

# Life, unity and the pursuit of enlightenment. Grundtvig and the Danish constitution

JENS LEI WENDEL-HANSEN

The pastor, author, historian, educational thinker and politician N.F.S. Grundtvig (1783-1872) is closely connected to Danish democratic development<sup>1</sup>. Since his death in 1872, he has in the political debate been used as a proponent of popular *Bildung*, societal engagement, freedom rights, equality, national culture (*danskhed*, Danishness) and democratic values. Few leading Danish politicians have never quoted Grundtvig, and in presentations of Danish culture and national spirit, there is regularly an abundance of references to Grundtvig's works or songs<sup>2</sup>.

In 2008, the Danish Ministry of Education published its democracy canon. It was to be used broadly in the education system. In this canon, N.F.S. Grundtvig is listed as a point on his own, alongside 34 other points like John Locke, the French Revolution and The Danish Constitution. In comparison, the democracy theorists Hal Koch and Alf Ross shares a point, which leaves Grundtvig as the only Dane canonized in his own personal capacity. As described on the min-

isterial home page, it is a «common perception that Grundtvig has had immense influence on the development of the Danish democracy during the last 150 years».

The official justification for his inclusion in this democratic hall of fame begins:

Grundtvig was, if any, the champion of freedom in Denmark. His philosophy of society is based on the liberal viewpoint that only in freedom will the individual voluntarily impose the necessary bonds on itself.

His constitutional views, the ministry left more vaguely described. Thus, he is presented as member of the Constituent Assembly 1848-49, but his demands for freedom «went far beyond the 1849 Constitution». The description emphasizes Grundtvig's opposition against the limitation of the suffrage in the Constitutional Reform in 1866, «[a]lthough he expressed reservations about the constitution issued in 1849»<sup>3</sup>.

The description has the characteristics of the typical representations of Grundt-

vig's general political views. The focus is on the freedom rights, which is very clearly promoted by Grundtvig himself, but his conceptions of the constitution as a whole or the political system specifically are, as I shall suggest, regularly rather superficially analyzed and the results vaguely expressed.

The purpose of this article is to make a clearer analysis of Grundtvig's constitutional position. This analysis will be based on a hermeneutic reading of Grundtvig's political writings and his speeches and proposals in the Constituent Assembly and *Rigsdagen*, but also of his historical accounts, since his constitutional views were often founded on historical analysis. These utterings will be compared to Grundtvig's contemporaries and classical political standpoints in order to give a comprehensive picture.

### *The politician Grundtvig in his own time*

N.F.S. Grundtvig lived from 1783 to 1872 and was in the most of his life a minister in the Danish Lutheran state church, after 1849 the Danish People's Church. He had a considerable literate production amounting to approximately 37.000 printed pages<sup>4</sup>.

Grundtvig's primary contribution to the body of Danish literature is his hymns. 253 hymns in the recent 2003 Danish Hymn Book of the Danish People's Church, is either written, translated or adapted by Grundtvig. It amounts to 32 percent of the 791 numbered hymns<sup>5</sup>. By his historical, political, theological, pedagogical and philosophical works, he, however, also broadly influenced the public debate of his time. In

1848, 65 years old, he even entered Danish politics by being elected to the Constituent Assembly, which in 1849 finished the work on a Danish constitution to replace absolutism. Thereby, he added the epithet «politician» to the other ones regularly used to describe him<sup>6</sup>. Grundtvig entered Danish politics in a period, when Denmark was engaged in an intense civil war on constitutional and national grounds. These conditions seriously influenced Grundtvig's political career, but was also an important cause for his political engagement. Both the national and constitutional agenda fundamentally challenged the princely defined and absolutist Danish-German monarchy. Confronted with this challenge and offered a nomination in a constituency in September 1848, Grundtvig wrote to his son Johan that he considered the offer, since he «knew better than most»<sup>7</sup>.

Absolutism in Denmark dated back to 1660. In this year, the king Frederick 3. in the wake of the defeat against the Swedish army orchestrated a coup d'état against the council of nobles. Hitherto, the council had demanded a coronation charter of the candidate for the throne in order to sanction his appointment, thereby checking the power of the king. Also, the council had legislative and decisive power in major political decisions. A Danish diet with representations from the four estates, the nobility, the clergy, the burghers and the peasants, in 1660 declared that the throne was now hereditary, thereby stripping the council of its influence, leaving the king with absolute power. Thereafter, ennoblement was made into a royal privilege and the nobility were deprived their monopoly to own manors and to hold public office. Thus, this reform was a serious degradation of the nobility as

well as a grant of some possibility for social mobility for the rest of the population, not least the burghers. The key to influence, however, was loyalty to the king, who in his person bound the realm together<sup>8</sup>.

Since 1814 and the partition of the Danish-Norwegian monarchy by the cession of Norway to Sweden, the conglomerate Danish or Oldenburg monarchy apart from colonies and dependencies consisted of four lands: The kingdom of Denmark and the duchies of Schleswig, Holstein and from 1815 Lauenburg. Apart from the Danish isles around Zealand and Funen as the most populous, the kingdom of Denmark consisted of Jutland north of a line by the city of Ribe and south of the city of Kolding. Between this line in the north and the river Eider in the south was the duchy Schleswig. The duchy was linguistically and culturally divided between Danish and German (and Frisian in Nordfriesland in the west). South of Schleswig lay the two culturally German duchies Holstein and Lauenburg. The river Elbe constituted the border of the monarchy.

In accordance with the decisions on The Vienna Congress in 1815, Holstein and Lauenburg became members of the newly founded German Confederation with the rights and obligations connected to this membership, for instance the right to an assembly of the estates and the obligation to a common defense within the confederation. Schleswig, as well as Denmark, was not a member of the confederation. However, the administrative and cultural bonds between Schleswig and Holstein were close and these bonds could be argued to be based on historical right<sup>9</sup>.

From around 1830, the culturally divide in the monarchy in general and in

Schleswig specifically increasingly became the object of national struggle within the national liberal movements. The political strongholds were in the two university cities in the monarchy, Copenhagen in the kingdom of Denmark and Kiel in the duchy of Holstein. The border between Danish and German nationality manifested itself somewhere around Flensburg Firth in the middle of Schleswig, thus dividing the monarchy. This intensification can be seen as in accordance with the similar intensification of the national movement in Europe – for example with the continuous Greek strife for autonomy from the Ottoman Empire during the 1820s and culminating in October 1830 with the Belgian War of Independence<sup>10</sup>.

The national cause as well as the revolutionary vibe – most intensely contributed to by the French with the overthrow of king Charles 10. in July 1830 – became the back cloth of Grundtvig's first directly political pamphlet *Politiske Betragtninger* published around New Year 1831. Herein Grundtvig address especially the issues of nationality and insurrection, explicitly with reference to the July Revolution in France<sup>11</sup>. This will be elaborated on later in this article.

In 1831, the king Frederick 6. forecasted the introduction of advisory assemblies of the estates not only in Holstein as ordered in the Confederation Act from 1815, but also in Denmark and Schleswig. Thus, the king introduced a parliamentary element in the still absolute government of the Danish Monarchy, thereby beginning a constitutional development within the monarchy. Although merely advisory, these assemblies became forums of intensified national and constitutional demands – and took on a

serious influence on actual political development<sup>12</sup>.

The assemblies of the estates marked another cornerstone in Grundtvig's political authorship. Skeptical at first, Grundtvig quickly tied himself closely to this institution to which he in 1839 wrote what can be seen as his political program in constitutional matters, the poem "Kongehaand og Folkestemme" (translated: The hand of the king and the voice of the people). In the poem, Grundtvig celebrated the combination of an absolutist king and the free voice granted to the people's representatives in the assemblies<sup>13</sup>.

In the national cause, especially the duchy of Schleswig became crucial since an agreement could not be reached on a division of the duchy. Thus, the conservative conglomerate absolutist state, united in the king's person, was threatened by both national and liberal movements.

The 1848 revolution came to the monarchy in March. In Copenhagen, it manifested itself in a march to the new king Frederick 7. with the demand to appoint a new government with (Danish) national liberal ministers. The purpose was among other things to establish a constituent assembly for Denmark and Schleswig in order to create a Danish constitution. These demands had intensified the conflict with the king's German subjects in the end causing a civil war within the realm, which was to last for almost three years<sup>14</sup>.

Thus, when Grundtvig entered The Constituent Assembly in November 1848, not only the constitutional work, but also the intense civil war preoccupied the mind of the assembly members. Exactly the national cause had Grundtvig's sincere interest, who as a historian and linguist had empha-

sized the importance of Danish history and culture in the survival of a Danish society.

Grundtvig delivered a remarkable effort in the assembly, his isolated position considered. Not being a member of any parliamentary commission, Grundtvig in his own capacity made a considerable amount of revision proposals in the assembly. However, his political results were limited. Of 38 smaller and larger proposals to the constitution proposal, four were accepted in one way or another, the three of these being merely editorial changes. The ones rejected by the assembly usually were rejected with a large margin – one proposal even unanimously. The one proposal with substantial changes, which was actually passed, was a proposal to secure orality and public access to the legal processes in the courts of law<sup>15</sup>. Grundtvig abstained in the final vote on the constitution, which was, nevertheless, passed with a considerable majority.

Along with his considerable speeches in the assembly, Grundtvig also contributed to the public national and constitutional debate, in his own magazine, *Danskeren* (translated: The Dane), which was published from 1848 to 1851 and continuously and intensely followed the development on both topics, for instance by publishing Grundtvig's own speeches. This publication is a cornerstone source to Grundtvig's constitutional views and is frequently used in the following analysis.

Because of the international negotiations in the wake of the Three Years War 1848-1851 (The First Schleswig War), the constitution was not to include Schleswig. Especially because of Russian pressure, the Danish government was prescribed to keep the conglomerate state together without making one tie between the different lands

stronger than the other. This effectively weakened the national political movement in favor of the conservative view to resist a change of the borders of the present principalities<sup>16</sup>.

The 1849 Constitution established a parliament, *Rigsdagen*, elected by universal suffrage by men over 30 years of age. Grundtvig sat in the lower house, *Folketinget*, almost continuously from 1850 to 1858. From a constitutional point of view, Grundtvig's key political issue was the survival of Danish society and thereby the rejection of any German influence in the Danish Realm. This was shown for instance in his poem "The Danish Necessity", an association to "the European Necessity", which was often used in argument by the Danish government in order to comply with international conventions. Grundtvig, however, emphasized the necessity of the Danish people to rise against continuous attacks on its integrity<sup>17</sup>.

In 1861, Grundtvig supported the Dannevirke (Dannewerk) Association, which supported the right of the government to reject German influence and insist on Danish sovereignty in Denmark and Schleswig. The incapability of the Danish government to make the conglomerate state function effectively, when confronted with postwar intensified inner conflict primarily carried by the national movement, as well as Bismarckian power ambitions, contributed to the outbreak of The Second Schleswig War, which ended with serious Danish defeat. In the wake hereof, Grundtvig in 1866 was elected member of the upper house, *Landstinget*, in order to vote on the 1866 revision of the constitution. Grundtvig decidedly, but in vain, voted no in order to hinder the

planned limitation of universal suffrage to the upper house<sup>18</sup>.

Grundtvig died in 1872, almost 89 years old, and his funeral was the object of incomparable and remarkable ceremony. Shortly thereafter, the political struggle to monopolize his views intensified.

#### *Grundtvig, freedom and constitution in research literature*

Grundtvig's major influence on Danish public debate, now and then, as well as his political engagement have made him politically interesting. Soon after Grundtvig's death in September 1872, the Danish liberal party *Det forenede Venstre* (The united Left) sought to claim Grundtvig as their own. The former house teacher in Grundtvig's household and editor of the grundtvigian journal *Dansk Kirketidende* Niels Lindberg was profoundly dedicated to this project. In 1876, he published *Grundtvigs politiske Stæde* (Grundtvig's political stand). Herein he described Grundtvig as a defender of popular rule with a clear address to the contemporary escalating constitutional crisis in Denmark between *Folketing* and government. To state the matter shortly, this strife was founded upon the view of the party *Venstre* that the lower house, *Folketinget*, as elected by equal and universal suffrage had a certain moral claim to be taken politically into account, when the king formed a government. The conservative party *Højre* rejected this claim, stating that the king was free to appoint any government and that *Folketinget* should not believe it constitutionally higher placed than the upper house, *Landstinget*, elected partly by the king, partly by

weighted suffrage. In 1873, this constitutional disagreement almost led to *Folketinget* rejecting the yearly budget, thereby beginning a constitutional crisis – a crisis, which turned into a cultural struggle. It was in this struggle, Lindberg saw it preferable to get the deceased Grundtvig on *Venstre*'s side.

Lindberg's pamphlet was published as an answer to Grundtvig's close friend, the church historian and Professor Frederik Hammerich, who under the title *Grundtvig og Det forenede Venstre* (Grundtvig and The united Left) in 1875 had criticized *Venstre* for this increasingly organized political project. Hammerich claimed that it was meaningless:

With him the naked reality occasionally could not be seen in the light of idealism, but with it [Venstre], the ideal has disappeared in sheer naked, raw realities. [...] First and last, his matter was the people and the power of spirit, while it [Venstre] do not leave thoughts for anything else than commoners, mass and power to the plurality<sup>19</sup>.

However, Grundtvig's opposition to royally selected members in the Constituent Assembly 1848-1849, to political privilege for the wealthy in *Rigsdagen* and limitation of the universal suffrage on the whole made it easy for liberal political agitators in *Venstre* to claim to be Grundtvig's political heirs. When the liberals exited the Danish constitutional conflict in the last third of the 19th century as victors, this view consolidated itself in the popular historical narrative until today<sup>20</sup>.

