

Changing practices of censorship: the Faculty of Theology at the University of Copenhagen, 1738–1770

Jesper Jakobsen and Lars Cyril Nørgaard

As a socially embedded practice, early modern censorship aimed to preserve public order. Accordingly, negotiations between censors, authors and printers reflect changing ideas about the public. This chapter examines different rationalities of censorship in eighteenth-century Denmark, focusing on the Faculty of Theology at the University of Copenhagen.¹ It might have been expected that, for instance, religious books were evaluated according to monolithic standards of Lutheran orthodoxy, and indeed theological conflicts are seen to have affected practices of censorship; but these practices cannot easily be reduced to a simple framework. Instead, we argue that the relationship between theological censorship and Enlightenment ideals is complex and somewhat misunderstood in overarching narratives of secularization, which often point to the Struensee regime (1770–1772) as a watershed between robust censorship and freedom of print.

In the Danish monarchy, institutionalized forms of censorship regulation were introduced in the sixteenth century, following the spread of print culture. The Church Ordinance of 1537/1539 stated that nothing could be printed without the approval of the university and the clergy.² The twenty-first chapter of the second book of the

1 This chapter builds on results from Jesper Jakobsen's unpublished doctoral thesis about censorship practices in eighteenth-century Denmark – Jesper Jakobsen, 'Uanstændige, utilladelige og unyttige skrifter: en undersøgelse af censuren i praksis 1746–1773' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Copenhagen, 2017) – which has been further developed within the research programme of the Danish National Research Foundation Centre for Privacy Studies (DNRF 138).

2 Martin Schwarz Lausten, *Kirkeordinansen 1537/39* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1989), p. 232. On censorship in Denmark–Norway between the Reformation and 1770, see Henning Matzen, *Kjøbenhavns Universitets Retshistorie 1479–1879* (Copenhagen: J. H. Schultz, 1879); Ludvig Koch,

Danske Lov ('Danish Code', 1683) confirmed such pre-publication censorship, which remained the legal foundation of later practices.³ By contrast, unrestricted freedom of print was introduced in 1770 under the regime of Johann Friedrich Struensee. On 14 September 1770, King Christian VII signed off on this unprecedented freedom.⁴ Unbridled debates immediately ensued; and as early as October 1771, the authorities proclaimed that defamation in print was still considered a crime. An Act of October 1773 further prescribed the imposition of severe fines to combat defamatory speech. In 1799 pre-publication censorship was partly reintroduced, as such a procedure became required of authors who had previously been punished for 'abusing' the freedom of print. Despite the short-lived period of the unrestricted freedom of print, the 1770 decree remains a milestone of the Enlightenment and an important step towards the abolition of religiously motivated censorship.⁵ Struensee's decree

'Bidrag til Censurens Historie under Fredrik V', *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 2 (1889), 67–94; Charlotte Appel, *Læsning og bogmarked i 1600-tallets Danmark*, 2 vols (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2001), I, pp. 367–454; Øystein Rian, *Sensuren i Danmark-Norge: Vilkkårene for offentlige ytringer 1536–1814* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2014), pp. 144–93.

- 3 Vilhelm Adolf Secher (ed.), *Kong Christian den femtis Danske Lov* (Copenhagen: Gads, 1929), p. 204. The censorship laws in the *Danske Lov* of 1683 were a codification of older laws, of which the most important was the *Censurforordning* of 6 May 1667. For a discussion on the connections between the Law of 1667 and the *Danske Lov*, see Appel, *Læsning og bogmarked*, pp. 367–454. This document, however, did not apply in the provinces of Schleswig and Holstein: this exemption also applied to the town of Altona with its thriving print business, which constituted a nodal point in the network of distribution; see Dagmar Cochanski, *Præsidual- und Oberpræsidualverfassung in Altona 1664–1746* (Hamburg: Selbstverlag Verein für Hamburgische Geschichte, 1984), pp. 30–2; Holger Bönig, *Welteroberung durch ein neues Publikum: die deutsche Presse und der Weg zur Aufklärung: Hamburg und Altona als Beispiel* (Bremen: Edition Lumière, 2002).
- 4 In 1766 Sweden had issued legally guaranteed freedom-of-print regulations. However, they involved several exemptions relating to religious and political literature; see Jonathan Israel, 'Northern varieties: contrasting the Dano-Norwegian and the Swedish-Finnish Enlightenments', in Ellen Krefting, Aina Nøding and Mona Ringvej (eds), *Eighteenth-Century Periodicals as Agents of Change* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 17–45; Jonas Nordin and John Christian Laursen, 'Northern declarations of freedom of the press: the relative importance of philosophical ideas and of local politics', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 81:2 (2020), 217–37.
- 5 Harald Jørgensen, *Trykkefrihedsspørgsmaalet i Danmark 1799–1848* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1944), pp. 15–47; John Christian Laursen,

did not come as a bolt from the blue, though. Before pre-publication censorship was removed, social changes had taken place – changes which, albeit incrementally, paved the way for what was to come.⁶

Throughout the eighteenth century, the robust requirements of censorship had increasingly become an obstacle to the expanding print culture and the successful business of print houses. This was especially true of print shops located outside the capital. Slowly but steadily, the official system had to adapt to a growing commercial market which developed outside Copenhagen's city walls. Initially, this adaptation was able to base itself on existing practices because local authorities had long taken an active part in the process of censoring religious manuscripts. Printers outside of Copenhagen were thus accustomed to interacting with bishops and, through these interactions, to securing a written assessment which allowed them to submit manuscripts to the Faculty of Theology. Indeed, bishops would increasingly be entrusted with the evaluation of minor works dealing with religion, while works containing more substantial argumentation still had to be shipped off to Copenhagen. During the 1730s and 1740s, printers in Viborg, Trondheim and Aalborg

'Spinoza in Denmark and the fall of Struensee, 1770–1772', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 61:2 (2020), 189–202; Israel, 'Northern varieties'. For an in-depth discussion of the short period of unrestricted freedom of print and the rise of a new public order, see Henrik Horstbøll, Ulrik Langen and Frederik Stjernfelt, *Grov Konfekt: Tre vilde år med trykkefrihed, 1770–73*, 2 vols (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 2020). For discussions on the restrictions in 1771 and 1773, see Horstbøll and others, *Grov Konfekt*, II, pp. 131–57, 399–410.

- 6 Since the 2010s, historians have unveiled how an increasing focus on commerce and economic theory became a vector for book circulation; the rise of a new culture of public debate in the eighteenth century was closely tied to this circulation. The Norwegian historian Jakob Maliks has demonstrated that the Danish-Norwegian government increasingly prioritized issues of commerce, thereby transforming the public sphere into a sphere of critical discussion and foreshadowing the abolishment of pre-publication censorship during the Struensee years. Maliks' doctoral thesis from 2011 sadly remains unpublished, but some key results are presented in Jakob Maliks, 'Imprimatur i provinsen – Sensuren av det trykte ord utenfor København 1737–1770', in Eivind Tjønneland (ed.), *Kritikk for 1814* (Oslo: Dreyer, 2014), pp. 78–102, and the same author's 'To rule is to communicate: the absolutist system of political communication in Denmark–Norway 1660–1750', in Ellen Krefting, Aina Nøding and Mona Ringvej (eds), *Eighteenth-Century Periodicals as Agents of Change* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 134–52. Importantly, these insightful studies do not focus on the actual practices of censorship and their logic, which form the focal point of the present chapter.

were also allowed to exercise local censorship; and following the expansion of the book market around the mid-eighteenth century, similar permissions were granted to printers in other provincial towns.⁷ Centralized censorship seems to have adapted to general developments in society and thereby lost, or at least loosened, its iron grip on the public sphere.⁸

The present chapter focuses on such small-scale changes in censorship. These changes not only emerged among local authorities but also in the censorship undertaken at the Faculty of Theology. This development is documented in a surviving protocol that details the censoring of minor works during the period from 1738 until 1770.⁹ The following discussion concentrates on this protocol and the historical period after 1737, when two institutional bodies in the Danish capital became charged with censoring religious writings. This situation was brought about by changes within the religious system itself: these changes deeply affected censorship, moving its exercise from a ‘traditional’ type of authority to the anonymous realm of institutional authority. We present the actual censorship as it is recorded in the protocol: this source reveals how a variety of concerns informed censorship, ranging from theological, stylistic

7 For an overview and discussion of provincial censorship in Denmark and Norway, see Maliks, ‘Imprimatur’. As argued in Jesper Jakobsen, ‘Der Klagen über das verdorbene Christenthum: om interessekonflikter og censurprocedure vedrørende oversættelsen af et teologisk skrift i 1739’, *Fund og Forskning*, 50 (2011), 259–78, these local practices were influenced by and, to some extent, mirrored the agenda of the censorship authorities based in Copenhagen.

