POPULAR LECTURES.

GIVEN AT THE INVITATION OF LECTURE SOCIETIES IN KOLDING,

FREDERICIA AND AAGAARD

BY

R. NIELSEN.

COPENHAGEN.

PUBLISHED BY THE GYLDENDAL BOOKSHOP (F. HEGEL).

PRINTED BY J. JØRGENSEN & CO.

1875.

Translated from the Danish

Contents.

Page

First Lecture. The Conditions of the Times: An Old Breach of the Fundamental Law **1**
Second Lecture, Christ as the Teacher and Leader of the Peoples **18**
Third Lecture. What Christ Teaches about the Historical Future **35**
Fourth Lecture. The Present Age: Light and Shadow **54**
Fifth Lecture. Church and Religion: Fiat and Authority **70**
Sixth Lecture. "Judgments of God" in History **86**
Seventh Lecture. The Ordering of the Danish People's Church by Law **103**
Eighth Lecture. The University and the Folk High School **120**
Ninth Lecture. A Small People **139**
In Memory of the Battle of Isted, a Festival Address **156**

First Lecture,

given in Kolding.

The present age is full of questions, for the world is full of doubt and unrest. Even if *[1]* it is quiet on the surface, yet it seethes in the depths; the stillness is like a calm at sea. The mighty speak of peace, but behold! they stand armed to the teeth, they measure one another with their eyes: a wrinkled brow, a word of threat, a grey cloud on the forehead of power at once takes shape as a drawn sword, an omen that awakens fear and sets mind and thoughts astir. Forebodings weigh heavily, the tension grows; one explanation takes refuge in another, one question calls to another: whence does it come? what does it aim at? whither does it lead?

We look at what lies nearest to us; but this nearest of ours points to something that is farther off, this again to something that is yet more distant. Whence proceeds the first impulse? Where is the source of the movements, the great driving-wheel that keeps the whole in motion? We are borne along by a mighty current, but where does it issue? Where is our goal, our anchorage, our safe harbor, when the storms come?

To give an all-sided, complete, in every respect reliable answer to such great questions surpasses human powers, and no mortal shall presume to read such dark *[2]* runes. Yet we are not without guidance. There is in all that is uncertain something that is unfailingly certain. History is an open book; we have a revealed word of truth to light our way: there are guiding stars in the heaven of the spirit. Everyone who has looked into the deep river and at the same time given heed to the guiding stars has an intimation of the direction of the movements and will be able, from his own station, to contribute, be it only a slight contribution, to the answering of the questions. I shall endeavor to make a contribution. What I have to communicate does not directly concern the burning question of the moment, not such practical affairs as are otherwise discussed in popular assemblies and ought to be discussed by men of insight and expert knowledge, men who with an unbiased eye for the real whole and for all the particulars know the means at hand and the nearest ways that lead to the goal. Outside the political movements of the present — but yet by no means indifferent to them —, I am, by the bent of my life, referred chiefly to a contemplative apprehension, a setting up of general points of view, an observation of the great laws according to which the movements proceed. I shall set forth my view as plainly and clearly, as openly and freely as lies in my power. What I then have to

say on this occasion I commend to the honored assembly's kind attention and serious examination.

The Preacher says that all is vanity, "vanity of vanities. One generation goes and one generation comes, but the earth abides forever. The sun rises and the sun goes
[3] down and hastens to the place from which it is to rise again. All the brooks run to the sea, but the sea is not full; for the place to which the rivers go, from there they return again. All words grow weary; no one can utter it, the eye is not weary of seeing nor the ear filled with hearing. What has been, that will be, what has happened, that will happen, and there is nothing new under the sun."

If this were the explanation; if the changing times brought nothing new and distinctive, but the same and the same in endless repetitions; if the present were only a ghost from the graves of the past, how hollow and ghostlike would the many-colored, richly stirring life of man then not be! It is the Preacher's last thought that *the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom*; if the thought of the fear of God is taken away, then the whole is a mere up and down. To establish this short, pithy thought the view of the cycle that has been set forth is to be understood as a prolix introduction; it is the faded experience of the great ones of the world, the moth-eaten worldly wisdom, the life-weary wisdom, that speaks.

"What has been, that will be; what has happened, that will happen;" that is undeniably true, so long as the talk is only of the general laws of existence. There are and there always have been sin and frailty in the course of the generations' lives; there is and there always has been a most dubious, here and there revolting discord between the mighty and the lowly, rich and poor, those who enjoy and those who suffer, the sorrowful and the glad. What has happened, that will happen, that the strong overpower the weak, that power is courted, that its center of gravity is now
[4] above and now below, now with a few and now with the multitude. It has happened and it will happen that those who come to power misuse it, whether in the name of the individual or of the multitude, if no counterweight is set up. It has happened and it will happen that men envy one another the use of power in the same degree as they flatter those in power. If power is with the individual, and the individual is absolute, then the absolute ruler is hated as a devil and hailed as a god. If power is with the multitude, then the voice of the majority is the voice of God, then cunning is afoot to spy out the passions of the mob, to use its dim instincts and to make the ignorant believe that they really have a will: then one flatters and crawls before the multitude. If this is the only sight on which we are to dwell, then the Preacher is right: vanity of

vanities; there is nothing new under the sun.

But the sight ought not to stop at the undulating surface of the movements, at the monotonous rocking up and down or at the shadows on the broad river which passing clouds cast; deeper at the bottom stands an image, the image of wisdom, a finger-post of a Providence that steers the movements toward a goal. Every age, when we look more closely, has its labors, its peculiar tasks and receives in proportion to these its stamp and its distinctive character. It happens thus, that one great endeavor gains power and takes up the others into itself, one thought of life rises and rules the many thoughts, one direction of the will works its way forward and gains the upper hand over the many wills, and in this thought of life and the corresponding will the Governance has laid a goal.

In the Middle Ages it was the Church that became the highest ruling power. Men *[5]* might turn whither they would, try whatever they liked, private or public, in family life or in civil society, everywhere they met the ever-watchful eye of ecclesiastical authority: only what received the Church's blessing could grow and thrive; what was struck by its curse had to wither and die. The Middle Ages were the age of the Church.

Between the Reformation and the French Revolution (1517—1789) lies a period in which the relations of society were gradually transformed in such a manner that the secular power gained a decided preponderance over the ecclesiastical. It was the State with its absolutism that, in the form of absolute monarchy, extended its scepter over high and low. From the Crown the light of life radiated; the small herbs found shelter, and the tall plants grew in the shadow of the Throne. It was no invention of the arbitrariness of an individual, but a natural consequence of the course of things. The State was the end, all else only means. The great enjoyed their privileges, in this there was no wrong; it was, after all, as the supports of the State, for the State's sake, for the glorification of the State. The multitude toiled and sighed, in this there was no wrong; it was, after all, in the service of the State, for the State's sake, for the good of the whole. Thus the absolutism of the State is the opposite of the Church's; no one can mistake the two ages.

But now our own age, the present in which we live, what character has it, and what name will it bear? It is still in its beginning, in its early spring. But in the early spring the weather is apt to be unsettled: sunshine alternates with drizzle and sleet. Many seed-corns and many kinds of seed lie hidden in the earth, and no one can *[6]* see what it is until it has sprouted and come up. Much of what comes up first is not

always the best, for where the soil is not cultivated and cleared, the weeds grow as luxuriantly as the corn. None the less the age has already such firm and distinctive features that we cannot be in doubt as to its character and nature. Its birth and descent are no accident; it is the true child of its past, born of the womb of the dispensations of Providence and baptized in the stream of events. It was in '48, a stirring year, that the thread snapped, and the newborn stirred vigorously in its swaddling-clothes. On a stormy day it was held over the font; black, lightning-laden clouds darkened the heavens, but the clouds parted, and the sun broke forth, when the age received the new, yet age-old name: *The Time of the People, the Time of the Peoples!* Great expectations, rich hopes attach themselves to this name; may the young age but grasp the greatness of its task; may it keep its coat of arms unspotted and bright and remain true to its mission; may its baptism of the people be more than a baptism of water, may it do honor to its name!

A difficulty at once presents itself when the talk is of the Time of the People, for by what is it actually to be known? When the highest governance has its seat in the Church, then it is easy to say what the Church is. It is like the city on the mountain, a grand institution with a distinctive doctrine and laws. It presents itself to view as a divine order of things; it knows its friends and it knows its foes: it can be stated exactly how far its dominion extends. The same holds of the State, when it
[7] has received its proper form as the sole ruling power on earth But to show exactly where the people is, and what it is, to make due distinction between its friends and foes, is by no means an easy task. Where is the people? In the whole mass of the population. The multitude must be included, if the people is to be included; and yet the multitude is not the people: the people as a people stands high above the multitude. The multitude must be kept in check and ruled; but the people must rule itself and its multitude. Without popular self-government no true popular life; but how is popular self-government possible?

Under the absolutism of the Church popular life could not thrive; for self-government lay exclusively in the Church's hand. The Church alone had to command, the peoples had to believe and obey; with that the matter was settled. In such a state of blind submission the people had, at least in part, to sink down to being a mere multitude. Likewise under the absolutism of the State. In this respect it is instructive to note the likeness between the two great powers, the Church and the State, as regards the conception of the people.

When the multitude, the great mob, sinks on its knees before the Pope, believes

in his miracles and goes devoutly in the procession, then it is not the multitude that kneels, no, it is the people, the pious, believing people; and the Church is popular, it loves the people. But if a deeper religious need awakens in the people, if a feeling stirs in its mind that the inward is the goal, that the divine is profaned by outward mummery: then the Church's eye grows dark; it does not see the people at all then, it sees only the multitude, the unbelieving mob, damnable heretics, who are to be rooted out.

When, in the age of the State, the ruler showed himself in public, and the mob *[8]* shouted Hurrah, and the multitude rejoiced, it was not the mob, not the multitude, that shouted Hurrah, no! it was the good citizens, the dear, faithful people; and the sole ruler was popular, he loved his people, after all. But if there awoke in the people a question of right, a feeling of oppression and revolting inequality, and an uncanny murmuring was heard, then the police had to step forward. It was naturally not the people that murmured, it was only the multitude, the rude mob, and the multitude, the rude mob, was to be chastised.

If it were only such self-governing disciplinarians as the absolute Church or the absolute State that the people had against it, it would long since have outgrown the rod; but it has an adversary to fight who is far more dangerous, because he is not merely outward, but also inward. He does not announce himself as a foe, but as a friend and brother; his nature is so naturally grown together with the existence of the people that at any moment, when occasion offers, he can step forward and say: it is I who am the people. This false friend, this dangerous brother is — *the multitude.* To wish to let the multitude rule, or to set about introducing popular self-government after the mind of the multitude, is the most absurd of all things, for the multitude cannot rule itself: its nature is to be unruly. Let it be well observed that the multitude has precisely the same conception of right and might as the most revolting tyranny of a single man. The same battle-cry, the same watchword; We are strong, for we are many; the watchword is: *the right of the stronger.*

From this point of view, history gives a sorrowful lesson. Every time a popular will is in the process of forming itself, a will that equally embraces all, small and great, *[9]* a will that wills the good and right, because it truly wills what is genuinely human, there is at once a craftiness in the game, a cunning deceit, which disrupts the whole. Now it is a gifted man of power who in the name of the people wins the multitude to his side and brings order after his own fashion by taking the lion's share and doing violence to the people. Now it is the multitude which, singing hymns of freedom,

tears asunder the bonds of order and at last, despite cries and shouts for law and right, ends in a disorder from which tyranny is born. It is a fate that has weighed heavily on peoples and generations for millennia on end. Whence can it come? From an old sin, from inner discord between will and will, between natural will, self-willed instinctual will, and the will of the spirit.

There is an old account outstanding between the spirit and the race, a breach of the fundamental law from time immemorial, a rebellion against the laws of the spirit, with which history begins. The events of the world form a web that conceals this; but the revealed word draws the veil aside and shows us what the spirit wills. In the morning of the ages judgment was held upon the egoism of the men of power as well as upon the multitude.

In the sixth chapter of the first book of Moses the following is related. "And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born to them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair, and they took them wives of all whom they chose. The giants were on the earth in
[10] those days, and likewise afterwards, after the sons of God had gone in to the daughters of men. These are the mighty ones, who from ancient times were men of renown."

There are now those who have thought that there was in this something veiled and mythical, something obscure and heathen, that the sons of God (the sons of Elohim) must be either sons of lower gods or perhaps fallen angels, demons. These ruminations are superfluous; what the Word reveals is plain enough. The sons and daughters of whom it is here spoken are of common descent, all, naturally understood, children of the same race, all, spiritually understood, children of God, created in God's image. Adam is called the son of God (Luke 3:38); the mighty on earth, princes and judges, are called gods. "God judges among the gods" (Ps. 82:1). "I said: Ye are gods, all of you are children of the Most High, but now ye shall die like men" (Ps. 82:6—7; John 10:34—35). The same human nature is here presented from two sides: in the strength of the man is seen the divine, in the beauty of the woman the human. Strong men and fair women, that is the race with its rich endowment, a vigorous race, which neither the toilsomeness of labor nor the yoke of bondage has yet bent.

What comes next and is more surprising is the look with which Jehovah regards this race; for it is not in mildness and grace, but in indignation and wrath. In this men have above all wished to glimpse a remnant of heathenism, a mythical, still half idolatrous conception of the nature of the spirit. Jehovah, it is said, according to the whole narrative has evidently become envious and afraid. He is envious of this

surpassing fullness of strength and beauty; he is afraid that these men of renown, these *[11]*
mighty giants, will — like the Titans in the Greek myth — try to storm his heaven and overthrow his throne. That is a small example of the supposedly higher knowledge of the present age about the divine, but for the rest an enormous misunderstanding. The wrath of the spirit of which it is here spoken is not directed against the rich gifts of nature with which the Creator himself from the beginning has endowed the human race; no, it is directed against the misuse of these gifts. Jehovah sees that the richly endowed race, which is now to try its powers and tread the path of freedom, will not use the gifts in the service of the spirit; he sees these giants give themselves up to selfish natural impulses, he sees them wildly working for their own renown and using the right of the stronger; and the Judge's voice is heard: "My spirit shall not rule among men forever, since he is flesh, and his days shall be one hundred and twenty years."

When the powers of spirit in the gifted are transformed into powers of flesh, when an unbridled self-will employs these powers only to sate rapacity, the hunger of ambition and the lust of enjoyment, then the spirit turns away with loathing from the strong; their boundary is set, their days are numbered, their doom is pronounced. They are terrible words, the words of Revelation about the giants' stock with its great deeds: "Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and all the devisings of his heart only evil every day." The holy wrath of the spirit cannot be depicted in stronger colors than when it is said: "it repented Jehovah that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him in his heart." The strife between the will of the spirit and the self-willed instinctual will of man, strong in nature, is already *[12]*
here at its height. We may be assured that what the spirit already at the beginning of history judged of the brutal renown won by violence and wrong, the same it judges even to this very day. Just as those first attempts of the giants, by which the earth was "corrupt before God" and "was full of violence," dissolved and were washed away in the Flood, so history in its continued course has been a flood of destruction for all great works which were not built upon truth and right, and had not the consecration of the spirit.

And now the great work of the multitude. The passage is found in the eleventh chapter of the first book of Moses. "And the whole earth was one tongue and one language. And it came to pass, when the peoples journeyed from the east, that they found a valley in the land of Shinar, and they dwelt there. And they said, one to another, Come, let us make bricks, and burn a burning; and brick served them for

stone and earth-pitch for mortar. And they said: Come! let us build a city and a tower, and its top shall reach to heaven, and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered over the face of the earth."

In this event there is something which at first glance must awaken our highest astonishment. What people is it of whom it is here spoken? "The families of Noah's sons;" thus Jehovah's, the spirit's, own people, for Jehovah had made a covenant with Noah. What evil can there then be in this, that these many set about working together and building a city and a tower? Here are no giants striking down among dwarfs, no
[13] men of violence overawing the weak, no slave-drivers, who whip the bondmen to gather straw and make bricks. On the contrary! All goes so evenly, so briskly and peacefully, that the immense multitude of busy hands makes the impression of a great, harmonious workers' association, in which the one unceasingly encourages the other with a: Come, come! It is, after all, a fair sight, a grand employment of the forces of the people, who work, not for dispersion, but for unity and brotherly cohesion: what can be objected to this? And yet the spirit is wroth; Jehovah comes down and confounds the workers and disrupts their work. How is it possible that confusion and disruption can proceed from the spirit? "And Jehovah said: Behold, it is one people and one tongue for all, and this they have begun to do, and now nothing will be able to be denied them of what they purpose to do." As dark, yes, as meaningless as these words would be, if we understood them in a manner so childish that the Almighty were really minded to scatter the peoples and weaken the popular will for fear of the high tower; so clear and intelligible are they, when we grasp them as an expression of the truth in the thought of the all-governing will. The tower, whose top was to reach to heaven, was by no means intended to pierce the vault of heaven; it was a great work which was to have significance on earth alone, a towering point of union, which, by defying the changes of the times, was to be an eloquent testimony to what human powers can accomplish.

The working tribes on this occasion think not at all of either insulting heaven or defiantly challenging the spirit; their thought is much rather this, that they can best
[14] do the whole thing themselves; so they let heaven be heaven, and the spirit spirit, and set about the work. Age-old and yet as of yesterday! The spirit is not, if we may so say, angered on its own account, because it is overlooked by men and does not enjoy the honor of being included. It is for men's sake, on behalf of the people and of popular life, that the spirit is wroth, for without the cooperation of the spirit popular life is impossible.

The busy people who build in the valley of Shinar have renounced what in a deeper sense can recall the claim of the spirit, and are on the point of sinking down to a mere multitude. They have forgotten what is original, their forefather's relation to Jehovah and the sign of the covenant that was set in the cloud. What is a rainbow, after all? A fleeting gleam of light without reality, without reliability; so it stands, in their opinion, with the spirit also. No, a tower is something quite otherwise real and lasting; and then it is besides the work of their own hands, the immortal work by which they "make themselves a name." Jehovah's word, his sign of omnipotence and his governing wisdom, of that one did not know what it was; it was something one could not get hold of at all, it was all fleeting and airy like the rainbow. Bricks, clay and earth-pitch, of these one knew what they were, they were things of value, something one could feel and lay hold of. Thus this teeming multitude with its bustle, its capacity for work and colossal striving has denied the deepest presuppositions of human life, broken with the spirit, broken the holy covenant with Jehovah.

This is the condition of life and freedom: if the original is denied, if the spirit is not allowed to be included in living faith, in inner appropriation and free obedience, then *[15]* the Invisible One gathers the cloud of his wrath over the anthill of spiritless self-will, disrupts its work and scatters what it has gathered. It is impossible that there in a human society can be true unity without a deeper ground of unity; but the deeper ground of unity is a ground of will. The ground of unity is in the recognition of the good and right; the true decisive will is the will of the spirit. Where the ground and the will are lacking, the unity is imagined and transitory; minds change, instinctual will expresses itself in shifting outbreaks of selfish inclinations and passions: disunity comes suddenly upon the united from behind, when they least expect it.

By the ground of unity and the kind of will one is to know the difference between the people and the multitude. If the great plan with the great tower in the valley of Shinar had really had a true will-demand deeply rooted in human nature, then we should have to admit without denial that here was more than a multitude, that the many tribes were one people, an enterprising, capable, aspiring people, which worked at something exalted and noble; the God who out of arbitrary caprice wished to disrupt a noble human work we should have to declare outright an idol. But the Babylonian tower-builders have no such ground of unity; had they such a ground, then they must necessarily have had the spirit along with them, but it is precisely the spirit that is shut out. It is not the people, it is the multitude, that has here banded together to complete an outward extraordinary thing, which could really catch the eye.

Let us look at the matter naturally and ask: how could the unity about so immense
[16] a joint undertaking be thought to hold? Were there no leaders, then there was no plan of building either; everyone had to go his own way, and that could then not possibly lead to unity. Were there leaders, chief overseers, then these must either apply compulsion or persuasion. Compulsion they could not apply, for when the multitude is to be put under compulsion, it gives itself out at once as the people, and then it is said straightway that violence is done to the people. The leaders have therefore had to limit themselves to applying persuasion. Now nothing is surely easier than to persuade the multitude to do something which at bottom it has a mind to, something to which it believes it feels an inner irresistible urge; but to persuade the multitude to do something to which it has no mind, that is the most difficult of all. It has therefore, one may imagine, when the work began to grow hard and the tower crooked in the valley of Shinar, come to a serious opposition against the chief overseers, to debates so motley, broad and long-drawn-out, that the languages were confounded, and the speakers at last did not understand one another.

And what is it, then, that the spirit does? It hastens the decision and pronounces the judgment. It is its will that the discord hidden in the nature of self-will shall become manifest; it makes it known of what kind such a cohesion, such a unity is. "Come, let us go down and confound their tongue, so that the one shall not understand the other's tongue. — And Jehovah scattered them abroad over the face of the whole earth, and they left off to build the city."

We learn from this that early there came a breach between spirit and people. As
[17] a consequence of this breach the many tribes with the many tongues had then to wander each his own ways — to victories or defeats, exaltation or humiliation, honor or disgrace. The will of the spirit has not been satisfied; there is wrath in the look of the spirit, and yet the spirit is love: there is a glimmering of spirit in the natural ground of the peoples. The gleam is different in proportion to the particular endowment of the individual peoples and their peculiar gifts; but something divine stirs in them all. They yearn, they struggle, they grope and stumble; but the movement goes on with unceasing speed — ever forward! On a thousand reefs, of the power of the great, of the tyranny of order and the wild multitude's hatred of order, the ship of the people has hitherto been stranded: the shores of memory are strewn with wrecks. It is the old offence, the old breach of the fundamental law, which again and again has taken its revenge. Always the right of the stronger! "But then righteousness itself must at last become the stronger"; that is the inmost thought in the mind of the peoples. It

is this sight — a rainbow in the cloud — that they yearn for; it is the goal of reality toward which they strive. After the confusions, sufferings and defeats of struggles a thousand years long, a turning-point has at last come. The sun of enlightenment has in our days risen so high in the heavens that we can see where we are. We cannot yet see the issue of the struggle, far from it! but we can nevertheless see the goal. If the goal is to be reached, there must be will. It is not the will of the individual, not the will of the multitude or majority will, that is in question; no, it is the popular will. But the true popular will is inseparable from the will of the spirit; if the people is to conquer in the hard struggle and reach its goal, then it must experience the power of consecration: it must be baptized with spirit.

Second Lecture,

given in Fredericia.

---

[18] It is taught in Holy Scripture that the human race dwells on the whole circle of the earth of one blood. But it is also related how it came about that the one lineage became many lineages, the one family of peoples many tribes of peoples, the one original, common language many different tongues. The dispersion and the difference are now so great that the investigators of our scientific age must begin their inquiries afresh and put to themselves the question: is the whole human race really of one descent? Can all these white, black, olive-yellow and copper-red human beings be supposed to descend from one pair of parents? The inequality is more than outward, it is not confined to the skin and the hair, to the shape of the skull and of the face, the iris of the eye, and the like; it is just as great in the inward as in the outward. Some tribes of people are wonderfully gifted, others not; some distinguish themselves by a high degree of enlightenment and culture, others are still on the lowest step of rudeness. Even among the gifted the inequality is great, the Indians, the Egyptians, the Greeks,
[19] the Romans and the Northmen have each had their own direction of spirit, each its own peculiar view of life. This is seen especially in their gods, for they are gods of the peoples; these gods of the peoples were, so to speak, the holders of the spiritual capital on which the peoples lived.

What a difference between two such circles of gods as the Greek and the Norse; with all that they have in common, there is, as regards depth and inwardness, a considerable distance between them: Odin does not understand Zeus, Aphrodite and Freja cannot live together under one roof. These gods are the original bearers of the peculiarity of a people; when they age, grow pale and sink, the strength of popular life withers away. If now what we call the spirit of the people were only a hazy fancy, a web of unclear stirrings and strong dreams: then we might indeed explain the gods to ourselves as the first bright figures in which the human being, the mind overfilled with thoughts, presentiments and half-understood longings, found a colorful, manifold reflection of its own moved interior; but then we should also at the same stroke have to reduce the spirits of the people to vanishing spirits of the times. Either we should then have to suppose that popular life in the present could thrive and flourish without spirit, or expect that the old faith of the people with the old gods would arise from the dead and displace the new enlightenment. The first is

just as unreasonable as the last. We must therefore regard the spirits of the people from heathen days as spirit-like powers, scattered gleams and dim proclamations of the one eternal Spirit of truth, whose light has never ceased to shine in the darkness.

When light passes through layers of cloud, the rays are broken and the colors many; so too when the spiritual light is to make its way through the unequal natural *[20]* ground of the peoples. We may very well ascribe validity to the spirits of the people without making them persons or setting them up as independent beings. The Spirit of truth will not efface the peculiarity of the peoples, but it will remove what is foreign, what is hostile, and, as it is permitted to rule, ennoble the distinctive and glorify the peculiar. The Spirit of truth is personal in the true religion; its human revelation is Christ. In order to see how the Spirit of Christ is related to the spirit of the people, we shall in this lecture consider Christ and the people.

