

*Praenotandum*

This article was published in *Numen* 45, 2 (1998): 115-162. The page numbers of the original publication are indicated in bold and have been set between square brackets. In *Numen* the article had endnotes at pp. 139-155. This version has footnotes. The page numbers of the original footnotes are, however, indicated in bold and between square brackets in the footnotes. I have also revised the article in several places and entered a few corrections.

Jan G. Platvoet  
Leiden University

CLOSE HARMONIES:  
SCIENCE OF RELIGIONS IN DUTCH  
*DUPLEX ORDO* THEOLOGY, 1860-1960

*Summary*

This article surveys the history of the Science of Religions in the Netherlands in the period 1860 to 1960 at the time when it was an integral part of Dutch liberal academic theology as pursued in the faculties of theology at the universities of Leiden, Groningen, Utrecht and Amsterdam. In 1876, these faculties were given a special statute, the so-called *duplex ordo*, in a law that separated the ‘confessional’ theological disciplines from the ‘scientific’ ones. It also introduced the new disciplines of the Science of Religions and the Philosophy of Religion into these reconstituted faculties. I discuss Tiele’s plan to make the Science of Religion their central discipline, and why it was ultimately given only a marginal place in them. My main concern, however, is to outline the theology which inspired the Science of Religion of Tiele, Chantepie, Van der Leeuw and Bleeker and to demonstrate its ‘close harmony’ with the liberal theology prevailing in these *duplex ordo* faculties, as also in at least some of the modalities of the *Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk* whose ministers were trained in these faculties. It was that close harmony which allowed Van der Leeuw to disregard the *duplex ordo* and to establish a full harmony between the Science of Religion and confessional theology. I also discuss dissonant voices, Kraemer’s especially, calling for the abrogation of the *duplex ordo* and the integration of the Science of Religion into a militantly confessional theology.

Vom Christentum aus unsern Blick auf die Welt der historischen Religionen richtend, meinen wir zu sehen, dass das Evangelium sich zeigt als Erfüllung der Religion überhaupt.<sup>1</sup>

---

[139] <sup>1</sup> ‘Directing our gaze from Christianity towards the world of the historical religions, we think that we see the Gospel manifest itself as the fulfilment of religion as such’ (Van der Leeuw 1933: 614; 1948a:

The main thesis of this article is that ‘Science of Religion’<sup>2</sup> was part and parcel of academic liberal theology in the Netherlands from its inception in the 1860s until 1960. To document it, the theologies undergirding the Sciences of Religion of Tiele, Chantepie, Van der Leeuw and Bleeker are discussed; and those of some other Dutch scholars of religions of that same period are also briefly indicated. [116] I also will discuss the institutional structure, known as *duplex ordo*, established by the Dutch parliament in 1876. It separated ‘academic’ theology from ‘confessional’, or church-tied theology and, and at the same time introduced the new discipline of Science of Religions into the Faculties of Theology of the Universities at Leiden, Groningen, Utrecht and Amsterdam. I conclude by discussing the protests voiced against the *duplex ordo* by Gunning and Kraemer in their pleas for a re-confessionalisation of academic theology and Science of Religion.

### *Tiele’s strategy*

When the Arminian minister C.P. Tiele (1830-1902) used the term *godsdienswetenschap*, ‘Science of Religion(s)’, for the first time in 1866, he did so in a programmatic rather than a descriptive sense. The term ‘Science of Religion(s)’ was only just beginning to gain currency in German,<sup>3</sup> French,<sup>4</sup> English,<sup>5</sup> and Dutch<sup>6</sup> academic writing, and the newly emerg-

---

629; 1963: 646). All translations from Dutch, German or French into English in this article are by the author unless a different translator is expressly mentioned.

<sup>2</sup> The academic study of religions has traditionally been termed ‘Science of Religion(s)’ in the universities of Continental Europe. It goes by the name of *Religionswissenschaft* in German; *godsdienswetenschap* in Dutch; *religionsvidenskab* in Danish; *religioznawcze* in Polish; *religiovedeniya* in Russian; *science(s) des religions* in French; *scienza delle religioni* in Italian; *ciencias de las religiones* in Spanish; etc. and by *godsdienswetenskap* in Afrikaans in South Africa. I use the term ‘Science of Religion(s)’ throughout this article, I prefer the plural, ‘Science of Religions’, in order to emphasise that it is the historical study of the discrete religions of humankind, and not the study of ‘religion’, conceived as an abstract idea, as is customary in Philosophy of Religion and in theology.

<sup>3</sup> Pinard de la Boullaye (1922: 504) traced the earliest use of *Religionswissenschaft* to a periodical for the History of Religions, entitled *Museum für die Religionswissenschaft in ihrem ganzen Umfang*, three volumes of which were published by H.Ph.K. Henke in Magdeburg between 1804 and 1806. Other very early uses of *Religionswissenschaft* were by the Czech philosopher of religion and mathematician Bolzano (1834<sup>1</sup>/1853<sup>2</sup>/1994<sup>3</sup>; 1837<sup>1</sup>/1841<sup>2</sup>/1994<sup>3</sup>); cf. also Post (1869). Its synonym, *Die Wissenschaft der Religion*, was used by Stiefelwagen (1858) and Tölle (1865-1871, I: 4; II: V).

<sup>4</sup> The earliest use of *science des religions* was by Leblanc in 1852 (Leblanc 1852, I: 17sq.). He, however, used it in a different meaning from the modern one, i.e. as the allegorical interpretation of the myths of the ancient religions. The first to use the term in its modern sense was Émile Burnouf in 1864 (Burnouf 1864, 1872), with whom F. Max Müller had studied in 1845-1846. Cf. Pinard de la Boullaye 1922: 277, 504; van den Bosch 1993: 108.

<sup>5</sup> Max Müller was the first to use it in English and he did so for the first time in an essay on ‘Semitic monotheism’ in 1860 (pace van den Bosch 1993: 109), which was republished in Müller 1867 (pp. 337-374). He popularised the term in his introduction to the *Essays on the Science of Religion* (1867) and his *Introduction to the Science of Religion* (1873), defining it as ‘the critical and comparative study of the religions of the world’ (cf. Müller 1867: XI, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXI, XXVI, 183, 373; and Müller 1873).

<sup>6</sup> Tiele was probably the first Dutch scholar to use the term *godsdienswetenschap* in 1856 (Tiele 1856: 118, 126). On this article, cf. also Van de Breevaart 2002: 39. In 1866, in his programmatic article ‘Theology and Science of Religion’, Tiele already uses *godsdienswetenschap* freely as a term that is well-established (Tiele 1866: 205, 218, 220, 221, 224, 226, 227, 228, 236, 240, 243). Apart from *godsdienswetens-*

ing discipline had as yet nowhere been granted chairs.<sup>7</sup> By this time, however, the discipline had already begun to create the scholarly identities with which it was to emerge as an academic discipline in continental universities in the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Tiele was undoubtedly one of its founders.<sup>8</sup> From as early as 1860, he began to pursue an ambitious ‘strategy of conquest’<sup>9</sup> not just to establish Science of Religion(s) as a new discipline in the (Leiden) Faculty of Theology, but to install it there as the very paradigm and centre-piece of what he called ‘scientific theology’.<sup>10</sup>

Tiele executed that strategy in three phases. He began in 1860 by publishing a caustic critique of the poor quality of J.H. Scholten’s teaching of History of Religions (*godsdiensgeschiedenis*) at the Leiden Faculty of Theology. At that time Scholten and the biblical

---

*schap* (‘science of religion[s]’), he also employs the term (*algemeene*) *wetenschap der godsdienst*, the ‘(general) science of religion’ (Tiele 1866: 215, 224, 227). See also Tiele (1870a: 102n1) where he praises Max Müller for having done so much to promote the ‘Science of Religion’ by his works that its birth as an academic discipline may be said to be mainly due to his ‘skill as a midwife’ (*maieutikè technè*). However, he refuses to call Müller its founder. He agrees with Whitney, Müller’s critic, that Müller identified the science of religion too much with linguistics, the science of languages. In his view, science of religion(s) should instead be conceived as a science of human ideas and conceptions, i.e. of the human mind and the human heart.

[140]<sup>7</sup> The first chair of *Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte*, ‘the General History of Religions’, was established in the Faculty of Theology of the University of Geneva, Switzerland, in 1873 (*pace* Kraemer 1959: 9). Its first incumbent was T. Droz who occupied it from 1873 to 1880. Chairs were also established in the Universities of Lausanne, Basle, and Zürich in the following decades. The first two chairs in *godsdiensgeschiedenis in het algemeen*, ‘General History of Religions’, in the Netherlands were established in 1877 and 1878 at the universities of Leiden and Amsterdam after that subject had been added to list of courses to be taught in the Faculties of Theology at the (State, i.e. public) Universities of Leiden, Utrecht and Groningen in 1876. That list was also adopted by the Faculty of Theology of the (Municipal) University of Amsterdam. The first incumbent at Leiden University was C.P. Tiele, from 1877 to 1900. P.D. Chantepie de la Saussaye was the first to occupy the Amsterdam chair, from 1878 to 1899, when he gave it up to become Professor of Ethics at the Leiden Faculty of Theology. The first chairs in France were those of A. Réville at the *Collège de France*, and of P. de Broglie at the *Institut Catholique*, both in Paris, in 1880. In Belgium, the chair of E.F.A. Comte Goblet d’Alviella at the *Université Libre* in Brussels was founded in 1884. In Italy, the chair in History of Religions of Baldassarre Lablance (1829-1913) was established at the University of Rome in 1886 (but changed to History of Christianity in 1887) (cf. Faitrop-Porta 1995). In 1914 that of R. Pettazoni was established at the University of Bologna. But ‘the first permanent chair of the History of Religions in Italy was held at the University of Rome, 1923-1953, by R. Pettazoni’ (Bianchi 1975: 28, note 21; also Bianchi 1994a: xx). Sweden’s earliest chairs were those of N. Söderblom at the University of Uppsala in 1901, and of E. Lehmann at the University of Lund in 1913. That of T.W. Rhys Davids was the first in England, at the University of Manchester in 1904. In Germany, they were those of E. Lehmann at the University of Berlin in 1910, N. Söderblom at Leipzig University in 1912, C. Clemen at the University of Bonn in 1920, and F. Heiler at the University of Marburg in 1922. The first chair in Science of Religion in Denmark was established at the University of Copenhagen in 1914; and in Norway at the University of Oslo in 1915. Cf. Pinard de la Boullaye 1922: 331-333; Van der Leeuw 1948a: 679; Waardenburg 1972: 381, 461, 639; Sharpe 1975: 120-133; Rollmann 1991: 87-91.

<sup>8</sup> Chantepie 1909a: 91. Another founder was, of course, F.M. Müller, as Tiele (1871a: 102) himself testified.

<sup>9</sup> Leertouwer 1989: 154, 156, 158

<sup>10</sup> Tiele 1860: 816. Cf. also: ‘I can hardly imagine a scientific theology of which the history of religions is not an important part’ (Tiele 1860: 816, note 1); and: ‘Theology and Science of Religion(s) must not be practised separately and independently. The former will have become truly scientific only when it has enlarged its boundaries and has merged completely with the latter’ (Tiele 1873a: 39).

scholar Abraham Kuenen were the two famous professors of theology in the Leiden Faculty.<sup>11</sup> Scholten taught New Testament, *theologia naturalis* (or *doctrina de deo*)<sup>12</sup> and Dogmatic Theology. He was the architect and undisputed leader of ‘modern theology’, a new Leiden-based school of liberal theology that had been gaining popularity since 1848.<sup>13</sup>

Its second phase ran from 1866 to 1867, when the Minister of Internal Affairs, the Arminian van Heemskerck, published the (first) [117] draft of a bill reorganising secondary and tertiary education in the Netherlands.<sup>14</sup> Tiele followed it up at once with two articles in which he outlined his concept of a Faculty of ‘Scientific Theology’ with Science of Religion as its core discipline. ‘Traditional theology’, with its polemics, apologetics and dogmatics, was to be banned from it.<sup>15</sup> The second of these articles was given a prominent place in the very first issue of the new Leiden-based *Theologisch Tijdschrift*.<sup>16</sup> It meant that Tiele’s ideas met with considerable sympathy with the Leiden Faculty.<sup>17</sup> It seems likely that the Leiden Faculty and Tiele continued to cultivate this mutual goodwill and understanding in the years that followed, as the third and crowning phase showed.

That phase ran from 1872 to 1877. In 1872, Tiele was granted a doctorate *honoris causa* by the Leiden Faculty. In 1873, after Tiele had been appointed Rector of the Seminary of the small Arminian Church at Amsterdam, the seminary was moved to Leiden. And on 13 February 1873, Tiele presented his inaugural address as its Professor in the *Groot Auditorium*, ‘Great Hall’, of Leiden University.<sup>18</sup> To crown it all, when the bill of 28 April

---

<sup>11</sup> J.H. Scholten (1811-1881) was professor extraordinary for *theologia naturalis* at Leiden from 1843 to 1845, and ordinary professor for dogmatic theology, history of *doctrina de deo*, introduction to New Testament, *theologia naturalis* and ethics from 1845 to 1881 (Jensma & de Vries 1997: 317, 335, 337). Abraham Kuenen (1828-1891) was Scholten’s special pupil and a leader of ‘Modern Theology’ as well. In 1852, at the age of 24, he was appointed professor extraordinary to teach New Testament Exegesis and the History of the Books of the Old Testament’, and promoted to ordinary professor in 1855 to teach Encyclopaedia of Theology as well, to which Ethics was added in 1860. But his particular field of study was Old Testament Exegesis in which he also offered classes and in which he became one of the leading scholar of his time (Oort 1892: 114; Kristensen 1939/1954: 31-32). He was formally appointed Professor of OT Exegesis and the History of the Religion of Israel in 1877 (cf. also Anonymus 1912: 734). He retired in 1891 (Jensma & de Vries 1997: 302, 335, 336).

<sup>12</sup> Natural Theology, or *doctrina de deo*, had emerged as a distinct discipline during the ‘Batavian’ revolution (1795-1801), when it was split off from confessional Dogmatic Theology because it was believed to transcend the dogmatic theologies of [141] particular Christian churches (cf. De Jong 1969: 14, 16, 17, 18, 20). It was the ‘predecessor of both Philosophy of Religion and History of Religions, incorporating much material from Dogmatic Theology’ (De Jong 1969: 21; 1968: 314). It was removed from the list of disciplines to be taught and examined in the *duplex ordo* faculties of theology in 1927.

<sup>13</sup> Tiele 1860. Cf. also e.g. Roessingh 1924a, 1924d; Van der Linde 1983.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. De Jong 1968: 316sq

<sup>15</sup> Tiele 1866, 1867: 39

<sup>16</sup> This journal became the stronghold of ‘modern’ (i.e. liberal) theology in the Netherlands in the following decades.

<sup>17</sup> Apart from Scholten and Kuenen, the faculty consisted of two more staff: J.J. Prins (1814-1898), who was professor of NT exegesis, Introduction to NT, ancient Christian literature and practical theology from 1855 to 1885 (Jensma & de Vries 1997: 312, 336); and L.W.E. Rauwenhoff (1828-1889), who was professor extraordinary of dogmatic theology, encyclopaedia of theology and church history from 1860 to 1865, and ordinary professor of the same subjects and philosophy of religion from 1865 to 1889 (Jensma & de Vries 1997: 313, 335).

<sup>18</sup> Tiele 1873a

1876 reforming Dutch secondary and tertiary education had at long last been steered through Parliament by again van Heemskerck<sup>19</sup> and had come into effect in 1877, Tiele was appointed Professor of History of Religions (and Philosophy of Religion)<sup>20</sup> at the Leiden Faculty of Theology in 1877. Not only was his chair the first of its kind in The Netherlands but he was also the only and first ever academic from outside the *Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk* (NHK church), the former Public Church, to be appointed professor in a faculty of theology at a Dutch public university.<sup>21</sup>

### *Tiele's scientific theology*

In his 1866 article, Tiele charged Science of Religion with the mission to save theology from the 'alien [i.e. confessional] interests' of the churches.<sup>22</sup> He branded Schleiermacher's confessional paradigm of 'academic theology' as thoroughly unscientific and incapable of producing *Religionswissenschaft*, because it linked 'scientific theology' intrinsically to the several Christian churches. It would, therefore, produce as many 'academic' theologies as there were churches.<sup>23</sup> But he praised Hegel for having 'allotted the science of religion(s) its independent place in the choir of the sciences'.<sup>24</sup> He branded

---

<sup>19</sup> After three earlier drafts had stranded (De Jong 1968: 316-324). The universities at Leiden, Utrecht and Groningen were given five faculties: Theology, Law, Medicine, Mathematics & Physics, and Arts & Philosophy (art. 41).

