

Funerary Customs Among the Nobility of Swedish-Era Estonia: Status Signifiers Displayed During Funeral Processions and Their Placement in Churches

Veikko Varik

University of Tartu, School of Theology and Religious Studies,
Ülikooli 18, 50090 Tartu; veikko@ut.ee

Abstract. Most of the Swedish period church interiors in Estonia have lost a significant part of their former richness of detail over the past three hundred years. Whether the cause is wars or natural disasters. Therefore, relatively little secular memorabilia has been studied so far. This article tries to give an overview of this type of object on the basis of archival material, old photographs and individual surviving objects. The fleeting insight into the funeral customs associated with the use of these objects at funerals showed that Estonia was connected to the Swedish-Finnish cultural space and the cultural diffusion took place between these two regions. At the same time, the differences between the Lutheran and other denominations in the use of secular memorabilia stand out clearly.

Keywords: *Pompa funebris*; *Kürasirer Reuter*; *Wappen-epitaph*; armorial bearings; funeral armour; funerary hatchment; funeral flag; Swedish-era Estonia

Funerary customs of specific social groups in the early modern period in Estonia have been relatively little studied, due to which our knowledge of these traditions is likewise fairly scarce. Above all, Baltic German and Swedish scholars have led the way in terms of studying the funerary customs practiced by the local nobility and burghers in the early modern period. The most important studies to date were overviews based on archive materials, written by Gustav Oskar Fredrik Westling (1850–1926)¹ and Rudolf Adam Winkler (1855–1917)², and a source publication by Eugen Johann Alexander von Nottbeck (1842–1900)³. The general conclusions they drew and the supporting factual material they presented at the turn of the twentieth century remain generally unchanged until today.

During recent decades, the study of Baltic German funerary culture more broadly, including customs in the early modern period, has once again become salient. That's why the last quarter-century has brought a number of studies to public light. Only two of these works include new information or new interpretations. Of the Estonian authors, Sulev Mäeväli is the only one to have published a thorough paper on the topic.⁴ Although in regard to seventeenth century customs, his work is likewise built on works of the abovementioned authors, he has done some additional interpretation of the content of the document published by Nottbeck and added new material on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, thus making it possible to examine changes in the development of the customs over a longer period.

Based on the report on costs of the funeral of Baron Konrad Uexküll-Güldenband and earlier Baltic German writings, Arnulf von Ulmann has analysed and interpreted seventeenth century funerary customs among the local nobility in the context of the broader European cultural space.⁵ In the course of his research, he highlighted a number

- 1 G. O. F. Westling. *Meddelanden om den kyrkliga kulturen i Estland under det svenska väldets tid: kyrkohistorisk studie*. [Rob. Sahlins boktryckeri], Sundsvall, 1896; G. O. F. Westling. *Mittheilungen über den kirchlichen Cultus in Ehstland zur Zeit der schwedischen Herrschaft. Kirchengeschichtliche Studie. – Beiträge zur Kunde Ehst-, Liv- und Kurland, 1900, 5, 270–303; G. O. F. Westling. Von den religiösen und sittlichen Zuständen in Estland (1561–1710). – Beiträge zur Kunde Ehst-, Liv- und Kurland, 1900, 5, 333–352.*
- 2 R. Winkler. *Aus den Jugend- und ersten Amtsjahren des Oberpastors am Dom zu Reval Christoph Friedrich Mickwitz: geboren den 18. Januar 1696, gestorben den 20. März 1748*. A. Mickwitz, Reval, 1908; R. Winkler. *Zur Geschichte der Domkirche und der Domgemeinde während der letzten 25 Jahre schwedischer Herrschaft in Estland*. A. Mickwitz, Reval, 1913.
- 3 E. von Nottbeck. *Eine Rechnung über Begräbniskosten aus dem 17. Jahrhundert. – Beiträge zur Kunde Ehst-, Liv-, und Kurlands, 1900, 5, 386–388.*
- 4 S. Mäeväli. *Mõnda matusekommetest Tallinnas 17.–19. sajandil. – Tallinna Linnamuuseumi aastaraamat 1996/97. Teaduste Akadeemia Kirjastus, Tallinn, 1997, 126–144.*
- 5 A. von Ulmann. *Mit „Pracht und Prahl“. Leichenbegängnisse in Estland. – Jahrbuch des baltischen Deutschtums 2006. Carl-Schirren-Gesellschaft e. V., Lüneburg, 2005, 22–52;*

of parallels and connections between early-modern-period funerary practices in countries ranging from France to Sweden and attempted, by use of analogy, to give meaning to more of the details found in funeral expense reports. Compared to the authors mentioned above, Ulmann has more thoroughly pondered the nature and significance of practices of using coats of arms, flags, armour and horses in the funeral ceremony. Later writings have not added noteworthy new data; rather, they are combinations of the descriptions, interpretations and conclusions found in the writings of Westling, Winkler, Mäeväli and Ulmann. However, in the process of translation, rephrasing and adding characterisation, the later writings have at times gone beyond the original hypotheses and assumptions to make firmer statements. Due to their lack of novelty from the standpoint of the present research, however, I will forgo a more detailed analysis of these works.⁶

The abundance of armorial bearings⁷ in churches, including in Estonia, has been dealt with frequently. In contrast, historiography pertaining to Estonia makes practically no mention of the suits of armour and flags that were mounted in churches, and which can be seen on a number of photographs of the interior of St. Nicholas' church taken before World War II.

In an inventory of St. Nicholas grave slabs (2002), Mari Loit cites an excerpt from the St. Nicholas' church book, set forth not in the most accurate fashion in the Nottbeck and Neumann work⁸, regarding the flags of Tiesenhausen's forebears⁹ in the church. Presumably relying

A. von Ulmann. Mit Pracht und Prah. Leichenbegängnisse des 17. Jahrhunderts in Estland. – Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte im Baltikum. (Studien zur Kunstgeschichte Kurlands, 24). Hg. v. L. O. Larsson. M.C.A. Böckler-Mare Balticum-Stiftung, Kiel, 2008, 85–96.

- 6 In summary, the current approach is seen in Merike Kurisoo's texts in the 2013 exhibition catalogue and Krista Kodres's overview article from 2017. See *Ars moriendi* – suremise kunst: näitus Niguliste muuseumis 02.11.2012–02.06.2013 = *Ars moriendi* – the Art of Dying: Exhibition in the Niguliste Museum 02.11.2012–02.06.2013. Catalogue texts by M. Kurisoo. Eesti Kunstimuuseum, Tallinn, 2013; K. Kodres. Trüüst ja mäle(s)tamine: matuserituaal ja memoriaalkunst varauusaegses Eestis. – Kroonikast epitaafini. Eesti- ja Liivimaa varauusaegsest haridus- ja kultuurielust. Toim. K. Kaju. (Rahvusarhiivi toimetised, 1 (32)). Rahvusarhiiv, Tartu, 2017, 437–465.
- 7 Starting from Heinz Loeffler, these items in old Livonia have generally been called “armorial epitaphs” (*Wappenepitaph*), and the German equivalent of funerary hatchment (*Totenschild*, “death shield”) has also been used in parallel. In the area under study, the word “epitaph” meant a pictorial epitaph. Some Swedish authors also use the term “mortality coat of arms” and generally “funeral achievement”. In my article, I have preferred the use of hatchment, i.e., a funeral coat of arms, and also “armorial bearing” as the most general terms. See H. Loeffler. Die Grabsteine, Grabmäler und Epitaphien in den Kirchen Alt-Livlands vom 13.–18. Jahrhundert. Verlag der Buchhandlung G. Löffler, Riga, 1929.
- 8 Cf. M. Loit. Tallinna Niguliste kiriku hauaplaatide kataloog. Manuscript, Tallinn (The Niguliste Museum), 2002, 4; E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. Geschichte und Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt Reval. Bd. 2, Die Kunstdenkmäler der Stadt. Lfg. 2, Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revals. Franz Kluge, Reval, 1899/1902, 163.
- 9 Der Kirchen St. Nikolai Todten-Buch (Grabsteinbuch), TLA.31.1.88:[232]; Denkelbuch der St. Nicolai-Kirche, TLA.31.1.142:91

on the same source, Loit reports on the existence of a flag and armour at Jürgen von Essen's burial site in St. Anthony's Chapel.¹⁰ This was followed by an general statement by Jüri Kuuskemaa (2005): "Knight's armour, flags and weapons were sometimes placed next to the coats of arms."¹¹ Ulmann (2006) has dealt with a majority of the items described by Nottbeck and Neumann that were brought into the church during funerals and which symbolised noble status, and later (2008) attempted to determine the background of the imitations of two knight's helmets found in Tallinn Cathedral.¹² Drawing on Ulmann's article, Kurisoo also described these objects in the catalogue of an exhibition held at Niguliste Museum (2013).¹³ Pia Ehasalu has called the funeral flag one of the various forms of sepulchral art alongside the funerary hatchment, grave monument, grave slab and picture epitaph.¹⁴ She does not mention suits of armour, other knight-related paraphernalia or imitations of them thereof specifically fashioned for funeral ceremonies. That amounts to practically all of the information found in research literature on flags and armour located in Estonian churches. However sparse, it does suggest quite a diverse wealth of material.

With all this in mind, I set the aim of at least partially filling the gap in knowledge as to the practices of placing nobility status symbols in sacral buildings, relying on, above all, documents in archives as well as old photos and extant artefacts. A secondary goal of this research was to put hitherto little discussed groups of objects into historical context. I also devoted attention to both the changes in the practice of customs during the period of Swedish rule in Estonia (1561–1710) and the origin and antecedents of the customs. It also examines how specific local characteristics are marked in the context of funeral customs among the nobility.

10 Cf. M. Loit. Tallinna Niguliste kiriku hauaplaatide kataloog, 2, 4; E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revels, 83.

11 J. Kuuskemaa. Memoriaalkunst: Vappepitaafid. – Eesti kunsti ajalugu 2. Peatoim. K. Kodres. Eesti Kunstiakadeemia, Tallinn, 2005, 412.

12 A. von Ulmann. Mit Pracht und Prah, 94, 95.

13 There is no reference in the catalogue but the Ulmann article in question is listed in the bibliography. The use of the article as a source points to a repetition of a factual error (pertaining to monograms on helmets) in the catalogue. Cf. *Ars moriendi*, 82, 83; A. von Ulmann. Mit Pracht und Prah, 94, 95.

14 P. Ehasalu. *Sub specie aeternitatis*. Varauusaegne epitaafmaal Eesti luterlikus kirikus 16.–17. sajandil. – Kunstiteaduslikke uurimusi, 2004, 14, 3–4, 11.

SUITS OF ARMOUR, FLAGS AND ARMORIAL BEARINGS IN ESTONIAN SACRAL INTERIORS

In looking for information that would help us to obtain an overview of funeral armour, weapons and flags in Estonian sacral interiors of the early modern period, it turned out that even though there are relatively few extant artefacts in churches today (2022), a surprising amount of diverse information can be found on these items from various sources. Apart from individual extant hanging hooks and corbels there are contemporary documents in both original publications and source books, as well as descriptions, drawings and photographs on no longer extant objects.

On the basis of documents on St. Nicolaus and St. Olaf's Church income in the seventeenth century, I prepared a table on the memorabilia used in funeral processions and thereafter placed in church buildings (see Appendix 1). The goal is to point out, in a case-by-case manner, the general trends over the century in question through the dynamics of development.

Given the generally laconic records kept by people of that era, it is unfortunately not always unequivocally clear what was meant by the record keeper. The word *Waffen* causes the most problems. It should mean weaponry (including protective armour) but often the same spelling is used to denote the word for coat of arms (*Wapen*). For example, the context of the notes in the St. Nicholas' inventory list would give reason to believe that a shield, and not armour, was mounted in the church in memory of *Oberstleutnant* Adolph Friedrich von Taube, though the word *Waffen* was used.¹⁵ Where there is doubt, I have provided a comment in the footnote and table.

In the course of the research, I succeeded in finding data on 17 cases from the 1600–1721 period, when armour (or individual pieces of armour), impressions of armour, or weapons were placed in a place of worship in memory of the deceased. Some form of documentary record has survived to the present day regarding 13 of these items. In addition, eight instances where flags and 21 cases where hatchments were mounted in sacral interiors immediately after funerals have been documented. In addition, there are some documentary references that do not directly substantiate an item being placed in the church but at least show that

¹⁵ Denkelbuch ..., TLA.31.1.142:107.

the item was used in the funeral procession. The three groups described overlap only partially (see table).

The first of two suits of armour whose mounting in a church is substantiated by both an extant image and a contemporary written document was located on the southern wall of St. Nicholas's chancel, which was renovated in the mid-nineteenth century.¹⁶ The suit of armour belonged to the *Oberst* and *Landrat* councillor Johan von Rechenberg, who was buried on [20] April 1651 (table pos. no. 9).¹⁷ Based on the context, the word *Waffen* in the funeral entry – “*wor Waffen Harnisch und Pferde*” – can be interpreted either as an adjunct to the word for “armour” or it may refer to a sword added to the armour, since previously¹⁸ Rechenberg's epitaph had been mounted on the church walls and no record has been found of his coat of arms. Some ten years later, a hatchment in memory of Baron Hans Heinrich Tiesenhausen¹⁹ was mounted in the immediate proximity of Rechenberg's memorabilia. Although a coat of arms, epitaph and armour were used to enshrine the memory of various noblemen, they make up an integral set due to the fact that they belong to the same burial site (no. 4).