Christ and the people: this relation is not the same as: Christ and the congregation. For the faith of the congregation, the Only-begotten of the Father stands as the revealer of God in flesh and blood, the Reconciler, the Crucified One, who suffered and died for the sins of the world, rose from the grave and entered into glory; Christ does not stand in so inward a relation to the people as a people. The popular eye sees the divine in him from the human side, regards him as a heroic figure, an eminent, unique character in the history of the world, and dwells on his public life. In his public life Christ shows himself as the man of the people, its guide, teacher and leader. What he teaches the people, what he judges about the people, what he will do for the people and what he wills that the people shall do, thus becomes, from this point of view, the main thing.

Immediately at his first appearance Christ sends out a light which separates the multitude and the people; the multitude seeks him, and in the multitude he seeks the people. His Sermon on the Mount is a speech to the multitude and yet in the highest sense a speech of the people. Here is something that distinguishes the speaker of *[21]* the people in Galilee from the orators in Athens and Rome. The great orators in the capitals of the world so readily began by reminding the assembled of their natural rights and claims. "Athenians! — Quirites! Free citizens, freeborn men, you know indeed that you yourselves have power to make laws; you know and feel that it is unworthy of you to obey other laws than those you have yourselves made." By such speeches the passions were set in motion, and the multitude took courage. Of course, it was not directly the multitude that was spoken of; it was expressly, with all the ring and force of a fully resounding eloquence, to the people that the speech was

addressed, about the people, solely and only about the people. None the less there was something questionable behind it. There was something political, not to say Polis-ish, in the whole procedure. It looked to the life in the eyes of the multitude as if freedom came with a leap, as if it sprang out of the head of the orator, just as the full-grown, fully armed Minerva once sprang out of the head of Jupiter. Thus the multitude broke loose, but the people was and remained a prisoner, it merely changed its leading-strings: it sounded like freedom, but ended in slavish dependence.

The speaker of the people in Galilee goes about it differently. In order to set the people free, he begins by binding the multitude. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you: till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." In thus speaking from the mount, he speaks from the height of the spirit, of eternity — not of civil laws, which can be transformed
[22] and changed, but of the unchangeable law, the holy fundamental law that is written in the hearts of men, the law of truth, of righteousness and of love, which endures though heaven and earth pass away. And he sharpens this law and makes it still stricter. "Ye have heard what was said to them of old; but I say unto you" . . . . A sum of outward commandments is not enough; what matters essentially is the inward. In thus impressing upon the listening throngs what it is that is originally required, an inner change, a thoroughgoing transformation of the mind: not to will because there is compulsion, but sincerely to will because it is a need of the heart, the strictness itself becomes gentleness. Thus he transforms the law from a law of the letter into a law of the spirit, from a law of compulsion into a law of freedom, and helps the people to freedom.

One might fear that the multitude would murmur and feel offended at so bold a speech from a single defenseless man — for that Christ at that time could not stand before the eyes of the many in the light in which he now stands for us goes without saying. He stood among them as one who wished to be judged by his words and deeds alone. But he knew how to lay hold of the consciences and transform the multitude into a people. The impression of the speech is — significantly enough — rendered in the words: "The people were astonished exceedingly at his doctrine, for he taught them as one that had authority, and not as the scribes." As one that had authority, how strange! Had the scribes, then, no authority? Judging by externals, it should surely be they alone who had the authority; they were indeed the authorities of the land, the interpreters and upholders of the law, the appointed guardians of the people.

But their authority was only a semblance. The people had a feeling that these scribes, *[23]* with all their word-splitting and legal learning without vitality, were without deeper sense for truth, without spiritual superiority. The whole existing order was an empty externality, something outlived, which clung to forms and conventions.

In order to restore the true authority, Christ must begin from the foundation by tearing down the false. He does it as the leader of the people, without any final regard, without circumlocution, without sparing. He tears the mask from hypocrisy; in the hearing of the whole people he cries woe over "the whited sepulchres." His words could fall like the dew of heaven, cooling the house like mild airs that stir about the child of the mountain; but when insolence wounded him, and the holy wrath broke forth, then his speech was a thunder, and the lightnings crackled. "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works, for they say, and do not. For they bind heavy burdens, grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders, but they themselves will not move them with one finger."

We can understand that the scribes and the Pharisees, the men of order, of sobriety and of the old godliness, must hate the new prophet with a thorough hatred. Seize him openly they dared not, catch him in words they could not. They therefore lay in wait for an opportunity, and meanwhile gave vent to their feelings in various judgments. Soon it was said, with the assumed superiority of a learned distinction: he is an idiot, an ignorant man, who does not know the Scriptures; soon with brutal slander: he is *[24]* a glutton and a drinker and consorts with the vulgar rabble; soon with undisguised wrath: he hath a devil, he is a past master of seducing the people, a devilish man. Others, who wished to pass for being more fair-minded, thought perhaps that what he said about the founding of his kingdom, his kingship of David and his throne was not so straightforward to understand according to the letter. But then one had to deplore deeply that he filled the multitude with delusions and spoke to the people of something that far exceeded its power of comprehension.

The words of hatred and the outbursts of blindness do not trouble us; but the question whether Christ as the teacher of the people could really be understood by the people weighs upon our mind. If the opposite were the case, not only would the work of Christ be in vain; but those who even in our days fear everything from a popular enlightenment and earnestly warn against speaking to the people of lofty things would indeed be perfectly right. We can console ourselves over this misunderstanding. The orators in Athens and Rome hardly always knew what they were doing when they

spoke to the people and meant the multitude; but the speaker of the people in Galilee is clearly aware of what he does when he speaks to the multitude and means the people: "he that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

Christ knew full well that in the whole population there were not only noble but also ignoble elements; he knew the hardness of hearts, of those who see and yet do not see, who hear and yet do not hear. He compares the word of his kingdom to a sowing and speaks of the sower: some falls by the wayside, some on stony ground, some
[25] among thorns, but there is also some that falls on good ground and bears, thirtyfold, sixtyfold, a hundredfold. All the people hung upon him and heard him, and he knew well that they could understand him when they sincerely wished to. When not only the twelve, but afterwards also the seventy disciples whom he had sent out returned and joyfully announced to him how the word had been received, "he rejoiced in spirit and said: I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto those under age." Here is, for the cause of popular life, a turning point of the times. There is something that surpasses the power of comprehension of the common people, and that is in learning and science: the course of the stars, the long history of the development of the earth, the natural descent of living generations from lower to higher in ascending links; there is in these enlightenments something glorious and great, something that popular society cannot do without. And yet the common people cannot understand it, a proof that it is indeed a higher thing, but not the highest. Thus: the higher the whole people cannot understand, but with inwardness of soul, in simplicity of heart, it can understand the highest. Wonderful wisdom! It is this thought of life that came into the world with Christ; it is he who vouches for an equal understanding of the great principles of equality and freedom, an understanding that is essentially compatible with the difference between the wise and the simple, the learned and the unlearned. By putting this thought of life into force Christ has founded popular enlightenment and taken the first decisive step toward the liberation of the peoples.

[26] The popular enlightenment that Christ has founded has, however, been misunderstood from two opposing points of view, one one-sidedly worldly and one just as one-sidedly godly.

From the worldly side it has indeed been willing to concede that there is knowledge of human nature, feeling and deep emotion in everything that the Nazarene says. His words about the lilies of the field and the birds under heaven are fitted to bring a beneficent relief to the mind depressed by cares of livelihood and anxieties. But,

it is objected, moods are not enough. We live on the earth in earthly conditions. Enterprising people must attend to their trade; they must work and spin, they must sow and reap and gather into barns, they cannot, like the lilies or like the birds, be free of care for the morrow. It would thus — so the worldly-wise think — be a deficiency in Christ's teaching that he took no account of the practical, the nearest, the useful. Instead of letting his hearers consider the lilies of the field and the birds under heaven, he ought at once to have taught them to read, write and reckon, to have initiated them into the economy of the state, especially into politics; all of which must be regarded as useful and necessary. A great misunderstanding. What is here adduced as a deficiency is precisely perfection. What Christ imparts to the people contains precisely the presupposition and condition for all that is practical, all that is useful, in which there is blessing.

There is something unhealthy in the feverish zeal and ruthless greed with which a worldly mind can give itself up to gain and gain in agriculture, in handicraft, in trade and industry, in short, to everything that procures advantage, embellishment and enjoyment of the present life. Especially, nothing is more dangerous for a people that *[27]* is to learn to use its freedom than to throw itself violently and headlong into a political commotion, supposing that politics is the highest thing on earth. If the mind is not filled and moved by something higher, it will easily happen that self-righteousness, willfulness and unclean passions confuse the sight and drag even the better away to a sorry imitation of the artifices that stain the politics of the great, that web of injustices in which servitude sits.

Christ's word is simple and deep: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things that ye have need of shall be added unto you." How this word is to be taken in the congregation shall not be treated here. We take it in this connection as a word to the people; we shall convince ourselves that it finds a great, decisive practical application. Far from paralyzing a people's powers of labor or making it indifferent to the temporal tasks, this word is on the contrary the only one that gives a full answer to a decisive practical question. What does a people need in order to become the most enterprising and industrious in the world, to become a people that has a sense for everything exalted and beautiful, a hard-working people that is able to bear even heavy burdens? The kingdom of God — the kingdom of the spirit.

To be in the kingdom of the spirit and to feel oneself borne by an invisible power is, in other words, to feel oneself lifted above the temporal. But to feel oneself lifted

above the temporal is a condition for being able to sink oneself into it and work with it without danger of going under. He who knows within himself that, even if misfortune breaks in, he has a greater capital in reserve, can venture the utmost, and he who
[28] need not be afraid of the consequences can seize the moment. We take life as it is; let us consider those who enjoy. Who enjoys the goods of temporality best of all, the one who sets his only goal in enjoyment, or the one who in the midst of enjoyment is raised above enjoyment and has spirit and strength to break off whatever moment it may be? Surely the latter; for the first is a desperate soul, who laments when the possibility of enjoyment ceases, and dies of boredom if it is bored enough to hold out with him. Let us consider those who fight. Who is the bravest, the one to whom wounds and death are the greatest misfortune, or the one who knows himself raised above the outcome of the strife and can fall, if so it must be? The latter is in the midst of danger raised above danger, and danger itself is almost afraid of him; the first is a wretch, whom danger is always after and as it were takes its pleasure in cowing, because he so inwardly wishes to run from it. Let us then take the matter in earnest, think of Christ's word and consider the conditions of temporal life. Hindrances and entanglements, resistance and barriers everywhere! not only for the small, but also for the great; yet by the everyday rule especially for the small.

A poor man has many burdens to bear, how shall he hold out? He steels himself, he pulls himself together, he wishes in his strife with the temporal to lift himself above the temporal. If now in his mind there is nothing but temporal strength and temporal desire, what will the end be? The temporal is overcome by the temporal, loses courage and lets his hands sink. But if there is in his soul a spark of eternity,
[29] a spark of spirit, then he is nourished by the invisible bread, then he holds out; his courage transforms itself into patience, and the courage of patience is invincible.

A small people must in the great relations of the world feel itself in many respects like the poor man. Even if it does not exactly suffer from cares of livelihood, indeed even if it abounds in well-being: there is nevertheless a pressure, an anxiety, that will not cease. The superior power may come with violence and plunder, how shall the small people find means to defend its right, to protect its independence and to keep up its courage? If now in such a people there is no spirit, no higher power of will, no thought of eternity; if all is only temporal, temporal calculation of temporal gain and temporal loss, then it will happen that the temporal is overcome by the temporal: the exertion flags, the powers slacken, despondency whispers: what can it help? But if the spirit is present, a thought of eternity, an uprising of the will, which seizes the mind

of the people and lifts it above temporal struggles, then the conditions of existence change. Everything, says the cold understanding, goes according to laws. Right. But — let us not forget it — there are in the world two kinds of laws, laws of necessity and laws of freedom, laws of nature and laws of spirit. However inwardly they hang together, they are nevertheless different. To want to build on freedom and yet believe in blind necessity is a contradiction, is: to want to rule one's own life and yet submit oneself to fate. Christ's word will break the yoke of fate and place the strongly willing people under Providence. The governing Providence, which lets its sun rise on the evil and the good, transforms courage into patience; the fatherly Providence, without whose will not a sparrow falls to the ground, transforms patience into courage: "fear *[30]* not, ye are of more value than many sparrows."

The light-shunning godliness sees the matter from another side; it will not admit at all that the spirit in Christ's word has anything to do with popular life. It understands the admonition: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God," as if the highest were attained when one simply cast the earthly away and concerned oneself with nothing else than weeping and wailing over the sin and folly of the world. We dare not forget the holy word: "Blessed are they that mourn"; but the sorrow in which there is blessedness cannot possibly consist in extinguishing all the lights of gladness merely to look sourly at the world. If it were in itself a sin to use the temporal and to work with the worldly, then not only popular life in the special sense, but human life, from whatever side one may consider it, would be made impossible at a single stroke. The sickly piety has never been able to carry through its view of life, has never managed to give up everything temporal. It has remained standing at a half-way state without giving itself an account of the claim of the spiritual upon the natural; it has wished to take part and yet not to take part in the advancing society, it has out of sheer decorum not known whether it dared to live among real human beings. The hermits and monks of the Middle Ages proceeded with quite another consistency ; but history teaches us how it ended.

One of two: either Christ has wished to help popular life forward too, or he has wished unconditionally to halt it; he was — let us speak humanly of him — not the man to stop half-way. Had the latter lain in his plan, he would surely not have *[31]* rejected the fasting holiness; he would have broken the staff over the whole lawful order of society, and above all: he would have begun by forbidding marriage and banning the propagation of the race. When now he does exactly the opposite. When now he regards the human order, the given relations between princes and people,

authorities and subjects, parents and children, masters and servants as something that follows naturally of itself, indeed as a divine order; when he again and again uses these relations as a ground for his parables of the kingdom of heaven; when he calmly and freely goes in and out of the houses of men, looks upon their goings and doings with mild eyes, takes part in their feasts, helps the suffering, comforts the sorrowful, blesses the little children and lets the wine of gladness be poured for bride and bridegroom: who then dares to say that Christ has broken the staff over the temporal, the human, the popular? To bless family life is to bless popular life, for what is popular life but a widely ramified family life embracing manifold families?

What the angels proclaimed to the shepherds, "a great joy, which shall be to all people," that Christ as the teacher and leader of the peoples has in the highest measure wished to make truth. That he, who was the Savior of souls, also wished to be the Savior of his people, he has himself expressly shown. It lay heavy on his mind how it would go with the small people whose great hour was drawing near. It was a vigorous but refractory people, which lived on great memories. He saw it split into parties, Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, the Roman-minded, those who
[32] were zealous for the old and held to the national, those who yearned for the new and admired the foreign; he saw its teachers without spirit, its authorities without authority, the common multitude like sheep scattered on the mountains without a shepherd; he saw the mighty, lurking enemy, the Roman eagle with the sharp claws, which was soon to seize its prey; he saw it all, and he sorrowed.

At his entry into Jerusalem, when the disciples rejoiced and the multitude cried Hosanna, the festival of the people was no festival of gladness for him. "And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, saying: If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace. But now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side. And they shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee, and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another, because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."

He *would*, but they *would not*, that was his lament. Even when he went to Golgotha and bore his cross, and the women wept over him, he forgot his own sufferings in the thought of what was in store for the unhappy people. "Daughters of Jerusalem! weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children."

There are knots in the history of the peoples, turning points, of which it holds:

now or never. If the opportune time is neglected, the good conditions misused, a wrong grasp taken, outrages committed: then generations must pay for it through centuries. No people on earth has fought with such a lion's courage, with such a magnificent strength of despair for its right and independence as the Jewish people at *[33]* the last. Too late, the Helper was gone: woe to the people that knows not the time of its visitation. More than fifteen hundred years, full of sufferings, disappointed hopes and bitter experiences, lie between that time and us. Now the time of visitation comes again; for the peoples are awakening.

The speaker of the people from Galilee will come forward once more. Believe me, he does not forget his altar and does not forsake his congregation because he shows himself once again, as he is humanly, on the stream of world history; he has strength to spare. Long enough have the self-appointed taskmasters of the peoples, spiritual as well as worldly, held him shut up as in a close air within official church walls. He wants out into the open, under the open sky; from the mount, among the lilies of the field and the birds out there, he will be seen by the multitude and heard by the people.

We cannot of ourselves begin the great work; our strength is too slight, our sight too dim, our heart too weak. But if He himself comes, the Mighty One in the power of the spirit, then his voice will be able to be heard by all. He knows what dwells innermost in man, he knows what sacrifice is, and what it is that is called courage. He has the word, he is indeed the Word himself, the Word of truth that goes to the heart, the Word of righteousness that strikes the consciences, the Word of brotherhood that asserts freedom and equality, the Word of love and reconciliation that smooths away all strife between small and great.

"Will ye now?" that is his question to all the tribes of peoples; will ye? — He pledges his crown of thorns that the work shall prosper. They can hear him, each *[34]* in his own tongue; they can all understand him — for the people understands the highest; they can all follow him, each on his own way, in whatever land they may dwell, and whatever colors they may bear. The common element that he offers, the first thing needful, is precisely fitted to consume what is hostile and nourish what is peculiar.

Would that our people, our small people with the great memories under the heavy pressure, might receive him with open arms! We bear indeed his banner; the red cloth with the white cross, that is his banner of victory. Forward, onward, where the banner waves; forward, onward, for truth and right; forward, onward, where he himself leads, the King of the peoples, the Teacher and Leader of the peoples.

Third Lecture,

given in Aagaard.

---

[35] In order to know human life, its aptitudes and aim and the way that leads to the aim, we must, as far as we are able, investigate the laws of existence. We must make a thorough acquaintance with the real world, we must consult nature and history. It does not, however, depend only on what it is we see, or how much we get to see; it depends also, and chiefly, on the eyes with which we see, the light in which we see, the standpoint on which we place ourselves.

Here it is at once obvious that man lives not merely in one world but in several. Outward nature with its many creatures, formations and productions lies spread out before our gaze; its summer and autumn, its winter and spring speak to us in a language of their own and call us to different work. But we have also an inner nature, a world of feelings and thoughts that we bear within ourselves, and this inward world, how different it can be. We also make the experience that it is chiefly the inward world that spreads its glow over the outward. When we are glad, then everything
[36] smiles in field and forest; but when we are sorrowful, then the sun may shine as much as it likes, it is as though all nature bore a quiet grief. The inner eye may be very different, and the explanation comes from within; the one sees in nature a wondrous play of matter and forces, a web of necessity woven of blind laws; the other sees the traces of God's wisdom, a revelation of the Creator's omnipotence.

Something similar is repeated when we consider history. The course of the human race advances independently of us, for each of us is only a vanishing member of the race. But each single human being has nevertheless his own course of life, his own little history; if the many little histories were to be told at length and honestly, how different they would be, for all that they have in common. Here, then, it is also remarkable that world history and our own history, the great and the little history, so far as understanding is concerned, essentially correspond to one another and show themselves to us in a common reflection of a common light. It is not the events, the outward, finite occurrences, of which we speak here; it is the interpretation, the judgment, the apprehension of the whole, on which it depends. He who cannot find God's providence in his own life, how should he discover it in world history?

We have many teachers of history, and we are grateful to them; we have learned researchers who know how to distinguish between true and false and to spread light

over the connection of events; we have thinkers who work to find out the laws of history: we are very grateful to them. Should it ever succeed in discovering the fundamental law by which world history moves, just as one has already discovered *[37]* the fundamental law by which the heavenly bodies move in the space of the heavens: then we should surely at last come so far that we could calculate what will happen in the future. Will it ever succeed? Hitherto the judgments about the future, I mean not merely about our own nearest future, but about the historical future as a whole, differ widely. There are those who expect a great age, a glorious and blessed age, although they are indeed at variance among themselves as to wherein the glory and the blessedness are to consist. Others look upon the future with dark anxiety.: Whirl, dissolution everywhere, breach of old customs, crumbling away of the old pillars of society, how fearful, how sad!

The difficulty in discovering the laws of history lies in this, that they are not merely laws of necessity, as in material nature, but also laws of will, laws of freedom. Those who cannot catch sight of any laws other than the so-called unchangeable laws of nature must arrive at whatever explanation they please, their explanation is always one-sided and false; and for the simple reason that the laws of history are more than mere laws of nature: they are laws of spirit.

If we are to think of a teacher of history who can hold up the mirror and show us features of the face of the future, it must be he who, in the fullness of spirit and of the Godhead, is himself the turning-point of history; it cannot be anyone other than Christ. But what is it that Christ teaches us about history, especially about the historical future? The visions appall us, we are seized with horror. First the destruction of Jerusalem and then immediately after — the end of the world; "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her *[38]* light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth wail." (Matt. 24:29–30).

Those who build their historical view on pure laws of nature have an easy time freeing themselves from the terror. When they wail, they wail only in honor of "the unchangeable laws," and for that reason lodge the most definite objections against the whole prophecy. Their proof is short and clear: "It is foretold that the world shall perish *immediately after* the destruction of Jerusalem. Nevertheless the world has since that time now stood for eighteen hundred and five years; therefore the prophecy is refuted. To this it must be added that the whole view of heaven and

earth is antiquated. The earth is not the center about which everything turns, the stars do not sit so loosely in the firmament that they should fall down," etc. So long as one follows exclusively the direction of natural science, these objections will be irrefutable. Woe to those who have taken upon themselves the superhuman task of defending the word of revelation about the signs in sun and moon with scientific reasons: their future is dark, they are in a sorry plight.

Otherwise, when we place ourselves on the standpoint of personality and ask about the laws of spirit. The earth is then the center, in so far as man, the being in whom spirit dwells, is the center. Christ, "the light of the world," is the center of history. What he has accomplished on earth would not be heightened by having been
[39] carried out on a greater star, were it even the common center of gravity about which the solar systems revolve. Everyone who has spirit will understand how false it is to apply a measure of outward greatness in space when the question is of spiritual greatness. For Christ's prophetic vision the whole historical future dwindles to a few days; for he measures with the measure of eternity. What is a day compared with a hundred thousand years, and what is even a hundred thousand years against eternity? Therefore Christ says: "Immediately after those days." But how, one asks, can the sun be darkened, and the stars fall from heaven? — It must surely happen when the powers of heaven are shaken, and the sign of the Son of Man appears in heaven; it must surely happen, as surely as it is spirit that bears nature.

Natural science is good and its guidance excellent, when we take it for what it is, an elucidation of the real, an illumination of natural causes, a pointing out of the given laws. But when it is employed to prove that "the given laws" are not *given*, because there is no legislation and no lawgiver: then this is a scientific outrage and an affront to spirit, for spirit is the original. For spirit itself, the almighty unity of wisdom and will, temporal nature in all its shapes, in all its duration, with all its greatness is a vanishing quantity. The power of spirit in matter is eternally the same, whether the mass be only a speck or a thousand times greater than the sun, for the power of spirit is omnipotence.

Christ, the revealer of spirit, of the Almighty, knows within himself that the innermost mover in him is that which moves heaven and earth. From this height his
[40] prophetic vision of the future must be apprehended. The unclear mixture of true and false, of good and evil, which confuses us so long as finitude with its many conditions stands in the foreground, disappears when everything is led back to the first source. History shows itself here in a super-historical light. It is not enough that nation rises

against nation and kingdom against kingdom, that there is hunger and pestilence and earthquakes here and there; the innermost thing in the "birth-pangs" is that spirit rises against spirit, that the cutting oppositions lay themselves bare and collide without mediating middle terms: the powers of truth and falsehood, of light and darkness, of life and death move here in the last conflict.

However hard the conflict is, its outcome is nevertheless not doubtful. The victory is at bottom already won. Christ sees himself in the vision as the victor, although his suffering and death still lie ahead. "I saw," he says "at another place, Satan fall from heaven, as lightning"; the power of evil is in the eternal sense a powerlessness, however much power it may have in the temporal. It is the same thought that in John's Revelation (12:7–12) is presented under the following image: "And there was war in heaven; Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon fought, and his angels. But they prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven.... Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them; Woe to them that inhabit the earth and the sea; for the devil is come down unto you! He hath great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." The historical struggle between the good and the evil is thus to be apprehended as the last scenes of a great battle in which the enemy has lost, but still fights the fight of despair. The continuing history is the long day of battle, which stretches out in time, so that the *[41]* liberation may be completed in reality, so that as many as will may take part in the fight and become partakers in the victory.

But — here a new objection arises — if the whole historical future is only to denote the continued destruction of the world, what then becomes of our expectation of the age of the rights of man, the new age of the people and the peoples, from which we promise ourselves so much? If Christ is to be our teacher of history, then it is probably best to let that sort of fancy go and to join those who clearly see that everything is getting worse and worse. If the good can only conquer by the world's going under, then we do best to work along toward its destruction.

