without fully integrating the spouses of offspring. Since women moved to join their husbands' households more often than men to their wives' households, this meant that rituals were experienced in a community consisting mostly of men. Women would give up their birth families and not be able to properly join a similar community in their new homes. Similarly, those who had entered the household by a work contract remained outsiders.³³

Secondly, though the court records never indicate that the defendants in question confessed to any other faith than Lutheranism, some features of these cases suggest an Eastern Orthodox influence: the exclusion of those not considered quite part of a community is reminiscent of the Eastern Orthodox practice of excluding catechumens from the Eucharist until they complete a period of spiritual preparation. Likewise, the households involved had previously set up altars either in the house or on the lands of the estate—the defendants testified that they were abandoned before the court case—which was customary in the Eastern tradition, and non-Lutheran saints like Catherine of Alexandria and St. George, who were celebrated by these defendants, had a prominent place in the Eastern tradition. Since these features could just as well be found in a Roman Catholic setting, and no one in the records suggests that the households in question were anything other than Lutheran, it should be concluded that this was the lived religion of a Lutheran parish that had been influenced by Eastern Orthodoxy during the period when Orthodox and Lutheran populations had spread to the area, competed for power, and lived side by side. The Orthodox population had conclusively moved out only after the War of Rupture or Russo-Swedish War of 1656–58, part of a wider northern war around the Baltic Sea and Poland. During this war, Russian troops perpetrated acts of terror when the areas of Ingria and Kexholm in eastern Finland/Sweden were occupied. Once the

Russian forces were pushed back, the Lutherans took revenge against the Orthodox population that had sided with the Russians during the bloody occupation.³⁴

These events took place on a relatively short timeline, though the frontiers near Russia and Poland had been volatile since the establishment of the Tsardom of Russia in 1547. Yet, the experiences created by these contacts—in peace and conflict—continued to influence lived religion long afterward. The simultaneous remembrance of peaceful coexistence and bloody conflict tinged religious experience with an ambivalent nature that could just as easily unite a group of people as it could set them apart from the larger society. As past recollections were returned to again and again in the process of experiencing Lutheranism within the household or kin community, they coalesced into a cultural structure of expectations and norms in which future forms of experience would take place.

Individual and self-exclusive experiences: Magic and mockery of Communion

Some experiences of Communion—or Communion elements—were not shared even in small groups. In Ulvila in 1634, the parish priest had served extreme unction to a dying woman at her home. Returning to the vicarage, he noticed that two

eucharistic hosts had gone missing from the box where he kept them. After investigation, two women of the dying woman's family admitted that they had stolen the hosts in the hope that they could also benefit from the great power that lay in the vessels of the Lord's mercy.³⁵

The women did not intend to eat Christ's body, however. The daughter of the house's current master intended to sew the host inside her son's frock, because—as she had been assured—it was common knowledge that it would be an efficient protection against fevers and coughs. The daughter-in-law of the master had taken another host with the intention of placing it in a purse to ward off "people's bad wishes," perhaps referring to those she encountered in the in-laws' house. Huittinen is located in the southwestern part of Finland, where field cultivation and smaller households were more common than in the eastern areas described above. However, these events took place in a multigenerational household with multiple married adult siblings and their families, and similar dynamics regarding kin and bloodline existed as in the east. This case shows the experience of a household community from the point of view of those who were not fully integrated.

The case reflected a widespread fear, also present in the Church Ordinance of 1571 and Church Law of 1686, about Communion bread being used for magical purposes. The Church

Law accordingly states that the parish priest was to see that "nothing be dropped or spilled, and if . . . something is left over from the Communion table, such leftovers may not be used for purposes of magic."³⁶ The case is rare, although there are a couple of other cases concerning defendants suspected of taking Communion bread out of their mouths to preserve it for later use—but usually suspects denied any magical intentions.³⁷

The attempt to secretly seek a blessing from the host's contact with the body was an experience that neither woman in the 1624 case in Huittinen was expected or allowed to have. They had privately appropriated—literally stolen—an experience that was reserved only for the priest when handling the eucharistic elements in celebrating the sacrament. The women had committed a religious offense, something forbidden but that nevertheless betrayed a tangible belief in sacred powers operating in everyday life: that hosts protected people from illness and ill wishes. It shows how religion and faith spilled into other spheres of life. There was enough scrutiny to make sure that, despite the secrecy of the women's actions, their experience was policed, albeit not severely punished. The eucharistic bread in the priest's box may not yet have been consecrated, and the women or their advisors could not be proven to have actually gone through with any of their intentions except for taking the hosts. Consequently, although the Cathedral Chapter was informed of the superstition

involved, the women and their advisors were judged not guilty of a crime and set free.