The other suit of armour photographed in St. Nicholas hung on the northern wall of the north-western vaulted area of St. Anthony's Chapel.²⁰ At the turn of the twentieth century, nearly the entire wall was covered with the Essen memorabilia (with the exception of the Hochgreve hatchment²¹). The existence of the armour was mentioned by Nottbeck and Neumann²² and, through them, by Loit and Ulmann²³. In Ulmann's opinion, it is no longer possible to determine whether the armour is connected to a specific family since the coats of arms have been removed from their original position on the church walls.

16 Photo: Otto Kletzl / Richard Hamann-Mac Lean, Bildarchiv Foto Marburg: Bilddatei-Nr. fm150692, (1940); Bilddatei-Nr. fm150694 (1940); UT Library, Art history photograph collection: A-94-534.

17 Grabsteinbuch ..., TLA.31.1.88: 29.

18 Probably between 1640–1643. See Ehst- und Livländische Brieflade. Eine Sammlung von Urkunden zur Adels- und Gütergeschichte Ehst- und Livlands, in Uebersetzungen und Auszügen, (Abt. 2, Bd. 1). Hg. v. E. Pabst; R. v. Toll. Kluge u. Ströhm, Reval, 1861, 475, 525.

19 E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revels, 87.

20 UT Library, Art history photograph collection: B-94-567.

21 Nottbeck and Neumann report it belonged to a judge named Hochgreff who was the owner Hüüru and Kuivaveski manors and who died at the age of 76. Thus, it is plausible that the coat of arms belonged to Blasius [II] Hochgreve. See E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revels, 83; Restitutionsakten. West-Harrien. Band II, RA, EAA.854.2.2320.

22 Nottbeck and Neumann say it was located close to the hatchment of Gotthard Wilhelm v. Essen (1676–1730). E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revels, 83.

23 M. Loit. Tallinna Niguliste kiriku hauaplaatide kataloog, 2; A. von Ulmann. Mit Pracht und Prahl, 94.



Figure 1. Funeral armour of *Rittmeister* Jürgen von Essen on the wall of St. Anthony's Chapel. Unknown author, 1930s. UT Library, Art history photograph collection: B-94-567

I do not share Ulmann's opinion. Although several suits of armour hung in the chapel according to the 1678 inventory list,²⁴ I believe that the affiliation of the three-quarter armour (*trabharnisch*) can indeed be identified as it was mentioned in the 19 January 1657 funeral entry of *Rittmeister* (cavalry officer's title) Jürgen, son of the owner of Esna Manor Alexander von Essen.²⁵ It was mounted in the vicinity of the burial chamber (no. 170) constructed a few years earlier by Alexander. A noteworthy element in the funeral entry was mention of flags being simultaneously brought into church and that the entry does not mention an armorial bearing.

Although St. Nicholas' Church was heavily damaged in the 9 March 1944 bombing of Tallinn, both the Rechenberg and the Essen suits of armour are at least partly extant, having been deposited with the Tallinn City Museum from 1947 as an anonymous cavalryman's armours. The first of these was already lacking the helmet by the time it was registered by the museum. It is currently on display in that form (2022) in the Neitsitorn, a branch of the City Museum. The Essen armour, survived in more complete form, is deposited to the Narva Museum.²⁶

Apart from St. Nicholas' and St. Olaf's Church, there are also incidental data – contained in lists of funeral costs – on status signifiers used in funerals held at the Cathedral. The oldest and, thanks to

24 The entry in the St. Nicholas' inventory list from 1678 could mean that in addition to half armour on display; there were also three full suits of armour on the same wall. (3 *gantz* und ein *halb harnisch*). One of them could have been part of a set of objects mounted by the grave of Salomon Rabe (see table pos. no. 12). (Denkelbuch. ..., TLA.31.1.142:107; Grabsteinbuch. ..., TLA.31.1.88:[178].)

25 Grabsteinbuch. ..., TLA.31.1.88:[208].

26 I established this in comparison with a suit of armour depicted in photos from prior to 1940 and displayed in Narva (2021).

publication, best-known is the list of expenses for Baron Konrad von Uexküll-Güldenband. Two entries are devoted to suits of armour. The first indicated that 18 talers had been paid to recondition armour and the other shows that heirs paid 4 talers for *dem Kürasirer Reuter zu Handschen, Sporen und Hut*.²⁷ The first key detail here is the use of the term “cuirassier”-rider (*Kürasirer Reuter*). A similar Swedish-tinged word was also used in the funeral entry for Jürgen Essen: “...*die fahnen und Cüritz henget...*”.²⁸ Considering the content of the term (see below), the use of this sort of cavalryman at a nobleman’s funeral in Estonia can be considered to be documentarily proven. The other noteworthy aspect is the amount of the payment. The low amount²⁹ may point to heirs having spent the money to purchase or hire old, used items.³⁰ Of course, there is also the theoretical possibility that the pieces were ordered as new (or as imitation) from some metal worker. Presumably the price of new items would have been much higher, though. In addition to this, it should be borne in mind that the list of Uexküll-Gyldenband funeral expenses usually records the payment to the corresponding artisan (*Maler, Bildschnitzer, Buchdrucker* and others). In this case, there is no such reference, so I tend to support the hypothesis of using “scrap metal” for assembling funeral armour.

The changes in tactics and weaponry in the great wars of the seventeenth century had a direct effect on cavalymen’s equipment. Three-quarter and half-armour, which had supplanted full armour, became useless in the second half of the century and by the turn of the eighteenth century, only the new type of helmet and the cuirass remained. This fact also led to changes in the practices used for memorialising knights. The list of funeral expenses for field marshal Baron Fabian Fersen (d. 1677) likewise contains three notes (in the expense list no. 75–77) on expenses for status symbols. A pair of gilded spurs was purchased for four talers, and the same amount was spent on a copper for helmet, with five talers spent on a gilded sword from Riga.³¹ We do not see gauntlets in this list, which does not however mean that there were none – the list of expenses included only items that were lacking in the first place.

27 E. von Nottbeck. Eine Rechnung über Begräbnißkosten, 387, 388.

28 Grabsteinbuch. ..., TLA.31.1.88: [208].

29 Kodres believes that the expenditure on the items in question and repairing the armour (22 talers) was a large sum. K. Kodres. Trööst ja mäle(s)tamine, 444.

30 The use of the hired items for a cuirassier has been noted by Engström. See A. Engström. Oliktetens praktiker. Adlig begravningskultur i Sverige ca 1630–1680. (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Historica Upsaliensia, 266). Uppsala Universitet, Uppsala, 2019, 83, 84.

31 This, too, was probably a used weapon. Verzeichniss der Beerdigungskosten, Schulden etc des seeligen Feldmarschal Baron Fabian von Fesen. Copie, RA, EAA.858.2.734: (page not numbered).

After all the list also does not mention a helmet, but solely copper (e.g. possibly for repairing it). Based on the fact that the purchases listed were among the last made and that one of them was made in Riga, it can be supposed that the spurs were acquired in Tallinn. It is quite likely that the listed items were placed not in the tomb after the interment, but on top of the field marshal's catafalque shape monument, and that they remained there until the Cathedral fire of 1686. For the funeral of Major General, Baron Johann Andreas von der Pahlen, gauntlets and spurs were ordered for 30 talers.³² This, too, points to the fact that there was no need to purchase an entire set.

When Johann Naha visited Reigi Church ca 1940, he had the opportunity to photograph, among other relics, a sword and a breastplate bearing the monogram of Queen Ulrika Eleonora.³³ The items possibly belonged to Captain Erasmus Jacobsen's burial site, being displayed in analogous fashion to Erik Olofsson Öberg's cuirass and sword in Husby-Långhundra Church. At the same time, the items may not have formed a set. For example, next to the funerary hatchment of Baron Bernhard Reh binder (d. 1705) in Vehmaa (Finland) Church, only a sword is on display.³⁴ Jacobsen had been a tenant of Kõrgessaare Manor and had become a church warden by 1696. He died in 1725.³⁵ No other tenant is known there between the years 1696 to 1726.³⁶

A kind of innovation introduced to the status-related attributes include two partly gilded helmet-like items extant in Tallinn Cathedral. They are symbolic knight's helmets (imitations). The collar panel (*corget*) of both helmets bears a monogram that assists in dating the helmet. Ulmann³⁷ and Kurisoo³⁸ consider one of them to belong to Carl X Gustav while they interpret the letter combination "BE" as the monogram of the deceased. However, they err in the latter determination – both are in fact royal monograms, as is indicated by the crown that appears above

32 Akte betreffend die Beerdigungskosten des im Sturm verunglückten Johan Andreas von der Pahlen, seiner Frau und seines Sohnes, RA, EAA.854.2.1521: [11].

33 J. Naha considers this monogram to belong to Swedish King Kristiine. See J. Naha. Hiiumaa vanemate ajalooliste ehituste, kunstivarade ja kultuurilooliste mälestusmärkide inventariseerimise katse [Mapp 52. Hiiumaa, kd. I A-3569 (1920–1944)], l. 23 [26], s. 122.66, n. 2, f. 5025. Muinsuskaitse arhiiv Tallinnas (Archive of the Department of National Heritage Board). ERA-T.76.1.11013.

34 A legend regarding the latter is that it was a gift to the baron from Carl XI.

35 Pastor Georg Handwig und die Erben der vormaligen Prediger auf Dagden contra die Erben der seligen Frau Christina Löwing der auch seligen Hauptmanns Erasmus Jacobsen Witwe ..., RA, EAA.858.2.1505.

36 Akte betreffend das Eigentumsrecht, die Verpachtung und den Zustand der Güter. Band X, RA, EAA.854.2.2226.

37 A. von Ulmann. Mit Pracht und Prah, 95.

38 *Ars moriendi*, 82, 83.

the initials.³⁹ The helmet with the monogram of Carl XII – two Cs in mirror image – was probably among the memorabilia and funeral items for field marshal Otto Wilhelm Fersen, who died in 1703 and was buried in Fersen’s Chapel (formerly Burt’s Chapel) in the Cathedral. The same is true of the funerary hatchment set in the same chapel. Evidence for this belief is provided by the Nikolai Nyländer photograph⁴⁰. It is unknown at the current stage of research whose funeral ceremony the other non-functional “helm” bearing the monogram consisting of a U and an E was connected to. The fact that Ulrika Eleonora reigned for quite a brief period – 5 December 1718 to 29 February 1720 – should somewhat facilitate identification of the deceased in future, though.

As mentioned by Nottbeck, the following was hung in St. Nicholas by the funerary hatchment for *Oberstleutnant* Paul Johan von Bremen: “... ein vergoldeter Spangenhelm, desgl. Handschube und Sporen.”⁴¹ The items were related to the Bremens’ burial site (no. 142), which had been acquired only in the early 1690s.⁴² Some old photographs⁴³ nevertheless do support the assumption that at least the helmet, which is similar in form to the imitation of helmet that could be found in the cathedral, may have been made by the master of the helmet with the monogram of Carl XII.

Flags are mentioned in funeral entries almost as infrequently as armour. Often they comprised, along with armorial bearings, integral

39 The monogram of Carl X Gustav was a C and G next to each other, or a smaller G set inside the C. (Compare an engraving depicting the funeral of Carl X Gustav (Jean Le Pautre’s engraving according to drawing by Count E. Dahlberg) and the obverse of coins forged in during his reign in Tallinn.) Ulmann’s discussion reveals that the reason for the confusion is a mistaken interpretation of the C in the monogram, where it is mistaken for a G in the engraving. In the case of the other monogram, scholars failed to notice the royal crown and letter U. This monogram actually consists of the letters U and E and was that of Queen Ulrika Eleonora (see for example the queen’s monogram on the obverse of a 1-ducat gold coin minted in 1719–1720).

40 Published: S. Mäeväli, E. Tromp. Tallinna toomkiriku epitaafid = Die Wappenepitaphe der Tallinner Domkirche = Epitaphs of the Tallinn Cathedral. Tallinn: Pakett, 2008, 46.