What, then, is the meaning of all this talk about the popular, the new, the great, the hitherto unseen; unless one is to understand the matter in this way, that the awakening of the people, popular life and the spirits of the people are to be the most powerful means of hastening the destruction of the world? — The cold mockery betrays a hidden despair. On the way of the future there are many stations. "Learn a parable of the fig tree: when the sap is come into its branches, and the leaves shoot forth, then ye know that summer is nigh." This parable applies not only to the very

last breakthrough, it applies also to the many intermediate ones. Many summers may come, each with a harvest of its time, before we reach the summer of eternity.

The law of development is now this: A confusion of the age arises every time an existing order dissolves, and something new is to come forth. The old falls into
[42] decay; the new, which is in the process of forming itself, has not yet won shape: out of fermentations, disturbances and wild disorder there then clears itself, no doubt under violent exertions, little by little a new and better order of things. Society comes into equilibrium, distributes its labors, sows and plants and prepares for a rich harvest. But the more abundantly one enjoys all temporal gifts, the more commonly one dreams of eternal peace and unbounded well-being, the more keenly is the surprise felt when the upheaval that a creeping corruption has long prepared suddenly sets in. Out of new fermentations and new struggles there must then form itself a new and better condition, always on other and higher terms; but every condition on earth, even the most perfect, is transitory. How intimately this thought is connected with the main Christian thought can be expressly shown.

In John's Revelation (20:1 — 3) we meet the following vision. "And I saw an angel come down from heaven; he had the key of the abyss and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut and sealed it over him, that he should deceive the peoples no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season." This is the thousand-year kingdom whose coming is announced; but what does the thousand-year kingdom mean? We dare not confound the super-historical with the historical and give ourselves up to enthusiasms. How the expectation of a thousand-year kingdom is to be understood in the congregation is a matter apart: here we stand on popular ground and have simply
[43] and plainly to do with a law of spirit. Every time a new and better order of things triumphs, the spirit of darkness is literally subdued; the evil will is chained, forced down into the abyss, and must keep itself hidden until a time when it again comes loose: that is the general thought. That even the thousand-year kingdom, however glorious and mighty it is said to be by reason of "the first resurrection," is nevertheless beset by strong enemies and exposed to great dangers, is depicted in vivid colors (Rev. of John 20:7–8). "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison. And shall go out to deceive the peoples which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle; the number of whom is as the sand of the sea."

That is an important lesson we can draw from this. We dare not deify the popular or set up a kingdom of a people in place of the kingdom of heaven, in which Christ's revelation is perfected. Nevertheless the Millennium may be to us an image of this, that Christ's spirit will give itself an imprint also in earthly conditions: the Savior of souls is also the Savior of the peoples. One may now place the popular as far below the Millennial as one will, yet this must stand firm: if truth and right are to gain the upper hand over lies and wrong, then it must happen by virtue of the spirit of righteousness and truth. If the temporal is too slight and the finite too wretched to furnish matter for the spirit striving upward, what then has the future to offer? Slackness of will and emptiness of mind, enfeebled nerves and burnt-out brains, raw masses and unused powers, surfeit and yet hunger, plans and yet perplexity, loathing of everything and yet greedy longing for enjoyment, all this in a jumble, stirred together into the strangest mixtures and sediments, shall then not give human life a *[44]* higher worth, shall by no means weaken the simple faith that it is Christ's spirit that must come with the signs of spring, that summer is near only when the fig tree gets sap in branches and leaves.

The historical driving force can be measured by the tension between the eternal and the temporal. Much is ventured when life is at stake, most of all, however, when there is a strong feeling that it is eternal life that is at stake. The spiritual cannot make an impression on human beings, least of all on a whole people, unless in some way or other there is something sensuous with it. Christ's exhortations are clothed in parables; they are nothing but exciting scenes, decisive moments, that glow in spirit with sensuous colors. "Watch therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come. But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched and not have suffered his house to be broken up. Therefore be ye ready, for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not." It is no idle waiting; all hands are kept busy: here is something to do. It is as when "a man traveling into a far country called his servants, and delivered unto them his goods; and unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one, to every man according to his ability. Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made other five talents. And likewise he that had received the two talents, he also gained other two. But he that had received the one went and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money." How hard and severe is the judgment upon this last servant. He steps boldly forward, as though he had a just *[45]* cause: "Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not

sown, and gathering where thou hast not strawed. And I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth: lo, there thou hast that is thine." Alas, it goes ill with him.

The temporal must be used, for the gifts of spirit must be used. The spiritual does not exist for the sake of the temporal; it is the other way around, the temporal exists for the sake of the spiritual. The mark that the temporal is used in the right way is that the powers of spirit grow by the use. There are in all temporal conditions of life, be they private or public, small or great, conditions for a development of the life of spirit: hardy men with weather-beaten faces and horny fists can quite as well have spirit as those who move in the perfumed atmosphere of fine cultivation. Especially must it be emphasized, what the parable inculcates, that no one may excuse himself by saying that his endowment is only slight. The servant who got the one talent got the same obligation to work with the one as he who got the five to work with the five. What holds of the single human being holds of a whole people: a gifted people has a great obligation. Not to use the gifts of spirit is to sin against spirit; but sin against spirit is punished doubly. The first punishment is that the gifts are taken away, that the person concerned becomes spiritless. "Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents. For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even
[46] that which he hath." The next punishment is that the spiritless man is condemned as a criminal against spirit. "Cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

That the expectation of the end of the world can in history coincide with magnificent transformations of the conditions of the world and corresponding breakthroughs of the life of spirit rests precisely on this, that it is linked with the expectation of the return of "the Son of Man." The spiritual law expressed in this shows, namely, that as the temporal exists only for the sake of the eternal, outward nature only for the sake of spirit, the world only for the sake of the Son of Man, so it is also both here and hereafter human life and its perfection about which the whole turns. How the super-historical in the progressive movements intervenes in the historical can be seen by casting a glance at the stations already traversed. Three points of time: the age of the apostles, the age of the Crusades and the age of the Reformation present themselves for consideration.

In the age of the apostles the opposition between the kingdom of spirit and the world-empires, spirit-denying yet so mighty, stood at its height. A few fishermen from Galilee, defenseless men and simple women, that was the whole equipment;

those were the men of arms with which the new spirit was to take up the struggle and complete the work of him who had died as a malefactor on the cross. Dark — and yet bright prospects! The great Departed One had whispered something to them in the chamber; that they were to preach upon the housetops. He had not remained in the grave and forgotten the Forsaken; he had visited them again, he had greeted them as the conqueror of death, and promised them that he would soon come — well equipped. He had not disappointed them with a vain hope, as if it were at once a *[47]* feast of victory. He knew the world, the hatred of the mighty and the blindness of the multitude. "They shall deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you; and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many. And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." The first prediction has found abundant, literal fulfilment, a pledge that the last also will constantly be fulfilled.

"Maran Atha, the Lord cometh, he standeth at the door and knocketh!" These omens, which were heard incessantly, had an electrical effect on sinking courage and awakened the Combatants, each time they began to fall asleep. It was decided in heaven that "the beast with the seven heads," the world-city on the seven hills, the rich city of the Roman empire, "Babylon, the great whore, a prison for every unclean spirit and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird," should fall. The description of its fall is vivid and gripping. "A mighty angel from heaven took up a stone like a great millstone and cast it into the sea, saying: Thus shall Babylon, the great city, be thrown down with haste, and shall be found no more. And the voice of harpers and musicians and pipers and trumpeters shall be heard no more in thee; and no craftsman of any craft shall be found any more in thee; and the sound of a millstone shall not be heard in thee any more. And the light of a candle shall not shine in thee any more, and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall not be heard in thee any more; for *[48]* thy merchants were the princes of the earth, for by thy sorcery were all the peoples deceived."

History has here furnished its most magnificent proof of what the spirit of truth with spiritual weapons can accomplish in temporal strife, when the powers of heaven are shaken, and "the sign of the Son of Man" shall appear in heaven."

In the Middle Ages the intermingling of the heavenly and the earthly was so peculiar, and the separation of the godly and the worldly at the same time so outward, that

spirit and spiritlessness almost flowed into one another. The unrest and lawlessness that set in with the dismemberment of Charlemagne's empire; the Mohammedans' attacks, the Hungarians' inroads and especially the Normans' plunderings, all this in union with exalted notions of monastic holiness and monkish abstinence stamped the whole earthly existence with a dark mark of frailty. People believed themselves to be in "the last birth-pangs." Plague, famine, eclipses and comets came to be regarded as signs of "the loosing of the dragon" and "the coming of Antichrist." All pious souls prepared themselves for the end of the world, which was fixed for the year 1000. When the year passed and the world remained standing, the date was moved forward to 1030, and the signs became more manifold still. A monk in Hungary saw a dragon, lifelike and shaped like Leviathan, advancing with lightning and thunder; a French bishop caused it to be proclaimed that he had received a letter from the third heaven, in which it was commanded among other things, "not to partake of anything but water and bread every Friday;" etc.

But however wild and motley it looks in those half-barbarous conditions, spirit is nevertheless present in the mighty pressure; the eternal weighs upon the consciences
[49] and portends a great upheaval and a day of judgment. The heavy pressure conditions a corresponding upswing. The enigmatic signs at last received a historical interpretation. In the Pope's word about the holy sepulchre the aim was made clear. The sepulchre of the resurrection! now the watchword was given, and a rushing flood of released powers found an outlet. The main idea of the Crusades is a popular idea of faith; it contains all that the Middle Ages possess of the peculiar and the great. When the many repellent features of blind fanaticism, wild cruelty, cunning self-interest and raw sensuality have aroused our displeasure, we are then drawn again by that inwardness of piety, the mighty enthusiasm, the mountain-moving faith which, despite the admixtures of superstition, is yet drawn from Golgotha's spring and tastes of the source. The sign of the Son of Man is stained by crimes, but the human race makes giant strides forward.

The age of the Reformation denotes on the whole the dissolution of the Middle Ages, and yet in a way its continuation. The Reformers too had a strong impression of the vanity of the world, and the possibility that the last day might be near at hand stood vividly before them; but it was chiefly Christ's spiritual return for which they hoped. The Holy Scripture was the mirror in which his figure could be seen distinctly; so they drew forth the Scriptures, and the Bible became a book of the people. How this has since been misunderstood by many, as if the meaning were that one really

could read Christ into oneself by reading in the Bible, shall not be treated here. What we have before our eyes are the conditions under which, and the tension with which, the half-extinguished life of spirit broke through anew. Christ did not come down from the clouds, but the sign of the Son of Man began to reveal itself in the inner *[50]* being of men. It was a living inwardness that was set against a dead outwardness. The outwardness of the papal church was rejected and its worldliness condemned. Rome was again "Babylon," the great whore, who by her sorcery deceived the peoples. It is the struggle, a *spiritual* one, yet through a multiplicity of worldly relations a *popular* struggle between the old and the new Church, that gave the Reformation its tension: Luther was on a grand scale a man of the people, a popular man.

To an outward view the whole historical movement now looks as if Christ's return were to take place not from above, from heaven, but much rather from below, from the spiritual depth in which life has its ground. From this point of view those who regard the laws of history as mere laws of nature can explain the whole to themselves in their own way. "Spirit," they say, "is nothing other than the human nature's own inner, universal being. It was this pure human being that, in the apostles' imagination, had taken flesh and blood in the man Jesus Christ. Since now spirit as spirit is at the same time the divine, those disciples, filled by the Master's life and teaching, believed that Christ as the Son of God was himself both God and man. The kingdom he had founded by taking upon himself the form of a servant he would then, after his exaltation, complete and lead to victory by coming as the Lord in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. But he did not come; something else happened. Instead of the expected Jerusalem, the holy city, which was to descend from heaven, there arose an earthly, and yet heavenly, Jerusalem upon the ruins of Babylon, the old whore: the Catholic Church was, in other words, the realization of the expected return. Yet *[51]* the spirit of man did not yet understand itself. The earth trembled under the violent shocks of a society torn asunder; people stared up into the clouds, and believed firmly and fully, what all the signs pointed to, that now heaven must open, and the Judge come with the angels and all the saints. But he did not come; something else happened. Weary of waiting for the heavenly Jerusalem, people set about conquering the earthly. It was a conversion of imagination into reality. Christ's return transformed itself into the rise of the papacy. Life with its stirring powers came from within; enthusiasm kindled, it was like a sea of flame of sensuous spirit and holy passions. Only with the Reformation did the spirit of man begin to surmise how it really stands with the return. The Son of Man is man himself, and man's self, the true man, righteous before

God, is in the inwardness of the heart, in faith. But the faith of the Reformers too was medievally afflicted with the notion of a kingdom of God that stood separate from worldly life. Therefore the Reformation, with all the awakening of the people and purification of morals that it unmistakably called forth, could not carry the matter through. Its official church organization went under the state; the state made the holy a means, and the thrones by the grace of God pressed the peoples down into masses. Only when the masses rose and burst the absolute, self-deifying state did the spirit come to consciousness of itself, and the supernatural return received a natural explanation. The rights of man: freedom, equality and brotherhood, that is the sign of
[52] humanity. This sign is not among angels in the airy clouds of heaven, it is in clouds of dust in the midst of men down here on earth. What the sign signifies, the future shall show, when the powers stir and the fight is waged for the holy cause of humanity with real, human weapons."

This explanation has something appealing in the eyes of the present age, because, though exalted, it yet hovers so low and keeps so close to the real. There is something true in it, but the truth is only half; when a half-truth is given out for a whole, then we have the lie. It is quite true that the way of spirit is the way of inwardness, that the powerful inner being must burst forth and give itself form in a real, present outwardness. But it is not true — it is in a lamentable manner untrue — that the great thoughts of freedom, equality and brotherhood, these thoughts of eternity, which embrace all the temporal tasks of humanity, should be only selfish thoughts of nature, conceived in bitterness and born in rebellion; the so-called new thoughts are old thoughts: they are distorted thoughts of Christ. It was not for nothing that Christ came forward as the friend of the poor, and took up the cause of the lowly. If the new thoughts with the new demands could really be carried through by a denial of Christ's spirit, then the revolutionaries of 1789 and 1871 would be right: the bloodier, the better. But history appears as a witness, and its testimony is: that it is not merely tyranny, but also the freedom of the people, which under the red banner of the rights of man can be smothered in blood.

With all our "modern knowledge" we are by no means on the straight road of humanity, freedom and progress; we are on the contrary about to turn onto a byway.
[53] Our faith-denying condition is a striking counterpart to the superstition of the Middle Ages. The Middle Ages imagined with the super-historical, the present age would help itself with the merely natural-historical. The truth is that the super-historical must bear the historical, that spirit from heaven must be present in all vigorous deeds

on earth. That is the law of movements; that is the foundation of popular life; that is, in sum, what Christ teaches us about the historical future.

Fourth Lecture.

(Fredericia).

---

[54] "Evil and good in every land, with thorns the roses mingled stand", that is an old ditty; it applies not only to the many lands but also to the many ages; our own present age has roses, but also thorns; it has strong sides of light, but also troubling sides of shadow.

Our age is the age of enlightenment; undeniably! The night itself bears witness to it. Our streets and houses are so brilliantly lit that we cannot help feeling a certain pride when we think how dark it looked in "King Hans's day". And the many lights of the understanding burn just as brightly. How much has not already been done for improved instruction of the young; to what a degree have the sense and taste for knowledge and cultivation not increased in the last two generations. The horizons widen; attention is no longer confined and held captive by the nearest everyday concerns; our thoughts wander far afield; foreign regions, foreign languages and foreign customs invite comparison with our own. We understand that what goes on
[55] in distant lands can concern us: we feel the pulse-beat of the great whole, and the events of the world are outlined as clearly as never before.

But the shadow follows the light. The manifold, which distracts the mind, can so easily crowd out the first simplicity; and yet it is precisely the simple that gives concentration, inwardness of strength, and resolute will. Instead of whole thoughts, in which the soul can rest, culture hatches a multitude of briskly playing but dissimilar notions, a swarm of fractions of thoughts, for which one searches in vain for a common denominator. To know a little about everything is not the same as to know something thoroughly. The man who must be in on everything, so as not to be one-sided, is seized by a restless striving; and the inquisitive man who absolutely must have wind of everything and an opinion about everything is seldom in a position to pass a thorough judgment on anything. The worst of it is that it tells upon the character. The man never acquires character who is not in a position to form himself a firm conviction. In an age in which a given view of life prevails with authoritative uniformity equally for all, it certainly looks as if every individual in society had been born with conviction; but under advancing enlightenment the uniformity begins to dissolve. Many ways of regarding life, many and conflicting points of view present themselves to the eye, and what is the consequence? There is, one says, something in the one; but there

is also something in the other: evil and good in all doctrines! All that one gets out of it is that much can be said for and against every thing. In the end everything becomes uncertain; one must go by impression and mood. But impressions change and moods vary: everything depends on circumstances. He who ten years ago was an *[56]* arch-liberal is now gravely gloomy and a die-hard conservative: it is circumstances. The fir tree, which was once the Christmas tree, now stands in the loft, and has been "set to growing": that too is circumstances. How uncanny to meet one's first original view on the way of development and then not to be able to acknowledge it again; it is almost as vexing as having to meet one's "first love" and to see that she has become engaged to another. To doubt everything, to criticize everything and to be dissatisfied with everything is often regarded as an infallible sign of superiority; and yet this superiority is just as deceptive as the flush on the cheeks of the consumptive. Endless doubting is a wasting disease, and in the age of enlightenment the disease is contagious.

Our age is an age of freedom; we acknowledge it with gratitude and say it with pride. But the age of freedom is also the age of dangers, for in freedom there are many kinds of possibilities: to deal with freedom is to deal with possibilities, but to deal with possibilities is like dealing with fire and light in a powder magazine.

In older times, indeed far into the eighteenth century, what is now called freedom was a forbidden fruit. Popular freedom was under lock and key, its thoughts lay hidden in the book of secrets, a book with seven seals. Woe to him who dared to break one of these seals, his doom was sealed. Even with religion and science, faith and reason, the power of the state kept strict watch; it brooded over the jewels of the spirit like a dragon over its treasures. When we Protestants cross ourselves at hearing of *[57]* all that the Catholic Church has managed to accomplish by means of censorship, the Inquisition, witch trials and heretic pyres, then we must above all things not forget to include our own Church. In this respect it is particularly instructive to become acquainted with the history of England in the time before and after the Reformation. After the persecutions with their bloody punishments had raged themselves out, a drowsy order in the High Church and a mystical enthusiasm among the sects became the natural condition. To illustrate this the painter Hogarth has furnished a picture in which the satire surpasses art. In the foreground one sees the sectarian spirit going about its mischief. A woman in garments full of folds lies flung down on the floor, and out from the folds there swarms a multitude of small animals, mice, as far as I remember. The groups around her are full of life, some in quiet rapture, others in

such consternation that their hair stands like bristles on their heads. It is a miracle that is taking place; the favored woman gives birth to mice. So: a great miracle of mice! The background is devoted to the High Church. The congregation is assembled, the priest in the pulpit, here is order and quiet. As commanded, the shepherd of souls reads his sermon aloud from the paper. A strip of it informs us what the text is whose content he lays upon the hearts of the devout. "You shall not think that I am come to bring peace on earth; I am not come to bring peace but a sword." The "pure doctrine" of Orthodoxy is, however, so reassuring that not even the word of fire and sword can disturb its peace: the priest looks sleepy, and the whole congregation is already sweetly slumbering.

[58] That whose essence is freedom cannot be held under constraint; it is an unnature that takes its revenge. For when freedom is spoken of, it is not enough to think of freedom in the outward sense, such as freedom of trade, freedom of the press, a free constitution and so forth. Outward freedom is an inestimable good; but it receives its worth only by furnishing conditions for the inward. Ignorance and superstition are incompatible with inward freedom. Science is by its essence free, for science wills to know the truth, and the knowledge of truth is in an inwardness. To will to prescribe to thought by outward commands what it shall recognize as true is the same as to will to command that two and three shall not be five, but four. Religion is by its essence free, for religion is in the highest sense an inward concern. In order rightly to use outward freedom, we must acquire inward freedom. The mind that is seized either by covetousness or by lust to rule or by any other disease is unfree. There are many who have made a great noise about liberality, freedom of mind, and yet, incredibly, have somewhat suffered from lust to rule: they have then not granted themselves the good that they so gladly wished to secure for others.

Our age is in a special sense an age of debates; that goes with enlightenment and freedom. Much of what in former days one scarcely dared think to oneself or whisper into a confidant's ear now comes openly forward in writing and speech and is discussed before the eyes of all the world. If we could now trust that the many voices, the many tones and the many opinions that let themselves be heard in the continually prolonged conversation with which the civilized world daily entertains
[59] itself really stood in the service of truth, then we would have rich means of getting the burning questions illumined from all sides and of getting to the bottom of the real conditions. But what is the procedure on the whole?

When one wishes to test a new machine, to appraise its building material, its

composition and working power, one does not content oneself with listening to the eulogies with which the inventor himself recommends it; just as little does one let oneself be deterred by the objections of those who manifestly have an interest in running down and censuring the machine. One proceeds carefully, takes experience and the experts into counsel, notes exactly what speaks for and against, and lets oneself be convinced by reasons. It is not moods or hasty, preconceived opinions that are here allowed to decide the issue: no, it is reasons, weighty reasons.

As regards the debates on the great, intricate machinery of society, it seems on the contrary as if the enlightened and free nations of the present preferred to strike out on another road. If we apply the saying about evil and good in every land to the now so rich newspaper literature that fertilizes all fields, irrigates all meadows, and shines upon all roads, then it would have to run: Evil and good in every paper! But no! When we see the parties group themselves to the Right and Left, extreme Right, extreme Left, right center, left center and so on, then it looks to the life as if the old saying suddenly changed and meant: pure good in some papers, pure evil in others. Those who have sworn themselves to the Right assure us that there are no roses at all in the Left papers, but only thorns; in return those who have sworn themselves to the Left must naturally make known, and that both with pictures and in bold type, that the Right papers are withered thorns, and that the genuine, true, unadulterated *[60]* fragrance of roses is to be sought in the Left papers alone. So a conviction and an opinion do indeed form; but it is of a negative kind. The conviction is that one has an opinion, and the opinion is that one will not let oneself be convinced.

The ship that carries the great cargo of the debates of the present does not draw deep enough; it does not plough in the open sea, but prefers to keep to where there are shallows. We see it when we cast a glance at the debates on religion and science. That no people can live without positive religion, that thrones fall and states totter when the holy pillars are taken away, on this statecraft is so much at one with itself that persons who, for their own part, have manifestly given up all faith in the doctrines of the Church are often the most zealous defenders of the existing ecclesiastical order. Religion is, in short, publicly recognized for what it is, a spiritual great power. The right and significance of science must, especially in an age of enlightenment and freedom, be exalted above every doubt: science too is then recognized for what it is, a spiritual great power. If now these two great powers could unite to work together toward a common goal, then slumbering forces would awake and a new day would break over peoples and states; but it is precisely the torment of the present that

between religion and science a chasm has opened as deep and wide as never before.

It is taught by the Bible and the Church that the world was created in six days; but science proves that between the coming into being of the first animals and the coming into being of the first human beings there must lie millions and millions of
[61] years. It is taught in the Bible and the Church that sun, moon and stars were created for the sake of the earth and of human beings; but science proves that the earth is a vanishing point in the infinite space of heaven, and so forth. Were it only deviations in the conception of the outward, of relations in time and space, it might pass; but the strife concerns the innermost kernel of existence, the divine power and will. Religion rests upon the miracle; science cannot acknowledge the miracle; how should two spiritual powers so much at variance with one another be able to work together: what the one builds up, the other must pull down.

In the old days the strife was a secret; the Church took care that no scientific deviation from the orthodox doctrine came to the knowledge of the people, or that at any rate, if a bold thinker spoke too loudly, a deterrent example was made. In our time, the age of enlightenment, freedom and publicity, the secret cannot be kept: every other person knows that natural science does not conform to what stands in the Bible. None the less the public debates move along the surface. Commissions are appointed to investigate the rights of the Church and of the state; but it does not occur to the enlightened present to arrange a serious inquiry into how things actually stand with the relation between religion and science. In the midst of an age of fermentation, of doubts, of criticism and of restless thoughts, one settles down to an instruction in which the biblical and the scientific accuse one another in the most naive way. One holds church for those who will believe, and science for those who
[62] will know; but a smoothed-over hodgepodge of faith and knowledge is not for the edification of the people.

"Such settlements," one objects, "cannot be forced." — There is here no question of force at all; what is here demanded is an accounting, an account of how it stands with the great moving powers of the spirit. Should such an account be either dangerous or impossible, then it must stand badly with the conscience of society. The only objection that could with reason be made would then be this, that such a debate would become so learned and protracted that the great multitude could not follow. We answer: what essentially concerns all must be capable of being understood by all; — the people can understand the highest. What is here aimed at is no declaration of authority, either from the side of those who represent the doctrine of the Church, or

from that of those who represent science, but simply and plainly a pointing out of the boundary by which religion and science necessarily must be parted and meet.