These encounters at Communion were personal and private rather than shared. At least in the case of the daughter-in-law, her experience seems to have marked her as separate from the rest of the community and household. While the practice of seeking a blessing by holding a host near one's body was undoubtedly a culturally shared notion, the experience in itself was thoroughly individualized: it was the individual body that was protected. In the case of warding off the ill wishes of "people," the experience even suggests a degree of consciously setting oneself apart from others when feeling threatened. More importantly, these experiences were—and had to be—intentionally secret: unlike the household or village appropriations of Communion meals discussed above, no one was supposed to know of the hidden hosts, not even members of the same household. These experiences set those involved apart not from outsiders but as outsiders.

Some experiences elicited even more drastic and self-exclusionary consequences, when lay members of the parish were reported to have mocked or misappropriated the Communion rite itself. These cases usually involved people from one household, sometimes also guests, who enjoyed a meal, during which someone—often the household mistress—treated the meal as the Communion rite, reciting the Words of Institution or some

derivative thereof. Sometimes the participants sang hymns and knelt in prayer.³⁸ These cases were prosecuted in the secular courts as blasphemy. Some of these cases were apparently meant to be jokes, while in other instances, according to the defendants, they were more or less genuine attempts to use the ritual for promoting household community. Admitting to a deed but claiming it was a joke was a defense that could be successfully used in a court of law in connection to a variety of cases, from breach of marriage promises (when the defendant claimed that whatever was thought to constitute the promise was actually a joke) to a threat of witchcraft (when the defendant claimed that whatever was understood as a spell was actually a joke). This defense strategy could also be successful in cases of defamation if the defendant immediately apologized for the offending joke.³⁹ It never worked, however, in cases of blasphemy, since blasphemy was, essentially, making a joke of religion. The end result was the same regardless of why the lay Communion had been organized: taking the Lord's name in vain and misusing the Eucharist was punished by the death penalty, which even the Court of Appeal did not overturn, even though it usually showed some leniency toward crimes of superstition. Perhaps this uncommonly severe punishment contributed to keeping such cases rare.

As far as these cases concerned attempts to use the Communion ritual in the household as a sign of faith, they

illustrate an active ownership of religion, albeit a forbidden one. Since at least some of these cases included an element of mockery, treating all of them as examples of lived religion requires caution, at least if lived religion is defined as religion-in-action or the living out of one's faith.⁴⁰ Rather than a sign of personal ownership of devotion, mockery points to a lack of faith in at least some aspects of the rituals that were mocked. The mockers did not accept the mocked things as integral to their own faith; they were an aspect of someone else's faith.

"Lived religion" as a concept has always focused on the ways and degrees to which people managed to live and express their own religion. Even when research concerns a time of oppression or persecution, the focus has usually been on how people expressed their beliefs regardless of pressure. This offers valuable insight into histories of religious resistance, but it can hide from our sight those who were not able to resist—who submitted—and the tensions and struggles related to losing one's religion. Nevertheless, even the specific cases of mockery I have discussed can be treated as experiences of religion. While it may be difficult to "live" a religion one does not share, one can certainly experience other people's religion. Often people were forced to do so. This may concern merely surface experiences of mimicking and following norms or customs one does not believe in, but it may

also include deeper experiences of having one's beliefs or practices condemned, mocked, or replaced by those who are in power. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, these situations sometimes entailed violent persecution and punishment. Often it also included elements of resistance, such as mocking the dominant religion.