8 The expanding book market was of course a general European trend that Rolf Engelsing correctly labelled as a ‘Leserevolution’; see Rolf Engelsing, *Der Bürger als Leser: Lesergeschichte in Deutschland, 1500–1800* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1974). On this topic, see also James Van Horn Melton, *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), and Henrik Horstbøll, *Menigmands medie: Det folkelige bogtryk i Danmark 1500–1840* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 1999).

9 This key source of eighteenth-century Danish censorship practices has attracted relatively little attention in historical studies. It was first studied in an article by the theologian Ludvig Koch (1837–1917), which focuses on the reign of King Frederik V; see Koch, ‘Bidrag til Censurens Historie’. An overview of relevant manuscripts dating from 1738 to 1746 can be found in Jesper Jakobsen, ‘Omorganiseringen af den teologiske censur’, *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 111:1 (2011), 1–36, which focuses on the censorship practices of the *Generalkirke-inspektionskollegiet* (Collegium for the general inspection of the Church, hereafter ‘the Collegium’). An analysis and discussion of the whole protocol is found in Jakobsen, ‘Uanstændige’, pp. 75–92.

and grammatical to juridical and economic concerns. The latter aspect is discussed with respect to the importation of books, as this activity was perceived in terms of economic theory and in the words of the university professors.

Institutional anonymity

The censorship procedures that were codified in the *Danske Lov* of 1683 stated that censors were personally responsible for their assessments of manuscripts, and thus the individual censor's professional evaluation of a manuscript was easily associated with his private conscience. However, with the introduction of the censorship protocols in 1738 the traditional printed personal assessment was replaced by an anonymized protocol, which effectively separated the censor's official/public duties from his private beliefs and consciousness.

King Christian VI's reign, lasting from 1730 until 1746, has often been associated with his pious beliefs and ambition to reorganize the Church. Christian and his advisers also implemented financial policies that facilitated what would later be known as 'den florissante periode' – that is, the flourishing period (1778–1807).¹⁰ Often overlooked, royal piety also affected the structures of censorship. Strongly inspired by the Hallesian brand of Pietism that had been initiated by August Hermann Francke (1663–1727), the King, among other initiatives, established the Collegium on 1 October 1737. This institutional body was given the task of administering clerical and theological matters pertaining to the Church itself, but also to schools and to the University of Copenhagen. Its duties included the supervision of censorship of theological and religious writings. The emergence of this institution has attracted interest from historians; but little attention has been paid to the actual, and sometimes creative, practices of censorship. Consequently, our focus is on these practices as they unfolded at the Faculty of Theology after the foundation of the Collegium.¹¹

10 Olaf Olsen (ed.), *Gyldendal og Politikens Danmarkshistorie*, 16 vols (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1988–1991), IX: *Ole Feldbæk, Den lange fred: 1700–1800* (1990), pp. 296–307.

11 For an overview of the relevant scholarship and of the censorship carried out by this institutional body, see Jakobsen, 'Omorganiseringen'; Jakob Maliks, 'Vilkår for offentlighed: sensur, økonomi og transformasjonen af det offentlige rom i Danmark-Norge 1730–1770' (unpublished doctoral

For a long period, during the first decades of the eighteenth century, Christen Worm (1672–1737) had served as Dean of the Faculty of Theology and as Bishop of Zealand. In an unprecedented move, Worm's successor, Peder Hersleb (1689–1757), declined to head the theological professors. Instead, Hersleb was awarded a prominent position within the Collegium, leaving the Faculty of Theology without a dean. On 24 September 1738, therefore, the professors petitioned King Christian VI that this prominent position should be made a temporary one: each professor should hold office as dean for either six or twelve months. The professors suggested that, alternatively, their most senior member be elected: this would have left Hans Steenbuch (1664–1740) in charge, but owing to old age and failing health Steenbuch had already requested not to be taken into consideration. In further support of making the dean's position temporary, the professors added that this would help ease the burden of censoring all theological works, which, as 'the heaviest workload ... surpasses the powers of one man'.¹² In the vacuum of 1737, brought about by religious conflicts, the professors were suggesting a rationalization of their organization.

The Crown consulted the Collegium before answering the faculty's petition. Its members approved the request on condition that an additional change be introduced, a change directly related to the practice of censorship: the name of the professor who acted as censor was no longer to appear on the printed page, where it had featured beneath the imprimatur up to that point. This might seem like a trivial detail, but it was not. The removal of the institutional sign and the censor's name is accounted for by reference to 'the reputation of a righteous theologian'. More specifically, the public might infer 'that a censor is of the same opinion as the book that he has approved'.¹³ We must conclude that the proposed disassociation of the censor's name from the right to print was intended to facilitate the dissemination of religious literature – that is, pietistic literature – which professors at the Faculty of Theology found questionable.

thesis, Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, 2011), pp. 92–5; Rian, *Sensuren i Danmark-Norge*, pp. 398–410.

12 'det tungeste arbeide ... overgaaer een Mand's Kræfter'; Copenhagen, Statens arkiver (SAR), Koncepter og indlæg til ST 1738 (D21-79), Nr. 578; compare Jakobsen, 'Uanstændige', p. 76.

13 'en retskaffen Theologi Reputation'; 'at en Censor er af lige Meening med den af ham approberede bog'; SAR, Koncepter og indlæg til ST 1738 (D21-79), Nr. 578; compare Jakobsen, 'Uanstændige', p. 76.

This was undoubtedly an important motive for the faculty's petition. However, the deletion of the censor's name, identifying a professional evaluation with a private individual, also has more profound, societal consequences.¹⁴ The Collegium's suggestion purposefully uprooted any monolithic framework for censorship. It indirectly implied the emergence of a public order wherein theological semantics was gradually losing its relevance while social subsystems and their semantics exercised an increasing influence. This differentiation, and the increase in societal complexity that followed from it, was rooted in the religious system itself. It was not external forces but rather internal conflicts that brought about this professionalization of censorship. This initiative was primarily a means to a theological end: members of the Faculty of Theology could now approve books of a pietistic flavour, although they would not want to be publicly associated with this stance. The anonymity afforded by the protocols has been recognized by other scholars, but the underlying reasons have been interpreted in different ways. For instance, Jakob Maliks has argued that the protocols were introduced as an attempt to conceal the academic discord at the faculty from the public eye.

The Crown implemented what the Collegium suggested, and on 17 October 1738, the Faculty of Theology therefore began keeping two record books or protocols. One protocol, dedicated to 'major works', is presumably lost, while a second protocol on 'minor works' survives.¹⁵ These protocols constitute a system of support that had not been required before the advent of the Collegium, when the faculty's dean had overseen all matters of censorship.