<sup>20</sup> The Faculties of Theology had usually only four, or exceptionally five, professors and some ten subjects to teach (cf. also below note 90). The professors of a faculty, therefore, used to confer amongst themselves on who would teach which courses, each taking two or, if need be, three or more (Kristensen 1939/1954: 31). Tiele, however, taught History of Religions only. The reason for this was probably his (Arminian) outsiderhood (cf. below). Except for the new subject, History of Religions, all the other fields of study were, as a matter of course, entrusted to the 'normal' staff. They were those who had been raised in the traditions of these faculties which they viewed as the reserves of the Public Church and its newly emerging modalities (Van Rooden 1996: 159-168, 173, 174). Tiele asserted his right to teach Philosophy of Religion, and revived the defunct part of his formal commission as professor of the Leiden Faculty, only in 1891, when he, by then the senior member of the faculty, clashed with J.H. Gunning over the *duplex ordo*. (See below the section on 'The *duplex ordo* as *simplex ordo*')

<sup>21</sup> De Jong 1968: 329. Pace Bos (1999: 427n87, 449n182) who writes that it was only in 1912 that A. Noordtzij was appointed to a professorship in a *duplex ordo* faculty of theology as the first non-NHK-minister ever. Arie Noordtzij (1871-1944) gained a PhD in Semitic Literature at Leiden University in 1898, and obtained a *candidatus* (first degree) in theology at the *Theologische School* (seminary) of the *Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland* (GKN-church) at Kampen in 1902, at which his father, Maarten Noordtzij, was professor of OT exegesis (<http://www.voorouder.nl/getperson.php?personID=I13831&tree=voorouder>). Arie served as *lector* in this GKN-seminary from 1903 till 1912 when he was appointed professor of OT Exegesis and Hebrew at the Utrecht Faculty of Theology. He retired from that chair in 1936 (cf. Jensma & de Vries 1997: 309, 336).

<sup>22</sup> Tiele 1866: 213, 229, 243; 1867: 42, 52

<sup>23</sup> Tiele 1866: 213- 216

<sup>24</sup> Tiele 1866: 220. Tiele had rejected the term 'paganism' already in 1856 and contended that non-Christian religions should be valued positively 'for the delightful, truly religious thoughts that are often found in them' (Tiele 1956: 115); and also because 'knowledge of the early [i.e. pre-Christian] religions throws a startlingly new light on the Christian religion' (Tiele 1856: 116); and because religion is a general human need with

confessional theology as ‘obscurantist supranaturalism’,<sup>25</sup> of one kind with that ruling ‘in the twilight of [R.C.] seminaries or the darkness of [its] cloisters’.<sup>26</sup>

The narrow-mindedness of theology tied to the confession of a particular church was, in Tiele’s view, the main [118] reason why a truly scientific, religion-tied theology had not yet been born. Theology should not be dependent on the ‘unscientific principle of [the] authority’ of the particular faith of a specific church but on research. Comparison, he asserted, is ‘the foundation, the starting point, [and] the condition of all science’.<sup>27</sup> By outlawing the comparative study of religions the churches precluded that they might gain a thorough understanding of their own kinds of Christianity and themselves. Two more reasons for the unscientific character of church-bound theology were the lack of information about ‘heathen’ religions, and the speculative methods of confessional theology.<sup>28</sup> By founding theology upon historical criticism and ‘the unbiased ascertaining and recording of facts’ Science of Religion would restore theology’s ‘inner coherence’.<sup>29</sup> As it was now it lacked coherence because, instead of being developed from the consistent concept of a scientific discipline, it served the needs of particular churches, and more especially that of the training of their future ministers.<sup>30</sup>

Science of Religion, however, would constitute the religions of humankind as theology’s proper object of study and cause scientific theology to coincide with the Science of Religion(s) by abrogating the distinction between natural and revealed religions and by integrating the study of the biblical religions with that of the other religions of humankind.<sup>31</sup> It was the task of the Science of Religion to develop a body of theory about the religions of humankind in four stages. The first was to accurately describe all religions. The second was to compare them judiciously in order to develop a genealogy of all the families of the world’s religions. The third was to analyse them morphologically in order to determine into what stages of evolution the religions of humankind could be ordered<sup>32</sup> and to deter-

---

which the Creator himself has endowed the human mind. Man is, therefore, religious by nature (Tiele 1856: 118, 121, 122).

<sup>25</sup> Tiele 1866: 213, 216, 226, 243; 1867: 41, 42, 52; on ‘supranaturalism’, cf. Bos 1999: 139-141, 322

<sup>26</sup> Tiele 1866: 212. He hastened to add that he was not referring to the theology taught in the seminaries of the small Arminian, Lutheran and Baptist churches in the Netherlands, in which, ‘however humble their name’, the theology taught, he asserted, was of an academic calibre. On earlier use of the presumed RC obscurantism in polemics between liberal and orthodox factions in the NHK-church in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, cf. Bos 1999: 138-141, esp. 140 149-150 426n51

<sup>27</sup> Tiele 1866: 213, 216; 1867: 42

<sup>28</sup> Tiele 1866: 217-218

<sup>29</sup> Tiele 1860: 815

<sup>30</sup> Tiele 1866: 212-215

<sup>31</sup> Tiele 1866: 216, 224-227. He added in 1873 that it was ‘unbefitting for the truly liberal theologian to shut himself up in the narrow circle of his own religion. He must look around in the large world of the religions. He should listen to the prayers that rise up, from all regions of the globe, to powers of heaven, to the sources of all life, to the one immutable God of the human heart whom men merely call by different names. Thereby one’s view is enlarged, as is one’s heart. Thereby [the student of religions] will become not only a better theologian but also a better Christian’ (Tiele 1973b: 588-589).

[142] <sup>32</sup> Tiele (1866: 239-240) distinguished four stages in the evolution of religions. They evolved from nature religions through mythological religions and dogmatic-philosophical religions to world religions. He saw ‘symbolic thinking’ as the transition between mythology and doctrine (Tiele 1870a: 9-11). Cf. also Tiele

mine how far specific religions had travelled along that road. The final stage was their ‘physiological’ and ‘psychological’<sup>33</sup> study in order to establish that faith and adoration constituted the innermost core of all religions, and that it was a fact of history that Christianity possessed these two in their highest form.<sup>34</sup> Tiele admonished the ‘small elite corps’ of ‘modern’ theologians who had exchanged orthodox ‘supranaturalism’ for an independent theology, not to keep their studies separate from [the] [119] History of [Non-Christian] Religions, but to join forces with it and constitute it into the ‘General Science of Religion(s)’.<sup>35</sup>

### *Tiele’s close harmony*

The historical and comparative study of the religions of mankind was for Tiele, however, only the foundation of what he termed the study of ‘religion as such’.<sup>36</sup> Humankind’s religions are ‘the diverse expressions of religion lying dormant, as a disposition, in every human being’. They are the ‘products of the human mind, religion being one of its qualities’, and one of its four faculties (the other three being to speak a language correctly, and the aesthetic and moral ‘senses’).<sup>37</sup> In a later essay, he added the intellect as the fifth faculty of the human mind<sup>38</sup> and argued that the origin of religion was not to be located in man’s moral and religious feelings only.<sup>39</sup> Its origin should be explained by man’s moral and religious feeling’s being informed by his intellectual capacity for abstraction.<sup>40</sup> The feelings and emotions which man has in common with animals could not, by themselves only, explain religion and morality, for they were the two distinctive and intimately con-

---

1871a on the phase of the nature religions, and in particular on the problem of whether or not fetishism is a mark of man’s earliest religion. As Christianity had already conquered numerous nature religions, Tiele was confident that it would win over [the believers of] all of them, and ultimately all other religions as well, for all religions would find their highest fulfilment in Christianity, which alone was able to satisfy fully the religious need that is felt in all religions. Christianity must, therefore, take root in all religions in order that they all may increasingly enjoy its refreshing shade (Tiele 1856: 126, 130-131).

<sup>33</sup> Both these terms must be understood in a wider, more metaphorical sense than they would normally be taken nowadays.

<sup>34</sup> Tiele 1866: 241-242; 1867: 44-48, 51. In Tiele’s Christianity, however, there was no room for the divinity of the Christ, but only for the historical Jesus of Nazareth who had taught men to adore God in spirit and truth (Tiele 1870b: 165, 167). That teaching of Jesus Christ must be propagated as the ‘religion of the coming age’ (Tiele 1870b: 168). Tiele was not alone in rejecting the divinity of the Christ: J.H. Scholten and a few other ‘modern’ theologians had also taken this ‘anti-supranaturalist’ position in the 1860s (cf. e.g. Roessingh 1924d, IV: 311-317).

<sup>35</sup> Tiele 1866: 225-227

<sup>36</sup> Tiele 1866: 227; or ‘religion itself’ (Tiele 1866: 227, 240), or its ‘essence’ (Tiele 1866: 233, 240-241).

<sup>37</sup> Tiele 1866: 227, 229

<sup>38</sup> Tiele 1870a: 18-25

<sup>39</sup> Tiele was referring here to J.H. Scholten’s appeal in the 1840s, and to that of C.W. Opzoomer in the 1860s, to religious feeling in order to prove the unique position of Christianity among the religions of humankind (cf. Roessingh 1924d, IV: 279-283, 286, 298-300).

<sup>40</sup> In line with the position taken by Scholten in his book on free will (1859; cf. Roessingh 1924d, IV: 291-296).

nected features that constituted man's uniqueness. Intellect, moral sense and religious feeling together constituted the human conscience. Tiele regarded them as the ultimate source of religion (and morality). He defined conscience as 'the feeling that we are bound by a moral world order',<sup>41</sup> of which God is the lawgiver.<sup>42</sup> His laws have, on the one hand, been made known to man by human reason, and on the other hand by his conscience, which is the 'feeling for the laws of God in the human heart'. He also equated conscience with [God's] 'Revelation', for the human conscience reveals that God's love 'pulls at our hearts'. This act of God revealing himself in 'the most important organ of [human] perfectibility', the human heart, provokes in humans the need to adore God as the perfect love.<sup>43</sup>

Tiele termed faith and the love of God the *godsdiensstige grondkracht*, the 'basic religious force'. He viewed it as the source from which religion had sprung in every human being.<sup>44</sup> He regarded this 'primeval force'<sup>45</sup> [120] as the [scientific] explanation of religion, on the grounds that religion was rooted 'in human nature' and 'related most intimately to [man's] innermost being'.<sup>46</sup> In fact, the very purpose of the Science of Religion(s), as a scientific discipline, was precisely 'to explain this fact'. Tiele considered the Science of Religion(s), therefore, to be a multi-faceted but unitary enterprise. It was, he said, a Science of Man, or Anthropology, and a Science of the Human Mind, or Psychology<sup>47</sup>; as

---

<sup>41</sup> Tiele 1870a: 20-21

<sup>42</sup> The concept of 'God', said Tiele (1870a: 21) originated as reason's 'highest abstraction' after that human faculty had evolved from its earliest phase of 'instinctive imagination' and had begun to 'reduce religion to concepts'.

<sup>43</sup> Tiele 1870a: 22, 20-25; 1870b: 167

<sup>44</sup> Tiele 1867: 51

<sup>45</sup> Tiele (1867: 51) himself translated the Dutch *grondkracht* ('basic force') in German as *Urkraft*, 'primeval force'.

<sup>46</sup> Tiele 1866: 234; also 1867: 43-44

<sup>47</sup> Tiele's 'psychological method' was actually a version of the then prevailing school of nature mythology. He asserted the psychological method explained religion from man himself. It did so by studying religions, and more specifically myths, as symbol systems. Man had borrowed these from his natural environment for expressing his belief that a spiritual principle governs the universe in the same manner [143] as the human mind consciously rules the human body and its natural environment (Tiele 1870a: 5). In 1870, i.e. before the publication of Tylor's *Primitive Culture* in 1871, Tiele combined elements of Müller's approach with some of Tylor's without apparently being aware of the contradiction between Müller's degressive and Tylor's progressive theories of cultural evolution. Thus Tiele spoke of his revulsion at the 'chaotic' myths and 'confused' beliefs of the savages (Tiele 1870a: 2) and regarded their fetishism a 'disease from which religion could not have originated' (Tiele 1870a: 16). But he praised 'natural man's relatively very pure' representation of 'the above'. He attributed his confused poly-, heno- and monotheistic beliefs to his childlike intelligence, which was as yet unable to see the contradiction between belief in one god and belief in many gods (Tiele 1870a: 16; also 1870b: 162). In 1871, however, Tiele shifted towards a consistent Tylorian position and severely criticised Müller's postulate of a primitive revelation and his Schleiermachian theology of man perceiving the infinite in the finite. He also rejected Müller's theory of the disease of language as the route along which the pure, primeval religion had degenerated into polytheism; his too close identification of the study of languages with the study of religions; and his extrapolation of insights, which were perhaps true for the Arian religions, to the religions of humankind (Tiele 1871a: 101-115). In same article, Tiele rejected the concept of fetishism as the earliest phase of human religious history and replaced it with that of the degenerate leftovers from earlier periods, a phenomenon which he said was found in all religions (Tiele 1871a: 98-101, 115-128). By 1873, Tiele had 'swallowed Tylor's animism lock, stock and barrel' (Leertouwer 1989: 160). The religions of the savages were no longer the most degenerate, but rather the least developed form of



well as a Natural Science, because they all aim to explain why man is religious ‘by nature’<sup>48</sup> and to discover the ‘permanent laws’ (*vaste wetten*) by which religion is ruled everywhere.<sup>49</sup> He saw the Science of Religion(s) also as Philosophy of Religion.<sup>50</sup> As such, it would serve as scientific theology’s centrepiece and replace confessional theology. He assured his fellow academic theologians that all the disciplines that had, since 1800, progressed towards becoming truly ‘scientific’, could be fully integrated into that philosophical Science of Religion(s).<sup>51</sup>

Tiele developed an elaborate argument and two diagrams to show that no contribution to Aesthetic, Historical and Systematic Theology by ‘modern’ theologians that had permanent scientific value would be lost by their being integrated into the framework of Science of Religion(s) as Scientific Theology. Only Apologetics, Polemics and Dogmatics ‘in the old meaning’, that is as irredeemably confessional disciplines, were to be returned to the churches, ‘with thanks for the services rendered’.<sup>52</sup> The ‘purely philological’ disciplines of Hermeneutics and Exegesis were to be returned to the Faculty of Arts & Philosophy. New Testament Exegesis ought to be studied in that faculty too, as part of Hellenistic Literature, rather than be placed in the Faculty of Theology.<sup>53</sup> Tiele offered two arguments against locating New Testament studies in the Faculty of Theology. ‘The books of the New Testament must not be explained by any other method than those used for the Old Testament, or the Koran, the Vedas, the Zend-Avesta, the Edda, or even whatever other piece of ancient literature’. And a curious exception would be created if New Testament Exegesis became the preserve of the Faculty of Theology, when Hebrew, Israelite antiquities, and the Exegesis of the Old Testament were all taught in the Faculty of Arts & Philosophy.<sup>54</sup> Tiele was referring here to the standard academic division of labour in Dutch uni-

---

a primeval religion that had been even more rude than theirs. From that ‘primitive religion’, all religions had descended by natural growth or reform (Tiele 1873: 12). However, in his article on ‘Religion’ in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1884), Tiele seems to have shifted again, this time towards a theory of primitive monotheism. He declared that primitive religions were ‘only the degraded remnants of [the more perfect religion that] they must once have been’ (Chantepie de la Saussaye 1909a: 117).

<sup>48</sup> Tiele conceded that he took the terms ‘nature’ and ‘natural’ here ‘not in the ordinary [meaning], but in [their] widest sense’ (Tiele 1866: 228, 230, 242-243).

<sup>49</sup> Tiele 1866: 229, 234, 235-236, 240-241, 242

<sup>50</sup> Tiele divided the Science of Religion into two parts: ‘the historical [part], or the philosophy of the history of religions’, which researches the morphology of religions; and ‘the psychological [part] or the philosophy of religious man’, which investigates the essence of religion (Tiele 1866: 236; cf. also Tiele 1860: 828-829).