Such experience could create cohesion among a minority group, and it could also set a minority group apart from a dominant one. It did not, however, produce the kind of all-encompassing social cohesion or communal hierarchy imagined by the normative script or approved uses of the Communion meal among Christians. These court cases document experiences of a more clearly exclusive nature: the mockery of Communion marked participants' self-exclusion outside the parameters of the authoritative eucharistic rite, and the inevitable punishment for blasphemy confirmed this exclusionary position from the point of view of the larger community.

If the kinds of activities documented in court records are treated as experiences of religion rather than as examples of lived religion, the problem of motives may not be of primary relevance. Whatever the purpose of the rituals—whether mocking Communion and setting oneself outside of the commonly shared religion or sharing in it in terms of an appropriation of the rite—the resulting experience was the same: total exclusion. The women in the court cases I have discussed ended

up alone on the scaffold with an experience that was, in the end, completely out of their control.

* * *

In this study, I have looked at Communion as an experience of shared lived religion in early modern Finland. I have examined church teaching and legal materials on Communion as scripts for approved experience, and I have searched court records for more or less illegal variations of the normative script used in specific situations by various individuals and groups of laypeople. Communion was supposed to be an experience that gave knowledge of the divine to the believer, but also of the believer to the divine: the experience was shared both ways. Through encounters with the divine in rituals like Communion, humans would also gain experience of each other and of humanity at large. By the end of the seventeenth century, the taught or scripted experience of Communion increasingly emphasized the sharedness of Finnish confessional culture, which sought to present itself, with varying success, as the heartland of Lutheranism and the leader of Protestantism. In practice, local conflicts among family and kin limited the scope to which it was possible to share a singularly common experience of Communion. Finally, appropriated Communion rites or the eucharistic elements could also register an opposition to the wider community, even self-exclusion from it, if these

activities engaged in mockery or provided magical protection from the rest of the community.

What this shows, first, is a continuous fluctuation of tension between individuals and the shared realm of experience in the Protestant relationship with God and the importance of the communal in Lutheran experience. Secondly, the article shows that religious experiences were far from uniform or cohesive in early modern culture. The need for cohesive experiences of sharing is among the slow-changing phenomena that progressed across the Reformation. Medieval religious and cultural forms that emphasized the social and communal in Communion persisted through the Lutheran Reformation, although the emphasis shifted. The household and village and kinship and bloodlines were held together and separated from others by these experiences, as happened both in the eastern Finnish household and the western villages. Sometimes individuals hoped that the magic of Communion or at least the eucharistic elements could protect them from the community into which they had little hope of being integrated.

Lutheran experiences of Communion in Finland were also influenced by other religions, as Sweden incorporated Catholic and Eastern Orthodox regions into its realm. Despite these encounters being sometimes short lived, they continued to influence lived religion long afterwards. While the study of lived religion often focuses on continuities, it is here in

examples of variant and even aberrant Communion experience that we may observe how disruption causes change that slowly turns into generational and cultural structures that shape human experience.

Notes

This article has been written with the support of The Research Council of Finland Centre of Excellence in the History of Experience, HEX, (RCoF project no. 352729) and "How Did Seventeenth-Century Finland Manage to Avoid Witch Hunts?" (RCoF project no. 356324). I thank all participants in both HEX Lived Religion seminars and the Early Modern Group at Tampere University History department for comments on this article.

¹ Susan Karant-Nunn, The Reformation of Feeling: Shaping the Religious Emotions in Early Modern Germany (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 3.

² Amy Nelson Burnett, "The Social History of Communion and the Reformation of the Eucharist," Past & Present, no. 211 (May 2011): 77-119, doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtr002; Eamon Duffy, The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400-1580 (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992); John Bossy, "Blood and Baptism: Kinship, Community, and Christianity in Western Europe from the Fourteenth to the Seventeenth

Centuries," in Sanctity and Secularity: The Church and the World; Papers Read at the Eleventh Summer Meeting and the Twelfth Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society, ed. Derek Baker (Oxford: B. Blackwell for the Ecclesiastical History Society, 1973); Euan Cameron, The European Reformation, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 188–93.