41 E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revels, 84.

42 Nottbeck and Neumann as well as Sten Karling (with reference to them) have mistakenly said that the Bremen coat of arms was made in 1636. This is not borne out by either the position of the coat of arms – it belonged to a tomb acquired in early 1690 – or by the style of the carving. Nor do Baltic German genealogical reference books list an *oberstleutnant* Paul Johan v. Bremen as having died that year. But it is known that the Paul Johan by whose tomb the hatchment was mounted was born in Riga on 16 December 1636. Bremen’s date of birth is given by the above authors as 5 February 1592. This is very similar to the date of Paul Johan’s death – 5 February 1692. Cf. E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revels, 83, 84; S. Karling. Holzschnitzerei und Tischlerkunst der Renaissance und des Barocks in Estland. (Õpetatud Eesti Seltsi toimetised, 34). Õpetatud Eesti Selts, Tartu, 1943, 313; Genealogisches Handbuch der baltischen Ritterschaften: Teil Estland. Bd. 1–3. Im Auftrage des Verbandes des estländischen Stammadels bearbeitet von O. M. von Stackelberg. Verlag für Sippenforschung und Wappenkunde C. A. Starke, Görlitz, 1929–1931, 8.

43 UT Library, Art history photograph collection: B-94-547; B-94-3327; EFA. 98.0-29203.

groups of memorabilia.⁴⁴ Unlike armour, of which there was always one piece present for a given funeral, flags could be numerous at a gravesite on the occasion of a funeral, depending on their function. For instance, ancestors' flags are mentioned in addition to a single large flag by Detlof Tiesenhausen's grave in St. Nicholas' Church ("... *seine Adelich fahnen und Ahnen alarüber auf wichten Lasen.*").⁴⁵

The largest group of flags from the seventeenth century hanging in the vicinity of interment sites in sacral buildings was by the turn of the twentieth century preserved in St. Anthony's Chapel in St. Nicholas' Church. Two of them were in the northern part of the western wall of the south-eastern vaulted area of the chapel and two were on the northern wall.⁴⁶ One of the latter two was also mentioned by Nottbeck, with Neumann.⁴⁷ The flags on the western wall presumably made up a pair and were introduced to the chapel at the same time in connection with the funeral of Rötger Tiesenhausen⁴⁸ on 4 March 1652.⁴⁹ The notation in the church book also refers to the flags being brought into the church. Burial site no. 168, where the body was interred, belonged to the church back then, but this was not an obstacle to placing flags.

Nottbeck and Neumann have mentioned a flag being located to the left of the hatchment of Anton Philipp von Saltza (1611–1680).⁵⁰ They did not however provide more detailed information about its affiliation. The old photographs⁵¹ show that one flag indeed was located to the left of Saltza's coat of arms, located to the west of the second window along the southern wall of the nave. It is possible that this was Johan Derfelden's memorial flag, the extant part of which is now in the collection of the Tallinn City Museum. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that the extant mounting corbel for this flag was located quite near the Derfelden's burial site (no. 127) in the south wall of the church.⁵² Moreover, the extant part of the flag coincides significantly with the shape of the flag that can be seen in the photograph published by Nottbeck and Neumann.⁵³ According to these authors, the flag (*Fahne des Bremen*)

44 Heinz Loeffler already mentioned that flags of mourning were hung next to hatchments in churches. H. Loeffler. *Die Grabsteine, Grabmäler und Epitaphien*, 94.

45 Presumably, W. Neumann and E. v. Nottbeck also provided an approximate rewording of this comment. (Cf. *Grabsteinbuch. ...*, TLA.31.1.88:[232], *Denkelbuch. ...*, TLA.31.1.142:91 and E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. *Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revels*, 163.)

46 UT Library, art history photograph collection: A-94-561.

47 E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. *Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revels*, 83.

48 *Genealogisches Handbuch der baltischen Ritterschaften: Teil Estland*, 409, 410.

49 *Grabsteinbuch. ...*, TLA.31.1.88: [206].

50 E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. *Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revels*, 86.

51 *Ibid.*, 69; Photo: brothers Hans and Jaan Christin, TLM: F.7770:3 [before 1900].

52 *Nikolaikirche. Verschiedene Akten*, TLA.230.1.Bl16.

53 E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. *Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revels*, photo 37.



Figure 2. Funerary flags and hatchments in St. Anthony's Chapel, St. Nicholas' Church prior to the late 1920s. Unknown author, 1930s. TLA.1465.1.5985⁵⁴

was also among the aforementioned memorabilia of P. J. Bremen.⁵⁵ It can be supposed that insofar as it was one of the newer ones found in the church in the late nineteenth century, it may have been possible back then to decode whom it memorialised. As to whether the information was verbal or pictorial (heraldic emblem), this is not known, unfortunately.

Flags were presumably also found in the Cathedral. Nevertheless, solely indirect references survive regarding their potential existence. The list of Uexküll-Güldenband's funeral costs includes an expense for the flag material, and also a fee for constables (*Constabeln*) to carry the two great flags and for boys (*Jungen*) for another large flag and an undefined number⁵⁶ of smaller flags. Looking at analogous items⁵⁷, the one great flag and multiple small flags could be interpreted as the flags of the deceased and his ancestors. The other great flags could be flags of mourning.

⁵⁴ In the Estonian Archival Information System (AIS), the photograph has the title "Toomkirik, vaade altarile" (Cathedral, view of the altar).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 84.

⁵⁶ As 4 talers was the sum paid for carrying smaller flags, there is a widespread opinion that four small flags were carried. But this is not the case. See S. Mäeväli. *Mõnda matusekommetest Tallinnas*, 128; K. Kodres. *Trööst ja mäle(s)tamine*, 444.

⁵⁷ For example, in the vicinity of the monument of Henrik Claesson Fleming buried in Mүнämäki Church on 31 August 1651, there were, in addition to armour, sword and coat of arms, also 14 flags with ancestors' coats of arms, plus two large black-bordered flags. Armours were hanged at grave of *rittmeister* Falkenfelt (d. 1704). See T. Tuhkanen. *Hyveellisen miehen ikuinen kunnia. (43–52) – Auraica. Scripta a Societate Porthan edita*, 2009, 2, 45; H. Pirinen. *Luterilaisen kirkkointeriöörin muotoutuminen Suomessa. Pitäjänkirkon sisustuksen muutokset reformaatiosta karoliinisen ajan loppuun (1527–1718)*. (Suomen muinaismuistoyhdistyksen ainakauskirja 103). Vammalan Kirjapaino OY, Vammala, 1996, 67, 68, 132.

We also know that the list of funeral expenses for Baron Fabian von Fersen included payment of a fee for the manufacture of six mourning flags (*die Traurfahnen*) and six embroidered fief flags (*die Lehn fahne zu sticken*).⁵⁸ Although the field marshal had died in Malmö, his body was interred at Tallinn (St. Mary's) Cathedral (burial site no. 35). The funeral ceremony was quite lavish and it is unlikely that the expensive coats of arms and flags ordered from Sweden went unused in the Estonian-based rituals. However, they could have been damaged in the fire that occurred just ten years or so later and were presumably removed from the church already in the seventeenth century.

The ravages of time have made it nearly impossible to study the design of flags related to seventeenth century Estonian funerals. Most of them were destroyed in one or another church fire. All of the flags in St. Nicholas' Church, like the hatchments, were removed from the walls no later than the second half of the 1920s. Most were moved to St. Anthony's Chapel. Presumably this took place at the same time as the removal of funeral coat of arms from the Cathedral. While the coats of arms were returned to the walls of the church some time later, the flags remained in storage because of their poor condition. Two of them ended up in the collection of the Tallinn City Museum among the possessions of the Black Heads' Club. Nothing is known of the later fate of the flags that were in St. Anthony's Chapel. It is quite likely that they were destroyed in a fire in 1944.

Based on the data found in the course of research, only the memorial flag, painted on fabric, for Herman Zoega (1651) and Johan Derfelden (1658) are extant, along with the staff⁵⁹ and a relatively small fragment of a flag of the same type in Martna Church, which was dedicated to the memory of an as yet unidentified person (Löven?)⁶⁰. Judging by the fragments of all three extant flags, the design was often the following: in the middle, the coat of arms of the deceased was painted, and below, analogous information regarding the status and dates of birth and date of the deceased was inscribed on the hatchment's text plaque.⁶¹ This also points to the flag of this type and coat of arms having an overlapping function.

58 Verzeichniss der Beerdigungskosten, RA, EAA.858.2.734: (page not numbered).

59 Both flags are in the collection of the Tallinn City Museum. (TLM 5870/a-b H395; TLM 5869/a-b H394 and Grabsteinbuch. ..., TLA.31.1.88: [159], [222]; Surmajuhtumite registreerimise raamat, TLA.236.1.29: 402).

60 H. Peets. Tekstiilide konserveerimisest Eestis. Tekstiilide toestamine – Renovatum. Anno 2010, 12.

61 Derfelden's flag also had the following text: *Anno 1658. den 6 January Ist der HochVollbl] gebobrn// Gestrenger. Vester und Ma[nnh]after HER: Johan von// Derfelden auff Leu[te]l ...] Weltz Erbgesesse[r]// Ge[w]ese[n]er Manrichte[r...]m der Werke in G[...]m// Herren*



Figures 3 and 4. Left: The console that supported R. von Tiesenhausen's funerary flag after the removal of the flag. Right: believed to be the mounting console for the Derfelden funerary flag along with the surrounding embedded mounting eyelets and hooks. Photos: V. Varik (2021)

Not a single embroidered flag is known to be extant in Estonia. Only based on their Swedish counterparts can we get some idea about their design. Considering the fact that the only known embroidered flags were made in Sweden, this may be a perfectly valid parallel to draw.

On the basis of the few extant data, it can be said that a flag intended for installation in church generally had one characteristic quality, its fabric was intended right from the outset to hang from a rod horizontally projecting from the wall. An ordinary flag meant for outdoor conditions required the rod to be vertical. Thus, the fabric of the flag meant for installation in a church was at a 90° angle with regards to the usual orientation.⁶² This in turn permits the conclusion that existing flag fabrics could not be used; rather, they had to be manufactured specially for a funeral. This fact should make it easier to identify this type of flag in later research.

Indications as to the positioning of flags in the church interior are provided by the extant wrought-iron flag corbels embedded in the wall. There were at least seven of them in St. Nicholas' Church in the early twentieth century. Old photographs show the hole behind them in the masonry, which was the second anchor point for the horizontally fastened flag staff. The St. Nicholas' flag corbels fall into two categories: simple and less simple. The wrought-iron corbels in the vicinity of the

entschlaffen [S]eines al[te]rs ins 54te Jahre// Dero Seelen Gott gned[i]g seyn Wolle.

62. Cecilia Candréus made the same observation regarding flags located in Sweden. See C. Candréus. *De hädangångnas heraldik: en studie av broderade begravningsfanor ca 1670–1720*. Gidlund, Hedemora, 2008, 35.

Poll and Buxhöwden coat of arms in the western wall of St. Anthony's Chapel take the simpler form. More complex in shape are the ones in the chapel's north wall and the one in the segment of wall between the first and second window in the south wall of the nave. However, the differences in form can't be used as a basis for dating them, since one of the more basic wrought iron elements was from 1652; and the more intricate one, from 1657. The shape of the 1692 funeral flag corbel could not be determined based on the material I used. Yet the extant corbels do appear to vary markedly from the later wrought iron ones, which were part of the Admiral Greigh monument.⁶³

After the 1820 fire in St. Olaf's, a few drawings were made of the burnt interior, which are factually accurate with one of them showing the wrought iron elements that had supported the flags. They were quite similar in form to the ones in St. Nicholas' Church and were located on the northern pillar of the chancel, the one that was closest to the altar.⁶⁴ This drawing could be the only extant visual confirmation of documentary evidence, showing that the items installed in St. Olaf's were a set of at least two flags, coats of arms and armour, one in memory of Philip Scheiding (buried 26 February 1647) and the other in memory of *Landrat* Arend Metstacken (buried 25 February 1650).⁶⁵

Documents and artefacts prove that the funeral armour, weapons and flags from the mid-seventeenth century were found in at least three of the four Tallinn churches used as burial sites by the nobility. But that was not all. Such objects were also found in the rural congregations. One suit of armour, with helm (Est. *raudrie raudkübaraga*) hung on the wall next to the altar in the chancel of the old church building in Rapla, according to pastor Carl Eduard Malm, and was said to have belonged to the lord of Alu and Rapla manors, Hans von Wrangell⁶⁶. This, however, is not all that plausible.⁶⁷ But there is reason to believe that it was the same armour that, according to the recollections of Helmut Maandi, was later in the Rapla cemetery chapel, along with hatchments⁶⁸.

63 EKLA, f 192, m 174:11(M.A): [6]; EKLA, ÕES, MB 58: [126].

64 [K. J. E. von Ungern-Sternberg]. Interieur der St. Olaikirche nach dem Brande des 16-t Juni 1820 [1821].

65 Surmajuhtumite registreerimise raamat, TLA.236.1.29: 366, 382.

66 C. E. Malm. Rapla kirik Harju maal. Rapla kogudusele mälestuseks. Lindworsi pärijad, Tallinn, 1868, 11.

67 Alu Manor was owned in 1647–1667 by the *Landrat* councillor and Baron of Luua Hans v. Wrangell, who died in summer 1667 and was buried in Tallinn Cathedral on 2 March 1668; next to his spouse who probably predeceased him. H. v. Wrangell owned burial site no. 63 there. It is extremely unlikely that he was re-interred in Rapla Church or that memorabilia hung by his burial site there were later taken to Rapla. (Restitutionsakten. RA, EAA.854.2.2320; Surmajuhtumite registreerimise raamat, TLA.236.1.29: 387, 525, 530.)