<sup>51</sup> Tiele 1866: 224-226

<sup>52</sup> Tiele 1866: 236-243, esp. 243; 1867: 38-52, esp. 39-42, 48-52. And Dogmatics only in as far as it consisted in ‘making church doctrine thinkable’ (*het denkbaar maken der kerkleer*), in the justification of biblical teaching, and in the creation of one’s own theosophic system’ (Tiele 1867: 52). All other elements of it were incorporated, Tiele argued, in science of religion(s) as the new scientific theology, more in particular in philosophy of religion.

<sup>53</sup> Tiele 1867: 39-42

<sup>54</sup> As they were until 1876 (Tiele 1867: 40; Oort 1892: 114). Tiele, however, excluded the History of the Religion of Israel as a matter of course from this [144] allocation of subjects to the Faculty of Arts &

versities in the 18<sup>th</sup> [121] and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries when Old and New Testament Exegesis had mostly been the province of professors of Eastern Languages and of Greek in the Faculty of Arts & Philosophy.<sup>55</sup> The disciplines of New and Old Testament exegesis had gained a prominent place in faculties of theology only after 1850 through the pioneer work of Abraham Kuenen (1828-1891) in the Leiden Faculty of Theology.<sup>56</sup> Tiele was, therefore, actually proposing that the 18<sup>th</sup> century model be reinstated.<sup>57</sup> Under the law of 1876, however, both New and Old Testament exegesis were assigned to the Faculties of Theology.

Tiele had decried confessional theology for serving the ‘alien interests’ of the church and for being so preoccupied with the issues of ministerial formation that they caused theology to disintegrate into a set of disciplines without focus. It is, therefore, remarkable that he nonetheless included Practical Theology into his scheme of Scientific Theology. Tiele viewed Practical Theology as the applied Science of Religion(s). It was to reflect on how the body of theory developed by Science of Religion could be used to reform and nurture the religion of Christians, through preaching and religious education, and on how these could be applied to the propagation of Christianity through mission. The aim of mission must, however, not be to eradicate other religions but to rather reform and refine them.<sup>58</sup>

Tiele concluded the outline of his programme by quoting Scholten to the effect that it is the task of mortal man to learn what is *a priori* – i.e. metaphysically – true by studying [natural and historical] reality *a posteriori* – i.e. as it is empirically. Tiele believed that hu-

---

Philosophy, because he considered it an integral part of the general history of religions (Tiele 1866: 242-243; 1867: 42).

<sup>55</sup> OT and NT exegesis had been included as teaching assignments (*leeropdrachten*) in the curriculum of the faculties of theology by royal decree in 1816 (cf. Bos 1999: 109; cf. also Jensma & de Vries 1997: 279, 284, 285, 293, 308, 326, 334, 335, 336 for the professors who were assigned to teach OT and/or NT exegesis in faculties of theology at Leiden, Groningen and Utrecht before 1850). Till 1876, however, all students, including those of theology, did a two-year propaedeutic study (*candidatus, candidaats*) in the Faculty of Arts & Philosophy in Dutch, Greek, Latin and Hebrew literature as well as in mathematics, logic, and general history (cf. Bos 1999: 168-171, 189, 276) before they were admitted to the propaedeutic (*candidatus, candidaats*) in theology. The latter ‘degree’ required that they were examined in *doctrina de deo* (philosophical theology), church history and Christian doctrine by professors of theology, and in metaphysics, philosophy of ethics and ‘Eastern literature’, i.e. Hebrew, by professors in the Faculty of Arts & Philosophy – most of who had themselves been a minister or at least had studied theology (Bos 1999: 199, 374). Students of theology were not examined in OT and NT exegesis for their *candidatus* in theology, however, but during the *proponent* (ecclesiastical) examination by which the NHK-church admitted those who had passed the *candidaats* in theology as candidates for the ministry (cf. Bos 1999: 110, 226, 257). OT and NT exegesis were taught and examined, however, in faculties of theology in the doctor of divinity degree course (cf. Bos 1999: 423n58).

<sup>56</sup> De Jong 1969: 5, 7

<sup>57</sup> As had traditionally obtained for students of the Arminian seminary at Amsterdam till it was moved to Leiden in 1873. They had not studied OT and NT exegesis with the professors of theology of the Amsterdam *Atheneum Illustre*, but with its professors of ‘Eastern languages’ (cf. also Bos 1999: 131). This municipal *Atheneum* was a proper ‘university’ but without the *ius promovendi*, the right to confer degrees (Bos 1999: 182). Its students had to sit for them with a university, and usually did so at Leiden university. The Amsterdam *atheneum* obtained the *ius promovendi* in 1876, and thereby became the (municipal) University of Amsterdam. On the theological education of the ministers of the Arminian, Lutheran and Mennonite churches at Amsterdam, cf. Bos 1999: 127, 130-134, 182-183, 188-189.

<sup>58</sup> Tiele 1866: 212-215, 242; 1867: 51-52

mans may ascend from knowledge gained by empirical observation, to an understanding of the eternal laws by which the universe is held together.<sup>59</sup> Empirical science served, in his view, as ‘the best defence of what is essential in religion and the best justification of the [Christian] faith’.<sup>60</sup> In tune with his age, Tiele’s theology was an evolutionist one, which granted, [122] as a matter of course, the topmost position among the religions of mankind to his own brand-new liberal Christianity. ‘Christianity meets the religious needs of the human heart better than any other religion and is therefore destined to become the religion of humanity’.<sup>61</sup>

Tiele regarded his scientific theology as fully compatible with a rigorous conception of science.<sup>62</sup> At its heart, however, was his unflinching conviction that God had revealed himself to all humans alike, in their hearts and consciences, their minds and reason,<sup>63</sup> and that the study of religions was not exhausted either by historical genealogies and morphologies, or by their social and psychological functions. The bedrock of his Science of Religion(s) was a true theology in its own right.<sup>64</sup> It allowed him to establish a close harmony between his new Science of Religion(s), being mainly the study of the non-biblical religions, and the study of the biblical ones as pursued by the other ‘modern’ theologians working in the Leiden Faculty of Theology during the last three decades of the 19th century.

In the period under review, other Dutch historians of religions have developed their own close harmonies between Science of Religion and their particular varieties of libe-

---

<sup>59</sup> Tiele 1860: 830

<sup>60</sup> Tiele 1867: 52

<sup>61</sup> Said Tiele in 1879 (quoted in Roessingh 1924d, IV: 359-360). Tiele added that Christianity would be ready to play that role only after it had assimilated ‘the best of the other religions’. For similar ‘religionist’ positions, cf. Groenman 1933: 208-216; Van den Bergh van Eysinga 1940: 114-115. For a incisive critique of the theological teleology of this Euro- and Christiano-centric evolutionism, see Kristensen 1915/1954: 75-79.

<sup>62</sup> As did Scholten in his dogmatic theology (Roessingh 1924d, IV: 294).

<sup>63</sup> Tiele 1870b: 167; cf. Groenman (1933: 213) who termed men ‘the organs of God’; and Van den Bergh van Eysinga 1940: 109

<sup>64</sup> There are, of course, important differences between Tiele’s unitarian and Van der Leeuw’s Christocentric theology as well as between their respective Sciences of Religion, as I will show in greater detail below. Even so, Wiebe (1991) is wrong to construct an absolute opposition between Tiele and Van der Leeuw, by arguing that Van der Leeuw subverted and destroyed Tiele’s scientific study of religions. The Science of Religion(s) of each of them sprang from a Christian theology. The semblance of scientific rigour evident in Tiele’s work is due mainly to the methodological *naïveté* of his more positivistic age. Wiebe’s polemic against Van der Leeuw however, is not without historical substance. Van der Leeuw did ‘reconfessionalise’ Science of Religion(s) by comparison with Tiele’s, as will be shown below. But that difference is better explained by Tiele’s being an ‘outsider’ and Van der Leeuw an ‘insider’, in terms of their relationship to the (informal NHK) ‘establishment’, than by the one ‘establishing’ and the other ‘subverting’ the ‘scientific’ Science of Religion(s). Furthermore, Van der Leeuw studied in Leiden from 1908 to 1913 and was in terms of his theology, much more a disciple of Chantepie, his Professor of Ethics and a member of the NHK church, than of Kristensen, his Professor of Science of Religion and a Norwegian Lutheran. Hak (1994: 122) also incorrectly suggests that Tiele had begun to separate Science of Religion(s) from Theology; nor does his reference to Sierksma 1977 support this assertion.

ral Christian theology in Dutch *duplex ordo* faculties of theology. I will first describe that of Chantepie.

*Chantepie's anti-evolutionist theology*

Pierre Daniel Chantepie de la Saussaye (1848-1920) developed his close harmony in the shape of a philosophical theology of religion. He articulated it in his Ph.D. thesis, the first ever in Dutch Science of Religion(s), and most likely the smallest ever,<sup>65</sup> which he defended before the Utrecht Faculty of Theology in 1871 at the age of 23. He called the Science of Religion(s), 'th[e] youngest among the sciences', and divided it into 'the Science of Religion(s) in general and in its special forms'. By the latter, he meant the historical study of single religions, and by the former their comparative, systematic and philosophical study.<sup>66</sup>

If Tiele held that the 'science of religion(s) is as distinct from [confessional] theology as astronomy is from astrology, and chemistry [123] from alchemy',<sup>67</sup> and protested sharply against the 'alien interests' of the churches which held [scientific] theology in bondage, there was no such chafing against the reins of confessional theology apparent in Chantepie's slim thesis. Nor did he strive to bring theology under the rule of Science of Religion(s). Though he held that the study of religions was of great use to theology, they were in his view distinct disciplines with different aims and methods.<sup>68</sup>

In his thesis, Chantepie postulated three metaphysical axioms<sup>69</sup> as constituting the foundations of an 'objective Science of Religion(s)'. The first was that the relationship between the believer and God, as practised in religion, was an objective one. Religion, he said, could not be an object of scientific research if God did not exist and if man had no innate disposition towards a relationship with him:

If religion were only the representations, expectations, ambitions, affective moods, and deeds of men; if religion were only man seeking a relationship with a God who does not really exist, then it would [truly] have to be termed a disease of the human mind. No reality could then be attributed to religion, and it could hardly be an object of scientific research, because one would not be able to find objective truth in it.<sup>70</sup>

---

[145] <sup>65</sup> The body of the thesis counts only 87 small pages and is supplemented by 19 pages of annotations. On the average size of Dutch DD theses in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, cf. Bos 254-256, 376.

<sup>66</sup> Chantepie de la Saussaye 1871: 3, 46, 47-58, 81, 93n1

<sup>67</sup> Tiele 1873b: 379

<sup>68</sup> Chantepie 1878: 25

<sup>69</sup> Chantepie (1871: 10) referred to them as [*ver*]onderstellingen, 'hypotheses'. They were, however, clearly not meant as provisional assumptions to be rejected if falsified, but rather as the basic and axiomatic conditions without which no 'objective' Science of Religion is possible.

<sup>70</sup> Chantepie 1871: 10; also 17-18, 55. Chantepie is referring here to Max Müller's theory postulating a degenerative phase in the evolution of human religion by man mistaking *nomina* for *numina* and thereby anthropomorphising them (cf. Müller 1880: 182, 194, 378; Trompf 1990: 36-44, 159-160).

Chantepie's second assertion, therefore, is that God exists objectively.<sup>71</sup> He knew that 'God's existence and his relationship to the world and to man cannot be proved', yet held that 'this postulate is the very foundation of the entire Science of Religion'. As the Science of Religion must necessarily enter 'the realm of the unprovable' and as religion finds its most objective explanation in [the assumption of] God's continuous activity for humankind, the Science of Religion(s) 'cannot but have a speculative element'. With Chantepie, that intuitive speculation took the shape of a (religious) philosophy of history.<sup>72</sup>

The corollary of this second postulate, therefore, is that religion is as much the act of God revealing himself as of man responding to it; and that man has a spiritual nature and is religious by nature.<sup>73</sup> Religion was the spiritual faculty by which man could enter into a relation with God. Quoting Max Müller's dictum, with approval, that man's *sensus luminis* was also his *sensus numinis*, Chantepie believed that God spoke to all men in the phenomena of nature, but in [124] particular in those of light. The unity of the human race was based on precisely this inborn common spirituality.<sup>74</sup> The anti-Darwinian corollary of this was that humans had been elevated by God above all (the rest of his) creation because of their unique religious nature. Chantepie held, therefore, that humankind could not have evolved from lower creatures,<sup>75</sup> as did Max Müller.<sup>76</sup> He deemed Darwin's theory a 'disorderly pile of hypotheses' which even plain common sense must dismiss.<sup>77</sup> Chantepie, therefore, refused to accept Darwinism 'in its absolute form', i.e. as valid also for human spiritual evolution: humans, having religions, could not have evolved 'from a lower species of beings without religion'. That would contradict 'the very simple rule that a religious being cannot evolve from a non-religious being'.<sup>78</sup> He was, inclined, albeit cautiously, to accept the theory of primitive monotheism.<sup>79</sup>

Chantepie's third axiom was that humankind's religious history represented the historical variation of the human response to God's three modes of revelation: in history, both to earliest humans and in the further course of history;<sup>80</sup> in nature;<sup>81</sup> and in man's innermost

---

<sup>71</sup> 'Though it cannot possibly be denied that the existence of God and his relationship to the world cannot be proved scientifically, the postulate of his existence remains nonetheless the very corner stone of the science of religion(s). [...] It [simply] cannot count God out.' (Chantepie 1871: 47-48).

<sup>72</sup> Chantepie 1871: 47, 48, 81, 83

<sup>73</sup> Chantepie 1871: 9-10, 11, 32, 41, 47-48, 54-55

<sup>74</sup> Chantepie 1871: 51-52, 101n47

<sup>75</sup> Chantepie 1871: 11, 33-35. Chantepie (1871: 98-99) referred to F.M. Müller's early publications on language to corroborate his argument.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Trompf 1990: 36-44

<sup>77</sup> Chantepie 1871: 12-15. He used the term 'hypothesis' here and on p. 38 in a very different meaning from that on pp. 10, 17-18, where it referred to the axiomatic metaphysical foundation of the Science of Religion.

<sup>78</sup> Chantepie 1871: 10-14, 87

<sup>79</sup> Chantepie 1871: 26, 37, 49-51, 59-76. Chantepie held that humans did not evolve from an animal state, for they had been endowed with language, culture and a 'healthy intellect' from the earliest moment of their existence (Chantepie 1871: 33-34, 98-99).

<sup>80</sup> Chantepie 1871: 49; 1878: 28.

being.<sup>82</sup> Chantepie stressed God's revelation in nature for two reasons. First, because he shared Schleiermacher's and Müller's view that man's *sensus luminis* was also his *sensus numinis*.<sup>83</sup> Secondly, because the same, one and only true God had revealed himself in both nature and history. This double dispensation must therefore be taken as one, as its recipient, mankind, was also a religious unity, its religions being based on this double dispensation. Moreover, Chantepie held that primitive monotheism had never been lost completely because of this unitary divine economy. However much it had been corrupted and adulterated in the course of history, primitive monotheism had nonetheless been preserved in a variety of forms and degrees, ranging from pure to impure. It had also been revived in the religion of Israel and in esoteric cults, and he asserted too that it 'lies at the bottom of the heathen religions even now'. The twofold divine revelation to humankind in history and in nature was at the heart of Chantepie's liberal *theologia religionum*. It enabled him to hold that 'the religions of the heathens [have] objective value' in spite of all their apparent 'corruption'.<sup>84</sup>

[125] Chantepie also held that the origin of religion could be explained only by a speculative and intuitive philosophy of history that penetrated to the very 'nature' of religion. He did not bother about his theory's circularity nor about the metaphysical assumptions on which it was founded, because, in his view, no one would ever be able to obtain empirical validation about the origin of humankind's religions, or about anything else pertaining to the metaphysical realm which for Chantepie was the Absolute.<sup>85</sup>

#### *Chantepie versus Tiele*

Siding with Max Müller against Darwinian evolutionism, Chantepie did not look favourably on Tiele's aim to discover the laws of human religious evolution, because the heart of religion, the interaction between God and man, was beyond empirical research. All attempts to find the laws of [religious] evolution, therefore, were bound to fail. Chantepie informed Tiele that 'the time for writing a coherent history of religions has not yet arrived'. He was even more unhappy about Tiele explaining religion virtually exclusively from the *godsdiensstige grondkracht* of humans, i.e. from man's inherent religious nature, as he was also with Tiele's consequent reduction of revelation to an inner subjective experience. As religion is a two-way affair between a real God and historical believers, the explanation of religion must always be twofold, detailing causality from both God and man's religious

---

<sup>81</sup> Chantepie 1871: 49, 51-54; cf. also 97, where he approvingly quoted M. Carrière to the effect that phenomena of nature caused man to become aware of superior powers. Not only did they feel dependent upon them but, at the same time, they felt borne by them and surrounded by their love (*liebevoll umfangen*). This is an early expression of the mysticism, at once deistic and Christo-centric, which was at the heart of the romantic spirituality Chantepie cultivated throughout his life. As with other theologians of the Groninger School, this emotional Christo-centrism did not necessarily imply that Chantepie held that Christ was divine, although he regarded him God's supreme revelation to humankind.