In order to document its institutional decision-making processes, the Faculty of Theology kept a special record. At a time when the censor's name was kept away from the public, the protocols disclose who had carried out individual acts of censorship. In public, readers faced the anonymous 'Imprimatur In Fidem Protocolli Facultatis'

14 On the reorganization of censorship during the reign of Christian VI, and on motives for introducing the protocols, see Jørgen Lundbye, *Kirkekampen i Danmark 1730–1746* (Copenhagen: Schønbergske, 1947); Erik Reitzel-Nielsen, 'Censuren af Pontoppidans katekismus', *Kirkehistoriske Samlinger*, 7:4 (1960–1962), 12–48; Jakobsen, 'Omorganiseringen'; Maliks, 'Vilkår'; Jakobsen, 'Uanstændige', pp. 75–7. In 1765, after the Collegium had lost influence, the name of the censor was reintroduced on the printed page. This return to a more personalized type of authority was a desperate attempt from a failing system to reassert itself.

15 'større skrifter'; 'smaae skrifter'; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Sager vedrørende censur af teologiske skrifter (3106-01).

(‘printed in accordance with the protocols of the Faculty’), while the protocols identify the professors behind the institution’s faceless mask.

Censors in action

The protocol on minor works holds information about more than seven hundred manuscripts.¹⁶ Close to 80 per cent of the submitted manuscripts were approved for printing, whereas 7 per cent were accepted on condition that they undergo some revision. Only 5 per cent could not be printed. A small number of manuscripts were labelled as being outside the faculty’s expertise, while other manuscripts were transferred to the lost protocol on major works. We only find a small number of Latin works, which probably implies that the censored manuscripts targeted a relatively broad readership. Small formats in the vernacular were a popular commodity. Manuscripts in German appear regularly, which is unsurprising since this language was widely spoken and written within the kingdom. We find no manuscripts in French, the preferred language of European courts.

Between 1738 and 1770, ten professors censored minor works submitted to the faculty: Søren Bloch (1696–1753), Erik Pontoppidan the younger, Marcus Wøldike (1699–1750), Jeremias Friedrich Reuss (1700–1777), Christian Langemach Leth (1701–1764), Johann August Seidlitz (1704–1751), Peder Rosenstand-Goiske (1704–1769), Peder Jakobsen Holm (1706–1777), Hans Otto Bang (1712–1764) and Johan Andreas Cramer (1723–1788). These men either held a chair at or were otherwise associated with the Faculty of Theology. In the hands of these professors, state-sponsored Lutheranism served as the standards of censorship. Authors were readily rejected when they did not abide by such standards.¹⁷ In 1750, Seidlitz censored a translation that he could not allow to be printed:

16 This section is based on and develops insights from the unpublished thesis by Jakobsen, ‘Uanstændige’, pp. 75–92. For a detailed overview of the annual distribution of the manuscripts in the protocol on minor works, see Jakobsen, ‘Uanstændige’, p. 256.

17 In his pioneering study of eighteenth-century Danish censorship, Ludvig Koch characterized the main task of the faculty’s censorship as preventing the dissemination of Moravian texts. This was indeed one aim of censorship in eighteenth-century Denmark–Norway, but certainly not the sole objective of this societal practice.

These canticles that, for the most part, have been translated into Danish from the German by the Moravian Brethren cannot be approved, since they are blemished throughout by ridiculous, mistaken formulations and Zinzendorf's senseless tautologies.¹⁸

This entry is telling because of the theological tone of the record-keeping, but the professors' censorship also reveals concerns that lie beyond theology proper. Clearly, standards were not simply a matter of theological orthodoxy; commercial questions and the expectations of buyers come into view as well. Those who exercised censorship seem to have been aware of an expanding market for printed texts, a market where stylistic correctness and aesthetic quality mattered. This aspect comes to the fore in Peder Holm's assessments.¹⁹ Holm was born in what is now Norway. His theological stance remains unstudied, but he seems to have been critical of the Pietists. A professor from 1738, he was not awarded a chair at the faculty until 1746. The protocol has him active from 1739 until 1769, and he was by far the most productive of all censors. Holm assessed more than 160 manuscripts, of which he only rejected 11. Concerning a manuscript of 1749, Holm concluded that it was fit for printing, 'but the style and spelling, which are everywhere filled with mistakes, should first be corrected by someone who knows how to write correctly'.²⁰ Two years later, he again approved a manuscript on the condition of certain improvements:

With adequate carefulness, these pious reflections have been either dictated or written by the author; this is evident, but they are badly transcribed by a most inexperienced man, and this to such an extent that it is beyond all measure. Repeatedly, so many mistakes distort

18 'Cantilenas hasce maximam partem ex germanicis Herrnhuthanis in linguam Danicam conuersas approbare non possum; quia erroneis phrasibus ludicris, et ineptis Tautologiis Zinzendorffianis passim sunt commaculatae'; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Sager vedrørende censur af teologiske skrifter (3106-01), 9 January 1750.

19 For information on Holm, see Albert Thorvald Jantzen, 'Peder Holm', in Carl Frederik Bricka (ed.), *Dansk biografisk Lexikon, tillige omfattende Norge for tidsrummet 1537-1814*, 19 vols (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1887-1905), VII (1893), pp. 584-6; Knud Banning, 'Det teologiske Fakultet 1732-1830', in Svend Ellehøj (ed.), *Københavns Universitet 1479-1979*, 14 vols (Copenhagen: Gad, 1979-2005), IV: *Det teologiske fakultet*, ed. Leif Grane (1980), pp. 213-82 (pp. 259-60).

20 'Men Stiilen og Bogstavringen der over alt er saa meget urigtig, burde dog først rettes af én, som forstaaer at skrive ret'; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Sager vedrørende censur af teologiske skrifter (3106-01), 10 June 1749.

the very meaning itself. This distorted copy should not have been handed in for theological censorship. When the most honoured author has truly corrected everything that originates from the transcriber's ignorance and negligence, he will recognize and better attend to just how easily a mistake is made: he will then be permitted to add the censor's rubric, also on the first page: *Imprimatur*.²¹

On other occasions, Holm would praise the authors and their manuscripts. In 1760 he assessed a manuscript version of a song that had allegedly been composed by Svendina Finger, the ten-year-old daughter of a vicar from a town near Flensburg. In the protocol, Holm notes that he had actually met the girl and made enquiries about the song before arriving at the conclusion that the young girl had written it: 'To the many objections, the little maiden answered with such conviction and surprise that I found myself confounded by it and took it not to be beyond belief that she could have authored the song'.²² Holm was clearly impressed by the girl and passed her manuscript for publication, merely adding that the minor errors 'must be regarded as permissible at her age'.²³ Concerning a Danish translation of *A Sure Guide to Hell*, Holm strikes a more uncompromising note:

-
- 21 'Piæ hæ meditationes ab Auctore quidem accurate satis sive dictatæ sive scriptæ fuerunt, quod satis apparet, at ab imperitissimo homine vitiose adeo supra omnem modum descriptæ sunt, ut tot mendis, ipsum sæpe sensum depravantibus, foedatum exemplar censuræ Theologiæ tradi haud debuisset. Quando vero emendari auctor plur(imum) reu(erendus) quicquid descriptoris inscitia atque neglegentiâ peccatum esse facile observabit, curaverit, licebit censuræ loco titulo et folio primo inscribere: *Imprimatur*'; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Sager vedrørende censur af teologiske skrifter (3106-01), between 6 and 17 May 1751. The censored work was authored by Hans Mossin (1716–1794) and later published in Bergen. Mossin was influenced by Pietism and tried, on several occasions, to earn a chair at the Faculty of Theology; see Daniel Smith Tharp, 'Hans Mossin', in Carl Frederik Bricka (ed.), *Dansk biografisk Lexikon, tillige omfattende Norge for tidsrummet 1537–1814*, 19 vols (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1887–1905), XI (1897), pp. 481–3. In 1751 Erik Pontoppidan secured him a position as chaplain at Nykirken in Bergen. Here, Mossin obtained royal privilege to run his own printing press. Without the manuscript that Mossin handed in, it is impossible to verify whether the author followed Holm's advice.
- 22 'Den lille Jomfrue svarede med saadan fermetet og overraskelse paa adskillige Indvendinger, at jeg forundret mig derover, og holder det ej utroeligt, at hun kand have forfattet Sangen'; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Sager vedrørende censur af teologiske skrifter (3106-01), 31 July 1760.
- 23 'maa holdes hende til gode i den alder'; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Sager vedrørende censur af teologiske skrifter (3106-01), 31 July 1760.