It is chiefly three points on which the inquiry turns: *the origin of things*, *the nobility of man* and *the verdict of conscience*.

Concerning the origin of things religion teaches that the world is *created*, that it is, in other words, a work of the Almighty's will. If science could really prove that the world is not created, then one would have to see, even if by gentle means, little by little, to getting religion abolished. But what does natural science now know really about the origin of things? Nothing. The science of experience takes things as they are given; by investigating their forces, connection and laws it discovers that the one state has preceded the other. The first state, the outermost boundary to which it can *[63]* reach, is, as is well known, an enormous "fog". If the science of spirit (philosophy) is to give an account of the origin of the fog, it must necessarily presuppose that an active reason, a divine wisdom, an almighty shaping will has been present in the fog. But from this standpoint it is impossible to prove that the world is not created. Everything in nature develops from the very beginning according to strict laws. Can the Creator change his laws? The miracle stands as an indelible boundary marker between religion and science; but the alleged fundamental contradiction is removed. Religion is right on its side when it asserts the miracle; for the innermost original of everything is the freedom of the lawgiving will. Science is right on its side when it maintains that the laws cannot be broken. But as surely as the laws of nature are the very own revelations of lawgiving freedom, so surely are they not broken by being taken up into the connection of the laws of spirit and made subject to the free omnipotence.

The nobility and high vocation of man religion expresses briefly and pithily in the saying: Man is created in the image of God. What has science to object to this? Natural history regards — and from its standpoint with full right — man as a link in the series of animals. Of course man occupies the highest place, the place of honor above apes and bats.

Great preparations are made to prove that, just as the higher forms of animals have little by little developed out of the lower, so man has developed out of a particular animal form, probably an ape-like primal form. Darwin emphasizes that apes have *[64]* a predisposition to consumption, just like man; that they become angry when one makes fun of them, exactly like man; that they can learn to smoke tobacco, like man, and so on.

The partiality with which many natural historians are at present working to efface the last traces of *original* difference between animal and man is so warm that one can only cool it somewhat by directing their attention to the relation between science and man. Science has weighed the globes, science has measured the speed of light, science has discovered stars that sit so high that the light they send down to us must be millennia on its way, and that although light covers a distance of over 40,000 miles in every second. These are high things. When the natural historian now considers that science is human, is a spiritual product of the human brain, he may even pass over to the opposite extreme and be carried away into such an enthusiasm that he sets the human brain in the place of God and deifies the human spirit. What a distance between the animal and man! How many millions, billions, trillions of years must not pass before the ape's brain becomes so developed that it can weigh the globes, before the bats manage to measure the speed of light.

The whole alarm about man's animal descent arises quite simply from this, that a famous natural scientist, in a commendable zeal to demonstrate the connection of the generations and the gradual transitions, has forgotten that there is something in
[65] nature called *endowment*. It is by virtue of his divine endowment that man appears as an image of God on earth.

Concerning the verdict of conscience religion teaches that it is an immediate and natural declaration of the all-knowing, holy and righteous will of God in the inward parts of man. Should science raise an objection to this doctrine, it would first have to prove that an all-knowing, holy and righteous God cannot possibly exist; but tasks of this nature lie outside the domain of science or, what says the same, outside its reach. Conscience is not like an animal instinct, which is at once finished from the hand of nature and always remains on the same level. Conscience is awakened and developed on the basis of the religious, moral insights that society offers, and is conditioned on the whole by the relation between religion and science. Real life with its many labors and duties must, so to speak, be illumined by two suns: as to what concerns the inward and personal, by religion; as to what concerns the laws of the world and the real conditions, by science. Conscience can make a man lonely; but it can also hallow and strengthen the bonds that tie men to one another: there is a public conscience just as surely as a private.

That conscience can hardly be counted among the saints who have so far found special worship in politics may perhaps be regarded as generally conceded. It is remarkable to see how the states everywhere, where their "honor" and "interests"

demanded it, have known how to preserve complete independence in face of the moral obligations that State-Church orthodoxy prescribes. From their mutual negotiations, *[66]* wars, conquests and so on one would, if one did not know it beforehand, hardly be able to guess that they were — what they after all really are — Christian states. Such coats of arms as lions, leopards, eagles, double eagles and the like are on the other hand more characteristic, for in them there is something of the beast of prey.

The age of enlightenment and freedom has already come so far that public opinion has become a power: politics, which is so independent of conscience, is by no means independent of public opinion. When the great beast of prey wants to advance, it scouts on all sides and cautiously draws in its claws if it notices that public opinion is becoming seriously angry. But public opinion, a product of moods, considerations of the understanding, interests and passions, is for all its sound sense nevertheless no reliable guide; it is the child of the moment, too much a child of the world. A clear-eyed daughter of calculating politics, witty and shrewd, but by her many suitors incessantly exposed to all sorts of temptations, public opinion sometimes acquires a disquieting likeness to the kind of ladies whom in Paris one calls the demi-monde.

Conscience, the conscience of society, on the other hand, is a reliable guide. But the conscience of society forms only gradually, as a popular mind and a popular will form. Public opinion cannot on its own get the better of the great beast of those who hold power. Conscience must come in: when the movements of the beast betray that it hungers after prey and thirsts after blood, the popular will must say No, and the soul of the people through millions of eyes fix its gaze on the beast. It works: the eagle's wing is lamed, the leopard forgets its spring, the beast of prey is tamed. *[67]*

The scientific view of the course of history is not very comforting. It goes with the peoples — so it is said — as with individuals, they have their ages. First a youth with golden visions, mighty striving and strong faith; next a manhood with keen understanding, sure plans and a well-calculated energy of action; at last comes old age with the wrinkles of criticism, doubt of everything except the material, inclination to rest and enjoyment, evil dreams, omens of dissolution and death. The same laws by which the states of antiquity sank hold also for the present. The nations of Europe are already strongly on the decline; it goes downhill with them all. Science goes forward, but religion goes backward. Scientific research must necessarily dissolve what is ecclesiastically handed down; it cannot help it. It cannot, alas, replace the loss. Science is not able to give the people what it sorely needs, a new religion. The common people and a part of the half-educated hold to the old faith, as best they

can; but it dwindles imperceptibly from them, it evaporates. The end will be that the peoples now in history must at last step down, and new tribes with fresh roots and young shoots fill the stage.

On this occasion we must again emphasize what from a scientific standpoint is so easily overlooked, that the laws of history are laws of spirit. The peoples do not age by the same law as individuals; their old age sets in only when the wellsprings of spirit
[68] dry up. The nations of the present live in 'this respect under other conditions than those of antiquity. At the turning-point of the times a life has been sacrificed; a capital of life has been put in, which with interest and compound interest is inexhaustible. Science shall not burden itself with giving the peoples a new religion; there is no need. Every people must become answerable for how it has known how to appropriate and apply the rich inheritance.

Instead of the dark picture of nothing but shadows, weakness and old age we can with more reason sketch a picture of rejuvenation, a picture of the future in bright colors. We know indeed that nothing is perfect on earth, that the real condition, whose features are to answer to the picture, will be reached only approximately; but for that there may yet be truth in the picture. It is joyful to hope; yes, it is more than joyful, it is a duty. It is the rejuvenation of the peoples, the growth of popular life, for which we hope.

When it comes, then, the expected time, when the people has become a full-grown man, who has fully learned to use his powers, the spiritual as fully as the material, then barriers will fall that now seem insurmountable. If society, the great body with the many limbs, is freed from all that is called dead flesh, and gets its proper mobility, sound juices in all tissues, fresh blood in all veins: then there will be capability to take up the struggle of reality, and courage to meet the possible dangers. If moral self-respect dawns upon the mind and thought of all, if the conscience of the people is so awake that willfulness must become shamefaced, obstinacy creep into hiding, and short-sightedness and presumptuous stupidity yield everywhere to better insight
[69] and to clear reasons: then unity will be great and the will strong; for it grows with understanding. If it comes some day, the expected time, when the burden of labor and the wages of labor shall be weighed against one another according to the claim of equity on the golden scales of justice, then 'many hands will work to one end, and the many interests mesh into one another like wheels and pinions in a well-joined machine. If it is one soul, one spirit, one stream of life that drives the works with the many wheels, then the burden will not be too heavy for anyone, and no one will be

thrust outside: the spacious workshop has room and a sphere of action for small and great. Yes, when it comes, the expected time, it will be a time of summer: light clouds and cool winds, bright nights and sunny days. It will be a time of harvest; then the kernel swells in heavy ears; then ripe fruits are plucked from the tree of freedom; then the apple of knowledge has no poison; the gnawing is stifled, the adder in the tall grass is dead: then all the roses of life and health send forth their fragrance.

Fifth Lecture.

(Kolding).

---

[70] A sound and vigorous popular life is impossible without a corresponding spirit of the people, the spirit of the people is impossible without the faith of the people; but the faith of the people is barren, impotent and meaningless when it is unable to prove its power in deed. What we here call the faith of the people is not superstition, the belief of the common people in old legends of the underground folk, ghosts, wizards and witches, a faith from the nursery; the faith of the people is a faith that endures the light, a faith in the power of light and of life, a faith in spirit. When one otherwise asks about the faith of a people, one usually means its confession of faith. One then easily comes to make the observation that one dare not without more ado infer from faith to life, that the confession of faith as a rule points so far beyond life, that one must choose another line of sight when one wants to have the real life in view.

The faith of the people is more than an exalted feeling or a beautiful imagination; it is a faith in reality, a living faith in deeds; as the faith is, so is life, and as life is, so is the faith; here it holds unconditionally: show me your faith by your works. To be sure,
[71] the Divine in which one believes is something superhuman; but this superhuman is, in its immediate presence, nevertheless wholly and entirely human: all the principal features of man's nature and being are recognizable in its revelations.

In this respect it might then seem as though the heathen gods, the old gods of the peoples, suited far better the nature of man and the peculiarities of the races than the eternal true God of the spirit, the God who has revealed himself in Christ. The Greek gods have Greek faces, Greek virtues and vices; they are Greek human beings of a higher order. Something similar holds on the whole of the gods of the Romans and of the Norsemen. But precisely because they are only human gods, gods with human faults and merits, they bear the seed of death in their hearts and, for all their immortality, can live only for a certain time.

It was the religion of the Aesir, the faith in the gods of lofty Valhalla, that held up the spirit of the North and carried the popular life forward on strong shoulders; but only for a certain time. In the 8th and 9th centuries after the birth of Christ the relation is reversed; then it is men who bear the gods. The hero relies on his strong arm and his sharp sword: he believes in Thor because he believes in his own valor. What, after all, does the mysterious element in the fate of the gods, which only the

Norns know, the riddle over which Baldur broods in melancholy, Mimir's well, where Odin has set his eye in pledge, signify, other than the dim, unexplored depth in the Northman's own inner being? With all their courage and their sense of independence and freedom, the strong men nevertheless feel themselves constantly subject to dark powers; there is an inflexible necessity, something sorcerous and wizardlike, that ensnares them in its net. They are silent, shut up within themselves, sparing of *[72]* words, when they hatch plans and proceed to action. The mind is weighed down, it is the yoke of necessity, the unfree, nature-bound being. A Sigurd Fafnir's-bane can slay the dragon and lift the treasure, but the serpent of fate, the great dragon of enigmatic existence, not even the spirit of the people itself is able to slay. Thus arises the presentiment of an All-father: Harald Fairhair believes in one single, almighty God; thus there is, in the midst of the din of battle, a quiet longing for peace, a search for light, a sigh for deliverance.

In his incomparable romance, "The Death of Hakon Jarl," Oehlenschläger has presented this transition in a symbolic manner. "The nights brood so long and so black, the Seven Stars glimmer so faintly" . . that is a Nordic winter night, the dark night of heathendom, whose cold breath we sense. Around the sacrificial mound stand the gods, old and gray, in cracked stones: "Our time is past, soon we shall sink". The counter-image to this is a shadow-outline of the Gothic church with the red walls. Through the leaded window the moon's ray reaches the crucifix of the altar and shines with a promise: "You will surely conquer, you white Christ, soon shall the wild northern zone bow to your crown of thorns". Then reality begins: "Olaf Trygvesen lands in Norway". Masses are sung, the banner of the cross waves, "The halberds wildly in the aether tumble, they flash, they flash away"; it is a popular collision, a bloody tryst between the old and the new faith.

Seen from an evangelical standpoint, flashing halberds and clanging swords naturally cannot be used as proofs of the truth of Christianity; but when the discussion is of a faith of the people, then truth is a power, vital power, heroic power: show me *[73]* your faith by your works. — Human life cannot bear itself and still less bear its own gods. The holy God of truth, who bears all, is infinitely exalted above the human; but precisely therefore also — like love itself — the true God of men, a true human God. The word of true life must be impressed upon the hearts and win the souls.

More than a hundred and fifty years before Olaf Trygvesen's appearance in Norway, Ansgar, an apostle of peace from the monastic cell, had proclaimed the Word among us. Mild as the Gospel, gentle, self-denying like one who treads in the footsteps

of the Savior, courageously patient like one seized by the Spirit who yearns for the martyr's crown, Ansgar had by the warmth of his word already begun to melt the ice, thaw the cold minds and kindle altar lights around those clad in mail. So it went both ways, that of the Word and that of the Sword, forward with the transformation of the faith of the people.

But however much that is evangelical there may be in Ansgar's teaching and personal life, we must nevertheless not forget whence he comes. His Gospel is not the originally pure one; a color has been put on it. It is Catholicism, the Roman, not yet fully developed Catholicism, that he brings with him for the conversion of the North.

How high Catholicism has lifted the faith of the people, what change of mind it has effected, how many chains it has loosed, how it has sheltered the defenseless, ennobled woman, taken up the cause of the poor and of the serfs and labored to bring unity, peace and order into the wildly confused society, shall be remembered with
[74] gratitude. Our Gothic churches: the buttresses, the pointed arches, the high vaults and the slender towers that point toward heaven, are more than monuments of a peculiar art of building, they are monuments of a peculiar stage of popular life, testimonies to the power of faith in times gone by. From these silent walls a petrified spirit speaks of vanished might and splendor.

But Catholicism has from the beginning committed a sin against the Spirit; there is a fault, a single fundamental fault, from which all its excesses, mistakes, indeed even its crimes against the spirit have their origin; it lies in the conception of the concept: *Authority.*

After the pattern of Christ the holy Word is to be proclaimed with authority; but after the pattern of Christ this authority is then also expressly to derive from spirit, i.e. from convincing truth, self-sacrificing love, personal superiority. How has Catholicism now conceived and applied the authority of Christ? It has quite rightly taken its starting point in the spirit. But however much it has been zealous to get the personality of the Holy Spirit fixed as dogma, it is nevertheless unmistakable that in the ordering of the whole ecclesiastical system it has come to do what it did not wish, in that it has in reality come to make its Holy Spirit as impersonal as possible.

Upon the dogma of the immediate presence of the Spirit in the infallible assemblies of bishops of the infallible Church the Catholic doctrine of spiritual authority is founded. The teachers and rulers of the Church thus do not have the divine authority, like Christ himself and his Apostles, from the personal element in their own inner being. On the contrary! the religious-moral inner being can, as with other mortals,

find itself in much frailty; their authority suffers no diminution because they are not *[75]* paragons of virtue. The clerical persons are not to be judged by their own personal worth, but by the position and rank they have in the Church. They are the Church's organs, its servants and yet at the same time its bearers: their authority is the authority of the Church system, personal in what is fallible, impersonal in what is infallible. The Church system is outward and the ecclesiastical persons likewise. The Church cannot act except through its persons; the whole Church system must then in reality comprise both persons and Church. But the persons can indeed err; in order that the Infallible may free itself from the Fallible, a miracle must occur, a miracle of the Spirit, every time the bishops assemble. That the bishops nevertheless not so seldom have been assembled without the miracle having occurred is notorious, since the one Catholic assembly of bishops has indeed solemnly condemned the other. The assertion of the miracle and the authority corresponding to it thus becomes a purely outward assertion. The authority becomes not less, but even more outward, when a single bishop, a single, in and of himself fallible person, is, by virtue of the miracle of the Spirit and the Church system, to be transformed into an infallible one.

On a groundless miracle the spiritual authority was founded and brought to completion in the Middle Ages. How outward the authority was is seen from the ecclesiastical separation between clergy and laity. All the clergy were of age; all laity, i.e. non-clergy, were — in the spirit — under age; with that the matter was settled. That such an authority was by no means, as one from the Protestant side has sometimes wished to pass it off, an arbitrary invention of clerical lust for power, is clear from *[76]* the whole ecclesiastical way of thinking. It shall be willingly conceded that outward authority was precisely suited to semi-barbarous conditions in a semi-barbarous age. It shall be conceded that a sensuously tangible authority was needed in order to have an educative effect upon the rude masses. But if we consider the educative element in this authority more closely, it also shows itself that precisely in its outwardness it has its limit.

If the point is to produce sudden and strong religious impressions, subdue coarseness of mind, awaken deeper longings, chastise doubt and take obstinacy by force, then surely there is no church system that can measure itself with Catholicism. The same holds when the task is to nourish a mystical inwardness and to bring the outward life with its countless particulars under strict general rules. But further one does not get; in inwardness it remains with the mystical: outward reality must make do with the sheen of piety which a colored light through the windows of the Church spreads

over "the good works." Masses and images of saints, choral songs and incense, ringing of bells and processions, all such things are suited to fill a sensuous imagination and make the spiritual outward. To kneel before the Mother of God, say one's rosary, lie with bare knees on peas in order to atone for a church penalty can be disciplining enough for those under age; but it is a sin against the spirit that understanding is lacking, that those under age never get so far that they could ever become of age.

At the beginning of the iconoclastic controversy we have a word from Gregory
[77] the Great (590 — 604); he says: "Let them read upon the walls what they do not read in the books." Against this there would be nothing to object, if we dared understand the words so that the provisional reading upon the walls were as soon as possible to be completed by a thoughtful reading in the books; but to educate a people to religious thinking for themselves would, what experience has sufficiently taught, be the same as to work against outward authority.

Fiat and outward authority are most closely united; outward authority wants, what Christ and his Apostles never wanted, to rule by the use of outward means and outward weapons. Hence the long embittered struggle between papal power and princely power; the former was in the eyes of the Church like the sun, the latter like the moon, which must borrow its light from the sun. Among the many outward means none is so effective as money. The Church needed money, always money, more money. When now not only money, but also remission of sins is an outward thing, then there was, one would think, no contradiction either in exchanging the one outward thing for the other, thus no contradiction at all in selling remission of sins for money. But — strangely enough — this clear logic the peoples could not understand. That the Pope took their souls, their conscience, their inner freedom and spiritual independence, they put up with patiently as good Christians; but that he took their money, that was revolting. Against the revolting one revolts; at last the measure was full: the Reformation broke through.

At the Imperial Diet at Worms (1521) the world saw an example that showed what
[78] spiritual authority can do, even if it meets in outward lowliness, and presents itself in an unprepossessing form. Imagine the glittering assembly; the Emperor, the princes, the papal legate, the Cardinal, archbishops, bishops, abbots, what representatives of worldly greatness, of ecclesiastical power and authority! And then the humble monk, the accused, whose defense they did not wish to hear, but whose disobedience they would sternly punish, unless he humbled himself under the infallibility of the Church and recanted all that he had spoken and written. It was a great moment when

the official of Trier broke in upon Luther and demanded a plain and straight answer whether he would recant or not; for Luther answered: "Unless I am convinced by the testimony of the Holy Scripture or by public, clear and evident reasons and caught in my conscience by the Word of God, then I can and will recant nothing, for it is neither safe nor advisable to do anything against one's conscience." Here was a newborn conscience with a new authority; the inner broke forth like lightning from the dark cloud, and the lightning kindled.

What awakenings and hopes, what streams of spiritual life the Reformation brought with it is generally acknowledged. Luther made the cause of the Reformation a cause of the people. "Every true Christian is of the clerical estate; the cup in the Supper belongs to the people; it shall stand free to everyone to believe the newly invented doctrine of transubstantiation or any real communion whatsoever between the consecrated bread and the divine body. Against the whole significance of the outward Church is set the sole saving omnipotence of faith. Therefore the Christian freedom must not be bound by any proposition and arbitrary vow" etc. But the new Church, which gradually formed itself, dared not stand weaponless as Luther at *[79]* the Diet. Through the Holy Scripture one went back to the original: instead of the authority of the Pope only the authority of Christ held, and the congregation of the Apostles became the pattern of the evangelical Church. If this thought of life, original in Luther, were to have been carried through, then the young Lutheran congregations must also have put up with remaining at the conditions of life of Christ and the Apostles; but voluntarily to choose suffering and martyrdom by such a measure, for that there was, with all the inwardness of faith and the heroism of sacrifice of which that age has so many and beautiful examples to show, nevertheless not strength of spirit enough. So one let the conditions decisive for spiritual authority remain outside, lowered the claims of following the pattern and held to the doctrine, "the pure doctrine." Despite its almost unbridled zeal for the pure doctrine the Church came to terms with the historical circumstances and submitted to the state. The inward authority gave up and fell into the arms of the outward: thus our Lutheran Church became a State Church.

If the people in this country could either overlook or fail to appreciate how much that is noble and good our Lutheran State Church has in the course of time furthered among us, how much has been accomplished, as well by God-fearing kings as by orthodox clergy, for the comfort of souls, for the purification of morals, for quiet progress in cultivation of the spirit and general enlightenment: then our people would

sadly lack — what happily it by no means lacks — historical sense. Not to speak of
[80] the fact that it was the State Church which with one blow struck the hierarchy to the ground, so almost every step forward, every measure by which the present state of freedom has been prepared, can be traced back immediately or mediately to the religious and civil influence of the State Church. When a people is on the point of forming and working out something new, then it is a duty of gratitude to take note of the merits which the old, that is now to be shelved, has really had. By fulfilling this duty one best secures oneself against the rash error of discarding precisely that which necessarily must be preserved.

In one point the Lutheran State Church has sinned; it has, like Catholicism, set outward authority above inward. Luther has with great force emphasized that every sacrament that is administered in the Church must expressly have Christ's command. Since this holds only of Baptism and the Supper, he rejected the Catholics' other five sacraments as self-made. The old State Church now concluded thus: if the sacraments have Christ's command, then it must above all be the duty of the Christian authorities that Christ's command be punctually fulfilled. To make sure of this, a command of the authorities was then added to Christ's command: outward authority stepped in to help the inward. It was a monstrous mistake, not to use the harsh word: a crime against the spirit. Where Christ commands, he tolerates no interference from other commanders; his authority is violated when unconcerned helpers step in and want to support it with an authority of quite another kind. Christ's command is to faith, and faith is free: free faith, free obedience, free appropriation are the first, indispensable
[81] fundamental conditions of the religious life. Had Christ wanted to put through his commands by the use of compulsion: then he had indeed power, and could have used power. But that he will not permit any outward authority whatsoever under any pretext whatsoever to meddle in that which by its nature belongs under spiritual authority, he has proved in deed by walking the way of suffering and letting himself be crucified. Luther understood Christ, when he declared that it should stand free to everyone to believe — imagine — "the newly invented doctrine of transubstantiation"! But, alas, the Lutheran State Church did not understand Luther.

Just as in Catholicism, so also in the Protestant State Church outward authority has dug its own grave; but, it goes without saying, the grave is another, for here is another gravedigger.

The eighteenth century has in a special sense received the name of the age of enlightenment, in particular of the enlightenment of the understanding. With

advancing science thinking was freed; the investigating understanding threw itself upon everything; it wanted to comprehend everything, and rejected everything that it could not comprehend. With blazing torch Enlightenment pursued goblins, trolls, ghosts and underground folk, who fled as fast as they could; at last it took on the Devil himself. According to the orthodox principle, one was to take reason captive under the obedience of faith; but the obedience of faith was indeed the same as obedience to the doctrine of faith prescribed by the State Church, a blind submission under an outward authority. Such a thralldom of spirit reason would no longer put up with. With the help of the understanding science soon brought it so far that it itself became *[82]* the supreme court, and religion had now to submit to the authority of reason.

Holberg, who must be regarded as the first champion of Rationalism among us, expresses himself on this among other things thus: "I have shown that Orthodoxy itself, which grounds itself alone on the authority of others, cannot be pleasing to God. For just as a great artist finds no pleasure in having his work praised by a blind or unappreciative man, who has no eyes; and a musician cannot rejoice that his music is praised by one who has no ears, so God can find no pleasure in those who judge of his glorious attributes, of which they have not troubled themselves to get the least idea. — If a hymn of praise or worship is to please, then it must be made by one who knows why he worships; and if a faith is to be called faith, then it must ground itself on knowledge, so that the phrase: *I believe*, must be the same as: *I know*.

The enlightenment of the understanding did not limit itself to shaking the existing orthodoxy from a standpoint outside the Church, it crept in through the church door. Under the guise of an enlightened, rational orthodoxy Rationalism began by criticizing the Bible and ended by explaining away the miracle and diluting Christianity.