68 Heino Maandi believes the suit of armour belonged to Baron Toll, without providing more detailed explanations for this. See H. Maandi. Mälestusi Raplast: Kuidas talurahvas mattis

The other nobleman's armour was said to have been hanging on the wall of Pärnu-Jaagupi Church as late as the early twentieth century; although the location was outside the boundary of the Estonian Governorate, it was still within Tallinn's area of influence.⁶⁹ It had been removed from the church by 1934.⁷⁰ Its owner has also not been determined as of this stage of research, but since here, too, a hatchment is mentioned in conjunction with armour, perhaps it will help to identify the armour's owner. True, in local oral history, both items – the armour and the coat of arms – have become hopelessly entangled and thus it is impossible to decide on the extent of completeness of the armour.⁷¹ According to Martin Körber (1915), a helmet, spurs, [breastplate] and sword also hung in Muhu Church next to Heinrich Knorring's coat of arms.⁷²

The fact that funerary flags were found outside Tallinn, in rural congregations, is indicated beside the documents also by a fragment of flag cloth found in Martna and the two consoles on the north wall of the chancel of Kaarma Church.⁷³ While the affiliation of the Martna flag needs deeper analysis, the Kaarma flags probably belonged to the Berg family, as decided by the description of an extant hatchment and its old location. They already owned a grave site by the north wall of the church chancel in the mid-seventeenth century.

Quite a few different opinions have been voiced regarding the number of the hatchments mounted in churches. For instance, Jüri Kuuskemaa contends that the total number of the extant hatchments is less than 200 (107 are in Tallinn Cathedral) and that "the nobles' armorial epitaphs were located in all parish churches".⁷⁴ Citing the Mäeväli and Tromp work, Krista Kodres has said that 109 armorial epitaphs were extant in the Cathedral.⁷⁵ I have succeeded in gathering

oma surnuid. – Eesti Päevaleht = Estniska Dagbladet, 56 (4244), 27.07.1977, 7.

69 Pärnumaa: maadeteaduslik, tulunduslik ja ajalooline kirjeldus. Toimetajad: A. Tammekann, J. Köpp, E. Kant. Eesti Kirjanduse Selts, Tartu, 1930, 472; N. N. Pärnu-Jakobi kirik 400-aastane. Pühaku auks ehitatud kirik andis hiljem nime terwele kihelkonnale. – Maa Hääl: maarahva ajaleht, no. 93, 10.8.1934, 3.

70 N. N. Mälestuslauleht P. Jakobi kiriku 400 a. juubeli puhul. 1534–1934 12. augustil. H. Laane trükikoda, Pärnu, 1934, 9.

71 KJ I 47 (39). Manuscript: E 21890/1 (19) < Pärnu-Jaagupi, Vee v. – J. Reitvelt (1895): "There is yet another image next to the altar on the right side: a suit of armour carved from wood, shield, gauntlets, helm, bugle, sword, spear, pistol and many other small forms."

72 "... zur Seite des Wappens Hut, Sporen, Tasche und Degen." M. Körber. Oesel einst und jetzt., Bd. 3: Die Kirchspiele Mohn, St. Johannis, Karmel, Kergel, Karris und Runö, von dem Verfasser der "Bausteine zu einer Geschichte Oesels". Typographie des Arensburger Wochenblattes, Arensburg, 1915, 6.

73 A monograph on Kaarma Church does not discuss them, unlike, for example, the "candle pipes" fastened to the wall. See T.-M. Kreem, K. Markus, A. Mänd. Kaarma kirik. (Eesti kirikud, 1). Muinsuskaitseamet, Tallinn, 2003.

74 J. Kuuskemaa. Memoriaalkunst: Vappepitaafid, 412.

75 S. Mäeväli, E. Tromp. Tallinna Toomkiriku epitaafid. EELK Tallinna piiskoplik

data on 168 early-modern-period hatchments or hatchment sets with ancestral escutcheons in the churches of the Estonian Governorate. There are about 120 extant hatchments, 50 of them in the Cathedral.⁷⁶ For comparison, it should be said that the number of hatchments in Sweden is estimated at about 2000⁷⁷ (of which 1078 date to the period 1580–1709⁷⁸). In Finland, the number of extant hatchments is estimated at about 400. A total of 161 extant hatchments were counted and registered in 2017 in the territory of the former Turku bishopric from the period 1630–1712⁷⁹. As for Livonia, a somewhat smaller number of such hatchments⁸⁰ are known than in the Estonian Governorate areas. A noteworthy share of these were made in the post-Great Northern War period, and among them there are dozens of hatchments for burghers. Only a few hatchments are known in Courland and this category is nearly non-existent in East Prussia⁸¹. Nor is there information from Saaremaa regarding any hatchment originating from the period of Danish rule.

toomkogudus, Tallinn, 2013; K. Kodres. Trööst ja mäle(s)tamine, 449.

- 76 The noteworthy difference between the figures stated by Kuuskemaa and Kodres stems from the different definition of hatchment. I do not consider it correct to describe as independent objects either the ancestral escutcheons that are part of a hatchment (*Abnenvapen*: 27 in the Cathedral; Kuuskemaa calls them little armorial epitaphs, Tallinn Cultural Antiquities Department (compiler); Tallinn: Estonian Evangelical Lutheran Church Tallinn Cathedral Congregation, [2002], [17])) or “family trees” (6 in the Cathedral) or that they should be counted as hatchments belonging to cenotaphs created in the nineteenth century. In the Estonian art historiography corpus, donor coats of arms that were originally attached to church interiors and later removed are sometimes referred to as armorial epitaphs. See for example the National Register of Cultural Monuments: 28229 Margaretha Rosenstrale vapp-epitaaf, 17. saj. (puit, polükroomia); Pühakodade säilitamine ja areng 2014–2018. Compiled by A. Randla and S. Sombri. Muinsuskaitseamet, Tallinn, 2019, 148, 150, 151, etc.
- 77 I. von Corswant-Naumburg. Huvudbanér och anvapen under stormaktstiden. Ödins Förlag, Visby, 1999, 11.
- 78 A. Engström. Olikhettens praktiker, 316.
- 79 C.-T. von Christerson. Huvudbaner med anvapen i Finland. (432–457) – Historisk Tidskrift för Finland, 2017, 102, 3, 432, 433.
- 80 There is no comprehensive study on funerary hatchments in the Latvian part of Livonia and Courland. Data on their onetime existence can be found above all in the Johann Christoph Brotze collection kept by the Latvian University academic library (*Sammlung verschiedener Liefländischer Monumente, Prospecte, Münzen, Wappen etc.*). They have also been mentioned in overview works compiled regarding Riga churches. I have succeeded in identifying 117 hatchments in Livonian churches based on the mentioned sources and writings about escutcheons. About 1/3 of them are from the period following the Great Northern War. Naturally, these are not final figures. For example, according to Arend Buchholtz, about 70 hatchments are said to have been removed from the walls of Riga Cathedral in 1782. (A. Buchholtz. Denkmäler im Dom zu Riga. W. J. Häcker, Riga, 1885, 2, 3.)
- 81 Such a category of object is not even motioned in an overview work about East Prussian wood carving art. This in spite of the fact that alongside altars, chancels, baptism rooms and galleries, all other ways of marking graves are mentioned ranging from grave slabs to epitaphs, suspended commemorative signs and memorial plaques. Nor are funerary hatchments seen in photos of the church interiors of this region. See A. Ulbrich. Geschichte der Bildhauerkunst in Ostpreussen vom Ausgang des 16. bis in die 2. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts, Bd. 1: Vom Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts bis in die Zeit von 1685 bis 1725 mit Einleitung über die gotische Kunst und die Renaissancezeit. Gräfe und Unzer, Königsberg, [1926]; A. Ulbrich. Geschichte der Bildhauerkunst in Ostpreussen vom Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts bis in die 2. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts, Bd. 2: Vom Ende des 17. bis in die

As the number of hatchments was large compared to other status-related memorabilia and the practice of displaying them in church as long-enduring, armorial bearings are certainly worthy of separate research. In this article, I deem it necessary to mention only a few characteristic facts related to the organisation of nobles' funeral rites in the seventeenth century and the display of armorial bearings in funeral procession and sacral interiors.

An entry in a record book by St. Nicholas' Church warden Jobst Dunte (1603) concerning hanging of coat of arms in church has become a veritable classic of art historiography.⁸² This entry is interesting for four aspects – a) escutcheons were found in the church in 1603 at the latest⁸³, b) the escutcheon lacks a liturgical edifying function, c) the system of payment for displaying the symbol in church had not developed yet⁸⁴, and d) the opinion of the church warden that even though such symbols lacked any importance from the Church's perspective, they could be displayed in the Church if the Church was paid for it (d.). One conclusion that could be drawn from the entry might be that insofar as the remuneration system had not been developed, the custom of mounting armorial bearing in churches could not have been all that old and may have been introduced in Estonia at the turn of the seventeenth century.

Many prints from that era show that the escutcheon of the deceased was borne in the funeral procession. There is, more or less, consensus among scholars that the escutcheon of the deceased was carried in the funeral procession in front of the coffin, and later mounted on the

zweite Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Königsberg: Gräfe und Unzer, Königsberg, [1929].

82. *Anno 1603, Man soll keinen edelleuten vergünstigen, ihre Wappen in der Kirchen auszuhanen, es sey denn das sie der Kirchen davor gerecht werden, denn wess ist der Kirchen mit ihren Wappen gedienet, wenn die Kirche nichts davor haben soll, es ist ein schlechter Ziradt und iben eine grosse hoffardt.* (Transcribed by Gotthard von Hansen) (Anno 1603. It should not be permitted for any noble-born man to hang their coats of arms in church unless they give to the church what is the church's due, for what benefit could a church reap from these coats of arms if the church does not get anything for it; [thus] it is a bad habit and [only] for them a great hope.) See G. von Hansen. *Die Kirchen und ehemaligen Klöster Revals*. Lindfors' Erben, Reval, 1873, 17; E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. *Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revals*, 52; H. Loeffler. *Die Grabsteine, Grabmäler und Epitaphien*, 93; J. Kuuskemaa. *Memoriaalkunst: Vappepitaafid*, 412; A. v. Ulmann. *Mit Pracht und Prah*, 87; T.-M. Kreem, T. Kröönström, I. Aaso-Zahradnikova, H. Hiio, A. Randle. *Christian Ackermann – Tallinna Pheidias, üilbe ja andekas. Eesti Kunstiakadeemia*, Tallinn, 2020, 77, 78.
83. As to when the custom in Estonia started and ended, there are as yet no scientific explanations or hypotheses. For instance, unlike Kuuskemaa's opinion, that coats of arms were hung in churches in 1603 at the latest, Kodres says the shield-epitaphs began to be hung in churches "from the close of the seventeenth century thenceforth". See J. Kuuskemaa. *Memoriaalkunst: Vappepitaafid*, 412; K. Kodres. *Tiööst ja mäle(s)tamine*, 449.
84. According to von Ulmann's hypothesis, nobles did not pay remuneration for coats of arms as a result of successful lobbying to that effect. See A. von Ulmann. *Mit Pracht und Prah*, 87.

church's wall or pillar.⁸⁵ References to cases that provide documentary evidence for this assertion in Estonia have thus far been lacking. The table annexed to this article includes 21 cases where a comment is made in the funeral report or inventory regarding an armorial bearing (*Wapen, Waffen, Schild*) being immediately or planned to be mounted in a church interior. A recent monograph on Christian Ackermann also reproduces an agreement commissioning a hatchment and makes reference to another one.⁸⁶

Confounding expectations, the practice of using hatchments was not uniform over the entire period of several hundred years. The material used in the research highlighted a nuance that shows the dynamics of the changes. The earlier period (up to about the mid-1650s) is characterised by the bringing of the coat of arms into church on the funeral day even where not many days separated the time of death and the funeral. In the case of later funerals, the coat of arms was installed after some delay. The lack of records on payment of remuneration in the funeral reports appears to show that the armorial bearing was not ready by the date of the funeral rites and there was no original desire expressed to install it in church or the church authorities had not yet been notified of such a desire. A similar delay in bringing a bearing into church was documented in detail in connection with the funeral of lieutenant Hanß Mohrenschildt on 8 February 1676. An additional 10 *rikstalers* was paid only on 13 March to mount his hatchment in St. Nicholas' Church.⁸⁷ A long period between death and funeral was not always a determining factor in the preparation of the hatchment. For example, the armorial bearing within Jürgen von Essen's (d. 23 June 1655, f. 19.1.1657) set of memorabilia was not mentioned in the funeral report, even though there is no doubt that it existed.⁸⁸

The main reason for a delay in mounting armorial bearings lay above all in the longer time it took to fashion intricately ornamented works⁸⁹, and the fact that their weight made it cumbersome to carry in

85 Brotze's notes include a remark about this, where he refers to something heard from elderly people. (A. Buchholtz. Denkmäler im Dom zu Riga, 23, 24.) See also Tallinna toomkiriku vapppeitaafid. Texts by J. Kuuskemaa. EELK Tallinna Toomkogudus, Tallinn, [2002], 2; C. Candréus. De hädangängnas heraldik, 25; J. Kuuskemaa. Memoriaalkunst: Vapppeitaafid, 412; *Ars moriendi*, 126; K. Kodres. Trööst ja mäle(s)tamine, 444, 449; A. Engström. Olikhetens praktiker, 113.