Although the work's intention seems to be good, this way of writing seems not to be such that it would be fitting for it to be approved for publication by a theological censor, because it is also to be expected that many could learn and perceive much that is evil from this work, which they would not otherwise have thought of themselves.²⁴

Similar concerns were voiced in relation to a catechism entitled *Fattig mands tanker til Gudelige Hiemsbrug, som Bønder og Børn, Der har liten tiid, og mindre nemme, at Føre til videre* ('A poor man's thoughts: for the godly use in the home by people who, like peasants and children, have little time and ability to educate').²⁵ The catechism was dated 18 November 1745 in the protocol, and Marcus Wøldike was charged with the task of censoring its seventy-eight pages.²⁶ After studying in Wittenberg and Jena, Wøldike had returned to Copenhagen, where he found employment at the Royal Library. In 1732 he became a professor at the Faculty of Theology, where he remained until his death in 1750. Wøldike was the first professor to lecture on church history, and his *Positiones fidei christianæ* (1740) was highly influential. The protocol documents Wøldike's activities as a censor from 1738 until 1750; in 1748 he approved *Fattig mands tanker*, adding interlinear corrections in the manuscript. In accordance with procedures, the manuscript with the signed 'Imprimatur in fidem Protocolli Facult[at]is Theolog[i]' was passed on to the Collegium, which, in this instance, decided against Wøldike and announced

24 'Skjønt hensigten af Skriftet synes at være god, saa synes dog den Skrivemaade ikke at være saadan, at det kand skikke sig ret vel at approbere samme ved en Theologisk Censur til Trykken, som det og ej er uventeligt, at mange deraf kunde lære og see meget ont, som de ikke ellers selv vare falden paa'; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Sager vedrørende censur af teologiske skrifter (3106-01), 9 February 1757. First published in 1750 or 1751 and purportedly written by Beelzebub, *A Sure Guide to Hell* is a playful response to the nonconformist pastor Joseph Alleine (1634–1668) and his *A Sure Guide to Heaven* (1671). The latter offers advice to parents, to youth, to those whose minds are possessed, to a good king, to the first minister of state, to the clergy and to young women.

25 The original manuscript is preserved in the archives of the Collegium: SAR, Kirkekollegiet (F4.18.3).

26 For information on Wøldike, see Albert Thorvald Jantzen, 'Marcus Wøldike', in Carl Frederik Bricka (ed.), *Dansk biografisk Lexikon, tillige omfattende Norge for tidsrummet 1537–1814*, 19 vols (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1887–1905), XIX (1905), pp. 257–8; Banning, 'Det teologiske Fakultet', pp. 220–2.

its disapproval of the manuscript.²⁷ Members of this body argued that similar books of higher quality were already available. One member remarked: ‘I am of the opinion that we should prevent not only hateful books but also useless books, since the buyer is deceived by the latter, and this [deception] causes disgust among our countrymen’.²⁸ Evidently, censors of religious literature cared not only about orthodoxy but also about quality and supply on the book market.

Pragmatic orthodoxy

No references to atheistic writings are found in the preserved protocol, and explicit criticism of the monarch, the Church or the government is equally absent. However, this does not mean that such writings were not in circulation within the realm of the Danish king. They certainly were; but for obvious reasons, their authors and printers had no reason to hand them in for official approval – such writings travelled through unofficial networks.²⁹ Even so, the censors sometimes saw manuscripts they thought would be inappropriate to print; but even when confronted by texts which originated outside the Lutheran cultural sphere, they occasionally exercised a remarkable pragmatism.

27 It was not the first time that *Generalkirkeinspektionskollegiet* overruled his assessments. In 1737, before the emergence of the Collegium, Wøldike had approved a Danish translation of Julius Bernhard von Rohr’s *Einleitung zu der Klugheit zu Leben, oder, Anweisung: wie ein Mensch zu Beförderung seiner zeitlichen Glückseligkeit seine Actiones vernünftig anstellen soll* (1730). Given the book’s content, its censorship assessment was carried out by the Faculty of Philosophy; but two chapters dealt with theological matters, and therefore Wøldike became involved. However, the newly established Collegium decided to overrule the theology professor. In 1738, members of the Collegium found Rohr’s two theological chapters in opposition to Hallensian teachings, and Wøldike’s approval had to be withdrawn. On this conflict in censorship, see Jakobsen, ‘Omorganiseringen’, 20–2.

28 ‘Jeg er af de tanker at mand burde hindre ej alene Hadlige, men unyttige bøger, thi ved de sidste bedragis kiøberen og det foraarsager vore landsmænd væmmelse’; SA, Kirkekollegiet (Generalkirkeinspektionskollegiet), Diverse Sager (F4.18.3).

29 Gina Dahl’s research on private collections in eighteenth-century Norway shows that controversial texts in foreign languages made their way to the north; see Gina Dahl, *Books in Early Modern Norway* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), and the same author’s *Libraries and Enlightenment: Eighteenth-Century Norway and the Outer World* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2014).

In December 1739 Holm censored a manuscript entitled *Eenfoldigt Bibellys, sat imod det exegetiske Mørk*. Its author, Hans Tulle (1711–1743), was renowned for his mastery of Hebrew, and in 1736 he had handed in a disputation on how to translate the Bible. His *Bibellys* actually identifies several mistakes in the Danish translation of 1739. Despite the young man's obvious talents, his methods did not go down well with the faculty.³⁰ Furthermore, Holm remarks about the manuscript version of the *Bibellys* that a specific section should include a prohibition in order for the work to be in accordance with the *Danske Lov*.³¹ The section in Tulle's work that Holm refers to is entitled 'on the marriage of stepchildren', and the censor thus evokes a larger, theological issue.³² At the University of Copenhagen, the first professor of natural law, Andreas Højer (1690–1739), had caused heated debate with his *De nuptiis propinquorum jure divino non prohibitis* ('On marriages between closely related persons which are not prohibited according to divine law'). This brief treatise was not just an intellectual challenge; as the main administrative body of the university, the Consistory possessed the *tamperret* – that is, the authority to decide in such matters – and its members frequently had to consider petitions from Zealanders who wished to marry a not very distant relative. Now, Højer claimed that incest was not a crime because it violated a divine order of things; rather, incest was a punishable offence because it violated a rational ordering of the social world.³³

30 Tulle's preface outlines his scientific approach to Scripture, which is rather idiosyncratic and cannot easily be identified as, for example, pietistic; see H. L. Tulle, 'Fortale', in *Bibellys, sat imod det exegetiske Mørk* (Copenhagen: Andreas Hartvig Godiche, 1740). To our knowledge, no study of Tulle and his work exists.

31 See SAR, Københavns Universitet, Sager vedrørende censur af teologiske skrifter (3106-01), 10 December 1739.

32 'om sammenbragte Børns Ægteskab'. On the early elaboration of this question in the seventeenth century, see Benjamin T. G. Mayes, *Counsel and Conscience: Lutheran Casuistry and Moral Reasoning after the Reformation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), pp. 137–42. On this issue and its relation to the new and social model of marriage which followed in the wake of the Lutheran upheaval, see also John Witte, Jr, *From Sacrament to Contract: Marriage, Religion, and Law in the Western Tradition* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2011), pp. 119–36.