In 1892, the *Venstre* historian Niels Neergaard published his work on the period 1848-66. Neergaard's work is still recognized in its impartiality and thoroughness as an authoritative account of this formative political period. Only on one

account, the sobriety seems to seriously betray Neergaard: He is not able to exclude his veneration of Grundtvig from his historical analysis. He generally described Grundtvig as a major idealistic capacity of the Constituent Assembly<sup>21</sup>. In regard to Grundtvig's opposition towards the 1866 Constitution, Neergaard writes that the other politicians "did not plumb the depth of Grundtvig's words"<sup>22</sup>.

The theologian and grundtvigian folk high school teacher Holger Begtrup's selection of Grundtvig's works, *Udvalgte Skrifter*, from 1904-1909 is today professionally recognized as representative in its selection and reliable as edition<sup>23</sup>. Even Begtrup in his selection of political speeches is tendentious. Of Grundtvig's speeches in parliament, he brings only a selection from 1866, in which Grundtvig because of his opposition towards the reform can most easily be read as a liberal defensor.

The opposite position that Grundtvig was skeptical about the democratic development was nurtured in the public debate connected to *Højre*. Thus, the conservative historian Alexander Thorsøe in the 1880's stated that Grundtvig in the Constituent Assembly had defended a strong position for the king and rejected universal suffrage as a right of nature<sup>24</sup>. These views did hardly leave permanent marks. In 1884, the conservative, but grundtvigian member of parliament Lars Dinesen stated that he once had a talk with Grundtvig, in which Grundtvig said that *Venstre* with its claim on power misunderstood the Danish constitution. Grundtvig rather understood the given freedom as a source of development of freedom in spirit within the people. Dinesen was strongly opposed in the *Venstre* press<sup>25</sup>.

This shows the strength of the *Venstre* narrative of Grundtvig as a liberal or even a democrat, but it does also show that the matter was hardly very clear and that Grundtvig had won a position in which it politically was beneficial to have Grundtvig on one's side. This is still true today<sup>26</sup>.

The idea of Grundtvig's liberal legacy still plays a leading role in the research on him as a politician or political thinker. Thus, Grundtvig's views on freedom rights have usually been in focus with regards to his constitutional views<sup>27</sup>. The link between the freedom rights and the actual constitution is, however, more superficially examined and has resulted in three different, but not overall incompatible conclusions:

Firstly, some scholars seem to be of the opinion that Grundtvig emphasized freedom to a degree where it ends in an implicitly downgrading of other constitutional elements. This is often described by the quote from 1848:

[...] of two evils, one should choose the smallest, and freedom without order has, at least since I first saw England, always been a lesser evil to me than order without freedom<sup>28</sup>.

Secondly, authors like Poul Dam and Esben Lunde Larsen have implicitly concluded from these Grundtvig's views on freedom to his support for democracy<sup>29</sup>.

Both these views leave the impression that Grundtvig was only limited interested in the discussion of constitutional elements beyond freedom rights.

Thirdly, however, Grundtvig's freedom views are often connected with Grundtvig's strong support for the advisory Assemblies of the Estates, which were in function from 1835 to 1848, by stating that Grundtvig in

the opinion-led absolutism saw the ideal combination of a strong royal will and, if not a free debate, then at least, some sort of public opinion<sup>30</sup>. This idea is often said to be clearly stated in one of his perhaps most famous poems "Kongehaand og Folketemme" from 1839. In fact, this poem has led more analysts to state that Grundtvig emphasized the mind of the people rather than constitutional form<sup>31</sup>.

This third view often ends with the claim that Grundtvig in time if not embraced democracy then at least accepted constitutionalism with significantly democratic elements.

Overall, analysts of Grundtvig's constitutional position either disregard his views on other elements of the political system than the freedom rights, or they are on a more or less firm foundation making him fit into some kind of democratic, or anyway liberal, position.

Grundtvig's abstaining on the vote on the 1849 Constitution is ambiguously explained and is, to this day, the perhaps most debated aspect of Grundtvig's constitutional work. Some, including as mentioned the Danish Ministry of Education's democracy canon, have claimed that Grundtvig did not find that it went far enough. The 2008 canon explicitly states that "Grundtvig's demands on freedom went far further than [...] the 1849 Constitution"<sup>32</sup>. Thus, the grundtvigian politician and historian Niels Neergaard implied that Grundtvig's abstaining vote was due to the limitations on the eligibility to the upper house, *Landstinget*, to merely a wealthy elite<sup>33</sup>. Poul Dam and Claus Bjørn later repeated this as a principal reason<sup>34</sup>. Tine Damsholt similarly argues that Grundtvig problematized the bicameral system, since it weakened the



Frontpage of the Denmark's 1849 constitution

expression of the voice of the people and made the people divide into parties<sup>35</sup>.

However, Damsholt also holds that Grundtvig even in 1850 preferred the previous assemblies of the estates allowing a free expression of a popular voice, but left the king with the legislative power. Anders Holm has similarly claimed that the constitution went to far – that Grundtvig in 1849 opposed the idea of a constitution, promoting the idea of opinion-led absolutism<sup>36</sup>.

Grundtvig's stand on the 1866 Constitutional Reform – he voted against – has been the object of some, but considerably less attention. This stand was, however, afterwards eagerly used by his political descendants in the liberal party *Venstre* in order to point to Grundtvig's democratic ideals<sup>37</sup>. For instance the two editions of

Grundtvig's selected works Holger Begtrup's *Udvalgte Skrifter* from 1904-09 and Georg Christensen's and Hal Koch's *Værker i Udvalg* from 1940-49 includes speeches from 1866 to supplement the speeches from the Constituent Assembly in the version from Grundtvig's own magazine *Danskeren*. Poul Andersen shortly concludes on the speeches that it was in consistence with his positive view on the 1849 Constitution that the universal suffrage should not be taken away, when given<sup>38</sup>.

These portrayals of Grundtvig's constitutional views have several limitations:

Firstly, the focus on freedom rights have shadowed a thorough analysis of Grundtvig's constitutional philosophy and its implications on political institutions.

Secondly, to the degree to which these views are actually included, it is based on either poetic sources or certain eagerly repeated quotes often detached from context.

Thirdly, the politically useful and tendentious elaboration on Grundtvig's constitutional views nurtured by *Venstre* during the constitutional strife from 1870 to 1901 seem to have no small influence on the representation.

Thus, the Grundtvig research, however, still lacks a thorough and systematic analysis of Grundtvig's political activity.

As a part in the present work by the The Grundtvig Study Centre on a critical edition of Grundtvig's works, this article analyses Grundtvig's parliamentary speeches and political works in their entirety. Thereby, it is the aim of this article to establish a more coherent picture of Grundtvig's views on constitution and constitutionalism.

*Grundtvig and the constitution*

As mentioned, Grundtvig was 65 years old, when he entered politics in the eventful year of 1848. In January, the king Christian 8. died and left the throne to his son Frederick 7. An intensified liberal claim for a free constitution and the abolition of absolutism followed. In March, idealistic pursuit and European revolutionary events led the national liberal party to demand that the king replaced his government and included liberal members in the new one. One of the leading tasks for this government became the appointment and gathering of a Constituent Assembly. Grundtvig failed to win a seat at the general election in October, but managed to win a by-election in November. As a political writer, Grundtvig had, however, been occasionally active since his first political piece, *Politiske Betragtninger* from the beginning of 1831. Thus, when confronted with the intensified constitutional claims from the beginning of 1848, Grundtvig was a trained constitutional thinker, but he was also troubled by the eagerness of the liberal constitutional claims<sup>39</sup>.

A key element in the understanding of Grundtvig's constitutional views is his distinction between the actual constitution and the written one. As it will be elaborated later, Grundtvig on certain principal issues argued that law established by the legal authorities was not compatible with actual law, no matter the words in the judicial document. Grundtvig was certainly no legal positivist.

In an article in his journal *Danskeren* from August 1848, Grundtvig rejected the liberal claim for a constitution, stating that the country already had a constitution. By the word *constitution* ("Constitution" or

"Statsforfatning"), Grundtvig did, however, not mean the written *Lex Regia* (Kongeloven) from 1665, which was only published in 1709 by king Frederick 4. By *constitution*, he understood nothing more than the actual form of government, the political circumstances, thereby linking this concept to empirical historical, political and social, but not judicial analysis<sup>40</sup>. In the case of Danish absolutism, he linked this firmly to the granting of absolute power to the king Frederick 3. by the assembled diet in 1660<sup>41</sup>. Thereby, Grundtvig connected closely to contract theory as one, but only one, of the main sources of legitimate authority.

In the Constituent Assembly, he said:

[...] My stand is not that the absolute power of the king is founded on the Lex Regia, which Frederick the Fourth issued, but that it is founded on the transfer of the people, which happened to Frederick the Third, thus it is not repealed with the Lex Regia. [...] it is only the one-sided and now intolerable claim to the right of unlimited and arbitrarily use of the absolute power. Likewise, it is with the right of succession; for the right of succession, which Frederik the Third's descendants have to the throne of Denmark, is only the one, which was transferred to Frederik the Third as well as absolute power, and what would be repealed by the revoking of the Lex Regia, will only be the one-sided and indefensible constant succession, which could, even in a near future, bring Denmark as inheritance and price to fall into the hands of its most vicious enemies<sup>42</sup>.

In the Constituent Assembly, Grundtvig early argued that the constitutional discussion should be postponed and that the assembly for now should limit its constitutional assignments to just abolishing the *Lex Regia* and the Freedom of the Press Regulation of 1799<sup>43</sup>.

This can be read in two ways. One way is that Grundtvig did not fear the lack of a constitution. In March 1848, in the mid-

dle of European political turmoil, he had made the often-quoted statement that he preferred freedom without order to order without freedom<sup>44</sup>.

This seems misleading. Firstly, because the uttering is probably just a cocky statement, which corresponds rather badly with Grundtvig's continuous emphasis on political stability and national unity, as shown later in this article. Secondly, Grundtvig's suggestion to abolish the *Lex Regia* would be of limited consequence to one, who saw the natural constitution as being independent of judicial documents, but rather shaped by legitimate authority.

Rather, his proposal in the Constituent Assembly should be seen in correspondence with his basic constitutional approach that a *constitution* was merely the actual form of government, and that the essential element herein was the royal legitimacy based on the transfer of power in 1660. In this regard, *Lex Regia* could not, in Grundtvig's view, claim the status of constitution.

This exemplifies very well that Grundtvig's constitutional standpoint and concept was based on an English standard: A constitution was not written, but developed on grounds of legislation and practice. As on a lot of other fields, Grundtvig was also constitutionally inspired from England.

In literature on constitutionalism, it is common to define this term as a certain limitation on government by law<sup>45</sup>. This definition regularly sees constitutional elements in their negative capacity, which seems to emphasize the formal constitutional arrangements and institutions. It seems to derive from the constitutional historical conclusion that modern constitutionalism begins with the American and French Revolution in 1776 and 1789 respec-

tively and their consolidation of constitutional division (and thereby limitation) of powers. In the contemporary Danish constitutional debate, this approach was exactly what Grundtvig questioned. Grundtvig's concept of constitution as an actual form of government establishing in Denmark a *positive* political cooperation between king and people caused a correction to the liberal politicians, who demanded a constitution (*forfatning*). Grundtvig argued that what they wanted was a basic law ("Grundlov") understood as a clear and formal division of powers based on the specific national premises. Grundtvig understood the concept of constitution as the in any given time or place actual form of government. You could not demand that, since it was there by definition.

To this idea of a Danish basic law, a *grundlov*, Grundtvig also connected a specific national, Danish, element in opposition to the generality and foreignness of the word *constitution* or *statsforfatning*. Thus, the demand of a constitution was from Grundtvig's conceptual perspective not only irrelevant, since the country already had one, it also to Grundtvig seemed to emphasize a general connection to an abstract idea of constitutionality, which could fail to connect the future basic law to specific Danish circumstances. As elaborated on later, the negatively defined limitation, division or destruction of royal power, which had been the center of prior constitutional demands, for instance in the American Revolution in 1776 and the French Revolution in 1789, but which had also led the Norwegians in their constitutional endeavors in 1814 and could be seen as central to the nationalist break of 1848 with the princely state, was not what led Grundtvig. He saw the centrality of roy-

al power as a natural Danish constitutional element and a bulwark against national division.

It should be mentioned that this conceptual distinction seems to some degree to have been implemented in Danish conceptual use: *Constitution* is in present Danish regularly translated to *grundlov* (literally: Basic Law) in the specific Danish case, while it is commonly translated into *forfatning* (similar to German *Verfassung*), when used as a general phenomenon or in foreign countries. A conceptual historical analysis is, however, not yet made on this topic.

The importance of the constitutional foundation being Danish in nature can hardly be exaggerated in regard to Grundtvig's political position. At an election meeting on October 3<sup>rd</sup> 1848, Grundtvig declared what he meant a constitution should be able to secure:

[...] a real Danish Basic Law [should] get the realm fixed again, so everyone can keep what is his and the king keep his power to do good, but make the ministers accountable to both the king and the people and that we all will get that freedom, as the human being, which is not created to be a machine, has a right to, and as we all need to make our trade with heart and soul<sup>46</sup>.

In *De l'esprit des lois* first published in 1748, Montesquieu initially rejects the idea of a universally most natural type of government. Instead, he argues that the most natural government is the one, which corresponds the best with the mentality of the people it is shaped for<sup>47</sup>. This view is easily seen in Grundtvig's perspectives and places Grundtvig between the constitutional rationalistic normative idealists, like Plato, and empirical descriptive realists, like Aristotle. On the one hand, Grundtvig implicitly rejects the idea of a rationalistically

deducted universal constitutional ideal in the style of either Plato or Polybios. On the other hand, he believes in a specific constitutional ideal for each nation derived from historical studies of its national peculiarity. Thus, he disregarded terminology as well as content in the classical constitutional literature. It could not be in this general literature that one could find the building blocks for a peculiar Danish constitution.

This national approach influenced Grundtvig's constitutional view in several ways.