86 T.-M. Kreem et al. Christian Ackermann, 190.

87 Grabsteinbuch. ..., TLA.31.1.88: [32].

88 Currently located in an exhibition in St. Nicholas' Art Museum. Nottbeck and Neumann have recorded his date of death as 1653. See E. von Nottbeck, W. Neumann. Kirchliche Kunst. Die Grabsteine Revels, 83.

89 It should be remembered that after the carvings were completed, the hatchment was sent to a painter, whose work was often valued higher than the carver's. Metal additions were then made by a smith and finally a mason handled the mounting process.

the funeral procession.⁹⁰ In parallel to the delays, there were changes in the structure of the bearings. Instead of the previous single support bar to support an escutcheon, it now took a more substantial system and the scheme of the fastenings embedded in the masonry also changed. Instead of two metal eyelets on top of each other, eyelets or hooks next to each other were introduced, sometimes even a three-point fastening. There was also a period of several decades when flags tended to be brought into churches at the same time as, or even in lieu of, the armorial bearing (from 1647–1661, according to the table). Truth be told, the coats of arms introduced into Estonian churches after the 1650s cannot really be considered explicitly funerary objects. In the second part of the century, they had merely become a form of memorial plaque.

The use of status symbols in Estonian Governorate also had a clear social dimension. Both the titles on the objects and the documents show that armours (both real and symbolic ones), flags and funerary hatchments were used only by nobles.⁹¹ Even among nobility these elements were used to a limited extent – there is no evidence that they were used at the funeral of female persons. In the case of male minors, the use of symbols other than funerary hatchment is not known, and even in this case, there was no helmet and gauntlets in the composition of hatchment.

STATUS-RELATED SYMBOLS IN THE FUNERAL PROCESSION AND CEREMONY: ANTECEDENTS

I would concur with Kodres's generalised position that signifiers of class played an important role in the ceremonial behavioural patterns of the nobility.⁹² Treatments of status symbols can be found in a number of different *Adelspiegel*-type works published in various courts of rulers.⁹³ Based on a number of literates from antiquity and his own

90 In the course of the hanging of hatchments on the wall of the cathedral following conservation, the press was told that the heaviest ones were up to 400 kg. A. Alas. Toomkirikusse paigutati viis uuendatud vappi – Eesti Päevaleht, 21 January 2003.

91 Here we see a big difference from the Livonian part of Baltic region. The funerary hatchments of the burgers appeared in the churches of Riga already in the 1680s, and in the eighteenth century they formed the vast majority of new ones.

92 K. Kodres. Trööst ja mäle(s)tamine, 444.

93 See for example B. de Chasseneuz. *Catalogvs gloriae mvndi, lavdes, honores, excellentias, ac praecminentias omnivm fere statvum. Per Dionysium de Harsy, Lyon, 1529*; M. Wagner, M. Von des Adels ankunfft Oder Spiegel: Sampt zweien Ritterlichen Adelichen Geschlechtenn. Kurtzer auszug aus vielen Antiquiteten. Magdeburg, 1581; C. Spangenberg. *Adels Spiegel. Historischer Ausfürlicher Bericht: Das Adel sey und heisse,*

time, Spangenberg described funerary customs among the nobility in chapter 10 of part II of the work in question. Of German customs, he writes the following: “We Germans have the custom, ... and the horse is left to the church or given to the pastor, or replaced in friendship with money. In many places, their corpses are furnished with helmet, suit of armour or greatcoat; sword, spurs, gauntlets or the like.”⁹⁴ Of customs related to the funeral of the last in a bloodline, he highlights the destruction, graveside, of the shield and signet ring. Spangenberg’s description allows conclusions to be drawn solely regarding a specific funerary ritual.⁹⁵

Yet funeral customs varied substantially in the details from one region to another. The differences pertained to the deceased’s specific confession and also stemmed from local tradition. The flow of time should also be considered when discussing nuances – customs were known to change over time in a given region. This is illustrated by a close look at one relatively short segment of the procession, between the casket and the deceased’s coat of arms⁹⁶ in the case of different funerals.

Judging by prints and descriptions of the day, the customs in Calvinist Low Countries and Catholic Central Europe were markedly different to the traditions in Lutheran Northern Europe. This is in spite of the widespread belief that the print graphics of the Low Countries had a dominant, standard-setting influence across the entire European cultural space. Going by descriptions from the era in question, there were more differences than similarities between customs in Calvinist areas and Lutheran Sweden. To name just a few, cavalymen in armour are not encountered in most seventeenth century funeral processions in the

Woher erkomme, Wie mancherley er sey, Und Was denselben ziere und erhalte, auch hingegen verstelle und schwäche. Michel Schmück, Schmalkalden, 1591; C. Spangenberg. *Ander Theil des Adels Spiegels. Was Adel mache befördere ziere vermehre und erhalte: und hinwider schwäche verstelle und verringere. Darinnen auch am Adler und sonst durch vielfeltige und mancherley Veranung und Warnung in Spruchen und Exempeln ein schöne Regentenspiegel.* Michel Schmück, Schmalkalden, 1594.

94 “*Bey uns Deutschen ist der brauch,... und mitbescharret wird das Pferd fellet der Kirche oder dem Pfarherrn anheim, oder wird von der Freundschaft mit Gelde wider abgelöset. An etlichen orten wird iren Leychen auch ir Helm, Brustharnisch oder Kriegsmantel, Schwerdt, Sporen, Handschuch, ect. fürgetragen.*” (Spangenberg (1594), 287)

95 It is impossible to trace stages of the funeral ritual in the customs described in part II of the publication cited by Kodres (1594), and these stages could correspond to the ritual stages derived from the list of Baron Konrad v. Uexküll’s funeral expenses, as she believes. But, as the title of the work indicates, it is a detailed historical overview (*Historischer Ausfürlicher Bericht*) of various customs in different times and places. Nor does the work describe the antecedents from antiquity they were based on; rather, Spangenberg refers in describing the customs of the contemporary nobility to a work by Barthélemy de Chasseneuze (1480–1542), *Catalogus gloriae mundi* (1529). Cf. K. Kodres. Tröst ja mäle(s)tamine, 444; Spangenberg (1594), 287, 287p.

96 Engström has called this the most intimate/personal part of the procession. (A. Engström. *Olikhetens praktiker*, 128)

Low Countries.⁹⁷ True, in some cases a walking knight in armour could fulfil the same symbolic role.⁹⁸ Only in the eighteenth century did the knight on horseback tend to find use in funeral processions of the Low Countries.⁹⁹ There were also differences in the use of the mourning horse usually covered in a black caparison with white cross¹⁰⁰ (*Trauerpferd*, *Leibpferd* or *le Cheual de Deuil*¹⁰¹) and battle steed usually bedecked in flags, coats of arms (*le Cheval de Service* or *le Cheval de Secours*¹⁰²), as well as the way in which status symbols were displayed in church and in the form of the hatchments. This method of exposition used in Low Countries, which can be seen from prints, starting from the close of the sixteenth century, is substantially different of method used in both the Swedish–Finnish cultural space and the customs rooted in Estonia. The Estonian memorial practice did not involve the use of stands attached to the walls of churches that allowed the mounting of sword, helm, gauntlets and spurs in an arrangement around the deceased’s coat of arms. On the other hand, such assemblies were found abundantly in the Low Countries starting from the second half of the sixteenth century.¹⁰³

It has sometimes been asserted that the early modern period funeral processions for the highborn were modelled after¹⁰⁴ the cortege of Emperor Karl V in Brussels.¹⁰⁵ In the funeral procession for the Duke of Parma, Alexander Farnese, who died on 2 December 1592, the rider at the fore of the casket, similar to the funeral of the emperor, bore the duke’s

97 See for example the funerals of admiral Jacob van Heemskerck (1607), Maurice, Prince of Orange (1627), Frederick Henry, Prince of Orange (1647), Abraham van de Velde (1677), Hendrik Adriaan van Rheede (1692), etc. William Frederick, Prince of Nassau-Dietz, at whose funeral (1665) a mounted knight was used, was from a family with a strong Lutheran tradition. See L. Nissen. *Staging the Nassau-Dietz Identity: Funerary Culture and Managing Succession at the Frisian Nassau Court in the Seventeenth Century (15–30)* – *The Court Historian*, 2020, 25, 1, 29.

98 See for example the funerals of William Louis, Count of Nassau-Dillenburg (1620), Ernest Casimir, Count of Nassau-Dietz (1633), and Admiral Michiel Adriaenszoon de Ruyter (1677).

99 See for example the funeral of Johan Willem Friso te Leeuwarden (1712).

100 C. Galle. [Begrafenisstoet van aartshertog Albrecht], Pl. LI, (1623).

101 A similar caparison was also universally used to cover the coffin. Yet the meaning of a caparisoned horse could vary from region to region. For example, all of the yoked horses wore a similar caparison at the funeral of Louis XIV.

102 F. Brentel. *Vaudemont et Clermont, poursuivants d’armes, les sénéchaux de Lorraine et Barrois...*, Pl. 31 (after the drawing by Claude de la Ruelle: 1610–1611).

103 See for example H. Goltzius. *Haec Pompa funebris spectata suit ... [Willem van Oranje grave] (1584)*, pl. 1; J. van de Velde (II). *Haec pompa fvnebris spectata fvit Delphis batavorum decimo sexto septembris Anno 1625, (1626)* J. van Doetechum (I). [Wapens en insignia van Karel V], (1619), (Hieronymus Cock’i järgi), 34. Such stands can also be seen in paintings and drawings of church interior starting from Pieter Janszoon of Saenredam (see Cathedral of Saint John at ‘s-Hertogenbosch:1646). They are found in the works of Daniël de Blicq, Emanuel de Witte (*Oude Kerk* (1650), *Oude Kerk* (1669), *Intérieur d’église gothique* (1679) and others), and less frequently also in the works of Dirck van Delen and Hendrick van Vliet and Anthonie van Borsom.

104 L. Rangström. *Dödens Teater. Kungliga svenska begravnningar genom fem århundraden*, Stockholm: Bokförlaget Atlantis, 2015, 17, 21.

105 F. Hogenberg. *Lijkstatie van Karel V (1559)*, plates 3–4, 6–29.

flag, but there was no battle steed, mourning horse, or bearers of status symbols, let alone the cuirassier often seen in Lutheran ceremonies.¹⁰⁶ A rider in armour was also lacking in the funeral procession of the Duke of Jülich-Cleves-Berg, William V (1592). However, on that occasion, signifiers of the knight's status were demonstrated in addition to flags. These elements were also listed by the image – *Suert, Helm und Schilt*.¹⁰⁷ The segment of Duke William's cortege in question is indeed largely similar to that of Karl V. Two caparisoned horses of mourning and a combat steed in full armour (*Peerd van eere*) were used in the 1608 funeral procession of duke of Lorraine Charles (III) de Lorraine, grandson of Danish King Friedrich II, but no rider. The steed bore only the duke's sword, and the flag bearing the coat of arms of the deceased was carried behind the catafalque.¹⁰⁸ All the funerals mentioned above had in common the fact that the deceased was Catholic.

Even if we start from the thesis that early modern period funerary customs had a single point of origin, we should still note that funerary customs in the Lutheran culture eventually became somewhat different. The number of flags and coats of arms could vary in these processions, but the part of the procession preceding the coffin, which symbolised the deceased's status, was assembled in a similar way starting from the last decade of the sixteenth century at the latest. The main flag, i.e., the flag of mourning¹⁰⁹ (*Hauptfane, Trauerfane*), was followed by a rider in armour (*Kürasirer Reuter*).¹¹⁰ The rider was followed by the horse of mourning and signifiers of status – for a nobleman, the helm, gauntlets and spurs. For kings, a crown and other regalia would also be included. This part of the procession generally culminated in the coffin containing the body of the deceased. This sequence can be seen in the case of the Duke of Saxe-Weimar Johan Ernst I (d. 1627)¹¹¹, and the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt Georg II (d. 1661)¹¹².

106 S. Frisius. [Funeral procession] (1592) (after the drawing by Abraham Hogenberg); A. Engström. *Olikhetens praktiker*, 184.

107 [F. Hogenberg]. *Begrabnisstoet op de binnenplaats van de burg te Düsseldorf (1592)*.