At last a turning point set in, where the strife between science and the orthodox, officially recognized doctrine of the Church became so violent that it brought the authority of the state itself into embarrassment. The state had undeniably committed itself to uphold the old Lutheran orthodoxy; it had had all its clergy swear an oath on the symbolic books. But on the other hand the state had indeed also to hold to *[83]* enlightenment and recognize the right of science; here was a crossroads. It showed itself, to mention an example, when the royal Danish Chancery in the year 1834 came to a clash with "the strong Jutlanders." The old-fashioned believing common people namely could not come to terms with the new textbooks, but sent the children to school with the old ones. It was regarded as school neglect, and the Ordinance of 1814 was applied. Fining and distraint were to convince the simple people of the excellence

of the new books; but it bore no fruit. The poor peasants put up with distraint and sale of their furnishings, their sheep, cows etc.; but in the use of Balle's textbook they would not acquiesce. They did not limit themselves even to simple refusal, they adduced reasons, and gave a list of the passages that stood in conflict with the old faith and had aroused their offense; but the high authorities could naturally not enter into religious grounds of proof.

Here stood right against right. The peasants really had the right to demand the old strict Lutheranism upheld; it was indeed precisely this upholding to which the supreme authority of the state had solemnly committed itself. But the Chancery also had right; it maintained the authorized textbooks, because they were *authorized.* To yield to insubordination against the Authorized was to weaken the authority of the state. In order to uphold its authority the state broke its obligation: the State Church authority had fallen into discord with itself.

To cover this discord with a suitable veil, one has appealed to something called
[84] the Protestant principle, and which is supposed in particular to consist in this. that the Lutheran doctrine in the name of the spirit and of freedom lies open to critical examination and lets itself be reshaped, according as the interpretations of Scripture with correspondingly adapted elaborations of the dogmas vary, whereas the Catholic doctrine of the Church, petrified and crystallized in old forms, must defend itself against free science by withdrawing from its criticism and applying fiat instead of reasons. The essence of Protestantism is development: it seeks the truth and keeps pace with the time. The essence of Catholicism is standing still, it maintains that it has the truth and wages a desperate struggle with the spirits of the new time. Herein is something true, but also something misleading.

In comparison with the loftiness, character and coherence which distinguish Roman Catholicism, the Protestant State Church system of the present looks wretched. Catholicism knows what it wants, on what foundation it stands and what weapons it is to use; it still has in its way authority, spiritual authority. That is more than can be said of the sadly crippled State Churches. On what foundation would they stand? Some appeal to the symbolic books, juridically, juridically! But when the juridical authority of the symbolic books is literally, strictly to be upheld by the power of the state, what then becomes of it with the Protestant principle? Others appeal to science: Criticism, criticism and more criticism! But if it is really scientific criticism, which in the highest instance is to decide what religion is, and how many scraps of the Bible
[85] still may have leave to be genuine: what then has the state authority to signify, and

what becomes of the Church?

Here is a task to solve. How its solution is possible, especially for us under our conditions, is a question whose full answer will be able to emerge only from very detailed discussions. What I on this occasion have to offer is a brief and definite statement of the points of view which in my conviction are and must be the decisive ones. I shall endeavor to elucidate these points of view in a following lecture.[*)]

[*)] See the Seventh Lecture.

Sixth Lecture.

(Aagaard.)

---

[86] "Man dies, but never dies man's memory", that is an old Norse saying, and it bears witness to a high-minded view of life. Those who live only for self-interest had best not mention this saying, for it threatens them with a judgment: base self-interest, crude egoism, may achieve much in the world, but there is something it has never attained and never attains: an honorable posthumous reputation. What holds of the individual man holds in a wider sense of an entire generation. We all know how tempting it is to look to the nearest advantage. When those who cling to what exists themselves must admit that the fall of the old building is unavoidable, and yet, for the sake of advantage, the nearest advantage, cling to the rotten pillars and set against every thrust of the future the poor comfort: "it will hold well enough as long as we live": then such conduct gives no honorable posthumous reputation. When a party of progress makes use of what it regards as a favorable moment in so reckless and passionate a manner that it must necessarily confuse and harm the nearest future, when the watchword becomes: "Now is our time, we must use our advantage, let the
[87] more distant consequences be as they will!" then such conduct gives no honorable posthumous reputation. The verdict of posterity becomes a sentence of punishment, a sentence of condemnation; "Man dies, but never dies man's memory."

The verdict of the future is more than a human verdict, it is a judgment of God. Through history there runs a connected series of judgments of God; it is only a question of how far we human beings are able to discover them, and in what depth we are able to recognize them.

The Middle Ages took the matter directly after the pattern of the Old Testament; David felled Goliath, that was a judgment of God. When a lawsuit or a matter of honor of great importance was to be decided, then it did not essentially depend on the witnesses and the legal hearings, no, the decision lay in something else, for example in a duel. If insulting accusations had been raised against the character of a noble lady, her knight seized his sword; and if he defeated his opponent, the latter's statement was at once overthrown as untrue. It was a faith of the people that God would by a miracle let the righteous man conquer. If we consider the judgments of God properly so called, ordeal by iron, trial by the sacrament, trial by the cross, and so on, then the characteristic feature shows itself. People believed that the bread on the altar, when a

certain formula was recited at the Mass, would turn over if the suspect was guilty. Or they wrapped some pieces of wood, one of which was marked with a cross and another not, in wool and laid them on the altar: if the suspect now took the piece with the cross on it, he was declared innocent, otherwise guilty. Drought, plague, famine were regarded as immediate arrangements of God for the punishment of *[88]* sinners and the advancement of righteousness. Even a mighty enemy's natural death was a hint from above. When the Emperor Frederick the Second, the Hohenstaufen, was dead (1250), Pope Innocent the Fourth burst out in an address to the clergy of Sicily: "Heaven rejoices and the earth exults, for the lightning and storm with which God the Almighty has so long threatened your heads have by this man's death been transformed into a refreshing zephyr and a fertilizing dew." Even some hundred years ago the Spanish clergy wished to forbid the performance of pieces consisting wholly of song (operas), "because this ungodly entertainment was to blame for the prevailing lack of rain." It has indeed since been urged that such religious interpretations were well suited to awaken consciences and make the idea of God's omnipresent justice vivid; but it is nevertheless obvious that if the Almighty by interposing miracles himself were willing to undertake the administration of justice, then it would be impossible for so much injustice to thrive in the world.

The modern age has reached the opposite extreme. The divine freedom has caught itself in the laws; the unchangeable laws are bonds which it cannot loosen: in the connection of natural causes, conditions and intermediate causes an inflexible necessity rules. It is declared outright that one will not hear of "an irresponsible God"; and with the responsibility of men, before the tribunal of history, it likewise has little to signify. If the acting persons are considered one by one, then a distinction must surely be made between good and bad, noble and ignoble characters: praise *[89]* and blame cannot be wholly excluded. But if we grasp the whole with its countless particulars in connection, then we are convinced that the great men of history have always acted as they, according to the circumstances, necessarily had to act. A moral standard for good and evil, just and unjust, cannot be applied to world events and the mighty spirits, the shopkeeper's scales of civic morality are too small here. The great will be neither praised nor blamed, neither loved nor hated; it will, in one word, be admired. A Tiberius and a Nero have just as much attraction for the historian as either a Paul or a Luther. World history is the world's judgment: the judge is like Fate itself, and the judgment without conscience.

Should anyone venture to meet this grandiose view of the world with religious-

moral weapons in the simplicity of faith — as David met Goliath, then one would certainly with a superior smile remind him that David is dead, and his faith a long since abandoned standpoint. "A judgment of God" one does not fear; one is sure that the miracle will fail to appear, and so on. — How remarkable! In the Middle Ages Omnipotence was free, but the whole age unfree; in our days the age is to be free, but Omnipotence itself unfree. There must be something behind this.

Every time a great goal with a great task is set into history, it is Omnipotence itself, the eternally free spirit, that opens the depth of possibilities and sets men the task. The task is not pronounced in plain words from heaven; it is through existing
[90] facts and inner impulses that it announces itself. A historical task does not come naked into the world; it is clothed in the many-folded garment of natural conditions, events, circumstances: it has a veil over its face. The human will awakens as the Veiled One shows itself. It is freedom that awakens freedom, will that speaks to will. As the task is more closely determined and its demands step out into reality, it sets off a multiplicity of separate, subordinate tasks: here is work enough in all directions. The human will, which chooses, acts and works, has in all parts and from all sides, whether it knows it or not, to do with the divine will. Our freedom is limited, our will in countless ways conditioned by circumstances. But circumstances are colored by the light of knowledge, and the obstacles themselves give the will its elasticity. Different circumstances may lead the human will into highly different tracks; but there is no circumstance that can prevent our will from willing.

The manner in which millions of wills work together and in relation to the common task form a common will, a ruling general will, characterizes the *spirit of the time.* On the spirit of the time the children of the time all without exception, the mightiest as well as the humblest, are dependent, and yet in relation to the task all without exception, the humblest as well as the mightiest, as regards possibility, independent. Everyone can will and choose in his own way, the one the good, the other the bad; but Providence makes them all responsible. When the set task has then been worked at so long that its content is exhausted and the forces worn out, then its age goes
[91] into its grave and gives place to a new time. In so far as at every such transition, whether it takes place quietly and slowly or suddenly as in a spiritual earthquake, we give heed to the spiritual will's infinite superiority over the finite, yet each severally responsible, human wills, we recognize a judgment of God in history.

From this point of view a peculiar light falls on the world-historical struggle between right and wrong, good and evil, which has aroused doubt in so many thinkers.

The ruling spiritual will does not award us possession of this or that earthly good; it will, in the eternal sense, help men forward in willing and acting, but it does not take sides directly with the good. The good which it historically wills, it lays into the great task. Men may seize this task from whatever side they will; those who fight under its banner have on the whole Providence with them. On the task's account crimes can be committed; indeed the crimes may even be the greater, the deeper the task lies, the more historical right it has.

Boccaccio, an Italian poet of the fourteenth century, has in his "Decamerone" a series of tales, among them the following. Two merchants, a Christian and a Jew, were very good friends. The Christian merchant had had so many proofs of his Jewish friend's honesty, faithfulness, readiness to serve and upright way of thinking that he, being himself a good Catholic, felt an inward distress at the thought that so honest a soul should be lost. What did he do? He naturally sought to convert him to Christianity. But as he soon noticed that his own arguments of persuasion would not do, for the Jew was sure of himself when he defended his religion, he thought *[92]* to himself: "I must get him to the priest." But that did not work. "To the bishop, then." But that did not work either; and so the good man at last did not know what he should do. One day his friend steps in to him and says: I want to make a journey to Rome; I have business there, and wish to look about me in the famous city. — Good Lord, sighed the Catholic to himself, if Abraham comes to Rome and sees that Sodom and Gomorrah, then I shall never get him converted; now my last hope is gone. — The Jew set out and was away for a longer time. When he came back there was talk of commercial affairs and all manner of worldly things; but that point of religion the Christian friend dared not touch, he dared not even mention either the Pope or the cardinals. How astonished he was when his friend suddenly fell silent, regarded him with a peculiar mild look and then said: I will confide something to you; I have resolved to become a Christian. — Is it possible? How could you, in the midst of the pool of insolence, blasphemies and debaucheries, get good thoughts of Christianity? It is clear, answered the Jew, the God who can bear such things must be more merciful than mine.

What is here said as a biting mockery can be taken in full earnest. The height of crimes to which the medieval Church at last carried things is at the same time a measure of the religious depth and moral greatness which the task originally contained. By this standard we must recognize the judgment of God under which it sank.

Let us cast a glance at the period that directly borders on our own, and yet lies

[93] closed for us, namely the age of Napoleon the First, and there we see an example of what a judgment of God is. The task that was here set was not directly religious; and yet the spiritual will was with it, it was in truth a great task, significant for the cause of humanity (humaneness). The Revolution broke brutally with the historical past. In its terrible wrath it wanted to break the old yoke, as one breaks a withered branch on an old tree; with a bloody axe it wanted to hew the tree down, and did not notice how deep the roots were. At no turning point in history have the wildness of the masses and the impotence of the multitude, where a guiding Providence is concerned, shown themselves in a clearer light than just then when "the Mountain" sank and "the Valley" began again to rise. Despite astonishing upsurges, immense exertions of calculating shrewdness, fanatical zeal and a robber's courage that staked everything, it nevertheless looked as though the "Rights of Man" were to be stifled in the inhuman, and the defenders of the old servitude to return with tenfold right. When Groa, says the myth, sang magic songs over Thor, the god became so glad that he told her how he had carried her husband, Ørvandel, across the Elivagar. Superhuman powers were required to carry the new society, convulsed to its innermost core, across the Elivagar of the Revolution. But the spiritual will was with it; there rose out of the depth of possibilities a heroic figure, a holder of power of a higher order, a world-historical genius, Napoleon Bonaparte. He had a will.

That such a will cannot possibly be a simple, naturally necessary product of
[94] circumstances, shines forth most clearly from this, that it everywhere, to the world's astonishment, makes itself the master of circumstances; it brings good fortune to go with it and teaches the chances it meets to bow deeply before the superior man. So the new world had received a new will, a central will. Millions and millions of wills, strong and weak, small and great, are set in motion. Surprise, envy, admiration, friendship, enmity, hope, fear, hatred, enthusiasm, freedom, compulsion, all one! all thoughts, all moods, all wills must join in: they must all revolve as planets about the one sun, all move about the one central will. Here is freedom in the midst of this necessity; here is a world of wills.

If we look at the course it took in the solution of the task, then the hero of the age unfortunately forgot on the way that it was the "Rights of Man" from which he had set out. Instead of being the servant of the spiritual will, he became an instrument of Fate: the imperial eagle swooped down on the whole like a bird of prey. When one considers how one step led to the next, how one extension of power demanded another, how the extraordinary was heaped upon the extraordinary, Ossa upon Pelion,

as in the days of the wars of the gods, until the colossal edifice at last crashed down, and the myth of the Titan, Prometheus chained to the rock, was made reality on St. Helena: then there is undeniably matter enough for those who immerse themselves in the concatenation of events and admire necessity. None the less this necessity is from first to last conditioned: outwardly by the clash of chances, inwardly by the choice of the will. In the interaction of chance and choice lies conditioned freedom. It is the world-ruler who, from selfish impulse, continually transforms the spiritual will *[95]* into the will of fate. The great drama, the tangled knot, the far-radiating points of splendor, the shattering scenes and the tragic ending, all is so interwoven with the threads of freedom and necessity that Providence and Fate both enter upon the right of the stronger and challenge each other to a world-shaking trial of strength. Such a trial was never seen on the stage of the old world. An Alexander, Hannibal, Scipio, Caesar are examples of what genius can do by virtue of invincible will of impulse; but Fate rules, freedom is overshadowed by necessity. The heroes of classical antiquity could not possibly have had such a consciousness of the essence and conditions of freedom as the son of the Revolution from the eighteenth century. So the Mighty One becomes responsible, so the spiritual will asserts its superior power; so the judgment becomes more than a world's judgment, it becomes a judgment of God.

When it can at times offend us that the right of the stronger is to hold as fully in history as in nature, then we dare not forget that it has, on the conditions of freedom, a peculiar connection with what we call the stronger. It is said in the language of religion: better to suffer wrong than to do wrong; but the meaning of the holders of power is: better to do wrong than to suffer wrong.

There may at times come upon crude holders of power such an involuntary lust for destruction that they visit countries with fire and sword and burn down peaceful towns, having no other purpose than that of wanting to show the world what a wretched thing it is that one calls law and right. Nero is not the only one who takes up a distinguished place among the crowned arsonists. Such an abuse of power is *[96]* vanishing in all civilized countries. But with that the "Rights of Man" are as yet but little helped. The positions of states toward one another are, and by the nature of the case must be, positions of power. To maintain right there is required power; the proposition, true in and for itself: *Right is Might*, is then turned around and comes to mean: *Might is Right.* Thereby arises a tacitly acknowledged rule of power which, more than anything else in the world, undermines the moral consciousness of peoples and states. It goes without saying that the holder of power never fails to give his

claims, even if they contain the most crying injustice, a semblance of right; there is pretext enough for war when one wants to overwhelm a weaker neighbor. So wrong is done on the grand scale. And when the wrong is done, what then? Then one judges by the outcome. What has happened has happened; the wronged party must resign himself to his fate. Let the wrong be manifest to all, so manifest that the simplest man can feel it with his hands; let the overmighty one himself see that it is really wrong, and that it only costs him a word to make the wrong good again: he cannot — so weak is he, the strong one, on this point — he dares not do it. And why not? Because it touches his honor too closely; it would look like weakness. The holder of power who voluntarily gives up a single piece, however small, of his power has given himself up and betrayed the whole rule of power. To make a wrong good is, after all, to concede its existence. "Might is Right"; how should a holder of power humble
[97] himself to concede that he ever either had done or could do wrong. To make a single wrong good? No, no! If one is to enter upon the particular, then the debt becomes too great; there stands an army of creditors outside the door. Better to do wrong than to suffer wrong.

And now public opinion? Politics is not sentimental, but practical. Public opinion is, from precisely this point of view, to be disciplined to understand that questions of right and wrong have their home only in the internal affairs of the administration of the state, in civil and criminal procedure, but in no way concern the position of power. That is no contempt for right and justice. On the contrary! The higher we esteem right and justice, with the greater esteem and awe must we look up to the holder of power who is placed so high that he, without diffidence, without a blush, can show the world that he has right under his foot, and teach us what wrong means. — That was, then, an explanation of the right of the stronger; we now pass on to another.

Better to suffer wrong than to do wrong; that is the poor man's comfort in the eyes of the mighty, and alas: by being misunderstood it can only too easily become poor enough. *To suffer* wrong is usually understood in such a way that the emphasis falls on the bare suffering, the deedless endurance, which in dullness consoles itself with the thought that here there is nothing to be done. That is an outrageous notion, offensive especially when it is to go under the name of Christianity, for it is an open denial of the thought of Christ.

There has been One in history, One alone, who in spirit and truth knew what it was to suffer wrong. Millions have suffered and still suffer to this very day greater or
[98] lesser wrong; there is hardly anyone among us, who in this respect has not something

or other to complain of. We may be in the right in much, but we are yet always in the wrong in something. No one dare say that he only suffered wrong, but never did wrong. Only the one Sufferer suffered wrong, not *although* he was in the right in much, but *because* he was in the right in all, because he had never done wrong. The many sufferers must admit that what chiefly brings suffering upon them is the lack of the goods of which they have wrongfully been deprived. Who dares say that for justice's sake he has voluntarily chosen to suffer? We do not love right itself so much as we hate those who deny us our right. Could we come to our right by abating a little of justice, we should gladly enough compromise: it is the intractability of our opponents that forces us to suffer. Only the one Sufferer, he who voluntarily suffered for the sake of justice, would not compromise, and therefore he suffered to the uttermost. Had his suffering been a feeble and deedless endurance, would he perhaps have accomplished nothing great in the world? He too applied the right of the stronger: he was in truth the Strong One.

If to suffer wrong were only a sign of weakness and impotence, Christianity would never have come into being. Christ with his witnesses vouches that he who suffers wrong may be far stronger than he who does wrong. Transferring this to popular life, it is obvious that a people which, in having to suffer wrong, understands how to transform the pressure of necessity into a task of freedom, may, even if it is a small people, attain a great significance in history.

To love right and to hate wrong is the first condition for attaining a better state of society. But in which people is one now to expect to find the greatest love of right *[99]* and the strongest hatred of wrong? Surely in that people whom the dispensations of Providence have taught what it means to suffer wrong. Here there is no question of a feeble and deedless suffering. If it goes so far with idle endurance and acquiescing in everything that at last one becomes reconciled with the wrong and thinks in one's quiet mind: the stronger is after all in the right; we should have done the same as he, if we had had the power, then the spark of independence is extinguished, and the people must die. There is nothing that so rouses the contempt of the overmighty as fawning, cowardly submissiveness in those whose right he has trodden under foot. We learn it from the Romans, we learn it from the history of the French Caesar.

The people that is brought up to love right by suffering wrong receives a good education. In all states with a free constitution there are debates enough about laws and rights, — an immense labor of legislation! The debates sometimes take such a turn that they are close to driving civilized society to despair. The machinery of

justice labors, groans and puffs; screws and wheels crack and creak. But the more people crowd about right and the right, the more crooked and warped it comes to look; at last it becomes impossible to bring forth a single work cast whole. Calculated accommodation, clever agreements, strategic tricks and tactical maneuvers will not do: what is inflexibly demanded is an all-pervading sense of justice, love of right and hatred of wrong. A strong and living sense of right is a thousand times more worth
[100] than ten thousand learned folios of law. Where the first is lacking, the last gives only a wretched substitute; but when the first is given, the second will follow as of itself.

If the business of legislation were to depend wholly on juridical insight into all particulars, then the whole people through its elected could not possibly secure for itself any real and living participation in legislation itself. But when it is not juridical hair-splitting in small matters, but an ever-wakeful sense of justice, a sound and open eye for legal relations on the large scale, on which it essentially depends: then the people can gradually educate itself to an ever more effective participation and deeper intervention in all branches of legislation. Self-education then advances on the following conditions.

1) The electors must take care that the elected man can on the whole be said to represent the mood of the constituency; for the people has an indisputable right to put its mood into the scales.

2) The elected man is, in all debates in the legislative assembly, bound to remain true to his character, the character in which he appeared before his electors; but he is by no means bound to vote with a closed party in one and all or to cling fast to a preconceived, petrified opinion; he is on the contrary bound, bound on honor and conscience in the holy name of justice, to seek enlightenment, to listen to the statements of experts, to take note of the arguments of opponents, to form an independent conviction and to vote according to his conviction.

3) The elected man is accountable to the electors. If these electors have once for
[101] all got it into their heads that only that is right which pleases them, and all that is unpleasant to them wrong: then they constitute only a crowd, not an organic part of the people. But if they are receptive to arguments and sincerely wish to know what right is, he can inform them of the connection of the matter and thereby put into their hands the means of passing a free and independent judgment. If they then find that the elected man has not hit upon what, in their view, is the useful and right thing, then they have full right to elect another. In any case a step forward has been taken on the way of better knowledge.

These propositions, with the truths lying in them, contain nothing new; but the old thing which constantly must become new to us is this: how does it stand with our sense of justice? We, who outwardly must suffer wrong, have we inwardly learned to love right? Has the injustice of majority power become so repugnant to us that in relation to one another we would rather, if it must be so, ourselves suffer wrong than wrong our opponents? Such questions are not political; they are questions of conscience. But politics dare not exclude conscience; as surely as there is a popular life, so there is also, and must be, a conscience of the people.

Who then is, in the higher sense, the stronger, he who proves his power by doing wrong, or he who has learned to develop his independence by suffering wrong? The first has placed himself under Fate, the last stands under Providence. The necessity of Fate spreads, when wrong must constantly make good wrong, and what is acquired by violence is possessed by compulsion. On a broad foundation of the serpent-knots of wrong great state-edifices can indeed be raised, and it is this semblance of greatness *[102]* that incessantly dazzles and tempts the holders of power. But as little as one can pluck grapes of thorns or figs of thistles, so little can one reap fruits of right on the field of wrong. Heaps of old wrong deposit cancerous growths in the body of the state. The strong constitution endures much, and the organism of society has many healing outlets; but the substances of wrong must be removed. One imagines that wrong can be forgotten, that time can gradually stop its consequences and put it out of action. That is a delusion of the holders of power. The elements of wrong are like a poison, slowly consuming, unceasingly working. The rule of power imagines that the art of politics will with time be able to transform the deadly substance into a wholesome nutriment. Impossible! If there does not come a healing hand which cuts out the cancerous sore of wrong, then the disease becomes incurable: the evil passes into the blood. It is a necessity of Fate that the great work of wrong must fall, for it bears the seed of its destruction in itself. Wrong is the destroying, right the sustaining principle in history. A great body of state, grown together out of violence and wrong, may by its very growing together at last become one single great, tangled cancerous knot. The worshippers of Fate admire the great cancerous knot and extol necessity. But necessity stands under freedom; necessity is that the spiritual will must be fulfilled; every time we see its fulfillment in history, we recognize a judgment of God.

Seventh Lecture.

(Kolding).

---

[103] The old Lutheran State Church has, in the sincerity of its heart, no doubt from the beginning with the very best intention, fused together two components of the life of faith that belong together but are nevertheless unlike in kind, namely: faith in *salvation and faith in morality.* Thereby the Church has been placed in an ambiguous light.

Faith in salvation is the faith of the congregation, and the Church signifies the congregation; faith in morality is the faith of the people, and the Church signifies the People's Church. Faith in both forms has essentially the same source; for spirit is, seen in its origin, the same: only the spirit of the congregation is able to furnish the eternal, fully valid foundation for a true spirit of the people.