[146] <sup>82</sup> Chantepie 1871: 54sq

<sup>83</sup> Curiously, in his valedictory address, Chantepie seems to join Müller's 'perception of the Infinite' with Tylor's animism and view it as a reductionist explanation of the origin of religion (Chantepie 1916: 9).

<sup>84</sup> Chantepie 1871: 51-53, 76, 101; cf. also Chantepie 1887, I: 51

<sup>85</sup> Chantepie 1871: 81, 86; see also Roessingh 1924c: 466, 468-471

nature. Tiele's psychological explanation of the origin of religion arising from man's innate religious disposition, was only the secondary and 'subjective' one. Contrary to Renan and Tiele, Chantepie held that man's religious nature was a necessary, but by itself insufficient explanation of religion. It did not in itself explain religion; it explained it only in combination with religion's 'objective' explanation: the existence, and active presence, of God.<sup>86</sup>

### *Tiele versus Chantepie*

In response, Tiele berated Chantepie for founding the scientific study of religions upon a religious hypothesis; for declaring it [126] binding on scholars of religion(s); for keeping the Science of Religion(s) in shackles forever; and for preventing it from following the laws binding upon all sciences. The Science of Religion(s) must not keep a backdoor open to the 'thoroughly unscientific theological [approach]': it must exclude infinite causes and only look for finite ones. The problem of the origin of religion does not, as Chantepie contended, belong to metaphysical philosophy, which Tiele considered to be 'the last stronghold of the old transcendental world view', but rather to 'the philosophy of anthropology'. Tiele suggested that the 'simple' method of 'observing and comparing the several religions and religious phenomena' be followed in order to 'establish what constitutes the essentially religious element in them'. Subsequently one should inquire, 'how this specifically religious content can be explained from what psychological inquiry has been able to establish about the nature of man'. Tiele believed, in fact, that it would establish that religion is 'something that resides in man's innermost spirit'. The 'objective' elements of religion: doctrine, cult, and institution are only the externals of the essence of religion. Serious psychological research reveals that the inner essence, and origin, of religion are to be found in the depths of the human mind. For Tiele, then, the Science of Religion(s) was part of 'Psychology' (as was Linguistics!), Psychology being part again of [philosophical] 'Anthropology'. He assigned to the Science of Religion(s) the task of investigating religions as proceeding from the revelations received in the human heart, i.e. as psychological phenomena subject to definite laws.<sup>87</sup>

### *The duplex ordo as simplex ordo*

What Tiele actually achieved in 1876 was much more modest than what he had proposed in his two programmatic articles of 1866 and 1867. The Faculties of Theology at the Universities of Leiden, Groningen, Utrecht and Amsterdam were not converted into Faculties

---

<sup>86</sup> Chantepie 1871: 33-34, 54-58, 83, 98

<sup>87</sup> Tiele 1871b: 374-380. The dispute between Tiele and Chantepie revealed the basically different orientations between the Leiden-based 'modern theology' emphasizing the unity of the sciences and postulating the

of Scientific Theology. Theology was not merged with Science of Religion(s) for the study of all the religions of humankind, and confessional theology was not completely banned from them.<sup>88</sup> Instead, they [127] were given the *duplex ordo* structure according to the provisions of the law of 28 April 1876. It separated the church-bound disciplines of Dogmatic and Pastoral Theology<sup>89</sup> and its two professors appointed by the NHK church<sup>90</sup> from the faculties proper which comprised only the four or five professors appointed by ‘the Crown’<sup>91</sup> to teach the ten subjects stipulated in that law.<sup>92</sup>

The History of Religions was introduced into these faculties proper as merely one of those ten disciplines and held a marginal position in them for a number of reasons.<sup>93</sup> One was that apart from Tiele, who was appointed as its first chair holder in Leiden University in 1877,<sup>94</sup> and Chantepie, who was given the second chair in the University of Amsterdam in 1878, there were no Dutch scholars available to teach Science of Religion. Academics from other Protestant denominations had either to be recruited from abroad, or the Science of Religion(s) had to be taught by Philosophers of Religion. Tiele was succeeded by the Norwegian Lutheran, William Brede Kristensen, from 1901 to 1938;<sup>95</sup> the German Lutheran minister and missionary in China, Heinrich Hackmann, occupied the Amsterdam chair from 1913 to 1934;<sup>96</sup> and the Swiss Protestant, Benedict Hartmann, held the chair of Ancient Religions at Leiden from 1950 to 1987. The marginality of the Science of Religion is even more apparent from its being an appendix to the disciplines in the service of which it was emerging. They were first of all the core disciplines of modern[ist] theology:

---

‘scientific nature of theology’, and the Groningen-based ethical theology which ‘explicitly opposed the natural sciences’ (Bos 1999: 355).

<sup>88</sup> See Roessingh 1919: 66, 69-72, esp. 71: ‘Our faculties [of theology] are not faculties of Science of Religion(s) and must not pretend that they are. [...] Actually, the [programme of] studies has remained completely oriented towards Christianity’.

<sup>89</sup> To which several other disciplines were added in the course of the twentieth century: Christian Ethics, Biblical Theology, the History of the Dutch Reformed Church, its ‘Canon Law’, the History of Christian Mission, Liturgics, Homiletics, Catechetics, Ecumenics, etc. (cf. De Jong 1968: 239-332.)

<sup>90</sup> Their salaries were, however, paid by the State (article 104 of the law of 28 April 1876). They were entitled to take part in the various ceremonies at their universities (art. 105). Candidates for the ministry were admitted to the university, as full students, at half the normal fees (art. 106).

<sup>91</sup> They were actually appointed by the Minister of Internal Affairs. As a result, political motives did sometimes play a major part in appointments such as those of Gunning (see below) and Visscher (see below).

<sup>92</sup> They were Encyclopaedia of Theology, History of the Doctrine about God, General History of Religions, History of the Religion of Israel, History of Christianity, Literature of Israel and Early Christianity, Exegesis of the Old and New Testaments, History of the Doctrines of the Christian Religion, Philosophy of Religion, and Ethics (art. 42). On the history of the genesis of this law and, in particular, its reconstruction of the faculties of theology, cf. Berkhof 1954: 24-29; Bakhuizen van den Brink 1954; Kraemer 1959: 10-19; De Jong 1968

<sup>93</sup> Pace Van Leeuwen 1959: 115

<sup>94</sup> In 1877, Tiele was appointed Professor of History of Religions and Philosophy of Religion, on maximum salary and some extras (De Jong 1982: 6).

<sup>95</sup> The other candidates for the chair were the Swedish scholar Nathan Söderblom and Edvard Lehmann from Denmark (Molendijk 2000: 20).

<sup>96</sup> Cf. Jensma & de Vries 1997: 292, 336



Natural Theology,<sup>97</sup> Philosophy of Religion,<sup>98</sup> and the Encyclopaedia of Theology, and secondly biblical studies.

In Groningen, G.H. Lamers, Professor of Philosophy of Religion from 1876 to 1883 when he moved to Utrecht, was also assigned to teach History of Religions. So was also his successor, I. van Dijk (1883-1917), though this Professor of History of Religions, Natural Theology, and the Encyclopaedia of Theology was not interested in any religion other than Christianity (although he did have a passionate interest in Socrates).<sup>99</sup> History of Religions was taught at Utrecht Faculty of Theology by the Professors of Philosophy of Religion and Ethics, G.H. Lamers (1883-1903) and H. Visscher (1903-1913/1931).<sup>100</sup> The union of History of Religions with these two disciplines, was [128] seen as so normal and natural that historians of religions in turn were often assigned to teach *doctrina de deo* and/or the Encyclopaedia of Theology<sup>101</sup> (but never Philosophy of Religion).<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> See above note 12

<sup>98</sup> It is of interest to note that Hume's *The Natural History of Religion* (1857) is the fountainhead not only of the term and the discipline of History of Religion(s), but also, at least in England, of Philosophy of Religion (Root 1956: 7).

<sup>99</sup> Apart from his inaugural address (van Dijk 1883), van Dijk never produced a publication on the History of Religions (van Haarlem 1983: 183). He held that true knowledge of other religions was possible only for those who possessed the 'faculty [147] of divination' for understanding the religious language of dependency upon the living God who had revealed himself to them, common to all men. That dependency was the essence of all religion, for religion was not merely a mood, but also both an ontological relationship between God and humans, and their awareness that they were bound to, and dependent on, God. Van Dijk also held that God was a proper object of [the] science [of Theology] because he had revealed himself in the finite realm of man (Van Dijk 1883/1927, I: 398-402, 409-410, 413).

<sup>100</sup> Lamers 1900; Visscher 1911

<sup>101</sup> H.Th. Obbink taught History of Religions, Natural Theology (*doctrina de deo*), and Assyriology at Utrecht University from 1913 till 1939. In 1918, G. van der Leeuw became Professor of History of Religions, the History of *doctrina de deo* (van der Leeuw 1918: 3), and Egyptology at the University of Groningen where he also taught the Encyclopaedia of Theology. In 1941, the NHK church commissioned him also to teach the (confessional) subject of Liturgics (cf. van der Leeuw 1948<sup>2</sup>/1935<sup>1</sup>; Sierksma 1951: 31, 107-108; Waardenburg 1983: 114-115). P.D. Chantepie de la Saussaye had no teaching duties other than History of Religions at the University of Amsterdam between 1878 and 1899, nor had Tiele's successor, W.B. Kristensen, at Leiden from 1902 to 1937. Chantepie, however, gave up his chair of History of Religions in Amsterdam in 1899 in order to succeed Gunning as Professor of the Encyclopaedia of Theology, Philosophy of Religion, and Ethics at Leiden University (De Jong 1982: 16). In his Leiden inaugural address, he stated that he was not really happy with the *duplex ordo* structure of the faculties of theology (Chantepie 1899: 16), but he did not demand, as Gunning had done, that theology be reconsecrated by being tied to the faith of the NHK-church, though his personal faith was a Christocentric one (Roessingh 1924a, [II]: 400; 1924c: 469; cf. also Hak 1964: 14-15).

<sup>102</sup> The fact that, except for Tiele, historians of religions were never assigned to teach Philosophy of Religion signals the beginning of the separation between Philosophy of Religion, which was the central subject of Christianocentric *duplex ordo* liberal theology, and Science of Religion(s), which remained marginal in terms of its subject matter and perceived relevance for 'ministerial formation'. The distance between the two disciplines gradually increased by the following steps. Chantepie introduced 'Phenomenology of Religion' for classifying the data of History of Religions in an orderly way (Chantepie 1887: 8, 67-73; Waardenburg 1973: 105-113). Kristensen (1960: 1-9) used Phenomenology of Religion in addition 'to grasp the [absolute] value which [religious phenomena] have had for the believers themselves', and to discover 'their ideal connections' and essences. Van der Leeuw equated (and exchanged) Phenomenology

The marginality of the Science of Religion is also apparent from the fact that Tiele, though he had also been appointed Professor of Philosophy of Religion in 1877, did not actually teach that central subject until after 1892. Indeed, he would not have taught it at all if he had not run into a conflict with J.H. Gunning over the *duplex ordo* in 1891.<sup>103</sup> Gunning, who was an articulate propagator of the more orthodox ‘ethical’ modality in the Dutch Reformed Church, had been Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the Amsterdam Faculty since 1882. He had been appointed to the Leiden *duplex ordo* chair of Philosophy of Religion<sup>104</sup> in 1889 by a government coalition of ‘confessional’ political parties<sup>105</sup> against the express wishes of the Leiden faculty.<sup>106</sup> Gunning held that theology should be tied to the faith of the church, and in particular to that of the local congregation of believers: it should be in conformity with the way in which that congregation experiences the mystery of God. In 1890 and 1892, he published books in which he not only declared that (Christian) theology and the neutral science of religion were incompatible, but moreover specifically directed his attacks at his predecessor, the Leiden philosopher of religion, Rauwenhoff.<sup>107</sup> By thus publicly proclaiming a *simplex ordo* position and rejecting the *duplex ordo* of 1876, Gunning contravened, as the Leiden Professor of Philosophy of Religion, the ‘golden rule’ of freedom from [confessional] theology fundamental to the Leiden modern[ist] position and the Science of Religion(s) as conceived by Tiele, thereby incurring Tiele’s wrath. Gunning admitted that he was unable and unwilling to teach Philosophy of Religion on the basis of the ‘neutral’, modernist model established by Scholten, Kuenen and Tiele. The conflict was ‘resolved’ by Tiele, who had been teaching *doctrina de deo* since Scholten’s retirement in 1881, and Gunning swapping their teaching assignments.<sup>108</sup>

Lastly, the History of Religions in these faculties consisted mainly, if not exclusively, in study of the religions of ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the extra-biblical Semitic regions in order to explore [129] the *Umwelt* of the Bible, and of those of the Greek, Helle-

---

of Religion with Natural Theology in his own project of the reconfessionalisation of Science of Religion. See below and Van der Leeuw 1918: 5; see also above note 12 on the history of Natural Theology as a subject in Dutch faculties of theology; and James 1985: 325-334. The separation became a huge rift after 1960 when [148] methodological agnosticism became the dominant paradigm of Dutch Science of Religion in *duplex ordo* faculties of theology (Van Baaren 1973: 44; Platvoet 1998).

<sup>103</sup> See Tiele 1892: 1

<sup>104</sup> J.H. Scholten (1811-1885), the former Professor of New Testament, *doctrina de deo* (Natural Theology) and Dogmatic Theology (1845-1876), had also been appointed Professor of Philosophy of Religion and *doctrina de deo* in 1876. When Scholten retired in 1881, L. Rauwenhoff, who had been Professor of History of Christianity and Christian Doctrine till then, was appointed Professor of Philosophy of Religion; in addition he was assigned the Encyclopaedia of Theology (Roessingh 1924a, (II): 396; Wiegeraad 1991: 23). After Rauwenhoff’s early death in 1889, J.H. Gunning was appointed Professor of Philosophy of Religion; with Ethics being added on Kuenen’s death in 1891.

<sup>105</sup> These parties were the first major signs of the re-organisation of Dutch society into a mode of *apartheid*, the ‘pillars’. Between roughly 1880 and 1960, they divided the Dutch nation into a number of sections each cultivating its distinct religious or ideological identity by each establishing its own political party, schools, universities, health care institutions, media, sports’ and other associations, etc.; cf. Van Rooden 1996: 32-42, 162-199; Platvoet 2002.

<sup>106</sup> De Jong 1982: 12-13

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Gunning 1890, 1892

<sup>108</sup> See Tiele 1892: 1-5; Roessingh 1924a, (II): 398-400; Kraemer 1959: 22-26; de Lange 1987

nistic and Latin worlds for the contextualisation of early Christianity. The Science of Religion served therefore in this respect as a handmaid to the study of the Bible and early Christianity.<sup>109</sup> Prior to 1950, nearly all Dutch scholars of religions were Egyptologists (W.B. Kristensen, G. van der Leeuw, A. de Buck, C.J. Bleeker, Th.P. van Baaren, and J. Zandee), Assyriologists (P.C. Tiele), or Semiticists/Egyptologists (H.Th. Obbink, H.W. Obbink). The exceptions were P.D. Chantepie de la Saussaye who specialised in ancient Teutonic and Nordic religions; H. Hackmann, who was the first to have personal experience of the Far-Eastern religions which he studied; H. Visscher who wrote on preliterate religions; and H. Kraemer, whose field of study was Javanese Islam. Generally speaking, the study of Islam, Indian and other Eastern religions, and those of the preliterate religions was developed till 1945 only in the Faculty of Arts & Philosophy. They began to be taught in the faculties of theology mostly after 1960.

