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In 1885 in Christiania (now Oslo) there appeared a 39-page booklet book entitled “The Shortcomings of Pontoppidan’s Exposition and the Principles for a New One.” The educator and politician Niels Hertzberg had published the little tract in order to gather support for the renewal of children’s religious instruction in school and church in Norway. The first sentence posed the problem: “To advocate a new authorized school textbook for Religion or an altered edition of Pontoppidan’s text is nothing new, but an old idea within church and school.”

Erik Pontoppidan’s exposition of Luther’s Short Catechism was still a living tradition and a state authorized foundation for instruction in Norway nearly 150 years after the book had left the printing house in Copenhagen, in 1737, with the cryptic title “Truth to God-fearingness.”

Pontoppidan’s exposition of the church-catechism was the first general and authorized manual for teaching Christianity in Denmark and Norway, and abridged editions or extracts of Pontoppidan’s exposition had for decades replaced the original text on the market. Nevertheless, the manual’s main content and key concepts had remained intact.

After the Eidsvoll Constitution 1814, it had been decided by supreme resolution in 1818 that Pontoppidan’s exposition or Saxtorph’s extract of it were the authorized texts in Norway’s public schools and to be used for instruction of pupils until a “new manual or new manuals in Religion might be introduced.”

Erik Pontoppidan’s manual was thus Norwegian tradition in the 1800s, while the situation was completely different in Denmark. Here Pontoppidan’s exposition became a symbol of opposition to state power and to the state Church in the first half of the 19th century. In 1794, Pontoppidan’s text had officially been replaced by a new one authored by Bishop Balle, and in Denmark the authorities retained use of Balle’s manual. The authority of the local pastor rose and fell with the ability to keep the former manual out of the classroom. Whereas Pontoppidans book in Norway during the 1830s contained everything necessary to know about salvation, the struggles in
Denmark to obtain permission to use Pontoppidan’s text by free choice continued into the 1830s and 1840s in various congregations from Jutland to Bornholm. Pontoppidan’s text had been a gathering point for anti-authoritarian revivalist movements which undermined the absolutist state Church.

Few books have had so much power over minds in Denmark and Norway, and few books have aroused so much debate and conflict over such a long period of time as Erik Pontoppidan’s exposition of the church-catechism. This is in itself sufficient grounds to investigate what it was that preoccupied these minds. Moreover, Pontoppidan’s manual had roots in pietist discourse. From the end of the 17th century and in the beginning of the 18th, pietist ideas played a key role in church and state policies across national boundaries, stretching from Württemberg over Prussia to Scandinavia. Hence, the history of Pontoppidan’s text also has comparative interest for the question of relations between pietism and political culture.4

In the following I will discuss some key concepts within Pontoppidan in relation to the manual’s historical context: the Second Reformation. What kind of view of man was imprinted on the public in the period, which began in 1730s. I investigate the diffusion of the text and the context of its utilisation. What kinds of attitudes about the individual, about society and the authorities were placed at the disposal of the citizens’ interpretation of their environment? Finally, I focus on the conflicts in connection with the use of Pontoppidan’s manual and the conflicts, which arose when the authorities tried to replace it in Norway and Denmark.

The reason for choosing Pontoppidan’s manual and genre is simple: the catechism and its exposition was the portal to the written word. From the Reformation to the first decades of the 19th century, Luther’s Short Catechism, together with prayers, psalms and the exposition of the catechism, were the entry into the world of the book, supplemented only by the signs and activities of the almanac and the calendar. For those who overcame the barriers of literacy, the spectrum of possible reading was extended. The foundation, however, was religious reading. However, before we embark on the analysis of Pontoppidan’s text, it is necessary to describe the context in which his new religious textbook arose.
“The Second Reformation”, 1736-1739

One of the first official historical commemorations in Denmark and Norway was the Bicentenary of the Reformation. The commemoration of the completion of the Reformation took place in the churches on October 30th, 1736. The Reformation was not only a historical tradition, and the Bicentenary was not only the commemoration of an old victory. It was also an occasion to pursue current ecclesiastical policy. The Jubilee year of 1736 had commenced on January 13th with a decree on the confirmation of youth.