33 Besides being a professor of law at the University, Andreas Højer was also the driving force behind the creation of *Generalkirkeinspektionskollegiet*. For discussions of Højer, see Holger Rørdam, *Historiske Samlinger og Studier vedrørende danske Forhold og Studier især i det 17 århundrede* (Copenhagen:

In Holm's censoring of Tulle, ideas like those of Højer loom large. The emerging scientific field of biblical exegesis, spearheaded by the Pietists, was raising issues of debate, and Holm's assessment chimes well with the overall renewal of Old Testament exegesis that made it increasingly problematic to lift juridical precepts from the biblical texts.³⁴

While Holm's engagement with Tulle is in accordance with an emerging critical rationality within theology, his censorship also involves elements that are more surprising. Since 1729, a popular devotional work had circulated which carried the Danish title *Armelle Nicolas gemeenlig kaldet den gode Armelle hendes daglige Omgang med Gud* ('Armelle Nicolas, commonly called the good Armelle, her everyday relations with God'). Originally written in French and published in 1676, the work was ascribed to Jeanne de la Nativité (1731–1798), an Ursuline nun and the superior of a convent in Vannes.³⁵ This text celebrates the mystical experiences of Armelle Nicolas (1606–1671), who was never canonized by Rome but played an important role in French religious worship. Including testimonies by the Jesuits, who had directed the conscience of 'la bonne Armelle', the French text was republished several times. In 1704 Pierre Poirer (1646–1719) reedited Armelle's *vita*,³⁶ and shortly thereafter, in

Gads, 1891–1902); Johannes Pedersen, *Fra Brydningen mellem Orthodoksi og Pietisme, 1704–1712*, 2 vols (Copenhagen: Gads, 1945–1948), II: *Mellem theologer 1712–1730* (1948), pp. 65–80; Tyge Krogh, *Oplysningstiden og det magiske: Henrettelser og korporlige straffe i 1700-tallets første halvdel* (Copenhagen: Samleren, 2000), pp. 158–90; M. Langballe Jensen, 'Libertas philosophandi and natural law in early eighteenth-century Denmark–Norway', *Intellectual History Review* 30:2 (2021), 209–31. On his connection to Pietism, see Kristian Mejrup, 'Andreas Hojer (1690–1739) – the standard-bearer of Danish–Norwegian Pietism', in Kjell Å. Modéer and Helle Vogt (eds), *Law and the Christian Tradition in Scandinavia: The Writings of Great Nordic Jurists* (London: Routledge, 2021), pp. 180–95.

34 On this issue, see Tine Reeh and Ralf Hemmingsen's contribution to this volume.

35 Jeanne de la Nativité, *Le triomphe de l'amour divin dans la vie d'une grande servante de Dieu, nommée Armelle Nicolas décédée l'an de Notre-Seigneur 1671*, 2 vols (Vannes: Jean Galles, 1676).

36 Olivier Échallard [and Jeanne de la Nativité], *L'Ecole du pur Amour de Dieu, ouverte aux savants et aux ignorants, dans la vie merveilleuse d'une pauvre fille idiote, païsanne de naissance, et servante de condition, Armelle Nicolas, vulgairement dite la bonne Armelle, décédée depuis peu en Bretagne: Par une Fille Religieuse de sa connaissance* (Cologne: Jean de la Pierre, 1704).

1708, Poiret's edition was translated into German.³⁷ The first Danish edition of 1729 is based on this German version.³⁸ Ten years later, in November 1739, the Faculty of Theology received an official request for publishing the book. This request was filed on behalf of the Danish-German printer Ernst Heinrich Berling (1708–1750); we might infer that Berling recognized that this book was in demand, but before publishing an official edition he had to secure an approval. The initial translation might actually have circulated among clandestine Catholics living in Copenhagen,³⁹ but Berling's request implies that a broader readership existed for this kind of literature. On 10 November 1739 Holm formulated the following concise censure: 'I find that this short story of the life and sayings of Armelle should by no means be printed. Laws forbid that it is published together with Pirckheimer's small book'.⁴⁰ What are we to make of this suggestion? The professor opposes any straightforward publication of this devotional text, but he also rejects Berling's attempt to publish the popular Catholic text together with a text from a certain Pirckheimer. Now, it is not entirely clear which specific text Holm is referring to. It might be the *Denkwürdigkeiten* by Caritas Pirckheimer (1467–1563), who was the abbess of a convent of Poor Clares in Nuremberg. This journal describes the period from 1524 until 1528, and the abbess documents how her community struggled as Lutheranism was introduced in the city.⁴¹ We have

37 *Die Schule der reinen Liebe Gottes Eröffnet den Gelehrten und Ungelehrten in dem Wunder Leben Einer armen unwissenden Weibs-Person / die von Geburt eine Bäurin / und dem Stande nach eine Dienst-Magd gewesen, Armelle Nikolas. Sonsten die gute Armelle genannt, welche vor weniger Zeit in Klein-Britannien gestorben. Durch eine ihr bekandte Kloster-Jungfrau / anjetzo aus dem Frantzösischen getreulich ins Teutsche übersetzt* (Regensburg: Johann Martin Hagen, 1708).

38 *Den fromme Tieneste Pige Armelle Nicolas i aldmindelighed kaldet den gode Armelle, hendes daglig omgiengelse med Gud uddragen af hendes under-levnets andendeel, som Anno 1708 er oversat i det Tüdske og nu i det danske Tungemaal dennem som elsker et helligt Levnet til en opmuntring* (n.p., 1729).

39 Urban Schrøder, 'Den gode Armelle', *Catholica*, 13:4 (1956), 155–62 (158).

40 'Narratiunculam hanc de Armellæ vita et dictis imprimi haud debere censeo. Additus vero Pirckheimeri libellus quin edatur leges haud prohibent'; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Sager vedrørende censur af teologiske skrifter (3106-01), 10 November 1739.

41 For modern editions, see Josef Pfanner (ed.), *Die 'Denkwürdigkeiten' der Caritas Pirckheimer* (Landshut: Caritas Pirckheimer Forschung, 1962);

not found a translation of this work, and it seems a rather strange fit, since Pirckheimer never submitted to the Lutheran authorities.⁴² Another and more likely fit is a booklet that Caritas' younger brother, the humanist Willibald Pirckheimer (1470–1530), published in 1524 and entitled *Wie alle Closter vnd sonderlich Junckfrawen Clöster in ein Christlichs wesen möchten durch gottes gnaden gebracht werden* ('How all religious houses, especially convents housing women who are not nuns, may be brought to a Christian character by the grace of God'). This work was published pseudonymously.⁴³ Willibald offers several suggestions for reform, including that all convents should acquire as many books as possible by Luther, Melancthon and Bugenhagen.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the author maintains that convents need not be abolished if they work for the common good of society and offer poor relief.⁴⁵ This booklet seems a more likely complement to the book on Armelle: Berling's suggestion for an intertext reveals an expectation to be able to revise the Catholic work and the intentions of its cloistered author.⁴⁶

Economic reasoning

Since the 1980s, scholars of pre-revolutionary France have pointed to the fact that French censors often prioritized financial concerns

Caritas Pirckheimer, *Caritas Pirckheimer: A Journal of the Reformation Years, 1524–1528*, trans. Paul A. MacKenzie (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2006).