³ Mikael Agricola, Rucouskiria Bibliasta (Stockholm, 1544), revised facsimile edition in Mikael Agricolan teokset, 3 vols. (Porvoo: WSOY, 1987), 1:578. Further citations of Rucouskiria are to vol. 1 of this facsimile edition, and translations are my own.

⁴ See Raisa Maria Toivo, Faith and Magic in Early Modern Finland (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 5–9, 141–46.

⁵ For more on the court system in Finland, see, e.g., Jan Inger, Svensk Rättshistoria (Lund: Liber läromedel, 1980), 42–62, 70–71, 80–85; Petri Karonen, Raastuvassa tavataan: Suomen kaupunkien hallinto- ja oikeuslaitoksen toimintaa ja virkamiehiä Suurvalta-aikana (Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 1995), 116–24, 145–47; Raisa Maria Toivo and Liv Helene Willumsen, "A Narratological Approach to Witchcraft Trial Records: Creating Experience," Scandinavian Journal of History 47, no. 1 (2022): 39–61, doi.org/10.1080/03468755.2021.2014953.

⁶ Sari Katajala-Peltomaa & Raisa Maria Toivo: Lived religion and shared experience. Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies 55, no 1 (2025) XXX-XXX; See also Sari Katajala-Peltomaa and Raisa Maria Toivo, "Introduction: Religion as Historical Experience," in Histories of Experience in the World of Lived Religion, ed. Katajala-Peltomaa and Toivo (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2022), 1-35, doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-92140-8; Sari Katajala-Peltomaa and Raisa Maria Toivo, "Three Layers of Experience," in Digital Handbook of the History of Experience (Oct. 11, 2022), doi.org/10.58077/8F3Q-5P34; Ville Kivimäki, Sami Suodenjoki, and Tanja Vahtikari, "Lived Nation: Histories of Experience and Emotion in Understanding Nationalism," in Lived Nation as the History of Experiences and Emotions in Finland, 1800-2000, ed. Kivimäki, Suodenjoki, and Vahtikari (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021), 1-28, doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69882-9. On lived religion, see also Nancy T. Ammerman, "Lived Religion as an Emerging Field: An Assessment of Its Contours and Frontiers," Nordic Journal of Religion and Society 29, no. 1 (2016): 83-99; and Päivi Räisänen-Schröder, "Lived Religion and Anabaptism: Considerations for Future Research," in Reformation and Everyday Life, ed. Nina J. Koefoed and Bo Kristian Holm (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2023), 69-85.

⁷ Ville Kivimäki, Antti Malinen, and Ville Vuolanto, "Communities of Experience," Digital Handbook of the History of Experience (Jan. 16, 2023), doi.org/10.58077/PXX2-ER19; Selina Todd, "Class, Experience, and Britain's Twentieth Century," Social History 39, no. 4 (2014): 489–508, doi.org/10.1080/03071022.2014.983680.

⁸ Joan Scott, "The Evidence of Experience," Critical Inquiry 17, no. 4 (1991): 773–97; Gareth Jones, "Une autre histoire social?," Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales 53, no. 2 (1998): 383–94.

⁹ Agricola, Rucouskiria, 578: "Ota siis Herra Laupiain Ise pois minulda caiki wäryteni ja syndini sen päälle ette mine mieleste ja sydhemeste pudhastettuna madhasin otolisesta maijsta pyhedhenpyhe ja lajna ette se pyhe sinun Rumis ja weres cokemus ionga mine epekeluotoin aijon otta olis minun Syndeni andexiandamus ia olis ricosteni teudhelinen pudhatus olis heijudhen aijtosten pelatos ja hywein tundoind wsisyndymys ja sinulle kluelisten töidhen woima ja myös minun sieluni ja rumini liuja wariello wastoin minun wiholisein wäghytyxije." I have translated the word "laina" (or Lajna) in the above text as a loan, which is its' literal meaning. I will explain the meaning for spiritual experience of communion in later in the article.

¹⁰ Researchers have counted the prayers differently, as sometimes Agricola merged prayers from different sources, while at other times he seems to have divided a prayer from an original source into two parts in his compilation. See Juhani Holma, "Sangen ialo Rucous: Schwenckfeldiläisten rukouskirja Mikael Agricolan lähteenä" (Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto, Ph.D. diss., 2008), 33.