Firstly, Grundtvig warned against escalating the constitutional debate and thereby causing national division, which could in the end lead to national destruction<sup>48</sup>. This warning probably seemed the more relevant, since the nation was in war. It became crucial in Grundtvig's approach towards the highly debated and divisive topic of the composition of parliament, as I will get back to.

Secondly, the content and the wording of the constitution should be of good Danish stock. In *Det Danske Fiir-Kløver* from 1836, Grundtvig's emphasis on a natural Danish constitution made him disregard the classics as a base of a Danish constitution. He found that the foundation of a Danish constitution should be found in the nature of the people, for which he called the history to witness, rather than in foreign books – one of Grundtvig's many blows against the academics influenced by French, German, Latin and Greek<sup>49</sup>.

Early in September 1848, a group of candidates for the Constituent Assembly, among whom were also N.E. Tuxen, Grundtvig's rival in the Nyboder constituency in October, was promoted by a large amount of national liberal notables. They

described the political goal of the candidates as «a constitutional monarchy build on a democratic basis» («et constitutionelt Monarchi bygget paa et demokratisk Grundlag»)<sup>50</sup>. Grundtvig discredited this description, because none of the bearing words were Danish. Therefore, it was, in Grundtvig's opinion, ill-defined<sup>51</sup>. The use of these phrases by the elite were merely a cover of ignorance on the subject<sup>52</sup>. This was again a disregard of the classical inheritance of Aristotle, Polybios and the like, which he had previously argued could not meaningfully be applied in a Danish context. Here, it was needed to go to one's own history in search for applicable constitutional thoughts<sup>53</sup>. The thought that constitutions could not be transferred from one state to another was generally accepted. It was the radicalism in the neglect of classical inspiration, which made Grundtvig the odd one out in this regard.

In the Constituent Assembly, Grundtvig used a considerable amount of time – or anyway so some members thought – to remove especially Latinizations from the constitution text and replace them with Danish words. Generally, the other assembly members seemed to have considered Grundtvig rather annoying, and his continuous language cleansing endeavors was only successful twice during the entire assembly. Thus, it seems likely that it was not only the rightwing member baron C.F. Zeuthen, who found this Grundtvig's approach irritating, as he wrote in his diary: «This eternal language cleansing bores me»<sup>54</sup>.

Probably, Grundtvig's concern in this regard was that words made what they described. As a *konstitution* or *forfatning* described only the presence of a constitution in a general sense, and a *grundlov* a specific

Danish basic law, the use of pure Danish words would create a Danish constitution. Therefore, he suggested for example the Danish words *synsmand*, *statsråd* and *hurtigskriver* to replace the latinized concepts of *revisor* (auditor), *minister* (minister) and *stenograf* (shorthand writer) respectively<sup>55</sup>.

It seems to me that a wrong Latin word in a Danish law is not only an egregious blunder in style, but also intolerable, because the law should as far as possible be clear to the whole people, [...] it is because I find it intolerable, and because it is a great principle, which I here wish to place in the heart of the assembly in regard to the openly foreign and undanish in our judicial language<sup>56</sup>.

As it was with most of his battles, he also fought this specific one alone, but it was part in Grundtvig's coherent attack on Latinized and Germanized academic culture especially among national liberals like the classical philologist J.N. Madvig, who was among the signers of the afore mentioned promotion. In his attack on the wordings in this request, he encouraged the common Dane not to be ashamed that he did not understand it, but to «laugh a little at the learned and respectable people, who actually is not at all wiser as to the constitutional monarchy on democratic basis than you and me; but have only learned it from the French to put a good face on a terrible story»<sup>57</sup>. He thereby questioned not only the Danishness, but the competence of the academic national liberals, because they were not able to speak the common Danish tongue<sup>58</sup>.

We see in this approach a serious inspiration from Herder and Fichte in the focus on the living daily and long-lasting public language, in opposition to a dead language like Latin and someone else's, like German. Therefore, these languages did not have liv-

ing creative potential in a Danish context<sup>59</sup>. However, in a mid-19th century Danish exchange of views in public, Grundtvig's statements must also have given the recipient serious connotations to the 18<sup>th</sup> century Norwegian-Danish playwright Ludvig Holberg, who had in comedies like *Jean de France* and *Erasmus Montanus* ridiculed the learned or travelled by rendering their knowledge expressed in grandiose foreign words either useless or without actual content. In the latter play, Holberg lets the simple brother of the student Erasmus state that his brother «has become so learned that he can no more explain his thoughts in his mother tongue»<sup>60</sup>. That was, in essence, the same accusation, Grundtvig levelled at the Danish academic elite. The road towards not only understanding, but also the very acquisition of the constitution lay in Grundtvig's view in the use of the common Danish of the common Dane. Vagueness and confusion would merely lead to national divide as seen in the power struggles of contemporary Germany<sup>61</sup>.

Thirdly, Grundtvig's constitutional views were firmly founded upon the idea of a natural Danish constitution, which lay beyond the written word. In his view, it was the purpose of the constitutional work to try to come as close as possible to this natural national constitution. In *Det Danske Fiir-Kløver* (1836), Grundtvig by reference to the 12th century chronicler Saxo Grammaticus stated that «'the absolute rule of the king' and 'the clear freedom of the people's voice' are the Law of the Kingdom from the beginning»<sup>62</sup>.

Although Grundtvig had a considerable amount of objections in regard to the 1849 Constitution as it developed during The Constituent Assembly, Grundtvig found it

to work to the favor of the constitution that it seemed to establish this dualistic and indigenous frame:

Nevertheless, it rests on the basis of an accountable government and the right impact of the voice of the people in the development of the whole, and this I find to be the ancient basic law in Denmark, though hitherto unwritten, but deeply, hopefully ineradicably inculcated in the heart of the Danish people, and nothing of what gets to stand on paper, I am sure of this, nothing of this will budge it, and I therefore shall not say more in this regard, but to remind, what this old and as I hope ineradicable constitution is, and I ask permission to bring to mind a small verse, [...] I have done myself:

The hand of the king and the voice of the people,  
Both strong, both free  
They have had a home in Denmark,  
Many hundred years before us.  
In spite of all flaw, all fear and danger  
Must it win and last  
Create in a golden age  
good conditions for old Denmark<sup>63</sup>.

It is not bold to say that Grundtvig in 1849 as when it was written in 1839 considered «Kongehaand og Folkestemme» to be his own constitutional program.

When discussed what temporary legislative authority lay in the Constituent Assembly other than the declared assignment to shape and pass a constitution, Grundtvig argued:

Shortly, my own opinion on this subject is that if the entire assembly consisted of popular elected members, then I could not for a moment doubt that we had all the authority, as the King have decided, or which the circumstances make necessary, hereafter resting in the common Danish assembly. Thus, it is only the variegated composition, which makes me highly doubt our authority too, either for giving firm laws or to impose in the people the responsibility for what the administration and government should decide. Since the extraordinary circumstances, we are placed in, are not only extraordinary, but of the

most important and most dangerous nature, I do not estimate otherwise, than that the assembly, as it is, have to participate in the lawmaking and all the negotiations, as is in the present moment found necessary for the welfare and the good of the realm, with all the authority, which can be bestowed upon a popular assembly<sup>64</sup>.

Since the Constituent Assembly did not only consist of popularly elected members, but also royally appointed, Grundtvig thereby did not find it to be natural, since the hand of the king and the voice of the people did not stand clear towards each other<sup>65</sup>.

Thus, Grundtvig nurtured the idea of a natural constitution independent of a formal legal document. Such a natural constitution was founded upon certain basic freedom rights: The right to educational development, the right to practice one's own occupation, the right to keep one's earnings from this occupation and the right to practice one's religion, language and tradition. The only reason for insurrection Grundtvig found in the tyrant, who would limit these liberties in order to strengthen his own power<sup>66</sup>.

Even in the case of the suppression of these freedoms, insurrection was, however, not to be taken lightly. In *Politiske Betragtninger*, Grundtvig directly addressed the French July Revolution in 1830. Here, the opposition had risen to violent revolt, because of conflict between parliament and the king, Charles 10., which caused the latter to initiate a coup d'état, in which he dissolved parliament, reduced the electorate, called for new elections and restricted the freedom of the press<sup>67</sup>.

Grundtvig found that the reasons for uprising were questionable at best, since French society was doing well and the lib-

erties were plenty. The conflict was, in Grundtvig's views, over political disagreements or the dislike of king Charles 10. This could not legitimize dethronement of a long reigning royal family and the following instability:

[...] we have to prepare for storm [and] take good care of the helm that it will not get into a boy's hands or miss an owner, but will stay in the hand of the mate [...] <sup>68</sup>.

This severe skepticism towards the use of insurrection makes it relevant to compare Grundtvig to certain of the opposers of revolution within the canonical literature from the history of ideas: Edmund Burke and Joseph de Maistre, both fierce opposers of The French Revolution in 1789. According to his book list from 1839, Grundtvig even possessed Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* from 1790, most likely bought on one of his trips to England.

Burke and Grundtvig both accepted certain basic human rights, however in a much more diminished form as the French revolutionaries. Not the least the right to be governed fairly was a similarity between the two. So was also the "right to the fruits of their industry" and the right to "instruction in life". Similar was, however, also the rejection of the right of the individual to govern himself<sup>69</sup>.

They both principally accepted insurrection, but only in the most extreme cases of violation against the constitution and only with the least possible consequences. An ideal kaleidoscopic case in this regard is the portrayal of The Glorious Revolution 1688-89. Seemingly both Burke and Grundtvig found James II to be tyrannical, but whereas Burke found the transfer of power to James' daughter and her husband

William of Orange to be a cautious return to legitimacy with no concession to popular sovereignty<sup>70</sup>, Grundtvig saw this as only an «illusion of succession» making way for a serious weakening of royal power, thereby weakening the constitution altogether<sup>71</sup>. Thus, in the view on insurrection, Grundtvig was considerably more conservative than Burke, who nurtured a traditional Lockean and old liberal view on contract theory.

Grundtvig seems considerably more comparable to the French philosopher Joseph de Maistre, who went into self-exile after The French Revolution. de Maistre refused the idea of revolution on the ground that such an undertaking was never under human control. «[T]he French Revolution leads men more than men lead it»<sup>72</sup>, de Maistre writes in *Considérations sur la France* from 1797. Grundtvig seems to accept the dangers and causes of revolts as a historical fact, but he does not see in them a reasonable instrument to make the political elite accountable to the social contract. To Grundtvig, revolution was the source of instability, not the instrument of stability.

Grundtvig clearly rejected insurrection as grounded in constitutional formalities, and he found this to be obvious to every prudent citizen. In regards to the Paris uprising in 1830, he rejected the argument that this should have been done on ground of Charles 10.'s breach of king Louis 18.'s Charter from 1815:

It befits only bookworms to rebel over a piece of paper<sup>73</sup>.

Thus, Grundtvig's emphasis on the natural constitution also weakened the authority of the written constitution. This was shown also in his only limited interest in a

constitution as judicial document, since the real constitution was beyond this.

Grundtvig's saying that he preferred freedom without order to order without freedom, can here easily be overemphasized<sup>74</sup>. No matter what he actually meant by this loose statement, Grundtvig in practice made vital constitutional points in order to secure constitutional stability. We see this confirmed in Grundtvig's pure rejection that suffrage should be a human right, but that his primary argument in 1849 and 1866 for a broad suffrage is that it is already given in 1848, and it would cause severe instability to abolish or limit what is already given<sup>75</sup>.

The historian Jes Fabricius Møller has placed Grundtvig constitutionally near Hobbes in the regard to contract theory. This is done on the ground that Grundtvig did not accept that the social contract could be terminated by either party. It was final. Rebellion was not legitimate. This places Grundtvig nearer Hobbes than Locke, because Locke actually accepted the termination of the social contract<sup>76</sup>. This seems a valid point, anyway in practice. Although Grundtvig seems to accept the principal idea of insurrection in connection with the tyrannical rejection of the afore mentioned popular natural rights, it is hard to find a place in Grundtvig's speeches or authorship, where insurrection is actually defended. Grundtvig did not go any higher than occasionally merely explaining insurrections historically.

Overall, Grundtvig drew a great deal from the English constitutional legacy. The developing constitution based on agreements, precedence and legitimacy did not leave much room for excitement over either revolutions or groundbreaking constitutional changes in written form, let alone anarchy.

Grundtvig did, however, recognize the influence legality could have on political legitimacy and showed awareness that the government could be expected to confuse the two. In 1842, when criticizing the governmental prosecution of the Baptist minority, Grundtvig stated that the very *Lex Regia*, he could not see as natural constitution, did obligate the king on the Augsburg Confession, which he argued did not allow religious prosecution<sup>77</sup>. In 1855, Grundtvig criticized the limitation of the Kingdom of Denmark's 1849 Constitution in order to establish a common constitution for the whole Oldenburg Monarchy including the duchies Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenburg. In the Limitation Act it was made possible to *Rigsdagen* to transfer affairs from the jurisdiction of the 1849 Constitution to the authorities of the common constitution by simple majority. Grundtvig's argument was the purely judicial that this did not actually leave any constitution, since all fields of affairs could be transferred and the 1849 Constitution thus become null and void<sup>78</sup>. By this legalist argument, Grundtvig however exactly tried to secure the national unity and the natural constitution, which Grundtvig to some extent in time found in the 1849 Constitution.

### *Grundtvig and the king*

As already stated, Grundtvig saw a strong monarch as an inherent and necessary element in a natural Danish constitution. In *Det Danske Fiirklover* from 1836, Grundtvig described the Danish four-leaf-clover as: King, people, fatherland and mother-tongue<sup>79</sup>. When Grundtvig in 1848 stat-

ed that he would in the Constituent Assembly secure the king his power to do good<sup>80</sup>, this could easily be seen as a parallel to the previous *Rigsdag* in 1660, which had done exactly that. Thus, Grundtvig wished to see the Constituent Assembly not in opposition to the *Rigsdag* in 1660, but in accordance with it.