So what Tiele actually achieved was a significant contribution to the establishment of the *duplex ordo* as the *simplex ordo* of Dutch liberal academic theology as it had emerged since the late 1840s in Leiden in particular.<sup>110</sup> Liberated by the law of 1876 from the need to conform to the confession of faith (*geloofsbelijdenis*) of the NHK church and from the supervision of its synod in doctrinal discipline (*leertucht*)<sup>111</sup> or by its modalities, which were just then emerging,<sup>112</sup> academic theology was now free, in as far as it wished to be free,<sup>113</sup> to pursue the study of religion(s) in accordance with the dual norms of critical, independent scholarship and its own ‘modern’[ist], inclusive theology of religions.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> Cf. e.g. Roessingh (1919: 71) on History of Religions as the ‘obliging maid-servant assisting us to understand better the piety and ideas of the Old and New Testaments’.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Roessingh 1924d (IV): 278, *passim*

<sup>111</sup> Actually, NHK-ministers were disciplined only in matters of conduct of life, not in doctrinal matters, because the *Algemeen Reglement* – General Rules and Regulations – imposed on the NHK-church by royal decree in 1816, had on purpose been kept void of provisions for the exercise of discipline in doctrinal matters. That had caused, and was causing much discontent among its orthodox members and ministers during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It had led to secessions in 1835; to the rise of the modalities in the NHK-church in the 1860s; to the foundation of the Free University by Abraham Kuyper in 1880; and to another secession in 1886. Rules for supervision in doctrinal matters were entered into the rules governing church life only in 1951 (cf. Bos 1999: 93-97, 113-122, 138-141, 307-308, 342-352, 359).

<sup>112</sup> Cf. e.g. Bos 1999: 245-251, 321-338, 347sq., 359

<sup>113</sup> Only a few, such as Tiele in Leiden and Van den Bergh van Eysingha in Amsterdam, actually strove for full independence from the NHK church. The largest faculty, the Utrecht one, in particular became closely allied to the orthodox wing of that church, the *Gereformeerde Bond*, after 1906. The several modalities of the NHK church – liberal, ‘ethical’, ‘confessional’, and ‘reformed’ –, and the several minor Protestant churches – Baptist, Lutheran and Arminian – that maintained a seminary at one of the *duplex ordo* faculties of theology, each cultivated strong links with a particular faculty. Through the informal processes of co-optation, they influenced often *de facto* who was appointed to what chair also in the *duplex ordo* faculties of theology, as Tak van Poortvliet, Minister of Internal Affairs, was forced to admit in Parliament in 1896 when pressed on this point by Abraham Kuyper (De Jong 1982: 15). When Kuyper himself was both Prime Minister and Minister of Internal Affairs from 1901 to 1906, he pursued a vigorous policy of ‘reconfessionalisation’, e.g. by appointing Hugo Visscher in 1903 as Professor of History of Religions, Natural Theology and Ethics at the Utrecht Faculty against its wishes. Visscher’s many dissenting ‘recommendations’ to Kuyper and his successors enabled them to steer that faculty even more solidly towards the right wing of the NHK church. A

That theology had relinquished Christianity's traditional claim to the *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* salvific exclusivity and had abandoned the *verafalsa religio* dichotomy.<sup>115</sup> It also had exchanged confessional Dogmatic Theology for varieties of Natural Theology (*doctrina de deo*) and Philosophy of Religion<sup>116</sup> as the central subjects of *duplex ordo* theology; and it had rejected the absolute authority of the Bible as well as the so-called 'supranaturalism' of orthodox confessional theology. It had, however, replaced them with its own set of metaphysical postulates. One was that the meta-empirical did really exist and intervene in human affairs. Another that man was by nature religious.<sup>117</sup> A third that there was an economy of salvation for all humans through all religions.<sup>118</sup> And a fourth that Christianity, [130] and especially its modern, local, Protestant varieties, in the ministration of which the students of a faculty of theology were to be trained, was, if not the 'fulfilment of religion as such'<sup>119</sup>, then at least the 'deep-rooted religion' of Dutch society.<sup>120</sup>

A number of practical consequences were deduced from these postulations. A faculty of theology ought to have, and actually has had, Christianity, and more specifically Dutch, mainline Protestant Christianity, as its substantive object of research and teaching.<sup>121</sup> Its students had to be taught that 'the Gospel has been a force for life throughout history'. They had to be presented with arguments against those who declare religion an illusion.<sup>122</sup> The *sui generis* doctrines of orthodox Christianity on the uniqueness of Jesus the Christ, the Bible, and the Christian church, were exchanged for another set of axiomatic claims about God, the religious nature of man, religious experience, and the fundamental equality

---

similar policy of 'reconfessionalisation' was pursued [149] by the various Dutch government coalitions of the 'confessional' parties between 1918 and 1933 (De Jong 1982: 29-32; cf. also Wiegeraad 1991: 45-67). On the pragmatic and political relationships between the NHK church and the *duplex ordo* faculties, cf. also Roessingh 1924b, (II): 416; 1924d: 288.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. e.g. Roessingh 1924a: 394-395; Van den Bergh van Eysinga 1940: 102-103; and especially Sierksma (1950: 197) who squarely located the 'a-theoretical' (i.e. normative) interest of this Science of Religion(s) in the theological problem posed by the plurality of religions.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Scholten (1877: 22): 'In any form of religion, however defective, we recognise truth and therefore relinquish the ancient opposition of true and false religion'.

<sup>116</sup> Van Heemskerck, however, was enough of a realist to acknowledge that it was unlikely that (church-tied) Dogmatic Theology would not palpably influence the teaching of these subjects by these *duplex ordo* professors of theology (De Jong 1968: 327).

<sup>117</sup> Cf. Scholten (1877: 13): 'We take religion for a psychological phenomenon that is to be explained, not from madness, priestcraft or tradition, but from the disposition of human nature. It develops in every human being from the moment of conception'.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. e.g. Kuenen 1874: 625, 634, 639-641; Van Dijk 1883/1926, I: 399-400; Groenman 1933: 206-208.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. above note 1. Except for Tiele (cf. above note 61), van der Leeuw (cf. note 1), Bleeker (with qualifications, see below), and of course Kuyper and Kraemer (see below), this theology of Christianity's superiority over other religions was more often a hidden assumption than an explicit theory in the publications of Dutch scholars of religions of this period. If they voiced these views at all, it was mostly *viva voce* in the lecture hall (Sierksma 1951: 41-42). Kristensen (1960: 11-15, 17) strongly resisted Tiele's grading of religions, on the basis of his (Kristensen's) (mistaken) argument that every religion was 'of absolute value' to its believers (Kristensen 1960: 6). Kraemer (1960: XXIV) was greatly troubled by this 'blurring of the majestic problem of Truth' by his teacher and predecessor Kristensen.

<sup>120</sup> Roessingh 1919: 70-72

<sup>121</sup> That was the case not only in Roessingh's time (Roessingh 1919: 71) but was true, *grosso modo*, throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. e.g. Roessingh 1919: 74-75; 1924b: 416-418

of the religions of humankind. Content-wise, these views were wider, but in terms of testability they were as impervious to falsification, and therefore as *sui generis*, as were orthodox Christian beliefs.

### *Van der Leeuw's reconessionalisation*

Nearly all other scholars who were appointed to chairs of History of Religions in the four *duplex ordo* Faculties of Theology in the Netherlands until the 1960s, created their own 'close harmonies' with the Christian academic theology of their own faculty of that time. They often accommodated likewise, implicitly or explicitly, the liberal, middle of the road or right wing modality of the NHK church allied to that faculty. The appointees who did so at Leiden were: W.B. Kristensen, from 1901 to 1937;<sup>123</sup> H. Kraemer appointed for 'Living Religions', from 1937 to 1948; A. de Buck, Kristensen's pupil, for Ancient Religions, from 1939 to 1959;<sup>124</sup> and K.A.H. Hidding for 'Living Religions', from 1948 to 1972; and B. Hartmann for 'Ancient Religions', from 1960 to 1987.

At Groningen, Gerardus van der Leeuw (1890-1950) took explicitly an NHK-church-congruent position as early as 1918, as is evident from [131] his inaugural address.<sup>125</sup> It is not accidental that he cultivated this confessional approach in the Groningen Faculty. As only future ministers of the NHK church were being trained in it, its climate was much more mono-denominational<sup>126</sup> than in the Leiden faculty, in which students of the Arminian church were also being trained, and in Amsterdam, where those of the Lutheran and Mennonite churches also studied. Moreover, in the spectrum of the modalities of the NHK-church, the Groningen Faculty cultivated links with the slightly left-of-centre 'ethi-

---

<sup>123</sup> See Kristensen (1960: 9-10; 1931/1954: 11; Kraemer 1960: XIII, XVIII-XIX, XXI-XXII, XXIII-XIV) on the need for the scholar of religions to have 'personal religious experience'. On Kristensen's Christian spirituality, cf. Van Leeuwen 1959: 116-117; Kraemer 1960: XI, XIII, XXII-XXIV. Kristensen's methodology was not free of contradiction. He held, on the one hand, that the only legitimate object of Science of Religion(s) was religion as the believers themselves saw it (Kristensen 1946/1954: 15). Its task, therefore, was to understand religions from the perspective of their believers (Kristensen 1960: 13); and the scholar of religions must himself or herself be religious and 'grow religiously' by that study (Kristensen 1919: 264; 1960: 10). He also insisted, however, that scholars, as modern man, 'cannot penetrate to the real meaning' which Ancient believers attached to their acts and myths. They cannot 'understand them in the same manner as the Ancients understood them', for modern man can only attach symbolical meanings to what was perfectly real for [150] the Ancients (Kristensen 1931/1954: 10-11). Modern scholars, therefore, 'remain strangers in the precincts of the temple' forever. They achieve an understanding of the irrational magical religiosity of the Ancients that is doomed to remain qualitatively different and merely approximate. Because 'their reality is no longer ours' and because 'we cannot look with their eyes', '[the Ancients] saw what we do not see, and we see what they did not see' (Kristensen 1931/1954: 9, 10, 12, 13, 14).

<sup>124</sup> Cf. Hidding 1960

<sup>125</sup> Cf. Kraemer 1959: 27

<sup>126</sup> At the Utrecht faculty, at which also, until the late 1960s, only students of the NHK church were trained, the climate was even more outspokenly 'confessional' than at the Groningen faculty because of its intimate link to the powerful right wing *Gereformeerde Bond* modality, founded in 1909.

cal' modality, to which Van der Leeuw belonged,<sup>127</sup> and the duly right-of-centre 'confessional' modality. The latter had been founded in 1864 to combat the liberal theology of the former and to restore the doctrinal discipline of the early (17th century) orthodox Calvinist 'Christ confessing' Reformed Public Church in the NHK church of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>128</sup>

Van der Leeuw explained in his address why he had no qualms about disregarding the legal separation between academic and confessional theology. He observed correctly that those of his fellow scholars of religions, who demanded that (confessional) Theology be replaced with Science of Religion(s), or that the two be strictly separated, had also founded Science of Religion(s) on meta-empirical postulates, such as the existence of God and the 'real' relationship of believers to him, and, therefore, on a proper theology.<sup>129</sup> His other argument was the psychic unity of humankind in matters of religion. He argued that the disparate discipline of the History of Religions (in the plural), i.e. the historical-philological study of the religions of humankind in their singularities, could be unified into the History of Religion (in the singular) by the study of their 'psychological unity', for the human mind functioned in all of them in identical ways.<sup>130</sup> He dismissed the *standpuntloos standpunt* ('the standpoint without a standpoint') of 'alleged objectivity' as both impossible and undesirable,<sup>131</sup> and rejected all non-religious explanations of religion, because

<sup>127</sup> Cf. e.g. Waardenburg 1983: 116; Waardenburg (1978: 189, 197, 242-243) characterizes Van der Leeuw's 'ethical' position as a 'balance between confessional orthodoxy and liberal modernism'.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. Golterman 1971

<sup>129</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 17-18. He might have referred for support to Kuenen who in 1874 had combated the 'naturalist' conclusion of the 'positivists' among the Dutch modern theologians that the rejection of the 'supranaturalism' [of orthodox confessional theology] by modern theology logically implied 'religion without metaphysics' and the reduction of religion to a merely pragmatic attitude to life (Kuenen 1874: 624, 635, *passim*). Kuenen accused his opponents of 'orthodoxophobia' (Kuenen 1874: 645)

<sup>130</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 5, 6, 7

<sup>131</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 15; Van der Leeuw expressed himself in even stronger terms when he termed the alleged unbiased treatment of data by the 'cold observer' 'from afar' as 'positively fateful' ('*geradezu verhängnisvoll*') (Van der Leeuw 1933: 613, 647, 648; 1948: 628, 666; 1963: 645, 678, 679). Van der Leeuw touched here on a raw nerve in Kristensen, who accused him of over-simplifying the methodology of the historical study of religions by collapsing their historical diversity into their 'common psychological ground' of 'religion as such' or 'natural religion'. That abstraction, said Kristensen (1919: 262), 'does not exist'. Only the historical religions exist. Moreover, Phenomenology of Religion is not competent to establish the nature of religion. That is the task of Philosophical Theology/Philosophy of Religion, and even that discipline could 'not solve that problem' (Kristensen 1919: 263; cf. 1960: 9). Kristensen (1919: 263) took the position that the historical research of religions should not be governed by definitions of religion that purported to established its essence. Against Van der Leeuw's dismissal of the 'alleged objectivity' of historical research and his shift to his own Christian subjectivity, Kristensen argued that the study of religions should be guided by the sincere interaction between the religiosity of the believers studied and of the scholar studying them. That study provided the [151] scholar with a constantly expanding religious horizon that not only caused the researcher to 'grow religiously' but also slowly changed his religious pre-conceptions (Kristensen 1919: 263-265; cf. also Waardenburg 1978: 244; 1983: 115). Historical research, he insisted elsewhere, is led astray by normative evaluation. Instead, the 'dangerous discipline' of the History of Religions demands that one abandon 'the notion of one's own centrality'. The safety of one's axiomatic certainties must be abandoned. One must surrender oneself to the object of one's study and understand it from the sympathy which it has generated in one, at the price of paralyzing uncertainty in matters of religious truth (Kristensen 1915/1954: 68-69, 70-73, 74-75, 80-81). Once a scholar has de-established his own centre, has reduced it to only one among many, and views each religion as the very

they failed to do justice to the *sui generis* nature of religion.<sup>132</sup> He said that he followed Kristensen<sup>133</sup> in relying on this (religious) ‘psychology’ and the art of the empathy of the religious scholar<sup>134</sup> for creating a unitary approach to human religions which aimed to discover ‘religion [132] as such’ in them. It sought to understand ‘the [common] religious [element] in [its many] different phenomena’ which was ‘at their heart’ everywhere, and to penetrate to “‘the psychological ground’”,<sup>135</sup> which was ‘their essence’.<sup>136</sup> Other than Kristensen (whose stipulation was merely that a scholar of religion must be religious),<sup>137</sup> Van der Leeuw ‘consciously and with conviction [took] one specific religion [Christianity], not only as his field of research but also as his norm’.<sup>138</sup>

He proposed that Science of Religion(s) be regarded as the modern version of Natural Theology, or *doctrina de deo*, and as its successor. He proposed to fuse it with *godsdiensgeschiedenis*, the History of Religion (in the singular),<sup>139</sup> or Phenomenology of Religion,<sup>140</sup> and to assign to it the task of dealing with ‘the phenomenon of religion as such’, including Christianity, in a non-confessional way.<sup>141</sup> Science of Religion(s), in his view, therefore, was ‘the precinct of Christian theology’<sup>142</sup> and as such an organic part of a faculty of theology.<sup>143</sup> In his scheme of that faculty’s disciplines,<sup>144</sup> Van der Leeuw included the History of Religions (in the plural) as an integral part in the History (or Science) of Religion (in the singular), defining the latter as their systematic study unified by the ‘psychology’ of [religious] empathy. The ‘History of Religion’ in its turn was to serve as a substantive part of the Historical Theology, together with the Biblical Theology and the

---

imperfect expression of the divine reality as believers have experienced it, each and every religion will lead the scholar deeper into its mystery (Kristensen 1915/1954: 82-83).

<sup>132</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 7-9

<sup>133</sup> Cf. Kristensen 1960: 7, 139-140

<sup>134</sup> Who is in need of intuition as much as he is need of knowledge (Van der Leeuw 1918: 9-10).

<sup>135</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 7, quoting Kristensen 1904: 237

<sup>136</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 21

<sup>137</sup> Cf. e.g. Kristensen 1960: 9-10; cf. also Van der Leeuw (1918: 14): ‘the study of religions requires a religious researcher’.