108 F. Brentel. [Funeral procession] (1610/1611) (after the drawing by Claude de la Ruelle).

109 As does Pia Ehasalu in her work, the Estonian-language version of this thesis used the term "matuselipp" (funerary flag) for this type of flag. The researchers at Tallinn City Museum use the term "leinalipp" (mourning flag) to denote the same category of objects. See P. Ehasalu. *Sub specie aeternitatis*, 11.

110 There was no rider in Catholic funerals. It was replaced by a battle steed in full array but without a rider (*le cheval bardé pour bataille*). F. Brentel. *Vaudemont et Clermont, poursuivants d'armes, les sénéchaux de Lorraine et Barrois...*, Pl. 31 (after the drawing by Claude de la Ruelle: 1610–1611).

111 P. Isselburg. *Wahrhaffte Abbildunge des ... Leichgevreng des ... Johann Ernsts des Jüngern Herzog zu Sachsen etc. [1627]* (after the drawing by Cristian Richter).

112 J. Schweizer. [Funeral procession of the *Landgraf* von Hessen-Darmstadt], [1662].

Customs in Scandinavia also underwent change. This largely took place during a period that in the last half-century has begun to be called the era of confessionalisation. The Catholic archbishop of Uppsala, Olof Magnusson (Gothus), wrote the following in 1555 regarding post-Reformation customs among the nobility in the Nordic countries: "...First comes a long train of clergymen. After them, a man rides on armoured horse, armed from head to toe, immediately preceding the dead body, which lies on a lavish catafalque. The knight is handed an unsheathed sword, which is held in his right hand with the grip raised skyward, shield slung over his back with [heraldic] symbol that the deceased wore in battle. All of this is given by the heirs, along with some holdings, as a voluntary gift to the shrine in which the funeral takes place. Yet the heirs buy back the horse, sword and armour immediately at a fair price, leaving only the shield, and that is hung in a visible place in the church, being a sign that this honourable man was born of an illustrious lineage and has fought honestly for the glory of God and truth and justice, ...".¹¹³ The bishop considers the customs described above an imitation of old Catholic traditions by Protestants. In any case, the armoured knight on horseback and the custom of leaving the deceased's shield in the church are mentioned as key elements of the funeral procession. The latter is also probably referred to by a set consisting of a shield and helmet dedicated to the memory of Nils Erengislasons in Strängnäs Cathedral [1440]. Yet the bishop's description shows that the helmet and gauntlets were not considered status symbols at that time.

To try to answer the question of when sword, helm, gauntlets and spurs began to be seen as status symbols of knighthood, we only have hypotheses. In my opinion, a parallel might be seen in the development of tomb effigies. On pre-Reformation grave slabs, in both Scandinavia and Estonia, knights are depicted in helmet and gauntlets, usually holding a weapon. On later slabs show the knight without headgear and with bare hands, both the helm and gauntlets being carved into the stone as independent features; on the other hand the sword is on the knight's belt and the spurs are sometime on his boots as part of equipment. In

113 "..."*Först kommer ett långt tåg af andliga. Efter dem rider på enpensarklädd häst en man, väpnad från hufvud till fot, närmast framför liket, som hvilar på en präktig bår. Förridaren gifver man ett blottadt svärd att bära i bögra handen med fästet lyftadt mot himlen samt hänger på hans rygg den sköld med tillhörande märke, som den döde burit i strid. Allt detta öfverlämna arfvingarna tillika med några jordagods såsom en frivillig gåfva till den helgedom, där begrafningen sker. Dock varda hästen, svärdet och vapenrustningen genast till skäligt pris återköpta af sagda arfvingar; allenast skölden blifver kvar och upphänges på en förnämlig plats i kyrkan, till ett tecken att denne utmärkte man varit boren af en ärorik ätt, och att han redligen kämpat för Guds ära och för sanning och rätt, ..."* (O. Magnus Gothus. *Historia om de nordiska folken*. Roma, MDLV, book, 6, chap. 47 [762].)



Figure 5. Signifiers of a knight (without spurs) on Caspar Tiesenhausen's grave slab (no later than 1591). Photo: V. Varik (2020)

my opinion, this change denotes a change in the symbolic meaning of these items, which in turn became the basis for new funerary customs.

Specifically, it appears to have occurred in Denmark in the late 1560s¹¹⁴, and about the same time in Sweden. In Estonia, we do not see any more old-style grave slabs after Caspar Tiesenhausen's grave slab was installed in Tallinn Cathedral (in 1591 at the latest). Tiesenhausen's grave marker is also the first to depict the coats of arms of three generations of his ancestors (*Abnenprobe*, proof of ancestry).

We get some idea of the final stage of the development of Danish early-modern-period customs by comparing the funeral procession of Frederick II on 5 June 1588¹¹⁵ with that of the Prince-Elector of Saxony Christian I, grandson of Christian III, (1591)¹¹⁶. While in a cortege for a king the regalia were carried in front of the catafalque, and heralds and the flag bearing the royal coat of arms participated (followed by the horse in a caparison emblazoned with the coat of arms), a mourning horse, weapons or cuirassier were not seen in the procession. Symbols

114 C. A. Jensen. *Danske adelige gravsten. Planchebind.* Andr. Fred. Høst & sons forlag, København, 1951.

115 F. Hogenberg. *Res Gestae Serenissimi Potentissimiq[ue] Ac Domini Friderici II ...* (1588/89), pl. 15.

116 Author unknown. *Wahre abris des Procesz, so zü Dresden Vnd Freÿbürg Vber Der Begrebnüz Des D.H. Fürsten ...*, [1598].

such as cuirassier, sword and spurs are however identifiable at Christian I's funeral.

Likewise, Swedish funeral rites began to take their final shape around the 1590s. Although at the funerals of Sten Sture and Peder Banér the hatchments, flags and spurs of the deceased were displayed¹¹⁷ it is thought that the rituals incorporating all of the later elements developed some time later. When the funeral of King Johan III was held in 1592, the procession lacked either status symbols or mounts, at least judging by graphic representations of the event.¹¹⁸ Judging by the helmet extant from Duke Magnus's funeral, elements of funeral armour (*begravningsrustning*) appeared in Swedish processions at the latest by 1595.¹¹⁹ There are no data on the rest of the components of the armour suite. For that reason, it is not possible to decide whether the helm belonged to the cuirassier's armour or whether it was brought into the church as a standalone status symbol. However, the cuirassier armour suits used at the funeral ceremony of Karl IX (1611) and his son Duke Charles Philip (1622) – as well as gilded horse armour in the case of the former – are still extant.¹²⁰

The position of the rider in the procession can be seen on a print depicting the funeral procession of Gustav II Adolf (1632).¹²¹ The same sequence recurred in the joint funeral procession of the Count-Palatine of Zweibrücken-Kleeburg, John Casimir and his son (1652)¹²². It seems that by the time of the funeral of Gustav II Adolf, as symbols and participants followed a specific sequence in the procession, Sweden's own *pompa funebris* has been formed: funeral flag, followed by (hatchment), cuirassier on battle mount, mourning horse (with black caparison with white cross), signifiers of class (on cushions or held) and the coffin.¹²³ The fact that this was not an arbitrary sequence is corroborated by several contemporary engravings, accounts of funeral processions¹²⁴

117 I. von Corswant-Naumburg. Huvudbanér och anvapen under stormaktstiden. Ödins Förlag, Visby, 1999, 26.

118 H. Nützel. *Deductio funeris ex Regio triclinio in arcis Sacellum ...*, [1593].

119 R. Bennett. Vadstena klosterkyrka. III Gravminnen (Sveriges kyrkor: Östergötland), Gravminnen. Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm, 1985, 22.

120 E. Bohrn, R. Bennett. Strängnäs domkyrka. II: 1, Gravminnen, Södermanland band II:1, Volym 159 av Sveriges kyrkor, konsthistoriskt inventarium. Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm, 1974, 15–29.

121 F. van Hulsen. [Funeral procession], (1634).

122 J. Sasse. *Des veilandt Hoghgeboren fursten vndt herren, h. JOHANN CASIMIR, Pfaltz graffen bey Rhein in Beyern, zu Gulich, Clevevndt Bergen, ...* [1652]; A. Engström. *Olikhetens praktiker*, 126.

123 Author unknown. *Vera representatio, quo ritu lugubri funus Gustavi Magni ... fuerit* (1633).

124 See e. g. Samuel von Pufendorf. *De rebus o Carolo Gustavo, Sueciae gestis commentarium libri septem...* (after Erik Dahlberg) [1700].

and also Alexander Engström's research findings.¹²⁵ Apart from drawings of funeral processions of the high nobility, the many items extant in churches attest to the fact that riders, flags and coat of arms were included in the funeral processions of the petty nobility.

The items in churches and the manner in which they were displayed is, in the absence of documents, the main source for assessing cultural influences and determining role models. Two historically and politically distinct regions could be considered direct influences on the Estonian nobility: on one hand, East Prussia and Poland; and on the other, Scandinavia, above all the Swedish and Finnish cultural space.

The burial sites of Swedish nobles have been studied in detail by Göran Lindahl¹²⁶, while individual classes of object related to funeral ceremonies have been researched by Inga von Corswant-Naumburg¹²⁷ (hatchments) and Cecilia Candréus¹²⁸ (embroidered funeral flags). The *Sveriges Kyrkor: konsthistoriskt inventarium* book series has often covered flags, weapons and suits of armour as funerary memorabilia.¹²⁹ Thematic overviews have also been written on these subjects.¹³⁰ The funerary flags of the East Prussian nobility have been studied by Irma Kozina and Jan K. Ostrowski¹³¹ and the carpentry there, including commemorative plaques, by Anton Ulbrich¹³². Hatchments found in Finland have been studied by Carl-Thomas v. Christerson.¹³³ The work of these researchers lay a fairly good basis for comparing the artefacts extant in Estonia and the

125 A. Engström. Olikhetens praktiker, 123–137.

126 G. Lindahl. Grav och rum. Svenskt gravskick från medeltiden till 1800-talets slut. (Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar. Antikvariska serien, 21). Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm, 1969.

127 I. von Corswant-Naumburg. Huvudbanér och anvapen under stormaktstiden.; I. von Corswant-Naumburg. Huvudbaner och anvapen inom Skara stift. En heraldisk och genealogisk inventering. Skara, 2006.

128 C. Candréus. De hädangängnas heraldik: en studie av broderade begravningsfanor ca 1670-1720. Gidlund, Hedemora, 2008; C. Candréus. The Use of Printed Designs in 17th-Century Embroidery – Layers of Transfer and Interpretation. – Konsthistorisk tidskrift/Journal of Art History, 2013, 82, 3, 191–204.

129 Published from 1912.

130 See for example S. Kinman. Vapenhistorisk inventering av kyrkor I Skara stift: med föremålsbeskrivningar, kommentarer och jämförelser. Skara stiftshistoriska sällskap, Skara, 2005; S. Kinman. Vapenhistorisk inventering av kyrkor i Uppsala stift: med föremålsbeskrivningar, kommentarer och jämförelser – Svenska vapenhistoriska sällskapets skrifter, N. S., No. 23. Svenska vapenhistoriska sällskapet, Stockholm, 2008, [17]–192; S. Kinman. Edged weapons in Sweden: partly based upon research results and findings in Swedish churches. Svenska vapenhistoriska sällskapet, Stockholm, 2014.

131 I. Kozina, J. K. Ostrowski. Grabfahnen mit Porträtardarstellungen in Polen und Ostpreußen. – Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte, 1992, 55, 2, 225–255.

132 A. Ulbrich. Geschichte der Bildhauerkunst in Ostpreußen vom Ausgang des 16. bis in die 2. Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Bd. 1, Vom Ende des 16. Jahrhunderts bis in die Zeit von 1685 bis 1725 mit Einleitung über die gotische Kunst und die Renaissancezeit. Gräfe und Unzer, Königsberg, 1926.

133 C.-T. von Christerson. Huvudbaner med anvapen i Finland.

way in which they were exhibited in contrast to corresponding items in neighbouring countries.

One outcome of the research into portrait funerary flags of the Prussian nobility by Irma Kozina and Jan K. Ostrowski is a typology of flag designs. This shows that there were many funerary flags in East Prussia similar to those used in Polish areas, many bearing the portrait of the deceased, or whose central composition is somewhat similar to the central panel of a picture epitaph.¹³⁴ Alongside flags of this type, Prussia also had memorial flags featuring an escutcheon and text.¹³⁵ As well as the abundance of flags, epitaphs dedicated to nobles and funerary hatchments, Prussian churches are typified by a lack of large-scale hatchments.¹³⁶

Sometimes, a stand meant for displaying a suit of armour and weapons, characteristically of the Low Countries, could be found there.¹³⁷ This was in essence a large-format wooden tablet that might, in order to look as ostentatious as possible, be decorated by a portal framing the base. While in the Low Countries both the escutcheon and insignia of knighthood were fastened to the stand, the Prussian stands lacked the escutcheon. Apart from mounting brackets, Prussia also had the possibility to fasten the memorabilia directly to the church wall.¹³⁸

The flags used in Sweden were predominantly heraldic and text design.¹³⁹ The Swedish and Finnish cultural space was also characterised by the abundance of flags. Citing a letter sent to clergymen in 1673 by Turku bishop Johannes Gezelius, Tuija Tuhkanen has said that hatchments and flags were so common in churches in the bishopric that limits had to be established as the bishop felt the items threatened to block natural light entering the church.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁴ I. Kozina, J. K. Ostrowski. Grabfahnen mit Porträt-darstellungen, 254. See also Dom in Königsberg in Preußen [Innenansicht mit Blick zum Chor] (1892), (Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, Nr.: 300b (96)); Arnau/Ostpreussen Dorfkirche. Innenraum, (1938), (Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, Nr.: 343-527).