An additional benefit of the youth’s confirmation was that “the entire congregation could thereby be reminded of its duty and obtain an admirable occasion to good and fruitful construction of its Christianity”. But how? The brief, almost compressed questions and answers in Luther’s Short Catechism could be laid out and learned in many ways, and there were many expositions circulating on the book market. In principle, the books were all subjected to theological censorship by the University of Copenhagen. However, sorting out the clearly distorted teachings was quite different from establishing an authoritative set of precepts in line with the modern religious tendencies of a moderate pietistic character. This was the concern of the King and of the main part of the Government. In the Jubilee year of 1736, Christian VI had his court pastor, Erik Pontoppidan, begin drafting the obligatory confirmation manual—the new exposition of the church-catechism.

Erik Pontoppidan, along with Andreas Hojer, was a key personality in the Reformation campaign, which culminated in the years around the Jubilee activities. After several years as parish pastor on the island of Als, Pontoppidan had become pastor to the King at Frederiksborg castle. That same year he published his own history of the Reformation. Pontoppidan’s pietism suited the King, and the following year saw Pontoppidan become pastor to the court. In the year of the Bicentenary, he published in Latin his strange little pamphlet with the title “Broom for Sweeping out the Old Remnants”, an instructive tract which used cultural historical documentation to explain the timeliness of a renewed Reformation against extant active remnants of both paganism as well as Catholicism, known as Papism.
In practice, Erik Pontoppidan elaborated “the broom” which was to do the “sweeping”: the new exposition of the church-catechism. Pontoppidan was to replace the local variations of catechism instruction with an authorized uniform framework.

Pontoppidan’s model was the German pietist Ph. J. Spener’s “Einfältige Erklärung der christlichen Lehre” (1677), which appeared in Danish translation in 1728.9

In July 1737, the printing house at the Vajsenhouse in Copenhagen obtained the rights to publish the new textbook, in return for annually distributing 1500 copies among the poor.10 A large-scale book production was begun, and the manual became one of the 18th century’s largest book projects. In August 1738, the project had reached the point where the King could decree that the book should be used by all new pupils in Denmark and Norway.11

But how could the central state power ensure that its intentions would be realized, that the true Christianity took root, that it was actually preached in church, taught in the schools or by the priest, and that these teachings were realized in the life of the congregation?

The dissemination and application of “Truth to Godfearingness”

The King decreed that Pontoppidan’s catechism exposition be used in all churches and schools and at private instruction in Denmark and Norway. The question, therefore, is not whether it was disseminated, for indeed it was, but, rather, how it became disseminated.

As mentioned, the Vajsenhouse printing house obtained sole rights to publish the book on July 19th, 1737. With the publication privileges, the printing house obligated itself to meet the demand for catechism expositions for a fixed price of 10 Danish shillings and to deliver 1500 copies annually for distribution among the poor. From the Vajsenhouse executive negotiations, we read that a normal press run of an edifying instruction manual was 2000 copies.12 It was thus almost an entire press run that was to be donated, and this provides some indication of the massive order that the Ecclesiastical central administration had given to the printing house.

The Vajsenhouse certainly had plenty enough to do. In 1743, in a letter to the Ecclesiastical administration, Erik Pontoppidan mentions in passing that the printer had by that time distributed 70,000 copies, i.e., more than 10,000 a year.13 Pontoppidan’s book was thus on permanent order at the Vajsenhouse, and remained so for decades. The list of various preserved editions is impressive: from the 1700s, over 40 different editions of Pontoppidan’s exposition of the Church-catechism have been preserved.14
In the early years, sales of the book overshadowed the obligation to distribute the free copies to the poor. The Vajsenhouse did not fulfill its distribution obligations, nor were these obligations precisely formulated as to how and when the distribution should take place. A new decree, issued on May 11\(^{th}\), 1742, clarified these matters. Every third year, 4500 copies of the book should be distributed among the parishes of Denmark and Norway. The bishop should distribute the books among the churches in his region and would be charged with ensuring that they were given to those who were most needy and willing to learn.\(^{15}\) Even though this amounted to no more than two free books to each parish, the intentions of the Ecclesiastical administration were clear: the book should reach every corner of Norway and Denmark.