But spirit works in human life in different ways, with different force in different directions. "Our citizenship is in heaven"; that is the faith which spirit awakens, confirms and nourishes in the congregation. "Our citizenship is on earth"; that is the faith which spirit awakens, confirms and nourishes in the people, a faith in the significance of a moral life full of energy for action, a popular faith, which shows
[104] itself in deeds. The faith of the congregation is the original, the faith of the people the derived. The difference is obvious: we can immerse ourselves in the original with a clouded, uncertain eye for the derived; and human beings by the thousand can make use of, employ and work upon the derived without therefore, in any deeper sense, troubling themselves about the original.

Spirit is the source of life, all life is from spirit; therefore the different fundamental chords of existence are to be brought into consonance in one great, full-toned harmony of the many souls, the many self-sounding instruments of spirit. But how different these fundamental chords are! When the banner waves, the red cloth with the white cross, and the people sing in a thousand-voiced chorus: "King Christian stood by the lofty mast," then something stirs wondrously in the breasts of many; it is the faith that we are one people: it is like a rustling of the wings of the spirit of the people that we hear. But the spirit of the congregation puts the banner of the cross in another light. The faith of the congregation sees in the Crucified One, the One crowned with thorns, who has bowed his head, a portent of another struggle, the last struggle; then it sings another song, to deep organ tones a death-song: "Who knows how near my

end is to me?" These are different fundamental chords; these are opposite poles of life; is the one of them, then, really to be destined to blot out the other?

The fundamental law of life is two-sided: to die to the world and yet to live in the world; we are to live vigorously in order to die, and to die in order to live vigorously. The two-sidedness rests on this, that the divine Word points in two directions: toward the blessed and toward the moral. "Whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also," so spoke Christ when he taught from the Mount; but when he *[105]* stood before the High Priest, and one of the servants gave him a blow on the cheek, then he did not turn the other cheek, but said: "If I have spoken ill, prove it, but if I have spoken rightly, why smitest thou me." — "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which do you harm and persecute you;" that is a condition of salvation, the mind that can understand this learns that there is Something which is called blessed. But what people will be able to understand it as if the law of morality forbade bearing arms against the enemies of the state and of the fatherland? The moral can be taken up into the blessed; but no one will assert that human beings cannot be moral without being blessed. Here, in spirit and faith, there is a difference between the blessed and the moral. This difference must in earthly life, under the conditions of finitude, develop into a real opposition — not contradiction — between the faith of the congregation and the faith of the people.

To the faith of the people corresponds the People's Church. There stands in our Constitution in plain words that the Evangelical Lutheran Church is the People's Church. By this it is by no means meant that the Evangelical Lutheran faith of the congregation is to be forced upon the people by law. Had this been the meaning, another word would have stood there: there would have stood, not *People's Church, but State Church.* It was precisely, as recently adduced, the characteristic of the old State Church that it fused in an unclear manner the faith of the congregation and the faith of the people. The government held unshakably fast to the principle that no one could be a good citizen of the state, a faithful and obedient subject, unless he were a *[106]* true, believing Christian, and that no one could be a true, believing Christian who did not confess the faith commanded by the state, in accordance with the teaching of Scripture and of the orthodox Church. It was not only for the sake of morality, of civil concord and uniformity in outward matters, that it applied such severe measures against those of other faith, no, it was expressly also for the sake of salvation, for the sake of the souls under age themselves. The ruler of the state really supposed that he, so far as the ecclesiastical was concerned, held the conscience of the subjects

in his hand and on the Day of Judgment would have to render account to God as supreme-commanding shepherd of souls.

How entirely and utterly this State Church point of view has been abandoned in the Constitution is clearly shown by § 76. "Citizens have the right to unite in congregations in order to worship God in the manner that agrees with their conviction, provided that nothing is taught or done that conflicts with morality and public order."

Every jot and tittle of this paragraph is a protest against the State Church. It is not a minority of those of other faith, some few religious parties, who simply will not swear by the symbolic books of the Lutheran Church, and who on that account receive permission to worship God in their own way, of whom it here speaks. No, it speaks here not of permission, but of right, not of the members of the congregation, but of the citizens, all the citizens without exception. But when all citizens have the right to worship God in the manner that agrees with their conviction, then undeniably the whole people has the right to do the same. On the other hand, citizens have
[107] by no means the right to teach or do anything that conflicts with morality. The separation between faith in salvation, the particular faith of the congregation, and faith in morality, the general faith of the people, is thus expressly recognized. The 3rd paragraph of the Constitution, which says: "The Evangelical Lutheran Church is the Danish People's Church and as such is supported by the state" stands in good agreement with this, for here it speaks not of something that *shall* be, but of something that is. If one would seek a remnant of the State Church in this, that the Lutheran Church is supported by the state: then we must ask why it alone is to be supported. It cannot be because the majority of the Danish people are for the time being Lutherans, for then there would have had to stand *Majority Church*; but now there stands expressly People's Church. It is a true blessing for land and realm that there stands People's Church; had there stood Majority Church, then not only the faith of the majority, but also the will of the majority, the right of the majority and the might of the majority would at the same time have been solemnly recognized.

That the Evangelical Lutheran Church is the Danish People's Church means: the Evangelical Lutheran spirit of the congregation and the Danish spirit of the people are essentially akin; the faith of the people and the education corresponding to it ought, in accordance with the peculiarity of our national nature, to go predominantly in a Lutheran direction and on average to take on an Evangelical Lutheran stamp. How this is to be understood more closely will show itself as we consider what follows: "The constitution of the People's Church is regulated by law."

Weighty voices are raised against letting the law by which the constitution of the People's Church is to be regulated proceed from the popular legislature. "The Rigsdag, *[108]* which has no confession," it is said, "cannot make laws for that which especially concerns the Evangelical Lutheran confession of faith." We cannot subscribe to this point of view, because we cannot approve its presuppositions. It is here presupposed that it is the Evangelical Lutheran affairs of the congregation, the doctrine, the arrangement of divine service, the administration of the sacraments, the calling of the shepherds of souls, etc., the regulation of which the Constitution speaks. But that the Constitution's thoughts go in another direction is seen from § 76. It is here presupposed that the laws are to be laws of compulsion, not, as in the days of the Apostles, spiritual laws of freedom. But to want to govern the inner affairs of the cure of souls by the application of laws of compulsion is surely simply to tread in the footsteps of the old State Church. Here is finally presupposed a legislative and governing authority of so purely ecclesiastical a kind that it takes up an independent position over against the secular. But if it is already unreasonable to want to introduce two entirely coordinate governing authorities, an ecclesiastical one right beside a secular one, in one and the same state, then it is more than unreasonable, it is manifest contradiction to want to withdraw from the people the right of legislation, when that which is to be regulated by law is precisely the concern of the People's Church, the Church of the people.

There are Others who think that the time has now come when one ought at last to make a serious matter of separating the Church from the State. Insofar as it is again the old notion of a State Church that haunts their brains, we have nothing to object to this. Religion and the state can both be served by the divorce: religion is freed from an oppressive burden, and the state likewise. But the question here is not of a State Church, but of the People's Church and its peculiar position in *[109]* relation to the congregation. What matters is to make the relation between the Church of the congregation and the People's Church as clear as possible. The Church of the congregation with the sacraments and the word of salvation has its definite confession of faith; the People's Church with the word of morality has no sacraments and professes only the general principles of the religious-moral life of the people. It is in good agreement with this that the light, the life and the power of inwardness with which the great principles of morality are filled and appear can give us a reflection of the spirit that stirs in the congregation. Since it is precisely the People's Church that contains within itself the means of spirit and the conditions that form the foundation

of the people's instruction and education as a whole, how will one then be able to justify separating the People's Church from the people's state.

The constitution of the People's Church can and ought to be regulated by law; here, on this point, there can be talk of laws of compulsion, civic laws. To want to apply compulsion to that which by its nature does not let itself be compelled is a blunder; but to rage against all compulsion where laws of compulsion essentially belong is also a blunder.

From old dread of State Church authority, several have spoken up for an almost boundless freedom in the People's Church. It is, in their opinion, supposed to stand in conflict with the principle of freedom that the teachers in the People's Church are appointed by the state, for thereby they become, one says, imposed upon the members. It is supposed to be an encroachment on the rights of the family that children without the consent of their parents are obliged to attend school and go through a course of instruction ordered by law, which among other things also includes religion and so
[110] forth. Would not what is unwarranted in such objections become clear if one begins by asking oneself what sort of state, what sort of church and what sort of educational system is here in question? The power of the state from which the laws proceed does not stand either outside the people or above the people; on the contrary, according to the Constitution it is a popular power; its will is a popular will expressed in laws. It is the people itself that, through the popular state, by way of legislation, orders its church constitution.

By the order fixed by law the people secures itself against the Church being given up as a prey, whether to the changing whims of the multitude or of individuals. It is not a self-willed state that sets itself over the people, but it is the people that by means of the state sets itself over the individuals; it is the people that, by its legislative authority, procures for itself security that all individuals in the whole population are made partakers of the instruction and education that the faith of the people requires.

In the different classes of society the particular education and cultivation can naturally be very different and be attained by very different ways; but there is Something that must be common to All, and that is the popular. All children, girls and boys, whatever they otherwise belong to, families of whatever rank and station, of whatever confession of faith, are not only to be brought up and instructed; but they are, so far as the popular is concerned, expressly to be brought up and instructed in the way that the popular will prescribes: they are to be brought up and instructed in the faith of the people. The humane people may, on the general conditions of morality, grant

the citizens the right "to unite in congregations and worship God in the manner that *[111]* agrees with their conviction;" but if there is a society whose confession of faith does not permit such a moral education as the faith of the people demands, then it is surely evident that the members of such a society cannot possibly be counted as belonging to the people. Those who assert that parents have the right to decide whether their children shall enjoy any instruction and education or not, assert at the same time that parents have the right to decide whether their children shall have title to enjoy the rights of citizens of the state or not. Those who grant parents full power to decide whether their children shall be educated in the faith of the people or not, must at the same time grant them the right to decide whether the children shall be counted as belonging to the people or not. But when one grants the individuals of the population such a right over against the popular will: where then is the authority of the people, what then is the people?

That the People's Church, as it exists at present, is an ambiguous being can be seen most plainly in the in many respects difficult position in which the servants of the Word find themselves. Christ says: "No man can serve two masters." But as long as the constitution of the Church is still as it is, the servants of the Word must admit to themselves that in reality what is demanded of them is the unreasonable, that they should serve two masters. They are to be Christ's servants, with authority from Christ's authority, spiritual authority; and they are at the same time to be the state's servants, for they are indeed the state's officials and have in this capacity all their authority from the state. How difficult such a double service is, we learn on every page of the history of the old State Church. Only when the opposition between *[112]* the Church of the congregation and the People's Church comes clearly forward will the two-sided relation of service be freed from all ambiguity.

In the congregation the servants of the Word are unconditionally Christ's servants; for this service they stand as shepherds of souls accountable to Christ and the congregation: here there applies no interference of authority in the law of the state. In the People's Church the servants of the Word are, in a religious-moral spirit, servants of the popular, and must in this capacity be subject to the popular authority of the state. In both services they are workers, and a worker is worth his wages; but the work of the shepherd of souls cannot be paid in the same way as that of the teacher of the people.

"When you go out," says Christ to his disciples, "then preach and say that the kingdom of heaven is come nigh. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast

out devils. *You have received it for nothing, give it for nothing.* You shall not have gold, nor silver, nor brass in your girdles; nor a bag for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, neither a staff; for a worker is worth his food." Here the talk is not of general popular instruction; here it speaks expressly of the proclamation of the word of salvation, of the soul-saving activity. Everything is given for nothing, for it is given out of love, and love is always given for nothing: it is a commodity that can be neither sold nor bought! On the other hand it can and ought to be presupposed that where the word of love finds entrance into the hearts of human beings, those who receive the spiritual goods will be willing to relieve the temporal need of those
[113] who for nothing impart to them these goods, in that they acknowledge that "a worker is worth his food." Such a relation cannot be "regulated by law"; the work of the shepherd of souls is no piecework: he is obliged to give All for nothing, but then he is also entitled to receive voluntary gifts.

Otherwise with the position of the teachers in the People's Church. The teacher of the people performs work commanded by law in return for remuneration in a salary fixed for that purpose. He is obliged to perform the work and he is entitled to demand his salary. Just as the authority of the people as a whole will know how to damp the arbitrariness of individuals, so will the popular legislation also know how to secure for the servants of the popular word the salary that such a service is worth, and to place the religious-moral educators so freely that they do not in an unseemly manner become dependent on individuals who ought most of all to feel themselves in free dependence on the educating word.

How little one has as yet thought of transforming the State Church into the People's Church can be seen from the provisions that have been made on the part of legislation concerning the establishment of free congregations. What now forms the opposite to the free congregations? The unfree congregations, the congregations in the People's Church supported out of the means of the state. The unfree congregations thus belong to the rule, the free ones to the exception; an unhappy exception! If there is any society in the world that has an original claim to freedom, then it is surely the congregation of Christ; its freedom is not usurped, it is dearly paid for: he bought it with his blood. That the congregations of the People's Church are unfree proves in fact that they still find themselves in the old State Church condition.

[114] The new arrangement with the separation between free and unfree congregations is especially characteristic in the manner in which it is defended. That a human authority has taken charge of the divine things and arranged the constitution of the

Church so that everything happens by virtue of a supreme command, that the word of salvation is commanded by law, the sacraments commanded by law, the general prayers commanded by law, etc., all this, for the sake of order, Commanded by law — one says — makes absolutely no encroachment on Christian freedom. And why not? Because every human being who is not content with the order commanded by law has surely the right to step out and seek, if he will, his edification in a free congregation or another society not commanded by law. So one comforts oneself with the thought that faith is free, that we in reality have a completely carried-out freedom of religion. There is in this way of regarding things not so little of a self-deception, after all.

Insofar as the talk here is of the individuals' freedom of choice, the freedom is certainly so extensive that no one has anything to complain of. But let one take careful note that it is not the freedom of individuals that is in question, but the freedom of the congregation, the Church of the congregation's own freedom, how does it stand with that? Or is it supposed that what we call Christian freedom has nothing at all to do with the word of salvation itself and its proclamation, not with the sacraments and their administration? Can the spirit of the congregation perhaps work best of all as the spirit of freedom, when the means through which it works are all unfree? Can the congregation hear freely, when it knows that the shepherd of souls dare not speak freely? Can any spiritual discipline (church discipline) be exercised by shepherd of souls and congregation together, when the co-operation of both can at any moment be broken through by an authority intervening from outside? These questions have *[115]* not been answered at all, because, so far as we can see, one has not yet put them to oneself with clear consciousness.

The free congregations, which were to remedy the total lack of spiritual freedom from which the State Church suffers, are, as it seems, likewise not in a position to solve the task. Free congregations may well form which bind themselves beforehand juridically to pay their shepherds of souls; but there is hardly any free congregation in which the shepherd of souls can essentially be said to fulfil Christ's command: "You have received it for nothing, give it in turn for nothing." Those who in One and All aim at fulfilling the apostolic freedom must also in One and All submit to the apostolic conditions of life.

In order that that which cannot be subjected to compulsion, and that which by its nature cannot do without laws of compulsion, may come into the right relation to one another, the mutual interaction of the Church of the congregation and the People's Church, of the faith of the congregation and the faith of the people must of necessity

be made clear. That the Church of the congregation can subsist by itself without a People's Church is evident in itself: the Apostolic Church with all its popular stamp was no People's Church, it was in the deepest sense of the word a Church of the congregation. The People's Church can for its part work by itself without immediate connection with the congregation; for although, in order to be what it is especially to be among us, it must be permeated by the Evangelical Lutheran spirit, and must have a general stamp of an Evangelical Lutheran life of the congregation: yet it is without
[116] definite confession of faith and without sacraments. The essential separation is a condition for their being able to work together in good understanding and peaceful unity. The congregation with the word of salvation and the sacraments contains what is particular and original; the great popular society of education with the word of morality, the instruction of youth etc. makes do with what is general and derived. If now the union and interaction of both is conceived in the light of the faith of the people from the popular side, then we have what the Constitution understands by the Evangelical Lutheran People's Church.

In order to be able to fulfil their office as servants of the Word in such a People's Church, the young men who feel an inner calling to it must go through a preparatory school that corresponds to the preparation in both directions. As prospective shepherds of souls they must make themselves familiar with the spirit and doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran congregation; as prospective teachers of the people they must make themselves familiar with the popular conditions, with the historical-moral way of thinking of the people, in short: with the conditions of life under which the spirit of the people works. As teachers of the people they are installed by the state authority; as shepherds of souls they are chosen by the congregation and receive the apostolic consecration. The strife that could arise on occasion of the double election and the double installation is in principle settled by this, that the religious-moral teacher of the people surely may very well work without being a shepherd of souls, and that the election of a shepherd of souls is so free that the congregation, if in a quite peculiar case it should feel the need of it, can, without offending the appointed teacher of the people or giving offence to the state authority, choose another as its shepherd of souls.

[117] As regards oversight, it is a matter of course that it also must become two-sided. The teacher of the people stands, like every other official, under the oversight of the governmental authority and his capacity for work is assessed in proportion to the spiritual power with which he works in a moral-popular direction upon the population

of the parish. The shepherd of souls stands under the oversight of such persons as have insight and spiritual authority to clarify the religious tasks of life, develop the peculiarities of the Evangelical Lutheran doctrine and point out the deviations from it. How a governmental authority chooses its overseers, and what the effects of the oversight can be, is a well-known matter. How the congregations in the apostolically free time got their overseers (bishops and elders) chosen, and what effects spiritual authority exercised, is likewise well known.

There prevails with Many a fear that a spiritual oversight without legal ordering and juridical means of compulsion will become indefinite and unfruitful, that confusion in doctrine and a corresponding disturbance of the life of faith cannot be avoided. It is an untimely fear. To be sure it must be conceded that many of the deviations which the State Church in its time stamped and punished as heresies may come forward anew. But if these deviations are dangerous, they can surely be brought to light; and when they are brought to light, every congregation surely has the right to call its shepherd of souls to account. Such storms of heresy as shook the old State Churches are not to be feared in more recent times; for the conception of *dogma* has on the whole undergone an essential change.

Dogma is a proposition of faith expressed in definite form. In older days, when orthodoxy was juridical, one held so exactly, so pettily to the form and literal expression of each single tenet, that anyone who dared to speak freely and livingly out of a *[118]* religiously moved mind exposed himself to being accused of heresies of which he had scarcely dreamed. Here there was in the rattling off of heresies Enough to inflame the passions, goad subtlety and increase the harassments. To free itself from the dead formalism of Orthodoxy, Pietism wanted to appropriate everything with feeling. But as feeling, so to speak, softened the dogmas to a mush, the doctrine of faith became jelly-like, and the whole flowed away into foggy indefiniteness. Both extremes are avoided when we consider that each single form of proposition is indeed a definite but at the same time one-sided expression of the content of faith, that the content is always richer than the limited form, that the forms of expression must change when the richness of the content is to be fully unfolded. It is not dogmatic indifferentism, but a more thorough conception of the nature of the truths of faith, on which we, by a rejection of that untimely fear, can base our assumption.

What has here been set forth is not to be regarded as a practical proposal for a transformation of the existing church constitution; it is no proposal at all, but an elucidation which, to the exclusion of every consideration of practical difficulties, is

aimed directly at clarifying the principles according to which the transformation in the course of time must of necessity take place. That in practical respects there are difficulties to be overcome cannot count as an objection to the view here set forth.

In the judging of this view only the principles themselves are to be taken into
[119] consideration. If it can be demonstrated that the standpoints set up are either wholly or in part mistaken, then naturally the principles are false, and the whole collapses of itself. But should it on closer examination be found that the fundamental relation between the particular faith of the congregation and the general faith of the people has been conceived and determined in such a manner that the principal propositions in question follow from it and correspond to the nature of the matter, then we have, even if in fleeting outline, a firm foundation. On a firm foundation, in accord with truth, the church constitution must be ordered. For surely there is no one who will assert that in a matter which with right can be called the highest and holiest matter of truth of human life, and thus also of the life of the people, there can be practical considerations that make it permissible to rest content with the half-true or even with the untrue.

Eighth Lecture.

(Kolding).

We have spoken of the spirit of the people, the faith of the people and the teachers of *[120]* the people in general, but how does all this look when it is carried over into reality: what, then, is the task of the teacher of the people, properly speaking? What is it that makes instruction popular?

For the enlightenment of a people many kinds of teachers are needed; just as we, indeed, also have many kinds of schools: schools for the common people, burgher schools, folk high schools, modern schools, agricultural colleges, military schools, veterinary schools, navigation schools, a polytechnic institution, Latin schools, the University, besides other schools such as: commercial academies, trade schools, drawing schools, singing schools and, then, also — dancing schools! Now, are all these schools popular, or is it only some of them that are popular, while others are not popular, indeed a few perhaps even unpopular?

That the population as a whole has need of many different schools is surely seen already from the fact that such schools are in operation; to found a school and keep it going costs money and labor: such a thing one does not do for nothing. In order now to consider which and how many of these schools can be said to be for the good of *[121]* the people as a people, we dare not confine ourselves to narrow regard for the barest necessities, or even for what is serviceable and useful in the everyday sense; we must at the same time look to the nobler, the spiritual; indeed, when our view is free, we can only most unwillingly persuade ourselves to exclude the pleasurable. From a strictly economic standpoint it might well seem as if the singing schools in particular, and especially the dancing schools, must belong to the articles of luxury. But no! What the singing schools in recent times have accomplished, everyone who has a popular sense will certainly appreciate with gratitude. The songs of the poets delight us most of all, after all, when they are sung, that is to say: when they are sung purely and in the right tone; for when the tone is false, it grates upon our ears. A naturally good voice gains much by going through a singing school. The same can be said of our natural movements, especially when we hop, leap and dance. The bare naturalness is not enough; a little schooling is needed. If it becomes an enlightened people to sing in an enlightened way, then it also suits it well to dance in an enlightened way.

But, one might object, one thing is instruction imparted in differing measure and

with differing aim to the different individuals in the population, another thing is popular instruction. To this it must be answered that that which in every branch of instruction, and in particular in every school, essentially grounds the distinction between the popular and the not-popular depends not so much on the subject matter as on the manner in which, and the spirit in which, the instruction is conducted. In my judgment both the popular and the unpopular, in so far as there can be any
[122] question in instruction of forming and developing a definite way of thinking, can thrive in all schools, in some more immediately, in others more mediately.

According to an opinion which preeminently calls itself popular, and maintains that it has the right view of what the people and the popular are, the matter is nevertheless said to stand otherwise. There are then said to be in this country two great schools, of which the one is straightforwardly popular, the other, to put it mildly, not-popular, indeed on the verge of becoming unpopular, namely: *the Folk High School and the University.* That the University cannot be absorbed straightforwardly into the popular, as the Folk High School is, shall willingly be granted; but why the scientific high school should absolutely be unpopular, we do not see. It is maintained that it has a shadow, a false shadow, which no longer corresponds to the side from which the light comes, an uncanny black shadow, which blinds the spirit and darkens the people; this sinister, corpse-like shadow is — Latin!

In order not to hasten into defending something that cannot be defended, we shall proceed soberly and thoroughly. We shall not begin by excusing the University and the Latin schools, for that might easily acquire a taint of one-sided partiality. No, we shall begin the other way round; we shall begin by collecting, bringing forward and pointing out all the evil that has partly been said and can still be said about Latin. We shall not let ourselves be frightened by a shadow, but boldly attack the Latin "bogey." Much can be said against Latin, a great deal.

In the first place Latin is a dead language. To love a dead language more than a
[123] living one, especially the mother tongue, to love it so highly that one not only reads it, but writes exercises both when one speaks it, and when one writes it, is to love the dead. But to love the dead is possible only for the stillborn or rather for "death-biters": "all Latinists are death-biters." How uncanny, when life is bright and the heart glad, to meet on one's way a stillborn, sullen Latinist with a face like a grammar; one is close to losing one's childhood faith. The only Danish Latinist who really has a claim to indulgence and absolution is Saxo, Absalon's clerk; therefore not only his history but also his name has been transplanted into Danish: he is called no longer Saxo

Grammaticus, but Saxe Sagemand; which is very popular.

In the second place it is a well-known matter that Latin corrupts the blood of the people. The Latin blood is originally mixed with wolf's blood. Romulus and Remus, these two first great Latinists of the world, did, according to the express testimony of history, suckle at a she-wolf. The marrow and juices of the noble stocks, of the Goths and Normans in particular, would have kept themselves far purer, and the peculiarity of the tongues would have stood far clearer to us, if the old Latinism had been choked in the migration of the peoples; but weeds do not perish so easily. The Latin blood of culture made culture wolfish at the same time as it deposited dead flesh in the hearts.