- 42 In face-to-face meetings with Philipp Melancthon (1497–1560), Caritas remained true to her beliefs, and her account offers a rather harsh depiction of, for instance, how nuns were forced to listen to the new doctrine of the Lutherans for hours on end; see Kenneth G. Appold, 'Taking a stand for Reformation: Martin Luther and Caritas Pirckheimer', *Lutheran Quarterly*, 32:1 (2018), 40–59.
- 43 Noricus Philadelphus [Willibald Pirckheimer], *Wie alle Closter vnd sonderlich Junckfrawen Clöster in ein Christlichs wesen möchten durch gottes gnaden gebracht werden* (Augsburg: Philipp Ulhart, 1524).
- 44 Philadelphus, *Wie alle Closter*, unpag. [pp. 5–6].
- 45 Philadelphus, *Wie alle Closter*, unpag. [pp. 14–15].
- 46 Whatever its precise nature, Holm's suggestion was not followed, as Berling never published an edition of 'the good Armelle'. A small portion of the work, just forty-eight small pages, was later published: *Dend fromme Tieneste Pige Armelle Nicolas i aldmindelighed kaldet dend gode Armelle, hendes daglig omgiengelse med Gud uddragen af hendes under-levnets andendeel, som Anno 1708 er oversat i det Tüdske og nu i det danske Tungemaal dennem som elsker et belligt Levnet til en opmuntring* (Copenhagen: Stein, 1764). This translation carries no imprimatur.

over religious orthodoxy; this was true of censorship in eighteenth-century Denmark as well, both in terms of censorship practice and on a legislative level.⁴⁷ During the 1740s, the censors of songs and ballads would sometimes issue tacit printing permissions but specifically asked not to have their names on the printed texts.⁴⁸ They hereby avoided having their private names associated with popular cheap prints, while not hindering printers from producing what was a lucrative commodity.⁴⁹ Consequently, the popularity of prints – that is, their value in the market place – was able to circumvent rigid control of their content: the societal ideals of censorship remained intact, but economic concerns seem increasingly to encroach upon this practice. In general, these concerns chimed with mercantilist principles and, most prominently, with the idea that accumulation of wealth in the national treasuries was a key to prosperity. Indeed, many European governments implemented customs schemes, restrictions on imports and other instruments of protectionism: money flowing outside of a given territory was perceived as detrimental to state finances. In 1759 Erik Pontoppidan expressed similar thoughts in his work *Oeconomiske Balance eller uforgribelige Overslag paa Dannemarks naturlige og borgerlige Formule til at gjøre sine Indbyggere lyksalige, saavidt som de selv*

47 As argued by Robert Darnton in his studies of royal censorship in eighteenth-century France, censorship is embedded in the societies where it unfolds, and consequently it follows different societal norms; see Robert Darnton, *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France* (New York: Norton, 1996). Raymond Birn documents how the censors' assessments were affected by their academic taste, which paved the way for fluctuating rationalities and practices within the institution; see Raymond Birn, *Royal Censorship of Books in Eighteenth-Century France* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012).

48 Popular songs were censored by the Faculty of Philosophy, and this faculty did not use an anonymizing protocol like that of the Faculty of Theology. Instead, the professor's name and permission were required to be printed on the front page.

49 See Harald IIsøe, 'Censur og approbation: lidt om bogcensurens administration i 16–1700-tallet', in John T. Lauridsen and Olaf Olsen (eds), *Umisteligt* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2007), pp. 119–35. On the legal proceedings concerning the cases from the 1740s, see Jesper Jakobsen, "...At I for saadant Eders u-tilladelige forhold skal vorde anseet og straffet...": Bogtrykkeren Johan Jørgen Høpfner mellem politikyndighed og akademisk censur i 1740'ernes København', in Sofie Lene Bak and others (eds), *'Kildekunst' Historiske og kulturhistoriske studier: Festskrift til John T. Lauridsen* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2016), pp. 165–83.

ville skionne derpaa og benytte sig deraf. After completing his studies in 1718, Pontoppidan had travelled in England and Holland, where he was influenced by, among others, Friedrich Adolph Lampe (1683–1729), who was attempting to translate pietistic trends into a Calvinistic framework. Upon his return to Denmark, Pontoppidan became vicar on the island of Als in the Baltic Sea, and his pietistic leanings soon earned him both enemies and supporters. In 1734 he was awarded a position affiliated to the parish of Hillerød and, more specifically, to the Castle of Frederiksborg. Pontoppidan became professor extraordinarius in 1738, and he maintained this position even after 1748, when he became Bishop of Bergen. He returned to Copenhagen in 1754 and later became pro-chancellor of the university. The protocol on censorship of minor works informs us that between 1738 and 1764, Pontoppidan censored seventy-seven manuscripts. In some instances, he employs a rather uncompromising tone: he rejects one manuscript by abruptly stating that ‘this foolish accumulation of words must be suppressed’.⁵⁰ Despite such harsh rejections, Pontoppidan also argued for a more lenient regulation of the book market, and this standpoint was clearly motivated by contemporary economic theories. Indeed, Pontoppidan relied heavily upon trends in European mercantilism and, more specifically, German cameralism.⁵¹ Thus, a substantial part of Pontoppidan’s *Oeconomisk Balance* is dedicated to the negative effects of imports, which the author describes

50 ‘supprimatur inepta verborum congeries’; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Sager vedrørende censur af teologiske skrifter (3106-01), 30 September 1740. The title of the censored manuscript is: *En omhyggelig Huusfaders gudelige Ombue for sin af Gud betroede Familie og Huuhstyrende, med Morgen- Middags og Aften Andagter, som af hellige tyske Evangeliske Mænds Skrifter er uddraget* (‘An attentive house-father’s pious care for his God-given family and household, including morning, noon, and evening prayers, which have been selected from the writings of holy German evangelical authors’).

51 The immense influence of German cameralism on mid-eighteenth-century economical thought is also stressed in Maliks, ‘To rule is to communicate’, p. 144. For a brief introduction to the spread of mercantilist and cameralist ideas in eighteenth-century Denmark, see Erik Oxenbøll, *Dansk økonomisk tænkning 1700–1770* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1977). On the discussion of luxury goods during the period, see Mikkel Venborg Pedersen, *Luksus: forbrug og kolonier i Danmark i det 18. Århundrede* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2013). See also Petterson’s contribution to this volume.

as draining the gutters of the treasury.⁵² Even so, the professor of theology remarked how the import of books from Germany, France and the Netherlands was inevitable.⁵³ Until domestic book production met the standards of foreign printers, this influx would be impossible to avoid; the failure of Danish printers to match international production standards posed a financial problem, and also raised the danger that controversial literature would steadily flow into the kingdom.⁵⁴ Accordingly, Pontoppidan suggested that the best way to control the importation of books was to ease restrictions on domestic printers and publishers.⁵⁵

Did such opinions influence the practice of censorship? The protocol on minor works does not provide us with sufficient information to answer to this question. However, a series of legal memoranda corroborate that the faculty was attempting to strike a difficult balance between religious orthodoxy on the one hand and the market conditions of printers situated outside Copenhagen on the other. These memoranda were drafted in response to the petitions of printers who applied for special rights or complete exemption from censorship. In 1757 the Jewish printer Coppel Samson Bloch (d. 1772) and his brother applied for permission to establish a Jewish print shop in Copenhagen. The Faculty of Theology was asked for a response; while not enthusiastic about the endeavour, the professors' memorandum includes an important financial consideration: the print shop could potentially be a source of income, and the brothers could thereby be able to 'make a living, and conserve some money in the nation, as well as attract money from elsewhere'.⁵⁶ In their

52 Erik Pontoppidan, *Oeconomiske Balance eller Uforgribelige Overslag paa Dannemarks Naturlige og Borgerlige Formue Til at giøre sine Indbyggere lykkelige, saavidt som de selv ville skionne derpaa og benytte sig deraf* (Copenhagen: Godiche, 1759), p. 229.

53 For a more detailed discussion on the importation of books, see Jakobsen, 'Uanstændige', pp. 65–9.

54 In early modern Europe, texts prohibited in one country were often printed in another country from where they could then be imported; see Darnton, *The Forbidden*. In Copenhagen, the French-speaking Swiss printer Claude Philibert (1709–1784) printed controversial French literature and distributed it to France; compare Henrik Horstbøll, 'En bogtrykker og boghandler i København: Claude Philiberts forbindelse med Societé typographique de Neuchatel 1771–1783', *Fund og Forskning*, 44 (2012), 311–35.