<sup>138</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 15, 18-20; also 1933: 613-614; 1948a: 629; 1963: 645-646. Van der Leeuw explicitly affirmed that his religion was that of the NHK church. He did so in the concluding part of his inaugural lecture, when he addressed the two professors appointed by that church to teach confessional theology as well as the students preparing for the ministry in that church at the Groningen faculty (Van der Leeuw 1918: 23-24, 27). He did so again in note 23.

<sup>139</sup> He proposed that the title of his chair be changed from *geschiedenis der godsdiensten in het algemeen* (the General History of Religions, in the plural) to *algemene godsdiensgeschiedenis* (the General History of Religion, in the singular). He considered that ‘reduction’ only as ‘a minor breach’ of the law of 1876, although he acknowledged that it introduced ‘a fundamental distinction’ (Van der Leeuw 1918: 5).

<sup>140</sup> On the genesis, history and multiple meanings of ‘phenomenology’ and its distinct uses in ‘Phenomenology of Religion’ as developed by Chantepie, Kristensen, Van der Leeuw and Bleeker, cf. James 1985; and Molendijk 2000

<sup>141</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 6, 7, 19

<sup>142</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 22

<sup>143</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 5-7, 14-15

[152] <sup>144</sup> Van der Leeuw was also assigned to teach the Encyclopaedia of Theology (and Egyptian Language and Literature in the Faculty of Arts) (cf. e.g. Waardenburg 1978: 189-190).

History of Christianity. This historical group of theological disciplines was again to serve as the broad, 'factual' basis of Systematic Theology. In reverse and descending order, all these disciplines had to take their norm not only from Systematic Theology, but also, in line with Gunning<sup>145</sup> and Chantepie, from 'the living faith of the Christian congregation'.<sup>146</sup>

In Van der Leeuw's system of the disciplines of a faculty of theology, Science of Religion(s) was part and parcel of a Christian theology that was academic and liberal as well as confessional and practical, i.e. directed towards 'the living faith of the [Christian] congregation'.<sup>147</sup> This theology provided it not only with its norm, and point of departure but also with its goal. Van der Leeuw developed this approach further throughout his tenure until his sudden [133] death in 1950.<sup>148</sup> By that time, he had redefined the difference between *duplex* and *simplex ordo* theology as that between the reflective stance of a Christian theologian in the university lecture hall of the faculty of theology on a weekday, and that same theologian's fervent sermon from the pulpit as a minister of the church on a Sunday.<sup>149</sup> By assisting Christian theology to achieve a profound awareness of the distinctly different revelations which God had granted to religions, Science of Religion(s) was to be instrumental in guiding the Church to its 'Living Lord, Jesus Christ', who alone was 'able to vivify it by His love'.<sup>150</sup> Van der Leeuw grew increasingly convinced that 'all theology is anthropology, and all anthropology is theology, [because] the principle of all knowledge about God and nature is the God-man, Christ'.<sup>151</sup> He stated that his Science of Religion was that of a 'Christian humanist'<sup>152</sup> and a 'Christian existentialist'<sup>153</sup> who was certain that he 'had been found' by God incarnate in Christ, the suffering *Ecce Homo*.<sup>154</sup>

His successor, Th.P. van Baaren, who held the Groninger chair from 1952 to 1980, also took a 'religionist' position in the first decade of his teaching there.<sup>155</sup> The same goes, much more explicitly, for H.Th. Obbink, who occupied the chair of History of Religions

---

<sup>145</sup> Van der Leeuw explicitly acknowledged his debt to Gunning's *Godgeleerdheid en Godsdienstwetenschap* ('Theology and Science of Religion(s)', 1892), praising it as a 'marvelous booklet' (Van der Leeuw 1918: 25, note 2).

<sup>146</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 15-16, 18-22

<sup>147</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 15-16, 18

<sup>148</sup> For surveys of Van der Leeuw's theological development, cf. Waardenburg 1978: 193-220; 1983: 116-118

<sup>149</sup> Van der Leeuw 1948b: 197. The briefest summary of Van der Leeuw's 'close harmony' was his saying that there was 'no culture without cult' (quoted by Van Veen [1951: 531]; cf. van der Leeuw [1933: 644n1]: 'Alle Kultur ist letzten Endes religiös', 'All culture is religious in the end'); another brief one is: 'jedes Verständnis [...] ist schliesslich religiös', 'all understanding is ultimately religious' (Van der Leeuw 1933: 647).

<sup>150</sup> Van der Leeuw 1918: 21-22

<sup>151</sup> Van der Leeuw 1948b: 196; cf. also Van der Leeuw 1933: 613-614; 1948a: 628-630; Kraemer 1959: 26-33; Mulder 1965: 8-9

<sup>152</sup> Van der Leeuw 1947a

<sup>153</sup> Van der Leeuw 1947b: 571-572

<sup>154</sup> Van der Leeuw & Sierksma 1949: 6-7, 10-12; cf. also Van der Leeuw 1933: 646-648; 1948a: 665-667; 1963: 678-679; Waardenburg 1973: 419-421; 1983: 119; James 1985: 328-329

<sup>155</sup> On Van Baaren's early religionism and his shift to methodological agnosticism, cf. Platvoet 1998: 339-341



from 1913 to 1939 in the highly confessional Utrecht Faculty.<sup>156</sup> As it did for his son and Van Baaren's teacher, H.W. Obbink, who held it from 1939 to 1968;<sup>157</sup> and for D.J. Hoens, Professor of 'Living Religions' from 1961 to 1982; and J. Zandee, Professor of 'Ancient Religions' from 1968 to 1982. The successors to Chantepie's chair in the Amsterdam Faculty were again no exception to this rule. They were A.J.H. Brandt (1900-1909),<sup>158</sup> H.Th. Obbink from 1910 to 1913, H. Hackmann from 1913 to 1934,<sup>159</sup> G.A. van den Bergh van Eysinga<sup>160</sup> from 1934 to 1935,<sup>161</sup> and C.J. Bleeker from 1945 to 1969. I will only discuss briefly Bleeker's 'close harmony' in view of the influence of his views in some quarters abroad.

### *Bleeker's transcendent reality*

Bleeker took 'awareness of the divine as a transcendent reality' as essential for any and all religions.<sup>162</sup> That is also apparent from his [134] definition of religion as 'man's relation to a divine reality',<sup>163</sup> which originated from 'a higher necessity': a hierophanic 'encounter with God or the Holy', and is expressed in sincere *godsdiens*, 'service of God'.<sup>164</sup> He viewed religion as 'an invincible, creative and self-regenerating force', as 'man's inseparable companion', which 'rises spontaneously in the human heart', and is 'indispensable' and 'inherent' in human life'.<sup>165</sup> He explained the 'disparate' variety of human religions as God having 'fixed' some human groups in one, and other peoples in another 'habit', or 'attitude', of receptivity towards one of his several modes of revelation: in nature, history,

<sup>156</sup> When Obbink retired, his students testified that he had taught the Science of Religion to them in closest union with Biblical Studies and in a Christo-centric manner, in order that they might become good ministers in the church (Edelkoort e.a. 1939: VII-XI). For examples of Obbink's biblio- and Christo-centric approach, see Obbink 1903: 22-28; 1913: 105-107; cf. also Hak 1964: 16.

<sup>157</sup> Cf. Hak (1964: 17-21) on H.W. Obbink's partly 'ethical', partly Barthian theology.

<sup>158</sup> Brandt was a German NT scholar with an interest in Mandeian religion (Brandt 1899; cf. also Molendijk 2000: 24n17)

<sup>159</sup> Hackmann read Theology and Semitic Languages at Leipzig and Göttingen Universities from 1883 to 1886, and obtained a Ph.D. in Old Testament Exegesis at Göttingen in 1893. He worked as a Lutheran minister in Shanghai from 1894 to 1903, and travelled extensively in the Far East from 1901 to 1903 and again from 1910 to 1912. While serving as the pastor of a German congregation in London, he published extensively on Chinese Buddhism. He was appointed Professor of History of Religions and the History of the Religion of Israel at Amsterdam University in 1913. His publications were virtually all on Chinese religions. Cf. Merkel 1934.

[153] <sup>160</sup> This 'last and probably the most erudite representative of the radical Dutch school [in New Testament Studies]' (Van der Horst 1988: 38) was another leader of 'Modern Theology'. He was appointed Professor Extraordinary of History of Religions in the Amsterdam Faculty in 1934. From 1935 till his retirement in 1944, he was Ordinary Professor for New Testament and Early Christian Literature.

<sup>161</sup> I have not been able to establish who taught Science of Religion in the Amsterdam Faculty from 1935 to 1945.

<sup>162</sup> Quoted in Sierksma 1979: 139; cf. also Bleeker 1963: 37-38; 1966: 77, 120-121; 1973: 151-152, 197

<sup>163</sup> Bleeker 1963: 45, 51; also 1966: 84; 1973: 11, 151, 156, 163

<sup>164</sup> Bleeker 1956: 7; 1965: 24, 34; 1966: 95, 117, 120; 1971: 646; 1972: 41; 1973: 156, 167

<sup>165</sup> Bleeker 1963: 24; 1966: 7, 60-62, 112, 117, 119-121

or the human mind.<sup>166</sup> He held that Schleiermacher had laid the theoretical foundation for the Science of Religion by ‘according the same absolute validity to all religions’; and he rejected both the Christian orthodox assertion that Christianity alone is the one true religion, and the reductive explanations of religion on the grounds of psychological and social factors.<sup>167</sup> He also published a *theologia religionum*, the core of which is that ‘God has lightened the path to truth for all peoples in all ages [...] in a pluriform dispensation of the truth’. ‘The spiritual notions [of mankind] are complementary’, therefore, and ‘the indisputably religious content of the non-Christian religions forces us to take seriously the notion of a general revelation’.<sup>168</sup> He accorded no unique value to the Christian religion, save for Christians. The gospel is, as one of God’s dispensations, of ‘exceptional significance [...] for Christians’ and ‘totally binding’ on Christians, because ‘God has revealed His love in Christ’ to them. But God did ‘not reveal in him his purpose for the world’ nor his ‘unfathomable wisdom and majestic omnipotence’. Bleeker considered the doctrines of Trinity, incarnation and the two natures of Christ to be laudable Christologies of the past but ‘untenable in modern times’.<sup>169</sup> Religions must constantly be reformed and re-conceived.<sup>170</sup> Christianity being a ‘Christonomous’ religion,<sup>171</sup> however, he concluded his review of Vestdijk’s *De Toekomst der religie*<sup>172</sup> with the set liturgical confession: ‘Christ is the same today, yesterday, and in all eternity’ (Hebr. 13: 8).<sup>173</sup>

[135]

### *The religionist paradigm*

The ‘close harmonies’ of Kristensen, Van der Leeuw, H.Th. Obbink, Bleeker, and Hidding took the shape of phenomenologies of religion grounded in the same metaphysical postulates as those on which Tiele and Chantepie had founded their philosophies of religion. They were that the meta-empirical is real; that man is religious by nature; and that religion is *sui-generis* and should, therefore, not be ‘explained away’. The others, H.W. Obbink, de Buck, Hartmann, Hoens, and Zandee also worked within this religionist paradigm without making any pronouncements upon it themselves. This common core of their several ‘close harmonies’, served as the virtually axiomatic philosophical-theological framework for the Science of Religion in the Netherlands till far beyond 1948,<sup>174</sup> when Van der Leeuw’s disciple, Fokke Sierksma, began publicly to dispute it. Despite his stark anti-Christian ‘nihil-

<sup>166</sup> Bleeker 1956: 77-80; 1958b: 339; 1963: 32-34; 1966: 72-74, 76, 95, 101-102; 1973: 163

<sup>167</sup> Bleeker 1956: 6-7, 13, 75, 85-88; 1958b: 335-336; 1963: 9, 19, 31; 1966: 58-59, 63, 70, 76-94; 1971: 645-646; 1973: 161

<sup>168</sup> \ Bleeker 1965: 122; 1966: 105-106; also 1959a: 171; 1966: 72-74, 81, 95-109, 128; 1972: 217

<sup>169</sup> Bleeker 1966: 107, 124-126

<sup>170</sup> Bleeker 1958a: 169-170; 1966: 36, 54, 127-128

<sup>171</sup> Bleeker 1966: 125

<sup>172</sup> Bleeker 1949, also in Sierksma 1979: 129-139

<sup>173</sup> In Sierksma 1979: 139; also Bleeker 1966: 121. Cf. also Mulder 1965: 8-9; James 1985: 313-318

<sup>174</sup> E.g. Bakhuizen van den Brink (1955: 211-212) argued in 1955 that one might conceivably equate *duplex ordo* theology with ‘Faculties of Science of Religion(s)’, provided that the ‘completely Western-Christian nature’ of *duplex ordo* theology is also acknowledged, as well as its intimate relationship with [Dutch] Science of Religion(s).

ism', even Sierksma was a believer, albeit in an 'unchristian god', whom he experienced as 'an x, a god-in-my-back', a silent god playing cruel games with him.<sup>175</sup> Until 1960, liberal Christian and, in Sierksma's case, post-Christian theologies of several sorts were taken to be the 'natural' setting of Science of Religion(s) in the Faculties of Theology of the Dutch public universities. They were presumed to create the conditions for an unbiased and fully objective study of the religions of mankind.<sup>176</sup> This choir, therefore, also sang in close harmony. But a few shrill voices of dissent were also heard.

### *Kraemer's dissent*

Hendrik Kraemer (1888-1965) was the principal exception to this general model, as Gunning and Visscher had been before him. The three had in common that they rejected the *duplex ordo* and strove after the re-absorption of academic theology and Science of Religion(s) into confessional theology.<sup>177</sup> Gunning and Visscher, however, had been foisted on their faculties whilst Kraemer had not. It is curious that Kraemer, the missionary linguist, islamologist and theologian of a militantly confessional kind,<sup>178</sup> was selected in early 1937 as Kristensen's successor by the Leiden Faculty at the behest of Kristensen [136] himself.<sup>179</sup> The Faculty may have appointed him for two reasons. First, it may have felt that the inclusion of the study of the modern religions of Asia (Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism) in the curriculum of the Faculty was overdue in the light of the increasingly significant presence of the NHK church in the Dutch colonies, partly through its recent missionary activities and partly because of its position of old as established church.<sup>180</sup> The religions of Asia, and Islam especially, were important cultural and political factors in the Dutch East Indies, now Indonesia. Secondly, the gradual weakening of the liberal modality of the

<sup>175</sup> Van der Leeuw & Sierksma 1948: 15-16; see Platvoet 1998: 337

<sup>176</sup> Cf. also van den Bergh van Eysinga 1940: 112

<sup>177</sup> Cf. e.g. Kraemer 1959: 14

<sup>178</sup> Kraemer (1888-1965) had been trained as a missionary at the *Nederlandse Zendingsschool* at Rotterdam from 1905 to 1911. He had read Languages and Literatures of Indonesia (mainly those of Java) at Leiden University, specialising in Islam under Snouck Hurgronje, from 1911 to 1921 (Van Leeuwen 1959: 10-16; Jansen Schoonhoven 1983: 104-105). He had sat in also on Kristensen's Science of Religion(s) lectures in those years. They had 'gripped' him, because Kristensen 'himself was gripped' (Kraemer 1960: XIX). He had concluded his studies in Leiden in 1921 with a *cum laude* PhD on a 16<sup>th</sup> century Javanese *primbon*, Muslim mystical treatise (Kraemer 1921). He had been employed, between 1923 and 1935, [154] as Bible translator by the *Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap* on Java. In addition, he had also been commissioned to study recent developments among intellectuals in Java and in Javanese Islam. He had travelled widely through Indonesia in his official function of *visitor* to, and reporter on, the many regional dependencies of the Protestant Church of the Dutch East Indies (Van Leeuwen 1959: 16-92; Jansen Schoonhoven 1983: 105-107). After his return to Europe in 1935, he had served as an officer of the International Missionary Council from 1936 to 1938, with the special task of preparing its third international conference at Tambaran, India, in December 1938 (Van Leeuwen 1959: 98-109).