With us in the Middle Ages the whole literature, with few exceptions, was Latin, the psalms in Latin, the whole service in Latin. Most of what people learned was Latin, and therefore it was at bottom a good thing that they learned nothing. The ballads of the heroes, the rhymed chronicle and the Euphemia ballads fortunately kept themselves free of Latin: the good nature of the people resisted the poisoning. The *[124]* clergy were indeed Latinists, to be sure, but the infection did not spread widely; they kept, so to speak, the blood to themselves: they were not allowed, after all, to marry. Added to this, the contagion was not so potent, either, as one might have feared, for it was bad Latin, it was monk's Latin. More dangerous it looked at the Reformation, since Latinism too was reformed. Then the corrupted monkish muddle was cast away, and the genuine, old, vigorous Latin from the golden days of the Roman empire was zealously fetched up from the classical cellar. Zwingli and Calvin took deep drafts, and Melanchthon himself was not free from getting a little tipsy. Luther kept sober; but then his marriage, however highly we otherwise must praise it, nearly occasioned a great misfortune. Let one consider well what it means that the priests, who now, owing to the improved Latin, got their blood in earnest corrupted in the black school, married and thereby made the corruption hereditary.

The famous naturalist Darwin has, as regards the hereditary, discovered something he calls atavism. There is born in a family a child with, for example, a peculiar wart on its nose. People wonder and ask: after whom can the little one have that wart? In neither of the parents is there found the slightest hint of such a protuberance; the grandparents, on the father's as well as on the mother's side, are examined and are likewise found to have normal, wart-free noses. And yet the wart is inherited. There is, when one goes further back, a great-grandfather or a great-grandmother who has had the wart; heredity has skipped some intermediate links: it is atavism.

This now finds a fine and rich and most fruitful application to Latinism. There is *[125]*

born in a family, let us suppose it, besides the healthy children, a pair of individuals with weak nerves, headache, scrofula, dryness of the heart and an extremely dull eye for the popular: whence does that derive? From Latin! That the mother cannot Latin and the father cannot either, makes no difference to the matter. If there is not a grandfather, then there is a great-grandfather or a great-great or a great-great-great-grandfather who has read himself stupid in the black school. By going back far enough one is sure in the end to run into Latin.

Where the Latin infusion has taken place in large portions, it produces autocratic palpitation, fermentation in the blood and a violent politics. In France, Italy, Spain, in general among the Romance peoples, the blood easily comes to the boil, and the parties clash violently with one another. The parties! Yes, here is indeed a peculiarity which at first glance must seem to speak against our assumption. If it were really the Latin blood that drove so strongly in politics, then our men of the Left, who are known not to be Latinists, would have to stand far behind the men of the Right, for the men of the Right are, alas, stiff Latinists. But that the matter stands the other way round cannot be denied; it is not the men of the Left, but on the contrary the men of the Right, who breathe with difficulty and are near to sailing astern. None the less the thing has its correctness, when we look more closely, and do not forget that it depends on the portions and on atavism. In older days Latin was taken in large portions; at the present time the portions grow ever smaller, indeed often so small
[126] that they approach a minuteness that recalls the homeopaths' invisible globules. Now one sees at once how the whole thing hangs together. The men of the Right, who have received the infusions in small portions, are distinguished by a certain coolness, circumspect caution, sober reserve, and a peculiar squinting of the eyes, which is an unmistakable sign that they often have difficulty in catching sight of the popular. The men of the Left, who have received no portions, are as a rule fresher, with growing courage and a large eye upon the people. That something violent sometimes comes over them, that they too, as Latin puts it, now and then seem to suffer from something human — humanum quid patiuntur — is not their fault; it is the Latinism in their blood that sweeps them along. It is not their own Latin, no, it is that of their forefathers, which according to the law of atavism breaks out in them, and that now and then with such strong jolts that even at this sight we must sigh and say: "all our misfortune comes from Latin."

It is a great confirmation of the validity of a hypothesis that what at first glance seems to speak against it is found on closer consideration to speak for it. We can then

confidently go further and put to ourselves the serious question whether the great confusion in the monetary system, the false speculations and dreadful bankruptcies of which one reads in the newspapers, are not, at least for a great part, to be found to have their first source and last root in Latin. Horace says: *virtus post nummos*, "Money first, then virtue may come after"; that is classical Latin. Be that as it may with the bankruptcies; so much is certain, that it is going backward with betrothals and that *[127]* this is the fault of Latin can be proved as clearly as that two and two are four.

It is a notorious matter, a fact confirmed by many and reliable experiences, that dead Latin makes the heart cold; but when the heart is cold, how then shall one be able to love? Hagbarth and Signe, Axel and Valborg, Other Ebbesen and Sigrid with the veil, such betrothals are no longer found in the North — unless it be as exceptions, by virtue of a quite peculiar Old Norse atavism — instead there are found parties of reason, parties of money and, what can almost make the hair stand on one's head, newspaper courtships in abundance. Whence this derives is easy to discover; it derives especially from the wretched, more and more prevailing habit of wooing in writing; but this habit, or rather bad habit, derives in turn from Latin. What is it that Latin despises? The living word. What is it that Latin esteems highly? Writing exercises. But to woo in writing is precisely to write an exercise. By putting the two things together one will be able to understand that a Nordic human being with a Latin heart must let that moment in life, in which the living word and, in a double sense, the warm oral communication is and remains the highest, pass him by, cold and indifferent.

A cold-minded, unloving heart cannot love the people, a Latin heart can never possibly either be or become a genuine Danish popular heart; that is in sum all the evil that I at the moment know to say about Latin.

So, back to the question: is the University unpopular because the thoughts of antiquity and the language of antiquity constitute an essential component of the foundation upon which it is built? Can comprehensive investigations and penetrating *[128]* expertise be supposed to weaken sound human understanding and cloud the natural sense? Is it perhaps a matter of course that sustained practice in connected thinking, many-sided apprehension of the conditions of existence, thorough understanding of the connection of the present with the past, careful distinguishing between what is known and what is not known, etc. should be a hindrance to a correct judgment of what goes on before the eyes of all and shows itself to the immediate sight? The teacher of the people who either directly or by roundabout ways spreads such false

notions among the people leads the people astray. That there can unfortunately be devotees of science, or rather learned busybodies, who busy themselves with the past to such a degree that they at last forget the present, is undeniable; but it is the duty of the teacher of the people to point out that the fault lies with the persons, not with science. Those who maintain that strict science has nothing to do with real life are distinguished precisely not by clear sight of the real. It is indeed precisely strict science that has taught us to master nature through knowledge of nature's forces and laws. Not only the steamships, the railways and the telegraph wires, but even our implements of agriculture and labor, the mixing of substances for the benefit of the soil, the treatment of plants and animals, etc., remind us every day and every hour of the day at every step we take, of science's wonderful intervention in our natural existence. If anyone wishes to express himself with the unprejudiced opinion that it
[129] is only the useful in science, not science itself, that a people must prize, then it is the duty of the teacher of the people to enlighten him as to his error. It is surely just as impossible to draw benefit from science when one withdraws from its cultivators the necessary means, as it is impossible to have benefit from a domestic animal when one neglects its keeping and care. Parceling out, quibbling and cavilling with a separation between the theoretical and the practical in science have no home anywhere: every science is, by its nature, theoretical.

On the other hand there is a difference, an essential and thoroughgoing difference between true and false, if one likes, lost sciences. Just as one has in real life various things that are called false — false curls, false teeth, false hips and the like — so there is still to be found in the circle of the sciences something that must be called false. To consult the dead (spiritism), to perform miracles or, what is about the same, to explain miracles, to fathom the divine mysteries and comprehend the Holy Trinity, such things belong under the false sciences. It is the duty of the teacher of the people to enlighten the people that there is something false which calls itself theology, a humbug science, which weakens and undermines the original sense for what is original in religion and thereby harms the popular.

The inward connection between the scientific and the popular shows itself especially when the question is of our own people's share in the advancement of civilization and science. In this respect we have not only kept pace with the times; but we have a relatively considerable number of men who stand on the topmost step
[130] and are honored by all enlightened nations as science's foremost representatives: a Niels Steensen, a Tycho Brahe, an Ole Rømer, a Hans Christian Ørsted, these are

names that mean something in science. There hardly appears a larger work on the history of the sciences, be it in Europe or in America, without these names being found in it and shining like stars of the first magnitude; they are names that cast luster over people and fatherland. Such things ought to be emphasized, not to give national vanity nourishment, but to awaken popular self-esteem and to impress a corresponding obligation.

In the age of enlightenment it is important that a people keep its horizon open on all sides, not shut itself up with its own notions and become infatuated with what is immediately home-made; but it is surely also important that a people, especially a small people, not lose itself in empty imitations of what is foreign, that it have confidence in itself, learn to rely upon its spiritual leaders and appropriate what is foreign in such a way that it thereby obtains conditions for a richer, surer and more many-sided development of its own. It is its own outstanding representatives, poets, artists, thinkers, orators, natural scientists, philologists, historians, etc., by whom a people is to know its endowment. It is the duty of the teacher of the people to point out that these gifted ones with their intelligence do not stand outside the people, but belong in the very strictest sense to the people, are the people's own organs. Their knowledge is the people's knowledge, their intelligence is the people's intelligence; it is with their eyes that the people sees what it could not otherwise see; it is in their *[131]* thoughts that it recognizes its own thoughts and can fully work along in the world of thoughts. Through them science is the people's science, its clear eye the people's eye. Therefore one shall teach the common man that those who disparage intelligence scorn the intelligent people. It shall be said loudly and freely that everyone who attacks the highest scientific institution of learning in the country is, if he otherwise knows what he is doing, engaged in putting out an eye of the people and stealing a jewel from the crown of popular life.

And one thing more. There is among the common people a feeling that science is worldly, that it nourishes unbelief and leads to contempt for religion. Some would see in this a good sign, an omen of deliverance from old oppressive prejudices, a promise that the human spirit is at last becoming of age and coming independently to itself. But most are agreed that the growing, ever more widely spreading "free-thinking" is dangerous, that one cannot for that reason do otherwise than harbor a certain distrust toward science. It is the duty of the teacher of the people to throw light on this confusion and to do so in such a way that the common people can follow and form an independent judgment. Certainly it would be impractical and unhealthy to

burden the people with scientific disputations and entangle it in learned controversies, but that is not needed either. There is something that can be made directly evident to sound sense, and that is sufficient.

Religion and science each have their own aim and their particular tasks. Religion addresses itself to the conscience of man; it will awaken us to *self-knowledge*, develop
[132] and clarify our *knowledge of God.* Science addresses itself to man's consciousness of the visible things, of their essence and connection; it will awaken us to *general thinking for ourselves*, develop and clarify our *knowledge of the world.* If one now tries in the name of religion to anticipate the knowledge of the world and to lord it over science, then one commits an encroachment; if one tries in the name of science to anticipate the knowledge of God and to lord it over religion, then one likewise commits an encroachment. Here a distinction must be made between religion itself and a false application of the religious, and likewise between science itself and a false application of the scientific. What matters here chiefly is a sufficient separation between religious truth and the religious mode of representation, between scientific truth and the scientific mode of representation.

According to the teaching of the Bible the world was created in six days. The religious man who does not know science holds in all simplicity to the biblical mode of representation, and does well therein; for every feature of the grand presentation makes vivid the creating omnipotence, the creating wisdom, the aim of the creating will. The scientific investigator takes real nature as it is; he looks away from the biblical mode of representation, and does well therein; for he must indeed look at things with an unbiased gaze. So he comes to the result that everything develops naturally and therefore slowly; that for the cooling of the earth there must have passed millions of years before living beings could appear, etc. If one now confuses the mode of representation with the truth, the confusion is boundless. The religious
[133] hold fast to the notion of the six days, because they hold fast to the notion of the creation of the world. The scientific reject the notion of the creation of the world, because they reject the notion of the six days. From both sides the truth is forgotten. The scientific truth, that a development of nature may require millions of years, does not stand in conflict with the religious truth, that real, developing nature has its origin from the creating spirit.

There is a series of boundary determinations concerning religion and science which, for the sake of the faith of the people, popular life and the spirit of the people, must necessarily stand clear to the consciousness of the whole people. It is not the

intricate investigations, but the distinctly prominent main points, on which it depends. Also from this side it will be seen what significance an institution of learning such as the University can have for popular life as a whole. The enlightenment to which the common people have a claim, and which they sorely need, if they are really to come along and make their voice count in the highest affairs of society, is of a quite peculiar kind. Simple catechism instruction in connection with some meager knowledge and a number of practical rules of prudence does not suffice; the eye of the people must little by little accustom itself to see the real conditions of the world in the light of the present; the people must, in other words, come to know the conditions of culture. In order that this may happen, it is not enough that a teacher of the people enter into the people's way of thinking and speak intelligibly and comprehensibly. Let his speech be ever so plain, intelligible and simple: it must nevertheless, as a whole and in detail, have the color and gleam of the light of truth which proceeds from the realm of clear *[134]* thoughts; the teacher of the people must be a man educated on all sides in science, he must himself be a living link between the popular and the scientific.

If we now turn to the folk high schools, I mean the Grundtvigian ones, we have here a grand, indeed unique example of how original, clear and deeply penetrating a spiritual view of the people's needs and of the popular itself can be. The "enlightenment of life" for which Grundtvig fought and which he at last got put into effect is in all main features, so far as we can judge, so aptly planned and so peculiarly ordered that with it it can in truth be said that a new beginning has been made. The ear is opened, the mind awakened; mythology, poetry, the saga and history unlock their hiding places and offer their rich treasures, not in order to burden the memory and one-sidedly exercise the understanding, but to open the inner sense, illumine human life and furnish a measure of what is small and what is great in existence. It is here not the task either to extol or to defend the Grundtvigian high schools; they defend themselves. However much groping and unclarity may cling to such a first, new beginning, it is nevertheless a fact that these schools in the different parts of the country — not least in this region — have exercised so awakening, so educating and enlivening an influence that no other institutions of instruction can show anything corresponding.

But just because we place so great a hope in the steady progress and growing influence of the folk high schools, just because we regard it as irreparable harm if these schools should miss their task and disappoint expectations, just for that reason it is our duty to call attention to the fact that even these schools, with all their popularity, *[135]*

can lead the people astray and thus become unpopular.

To fall in love with our heathen antiquity and our Catholic-Romantic Middle Ages in such a way that one thereby neglects to make clear to oneself an understanding of the conditions of the present, is unhealthy. A people of action cannot live on mere memories, be they ever so glorious, ever so great; still less can an enlightened people wish to make an attempt to screw the present back to antiquity. For the common people there is something appealing in looking back upon the great age of the peasants. Thorgny the Lawman's speech to Olaf Skötkonung is sometimes drawn forth as an example of how a free people is to conduct itself toward a free king. This picture, however characteristic it may be of that time, is dazzling and misleading when it is set up as a model for the present time. Let one note well that Thorgny's bold words are precisely indicative of the challenging self-confidence with which the peasantry thought it could rely on the old forces and the old rights, without a notion that the two powers of culture, the Church and the State, which were destined to carry history further, were also destined to subdue the defiant common people, indeed to press them down into a bondage of almost eight hundred years. Thorgny the Lawman does not see what two wondrously dark thunderclouds are already rising and gathering over his head.

We praise the time of the Valdemars; we look up to Bishop Absalon and honor him as a man of the realm and of the people. But it is well known that the time of
[136] the Valdemars was no age of the peasants: Bishop Absalon was not the peasants' friend; and yet he was, according to the conditions of the time, in the true sense of the word, the people's friend. How little "the common man" in Absalon's time was fitted to have a say in war and peace, may be seen among other things from the scruples and evasions that prevented King Valdemar from carrying out his first intention: at once to attack the Wends. Absalon's answer on this occasion is known; in his quiet mind he was embittered that the King had been so unwise as to take counsel with the common man about such a matter. Saxo is entirely of Absalon's opinion; "for," he says, "war shall be decided with the counsel of a few wise men and carried out with the common man's help and strength."

The history of the Valdemars teaches us that the rule of the nobility, no more than the hierarchy, was a product of chance or of the arbitrary lust for power of the great families. The oppression and steady sinking of the common people was deeply grounded in the nature of the conditions, a sorrowful but necessary consequence of the fact that the unenlightened and therefore minor common people were not able

to grasp the high powers of culture, to secure their independence by using the right means and to follow the course of civilization.

To give the appearance that the common man's view and the common man's understanding, left to themselves, is capable of mastering the conditions of culture, of organizing society after its own head and of standing alone at the helm, is to deceive the common man and to prepare for him bitter disappointments. If the common people are to have a voice in counsel and give their vote weight, then they must gradually learn to see through the resistance which they have hitherto had in their unacquaintance with the powers of the spirit whose influence it has all too easily *[137]* thought it could overlook. We wish the great age of the peasants back, but, mark well, not on the conditions of antiquity, no, on the conditions of the present.

There is a piece of the history of the fatherland that does not at all look popular; it runs from the introduction of absolute power to the loosening of the adscription to the soil. One cannot tell it as one tells an old saga or reproduces a scene from Saxo or from Snorre; and yet it contains a section whose right illumination is of the highest importance when the common people are to have their eyes opened to the genesis of the social conditions in which we live. Moods, imagery and lively descriptions are of inestimable value for popular awakening; but in reality the bare awakening is not enough. The conditions of the present are intricate; insight and expert knowledge are needed to unravel the web and untie the knots. To go into particulars and attempt a real solution cannot of course be the task of the teacher of the people. But it can and must be his task to make the common people aware that the knots are once and for all there, and that they can no more be untied in imagery than they can be cut through with a blunt axe.

If it is to succeed in our country, what is striven for everywhere but nowhere yet attained, to carry through a real education of the people, popular enlightenment and popular cultivation, then there must be a field where the University and the Folk High School faithfully work together. Such a cooperation will not efface the difference of the character of the two schools; but it will — in the popular sense — efface the old uncanny boundary line between learned and unlearned, common and not-common, intelligent and not-intelligent, which wounds and divides, it will bring *[138]* light from above and forces from below into such an interaction that the spiritual sap of nourishment comes into circulation, that we, with all the tones of color of an all-sided enlightenment, with all the shadings in all transitions from the obscure to the clear, from the simple to the manifold in knowledge and insight, constitute an

enlightened people united in the recognition of truth and reality.

That the interaction will be fruitful not only for the Folk High School but certainly also for the University, is a conviction which in a striking manner has confirmed itself to me through the spiritual alertness and unbiased receptiveness that I have found in this circle. I thank the honored assembly, ladies and gentlemen, for kind attention. I shall not forget that if what has been said here has, as I hope, been understood as it has been heard, then it is owing for a good part to the folk high schools which for a series of years have worked in this region. The thanks which I bring you are well founded; I am grateful for the impression that I have here received of an open ear, of an awakened sense and above all of a fresh, blossoming popular life.

Ninth Lecture.

(Fredericia).

We are a small people. "Yes, alas," one answers with a sigh, "we are too small to assert *[139]* our right. Had we an army of 800,000 men and a fleet to match, how it would brighten up in the old and new papers of the law of nations. The moral effect alone upon the diplomatic corps would be edifying to behold. The fairness and obligingness, the honest will and sincerity of heart with which one would then, from all sides — for the sake of peace and concord and good understanding — offer one's bona officia, would surely have to make a touching impression upon every friend of man; a restless zeal to get torn treaties healed, sworn promises fulfilled, forgotten indemnities paid, etc., would surely give the now doubting Europe a proof as striking as it would be surprising that there is still honesty, fidelity to one's word and uprightness in the political world. But, alas, we are a small people! That we should now just lack the quantum of iron and lead which is so necessary for setting justice in motion, is surely as though a curse rested upon us." This way of looking at things is not only oppressive, *[140]* it is also one-sided and false. If it is already a questionable thing when an otherwise well-endowed person has become so angry with fate that he no longer cares to use the powers he has, then the matter becomes still more questionable if a well-endowed people were to fall into a similar despair. Heavy burdens may rest upon the small peoples; but it must not therefore be overlooked that those which rest upon the great may be, in proportion, just as heavy. Let us in this connection regard our conditions from the bright side and consider how much blessing may go with being a small people.

A small people, however courageous and brave it may be, cannot, especially in our days, expect to reap such laurels in war as a great people; but can it therefore do nothing to defend its independence? The French people is, in the nobler sense of the word, assuredly a great people, a people that has shone and in the future will surely shine again on the stage of war; but has it nevertheless not had to learn what defeat and humiliation are, quite as well as we? There is for the selfish element in human nature undeniably something satisfying in setting oneself above the prejudices of morality and making great conquests; there is, when the passions are inflamed, something still more satisfying in letting the sword of retribution flash and taking vengeance for defeats suffered. Such satisfactions are reserved for the great peoples

alone. Should we now have to admit to ourselves that the monstrous human slaughters with which the lust for dominion and vengeance feed one another in turn belong to
[141] the noblest and best things for which it is worth living, then we should undeniably have cause for complaint; but if the cause of humanity can also be advanced in a peaceful way, then a small people has nothing in this respect to complain of. A great people can sacrifice human lives by the thousand without thereby putting its existence at stake; it has masses enough to serve as cannon fodder; but a small people must stake its life when its independence is threatened. For a small people, then, a war of defense acquires a quite different moral, personal significance from what a war of conquest or a war of vengeance acquires for a great one. In this moral, this personal element there is a blessing.

A brave but otherwise peaceable knight does not ask how great the probability is of winning when his honor and person are attacked; he risks his life, for honor and life are inseparable in him. He does not skimp on a shilling when the question is of a sword and a reliable suit of armor, for sword and armor make up an essential part of his real personality. He does not regard the time and diligence he has had to spend on his exercises in arms as wasted; he does not suppose that anything is thereby lost to his peaceful life and pursuits, for he knows that a life in peace and quiet is worthless when independence is lacking.

A small people must be like a peace-loving but brave and well-equipped knight. It does not ask how great the probability is of winning when its honor and personality are attacked. It knows within itself that true independence stands independent of victory and defeat. So long as the majority of the population only felt themselves to be blindly obedient subjects under a self-willed state, it might seem natural that the
[142] citizens should leave defense to the state, regard war as a sheer misfortune and peace at any price as an unconditional good. If the state could not defend itself, what was that but that one got a new government; one could always be sure of keeping the old burdens and vexations. That was the political view in the fable of the horse and the ass, repeating itself with a slight change. Otherwise, when the state is popular, is the state of the people; such a state is an expression of the people's real personality, and personality must be defended.

A great and mighty people can be at one time warlike, at another peaceably disposed; but it has, on account of its massiveness, difficulty in making the opposite moods go together into unity. In a small people, which can wage war only for the sake of peace, the spirit of the people must at all times be in equal measure both

warlike and peaceable. The independence of the small people is not, like that of the great, now and then exposed to danger and then again secured; no, the small people is, essentially viewed, always in danger, just because it is small. It must always be watchful, always in tension. But precisely in this watchfulness, this tension there is a blessing. The works of peace and the preparations for defense of life and death ought to go hand in hand with each other.

It is not overstrain, not a screwed-up chivalry, that is hereby recommended. The screwed-up chivalry is on the contrary on the side of those who, without a sense of the real conditions of self-defense, sing of the berserkers of old and the heroes of yore, supposing that it does not properly depend on arms and exercises in arms, but solely *[143]* on "the word and the spirit." That is lack of sense, that is hollow enthusiasm. To send unpracticed or only half-practiced soldiers into the field is, to put it plainly, to send the sons of the fatherland blindly to death. No, better then to join those who take the matter materially. There is after all always a sense of reality in working for the nourishment of the population; one can after all in the end — out of respect for the real — bid the independence of the people good day and set the porridge pot higher than honor.

For an all-sided carrying through of the principles of freedom and equality, the historically inherited order of society undeniably puts great obstacles in the way. But to charge the existing disproportions exclusively to the account of the institutions of the state and to think one can get at inequality by raking over the existing order, is an enormous error. Inequality is more than arbitrary; it is deeply rooted in the natural conditions of man. Were it to be wiped out, it would have to happen by so unnatural a compulsion and so merciless a despotism of society that Spartan severity would be child's play in comparison. How sharply the classes of society, with the highly unequal distribution of goods and rights, can stand against one another, even at stages of cultivation that belong more to nature than to culture, history shows in manifold examples. We shall not here expatiate on the caste system in India or in ancient Egypt, but hold to our own past.