55 Pontoppidan, *Oeconomiske Balance*, p. 228.

56 'fortienne Deres Brød, samt at menagere nogle Penge i Landet, sa vel og at trekke Penge anden Steds fra herind'; SAr, Københavns Universitet,

response, the theologians seem sensitive to a mercantilist and cameralist line of reasoning. They take state finances into consideration, and despite theologically motivated suspicions against Jews, the professors allow for the establishment of the print shop. As part of the increasing rationalization of society, economics – in theory and practice – influenced the practice of censorship. Indeed, Pontoppidan was both a censor and an active proponent of such theories and practices.⁵⁷

In the first half of the eighteenth century, local censorship administration was introduced for provincial printing houses in both Denmark and Norway. Jakob Maliks has argued that the de-monopolization of the university's censorship administration was an attempt by the Royal Chancellery in Copenhagen to reclaim control of all material that left the printing presses within the kingdom, as 'the provincial printers seem to have managed to avoid sending non-controversial print material to the capital for censoring'.⁵⁸ We will argue that the practice of establishing local censorship administration was, on the contrary, perceived by the university as a weakening of control over printed materials. However, during the 1760s the university still approved the further establishing of local censorship administration; in this process, the university clearly prioritized business conditions for the provincial printing houses over the maintenance of religious orthodoxy. In 1765 the aforementioned Hans Mossin argued that his print shop, situated in Bergen, was suffering from unnecessary expenditure because manuscripts had to be forwarded to the Faculty of Theology in Copenhagen. He asked permission for the local bishop, Frederik Arentz (1699–1779), to assess and approve manuscripts prior to printing. The Faculty of Theology was asked to formulate an official response to Mossin's request, and this memorandum recognizes the validity of his complaint; the professors even welcome the

Konsistoriums kopibog (1213-11), 399. On this and the ensuing memoranda, see Jakobsen, 'Uanstændige', pp. 148–64.

57 Between 1757 and 1764 Pontoppidan was also the editor of the periodical *Danmarks og Norges Økonomiske Magazin*. This financial periodical was the first of its kind in eighteenth-century Denmark, and it invited 'patriots' to publish their suggestions as to how state finances might be improved. Thus, and as argued by Maliks, the introduction of this state-sponsored journal facilitated a space for critical discourse, although this space was closely monitored and regulated; Maliks, 'To rule is to communicate', pp. 144–5.

58 Maliks, 'To rule is to communicate', p. 140.

prospect of having less work on their plates. However, they also maintain that a less centralized system of censorship would allow texts to be published which should have been suppressed. Furthermore, the professors remark:

Today, caution is much more required than two hundred years ago, as a portion of the worst writings, classifiable as of the crudest kind, which are being imported from Germany and other countries, are now being published with the greatest audacity and in several languages.⁵⁹

Finally, in 1767 the printer Emanuel Balling (1733–1795), who had established his shop in the town of Elsinore, handed in a request like Mossin's. Located fifty kilometres north of Copenhagen, his shop was just four kilometres from the Swedish coast. Balling therefore argued that he hoped to attract customers from across the Øresund, but this venture 'would vanish completely' if Swedish authors were to be committed to letting themselves be censored in Copenhagen, and could not be censored in the same location where the printing was done.⁶⁰ In their response, the professors again recognize the need to ease restrictions and rationalize conditions, but they also reiterate the potential risk of 'private concern or private affiliation between censor and author'.⁶¹ This challenge is specific to the relatively small social milieu of a provincial town like Elsinore. It was unclear to the professors at the university how impartiality could be secured outside of the capital.

Conclusion

Before freedom of print was introduced in Denmark on 14 September 1770, an increase in societal complexity caused debates and conflicts. We might perceive such debates and conflicts

59 'i disse tider behøves forsigtighed langt meere end i nestforige 200de Aar, da henhører end og af det Allergroveste Slags nu med største dristighed i adskillige Sprog udgive i trycken én Mængde af de værste Skrifter som fra Tydskland og andre Lande her indføres'; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Konsistoriums kopibog (1213-12), 684.

60 'vilde ganske forsveinde, dersom Svenske forfattere skulle være forbunden til at lade sig Censurere i København og ikke kunde have Censuren paa samme Stæd, hvor Trykningen skeede'; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Konsistoriums kopibog (1213-13), 17.

61 'privat interesse eller privat Conexion imellem Censores og forfatteren'; SAR, Københavns Universitet, Konsistoriums kopibog (1213-13), 18.

as precursors of the historical moment when Enlightenment became not the answer to a question, but rather the question that societies had (and still have) to pose to themselves. Since the 2010s, scholars of the eighteenth century have nuanced our understanding of these emerging spaces of public debate. During this century, the Danish monarchy underwent a reorganization that opened its public sphere to an unprecedented level of debate about, for example, economics. Furthermore, pre-publication censorship had slowly but surely been undermined. Struensee's introduction of an unrestricted freedom of print was the crest of wave that had long been rising. The professors of theology took an active part in this process as well. The introduction of competing frameworks for religious authority became an important factor driving societal changes that would later be recognized as secular. Less rigid practices of censorship constitute one example of changes that were not imposed upon the religious system but rather developed inside it.

Bibliography

Archival sources

Copenhagen

Rigsarkivet (SAr)

- Danske Kancelli Koncepter og indlæg til Sjællandske Tegnelser (D21)
 Københavns Universitet, Konsistoriums kopibog (1213)
 Københavns Universitet, Sager vedrørende censur af teologiske skrifter
 (3106-01)
 Kirkekollegiet (Generalkirkeinspektionskollegiet), Diverse Sager (F4.18.3)

Printed sources and literature

- Appel, Charlotte, *Læsning og bogmarked i 1600-tallets Danmark*, 2 vols (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2001).
 Appold, Kenneth G., 'Taking a stand for Reformation: Martin Luther and Caritas Pirckheimer', *Lutheran Quarterly*, 32:1 (2018), 40–59.
 Banning, Knud, 'Det teologiske Fakultet 1732–1830', in Svend Ellehøj (ed.), *Københavns Universitet 1479–1979*, 14 vols (Copenhagen: Gad, 1979–2005), IV: *Det teologiske fakultet*, ed. Leif Grane (1980), pp. 13–82.
 Birn, Raymond, *Royal Censorship of Books in Eighteenth-Century France* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2012).

- Bönig, Holger, *Welteroberung durch ein neues Publikum: die deutsche Presse und der Weg zur Aufklärung: Hamburg und Altona als Beispiel* (Bremen: Edition Lumière, 2002).
- Cochanski, Dagmar, *Präsidential- und Oberpräsidentialverfassung in Altona 1664–1746* (Hamburg: Selbstverlag Verein für Hamburgische Geschichte, 1984).
- Dahl, Gina, *Books in Early Modern Norway* (Leiden: Brill, 2011).
- , *Libraries and Enlightenment: Eighteenth-Century Norway and the Outer World* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2014).
- Darnton, Robert, *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France* (New York: Norton, 1996).
- Échallard, Olivier [and Jeanne de la Nativité], *L'École du pur Amour de Dieu, ouverte aux savants et aux ignorants, dans la vie merveilleuse d'une pauvre fille idiote, paysanne de naissance, et servante de condition, Armelle Nicolas, vulgairement dite la bonne Armelle, décédée depuis peu en Bretagne. Par une Fille Religieuse de sa connaissance* (Cologne: Jean de la Pierre, 1704).
- Engelsing, Rolf, *Der Bürger als Leser: Lesergeschichte in Deutschland, 1500–1800* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1974).
- Horstbøll, Henrik, 'En bogtrykker og boghandler i København: Claude Philiberts forbindelse med Société typographique de Neuchatel 1771–1783', *Fund og Forskning*, 44 (2012), 311–35.
- , *Menigmands medie: Det folkelige bogtryk i Danmark 1500–1840* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 1999).
- Horstbøll, Henrik, Ulrik Langen and Frederik Stjernfelt, *Grov Konfekt: Tre vilde år med trykkefrihed, 1770–73*, 2 vols (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 2020).
- Ilse, Harald, 'Censur og approbation: lidt om bogcensurens administration i 16–1700-tallet', in John T. Lauridsen and Olaf Olsen (eds), *Umisteligt* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2007), pp. 19–35.
- Israel, Jonathan, 'Northern varieties: contrasting the Dano-Norwegian and the Swedish-Finnish Enlightenments', in Ellen Krefting, Aina Nøding and Mona Ringvej (eds), *Eighteenth-Century Periodicals as Agents of Change* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 17–45.
- Jakobsen, Jesper, "'... At I for saadant Eders u-tilladelige forhold skal vorde anset og straffet ...': Bogtrykkeren Johan Jørgen Høpfner mellem politimyndighed og akademisk censur i 1740'ernes København', in Sofie Lene Bak and others (eds), *'Kildekunst' Historiske og kulturhistoriske studier: Festskrift til John T. Lauridsen* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2016), pp. 165–83.
- , 'Der Klagen über das verdorbene Christenthum: om interessekonflikter og censurprocedure vedrørende oversættelsen af et teologisk skrift i 1739', *Fund og Forskning* 50 (2011), 259–78.
- , 'Omorganiseringen af den teologiske censur', *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 111:1 (2011), 1–36.