But how should the catechism exposition be used? What should the pastor, or the local schoolteacher if one existed, do with the many questions and answers?

The open letter which introduced the new catechism exposition as authorized reading, contained some important pedagogical considerations. In fact, it appears that it was not intended that the youth should recite the explanation word for word. Rather, the intention was that they should understand the content and be able to recapitulate it in their own simple words.\(^{16}\) The change from learning by rote to comprehension was in this way decreed by law in connection with the new exposition of the catechism.

Erik Pontoppidan’s book became the cutting edge of the Second Reformation. It was to be the instrument for creating the disciplined, Christian citizen through uniform instruction and readings. What was the nature of this truth to God-fearingness?

Pontoppidan began his work from a historical perspective: “We live in an era when secular wisdom and all types of knowledge founded upon this are on the path toward a higher degree than our ancestors could possibly have imagined”.\(^{17}\) No one in the secular sciences at that time would be content with half-truths of the past, he wrote in the introduction to the first edition. A similar development concerning the insight in “Truths of Religion” was both desirable and opportune.

We thus witness a 1737 version of optimism. This optimism is founded upon pietism, and upon words such as “light”, “enlightenment”, “reason” and “truth”, all key concepts in the exposition of the catechism.

“Light” was a central metaphor and enlightenment a key concept. In the 18\(^{th}\) century, “enlightenment” had both a worldly and a spiritual dimension. Only in the final decades of the century did the enlightenment concept become explicitly secularised, as we find it in Kant.\(^{18}\) For Pontoppidan, enlightenment thus has a dual meaning: light is “the advantage of
our era over that of our forefathers”. Darkness and twilight can now be left behind. Besides this secular and intellectual dimension of enlightenment, however, the light of truth and the true enlightenment also have a spiritual significance for Pontoppidan.

On the question of what “The Word” does to those who convert, allow the gospel to come into their heart, the answer is unequivocal: enlightenment. It means living knowledge and strong conviction about the divine truths. But continues Erik Pontoppidan: Tell me the real difference between human teachings and divine enlightenment!

In the following key answer, which has certainly caused many pupils to break out into a sweat during their examination, he distinguishes between teachings, which by reason and diligence are learned by The Word, and enlightenment, which is made active by The Word. Teachings are located only in the brain and are “a simple historical knowledge”, while enlightenment occupies the heart. In the distinction between the light in the brain and the enlightenment of the heart, we find the 18th century’s dual concept of enlightenment sharply formulated: Light has one dimension conditioned by reason and another inconceivable, emotional dimension. There is a decisive difference between the two dimensions, but not necessarily any contradiction or conflict. On the contrary, religious enlightenment is the key prerequisite for the rebirth of the individual. Here we are at the very core of Pontoppidan’s manual. The enlightenment of the heart entails the rebirth of a new person: “in reason a new light, in will a new longing, desire and strength”.20

Having come so far, Pontoppidan could pose the main question: “How does one act correctly with God’s Word?” The answer was simple: when one first beseeches God about his spirit’s enlightenment, and then reads with piety and serious afterthought, one can then act correctly with the Word. One must read, but one must read in order to satisfy the hunger of the soul, not the curiosity of the flesh. One must not distort the words according to one’s own belief, but must search “in an impartial way therein for The Truth which is to God-fearingness and try one’s own heart after this”.21 By whom should the Holy Scriptures be read? By everyone.