The old Norse poem *Rigsmaal* describes for us the origin of the different estates. "The god Heimdal had once, under the name of Rig, set out on a wandering. He came in to a pair of old poor people, Ae and Edda; it was wretched with them, the bread *[144]* was baked in the ashes and full of husks. Some time afterwards the wife bore a son, who was sprinkled with water and called *Træl*. He was dark of color, the skin on his hands was coarse, the knuckles thick, the fingers clumsy, his complexion sallow, his

back crooked and his heels long. He grew up and learned to use his strength. Once a woman came to the house with a heavy gait, sunburnt arms and blisters under her feet. She was called *Thy*, that is, bondwoman, and married Træl. Their sons, who were called Herdsman, Bungler, Clumsy, Sluggard, Dawdler, Crookback and Drudge, busied themselves with setting up fences, manuring fields, tending swine and goats and cutting turf. The daughters were called Black, Lump, Crooked-nose, Hunchback and Longshanks. From these the race of the thralls has sprung. Rig wandered on and came to the farmer's homestead, to a pair of happier people, Ave and Amma. A fire was kindled in the middle of the floor. The man sat and whittled wood for a loom; his beard was combed and his hair cut across the forehead, his shirt was close-fitting and open at the breast. The housewife twisted the thread and prepared the yarn for the loom; her hair was twisted into a topknot, her jacket stood open at the breast, and she had a collar about her neck and buttons on her shoulders. The wife got a son, who was wrapped in linen, sprinkled with water and called *Karl*, that is, Freeborn. He was a blooming boy, light of hair and with sparkling eyes. He grew up, learned to build, to forge, and to drive the plough. A girl whose name was *Flink* came driving to the farm in a goatskin gown with the bunch of keys at her side. They married and lived contentedly together. Their sons were Man, Lad, Landowner, Peasant, Householder,
[145] Longbeard and Brave-man. The daughters' names were Wordy, Bride, Snow-white, Bashful, Finery-lover, Of Age and Woman. Rig then came to a building whose door faced south; in the door, which was shut, there was a ring, and straw was strewn on the floor. The man and the housewife sat looking at each other and playing with their fingers. The man busied himself with weapons, and the wife wore a ring ornament on her breast; her brow was brighter and her neck whiter than the newly fallen snow. Nine months after Rig's visit she bore a son, who was wrapped in silk, sprinkled with water and called *Jarl*; he had light hair, and his eyes sparkled like a serpent's. As he grew big he learned to shoot with the bow, to ride, to swing the sword and to sport in the water. And Rig came to him, taught him to know runes and bade him win lands. So *Jarl* went forth, moved about in war and won eighteen farmsteads as his own possession. *Erna* (the Brisk), daughter of Herse, who was slender of waist and whiter and prouder than other maidens, became his wife, and glorious sons adorned their marriage."

A society with inequalities so ingrown, fixed and bound to nature is, as far as the example of the thralls is concerned, not far from the inhuman: might not something similar, even if under other conditions, be said with respect to the proletariat that in

our days is constantly growing? In every society, be it ever so democratic, there will always be an inequality which either already is or is at least on the point of becoming revolting: against the excesses of inequality the people must unceasingly be at its post. But in the nature of inequality there is a secret.

Equality becomes inhuman when one wants to abolish inequality; inequality *[146]* becomes inhuman when one will not carry through equality: *it is on the foundation of inequality that equality must be carried through.* The torments of society arise from the fact that this simple proposition is misunderstood from two opposite sides.

Those who have an interest in maintaining inequality hold one-sidedly to what is necessary by nature, with all the arbitrariness flowing from it. That the ladder of society has many rungs, that on account of the division of labor there must of necessity be different classes of labor, higher and lower, that the inviolability of the right of property, the heritability of fortune, different ability, different luck, etc., must produce inequalities which no human hand is able to wipe out, of all this the defenders of the existing order are excellently informed. But when the matter takes on the appearance that inequality without more ado is the solid, the rightly reasonable, whereon one may safely rest; when it is again and again forgotten that inequality, held fast for itself, is inhuman, that inequality exists only in order that equality may be realized in an ever richer measure: then the outlook becomes unreasonable, and the party that fights under its banner, intractable.

Those who suffer under the pressure of inequality and for that reason are interested in asserting equality have weighty grounds to adduce. "Can it be called an age of freedom and equality when one assures the possessors of letting the untiring capital work for them, grow, unwearied amid the progress of labor, while thousands and thousands of real workers must wear themselves out without attaining the bare necessaries, because the economic question is not about the worker, but about the work, because capital, this impersonal thing that sucks the blood of all, has become *[147]* labor, and labor capital? A horse one may value and treat according to its work, for the work is not for the sake of the horse, but the horse for the sake of the work. Is public morality perhaps to be glorified by the profit of political economy: to set a man who works on a level with a horse? Can it be called respect for the personality of man when barren abstractions, general products of the exertion of real men in the sweat of their brow, — for nothing else are capital and labor — are to have a right to use the working persons as living machines? Is it perhaps the prerogative that the law grants to the living over the lifeless, that capital is bound to repair the dead

machines as they wear out, while the living may be thrown away when they are no longer able to repair themselves?" Here are questions which, when put in practical form with an eye to the particular case, may well embarrass political economists and make civilized society with its "rights of man" blush. We could give the champions of equality our undivided sympathy, if only it were possible to get the error rooted out which weakens and hampers the whole endeavor. The fundamental error lies in this, that one, instead of recognizing the significance of inequality as the foundation of equality, wants to have inequality itself pulled up by the root. A sad error! The equality that is not able to take the element of inequality up into itself is, and remains, utopian.

Among the animals that live in society, the Lord of Nature has seen to it that
[148] the individuals of different classes, where such are found, exactly perform the work corresponding to each class and in accordance with this receive their share of the whole product of society. Ants, termites, bees, etc., furnish examples of how inequality can be reconciled in a natural way with equality. The condition of the union is that each class of individuals has by nature so peculiar a stamp that it is driven from within to perform its peculiar work and for that reason finds itself in such a dependence on the whole society that it cannot possibly tear itself loose from it. It is such a dependence on particular natural dispositions to which the description in the cited "Rigsmaal" points. The thrall, the farmer, the Jarl all have their origin from the visit of the god; but their natural endowment is so different that one can even see directly from their exterior to which class each among them originally belongs. This explanation is thoroughly false; inequality here gets so terrible a right of the firstborn that equality cannot possibly come forth. To be sure there is a lower and a higher natural endowment, but it applies to individuals, not to classes; history has shown that there can be clever thralls just as well as stupid Jarls. From another, more exalted position inequality has been defended by appealing to the express will of God. It is then, according to the official religion, to be quite settled that God himself has willed such a separation of the estates, that one estate is set in eminence, another in lowliness, that some men are by Providence destined to toil and poverty, others to enjoyment and riches. The fruits of this official interpretation have shown themselves in various lands. The neglected proletariat,
[149] whose ignorance of the spiritual is in many places boundless, has, understandably enough, confounded the outward ecclesiastical system with religion itself and let itself imagine that faith in a living personal God was the same thing as faith in a superhuman despot who took the side of the great and helped them to subdue the

small. This imagination must be rooted out from the ground up, if it is to succeed in any degree in carrying through equality.

What is peculiar to the religion of Christ is that it lays weight both on inequality and on equality; it not only lets the existing opposition between high and low, mighty and humble, masters and servants, rich and poor stand, it goes further and refers all this inequality to a divine order. But it must above all not be overlooked that it regards the presupposed inequality precisely as a condition for carrying through equality. It speaks to master and servant, to rich and poor, and what does it say? "Remember that ye are equal before God, that ye are brethren." On this condition the servant has just as much obligation toward the master as the master toward the servant, the poor just as much obligation toward the rich as the rich toward the poor. But the spirit of religion knows the world and knows how hard existence is; just therefore it lays two times, three times weight on the obligation of the rich toward the poor, two times, three times weight on the obligation of the master toward the servant, on the obligation of the employer toward the worker. If thou knewest, poor worker, who He is who has spoken and still speaks thy cause before God and men, and with such authority that thy personal worth, thy inalienable right shall stand immovably firm, that thou in spirit and being canst be the equal of the rich and mighty of the earth: in *[150]* truth, thou wouldst never forget him!

With the religious-moral recognition of the worth of man the political-civil leveling out of the disproportions which inequality introduces must be unceasingly striven for. It ought to be admitted from both sides, as well from theirs who feel oppressed as from theirs who are favored, that the knots of inequality cannot be untied as one unties a bow. There must be on the one side a willingness to make sacrifices and on the other prudence enough to give time and to be content with something, until more can be attained. The main thing is that a plan be laid for the endeavors as a whole which both parties must acknowledge as appropriate; that work be done continuously step by step, so that what goes before prepares what follows; that something really be accomplished by way of civil legislation. Here, if anywhere, it can be seen how intimately disposition and action belong together. If disposition is lacking, then all practical proposals are in vain; if action is lacking, then one may reason and moralize as much as one pleases: it leads to nothing.

If we now look around for the most favorable conditions for a real solution of the tasks of equality, might it not turn out that a small people has essential advantages over a great one? In a great people the different classes of society will not only keep

apart; but each class will even, on account of the greatness of the masses, the multitude of individuals, constitute a world of its own. Two classes of the same population
[151] can in manner of living, colloquial speech, customs and habits stand farther from one another than two persons of different nationality, when they find themselves at the same stage of cultivation. Admittedly, mixtures, transitions and fusions will take place in many ways; but the elements of inequality with what is foreign, what separates and repels, crop up in so many forms and hold to so hard an immediacy that the ethical-practical working through becomes, if not impossible, yet exceedingly difficult. "There are," says a witty French author, "two peoples in France: the provinces and Paris; the one eats, sleeps, yawns, listens; the other thinks, dares, watches and talks. The first is drawn along by the second like a snail by a butterfly, being by turns amused and disquieted by the caprice and daring of its leader. It is the leader, then, to whom we must look." The last years' events have shown in a sorrowful way that the moral, political and social discord between the particular classes of society in the great country by no means confines itself to the opposition here indicated between province and capital; it branches so far and cuts so deep into the roots of society that it will surely be a long time before equality in the fatherland of the rights of man is reconciled with inequality and the contending parties are made one.

With us the conditions are differently favorable, that is to say, when the popular will seriously wants to use them. It is a fact that the smaller a company is, the more weight can be laid on its single members. Precisely the circumstance that the classes of society with us are too small to constitute worlds of their own, closed off, must favor
[152] an approach, a so to speak personal understanding between them. One individual of a hundred is, in the capacity of individual, ten times as much worth as one individual of a thousand, and ten thousand times as much worth as one individual of a million, according to the common calculation of masses. But what is a mass? The word mass is precisely characteristic of matter, of the dead, the inorganic, the lifeless. Matter consists of indivisible parts, whose collected quantity makes up the mass. The more parts, the greater the mass, the greater the mass, the greater the force of attraction. The globes in space act in proportion to their masses, in that they affect one another according to the law of attraction: in this region the great masses are great powers. If this view is transferred to human societies, then human individuals become parts of mass, and the law repeats itself: the more individuals, the greater the mass, the greater the mass, the greater the force of attraction. But who does not see the danger, the corruption for popular life, in the dead law of attraction being applied to personal

beings. The less feeling of independence there is in the single individuals, the stronger the inclination they have to flock together in a crowd and lump themselves together in a mass. On these conditions the great people will always exert a weighing, oppressive influence upon the small. Not only in war, also in peace. A silly fashion, a thoughtless, but lewdly glittering, nerve-titillating novel, e.g., goes out in Paris, and what happens? The new phenomenon is not judged according to its inner worth; far from it! Though criticism also does its duty, it does no good. It is voracious masses that hold the scales, mass-individuals that pass the judgment. The novel comes out in seven editions; the great nation, it is said, has approved its significance for the history of culture. What *[153]* follows from this? "That a translation is naturally necessary in order to enrich our literature; we dare not stay behind": the small people is quite impressed.

A small people cannot fight its way through by means of masses; it has by Providence just been placed under such conditions that sound sense must make it attentive to the difference there is between people and mass. The mass as mass is inorganic and so far always crude; in the people as people everything is organized, living, personal: the more the mass spreads out, the more the people is narrowed; the more the people expands, the more the mass is narrowed; or: the less mass, the more people, the more mass, the less people. But to be placed under such conditions that for the will of spirit there is precisely the very strongest summons to get the individuals developed to personal independence, to get the mass organized and transformed into a living people, to get the whole permeated, inspirited and moved by one thought, one will, one mind, in this there is then no curse; no, on the contrary, the greatest blessing.

Our fatherland, which in earlier days has at times been near to perishing, but nevertheless in a wonderful way has been saved, has, in this century in particular, suffered rough treatment. Through all this we have yet retained a good which is beyond price. There are in history two great laws which, because they are laws of spirit and of freedom, in the clashes of finitude so easily come into conflict with one another, and yet must constantly be brought into agreement, namely: the Law of *Continuation*, a law for even development, and the Law of *Progress*, a law for the *[154]* breakthrough of new ideas. At every decisive turning point there shows itself a tension between these two laws. In France, in "the great nation," the Law of Breakthrough has gained so decisive a preponderance that the foundation of legitimacy is undermined. Every idea of society that is able to inflame the multitude and gather the masses around it has, because the historical Law of Continuation is broken, fundamentally the same right as what exists for a moment. The ship of state is holed in the keel and

must constantly be kept at the pumps. How can unity of the people come to strength in a country where three dynasties and two republics, at the same time in full activity, fight one another to the death, in that each of these powers — as circumstances may be — considers itself fully entitled to seize the reins of government. We shall not lord it over "the great nation"; we shall with admiration acknowledge that it, even in its defeats, has displayed astonishing powers; we shall — for the sake of "the rights of man" — believe and hope that the people which amid terrible crises and excesses has been able to hold the banner of freedom aloft will continue its course and reach its goal, to its own honor and for the benefit of the civilized world. But when we consider what it means to venture such breaches of the Law of Continuation (Continuity) as have here occurred, then we must count ourselves fortunate.

The remarkable thing about our constitution of 1848 is precisely this twofold character: that the change is so thoroughgoing, and its introduction nevertheless so lawful. It casts a historical luster on Frederick the Seventh and his men that continua-
[155] tion and breakthrough here show themselves as two sides of the same thing. It is a foothold for those who hold to what exists; the lawful way, the even, quiet transition is fixed as a principle. But it is also a support for those who boldly and confidently work for progress; for from the principle it is seen that one can — understand, in sober earnestness — take a matter from the root up, without bringing about a violent, lawless upheaval.

So we have, then, what is a blessing upon our small people and makes "the heavy unity" light, with the assistance of Providence all conditions for an energetic, yet calm development of a sound and vigorous popular life in Denmark.

Theoretical surveys must not be mixed up with the practical tasks; but as surely as disposition and action unceasingly condition one another, so necessary is it that the people be sufficiently enlightened about its own conditions by being enlightened about the conditions of human life as a whole. It is teachers of the people, well-prepared, well-equipped teachers of the people, on whom in this respect first and last everything depends. We close by recalling the words of the great teacher of the people himself: *The harvest is great*, but the *laborers are few; pray* the Lord of the harvest that he *send forth laborers into his harvest* (Luke 10:2).

In Memory of the Battle of Isted.

(in Aagaard Wood).

Today twenty-five years ago there was a solemn day here in the country; a festival *[156]* was held then, — a bloody festival on the brown heath of Isted; it was a sacrificial feast in the old Norse style. We all know, of course, what it was about. It was about a joust against the aggression of defiant arrogance, of intrigue, that breaks faith and laws; it was about defending our boundary-mark, our old right, our young freedom, our mother country's independence and honor. To trample the serpent of rebellion underfoot and raise the Dannebrog high was the goal of the struggle; and the goal had to be attained, for it was the will of the King, the will of the people, and the will of the soldier. So it went forward; despite resistance, rain of bullets, and smoke and blood, yes, even despite the whims of fortune, our brave men went boldly forward to the goal. It was a day of honor for Danish hearts and for Danish lions. Schleppegrell and Læssø! these names Saga has carved upon her shield; there they shine with undimmed splendor in remembrance among a grateful people. Yet it was more than renown that was sought. The hero who fought the great fight did not look too high, did not take aim at the stars of fame; he was a sturdy, modest hero: the honor of the *[157]* colors, the girl's smile and the King's thanks were all his reward; it was the brave Landsoldat who brought his festival sacrifice here.

A glorious victory without bluster or boast. In the jubilation of joy there was no arrogance, ah no, but a quiet sigh, a melancholy blinded with tears. The news of victory struck like lightning; but then there followed with it — the dear reckoning, the long, the terrible list. Everyone who has lived through it knows well what it means: in anguish of soul, with beating heart and trembling hand to run through the list of wounded and fallen; everything grows black before the eyes at the thought of finding there — ah, precious names. Of joy's play of colors and sorrow's shadows Time, with a gentle hand, has little by little brought an equilibrium about and painted for us a picture in memory.

Upon the victory of Isted there has, alas, followed a defeat, a loss, that hurts; but honor is unstained. Superior force broke through and tore our land asunder; but the Dannebrog is whole still, in this cloth there are no rents. To engage one, to stand against two, to give way a little with the foot before three and without shame to flee before four, that was King Frode's law of manly courage, and this law the Landsoldat

has faithfully fulfilled. If we consider the superior numbers against which we had to fight in the last battle, then our defense is to our honor; for here there were more than two and three against one, and our enemies, by the laws of chivalry, have no particular cause to boast of the victory.

The struggle is still going on; there is still a victory to be won for our independence, though with other weapons and under other conditions. Independence is, after all, of different kinds, partly something outward, partly something inward. A great country
[158] with a great people can hold itself independent outwardly, so long as its military power is able to subdue and defeat the outward enemies; but that is not to say that it is also inwardly an independent people; far from it! It has often been seen in history that such a people can be in much discord and dissension with itself, that precisely for the sake of greatness and outward independence it must bear heavy chains. Also a small country with a small people can preserve its independence outwardly, if Nature, with rare favor, by steep coasts, high mountains, inaccessible regions, has made it safe against attack; but, even surrounded by a Chinese wall, such a securely protected small people can yet inwardly be highly unindependent; it can split into irreconcilable parties, it can consume its strength in an empty, unfruitful bustle, it can wear itself down in petty squabbling. For outward independence no human power dares to vouch; even the strongest can stumble: great kingdoms, great thrones fall. Over the fate of the peoples in the course of the ages rules a guiding Providence, and, let it be our consolation, Providence's eye looks as mildly upon the small as upon the great.

What matters, then, is to win inner independence; but to inner independence belongs concord, mutual concord in the spirit of truth, justice, freedom and love. Popular life is not a life in Paradise; the popular soil must be cleansed, plowed and cultivated, it costs labor. Around the tree of freedom there are roses and love tokens, yes! but also thorns and thistles. It is impossible that independence and freedom can develop in a vigorously growing people without inward tension and strife. So
[159] view stands against view, party against party, and opposed endeavors clash with one another. It is necessary that amid such clashes there be a strong foundation of unity and concord. If the foundation of concord breaks, then the independence of the people is in danger.

Who among us has not experienced how difficult it is to bring two persons, even if each, for his own part, sincerely wishes what is right, to come to agreement, when there is suspicion and secret grudge between them. In public affairs, when the parties contend, it may often seem to an outsider as if the clear cause, the right view stood

mediating in the midst of the strife; but all at once it has vanished again, a But, a side glance, a single word has chased understanding away: it is not dishonest intent, not conscious duplicity, it is the serpent of grudge, it is the prompting of suspicion. What is to cleanse out suspicion and stifle the serpent of grudge? A deep, strong and living feeling of what the people is, and what the fatherland requires, when great interests are at stake. Also in this respect the memory of the Battle of Isted can be a blessing to us. There was concord, yes there was unity, one spirit, one soul, one watchword. "With God, for King and Fatherland!" that was a word which gave the soldier courage; it dwelt in his silent mind, it gave him certainty of his calling, it kindled the flame in his breast, it sounded with hurrahs in forest and vale, it roared across the heath. Could we see these sacrifices, these dead, these dying, see the blood trickle out from the springs of the heart, without forgetting our everyday squabbling and feeling lifted above petty willfulness, suspicion and grudge, then we would be an ungrateful people; the memory of the warriors, the spirit from the graves of the heroes would have to bear witness against us that we gave up our best possession, *[160]* our inner independence, and were not worthy of freedom.

In the great concerns of the people and the fatherland concord is, on the whole, more than a matter of feeling and more than a calculating consideration of the understanding; it is a matter of will; there shall be, there must be concord on what is most important. The man who cannot become of one mind with himself never becomes independent, and the kingdom that is at odds with itself must fall. To concord belongs will; to a concordant and independent people a clear and mature popular will. Measures for the fatherland's defense, the first conditions for the many-sided development of popular life in spiritual as in material respects, belong to the things that tolerate neither evasion nor delay; here is something that cannot wait until all byways have been tried, and all means of resistance on the part of the contending parties exhausted.

If the work of independence is not to come to a standstill, a watchful eye must be kept on a twofold danger. The one is: to give way too much and let oneself be blinded by empty promises and meaningless agreements. The other is: to press too hard and, cost what it may, to carry through, as the saying goes, one's own war. The latter is just as ruinous as the former. By using means too strong the leaders of the people, with all their zeal and good will, may easily come to behave like those quacks who, in order to cure a single injury in haste, ruin the whole body and kill the patient. Also in this respect the men of peace have much to learn from the warriors. — Look

to the right! Look to the left! — Straight ahead! that belongs to the young soldiers'
[161] first drills. If the way of truth lay open for us, like a ditched highway, we should certainly need to look neither to the right nor to the left; but since we must constantly fight our way forward; since the road may wind through the impassable ground of errors, and the truth lie now to the right, now to the left, it matters to have an open eye for both possibilities: a plain trotting "Straight ahead!" could easily deceive us through illusions of our own infallibility. And one thing more. In the tumult of battle a double word of command sounds, now one: Forward, on! now again a Halt, stand! The latter is for the soldier fired up for combat often harder than the former. To go on, when everything is staked, and passion gives speed, comes naturally; but to stand still in the midst of a rain of bullets, see comrades storm and fall, without daring to hasten to their aid, costs self-conquest. None the less it is, for the sake of victory, just as important to obey the last order as the first. To true courage in battle belongs self-control; should anyone doubt it, let him consult the heroes of Isted.

When a people is in earnest to fight for its independence, it is not enough that a leader sets himself a goal, gathers a crowd around him, a majority, and says: we are the people. It is indeed possible that such a majority will may be a first, beginning expression of the true and proper popular will ; yes, it is possible, but it must nevertheless be tested. By what is it then to be known ? It is to be known precisely by this, that the goal that is set embraces equally everything and everyone. To aim upward in such a way that it looks as if the whole people were especially to work for some higher institutions of learning, some learned and cultivated persons, whose
[162] learning and cultivation, it does not understand, is unhealthy. To aim downward, and in such a way that it always looks as if it were only the material, carnal well-being, temporal fatness, that was the one thing needful, is likewise unhealthy. In both cases we may be assured that it is a party will we have before us, no true popular will. Where a society suffers from the fundamental ill that a single party, be it a minority or a majority party, rules one-sidedly, there the popular will is paralyzed. Above all the small peoples must guard against deifying the majority will; for by such a deification they sign their own death sentence. If a majority is right merely because it is a majority, what follows from this? This follows from it, that, since the small peoples are always a minority and the great a majority, a small people has — as a great power is fond of asserting — really no right to exist independently.

As the goal is, so must the means be; by the choice of means and by the use of them we recognize again the difference between party will and popular will. We

remember King Solomon's judgment, which ordered that the living child be divided. But the true mother would rather leave her child to the false one than suffer it to be divided and killed. Show me for once a majority will which, although it is conscious of its right and can testify to it loudly, yet for the sake of life and concord, like the child's true mother, exhibits the self-denial to yield for a moment, so that nothing existing shall be violated and no necessary intermediate step skipped over! Yes, when a majority will is so high-minded, then it is sure of itself; it wins the respect of its opponents, it wins more than that, it wins the heart of the people: it will surely appear *[163]* that it is and remains the true, independent popular will.

Today twenty-five years ago the spirit of the people held festival in Denmark. Treason, which always speculates in party spirit, wanted to split us apart and cut a piece from our own flesh; but the King raised his voice: *it shall not be*! and the royal will was a popular will. Alas, when that voice fell silent in death, then there happened what we had long feared. But the word from the royal lips is not dead; it summons us to be at our post, it still sounds in our ears, a voice of the spirit, a word of prophecy, confirmed by God's Providence.

There is an independence that cannot be robbed; there is something in a noble people that cannot be shot down with cannon. If we still strive for the cause of popular life, so that our watchword is still as before: with God, for *King and Fatherland*! then let only those who trust confidently in their own strength set Right on the spear-shaft for long enough; let them only think that the superior power of a majority is enough to force a foreign tongue, a foreign nature and a foreign soul into a people which has honestly resolved to live its own life: every earthly superior power has its limit after all; there is a word of Godhead that says: thus far, and no farther! We have no right above other peoples, whether great or small, to call ourselves God's own people; but we have both the right and the obligation to lead our life and fight for our independence in such a way that we may with reason be said to work for a sensible and many-sided development of noble and true humanity. If our cause becomes in a deeper sense a cause of humanity, then we may believe and hope that the cause *[164]* will prosper, that no superior power will dare the inhuman. It is after all the cause of mankind and the victory of humanity to which history points; but the victory of humanity is inseparable from an independent popular life. Away then with anxious forebodings and heavy dreams! every threat against our land and people shall be blown away; they shall not cow us, "it shall not be". We believe in God and in our good right. Justice has a mighty voice, and the word gives an echo here in these

valleys; from field and forest, from land and sea, from Danish hearts and from Danish lions, from the tone of our song, from the voice in our breast, from the vault of heaven and from the graves of the heroes of Isted echoes this word: *it shall not be*! With this faith, in this hope we bless the memory of the fallen, we bring the still living our thanks, and — long live old Denmark!