The king was to Grundtvig a natural authority. The king's authority was grounded not in written constitutions, but in the ancient Danish constitution. Thus, Grundtvig's view on royal authority could easily be seen as linked to a British common law approach. The king was to be the uniting and impartial leading and acting figure listening to the people<sup>81</sup>. In this regard, the king was in Grundtvig's perspective, the opposite of a legislative parliament, which would divide the people into parties, and which Grundtvig, as mentioned below, strongly discouraged. A king would include and unite the people. His skepticism towards the work of the Constituent Assembly in 1848-49 should be seen in the light that Grundtvig saw the advisory assemblies of the estates as established in 1834 as the reestablishment of the ancient and natural Danish constitution<sup>82</sup>.

The necessity of a strong king was, however, not merely to Grundtvig connected to the idea of the natural Danish constitution, but seemingly a criterion universally connected to the monarchical type of government. As mentioned before, Grundtvig's criticism of The Glorious Revolution was especially linked to the weakening of the sovereign – the beginning of a non-desirable withdrawal of the king's freedom to act politically<sup>83</sup>.

This view is further emphasized when combined with his general opposition towards insurrection. Grundtvig's fierce op-

position towards the 1830 Paris Revolt, he based on the arbitrary arguments of the people, which, in Grundtvig's view, were actually based on little else that they had grown tired of Charles 10. By referring to the plentiness and freedom of the French people and the old age of the royal family, he disregarded the rebel argument that the king had acted like a tyrant by violating the Constitution<sup>84</sup>.

Grundtvig's opposition towards insurrection did, however, not inhibit him from having an opinion on the way, a king should act, should «do good». In 1839, Grundtvig even denied the king the right to abuse his power<sup>85</sup>. Grundtvig found several insurrections of history to be, although not justifiable, still explainable.

Firstly, a king should show strength, courage and love. Grundtvig argued that in England, Charles 2. had been too spineless and James II too stiff. The lack of these qualities had to some extent led to The Glorious Revolution<sup>86</sup>.

Secondly, a prince, especially an absolutist one, was obliged to use his strength and power to guard the freedoms of their people. These freedoms had seriously been under attack in England during the 17th century<sup>87</sup>. Grundtvig explained the Paris Rising in 1830 by referring to restrictions on suffrage, which also led Grundtvig to support universal suffrage, not because he principally supported it, he did not, but because a restriction on already given rights could lead to unrest and in the end insurrection towards the king<sup>88</sup>.

On the other hand, he found the necessity of the strong role of the king confirmed in the case that the long parliament during the English Civil War and the liberal victory of The Glorious Revolution had not brought

freedom, but rather abandoned it in regard to the people and the king respectively<sup>89</sup>.

Thirdly, a king should act on ground of reason, thereby also Grundtvig's emphasis on enlightenment. Also here, Grundtvig followed Holberg in his understanding of rationality. Grundtvig emphasized in his writings the reality, often founded on history, rather than foreign theories<sup>90</sup>. Grundtvig criticized the Austrian enlightenment emperor Joseph II for trying to shape his empire without taking reality into account – especially in regard to the national and cultural feelings of his subjects. For instance, the rejection of Joseph to be crowned as king of Hungary, his removal of the Hungarian crown to Vienna, his emphasis on making German the common language and his disregard for the Hungarian representation and constitution showed an unnatural desire to turn the Hungarians into Germans. He compared this to the classic scene in Holberg's *Erasmus Montanus*, when Erasmus by syllogisms seemingly turns his mother into a rock. It had nothing to do with actual constitutional nor national reality<sup>91</sup>.

Making a detour to the political memory of Grundtvig, it is important to understand that the moderate and grundtvigian fraction of the Danish liberal party *Venstre* did actually uphold Grundtvig's focus on the politically active sovereign in the emphasis on the ideal constitution as a cooperation between king and people<sup>92</sup>. The great emphasis in later historical presentations on the constitutional conflict in the last third of the 19<sup>th</sup> century as a conflict between those defending the right of the king to appoint his own government and those promoting parliamentary government has generally overlooked this element.

*Grundtvig and freedom*

Writers on Grundtvig's political views have often treated his views on the political system with care or ambiguousness. This approach has, however, not been used on the description of his views on freedom rights. Here, the presentations have been rather more certain and clear. Especially his views on freedom of religion have been the center of attention and has fostered the implicit or explicit conclusion that Grundtvig's constitutional stand was all about freedom<sup>93</sup>. Although his aspirations for public freedom rights seem to be clearer than his views on the political system, it is also because it is a rather simpler concept. It is a question of more or less freedom, where the design of the political system is left with a far more diverse political landscape. I will get back to this.

Grundtvig did not see his great emphasis on freedom as being in opposition to the position of the king. Instead, it was a matter of reciprocity inherent in the natural Danish constitution between the two fundamental elements in Danish society: King and people. In *Det Danske Fiir-Kløver* from 1836, Grundtvig blamed King Canute the Holy (1080-86) that he had forced Christianity on the people and thereby violated the freedom and conscience of the people. By this disrespect of the voice of the people, Saint Canute himself lost his power by insurrection<sup>94</sup>. The point was that constitutional balance was upheld by keeping king and people, borrowing Grundtvig's words from 1839 «both strong, both free».

Grundtvig's focus on freedom can be divided into two categories: The fundamental human rights, which were not and should not be limited, and the rights, which he

promoted, but also placed within certain boundaries.

On the one hand, Grundtvig had a somewhat natural law approach towards certain freedom rights, thus reality no matter what legislation might dictate. They were, however, not universal, but national. In *Det Danske Fiir-Kløver*, Grundtvig stated «freedom of conscience and trade» as part of the ancient and natural Danish constitution<sup>95</sup>. In *Tidens Tarv og Tidens Brøst* from 1839, he equally stated that the freedoms the people needed in order to live in a civil society was freedom of heart (belief and faith), freedom of spirit (speech, but *not* print) and freedom of trade<sup>96</sup>.

In 1831, Grundtvig stated the right to educational development and the right to practice one's religion, language and tradition as fundamental<sup>97</sup>. The same can be derived from his afore mentioned condemnation of Emperor Joseph II of Austria's politics against the Hungarians<sup>98</sup>. Thereby Grundtvig supported the universal right to continuous education and enlightenment. As will be elaborated on later, Grundtvig saw enlightenment as a goal in itself – on both an individual and a national level. Firmly connected to this ambition, Grundtvig saw liberty of conscience as fundamental as also seen in his afore mentioned description of Canute the Holy.

In his pamphlet on religious prosecution from 1842, Grundtvig from a Protestant point of view argued that religious prosecution was unchristian. He clearly implied Lutheran hypocrisy by stating that religious prosecution would force the prosecuted to become martyrs for a «matter of conscience»<sup>99</sup>. To a just moderately educated Lutheran, this would signify a serious contradiction – that a Lutheran state pros-

ecuted a religious minority on seemingly the same problematic grounds, on which the German emperor Charles 5. had condemned Martin Luther in Worms in 1521. Christianity was to Grundtvig a matter of conscience, which no third party should interfere in<sup>100</sup>. Thus, both religious limitation and prosecution was fundamentally wrong. In the Constituent Assembly, Grundtvig protested against the proposed limitation that religious teachings against decency and public order («Sædeligheden og den offentlige Orden») should be outlawed, since it could easily be overemphasized or even exploited by people of another creed<sup>101</sup>.

In *Politiske Betragtninger* from 1831 as well as in the Constituent Assembly in 1849 Grundtvig claimed that the freedom of trade was the most fundamental and inalienable right. In the Constituent Assembly, Grundtvig proposed to add to the paragraph on freedom of trade that one could not be sentenced for what he had made with his hands. He stated that he found it deeply disturbing, if even only one could be brought to the poorhouse, because he was not allowed to work his trade<sup>102</sup>. Also, individuals could morally, from Grundtvig's point of view, not be put in labor bondage. In the 1840's, Grundtvig sat in a committee on the abolition of slavery in the Danish West Indies. During a debate on the situation on the Danish Caribbean islands after the single-handed liberation of the unfree laborers in 1848 by the Danish governor-general, Grundtvig categorically denied «in the name of myself and [...] all friends of man» that «one could actually obtain full property right over one's fellow men»<sup>103</sup>.

In the discussion on the abolition of the copyhold system (*fæstevæsenet*) in 1851,

Grundtvig as member of *Folketinget* likewise stated «the unshakeable principle that the people own the land and no one rightfully owns the people»<sup>104</sup>.

In the 1850's these principles set Grundtvig in an antagonistic relationship towards the still influential guilds and made him strongly oppose stringent copyright laws. Both was a limitation of free trade. His zeal in this cause was clearly stated in his vote against the Freedom of Trade Law in 1857, because he could not even accept a gradual reduction over five years of the guild privileges. That would, in Grundtvig's view, be to sanction their right to have them<sup>105</sup>.

On the other hand, Grundtvig supported some freedom rights not as universal, principal and fundamental, but to the extent, they were feasible. Thereby, they were not granted in their own right, but with another ideological goal. In this regard, Grundtvig saw the freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

In *Politiske Betragtninger*, Grundtvig argued that the use of this freedom should be well-regulated and not too restrictive. Thus, his continuous attacks on the Freedom of the Press Regulation of 1799, which limited politically oppositional utterings, were not initially led by his want to broaden it, but to make it understandable, so it was clear, what was unlawful and what was not<sup>106</sup>.

When Grundtvig saw this limitation to be relevant, it was, because freedom of speech and freedom of the press were not goals in themselves. In good accordance with the initial idea behind the rather liberal press regulation in absolutist Denmark the purpose of these freedoms was enlightenment in order to secure as good government as possible. Did the rights not meet these goals, they should be limited to a

group, which would secure such enlightenment, Grundtvig found.

Historian Jes Fabricius Møller has problematized the seemingly incompatibility between Grundtvig's emphasis on freedom of the press and Grundtvig's criticism of Johann Friedrich Struensee, who introduced freedom of the press in Denmark in 1770<sup>107</sup>. Møller explains this discrepancy by focusing on the difference between the young Grundtvig, who condemned Struensee in *Verdenskrøniken* in 1812, and the older Grundtvig, who in *Politiske Betragtninger* from 1831 promoted a well-organized freedom of the press. However, Grundtvig did also condemn Struensee's slavish theoretical, and German, reforms in *Danskeren* in 1849<sup>108</sup>. A more explaining solution would be that Struensee's legislation on press freedom was simply not well-organized, since it was rashly introduced and without boundaries. It did therefore not actually enlighten, but caused «all kinds of filth» and «propagated disbelief and spinelessness»<sup>109</sup>. The goal of actual enlightenment demanded that the partakers in public debate was actually enlightened.

As was the case with the composition of parliament, as we shall see, Grundtvig found it easier to limit the granting of this freedom, than to limit the freedom itself. In *Politiske Betragtninger*, he limited the broadness of the freedom of the press to «a reasonable number of pen masters, who with good reason can be expected to unite the writing skills of all the people»<sup>110</sup>. Confronted with plenty of misuse of the freedom of the press, Grundtvig argued that only educated people of a legal age could be granted this privilege<sup>111</sup>. On the other hand, «the forbidden trees» of these «pen masters» should be as few as possible<sup>112</sup>. This

fits well with Grundtvig's goal of the freedom of uttering. By limiting the broadness of the freedom to the enlightened, but not the freedom itself, society secured only enlightened answers, but to all questions.

This seemingly elitist statement should, however, be seen in a meritocratic light. Grundtvig's emphasis on public education – by public lectures and folk high schools – was his solution on a broader freedom of uttering. In his demand that only learned men be granted the freedom of uttering, he saw also an encouragement that more people got educated<sup>113</sup>. This was in line with his skepticism towards too broad a suffrage, as shall be further elaborated in the next section. Clearly demonstrated that the right was not abused, it could stay the same. However, in the 1830's, Grundtvig thought the freedom of the press to be abused<sup>114</sup>.

On the other hand, in 1831 he herein saw an argument against a parliamentary element in the constitution. If a parliament could bring the same degree of enlightenment into government as was the freedom of the press, the freedom of the press would seem unnecessary. Thus, Grundtvig saw in the demand for a decisive parliament an attack on the freedom of the press rather than a defense of it<sup>115</sup>. This helps explain Grundtvig's fear of a constitutional monarchy in 1849. Placed in a choice between parliament and freedom, he chose freedom.

Thus, Grundtvig's support of freedom of religion and freedom of uttering is of such a diverse nature that they can hardly be linked. An explanation on Grundtvig's diverse views is to be found in the different epistemological instruments used by man in regard to religion and enlightenment. The tool of political and societal cognition

was reason, the tool of religious belief was conscience. The former could be contested, the latter could not. It was a possibility to limit press freedom in order to get only enlightened answers to participate in the contest. To limit religious freedom was to limit conscience, which was, in a Lutheran world, hypocrisy.

### *Grundtvig and parliament*

As we have seen, Grundtvig continuously supported a strong and active royal power as well as a free public opinion, the latter as far as it benefitted to further enlightenment. His views on political assemblies, however, seemingly became the object of an otherwise considerable change from the 1830's to his death in 1872. In *Politiske Betragtninger* from 1831, he stated on parliaments that «all the expectations you connect with them are airy, but all the inconveniences, which follow and the danger linked to them are real»<sup>116</sup>. He even argued that one of the few limits on the freedom of uttering should be the support of a politically independent parliament<sup>117</sup>. This could be to get on the good side of the censorship, but it could also be seen as the logical consequence of Grundtvig's argument that parliaments created «more confusion than enlightenment» and thus, parliaments did not correspond with the goal of freedom of uttering, which was enlightenment<sup>118</sup>.