¹¹ Jaakko Gummerus et al., Mikael Agricolan Rukouskirja ja sen lähteet (Helsinki: Suomen kirkkohistoriallinen seura, 1955); Holma, Sangen ialo, 33 ff.

¹² The identification of Agricola's source material is by Gummerus, Mikael Agricolan Rukouskirja, 354-55. Some of Gummerus's identifications have been revised since their publication, mostly regarding prayers from Erasmus of Rotterdam's and the Schwenckfeldian prayer books but also regarding individual prayers here and there. See, Simo Heininen, Mikael Agricola ja Erasmus Rotterdamilainen (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2006); Holma, Sangen ialo; and for further information, see Simo Heininen, Mikael Agricolan Uuden testamentin reunahuomautukset (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2023), 13. There were numerous editions of Hortulus Anime, both in Latin and German, that were different from each other. See Stefan Matter, "The Hortulus animae—An Archive of Medieval Prayer Book

Literature," in Vernacular Books and Their Readers in the Early Age of Print (c. 1450-1600), ed. Anna Dlabáčová, Andrea van Leerdam, and John Thompson (Leiden: Brill, 2023), 91-108, doi.org/10.1163/9789004520158_005. According to Gummerus, Agricola borrowed from several editions, this prayer from a Latin version printed in Nurnberg in 1519. The corresponding quotation from Hortulus Anime in Latin (according to Gummerus) reads: "Aufer ergo a me clementissime pater omnes iniquitates et peccata vt purificatus mente et corpore digne degustare merear sancta sanctorum: et concede vt sancta prelibatio corporis et sanguinis tui quam ego indignus sumere intendo: sit peccatorum meorum remissio: sit delictorum perfecta purgatio: sit turpium cogitationum effugatio: bonorumque sensuu, regeneratio: operumque tibi placentium salubris efficacia: anime quoque et corporis contra inimcorum meorum insidias firmissima tuitio."

¹³ Agricola, Rucouskiria, 91. See also Kotus: Kotimaisten kielten keskus [Institute for the Languages of Finland], Vanhan kirjasuomen Korpus: Agrigola [Corpus of Old Literary Finnish], at https://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/vks/meta/agricola/agrilrkl_rdf.xml, [A-I-090] , A-I-116: "Sijs salaa ia iulki neite hoge . ettes saijsit sen Armon coke." [A-I-090] and "Ja annaijs Lakia mielelem ia ehdolam racasta / ia vaatimat hywisse töisse

achkerat olla / nin / ette me saijsima elä omasatunnosa /
mureheta ia rauhasa / waica elemen pidheis / taica cokeman /

[A-I-116]". Citations of this dictionary reference sigla standing for Finnish-language works that may be found listed at kaino.kotus.fi/vks/?p=references#lahteet.

¹⁴ "Tesse wisista tutan ia coetan Isen hyue tacto meiden tygen". Agricola, Rucouskiria; Vanhan kirjasuomen korpus, A-I-831.

¹⁵ "Ja quinga tosin hen itzestens eij mikä ole / Ette hen mös sijttenki itzens tundis / Ja hylkäis sen luultawan Lain wanhurscaudhen / ia coettelis / quinga hen tyhije ombi / sijtä oijkeasta wanhurscaudhesta / cosca hen tasoitta henens nijhin / ioijta Laki anopi / [A-I-116]" Agricola, Rucouskiria, 91; Vanhan kirjasuomen korpus, A-I- 116.

¹⁶ Agricola, Rucouskiria, in Vanhan kirjasuomen korpus Vanhan kirjasuomen korpus, A I, 566: "ioca wlco siselde tesse ia caukana coettele minun munaskwni."

¹⁷ Agricola, Rucouskiria, in Vanhan kirjasuomen korpus A-I-533 and A-I-548: " Ele mös meite coetuxehen eleke kiusauxehen wie [A-I-553] and "ettes heite kyllle cokenut / neurittenyt [A-I-548]

¹⁸ See Christfried Ganander, Nytt Finskt Lexicon, a facsimile edition of an unprinted manuscript from 1787, 3 vols. (Porvoo, 1937-1940), s.v. kokemus; Vanhan kirjasuomen sanakirja, s.v.

kokemus, kokea, Alm 1785, B4b: quotation "Joka halajaa tietä saadansa, kuka mullan-lai hänen peldo-maasansa on waldijana, taitaa ja tulee tehdä samaa kokemusta."