¹³⁵ See for example Königsberg, Dom Chor nach NO [1934–1944] (Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, Nr.: fm1204452).

¹³⁶ See for example I. Kozina, J. K. Ostrowski. Grabfahnen mit Porträt-darstellungen, 253; Foto: Archiv Dr. Franz Stoedtner, Bildarchiv Foto Marburg: Bilddatei-Nr. fm1204452, (um 1939/1940?).

¹³⁷ See for example BFM, Nr.: fm1204452; Dom in Königsberg in Preußen [Innenansicht mit Blick zum Chor] (1892) (Berlin, Universität der Künste Berlin, Universitätsarchiv, Inventar-Nr. 300b, 96, Messbilder); Author unknown. Innere Ansicht des Doms zu Königsberg (1836) (lithography after Johan Karl Schultz); I. Kozina, J. K. Ostrowski. Grabfahnen mit Porträt-darstellungen, Photo. 29.

¹³⁸ See for example Dom in Königsberg in Preußen [Innenansicht mit Blick zum Chor] (1892), (Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, Nr.: 300b (96)); Königsberg, Dom Chor nach NO [1934–1944] (Bildarchiv Foto Marburg, Nr.: fm1204452).

¹³⁹ See for example the memorial flags of barons Christer Carlsson (d. 1659) and Gustaf Christersson (d. 1645) Bonde in Aspö Church.

¹⁴⁰ T. Tuhkanen. "In memoriam sui et suorum posuit." Lahjoittajien muistokuvat Suomen

Unlike Prussia, there is no record of memorabilia being fastened to mounting brackets in churches in Sweden or Finland. Nor was there any known instance in the Estonian Governorate where armour or weapons had been mounted on intermediate hardware instead of directly to the wall. The design and means of preparing flags related to funerals in Estonia corresponds most closely to the flags extant in Sweden. Riga was the closest known place to Estonia to have flags of mourning bearing portraits originating in the Prussian tradition.¹⁴¹

Current research findings suggest that the custom of leaving flags and armour as memorabilia in churches was introduced in Estonia later than it was in Sweden or Finland. Apart from use in funerals of the high nobility in Sweden, fairly early examples of this custom also come from Finland.¹⁴² The earliest records of a similar custom among the nobility of Estonia date only from 1647. However, a rider clad in armour may have participated in the funeral ceremony before that, presumably back in 1615 (see table in appendix). The documents studied occasionally use the terms *Cüritz* and *Kürasirer Reuter* to refer to the armour and its wearer.¹⁴³ Both are very similar to the Swedish terms and appear to be loan words. This fact, too, supports the hypothesis that the funeral customs among the nobility of the early modern period, including the principal elements of the funeral procession, arrived in Estonia mainly through Sweden.

Apart from the many similarities, the practices in the Estonian and Swedish-Finnish cultural space also have a few differences. Namely, to some degree, Sweden has hatchments carved of wood, to which the weapons of the deceased are fastened. For example, in the early years of the eighteenth century, a sword was attached to the escutcheon of baron Sparre in Ängsö Church and to that of Andreas Blomenschiöld in Hogstad Church.

No such examples are known in Estonia. Yet starting from the 1680s, instead of analogous fashion to the design of grave slabs from the closing decades of the 1500s, carved wood helmets and gauntlets were added to the text part of the hatchment. These were located, clearly emphasised, centred along the bottom or top edge of the bearing. On

kirkoissa 1400-luvulta 1700-luvun lopulle. Åbo akademis förlag, Åbo, 2005, 165.

141 J. Ch. Brotze. Sammlung verschiedener Liefländischer Monumente, Prospective, Münzen, Wappen ets. T. 2, Fol. 95, 102.

142 The suit of armour belonging to Axel Jönsson Kurck, donated to the Finnish National Museum in 1875 by Ulvila congregation, was mounted in the church in 1630.

143 Engström has used the term *kyrassryttaren*. Another, older term, *kyritysryttaren*, was also used at an exhibition held in Stockholm in 2015, *Dödens teater*, and the related publication. Cf. L. Rangström, L. Dödens Teater and A. Engström. Olikhettens praktiker.



Figure 6. A pair of gauntlets with a possible example of a new type of helmet depicted on the Hastfer monument (1676). Photo: K. H. Akel (1936). UT Library, Art history photograph collection: B-94-137

three occasions, they were placed within the framework in not so central a location. I would also draw attention to the fact that one of the class signifiers, the sword, remained relatively secondary, being located along the edge of the composition along with the rest of the “trophy”. Spurs are not seen in these compositions at all. Yet it does not mean that the sword and spurs had diminished symbolic value. As was seen from the funeral costs of Field Marshal Fersen and Major General Pahlen, these items were still important.

In the period from 1680 to 1730, more than two-thirds of all hatchments of which at least a picture survives were decorated with a central helm and pair of gauntlets. This custom was practiced until ca 1730, although the helmet might occasionally be seen in a central position in later hatchments. The phenomenon is accompanied by the disappearance of tomb effigies (*gisant* figures), the decline of the practice of including genuine weapons, and the appearance of metal replicas of helmets in church interiors.



Figure 7. Helmet and gauntlets in the composition of Alexander Gustav von Essen’s (d. 22 December 1689) funerary hatchment. Photo: V. Varik (2021)

Interestingly, it is extremely rare for Swedish hatchments from the same era to have helmet and gauntlets as a central element.¹⁴⁴ It is just as rare in Finland. In some cases, there is reason to believe that since the deceased was connected to Estonia, the hatchment was commissioned specially from Tallinn.¹⁴⁵

There are also hatchments which lack a tie-in with Estonia at first glance but where the armorial bearing is still discernibly Tallinnesque.¹⁴⁶ This can be explained by the fact that Finland in the early modern period was a region where the services of artisans from beyond the province were often used. There were a few other cases where the compositional concept was from Tallinn but the work was performed outside Estonia.¹⁴⁷ Two groups can be distinguished even on Saaremaa island, the works of Tallinn artisans and local works. Among the works by Tallinn artisans, the helmet and gauntlets are shown while in the local work, they are absent.

The Tallinn style of hatchment design is also the basis for the grave slab for *Oberst* Georg Anton von Brackel (d. 15 January 1686, buried 4 January 1689), carved between 1686 and 1688, and Catharina Vellingk's (died after 1697) grave slab in Narva Cathedral. The direct influence of Tallinn's wood carvers is signalled not only by the depiction of the helmet and gauntlets above the text but the trophies around the plaque, palm branches surrounding the alliance arms and the putti holding a crown that complete the composition. The analogue of the latter, a fairly rare detail, is the armorial bearing of Jürgen Bistram in Tallinn Cathedral (ca 1686). The Narva grave slab appears to have been carved by a local stonecutter but there is not complete certainty about this in the present stage of research – the stone is known only from old photos, making it impossible to study the origin of the stone.

These facts appear to point to the fact that display of reproductions as opposed to mounting genuine weapons on wall – both on the hatchment and in church interiors as a whole – is one particularity of Tallinn customs. It cannot be associated with a specific artisan or even the work of artisans in a specific branch of craftsmanship.

¹⁴⁴ One such hatchment, with a helm and gauntlets, is that of lieutenant general Blecher Wachtmeister (d. 1701) in Kalmar Cathedral and the one for Carl Gustaf Dahlberg (d. 1697) in the Dahlbergs' chapel at Turinge Church, which has gauntlets but lacks a helm.

¹⁴⁵ See for example the Patkull hatchment in Sipoo Church.

¹⁴⁶ See for example also the hatchment of Gerhard Friedrich Kuhlman (d. 1691) that was hanging in Tammela Church in 1943. I. Kronqvist. Kuhlman-suvun vaakuna Tammelan kirkossa – Kotiseutukuvauksia Lounais-Hämeestä, 23. Forssan Kirjapaino Oy, Forssa, 1942, 59–61.

¹⁴⁷ See for example the funerary hatchments of Johan Gjöes (d. 1697) and Gustaf Sölferkling (d. 1698) in Tenhola Church.

An armed-hand-shaped mounting console holding four hatchments in St. Nicholas constitutes a separate episode in the practices of displaying signifiers of knighthood in churches. All of them were located in the central nave of the church on the inner side of the four easternmost pillars. The positioning was intrinsically balanced: the easternmost ones were higher and the western ones lower. The corbels supported hatchments in memory of Philip Johan Uexküll (d. 20 July 1669; see table pos. 22), Johan Adolph Eberschildt (d. 14 April 1671; see table pos. 28) and an as-yet unidentified member of the Lode and Tiesenhausen family. Only the corbel that held the Lode hatchment survives intact.

It appears that the unusual fastening method was not planned right from the start in all cases. Looking at the back side of the Eberschildt hatchment, we can see three metal eyelets fastened to board, which were intended to fasten the hatchment to the wall directly in the usual way. This gives reason to believe that it was not the original decision to opt for the more exclusive means of presentation. This also suggests that the date of the corbels completion was later than April 1671. The fastenings of the Lode and Tiesenhausen arms may be earlier. Thus the time in which this practice was used largely coincides with the era in which suits of armour were displayed. It appears that this sort of solution offered a substantive alternative to emphasising the knightly status of the deceased through introducing suits of armour into the church interior. Being



Figure 8. Armed-hand-shaped corbel on the wall of St. Nicholas' Church for Lode's armoural bearing. Photo: V. Varik (2021)

quite unusual, this custom appears to be endemic to Tallinn; this research did not turn up similar features in other regions.

Taking into consideration all of the abovementioned facts, it can be said that most similar funerary customs to Estonia's in the early modern period were found in the Swedish-Finnish cultural space. The migration of the customs from the neighbours to Estonia was driven not so much by descriptions in books and serially printed pictures, but rather personal experience. The experiences were gained while in service, or interacting with relatives¹⁴⁸ or witnessing the proceedings in Sweden for some other reason. Still, the Swedish customs did only take place in larger settlements in Sweden and Finland; rather grand funerals of members of the high nobility also took place in Tallinn.

Despite the numerous parallels to Swedish customs, I believe it would be premature in the current stage of research to hasten to transpose interpretations of the meaning of the various tangible elements (armoured riders, caparisoned horses, various flags, *castrum doloris*, etc.) or the intangible elements (candlelight, sound of church bells pealing, cannon blasts, etc.). The research has clearly shown that regional differences existed both in the design of the class-related status symbols, the manner in which they were displayed and used¹⁴⁹, as well as in contemporary designations and present-day terminology.

The above should be read as an attempt to supplement factual knowledge concerning the use of the attributes of nobility in early modern period Estonia. The research findings give reason to refine the current historiography in light of new data. Work in this field can never be considered completed as the possibilities for finding additional facts are far from exhausted. For this reason, I would like to urge all researchers investigating the history of the Estonian church in the early modern period to devote attention to keywords such as *Harnisch*, *Waffen*, *Handschen*, *Sporen*, *Hut*, *Helm*, *Cüritz*, *Fabne* and *Kürasirer Reuter*. It would also be wise to examine mention of horses in the context of funeral rites or remuneration for such a service.

148 For example, memorial flags for Johann (d. 1645) and Wolmar Stackelberg (d. 1652) were still hanging in Örebro Cathedral in the nineteenth century. The customs of the Baltic nobility in the use of hatchments in Sweden has been researched by Sigurd Wallin. (See E. Lundberg.; B. Waldén. Örebro stads kyrkor. Kunsthistorisk inventarium Bd. I, Hft. I. Editors: S. Curman; J. Roosval. Centraltryckeriet, Stockholm, 1939, 131, 132; S. Wallin. Svensk processionsvapens hos baltisk adel – Svio-Estonica: Studier utgivna av Svensk-estniska samfundet = Akadeemilise Rootsi-Eesti Seltsi toimetused, 16 (Ny följd 7). Skånska Centraltryckeriet, Lund, 1962, 73–100.

149 The Brotze collection contains a drawing of a copper engraving depicting the funeral procession of the Courland Duke Friedrich (1643), which is exceptional as two riders in armour are shown simultaneously. (*Sammlung verschiedener Liefländischer Monumente, Prospekte, Münzen, Wappen ets.* T. 4, fol. 23–31).