Grundtvig's fear was that a legislative parliament would cause division between parties and thus risk to undermine the national unity and blinded by party strife work in the opposite direction than the common good<sup>119</sup>. In *Danskeren* 1848, he wrote:

[...] every government, which wants to rest securely on the popular opinion, has to place the honor and benefit of the fatherland first, above all party matters, [...] and thereafter it has to keep the public debate open, in the people's council and the daily press, about what in any given case is dignifying and beneficial for the fatherland, so that the parties in the gathering of words have free space (fair play)<sup>120</sup>.

This would both strengthen possibilities of the independent members of parliament, but also the enlightenment of the government to the benefit of the nation. In his capacity of member of the Constituent Assembly, Grundtvig also refused to belong to a party other than that of the Danish people<sup>121</sup>.

Since the Danish national movement to a large degree defined themselves as liberals, Grundtvig's views differed seriously because of the idea that the national identity could be weakened by a legislative assembly.

It is interesting in this regard that Grundtvig in a pamphlet addressed to the Norwegian public abstained from taking any stand towards the Norwegian political system. This could be explained by the very different circumstances in the two nations. Grundtvig had no interest in creating conflict between his constitutional opinions and Norwegian constitutional monarchy. A major difference, however, was also, that the Danish king was a Dane, but the Norwegian king was the Swedish king. Thereby, the king was not as obvious a warranty for national unity as in Denmark and constitutionalism maybe more relevant<sup>122</sup>.

Few months after the publication of *Politiske Betragtninger* in early 1831, king Frederik 6. proclaimed that he was to establish four advisory assemblies of the estates throughout his monarchy. The assemblies

of the estates, which existed from 1834 to 1848, were not legislative, but merely advisory. A sceptic at first, Grundtvig became a firm celebrator of the assemblies and believed, as mentioned, that this was the rebirth of the ancient Danish constitution<sup>123</sup>. Regularly, he published a song or poem in connection with May 28th – the date in 1831, where Frederik 6. had published the regulation, which proclaimed the establishment of the assemblies.

Also, the poem «The hand of the king and the voice of the people» from 1839, which stands as a corner stone of Grundtvig's constitutional thought, was written for a celebration of these assemblies. In it, he described the assemblies as Frederik 6.'s giving the people its voice back<sup>124</sup>.

This excitement of an advisory assembly in an absolutist system can be hard to understand today. Nonetheless, the historian Hans Jensen argued that the assemblies had a serious and real impact on the royal government in the years of its activity<sup>125</sup>. Thus, the system which was to be abolished in 1848 and which Grundtvig saw as the incarnation of the natural Danish constitution, was in 1848 not just an institution in some accordance with Grundtvig's historicized imagination of a Germanic ideal society, but an institution, which had actually succeeded on its own terms. It had contributed to the public opinion, which the king had taken into account in his administration. The larger also Grundtvig's anger, disappointment and opposition when confronted with the victorious constitutional aspirations of spring 1848. In this light, Vilhelm Birkedal's often quoted description of Grundtvig in March 1848 as «a lion snorting in his cage» is hardly surprising nor necessary of any excuse or justification<sup>126</sup>.

The end goal for Grundtvig's initial idea for a Danish public high school (*folkehøjskole*) was to establish an institution for the education of the future members of the estate assemblies and the development of public acquisition of the assemblies. Grundtvig in 1848 now drew the conclusions that firstly the broader and more direct popular influence on politics would demand the more constraint from the public and secondly would leave his public high school project the more important. The new government, however, did not support it.

In the Constituent Assembly, Grundtvig with his strong skepticism of constitutionalism left himself at the periphery of the constitutional discussion on two crucial points.

Firstly, by stating that he did not find that a parliament should deal with the laws as juridical documents, but only with the fundamental principles in law. Grundtvig in practice accepted a large room for governmental interpretation<sup>127</sup>.

This did not correspond with the contemporary liberal view on constitutionalism as defined by the rule of law in contrast to the rule of mercy, which constituted absolutism. Grundtvig's indifference towards this principle was also expressed in his proposal to end the work of the Constituent Assembly by simply abolishing the *Lex Regia* and the 1799 Press Freedom Regulation without suggesting any replacement.

The second point which marginalized Grundtvig from the rest of The Constituent Assembly was the composition of the parliament. This topic was of no serious interest to him.

This perspective is confirmed by his later political activity, where he seldom took part in such discussions also in regard with

the intense debates on local assemblies in the 1850s<sup>128</sup>. Thereby, he was in opposition to the dominating public opinion, which focused very much on the composition of the different elected or selected assemblies.

In 1831, Grundtvig explained this future abstention in the debate by stating that it was impossible to make a broadly accepted parliament composition<sup>129</sup>. In the Constituent Assembly, after years of public discussion on the topic, Grundtvig argued that this issue could not be solved without risking serious national division:

[...] this case has outside this House become a party issue, such one even that one could say that it has become an apple of discord between almost the whole population<sup>130</sup>.

Grundtvig's participation in this debate on parliamentary composition limited to four rather consistent, but negatively defined principles:

Firstly, Grundtvig did not find that the composition of parliament was a matter for the constitution<sup>131</sup>. In this regard, he gained support from the former minister of War and prominent liberal politician A.F. Tscherning, which stated that the issue could become more central in the debates than it was feasible<sup>132</sup>. Grundtvig saw the profound disagreement on this topic to be a serious threat to national division – or that a decision on the subject could be made too rashly. Instead, such an institution should be based on a firm understanding of reality as in Great Britain, not on ideological basis<sup>133</sup>.

In the Constituent Assembly, Grundtvig's proposal to abandon the issue altogether and leave it for later gained the votes of three members in favor, 118 was against<sup>134</sup>.

Secondly, he spoke against royally selected members of the Constituent Assembly<sup>135</sup>. As earlier mentioned, this clouded the *Rigsdag's* demand on being an actual representation of the people<sup>136</sup>. He openly questioned the ability of The Constituent Assembly to pass regular laws, because of its motley composition – in other words: Because it was not all popular elected<sup>137</sup>. Thus, his promotion of the free hand of the king and the free voice of people demanded that it was possible to recognize the one from the other.

Thirdly, he opposed the idea of bicameralism. Grundtvig stated that «one does not at all drive better with one runaway horse and one obstinate than with two of either»<sup>138</sup>. Grundtvig discarded the idea that the wealthy part of the population should be a better warranty of conservative interests than the less fortunate. The broad argument, which also to some degree won the day, that the personal independence was more present in the wealthy group, Grundtvig found a feeble argument. It was not enough, since they did not necessarily represent patriotism<sup>139</sup>. He seriously problematized the strong bicameralism of the 1849 Constitution, where the upper house had an absolute veto, which, Grundtvig noted, was unprecedented in any other upper house<sup>140</sup>.

Fourthly, he spoke against a limitation of the universal suffrage as it was introduced in the elections for the Constituent Assembly<sup>141</sup>. He accepted that the granting of a broad suffrage was no mistake, since it had not been misused. Only it was a problem that it was not broader, because subjects outside the limitations could now argue that they should be included in the suffrage<sup>142</sup>.

It is worth a thought that the suffrage in Denmark by the 1849 Constitution became considerable in an international perspective. Few contemporaries would argue that Grundtvig was a radical, therefore this argument, if in accordance with Grundtvig's previous standpoints, should rather be seen as a criticism that universal suffrage at all had been introduced and the assemblies of the estates abolished.

Grundtvig repeated his argument in 1866. Condemning the 1830 Paris Revolt in 1831, it is interesting that Grundtvig in 1866 used one of the sources of unrest in his argument: His opposition against limiting the already granted suffrage was based on the actions of the last Bourbons, who had done exactly that, causing dissatisfaction and riot. Also in 1838, he had criticized the last Bourbons of trying to make «the free voice of the people [...] to merely a shadow» in order to re-establish the ancient regime, thereby explaining the July Revolution of 1830<sup>143</sup>.

This, however, very clearly states that it was a matter of state stability rather than a principal approving of the universal suffrage. As with the freedom rights, Grundtvig did not see any principal wrong in the limitation in the group granted liberties.

This, Grundtvig also showed in the 1850s, when he criticized that the government tried to include still more fields of responsibility under the more conservative 1855 Constitution covering the whole monarchy including the German lands<sup>144</sup>. The focus was not here the defense of the liberal 1849 Constitution in opposition to the more conservative 1855 Constitution, it was on the defense of the right of the Danish institutions to manage Danish affairs and rejecting any kind of German influence. His

limited confidence in the legislative body came to light in Grundtvig's criticism that the division of the affairs was regulated by simple law instead of constitutionally secured.

Rather, the leading motive in Grundtvig's approach towards parliament was national unity. He saw a decisive and bicameral parliament and a limitation of the already granted suffrage as a stepping-stone towards party division and thereby national conflict. Already in 1831, Grundtvig had argued that a parliament was in no way an instrument of mediation and conciliation, but rather the cause of division<sup>145</sup>. From his first days as a politician, Grundtvig made it clear that he belonged only to one party: The Danish people<sup>146</sup>. This statement should, however, probably also be understood as an implicit accusations towards other Danish politicians, the party men.

Thus, his focus in the discussions on parliament was to try to lead the parties together. This is also clearly seen in his own composition proposal, which Grundtvig seemingly felt forced to elaborate during his time in the Constituent Assembly. He argued that the parliament should consist of two chambers, *Bytinget* (the urban gathering) and *Landstinget* (the rural gathering), which together made up *Folketinget* (the gathering of the people)<sup>147</sup>.

The purpose of this divide was to prove that there was no conflict in the Danish nation, that the often problematized clash of interest between country side and urban areas was not real. This was to be done by clearly stating through the divide that they were in fact in agreement. However, he still opposed bicameralism, anyway in its strong form.

In this regard, Grundtvig spoke himself into a contemporary tendency. In the ongoing European discussion on composition of parliament, the division between urban and rural society became increasingly relevant. The threat agricultural society faced from urbanization and the self-confidence of the still larger bourgeoisie as well as the increasing political self-awareness of the rural commoners consolidated the divide. It was a similar conflict of interest, Grundtvig sought to bridge by his proposal.

In Grundtvig's proposal, one can see certain similarities with the Norwegian 1814 parliament, where the two chambers too could end up voting together in the case of repeating disagreement<sup>148</sup>. The difference is important, however:

The Norwegian *Storting* was selected by one election of all the electorate. Thereafter the *Storting* selected a fourth of its members to constitute the upper house, the *Lagting*, the other three fourths made up the lower house, the *Odelsting*<sup>149</sup>. In Grundtvig's proposal, the electorate was initially divided and the parliament afterwards united. Thus, the Norwegian constitution did not recognize such a popular divide in its composition as Grundtvig meant to bridge.

In the contemporary debate on the composition of parliament, one can locate a divide between what could be called an idealistic and a materialistic approach<sup>150</sup>. The idealistic approach was represented by those who found that the representation generally and the upper house specifically should give voice to enlightened and educated perspectives in order to get the best political outcome. This view was to a high degree represented in the Danish Constituent Assembly and ended up shaping the final composition. Thus, the member P.D.

Bruun in motivating what ended as the successful compromise on the subject, argued that indirect elections to the upper house would secure intelligence and liberal education (*Dannelse, Bildung*)<sup>151</sup>.

Members nurturing the materialistic perspective, however, refused the possibility of appealing to the higher qualities in the human race and suggested to compose the parliament in such a fashion that the driving interests in society was represented and able to check each other.

In political theory, an example on a materialistic perspective is the slavery-apologist and Southern U.S. politician John C. Calhoun (1782-1850). In his posthumously published constitutional works, he argued that constitutional government should be based not on numerical majority, but concurrent majority – that both amalgamated blocks of interest in a society should have a veto in political decisions<sup>152</sup>.

Calhoun's seemingly principal statements spoke clearly into the actual strife between the industrial North and the slave-holding agricultural South. Although the American conflict was extreme, Calhoun's theories were founded in a clearly divided society, similar in character, although not in degree, to the divide commonly recognized in Danish society anno 1849 between agrarian and urban interests.

Calhoun's interest representation has been interpreted as an attempt to secure political consensus and national unity in a strongly divided society, because the mutual veto would make conflict fruitless<sup>153</sup>. Although Grundtvig's aim was the same, his approach was the opposite. His proposal in 1849 to make a divide between urban and rural society showed an immense confidence in the national unity, since he

believed that this parting of the parliament would show exactly that the rural-urban divide was not existing and only imagined.

Grundtvig would not leave either of the parts with a veto, but the separation of the two chambers would, in Grundtvig's view, make it clear that no such conflict of interest actually existed. The national unity would prevail.

The composition proposal, Grundtvig ended up supporting limited the suffrage for the upper house to an interest representation for wealthier citizens: larger farmers and tenant farmers or industrialists as well as owners and tenants of buildings and apartments of some value. It was posed by C.N. David, H.P. Hansen, J.E. Larsen, Carl de Neergaard, Tage Algreen-Ussing and A.S. Ørsted, all leading politicians of the extreme right. Grundtvig explicitly distanced himself from another proposal by the same crowd, which did not limit the suffrage, but the eligibility<sup>154</sup>. It corresponds well with the previous stated principle that Grundtvig did not see boundaries in the granting of a liberty or right as a problem, while the curtailment of this granted liberty and right was highly problematic. The proposal fell with 27 for and 97 against. This was no slim defeat and probably labelled as too conservative for most of the assembly<sup>155</sup>. This approach seriously problematizes the argument from the *Venstre* tradition and inherent in the 2008 democracy canon that Grundtvig voted against the 1849 Constitution, because it did not go far enough. The focus in this regard had been that it was because of the limitation on eligibility<sup>156</sup>. However, Grundtvig did not find any principal problem in limiting the electorate in the same instance.

This materialistic approach based on interests rather than the appeal to education and enlightenment had a limited success in Denmark in 1849 with the academically dominated national liberal party playing a key role. After the national defeat in 1864 and the following national liberal loss of authority, the materialistic approach, however, became a leading principle in the 1866 Constitutional Reform in Denmark<sup>157</sup>.