¹⁹ Sven Kjöllnerström, ed., "Den Svenska Kyrkoordningen 1571," in Den Svenska Kyrkoordningen 1571: Jämte Studier Kring Tillkomst, Innehåll Och Användning, ed. Kjöllnerström (Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Förlag, 1971), 84-85; "Kircko-laki ja ordningi 1686," in Kircko-Laki ja ordningi 1686—facsimile, ed. Lahja-Irene Hellemaa, Anja Jussila, and Martti Parvio (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 1986), §VII; Cameron, European Reformation, 175-79; Miia Kuha, Pyhäpäivien vietto, varhaismodernin ajan Savossa (vuoteen 1710) (Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 2016), 60-90; Raisa Maria Toivo, "Kilpailu pyhän tilan kokemuksesta," in Kirkko, Papisto ja Yhteiskunta, 1600-1800, ed. Ella Viitaniemi (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2023) 182-210, doi.org/10.21435/ht.289.

²⁰ Kjöllnerström, "Den Svenska Kyrkoordningen 1571," 86; "Kircko-Laki ja ordningi 1686," §XI.

²¹ Kjöllnerström, "Den Svenska Kyrkoordningen 1571," 92, 93; "Kircko-Laki ja ordningi 1686," §III-V.

²² The quotation is from Helsinki, National Archives of Finland (hereafter NAF), District Court Records, Ala-Satakunta I KO a 6, fol. 148r (Huittinen, Aug. 30-31, 1624): "brukar läseband och gammel Påwesck willfarelse." See Anu Pylkkänen, Puoli

Vuodetta lukot ja avaimet: Nainen ja maalaistalous oikeuskäytännön valossa (Helsinki: Lakimiesliiton kustannus, 1990), 248; Raisa Maria Toivo, Witchcraft and Gender in Early Modern Finland (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 108-9; Toivo, Faith and Magic, 72-73; Toivo, "Kilpailu pyhän tilan kokemuksesta," 199-200. For corresponding ideas elsewhere in Europe, see, e.g., Burnett, "Social History of Communion" 87-88.

²³ NAF, District Court Records, Jääski, Ranta ja Äyräpää II KO a 3, fols. 227r-29r (Jääski, June 2-3, 1686).

²⁴ E.g., Anu Mänd, Pidustused keskaegse Liivimaa linnades, 1350-1550 (Tallin: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus, 2012).

²⁵ Marko Nenonen, Noituus, taikuus ja noitavainot: Ala-Satakunnan, Pohjois-Pohjanmaan ja Viipurin Karjalan maaseudulla, 1620-1700 (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 1992), 71-72; Veijo Saloheimo, Savon historia II, 2: Savo suurvallan valjaissa, 1617-1721 (Kuopio: Kustannuskiila, 1990), 528-29; Toivo, Faith and Magic, 110-11, 133-36.

²⁶ See Stephen Ozment, The Reformation in the Cities: The Appeal of Protestantism to Sixteenth-Century Germany and Switzerland (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1990), 116-20; Lee Palmer Wandel, The Eucharist in the Reformation: Incarnation and Liturgy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Susan Karant-Nunn, The Reformation of Ritual: An Interpretation of Early Modern Germany (London: Routledge,

1997, repr. 2007), esp. 89–131; Bodo Nischan, Lutherans and Calvinists in the Age of Confessionalism (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1990).

²⁷ NAF, District Court Records, Jääski, Ranta ja Äyräpää II KO a 3, fols. 227r–29r (Jääski, June 2–3, 1686).

²⁸ NAF, District Court Records, Jääski, Ranta ja Äyräpää II KO a 3, fol. 183r (Ruokolahti, Feb. 18–20, 1689).

²⁹ NAF, District Court records, Ala-Satakunta I KO a 6, fol. 192v (Huittinen, Nov. 16–18, 1646).