- , ‘Uanstændige, utilladelige og unyttige skrifter: en undersøgelse af censuren i praksis 1746–1773’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Copenhagen, 2017).
- Jantzen, Albert Thorvald, ‘Marcus Wöldike’, in Carl Frederik Bricka (ed.), *Dansk biografisk Lexikon, tillige omfattende Norge for tidsrummet 1537–1814*, 19 vols (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1887–1905), XIX (1905), pp. 257–8.
- , ‘Peder Holm’, in Carl Frederik Bricka (ed.), *Dansk biografisk Lexikon, tillige omfattende Norge for tidsrummet 1537–1814*, 19 vols (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1887–1905), VII (1893), pp. 584–6.
- Jensen, M. Langballe, ‘Libertas philosophandi and natural law in early eighteenth-century Denmark–Norway’, *Intellectual History Review*, 30:2 (2020), 209–31.
- Jørgensen, Harald, *Trykkefrihedsspørgsmaalet i Danmark 1799–1848* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1944).
- Koch, Ludvig, ‘Bidrag til Censurens Historie under Fredrik V’, *Historisk Tidsskrift*, 2 (1889), 67–94.
- Krogh, Tyge, *Oplysningstiden og det magiske: Henrettelser og korporlige straffe i 1700-tallets første halvdel* (Copenhagen: Samleren, 2000).
- Laursen, John Christian, ‘Spinoza in Denmark and the fall of Struensee, 1770–1772’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 61:2 (2020), 189–202.
- Lausten, Martin Schwarz, *Kirkeordinansen 1537/39* (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1989).
- Lundbye, Jørgen, *Kirkekampen i Danmark 1730–1746* (Copenhagen: Schönbergske, 1947).
- Maliks, Jakob, ‘Imprimatur i provinsen – Sensuren av det trykte ord utenfor København 1737–1770’, in Eivind Tjønneland (ed.), *Kritikk før 1814* (Oslo: Dreyer, 2014), pp. 78–102.
- , ‘To rule is to communicate: the absolutist system of political communication in Denmark–Norway 1660–1750’, in Ellen Krefting, Aina Nøding and Mona Ringvej (eds), *Eighteenth-Century Periodicals as Agents of Change* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 134–52.
- , ‘Vilkår for offentlighet: sensur, økonomi og transformasjonen af det offentlige rom i Danmark-Norge 1730–1770’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet, 2011).
- Matzen, Henning, *Kjøbenhavns Universitets Retshistorie 1479–1879* (Copenhagen: J. H. Schultz, 1879).
- Mayes, Benjamin T. G., *Counsel and Conscience: Lutheran Casuistry and Moral Reasoning after the Reformation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).
- Mejrup, Kristian, ‘Andreas Hojer (1690–1739) – the standard-bearer of Danish-Norwegian Pietism’, in Kjell Å. Modéer and Helle Vogt (eds), *Law and the Christian Tradition in Scandinavia: The Writings of Great Nordic Jurists* (London: Routledge, 2021), pp. 180–95.
- Melton, James Van Horn, *The Rise of the Public in Enlightenment Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

- Nativité, Jeanne de la, *Le Triomphe de l'amour divin dans la vie d'une grande servante de Dieu, nommée Armelle Nicolas décédée l'an de Notre-Seigneur 1671* (Vannes: Jean Galles, 1676).
- Nordin, Jonas and John Christian Laursen, 'Northern declarations of freedom of the press: the relative importance of philosophical ideas and of local politics', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 81:2 (2020), 217–37.
- Olsen, Olaf (ed.), *Gyldendal og Politikens Danmarkshistorie*, 16 vols (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1988–1991), IX: *Ole Feldbæk, Den lange fred: 1700–1800* (1990).
- Oxenbøll, Erik, *Dansk økonomisk tænkning 1700–1770* (Copenhagen: Akademis Förlag, 1977).
- Pedersen, Johannes, *Fra Brydningen mellem Orthodoksi og Pietisme, 1704–1712*, 2 vols (Copenhagen: Gads, 1945–1948), II: *Mellem theologer 1712–1730* (1948).
- Pedersen, Mikkel Venborg, *Luksus: forbrug og kolonier i Danmark i det 18. Århundrede* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2013).
- Pfanner, Josef (ed.), *Die 'Denkwürdigkeiten' der Caritas Pirckheimer* (Landshut: Caritas Pirckheimer Forschung, 1962).
- Pirckheimer, Caritas, *Caritas Pirckheimer: A Journal of the Reformation Years, 1524–1528*, trans. Paul A. MacKenzie (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2006).
- Philadelphus, Noricus [Willibald Pirckheimer], *Wie alle Closter vnd sonderlich Junckfrauen Clöster in ein Christlichs wesen möchten durch gottes gnaden gebracht werden* (Augsburg: Philipp Ulhart, 1524).
- Pontoppidan, Erik, *Oeconomiske Balance eller Uforgribelige Oberslag paa Dannemarks Naturlige og Borgerlige Formue Til at giøre sine Indbyggere lykkelige, saavidt som de selv ville skjønne derpaa og benytte sig deraf* (Copenhagen: Godiche, 1759).
- Reitzel-Nielsen, Erik, 'Censuren af Pontoppidans katekismus', *Kirkehistoriske Samlinger*, 7:4 (1960–1962), 12–48.
- Rian, Øystein, *Sensuren i Danmark-Norge: Vilkårene for offentlige ytringer 1536–1814* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2014).
- Rørdam, Holger, *Historiske Samlinger og Studier vedrørende danske Forhold og Studier især i det 17 århundrede* (Copenhagen: Gads, 1891–1902).
- Schrøder, Urban, 'Den gode Armelle', *Catholica*, 13:4 (1956), 155–62.
- Secher, Vilhelm Adolf (ed.), *Kong Christian den femtis Danske Lov* (Copenhagen: Gads, 1929).
- Tharp, Daniel Smith, 'Hans Mossin', in Carl Frederik Bricka (ed.), *Dansk biografisk Lexikon, tillige omfattende Norge for tidsrummet 1537–1814*, 19 vols (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1887–1905), XI (1897), pp. 481–3.
- Tulle, H. L., 'Fortale', in *Bibellys, sat imod det exegetiske Mørk* (Copenhagen: Andreas Hartvig Godiche, 1740).
- Witte, John, Jr, *From Sacrament to Contract: Marriage, Religion, and Law in the Western Tradition* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2011).