### *Concluding remarks*

In essence, a constitution to Grundtvig was a dynamic whole constituted by institutions and their mutual actions. It was always present in society and not necessarily closely linked to a written basic law. Societal stability and the common good, which was a key issue to Grundtvig, depended on the constitutional foundation in the national and historical circumstances of a given society. This in itself disconnected the constitutional debate from a common principal discussion based on classical political literature. Rather, Grundtvig found his ideal, the strong king in cooperation with a free people, in ancient Danish literature.

The national premises on which the stable constitution was based, however, made the constitution the more vulnerable to national division. In the intensified political environment in the middle of the 19th century, especially during the civil war of 1848-1851, this was highly accentuated in Grundtvig's political standpoint.

Thus, in the constitutional system in general and in a decision-making parliament specifically, Grundtvig saw a serious threat to national unity because of the an-

ticipated and already developing party formation. Such national division was directly opposed to Grundtvig's aspirations within education and enlightenment, in which public lectures and his folk high school project in Sorø should help to inform and excite the public about the popular community. Grundtvig's emphasis on the balance of both these elements also nurtured his scepticism about the easily excitable mob, which is also visible in his political works<sup>158</sup>.

Thus, at least until 1849, Grundtvig saw a broad and decisive popular government in opposition to his key enlightenment project, not in correspondence with it. In 1855 and 1866, he defended the 1849 Constitution, but in both, it was on national, not liberal grounds. In 1855 because the German elements of the monarchy gained influence on common affairs, in 1866 in regard to the thread of national stability, if people had their suffrage taken from them. The latter argument, he had also used in 1849. Grundtvig was not principally against the limitation of admission to neither freedom nor suffrage.

However, it is correct that Grundtvig to a fierce degree rejected the limitation of rights and freedoms to the ones, who this was already granted. He did also not accept, what I have called, the idealistic parliamentary approach that materialistic criteria could to some degree guarantee the presence of *dannelse* (*Bildung*, liberal education) in parliament. In 1849, this was the winning principle. He did, though, accept the materialistic parliamentary approach that materialistic criteria could be the foundation for a representation of interest<sup>159</sup>.

Freedom of the press and freedom of writing was means to a higher goal: En-

lightenment. It was not in itself as the freedom of trade and freedom of religion morally good or necessary in itself, but was in Grundtvig's view to be measured on its use. Therefore, he also accepted that both the freedom of speech and the right of suffrage required a certain level of enlightenment of the ones using it. Thus, his skepticism upon the meeting with the 1848 revolution – often described by the friend Vilhelm Birkedal's words that Grundtvig «snorted like a lion in his cage»<sup>160</sup> – is easily understood. The people did not have the necessary enlightenment.

This difference within Grundtvig's freedom views, also seriously questions the tendency in the historiography to see freedom of religion and the different freedoms of uttering as intimately linked<sup>161</sup>. They dwelled on fundamentally different conditions. Whereas freedom of religion was a matter of conscience and in Grundtvig's view impossible to limit for a good Lutheran, the freedoms of uttering could be limited in as far as they did not in regard to broadness meet the goal of enlightenment.

Jes Fabricius Møller states that the freedom of writing and press in Grundtvig's view was the most important of the rights<sup>162</sup>. How this measurement should be done, is of course a matter of discussion, but anyway it was neither a matter of natural right nor beneficial in itself. In contrast, freedom of religion as well as also the freedom of trade in order for anyone to make a decent living were fundamental and unconditional rights.

Although his skepticism towards the 1848 political upheavals, Grundtvig soon accepted the course, which the political developments had taken. Nonetheless, his words and deeds in 1848 seem to signal

that it was by necessity and with no small amount of scepticism. To his dear friend, the dowager queen Caroline Amalie, he expressed the immediate necessity of raising and educating the people, in order to make it «overall wise and graceful masters». In his speech on March 14<sup>th</sup> – one week before the rising came to Denmark – he invoked ancient and renaissance pursuit of virtue in stating that it now was not enough to have *one* king, but he wished now to see «sheer small kings», mastering «the noblest of all arts: the royal art to restrain oneself»<sup>163</sup>.

Thus, Grundtvig was no celebrator of constitutionalism, let alone democracy. His political objective was the best possible government based on history, impartiality and enlightenment. He saw by far absolutism as the best warranty in this regard, especially because of its national and historic roots. Confronted with constitutionalism based on universal suffrage, he did not see it possible to limit or eradicate it and the only possibility remained an overall education project of the public. As Tine Damsholt has drawn forward, Grundtvig as late as in 1850 did, however, still hold that the estate constitution was the natural Danish constitution, as he stated that he did not want to let himself budge on his views by the *Zeitgeist*<sup>164</sup>.

Since Danish constitutional history has over time had an increasingly formalized approach, this has made it necessary to link Grundtvig firmly to his not very profound contributions to Danish constitutional development – especially the one paragraph that Grundtvig actually got included in the 1849 Constitution about orality in judicial procedure<sup>165</sup>. Such a focus has led to an overemphasis on this sole element in an analysis of Grundtvig as a constitutional thinker.

I would argue that this is a misrepresentation on Grundtvig's constitutional views. Firstly, Grundtvig had a firm understanding of the role of nationality in establishing and consolidating a popular constitutional rule. Secondly, Grundtvig understood the inherent danger in popular rule that the legislative role of parliament would increase the party division. Thirdly, Grundtvig understood the informal strength of opinion in political reality. He showed this in his support to the estate constitution, because he found that the free voice of the people, even without formal political decisive power, would have political influence. The political reality of the estate assemblies shows that he was right<sup>166</sup>.

As he did in theology, Grundtvig also saw the congregation rather than the text as a starting point in politics<sup>167</sup>. Constitutional conditions derived from the actual relationship between public and institutions, not least the king. Written constitutional texts did only, in good British tradition, mean anything to Grundtvig in as far as it had connection with this living constitutional relationship.

Within his historical works, Grundtvig seriously emphasized his own constitutional views in his interpretation of the political development. It probably makes little sense to ask, if Grundtvig's historical interpretation was grounded upon his political views or the other way around. Nevertheless, Grundtvig founded his constitutional views to a high degree on particular national historical analysis.

Tine Damsholt has portrayed previous Grundtvig research with a tendency to adapt Grundtvig to contemporary democratic standard by arguing that he changed his position over time. In opposition to this view,

Damsholt claims Grundtvig's consistency in a changing time, in which he had adapted, not changed, his views in order to make them fit into the political reality<sup>168</sup>. This article has reached the conclusion that although Grundtvig changed his focus, he did not change his fundamental views: Fundamental rights were the freedom of trade and freedom of conscience, and both the cause and purpose of good government was the national unity and the pursuit of enlightenment. However, that Grundtvig should have nurtured the idea that the people was the real sovereign, as Damsholt also claims, is considerably harder to see. As Jes Fabricius Møller has suggested, Grundtvig's ideas were closer to Hobbes than to Locke or Rousseau<sup>169</sup>. His contract theory perspec-

tive left him on the spot, where people and king could build each other up, but did not have a right to tear each other down.

<sup>1</sup> I want to thank Katrine Frøkjær Baunvig, Lisbet Christoffersen, Lone Kølle Martinsen, Niels Riisager, Steen Tullberg and Henrik Yde for constructive conversations on the topic.

<sup>2</sup> J.L. Wendel-Hansen, "Alle vil være på hold med Grundtvig", i: *Weekendavisen*, Ideer, December 9th 2022, pp. 12-13, Møller, Jes Fabricius, *Grundtvigs død*, Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 2019, pp. 7-11. For Grundtvig's influence on Danish popular national culture, see the considerable amount of references in Adriansen 2003. I. Adriansen, *Nationale Symboler i Det Danske Rige 1830-2000*, vol. I-II, Museum Tusculanum Forlag, 2003, vol. II, p. 678.

<sup>3</sup> *Demokratikanon*, Undervisningsministeriet, 2008, <<https://static.uvm.dk/Publikationer/2008/demokratikanon/index.html>>, p. 44, (30.10.2023).

<sup>4</sup> These are at present being published in the digital edition

*Grundtvigs Værker* on <[www.grundtvigsvaerker.dk](http://www.grundtvigsvaerker.dk)> by the Grundtvig Study Centre at Aarhus University (30.10.2023). The author of this article works as an edition philologist at this project and has as his primary focus Grundtvig's parliamentary speeches.

<sup>5</sup> Based on count in the hymn book register. *Den Danske Salmebog*, Det Kgl. Vajsenhus' Forlag, 1<sup>st</sup> edition, 5<sup>th</sup> print, 2005, pp. 1348-1349.

<sup>6</sup> A. Holm, *Grundtvig. En introduktion*, FILO, 2019, p. 155. Knud J.V., Jespersen, *Historien om danskerne 1500-2000*, Gyldendal, 2007, s. 305.

<sup>7</sup> G. Christensen, G. Stener (eds.), *Breve fra og til N.F.S. Grundtvig*, vol. II, Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1926, p. 476. Bjørn 2007, p. 57.

<sup>8</sup> T. Lyngby, S. Mentz, S. Olden-Jørgensen, *Magt & pragt. Enevælde 1660-1848*, Gads Forlag, 2010, pp. 41-52, 76-80.

<sup>9</sup> M. Rackwitz, *Märzrevolution in Kiel 1848. Erhebung gegen Dänemark und Aufbruch zur Demokratie*, Boyens, 2011, pp. 10-11.

<sup>10</sup> Rackwitz, *Märzrevolution in Kiel 1848* cit., p. 11. R. Glenthøj, *1864. Sønner af de Slagne*, Gads Forlag, 2014, p. 120ff.

<sup>11</sup> Grundtvig, N.F.S., *Politiske Betragtninger med Blik paa Danmark og Holsteen*, Wahlske Boghandels Forlag, 1831, after, *Grundtvigs Værker*, vers. 1.19, 2022, <[http://www.grundtvigsvaerker.dk/tekstvisning/8587/o#\(%22o%22:o,%22vo%22:o,%22k%22:1\)>](http://www.grundtvigsvaerker.dk/tekstvisning/8587/o#(%22o%22:o,%22vo%22:o,%22k%22:1)>) (30.10.2023).

<sup>12</sup> H. Jensen, *De danske Stænderforsamlings Historie 1830-1848*, vol. II, J.H. Schultz Forlag, 1934, p. 100.

<sup>13</sup> Grundtvig, N.F.S., "28de Mai", in: *28de Mai i det Danske Samfund*, Copenhagen, 1839(a), pp. 7-8, after, *Grundtvigs Værker*, vers. 1.19, 2022, <[http://www.grundtvigsvaerker.dk/tekstvisning/26638/o#\(%22o%22:o,%22k%22:o\)>](http://www.grundtvigsvaerker.dk/tekstvisning/26638/o#(%22o%22:o,%22k%22:o)>)