³⁰ NAF, District Court records, Ala-Satakunta I KO a 6, fol. 192v (Huittinen, Nov. 16–18, 1646).

³¹ Bridget Heal, "Sacred Image and Sacred Space in Lutheran Germany," in Sacred Space: The Redefinition of Sanctity in Post-Reformation Europe, ed. Will Coster and Andrew Spicer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 39–59; Karant-Nunn, Reformation of Ritual, 116–20; Burnett "Social History of Communion," 99, 117–18.

³² "Sacramental gaze" is a term coined by Robert Scribner in "Popular Piety and Modes of Visual Perception in Late-Medieval and Reformation Germany," in Religion and Culture in Germany, 1400–1800, ed. Lyndal Roper (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 113–17; and see Burnett "Social History of Communion," 88–96.

³³ See Kirsi Sirén, Suuresta Suvusta Pieneen Perheeseen: Itäsuomalainen Perhe 1700-luvulla (Helsinki: Suomen historiallinen seura, 1999).

³⁴ See George Maloney, A History of Orthodox Theology since 1453 (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland, 1976); Jaroslav Pelikan, The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700), vol. 2 of The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975); Kimmo Katajala, Suurvallan Rajalla: Ihmisiä Ruotsin ajan Karjalassa (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2005); Toivo, Faith and Magic, 112-40.

³⁵ NAF, District Court Records, Ala-Satakunta I KO a 3, fol. 354r-v [in the newer numbering system, 322r-v] (Ulvila, Nov. 28-30, 1634). A similar case using hosts for curing an illness—with a rather more somber result than in the Ulvila case—may be found in District Court Records, Pohjanmaa KO a 25, fols. 42v-45v (Oulu, Feb. 26-28, 1680); fols. 46r-51v (Oulu, Mar. 30, 1680); fols. 152v-54r (Oulu, June 21-23, 1680).

³⁶ "Kircko-Laki ja ordningi 1686," §X.

³⁷ See Nenonen Noituus, taikuus ja noitavainot.

³⁸ There is a cluster of four such cases in the Court of Appeal in Turku. The first case indicates that the participants mocked the eucharistic rite, but in the others Communion is

treated more as a superstitious practice. Nevertheless, in each of the cases the participants were given a death sentence, which the Court of Appeal upheld. See Stockholm, Riksarkivet, winter session in the Counties and Baronies of ÖsterNorlanden 1665, n.p. (look for Henrik Mattson). This is the only instance in which the Court of Appeal record actually mentions that defendants mocked Communion. The other cases mention misusing Communion; see winter session in ÖsterNorlands Province 1669 for Count Claus Tott, County of Carleborg, n.p. (look for Karin Henrichsdotter); winter session in ÖsterNorlands Province 1669 for Mr. Gustaf Paikels, Barony of Wöröborgh, den 26 maij., n.p. (look for Karin Henriksdotter and Karin Sigfredsdotter); fall session in ÖsterNorrland 1669 for the heirs of Gustaf Bonde, Barony of Laihela, den 26 Novembris, n.p. (look for Katarina Bengtsdotter, Laihia). For eastern Finland, see Kuha, Pyhäpäivien vietto, varhaismodernin ajan Savossa, 119-27; and Miia Kuha, "A Parody of the Church Service in Seventeenth-Century Finland: Reconstructing Popular Religion on the Basis of Court Records," Frühneuzeit-Info 23, no. 1-2 (2012): 99-104, which documents a case that also was clearly a parody.

³⁹ Mari Välimäki, "Poikien, äitien ja isien toimijuus Perheenjäsenten reaktiot pojan esiaviolliseen suhteeseen 1600-luvun Ruotsissa," Ennen ja nyt-Historian tietosanomat 20, no.

3 (2020): 24-42, doi.org/10.37449/ennenjanyt.88656; Toivo, Witchcraft and Gender, 49, 92.

⁴⁰ See Toivo, Faith and Magic; and Katajala-Peltomaa and Toivo, "Introduction: Religion as Historical Experience"; and Ammerman, "Lived Religion as an Emerging Field."