<sup>179</sup> Kraemer 1960: XI; Van Leeuwen 1959: 116-117

<sup>180</sup> Cf. e.g. Van Leeuwen 1959: 21-92; on its position as established church, cf. Van Leeuwen 1959: 84-87

NHK church in the interbellum<sup>181</sup> made it mandatory for the Leiden Faculty to improve its relation with that church. One way to do so was through its the missionary institutions in which Kraemer played a pivotal role, as Chairman of its Mission Board and as Deputy Director of its *Zendingsschool* at nearby Oegstgeest, in which its missionaries were trained.<sup>182</sup> It is probably for these reasons also that the Leiden Faculty allowed Kraemer to spend most of his time on his work for the Christian missions worldwide before and after World War II, and during the war on his efforts to reform the NHK church. All in all, he seems to have spent rather little time on teaching and on his other duties as Professor of Science of Religion(s).<sup>183</sup> At his request, the Faculty appointed the Egyptologist de Buck to teach Ancient Religions (1939-1959).<sup>184</sup>

Kraemer called his variety of Barth's dialectical theology 'biblical realism'.<sup>185</sup> It was an equally polemic one, for Kraemer regarded 'God's revelation in the Bible' as radically opposed to all human religion.<sup>186</sup> But he dissented from Barth in one important respect. Kraemer held, as did Kuiper,<sup>187</sup> that human nature was 'ineradicably stamped with a *sensus divinitatis* and [had] a *sensus religionis* implanted into it'.<sup>188</sup> But he agreed with Barth nonetheless that 'the relationship between God and man [was] fundamentally defective and [could] only be restored by divine initiative'.<sup>189</sup> The Christian faith must, therefore, in his view be radically theocentric, bibliocentric, and Christocentric. All (the other) religions

<sup>181</sup> Mainly through the growing influence of Dutch varieties of Barth's 'dialectical' theology, developed by O. Noordmans (1871-1956), H. Kraemer and H. Miskotte (1894-1976), confessional systematic theology lost virtually all interest in the other religions of humankind and in Science of Religion(s) (Waardenburg 1978: 243, 246; 1983:119).

<sup>182</sup> Van Veen 1947: 562

<sup>183</sup> Van Leeuwen 1959: 117; 103-113. The Leiden Faculty agreed that Kraemer would assume teaching duties only after the conference at Tambaran in December 1938 (Van Leeuwen 1959:117). Though heavily preoccupied with the preparation of that conference, Kraemer did manage to deliver his inaugural address on 3 December 1937. After Tambaran, Kraemer traveled for four months through Southern India, Ceylon, Sumatra, Java, Celebes and Bali (Kraemer 1940: 55-202; Van Leeuwen 1959: 109-113), returning to Leiden in the early summer of 1939. The University of Leiden was closed from 26 November 1941 until the end of the war. With many other leading intellectuals, Kraemer was detained as a hostage by the Germans at St. Michelsgestel from July 1942 until September 1943 (Van Leeuwen 1959: 139-141, 151). In addition, from 1940 until his departure for Bossey in late 1947, Kraemer was deeply involved in NKH church renewal (Van Veen 1947; Van Leeuwen 1959: 114-157). Kraemer had an aversion to the routine of teaching (Van Leeuwen 1959: 114, 120). He suffered a serious collapse in late 1946 (Jansen Schoonhoven 1983: 108-109).

<sup>184</sup> Cf. van Leeuwen 1959: 120. De Buck was appointed Professor Extraordinary in Egyptology and the History of Ancient Religions in both the Faculty of Arts & Philosophy and the Faculty of Theology (de Buck: 1939: 3, 5, 22-23).

<sup>185</sup> Kraemer 1938: 61sq. On Kraemer's Barthianism, cf. e.g. Kraemer 1945; Bronkhorst 1946: 322-323; Jansen Schoonhoven 1983: 108

<sup>186</sup> Van Leeuwen 1959: 100-101, *passim*

<sup>187</sup> Kraemer (1959: 19) quoted Kuiper on the *sensus divinitatis in ipsis medullis et visceribus hominis hominis infixus* ('the sense for the divine fixed into the very [155] innards and bowels of man'). Through it, says Kuiper (1909, III: 448, 449, 451-453, 563) all humans possess *cognitio Dei concreata*, 'co-created knowledge about God'.

<sup>188</sup> Kraemer 1959: 19-20; 1938: 120-121, 133-134; 1963: 311. Kraemer's other teachers were Kristensen and Chantepie, and he was also influenced by Pascal, Kierkegaard, and Blumhardt (Van Leeuwen 1959: 150; Jansen Schoonhoven 1983: 105).

<sup>189</sup> Kraemer 1938: VI

of man were, he wrote, radically anthropocentric:<sup>190</sup> they were naturalist and totalitarian systems embracing nature, society, cosmos and the believers, in monistic, [137] relativist and even fundamentally agnostic ways.<sup>191</sup> Because they were basically similar, they were, he argued, tolerant of each other and syncretistic, each easily assimilating, and peacefully coexisting with, other religions. But no such coexistence was possible between these religions and prophetic missionary Christianity, for according to Kraemer 'naturalist' religions must by their nature radically resist the theocratic claims of Biblical religion. The two were diametrically opposed.<sup>192</sup>

*Duplex ordo* academic theology also resisted these neo-orthodox claims. In Kraemer's view, however, 'theology, history, psychology, anthropology must [all] be exploited to achieve one aim, and one aim only: to be a better instrument in conveying the conviction that God is speaking His decisive Word in Jesus Christ to individuals, nations, peoples, cultures and races without distinction'.<sup>193</sup> He termed the *duplex ordo* a 'crooked' and 'schizophrenic construction', and the faculties of *duplex ordo* theology 'positivist' conglomerations of literary and historical disciplines, that were only 'half-Christian' and 'quasi-theological', i.e. theological in name, only.<sup>194</sup> He also demanded that Philosophy of Religion be expanded into one catering not only for the West but also for the East. Science of Religion(s) ought to be placed in the margins of a 'proper' (i.e. confessional) Faculty of Theology. Its professors should not only be lecturers, researchers and mentors but also *militia Christi*, 'soldiers of Christ'; and Science of Religion(s) should be 'crowned' by a Theology of Religions.<sup>195</sup>

Although Kraemer maintained that the *simplex ordo* ought to be restored, he had no intention of banning Science of Religion(s) from *simplex ordo* theology. His linguistic studies and missionary work had made it plain to him that no modern theology, whether confessional or 'academic', whether for missionaries in the colonies or for ministers 'at home', could do without the study of the other religions, historical and comparative.<sup>196</sup> It must, however, not claim a central position.<sup>197</sup> Kraemer also voiced strong reservations about the 'scientific method' in the study of religions. He claimed that scholarly analysis of religions breaks up their living, indivisible unity and thereby greatly distorts their actual realities. He insisted that all religions must be studied 'in [138] the illuminating light of

---

<sup>190</sup> Kraemer distinguished 'three fundamental approaches to life and the world': the naturalist, the rationalist, and the prophetic. The aim of the first was the realisation of the self, that of the second was rational comprehension, and of the third was being receptive to God's revelation. The first two were anthropocentric; the third was theocentric (Kraemer 1937: 18-20).

<sup>191</sup> Kraemer 1937: 21-25; 1938: 101sq

<sup>192</sup> Kraemer 1937: 5-25; 1938: 142sq. Cf. also Van Leeuwen 1959: 100-103, 114-120; Jansen Schoonhoven 1983: 109

<sup>193</sup> Kraemer 1938: 445; cf. also 1937: 27-28

<sup>194</sup> Kraemer 1959: 14, 17-18, 45; Berkhof 1954: 29; Van Leeuwen 1959: 119

<sup>195</sup> Kraemer 1959: 39-43; Van Leeuwen 1959: 119

<sup>196</sup> Kraemer 1960: xxv; cf. also Kraemer 1959: 34-38; Van Leeuwen 1959: 119

<sup>197</sup> Van Leeuwen 1959: 119

the revelation in Christ'. That revelation showed 'all religious life, the lofty as well as the degraded, [... as fundamentally] *misdirected*'.<sup>198</sup>

Kraemer spent barely ten years at Leiden. On 1 January 1948, he exchanged his chair at Leiden for the directorship of the new study centre of the World Council of Churches in Bossey, near Geneva, Switzerland. With the exception of his inaugural address, he had produced not a single publication in *Science of Religion* in that decade.<sup>199</sup>

### *Epilogue*

It is a firm conclusion of this article that the duplex ordo may be seen in retrospect to have served as the simplex ordo of Dutch Protestant liberal theology between 1860 and 1960.<sup>200</sup> The 1876 law did not 'convert the faculties of theology, as a matter of principle, into faculties of science of religion(s)',<sup>201</sup> as has been asserted by its opponents. The crucial factor was the emergence of liberal theology with its different appreciation of humankind's religions in the course of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. That may be convincingly shown from another century of the history of Dutch Science of Religion(s): that in the Dutch simplex ordo institutes of (confessional) theology between 1880 and 1980. In 1880, Kuyper founded the first of the Dutch simplex ordo institutes of academic theology: the Faculty of Theology at the Free University at Amsterdam, in explicit opposition to the new duplex ordo liberal theology established by the 1876 law in the Faculties of Theology of the public universities. In the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, however, liberal theology gradually came to pervade nearly all Dutch academic institutes of confessional theology. The introduction of Science of Religion(s) into them was one of the signposts signalling that shift. Science of Religion(s) in those institutes displayed, and displays, a range of traits broadly similar to those of Science of Religion(s) in duplex ordo theology in the period discussed. But that is matter for another article.<sup>202</sup>

### [155]

#### *References*

- Anonymous 1912, 'Kuenen (Abraham)', in Molhuysen & Blok 1912, II: 734-735
- Baaren, Th.P. van, *e.a.* (eds.) 1963, *Verbum: Essays on some Aspects of the Religious Function of Words, dedicated to Dr. H.W. Obbink, Professor in the History of Religions and Egyptology [at the] University of Utrecht on November 14<sup>th</sup>, 1964*. Utrecht: Kemink
- Baaren, Th.P. van, 1973, 'Science of Religion as a Systematic Discipline: Some Introductory Remarks', in Van Baaren & Drijvers 1973: 35-56
- Baaren, Th.P. van, & H.J.W. Drijvers (eds.) 1973, *Religion, Culture and Methodology: Papers of the Groningen Working-group for the Study of Fundamental Problems and Methods of Science of Religion*. The Hague: Mouton

<sup>198</sup> Kraemer 1938: 135-136, his italics; cf. also Van Leeuwen 1959: 119

<sup>199</sup> Van Veen 1947

<sup>200</sup> Not unlike Van der Leeuw (1933: 647; 1948a: 665) finding a *duplex ordo* attitude in the R.C. *simplex ordo* theology of E. Przywara as early as 1928.

<sup>201</sup> *Pace* Van Leeuwen 1959: 115

<sup>202</sup> Platvoet 2002

- Bakhuizen van den Brink, J.N., 1954, 'De faculteit der godgeleerdheid aan onze rijksuniversiteiten', in *Wending* 9 (1954/55) 209-219
- [156] Bergh van Eysinga, G.A. van den, 1940, '1866-1940: gedachtenisrede in de vergadering van moderne theologen, 2 april 1940', in *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift* 29: 101-123
- Berkhof, H., 1954, 'De theologische faculteit: een nationaal cultuurprobleem', in *Wending* 9 (1954/55) 25-37
- Bianchi, U., 1975, *The History of Religions*. Leiden: Brill
- Bianchi, U., C.J. Bleeker & A. Bausani (eds.) 1972, *Problems and Methods of the History of Religions; Proceedings of the Study Conference organized by the Italian Society for the History of Religions on the Occasion of the Tenth Anniversary of the Death of Raffaele Pettazoni, Rome, 6<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> December 1969; Papers and Discussions*. Leiden: Brill
- Bianchi, U., 1994a, 'Perspectives du Congrès', in Bianchi 1994b: IXX-XXI
- Bianchi, U., (ed.) 1994b, *The Notion of 'Religion' in Comparative Research; Selected Proceedings of the XVI IAHR Congress*. Roma: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider
- Bleeker, C.J., 1949, 'Het gesprek met de "ongelovige"', in *Theologie en Praktijk* (January 1949); also in Sierksma 1979: 129-139
- Bleeker, C.J., [1956], *De structuur van de godsdienst: hoofdlijnen ener fenomenologie van de godsdienst*. De Haag: Servire
- Bleeker, C.J., 1958a, 'Een godsdienstig gesprek tussen Oost en West', in *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 13: 161-172
- Bleeker, C.J., 1958b, 'Zelfportret van de fenomenologie van de godsdienst', in *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 13: 321-344
- Bleeker, C.J., 1963, *The Sacred Bridge: Researches into the Nature and Structure of Religion*. Leiden: Brill
- Bleeker, C.J., 1965, *Christ in Modern Athens: The Confrontation of Christianity with Modern Culture and the Non-Christian Religions*. Leiden: Brill
- Bleeker, C.J., 1966, *Christus in het moderne Athene: confrontatie van het christendom met de moderne cultuur en de niet-christelijke godsdiensten*. Wassenaar: Servire
- Bleeker, C.J., 1971, 'Epilegomena', in Bleeker & Widengren 1971, II: 642-651
- Bleeker, C.J., 1972, 'The Contribution of Phenomenology of Religion to the Study of the History of Religions', in Bianchi, Bleeker & Bausani 1972: 35-45
- Bleeker, C.J., 1973<sup>3</sup>, *Het geheim van de godsdienst*. Den Haag: Servire (1956<sup>1</sup>)
- Bleeker, C.J., & G. Widengren (eds.) 1972, *Historia Religionum: Handbook for the History of Religions*. Leiden: Brill, 2 vols
- Bolzano, B., 1834<sup>1</sup>, *Lehrbuch der Religionswissenschaft*. Sulzbach: no publisher (= 4 Bände; 1853<sup>2</sup>: Lemgo-Detmold: A. von Coelln; 1994<sup>3</sup>: Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog)
- Bolzano, B., 1837<sup>1</sup>, *Wissenschaftslehre und Religionswissenschaft*. Sulzbach: no publisher (1841<sup>2</sup>; 1994<sup>3</sup>: Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog)
- Bos, David, 1999, *In dienst van het Koninkrijk: Beroepsontwikkeling van hervormde predikanten in negentiende-eeuws Nederland*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker
- Bosch, L.P. van den, 1993, 'Friedrich Max Müller: een Victoriaans geleerde over de oorsprong van de taal en het religieuze denken', in *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 47, 2: 107-118

- Brandt, A.J.H.W., 1899, *Die Mandäische Religion: ihre Erscheinung und geschichtliche Bedeutung erforscht, dargestellt und beleuchtet*. Utrecht: no publisher (PhD, Utrecht University)
- Breevaart, Hans van de, 2002, 'Wetenschap is beschaving: Over het intellectuele milieu van C.P. Tiele', in A. van der Lem (red.) 2002, *Religie in de academische arena: Leven en werk van C.P. Tiele*. Leiden: Universiteitsbibliotheek Leiden (= Kleine Publicaties van de Leidse Universiteitsbibliotheek, 46), 34-70
- [157] Burnouf, É., 1864-1869, *La science des religions*, in *Revue des deux mondes* no. 54 (1864) 521sq. to no. 59 (1869) (= separate articles)
- Burnouf, É., 1872, *La science des religions*. Paris: Maisonneuve
- Chantepie de la Saussaye, P.D., 1871, *Methodologische bijdrage tot het onderzoek naar den oorsprong van den godsdienst; academisch proefschrift [...] aan de Utrechtse Hoogeschool*. Utrecht: P.W. van de Weijer
- Chantepie de la Saussaye, P.D., 1878, *Het belang van de studie der godsdiensten voor de kennis van het Christendom*. Groningen: Noordhoff
- Chantepie de la Saussaye, P.D., 1887, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Mohr
- Chantepie de la Saussaye, P.D., 1899, *De taak der theologie*. Haarlem: Bohn
- Chantepie de la Saussaye, P.D., 1909a, 'Cornelis Petrus Tiele', in Chantepie de la Saussaye 1909b: 82-120
- Chantepie de la Saussaye, P.D., 1909b, *Portretten en kritieken*. Haarlem: Bohn
- Chantepie de la Saussaye, P.D., 1916, *Afscheidscollege*. Haarlem: Bohn
- Dijk, I. van, 1883/1926, *De eischen der historie en de eischen der wijsbegeerte op het gebied der godsdienstwetenschap*. Groningen: Noordhoff; also in van Dijk 1926<sup>2</sup>, I: 386-420
- Dijk, I., van, 1926<sup>2</sup>, *Verzamelde werken*. Groningen: Noordhoff, 6 vols. (1916<sup>1</sup>)
- Edelkoort, A.H., 1939, 'Woord ter opdracht', in Obbink 1939: VII-XI
- Faitrop-Porta, Anne-Christine, 1991, 'Baldassarre Labanca en France', in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 208, 3: 303-325
- Golterman, W.F., 1971, 'Confessionele richting', in Wiggers *e.a.* 1970-1975, vol. 5 (1971): 673
- Groenman, A.W., 1933, 'Het kenmerk van den modernen theoloog', in *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift* 22: 204-231
- Gunning, J.H., 1890, *Het geloof van de gemeente als theologische maatstaf des oordeel in de wijsbegeerte van de godsdienst*. Utrecht: C.H.E. Breijer
- Gunning, J.H., 1892, *Godgeleerdheid en godsdienstwetenschap: eenige gedachten naar aanleiding van Dr. O. Pfleiderers: die Entwicklung der prot. Theologie, enz.* Utrecht: C.H.E. Breijer
- Haarlem, A. van, 1983, 'Dijk, Isaäk van', in Nauta *e.a.* 1983, II: 181-185
- Hak, D., 1994, *Stagnatie in de nederlandse godsdienstwetenschap, 1920-1980: de bijdrage van Gerardus van der Leeuw, Fokke Sierksma en Theo P. van Baaren aan de godsdienstwetenschap*. Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers
- Hak, H.J., 1964, 'Levensbeschrijving' [van H.W. Obbink], in van Baaren *e.a.* 1964: 3-21
- Hidding, K.A.H., 1960, 'In memoriam prof.dr. A. de Buck', in *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 14: 239-240
- Horst, P.W. van der, 1988, 'Bergh van Eysinga, Gustaaf Adolf van den, 1874-1957', in Nauta *e.a.* (eds.) 1988 (III): 37-39
- Hume, D., 1956, *The Natural History of Religion; Edited with an Introduction by H.E. Root*. London: Adam & Charles Black