The Holy Writ was but the medium, which transmitted The Word to the reader, just as reading with eye and brain helped transmit The Word to the heart, where true enlightenment was made active. The result, however, was dependent upon the process: there was no true enlightenment without learning. The teachings of the brain were to a certain degree a prerequisite for the enlightenment of the heart and thereby for the formation of the Christian individual. Literacy was the minimum requirement. It was a decisive step on the path toward salvation.
Spener’s book was the model, in both form and content, for Pontoppidan’s catechism, but Spener’s text was long and the Danish translation convoluted. While Pontoppidan chose to retain Spener’s construction of the exposition in the form of questions and answers, he rewrote the text and reformulated the key concepts. At the same time he decided, with a certain symbolic value, to abolish the list of household duties which was still an independent text in Spener’s book. The world of the list of duties now belonged to the past.

Self-love, love of they neighbour and citizenship

With the elimination of the list of duties, an independent review of the estate society’s duties of obedience was kept out of the decreed manual. What remained was the recapitulation of the obligations according to the Ten Commandments, where duties to the state, to the household and to the family became part of the exposition of the “second table” of the commandments.

The “first table” of the Ten Commandments consists of the first three commandments; taken together they deal with “love to God”. To the question, “What is the essence of the second table?” Pontoppidan answered: “Love to ourselves and to our fellow man”. It is in the second table that we must seek Pontoppidan’s social teachings which, quite surprisingly, take their point of departure in love of ourselves—in the individual’s own self-love.

In reality, it is quite consistent to begin with the precondition of love of one’s neighbour (cf. Matthew, Ch. 22, v. 39): “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy self”, which brings the catechism’s first question, “Is it indeed right to love oneself?”

“Yes,” answers Pontoppidan, as long as love of self is orderly and innocent. But what is the nature of an orderly and innocent self-love? “It is a desire implanted in Man by God to make possible his true welfare and salvation”. This new concept of welfare becomes a central feature of Pontoppidan’s social vocabulary.

The key to the understanding of loving they neighbour and the obligations of the citizen in Pontoppidan is love of self. The positive formulation—that one must treat one’s fellow citizens or neighbours as one would wish to be treated—is turned on its head by Pontoppidan: “When I insert myself in the place of my neighbour, and ponder whether I will fight wildly with him, be cursed, cheated, robbed, criticised behind my back, and that in my own self-love say, ‘No’, it is for me a rule of love toward my neighbour”. In this way, Pontoppidan establishes a social individual. In this minimal version the utopian demand to
love thy neighbour becomes a social opportunity: It opens the perspective of linking together earthly welfare with heavenly salvation.

Erik Pontoppidan attempted to modernize catechism instruction, to bring it up to date. The result appears as a combination of the secular Enlightenment’s view of man as a social being with the sin-conscious demands of Pietism for active intervention, action and strength of will. In Pontoppidan’s reborn, Christian person, one catches a glimpse of the 18th century’s new, self-assured social individual – the individual possessed with a moral sentiment.

The reception of Pontoppidan’s exposition of the Church-catechism

It was unavoidable that a new instruction manual which took a position on the theological controversies of the time and broke with the patriarchal list of duties would arouse opposition and even resistance. In the town of Aarhus, the pastor Fr. Nannestad attacked the book from the pulpit and would have it burned, though he ultimately came to use it. Erik Pontoppidan summarized the book’s reception in a letter to the central administration - the Church Collegium - thusly: “How the audience received it is well known, the common people corrected themselves at each place according to the various tastes of its clerical authorities”. It was their pastor’s judgement that was decisive for the opinions of the ordinary layman, and among the sceptical pastors there was one who took up the cause of resistance: Niels Tøxen, pastor in the parish Verst and Bekke in the county of Andst, outside the east Jutland town of Kolding.

When Bishop H.A. Brorson, at a country-wide church assembly in Ribe in 1742, reminded the pastors of their obligations to utilize the authorized catechism exposition, Tøxen went for his pen and complained about Pontoppidan.