- (30.10.2023).
- <sup>14</sup> H. Vammen, "Casino 1848" in: *Historisk Tidsskrift*, vol. 88, No. 2, Den danske historiske Forening, 1988, pp. 253-281.
- <sup>15</sup> C. Bjørn, *Grundtvig som politiker*, publ. by Thorkild C. Lyby, Anis, 2007, p. 105. The author of this article has worked out a complete, but still unpublished list of Grundtvig's proposals in the Constituent Assembly, 45 in all. Please contact the author on jwh@cas.au.dk if interested.
- <sup>16</sup> Glenthøj, 1864. cit., p. 182ff, 217-218.
- <sup>17</sup> Grundtvig, N.F.S.: "Den danske Nødvendighed", in *Dannebrog*, June 17<sup>th</sup> 1853.
- <sup>18</sup> N. Neergaard, *Under Junigrundloven. En fremstilling af det danske folks politiske historie fra 1848 til 1866*, vol. II, Gyldendalske Boghandel – Nordisk Forlag, 1916, pp. 1825-1831.
- <sup>19</sup> F. Hammerich, *Grundtvig og Det forenede Venstre. En Redegørelse og et Vidnesbyrd*, Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1875, p. 51: "Hos ham blev den nøgne virkelighed undertiden ikke set for idealets glans, men hos det [Venstre] er idealet blevet som borte i lutter nøgne, rå virkeligheder. [...] Han tænkte først og sidst på folket og åndsmagten, mens det ikke har tanker for andet end almue og mængde og flertalsmagt."
- <sup>20</sup> H. Begtrup, *Det Danske Folks Historie i det 19. Aarhundrede*, vol. 3, Gyldendalske Boghandel. Nordisk Forlag, 1911-13, p. 539. P. Dam, *Politikeren Grundtvig*, Aros, 1983, pp. 34, 87, 90. *Demokratikanon* 2008, p. 44. R. Skovmand, *Folketingsrets Fødsel 1830-1870*, Politikens Forlag, 1964, pp. 282, 506.
- <sup>21</sup> N. Neergaard, *Under Junigrundloven. En fremstilling af det danske folks politiske historie fra 1848 til 1866*, vol. I, P.G. Philipsens Forlag, 1892, pp. 376, 385, 412, 416-417.
- <sup>22</sup> Neergaard, *Under Junigrundloven* cit., p. 1828.
- <sup>23</sup> J. Kondrup, "1. Tidligere store udgaver af Grundtvigs værker", in: *au.dk*, March 2008, <<https://grundtvigcenteret.au.dk/grundtvigs-værker/edition/tidludgaver>> (30.10.2023).
- <sup>24</sup> A. Thorsøe, *Kong Frederik den Syvendes Regering*, vol. I, Gyldendalske Boghandels Forlag, 1884, pp. 537, 563.
- <sup>25</sup> *Nestved Tidende*, January 18<sup>th</sup> 1884, p. 1.
- <sup>26</sup> Wendel-Hansen, "Alle vil være på hold med Grundtvig" cit., Korsgaard, Ove, "Den republikanske Grundtvig", in: M. Lone Kølbe (ed.), *Den store mand. Nye fortællinger om Grundtvig*, Gads Forlag, 2022, pp. 152-167, p. 153.
- <sup>27</sup> Holm, *Grundtvig* cit., pp. 160-161, 164-166.
- <sup>28</sup> Grundtvig, N.F.S., *Danskeren, et Ugeblad*, F.H. Eibe, 1848(a), after, *Grundtvigs Værker*, vers. 1.16, 2020. <[http://www.grundtvigs-værker.dk/tekstvisning/22779/0#\(%22o%22:o,%22vo%22:o,%22k%22:1\)>](http://www.grundtvigs-værker.dk/tekstvisning/22779/0#(%22o%22:o,%22vo%22:o,%22k%22:1)>), p. 85 (30.10.2023), jf. K. Thaning, *Grundtvig og Den Grundlovgivende Rigsforsamling*, in: *Grundtvig-Studier*, No. 2, 1949, pp. 35-73, p. 36 og Johansen, Steen, *Bibliografi over N.F.S. Grundtvigs skrifter*, vol. II, 1837-49, Gyldendal, 1950, vol. II, p. 329. Larsen, Esben Lunde, *Frihed for Løke saavel som for Thor. N.F.S. Grundtvigs syn på åndelig frihed i historisk og aktuelt perspektiv*, unpublished dissertation, University of Copenhagen, 2012, pp. 191-193.
- <sup>29</sup> Dam, *Politikeren Grundtvig* cit., pp. 21-23. Larsen, *Frihed for Løke* cit., p. 193, see J.F. Møller, "Grundtvigs betydning for samfundet", in: *Grundtvig-Studier*, No 66, 2015, pp. 103-130, p. 114.
- <sup>30</sup> Holm, *Grundtvig* cit., pp. 157, 162. T. Damsholt, "'Jeg er en gammel Royalist, det ved De nok'. Elementer i Grundtvigs politiske tænkning", in: *Grundtvig-Studier*, 1995, pp. 140-162, p. 154-156.
- <sup>31</sup> Thaning, *Grundtvig og Den Grundlovgivende* cit., p. 37. Damsholt, "'Jeg er en gammel Royalist, det ved De nok' cit., pp. 140-162, p. 157. Holm, *Grundtvig*, p. 157.
- <sup>32</sup> *Demokratikanon* 2008, p. 44. Al-so *Nestved Tidende*, January 18<sup>th</sup> 1884, p. 1 and Andersen, Poul, *Grundtvig som Rigsdagsmand og andre Afhandlinger*, Gyldendalske Boghandel – Nordisk Forlag, 1940, p. 53; implied N. Lindberg, *Grundtvigs politiske Stade*, R. Nielsen, 1876, p. 3.
- <sup>33</sup> Neergaard, *Under Junigrundloven* cit., p. 442 (the footnote).
- <sup>34</sup> Dam, *Politikeren* cit., p. 58-59. Bjørn, *Grundtvig* cit., p. 96-97, 105. Also Andersen, *Grundtvigs som Rigsdagsmand* cit., 1940, p. 42.
- <sup>35</sup> Damsholt, "'Jeg er en gammel Royalist' cit., p. 156.
- <sup>36</sup> Holm, *Grundtvig* cit., p. 157.
- <sup>37</sup> Lindberg, *Grundtvigs* cit., p. 3. *Nestved Tidende*, January 18<sup>th</sup> 1884, p. 1.
- <sup>38</sup> Andersen, *Grundtvig som Rigsdagsmand* cit., p. 40.
- <sup>39</sup> Dam, *Politikeren*, cit., pp. 21-23.
- <sup>40</sup> Grundtvig, *Danskeren, et Ugeblad* cit., p. 370.
- <sup>41</sup> *Beretning om Forhandlingerne paa Rigsdagen*, Kgl. Hofbogtrykker Bianco Luno, 1848-49, 1849, col. 1797.
- <sup>42</sup> *Beretning om Forhandlingerne* cit., col. 1566: "Det er nemlig klart for mig, fordi jeg ikke staaer i den Formening, at Kongens Enevoldsmagt, der i Ordets ligefremme danske Betydning kun siger, at al Folkemagt kun kan øves af ham og for ham; denne Enevoldsmagt, siger jeg, beroer ikke paa den Kongelov, som Frederik den Fjerde udgav, men beroer paa den Overdragelse fra Folket, som skete til Kong Frederik den Tredie, saa at den ikke bortfalder med Kongeloven; det er ikke denne, men det er kun den eensidige og nu uataalelige Paastand om Ret til en uindskrænket og lunefuld Anvendelse af Enevoldsmagten. Ligesaadan er det med Arveretten; thi den Arveret, som Frederik den Tredies Efterkommere have til Danmarks Throne, det er kun den, som blev Frederik den Tredie overdraget tilligemed Enevoldsmagten, og hvad der vilde bortfalde ved Kongelovens

- Ophævelse, det var kun den eensidige og uforvarsrlige faste Arvegang, der kunde, endog i en nær Fremtid, bringe Danmark til som Arvegods og Bytte at falde i sine arrigste Fjenders Hænder".
- <sup>43</sup> Beretning om Forhandlingerne cit., col. 1565, jf. Bjørn, *Grundtvig* cit., p. 84.
- <sup>44</sup> Grundtvig, *Danskeren, et Ugeblad* cit., p. 85.
- <sup>45</sup> S. Gordon, *Controlling the State. Constitutionalism from Ancient Athens to Today*, Harvard University Press, 2002, p. 5. J.-E. Lane, *Constitutions and political theory*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Manchester University Press, 2011, p. 1-2.
- <sup>46</sup> Grundtvig, *Danskeren, et Ugeblad* cit., p. 490, jf. Thaning, *Grundtvig og Den Grundlovgivende*, cit., p. 45: "med en ægte Dansk Grundlov at faae Riget sat i Skik paany, saa hver kan beholde sit og Kongen beholde Magt til at gjøre godt, men Ministrene komme til at staae til Ansvar og gjøre Regnskab baade for Kongen og Folket, og at vi faaer alle den Frihed, som Menne-sket, der ikke er skabt til at være en Maskine, har Ret til, og som vi alle behøver for at drive hver sin Syssel med Liv og Lyst".
- <sup>47</sup> Montesquieu, *Om Lovenes Ånd*, Gads Forlag, 1998, p. 8 (book 1, chapter 3).
- <sup>48</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske Betragtninger* cit., pp. 31-32. Grundtvig, *Danskeren, et Ugeblad* cit., p. 386.
- <sup>49</sup> Grundtvig, N.F.S., *Det Danske Fiir-Kløver eller Danskheden partisk betragtet*, Wahlske Boghandel, 1836, after, *Grundtvigs Værker*, vers. 1.20, 2022, <<http://www.grundtvigsværker.dk/tekstvisning/655/o#l/%22o%22:o.%22v%22:o,%22k%22:1>>> pp. 15-16 (30.10.2023).
- <sup>50</sup> *Fædrelandet*, September 8<sup>th</sup> 1848, p. 1.
- <sup>51</sup> *Fædrelandet*, October 4<sup>th</sup> 1848, p. 3. Grundtvig *Danskeren, et Ugeblad* cit., pp. 465-474.
- <sup>52</sup> Grundtvig, *Danskeren, et Ugeblad*, cit., p. 470.
- <sup>53</sup> Grundtvig, *Det Danske* cit., pp. 12-14.
- <sup>54</sup> C. Bjørn, L. Christian (pub.), *Men meest talte vi om Landboeforholdene... Thorkild Christian Dahls dagbog fra Den grundlovgivende Rigsforsamling 1848-49*, Landbohistorisk Selskab/Moesgård Museum, 1999, pp. 88, 90. Møller, "Grundtvig cit., p. 124. The change of "Emanation" into "Udstedelse" was, however, not in the Constitution, as Møller states, but in the Law on Common Conscription. Poul Møller, "Baron C. Zeuthens Dagbog fra den grundlovgivende Rigsforsamlings Tid", in: *Danske Magazin*, 7<sup>th</sup> row, vol. 4, no. 2, 1945, p. 181.
- <sup>55</sup> Andersen, *Grundtvig* cit., p. 14
- <sup>56</sup> Beretning om Forhandlingerne, col. 967, "mig synes, at et galt latinsk Ord i en dansk Lov ikke blot er en grov Bommert i Stilen, men ogsaa utaalelig, fordi Loven skal saavidt muligt være tydelig for hele Folket, altsaa ikke blot, fordi godt Dansk allevegne og i ethvert Tilfælde er meget bedre end slet Latin, og, fordi selv det bedste latinske Ord i en dansk Lov altid er paa urette Sted, og heller ikke fordi Talen her er om et slet latinsk Ord, thi man kan ligesaa lidt gjøre et dansk Ord af et latinsk blot ved at sætte et N til, som man, som der staaer i Comedien, kan gjøre et latinsk af et dansk ved at sætte us til - det er virkelig ikke blot derfor, men det er, fordi jeg finder det utaaleligt, og, fordi det er en stor Grundsætning, som jeg her ønsker at lægge Forsamlingen paa Hjerte med Hensyn til det aabenbart Fremmede og Udanske i vort Lovsprog."
- <sup>57</sup> Grundtvig, *Danskeren, et Ugeblad* cit., p. 470: "jeg pleier gierne at trøste Danske Folk med, at de skal ikke sukke saa dybt, men heller lee lidt ad de lærde og de pæne Folk, som igrunden slet ikke er klogere paa det constitutionelle Monarchi med demokratisk Grundlag, end De eller jeg; men har kun lært af Franskmændene at holde gode Miner med slet Spil".
- <sup>58</sup> Se also Grundtvig, *Danskeren, et Ugeblad* cit., pp. 324, 500-501.
- <sup>59</sup> J. Adamsen, "Opfattelser af det nationale - op til og omkring Grundtvig", i: O. Korsgaard, og S. Michael (red.), *Samfundsbyggen. Artikler om Grundtvigs samfundstænkning*, Anis, 2013, pp. 29-55, pp. 37-38, 46-47.
- <sup>60</sup> L. Holberg, *Erasmus Montanus eller Rasmus Berg*, 1731, after: *Ludvig Holbergs Skrifter* 2.13, <<http://holbergsskrifter.dk/holberg-public/view?docId=skuespill%2FERasmus%2FERasmus.page&brand=&chunk.id=start>>, akt 4, scene 4 (30.10.2023): "Monsoeren er bleven saa lærd, at hand ikke meer kand forklare sin Meening paa sit Mors Maal".
- <sup>61</sup> Grundtvig, *Danskeren, et Ugeblad* cit., pp. 466, 469-470.
- <sup>62</sup> Grundtvig, *Det Danske* cit., p. 13. Translation from E. Broadbridge, W. Clay, J. Uffe, *The School for Life. N.F.S. Grundtvig on Education for the People*, Aarhus University Press, 2011, p. 132.
- <sup>63</sup> Beretning om Forhandlingerne, col. 2874: "det hviler dog paa Grundsætningen om en ansvarlig Regjering og om Folkestemmens rette Betydning i det Heles Udvikling, og dette mener jeg er den gamle Grundlov i Danmark, vel uskrevet hidtil, men dybt, jeg haaber uudslettelig indpræntet i det danske Folks Hjerte, og Intet af det, som kommer til at staae paa Papiir, det er jeg viis paa, Intet af det, vil rokke den, og jeg skal derfor ikke sige mere ved denne Leilighed, end blot minde om, hvad denne gamle og som jeg haaber uudslettelige Grundlov er, og jeg beder om Tilladelse til at minde om det i et lille Vers, skjøndt det er taget af en Vise, jeg selv har gjort: Kongehaand og Folkestemme, Begge stærke, begge frie, De har haft i Danmark hjemme, Mange Hundred' Aar før vi. Trods al Brøst, al Frygt og Fare Gid det vinde maa og vare, Skabe i et gyldent Aar Gamle Danmark gode Kaar."
- <sup>64</sup> Beretning om Forhandlingerne, col.