- [158] James, G.A., 1985, 'Phenomenology and the Study of Religion: The Archaeology of an Approach', in *The Journal of Religion* 65: 311-335
- Jansen Schoonhoven, 1983, 'Kraemer, Hendrik', in *Nauta e.a.* 1983, I: 104-111
- Jensma, G. & H. de Vries 1997, *Veranderingen in het hoger onderwijs in Nederland tussen 1815 en 1940*. Hilversum: Verloren
- Jong, O.J. de, 1968, 'De wetgever van 1876 en de theologische faculteiten', in *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* N.S. 48, 2: 313-332
- Jong, O.J. de, 1969, *De theologische faculteiten en de Bataafse revolutie*. Nijkerk: Callenbach
- Jong, O.J. de, 1982, *Benoemingsbeleid aan de Rijksuniversiteiten (1876-1931); rede bij de viering van de 346ste Dies natalis der Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht op 19 maart 1982 in de Janskerk*. [Utrecht: Rijksuniversiteit te Utrecht]
- Kippenberg, H.G., & B. Luchesi (eds.) 1991, *Religionswissenschaft und Kulturkritik: Beiträge zur Konferenz The History of religions and critique of culture in the days of Gerardus van der Leeuw (1890-1950)*. Marburg: diagonal-Verlag
- Klostermaier, K.K., & L.W. Hurtado (eds.) 1991, *Religious Studies: issues, prospects and proposals*. Atlanta (Georgia): Scholars Press
- Kraemer, H., 1921, *Een Javaansche primbon uit de zestiende eeuw*. Leiden: no publisher
- Kraemer, H., 1937, *De wortelen van het syncretisme*. Den Haag: Het Boekencentrum
- Kraemer, H., 1938, *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian world*. London: Edinburgh House Press (1946<sup>2</sup>, 1956<sup>3</sup>)
- Kraemer, H., 1940, *Van godsdiensten en mensen: reisindrukken van een Tambaranganger*. Nijkerk: Callenbach
- Kraemer, H., 1959, *De plaats van de godsdienstwetenschap en godsdienstfenomenologie aan de theologische faculteit*. Nijkerk: Callenbach
- Kraemer, H., 1960, 'Introduction', in Kristensen 1960: XI-XXVIII
- Kristensen, W.B., 1904, 'Dualistische en monistische denkbeelden in den Egyptischen godsdienst', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 38: 233-255
- Kristensen, W.B., 1915/1954, 'Over de waardering van historische gegevens', in *Onze Eeuw*; also in Kristensen 1954: 66-84
- Kristensen, W.B., 1919, 'De inaugurale rede van Prof. Van der Leeuw', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 53: 260-265
- Kristensen, W.B., 1931/1954, 'Symbool and werkelijkheid', in *De Gids*; also in Kristensen 1954: 7-23
- Kristensen, W.B., 1939/1954, 'Abraham Kuenen', in *Leids Universiteitsblad* 20 October 1939; also in Kristensen 1954: 31-35
- Kristensen, W.B., 1946/1954, 'Geloof of bijgeloof?', in *Vox Theologica* 16: 166-171; also in Kristensen 1954: 15-23
- Kristensen, W.B., 1954, *Symbool en werkelijkheid: een bundel godsdiensthistorische studiën*. Arnhem: Van Loghum Slaterus
- [159] Kristensen, W.B., 1960, *The Meaning of Religion: Lectures in the Phenomenology of Religion*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff
- Kuening, A., 1974, 'De godsdienst, de wetenschap en het leven: gedachten over "Godsdienst zonder metaphysica"', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 8: 617-648

- Kuyper, A., 1909<sup>2</sup>, *Encyclopaedie der heilige godgeleerdheid; derde deel; tweede herziene druk*. Kampen: Kok (1894-1896<sup>1</sup>)
- Lamers, G.H., 1901, *De wetenschap van den godsdienst*. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 2 vols
- Lange, A. de, 1987, *De verhouding tussen dogmatiek en godsdienstwetenschap binnen de theologie: een onderzoek naar de ontwikkeling van het theologiebegrip van J.H. Gunning Jr. (1829-1905)*. Kampen: Mondiss
- Leblanc, P., 1852-1854, *Les religions et leur interprétation chrétienne*. Paris, 3 tomes
- Leertouwer, L., 1989, 'C.P. Tiele's Strategy of Conquest', in Otterspeer 1989:153-167
- Leeuw, G. van der, 1918, *Plaats en taak van de godsdienstgeschiedenis in de theologische wetenschap; rede uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het ambt van hoogleeraar in de godgeleerdheid aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Groningen op 25 september 1918*. Groningen, etc.: J.B. Wolters' U.M.
- Leeuw, G. van der, 1933, *Phänomenologie der Religion*. Tübingen: Mohr
- Leeuw, G. van der, 1947a, 'Christelijk humanisme', in *Wending* 2: 247-252
- Leeuw, G. van der, 1947b, 'Existentialisme', in *Wending* 2: 567-572
- Leeuw, G. van der, 1948a, *La religion dans son essence et ses manifestations: phénoménologie de la religion*. Paris: Payot
- Leeuw, G. van der, 1948b, *Inleiding tot de theologie; 2e herziene druk*. Amsterdam: H.J. Paris (1935<sup>1</sup>)
- Leeuw, G. van der, 1963<sup>2</sup>, *Religion in Essence and Manifestation: A Study in Phenomenology*. New York: Harper & Row (1938<sup>1</sup>)
- [Leeuw, G. van der, & F. Sierksma] 1949, 'Nihilisme en christelijk geloof: een briefwisseling', in *Wending* 4: 1-7
- Leeuwen, A.Th. van, 1959, *Hendrik Kraemer: dienaar der wereldkerk*. Amsterdam: ten Have
- Linde, S. van der, 1983, 'Scholten, Johannes Henricus', in *Nauta e.a.* 1983, I: 320-321
- Molendijk, A.L., 2000, 'At the Crossroads: Early Dutch Science of Religion in International Perspective', in S. Hjelde (ed.) 2000, *Man, Meaning and Mystery: Hundred Years of History of Religions in Norway; The Heritage of Brede Kristensen*. Leiden: Brill, 19-56
- Molhuysen, P.C., & P.J. Blok (eds.) 1912, *Nieuw nederlands biografisch woordenboek; deel 2*. Leiden: Sijthoff
- Mulder, D.C., 1965, *Theologie en godsdienstwetenschap: rede uitgesproken bij de aanvaarding van het ambt van gewoon hoogleeraar in de Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid aan de Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam*. 's-Gravenhage: van Keulen
- Müller, F.M., 1860, 'Semitic Monotheism'; republished in Müller 1867: 337-374
- [160] Müller, F.M., 1861, *Lectures on the Science of Language*. London: Longmans/Green
- Müller, F.M., 1867, *Chips from a German Workshop; vol. I: Essays on the Science of Religion*. London: Longmans/Green
- Müller, F.M., 1873, *Introduction to the science of religion*. London: Longmans/Green
- Müller, F.M., 1880<sup>2</sup>, *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religions of India*. London: Longmans, Green & Co (1878<sup>1</sup>)
- Nauta, D., e.a. (eds.) 1983, *Biografisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands protestantisme*. Kampen: Kok, volumes I & II
- Nauta, D., e.a. (eds.) 1988, *Biografisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands protestantisme*. Kampen: Kok, volume III.
- Obbink, H.Th., 1903, 'Denker of profeet', in Obbink 1939: 1-28

- Obbink, H.Th., 1939, *Keur uit verspreide geschriften*. Amsterdam: H.J. Paris
- Oort, H., 1892, 'In memoriam: Abraham Kuenen', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 25: 113-116
- Otterspeer, W., (ed.) 1989, *Leiden Oriental Connections, 1850-1940*. Leiden: Brill
- Pinard de la Boullaye, H., 1922, *L'étude comparée des religions; essai critique; tome I: son histoire dans le monde occidental*. Paris: Beauchesne
- Platvoet, J.G., 1998, 'From Consonance to Autonomy: Science of Religion in the Netherlands, 1948-1995', in *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 10, 4: 334-351
- Platvoet, J.G., 2002, 'Pillars, Pluralism and Secularisation: A Social History of Dutch Sciences of Religions', in Gerard A. Wiegers (ed. in association with Jan G. Platvoet) 2002, *Modern Societies & the Science of Religions*. Leiden, etc.: Brill, 82-148
- Post, A.H., 1869, *Untersuchungen über den Zusammenhang der Christlichen Glaubenslehre mit dem antiken Religionswesen nach der Methode der vergleichende Religionswissenschaft*. Bremen: no publisher
- Roessingh, K.H., 1919, 'De theologische opleiding van den predikant: *pia desideria*', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 53: 60-88; also in Roessingh 1924e, II: 407-428
- Roessingh, K.H., 1924a, 'De Leidsche theologische faculteit, 1875-1925', in Roessingh 1924e, II: 393-405
- Roessingh, K.H., 1924c, 'Pierre Daniël Chantepie de la Saussaye', in Roessingh 1924e, II: 459-471
- Roessingh, K.H., 1924d, 'Het modernisme in Nederland', in Roessingh 1924e, IV: 231-385
- Roessingh, K.H., 1924e, *Verzamelde werken*. Arnhem: van Loghum Slaterus, 6 vols
- Rollmann, H., 1991, 'Adolf von Harnack and the "History of Religions" as a University Subject', in Klostermaier & Hurtado 1991: 85-103
- Rooden, P. van, 1996, *Religieuze regimes: over godsdienst en maatschappij in Nederland*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker
- Root, H.E., 1956, 'Editor's introduction', in Hume 1956: 7-20
- Scholten, J.H., 1877, *De godgeleerdheid aan de Nederlandsche Hoogeschoolen volgens de wet op het Hooger Onderwijs, uitgevaardigd in 1876*. Leiden: Engels
- Sharpe, E., 1975, *Comparative religion: a history*. London: Duckworth
- Sierksma, F., 1950, *Phaenomenologie der religie en complexe psychologie: een methodo-logische bijdrage*. Assen: van Gorcum
- [161] Sierksma, F., 1951, *Professor dr. G. van der Leeuw: dienaar van God en hoogleraar te Groningen*. Amsterdam: Het Wereldvenster
- Sierksma, F., 1977, *Theologie en godsdienstwetenschap: voordracht oorspronkelijk bestemd voor de Tieleherdenking op 15 oktober 1977*. [Leiden]: Universitaire Pers
- Sierksma, F., 1979<sup>2</sup>, *Tussen twee vuren: een pamflet en een essay*. Utrecht: Reflex (1952<sup>1</sup>)
- Stiefelhagen, F., 1858, *Theologie des Heidenthums: die Wissenschaft von den alten Religi-onen und der Vergleichende Mythologie*. Regensburg: Manz
- Tiele, C.P., 1856, 'Iets over de vóór-christelijke godsdiensten', in P.D. de Génestet & P.C. Tiele (red.) 1856, *Christelijke Volksalmanak voor het jaar 1857: Nieuwe serie; Tweede jaargang*. Amsterdam: P.N. van Kampen, 115-131
- Tiele, C.P., 1860, 'Het onderwijs in de godsdienstgeschiedenis aan de Leidse Hoogeschool', in *De Gids* 24: 815-830

- Tiele, C.P., 1866, 'Theologie en godsdienstwetenschap', in *De Gids* 30: 205-244
- Tiele, C.P., 1867, 'Godsdienstwetenschap en theologie: nadere toelichting van het artikel "Theologie en Godsdienstwetenschap"', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 1: 38-52
- Tiele, C.P., 1870a, 'De oorsprong van mythologie en godsdienst; naar aanleiding der theorieën van De Quatrefages en Brinton', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 4: 1-27
- Tiele, C.P., 1870b, 'Een proeve van vergelijkende godsdienstwetenschap', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 4: 158-168
- Tiele, C.P., 1871a, 'Een probleem der godsdienstwetenschap', in *De Gids* 35: 98-128
- Tiele, C.P., 1871b, 'Het wezen en de oorsprong van den godsdienst', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 5: 373-406
- Tiele, C.P., 1873a, *De plaats van de godsdiensten der natuurvölker in de godsdienstgeschiedenis; redevoering bij het aanvaarden van het professoraat aan het Seminari-um der Remonstranten, den 13den Februari 1873, in het Groot Auditorium der Leidsche Hoogeschool*. Amsterdam: P.N. van Kampen
- Tiele, C.P., 1873b, 'Over de geschiedenis der oude godsdiensten, haar methode, geest en belang', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 7: 573-589
- Tiele, C.P., 1874a, 'Over de wetten van de ontwikkeling van den godsdienst', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 8: 225-262
- Tiele, C.P., 1874b, 'De ontwikkelingsgeschiedenis van den godsdienst en de hypothese waarvan zij uitgaat', in *De Gids* 38: 421-449
- Tiele, C.P., 1892, 'Eenige woorden ter inleiding van den nieuwen cursus over de wijsbegeerte van den godsdienst', in *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 26: 1-9
- Tölle, W., 1865-1871, *Die Wissenschaft der Religion*. Göttingen: no publisher, 2 vols
- Trompf, Gary, 1990, *In Search of Origins*. London: Oriental University Press
- Veen, J.M. van, 1947, 'Een afscheid en een boek: bij het vertrek van Prof.Dr H. Kraemer', in *Wending* 2: 562-567
- Veen, J.M. van, 1951, 'Prof.dr. G. van der Leeuw', in *Wending* 5: 529-532
- [162] Visscher, H., 1911, *Religion und soziales Leben bei den Naturvölkern; I: Prolegomena; II: Die Hauptprobleme*. Bonn: Schergens
- Waardenburg, J., 1972, 'Religion between Reality and Idea: A Century of Phenomenology of Religion in the Netherlands', in *Numen* 19, 2/3: 128-203
- Waardenburg, J., 1973, *Classical Approaches to the Study of Religion; Volume 1: Introduction and Anthology*. The Hague, etc. Mouton
- Waardenburg, J., 1978, *Reflections on the Study of Religion; Including an Essay on Gerardus van der Leeuw*. The Hague, etc.: Mouton
- Waardenburg, J.D.J., 1983, 'Leeuw, Gerardus van der', in *Nauta e.a.* 1983, I: 114-120
- Wiebe, D., 1991, 'Phenomenology of Religion as a Religio-cultural Quest: Gerardus van der Leeuw and the Subversion of the Scientific Study of Religion', in *Kippenberg & Luchesi* 1991: 65-86
- Wiegeraad, B.J., 1991, *Hugo Visscher, 1864-1947: 'een Calvinist op eigen houtje'*. Leiden: Groen & Zoon