Tøxen argued that the good self-love was the root of all evil in Pontoppidan’s book. Tøxen could find no command for self-love in the Holy Scriptures; he saw it as being Pontoppidan’s invention. The background for Tøxen’s anger about self-love was the consequences it obtained for the Christian view of man. In Pontoppidan, it was somehow possible for man to keep to God’s law. This law, in its strictest version, demanded unconditional love of thy neighbour. It was a monstrosity that mankind, no matter how converted and reborn it might be, was no longer completely powerless before God. When this was added together with Pontoppidan’s concept of enlightenment, the perspectives became baffling. Man was neither completely powerless before God nor completely dependent on
his local pastor. Tøxen’s resistance ultimately led to his being dismissed as pastor. A new pastor was named, enabling Pontoppidan to be read by the congregation in Verst.

After these “birth pangs”, there was official tranquillity regarding the school textbook situation, and the only nod toward the critique was the approval to publish an abridged version of the catechism exposition in 1771 during the Struensee regime. The writings of Peder Saxtorph, the pastor and member of the Hutterite Brethren Society in Copenhagen, were important within the revivalist circles, and it was Saxtorph who edited the “Extracts of Erik Pontoppidan’s Exposition, Excerpted for the Use by Simple Folk”.29 The “Extracts” radically reduced the extent of questions and answers, but from 1785 it appears in an “enlarged and improved edition”, where Saxtorph anonymously returns to a more detailed version of Pontoppidan’s text, including the distinction between proper and improper self-love. In Copenhagen “The Extracts” went out of print after 1798, but in Norway the book obtained a long life on the book market, comprising the basis for the many Norwegian Pontoppidan extracts in the 1800s.

The replacement of Pontoppidan’s “Exposition”

During the culmination of the rationalist tendencies in the first years following the French Revolution, efforts began to create a new manual for religious instruction. The result was Bishop Nicolaj Balle’s “Manual of the Evangelical-Christian Religion, Prepared for Use in the Danish Schools”.30 In 1794, Balle’s text was declared universal and compulsory reading. Pontoppidan was replaced—at least officially. The introduction of Balle’s manual gave rise to several conflicts—mostly in Norway, but also on the island of Bornholm and in Jutland.31 The conflicts raged between the state-ecclesiastical power in Copenhagen and local congregations in the periphery. No longer were these controversies limited to the clerics and within the church’s administration. It was now a conflict between the common people and the authorities, between citizens and the state.

The congregations kept their children home from school (and from the book of Bishop Balle), while they met privately to read Pontoppidan’s exposition and his edition of Kingo’s psalms. The same book which had previously been diffused by way of royal decrees could not be eliminated by law, nor by any sort of verdict in the parishes, where Pontoppidan had contributed to: “in reason a new light, in will a new longing, desire and strength.”

The situation became especially tense in the eastern Jutland area around Kolding, Horsens and Vejle. It was not far from this parish that pastor Tøxen had fought against the
Bishop and the Church Collegium, having expressed his fear of Pontoppidan’s “enthusiasm”. At that time, it had been incumbent upon the authorities to press forward with the authorized catechism exposition, with its emphasis on the need to achieve reading for understanding. After a little more than half a century of this kind of literacy the authorities had lost control over the uses of literacy. Even with fines and punishments, it was not possible to prevent the revivalist congregations from using Pontoppidan’s textbook. The feud culminated with the “Great Pontoppidan Address”, a request from the parish of Øster Snede to the Chancellery in 1835, supported with signatures from the entire country, for the free exercise of religion.32

At that time and afterwards, the conflicts surrounding the replacement of Pontoppidan’s manual were viewed as a rebellion against the modern ideas of enlightenment from a common people, which held onto their tradition-bound lifestyle. But the conflict in Øster Snede and in many other locations was also an unintended consequence of the intensified diffusion of literacy and of the teachings, which had been the original intention of “the Second Reformation”.

The reforms of the 1730s reflect various state interests. There is the interest in educating the population as both Christians and as citizens. In addition, we can identify the state’s interest in increased control of society at all levels. In the form Pontoppidan rendered to the instruction, the first interest became an obstacle for the second.

The struggle over Pontoppidan’s manual was not only a struggle between modern, enlightened ideas and traditional ones. In its content, it was a case of a conflict between two different versions of the modern breakthrough in catechism teaching in the eighteenth century. It was a conflict between Pietism and Rationalism, whose social views of man worked for some of the same goals as those which opposed the orthodoxy of the past.