- 936: "Min Anskuelse derom er korteligen denne, at dersom den hele Forsamling bestod af folkevalgte Medlemmer, da kunde jeg intet Øieblik tvivle om, at vi havde al den Myndighed, som Kongen har bestemt, eller som Omstændighederne gjøre nødvendigt, herefter maa hvile iden almindelige danske Rigsforsamling. Det er altsaa blot den brogede Sammensætning, som gjør, at ogsaa jeg maa høiligen betvivle vor Myndighed, enten til at give faste Love eller til at paalægge Folket Ansvar for hvad Regjeringen og Ministeriet maatte bestemme. Da imidlertid de overordentlige Omstændigheder, hvorunder vi ere stillede, ikke alene ere overordentlige, men ere af den allervigtigste og den allerfarligste Natur, saa skønner jeg ikke rettere, end at Forsamlingen, saaledes som den nu engang er, vil blive nødt til at tage Deel i Lovgivningen og alle de Forhandlinger, som i nærværende Øieblik maae findes nødvendige til Rigets Tarv og Bedste, med al den Myndighed, som kan tilkomme en folkelig Forsamling".
- <sup>65</sup> Grundtvig, N.F.S.: *Om Forslaget til en ny Valglov*, 1848(b).
- <sup>66</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske cit.*, pp. 10-11.
- <sup>67</sup> R. Gildea, *Children of the Revolution. The French 1799-1914*, Penguin Books, 2009, pp. 49-50.
- <sup>68</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske cit.*, p. 9.
- <sup>69</sup> I. Kramnick (ed.), *The Portable Edmund Burke*, Penguin Classics, 1999, pp. 441.
- <sup>70</sup> Ivi, pp. 421-423.
- <sup>71</sup> N.F.S. Grundtvig, *Haandbog i Verdens-Historien*, vol. 3., J.H. Schubothes Boghandling, 1843, p. 404: "Skin af Arvefølge".
- <sup>72</sup> J. De Maistre, *Considerations on France*, Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 5.
- <sup>73</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske cit.*, p. 15: "blot for et Stykke Papir sømmer det sig kun Bog-Orme at gjøre Oprør".
- <sup>74</sup> Grundtvig, *Danskeren, et Ugeblad cit.*, p. 85.
- <sup>75</sup> *Rigsdagstidende 1866* (Overordentlig Samling), *Forhandlingerne paa Landstinget*, col. 20.
- <sup>76</sup> Møller, "Grundtvigs betydning cit.", p. 122.
- <sup>77</sup> Grundtvig, *Om Religions-Forfølgelse cit.*, pp. 4, 6-9.
- <sup>78</sup> *Rigsdagstidende 1854-55* (2den samling), *Forhandlingerne paa Folkethinget*, col. 91-93.
- <sup>79</sup> Grundtvig, *Det Danske cit.*, p. VI. Translation from Broadbridge et alii, *The School for Life cit.*, p. 129.
- <sup>80</sup> Grundtvig, *Danskeren, et Ugeblad cit.*, p. 490.
- <sup>81</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske cit.*, pp. 31-32, 36-37.
- <sup>82</sup> Grundtvig, *Danske cit.*, pp. 12-13.
- <sup>83</sup> Grundtvig, *Haandbog cit.*, p. 404.
- <sup>84</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske cit.*, pp. 9-16.
- <sup>85</sup> Grundtvig, N.F.S.: "Tidens Tarv og Tidens Brøst", in: *Brage og Idun*, vol. 2, Copenhagen, 1839(b), pp. 143-162, p. 145.
- <sup>86</sup> Grundtvig, *Haandbog cit.*, p. 401.
- <sup>87</sup> Grundtvig, *Haandbog cit.*, p. 404.
- <sup>88</sup> *Rigsdagstidende 1866* (Overordentlig Samling), *Forhandlingerne paa Landstinget*, col. 20.
- <sup>89</sup> Grundtvig, *Haandbog cit.*, p. 404, 411.
- <sup>90</sup> Grundtvig, *Det Danske cit.*, p. 12. Holm, *Grundtvig cit.*, p. 157.
- <sup>91</sup> N.F.S. Grundtvig, *Mands Minde 1788-1838. Foredrag over det sidste halve Aarhundredes Historie, holdte 1838*, Karl Schønbergs Forlag, 1877, after: *Grundtvigs Værker*, vers. 1.9, 2016, <[<http://www.xn--grundtvigsvrker-71b.dk/tekstvisning/6450/0#\(%220%22:0.%22k%22:0\)>](http://www.xn--grundtvigsvrker-71b.dk/tekstvisning/6450/0#(%220%22:0.%22k%22:0))>, pp. 29-30 (31.10.2023).
- <sup>92</sup> Jens Lei Wendel-Hansen, "Frk. Friis' klarsyn og fru Møhges senilitet. Fortællinger fra forfatningskampen", in: Sissel Bjerrum Fossat, Rasmus Glenthoj and Lone Kølle Martinsen (ed.), *Konfliktzonen Danmark. Stridende fortællinger om dansk historie*, Gads Forlag, 2018, pp. 126, 129. Jens Lei Wendel-Hansen, "Replik til Claus Friisberg: Venstres kamp for folketingsparlamentarismen 1870-1909?", in: *Historisk Tidsskrift*, vol. 115, no. 1, Den danske historiske forening, 2015, p. 148.
- <sup>93</sup> Bjørn, *Grundtvig cit.*, pp. 54-55. Larsen, *Frihed for Loke cit.*, pp. 191-193. Holm, *Grundtvig cit.*, pp. 164-169.
- <sup>94</sup> Grundtvig, *Det Danske cit.*, pp. 17-18.
- <sup>95</sup> Ivi, p. 15.
- <sup>96</sup> Grundtvig, "Tidens Tarv cit.", pp. 143-162, pp. 146-153.
- <sup>97</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske cit.*, p. 10.
- <sup>98</sup> Grundtvig, *Mands Minde cit.*, pp. 29-30.
- <sup>99</sup> Grundtvig, N.F.S.: *Om Religions-Forfølgelse. En Stemme fra Nik. Fred. Sev. Grundtvig*, Wahlske Boghandlings Forlag, 1842, after: *Grundtvigs Værker*, vers. 1.18, 2021, <[<http://www.grundtvigs-værker.dk/tekstvisning/25141/0#\(%220%22:0.%22v%22:0.%22k%22:1\)>](http://www.grundtvigs-værker.dk/tekstvisning/25141/0#(%220%22:0.%22v%22:0.%22k%22:1))>, pp. 6-7 (30.10.2023).
- <sup>100</sup> Grundtvig, N.F.S.: "Om Religions-Frihed", in: *Theologisk Maanedsskrift*, Wahlske Boghandling, 1827, pp. 28-59, 136-171, 193-266 [this third and last section, however, was confiscated by the police before release and finally published only in 1866], after: *Grundtvigs Værker*, vers. 1.15, 2019, <[<http://www.grundtvigsværker.dk/tekstvisning/19658/0#\(%220%22:0.%22v%22:0.%22k%22:1\)>](http://www.grundtvigsværker.dk/tekstvisning/19658/0#(%220%22:0.%22v%22:0.%22k%22:1))>, p. 28 (30.10.2023).
- <sup>101</sup> Grundtvig, *Danskeren cit.*, p. 234.
- <sup>101</sup> *Beretning om Forhandlingerne*, col. 5549-5550.
- <sup>102</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske cit.*, p. 10. *Beretning om Forhandlingerne*, col. 3203.
- <sup>103</sup> *Beretning om Forhandlingerne*, col. 462.
- <sup>104</sup> *Rigsdagstidende 1850-51, Forhandlingerne paa Folkethinget*, col. 6495.
- <sup>105</sup> *Rigsdagstidende 1857-58, Forhandlingerne paa Folkethinget*, col. 3748, 3750. Andersen, *Grundtvig cit.*, pp. 37-38.
- <sup>106</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske cit.*, pp. 41, 43-44, 52-53. Grundtvig, "Om Religions-Frihed" cit., pp. 163, 254-255.
- <sup>107</sup> *Grundtvigsk Tidende*, no. 2, 2022, pp. 8-11.
- <sup>108</sup> N.F.S. Grundtvig, *Danskeren, Et Ugeblad*, Copenhagen, 1849, after: *Grundtvigs Værker*, vers. 1.18, 2021,

- <<http://www.xn--grundtvigsvrker-71b.dk/tekstvisning/25136/o/#{%22o%22:o,%22k%22:o}>>, p. 520 (31.10.2023).
- <sup>109</sup> Grundtvig, "Om Religions-Frihed" cit., p. 203. N.F.S. Grundtvig, *Kort Begreb af Verdens Krønike i Sammenhæng*, Andreas Seidelins Forlag, 1812, p. 324, jf. *Grundtvigsk Tidende*, no. 2, 2022, p. 8.
- <sup>110</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske* cit., p. 45.
- <sup>111</sup> Ivi, p. 46-50.
- <sup>112</sup> Ivi, p. 53.
- <sup>113</sup> Ivi, p. 50-51.
- <sup>114</sup> Ivi, p. 46.
- <sup>115</sup> Ivi, p. 43.
- <sup>116</sup> Ivi, p. 27-28.
- <sup>117</sup> Ivi, p. 53.
- <sup>118</sup> Ivi, p. 43.
- <sup>119</sup> Ivi, pp. 31-32, 40. Grundtvig *Danskeren*, et *Ugeblad* cit., pp. 173, 194, 198, 201, 386, 394, 498.
- <sup>120</sup> Grundtvig, Ivi, pp. 203.
- <sup>121</sup> Ivi, pp. 76, 394-395, 476, 490.
- <sup>122</sup> Yde 2015, pp. 180-181.
- <sup>123</sup> Grundtvig, *Det Danske* cit., pp. 12-13.
- <sup>124</sup> A. Pedersen, Vibeke, "Indledning til '28de Mai'", in: *Grundtvigs Værker*, vers. 1.19, 2022: <<http://www.grundtvigsværker.dk/tekstvisning/26638/o/#{%22o%22:o,%22v%22:o,%22k%22:o,%22f%22:1}>> (30.10.2023), *28de Mai i det Danske Samfund* 1839, p. 3.
- <sup>125</sup> Jensen, *De danske* cit., vol. II, p. 100.
- <sup>126</sup> Bjørn, *Grundtvig* cit., p. 37.
- <sup>127</sup> Andersen, *Grundtvig* cit., p. 14.
- <sup>128</sup> This point is based on the lists of Grundtvig's speeches in *Rigsdagen* present in Johansen, vol. III, 1952, p. 31-34, 42-43, 62-63, 74-75, 89-90, 98-99, 131, 136-137, 143-145, 147-148, 183-184, 198-199, 222-223.
- <sup>129</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske* cit., p. 35.
- <sup>130</sup> *Beretning om Forhandlingerne*, col. 1803.
- <sup>131</sup> Thorsøe, Kong Frederik cit., vol. I, p. 570. *Beretning om Forhandlingerne*, col. 1803, 2129, 2269. His proposal accordingly, *Beretning om Forhandlingerne*, col. 2879.
- <sup>132</sup> Ivi, col. 2273.
- <sup>133</sup> Ivi, col. 2270.
- <sup>134</sup> Ivi, col. 2880.
- <sup>135</sup> Grundtvig, *Om Forslaget* cit.
- <sup>136</sup> *Beretning om Forhandlingerne*, col. 3136.
- <sup>137</sup> Ivi, col. 936.
- <sup>138</sup> Ivi, col. 2128, also *Beretning om Forhandlingerne*, col. 3060.
- <sup>139</sup> Ivi, col. 2985-2986, 3135-3136.
- <sup>140</sup> Ivi, col. 3796.
- <sup>141</sup> Ivi, col. 1886, 1927, 3136.
- <sup>142</sup> Ivi, col. 1927.
- <sup>143</sup> *Rigsdagstidende 1866* (Overordentlig Samling), *Forhandlingerne paa Landstinget*, col. 19-20. Grundtvig, *Mands Minde* cit., pp. 414-417.
- <sup>144</sup> Wendel-Hansen, Jens Lei: "'Et Land, hvortil nordiske Traditioner altid have knyttet sig'. Kampen om Grønland 1855-56", in: *Historisk Tidsskrift*, vol. 116, no. 2, 2016, pp. 309-335, p. 325. RDFT 1854-55 (2<sup>nd</sup> gathering), col. 91.
- <sup>145</sup> Grundtvig, *Politiske* cit., p. 40.
- <sup>146</sup> *Beretning om Forhandlingerne*, col. 318.
- <sup>147</sup> Ivi, col. 2128, 2270-72 (specific 2272), 3698.
- <sup>148</sup> The 1814 November Constitution of Norway is found in E. Holmøyvik, D. Michaelsen (eds.), *Kilder og årstall i forfatningshistorien*, Pax Forlag, 2015. The mentioned article is § 76, which is found on pp. 106-107.
- <sup>149</sup> The 1814 November Constitution, § 74. Holmøyvik, Michaelsen (ed.), *Kilder og årstall* cit., p. 106.
- <sup>150</sup> This divide, or anyway its terminology, is my own intervention as seen in H. Wendel-Hansen, *De Jordbundne. Danmarks godsejere og det konstitutionelle monarki 1835-1919*, unpublished dissertation, Aarhus University, 2012, p. 166.
- <sup>151</sup> Wendel-Hansen, *De Jordbundne* cit., p. 172. *Beretning om Forhandlingerne*, col. 2118.
- <sup>152</sup> J.C. Calhoun, *A disquisition on government and a discourse on the constitution and government of the United States*, General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, 1851, pp. 24-26.
- <sup>153</sup> J.H. Read, *Majority Rule versus Consensus. The Political Thought of John C. Calhoun*, University Press of Kansas, 2009.
- <sup>154</sup> The proposal in *Beretning om Forhandlingerne*, col. 3124; Grundtvig's declared support, col. 3136.
- <sup>155</sup> Ivi, col. 3161.
- <sup>156</sup> *Nestved Tidende*, January 18th 1884, p. 1. Also implied Lindberg 1876, p. 3. Neergaard, *underjuni-grundlove* cit., p. 442 (the footnote).
- <sup>157</sup> Wendel-Hansen, *De Jordbundne* cit., p. 258.
- <sup>158</sup> K. Frøkjær Baunvig, "Det folkelige foredrag", in: Sune Aukén og Christel Sunesen (ed.), *Ved lejlighed. Grundtvig og genrerne*, Forlaget Spring, 2014, p. 78-79, 84, 86.
- <sup>159</sup> The distinction is introduced in Wendel-Hansen, *De Jordbundne* cit., p. 166.
- <sup>160</sup> Bjørn, *Grundtvig* cit., p. 37. Dam, *Politikere* cit., p. 22. Damsholt, "*Jer er en gammel Royalist*" cit., p. 140, 160.
- <sup>161</sup> Møller, "*Grundtvigs betydning*" cit., p. 115.
- <sup>162</sup> Møller, "*Grundtvigs betydning*" cit., p. 115. See also pp. 120-121.
- <sup>163</sup> *Danskeren* 1848, pp. 86-87.
- <sup>164</sup> N.F.S. Grundtvig, *Danskeren*, et *Ugeblad*, Copenhagen, 1850, after, *Grundtvigs Værker*, vers. 1.20, 2022, <<http://www.xn--grundtvigsvrker-71b.dk/tekstvisning/28360/o/#{%22o%22:o,%22k%22:o}>>, p. 281-282 (31.10.2023), see Damsholt, "*Jeg er en gammel Royalist*" cit., p. 156.
- <sup>165</sup> The 1849 Constitution, § 79. In the present 1953 Constitution, § 65.
- <sup>166</sup> Jensen, *De danske* cit., p. 100.
- <sup>167</sup> Holm, *Grundtvig* cit., pp. 68-69.
- <sup>168</sup> Damsholt, "*Jeg er en gammel Royalist*" cit., p. 157.
- <sup>169</sup> Møller, "*Grundtvigs betydning*" cit., pp. 103, 122.