ROOTSIAEGSE EESTIMAA
AADELKONNA MATUSEKOMBESTIK.
STAATUST SÜMBOLISEERIVATE
ESEMETE DEMONSTREERIMINE
MATUSERONGKÄIGUS JA NENDE
PAIGUTAMINE KIRIKUSSE

Veikko Varik

Seisusel oli varauusaegses Euroopa kultuuris äärmiselt oluline koht. Sellest tulenevalt oli tähtis ka vastavate tunnuste esitlemine. Seda eriti niisuguste esemete kaudu, mis olid kättesaamatud (keelatud) teiste sotsiaalsete rühmade esindajaile. Artiklis kirjeldatakse Eestimaa aadlike seisuslike sümbolite esitlemise praktikat rootsiaegses matusekultuuris. Baltisaksa ja Rootsi ajalookirjutuses on seda teemat kuni 20. sajandi teise pooleni käsitletud üsna üldistavalt, haruharva vaid üksikuid konkreetseid näiteid esitades. Uuemaid uuringuid on seni väga vähe ja domineeriv käsitlus lähtub 19. ja 20. sajandi vahetusel publitseeritud. Värskeid, ennekoike arhiiviuuringutele toetuvaid andmeid on siiski lisanud viimaste aastakümnete Rootsi kultuuriruumi kohta tehtud uurimused.

Allikadena on artiklis kasutatud peamiselt Tallinna kirikute sissetulekuid ja inventari kajastavaid kaasaegseid dokumente, teadus- asutuste kollektsioonides asuvat vanemat fotomaterjali ning 19. ja 20. sajandi vahetusel koostatud Tallinna sakraalhoonete inventari kirjeldusi. Nende allikate toel on püütud täpsustada, missuguseid seisuslikke atribuute ning missugustel asjaoludel siinses sakraalruumis eksponeeriti. Uurimistöökäigus õnnestus oluliselt laiendada teadmisi faktoloogiast, mis näitab, et lisaks üldteada faktile mälestusvappide kirikuisse viimise ning ülesriputamise kohta kasutati ka Eestis rüütli seisusliku tunnusena turvistikku või selle osi – kürassi, kiivrit, kindaid, kannuseid ning harvem ka mõõka. Lisaks vappidele ja relvastuse elementidele leidsid kasutamist mitut erinevat tüüpi lipud.

Kõige arvukama rühma seisuslike atribuutide hulgas moodustavad mälestusvapid. Neist vanimat säilinud ja dateeritud eksemplari kasutati 10. juulil 1630 surnud Hans Krüdeneri matusetseremoonial ning vapp jäeti hiljem tema hauakoha juurde. Sellele faktile saab lisada veelgi varasema kaasaegse kirjaliku märkuse, mis annab mõista, et vappe on kirikuisse toodud juba 16. ja 17. sajandi vahetuse paiku.

Vappide kõrval õnnestus autoril välja selgitada kümmekond turvistiku või selle elementide kirikus eksponeerimise juhtu ning neist

kahe raudrüü praegune asukoht – Tallinna linnamuuseumi kollektsioon. Üks neist on eksponeeritud Tallinnas, teine deponeeritud Narva muuseumisse. Säilinud matuselippudele täiendust leida ei õnnestunud ning nende arv jäi muutumatuks: andmeid on endiselt vaid kolme (osaliselt säilinud) eksemplari kohta.

Uurimistöökäigus koorusid välja ka mõned seisuslike atribuutide kasutamise ajalise dünaamika eripärad. Võib nõustuda kunstiajaloolaslega, kes on olnud seisukohal, et maalitud või nikerdatud mälestusvappe kanti algselt matuserongkäigus, seejärel viidi talituse ajaks kirikuruumi ning kinnitati hiljem lahkunu hauakoha lähedale sakraalruumi seinale. Siiski järeltööd uuritud dokumentidest ka see, et vapi rongkäigus kandmise komme lõppes 1650. aastatel. Muutuse peamise põhjusena võib oletada mälestusvapi formaadi suurenemist, mis tegi selle kaasaskandmise äärmiselt ebamugavaks. Seetõttu ei olnud vapi valmimine ilmtingimata matusepäevaks enam oluline. Uued kombid töid kaasa mälestusvapi olemuse muutumise – rongkäigus kantavast seisusetunnusest sai hauatähis.

Turvistikku kasutati Eestis matuserongkäigus ja -tseremoonial osaleva kūrassratsaniku „riietamisel“ peamiselt perioodil 1650–1670. Hiljem asendus see kombega demonstreerida matustel vaid kiivrist, mõõgast, kinnastest ja kannustest koosnevat komplekti, mis matuse-tseremoonia järel sakraalruumi paigutati. Alates 1680. aastatest hakati alternatiivina ehtsatele relvadele kasutama seisuse tunnuseks nende esemete puust kujutisi, mis lisati mälestusvapile. Pärast 1700. aastat valmistati sümbolsemete alternatiivina ka relvade plekist mullaže.

Matuste tarbeks valmistatud lippudest õnnestus teateid leida alates 1640. aastatest. Viimane niisugune riputati seni teadaolevate andmete põhjal otsustades ca 1692. aastal ooberst Paul Johann von Bremeni hauakoha juurde. Maalitud lippude kõrval leidis ka tikitud eksemplare. Matusekombestikus kasutatud esemelisi seisuslike tunnuseid või nende komplekte ei saa vaadata lahusolevana hauakoha tähistamise tavapärasemast viisist – hauakivist ja -monumendist. Nende esemete näol oli vähemalt algselt tegemist pigem hauatähisele raiutud atribuutika täiendusega. Hiljem, alates 17. sajandi viimasest kolmandikust asendasid sakraalhoonesse jäetud staatusetunnused juba täielikult hauakividelt kadunud sümbolikat – seda asendas sakraalruumi seintele riputatu.

Faktide võrdlus teiste lähipiirkondade kombestikuga näitab, et ehkki mälestusvappe, turvistikke, relvi ja leinalippe eksponeeriti sakraalhooneis ka pea kõigis naaberpiirkondades – Rootsis, Soomes ja Preisimaal –, on Eestis viljeletud matusekommetel suurim sarnasus just Rootsi ja Soomega. Saaremaa kombestiku päritolu ei ole materjali

vähesuse tõttu veel lõplikult selge, kuid leitud andmestik lubab arvata, et mälestusesemete kasutamine langeb seal 17. sajandi teise poolde ehk Rootsi valitsusperioodi. Liivimaa Riia mõjualas olevalt territooriumilt ja Kuramaalt kirjeldatud kommete järgimise kohta (v.a mälestusvappide eksponeerimine sakraalruumis) materjali läbitöötamise käigus teateid leida ei õnnestunud. Oluline on silmas pida Eesti aadli matusekommete lokaalset eripära, millele viitavad mitmed nüansid atribuutika eksponeerimisel, millele lähipiirkondades analooge ei leidu.

Andmestiku esmane analüüs on andnud küll mõningaid võimalusi seniste hüpoteeside kinnitamiseks ning vahest ka korrigeerimiseks, kuid töö nende täpsema, kohaliku tähenduse väljaselgitamisel seisab alles ees. Näiteks ei ole praeguseks selge, kas seisusesümbolite matuserongkäigus kasutamisel oli Rootsi vastavate kommetega võrreldes mingeid kohalikke eripärasid. Samuti ei ole teada põhjus, miks vaatamata sellele, et rüütli tunnusteks peetakse üldlevinult kiivrit, kindaid ja kannuseid, kohtab mälestusesemete (nii ehtsate kui sümboolsete) hulgas kannuseid äärmiselt harva. Nendele ja teistele seni vastamata küsimustele vastuse leidmine on varauusaegse Eesti matusekombestiku tundmaõppimise seisukohalt oluline ning aitab kaasa kultuurinähtuste toonase leviku mõistmisele, olles seega vägagi perspektiivikas uurimisvaldkond.

ANNEX I

Key: V – armorial bearing; L – flag; TR – suit of armour or parts thereof/weapons; H – horse; T_H – caparison (R) – rent/hire; Ag – silvered; Au – gilded; M – imitation; ++ – there is more than one of the item and their exact number is unknown. The marker is shown in square brackets if the nature of the object is not unequivocally clear due to the word use. The amount of the payment is shown in brackets if it is not itemized and is included in the rest of the funeral costs.

Pos. no.	Name of deceased	Date of comment	Group of items			Monetary donation		Donation		Donation's value	Reference
			V	L	TR	H	T _{HR}	H	T _H		
1.	<i>Fromboldt Mettakenn</i>	3.1603	+								TLA.31.1.142:31
2.	<i>Jacob von Lunden Schlotiß Hoppman</i>	29.10.1611	[+]				(4)				TLA.236.1.29:73
3.	<i>Dietrich Hogegeuens, so ein Konigl: Corporal</i>	29.12.1615	[+]			+	1¼			?	TLA.236.1.29:98
4.	<i>Euerdt Dellwich</i>	25.6.1616	[+]				1¼	+	+	30	TLA.236.1.29:105
5.	<i>Otto Bremock</i>	3.3.1621	+				(22,75)				TLA.31.1.88:[39]
6.	<i>Carsten Schade</i>	10.6.1624	+				(144)				TLA.31.1.88:[31]
7.	<i>Jacob Hastfer</i>	31.7.1629	[+]				(5)				TLA.236.1.29:255
8.	<i>Jürgen Uxkull von Mentz</i>	20.12.1636	+								TLA.31.1.142:31
9.	<i>her Philip Scheding</i>	26.2.1647	+	+	+		(96)				TLA.236.1.29:366

Pos. no.	Name of deceased	Date of comment	Group of items				Monetary donation	Donation		Donation's value	Reference
			V	L	TR	H		H	T _H		
11.	<i>Herr LandtRabt und Obrister Johan von Rechenberg</i>	[20.]4.1651			+			+		Lgt 300	TLA.31.1.88:[29]
12.	<i>Landrath Johan Brakell</i>	30.6.1651			+ Ag			+		Lgt 100	TLA.31.1.88:[34]
13.	<i>Alter Rögert Tiesenhausen</i>	4.3.1652			+			+		15	TLA.31.1.88:[206]
14.	<i>Philip Rabe Adj. ... sein Vater Salomon Rabe</i>	30.6.1652			+ ₊			+		(60 ¼)	TLA.31.1.88:[178]
15.	<i>Johan Heinrich von Tießen Haußen sein Sohn ... Ditlof von TiesenHaußen</i>	3.2.1654			+ ₊			+		Lgt 200 36 ¼	TLA.31.1.88:[232]
16.	<i>Adam Johan Schrapfer</i>	14.7.1656					+ Ag			(45)	TLA.31.1.88:[209]
17.	<i>Ha: Bernhart von Saltza</i>	15.1.1657			[+]			+		(24)	TLA.31.1.88:[158]
18.	<i>Alexander von Eßen sein Sohn Jürgen v. Eßen</i>	19.1.1657 ?						+		(33) ?	TLA.31.1.88:[208]
19.	<i>Bernhart Koeb oder MohrenSchilt</i>	17.3.1657 ?(d. 19.1.1657)			+			+		77?	TLA.31.1.88:[124]
20.	<i>Johan Olofsohn Ackerfeldt</i>	26.3.1661			+			+		(24)	TLA.236.1.29:482
21.	<i>H. Obristerl. Adolph Friedrich Taube von Pajack</i>	13.2.1672 ?			+			+		?	TLA.31.1.88:[200] TLA.31.1.142:107

Pos. no.	Name of deceased	Date of comment	Group of items				Monetary donation		Donation's value	Donation's Reference
			V	L	TR	H	T _{HR}	H		
23.	<i>H. Cornet Johan Wolandt</i>	18.3.1672	[+]					(25)	TLA.31.1.88:[162]	
24.	<i>H. Albert. Lantingshausen</i>	9.2.1674	+					(32)	TLA.236.1.29:560	
25.	<i>Tönnies Johan Wrangcl, von Tatters</i>	21.1.1676					+	(17 1/4)	TLA.31.1.88:[74]	
26.	<i>Otto von Lode</i>	25.1.1676					+	(17 1/4)	TLA.31.1.88:[74]	
27.	<i>H. Leutnant Hanß Mobrensbildt</i>	8.2.1676 13.3.1676	+				+	(16 1/4) 10	TLA.31.1.88:[32]	
28.	<i>Johan Adolpf Eberschildt (Junge)</i>	2.6.1676 d. 14.4.1671	+						TLA.31.1.88:[178]	
29.	<i>H. Ritmeister, J. H. w. derfeldte sein Sohn [Hans]</i>	19.2.1663 8.2.1677 2.5.1677	+					20	TLA.31.1.88:[159]	
30.	<i>der Junge [Alexander] Wärtman</i>	10.2.1677	+					10	TLA.31.1.88:[156]	
31.	<i>Herrn Feldmarschal H. Baron Fabian von Fersen</i>		+	+					R.A.F.A.A.	
32.	<i>H. Oberster Paul Johan Brebmen</i>	18.2.1693 ?	+				+	(23 3/4) + M/ Au	TLA.31.1.88:[174]	
33.	<i>Hr. Landtrabt Gotthard Wilhelm von Essen</i>	20.2.1731	+					20	TLA.31.1.88:[208]	