Echoes of Pontoppidan: opposition and tradition in 19th century Denmark and Norway

In December 1814, the revivalist preacher Hans Nielsen Hauge left prison in Christiania in Norway for the last time. The case against him had ended. Hauge had been convicted of violating the prohibition on religious gatherings (according to Konventikelsplakaten from 1741) and of slandering pastors and authorities. That same year, Norway, following the Treaty of Kiel and after the Eidsvoll Constitution, was no longer tied to the central administration in Copenhagen, which had controlled the process from afar. Immediately prior to the beginning of the long trial against Hauge, in 1804, he had visited the revivalist circles in Jutland, where the controversy between Pontoppidan and Bishop Balle was taking place.33
Hauge and the Hauge movement had a tremendous impact on the institutionalisation of Pontoppidan’s text in Norway in the nineteenth century. The resolution from September 8th, 1818 states that Balle’s text could continue to be used where it was already in use, while for the remainder public schools and confirmation instruction no other textbook could be used besides Pontoppidan’s “Truth to God-fearingness” and Saxtorph’s extracts of same. Balle’s officially authorized textbook could be used, while Pontoppidan had to be used for the future. The resolution was a provocation to the chancellery in Copenhagen and to the former administration.

We are now back to Hertzberg’s little debate book from 1885, “The Shortcomings of Pontoppidan’s Exposition and the Principles for a New One”, with which I began this essay. Niels Hertzberg, an exponent of teacher college training for the institutionalised Norwegian schools, proved unable to cast Pontoppidan out of the market. The new textbooks which the debate brought with it were based primarily on Pontoppidan. Several new textbooks would subsequently appear, but Pontoppidan’s would prove to outlive them. An abbreviated version by J.R. Sverdrup brought Pontoppidans book into the 20th century.

In Denmark, the original “Truth to God-fearingness” (1737 edition) appeared in Horsens in the 1840s as part of a local victory over the authorities. It became permissible to teach children at home following Pontoppidan, as long as they were to be examined in school. New editions of the text were produced in Jutland, but it was only the unabridged text which was republished. Saxtorph’s “Extract” did not find renewed diffusion, as occurred in Norway. Pontoppidan’s text was and remained the stuff of conflict in Denmark.

The authorities’ acquiescence in the Pontoppidan case after four decades of resistance came too late to alter the peasants’ position on the political chessboard. The “Peasant Circular” was the move from the authorities, which in November 1845 decided the game. The circular outlawed the holding of political meetings without the approval of the police, and it absolutely forbade meetings across parish boundaries. It was a political repetition of the religious konventikelplakat from the 18th century, and there was a narrow historical association between the revivalist movements and the new political movements in the countryside. When the “Peasant Circular” was again revoked in May 1846, the political association known as The Society of the Friends of the Peasant had become a reality.

That the legacy from the pietism of the eighteenth century allied itself with liberal political forces in the final phase of the absolutist regime is due to a combination of political events. The religious worldview and the key concepts, which we have investigated above, made their impact in different political contexts. Pietism and the religious movements did not
have a specific political implication. This applied in the eighteenth century as well as in the
nineteenth century. The Second Reformation could contribute to the modernization of the
absolutist state’s educational and administrative system from the 1730s, and the revivalist
movements could contribute to the demise of the absolutist state institutions in the 1840s. The
common denominator for the impact of pietism was *individualization* and *responsibility*. The
internalisation of the Christian sense of belief individualized the relationship to God, and
made salvation an individual matter. Responsibility and conscientiousness followed
enlightenment, “in reason a new light, in will a new longing, desire and strength”.

The historical effects of Pontoppidan’s religious instruction manual in Norway and
Denmark differed only on the political surface. Underneath these controversies, the
undercurrent was the same, whether the text was the expression of tradition after the Eidsvoll
Constitution or the medium for opposition in the period before the Danish Constitution of
June 1849.
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