

C.P. Tiele. Leading Change?

Master Religious Studies
Final Thesis
Student: A.J. Keemink
Student number: 0341754
Supervisor: A.F. De Jong
Schiedam: August 13, 2017

Preface

At the end of "yet another study" (CM) I am glad that I've finally laid this egg. I couldn't have done this without the help of Cynthia Schoonderwal (who pressed me to go on) and prof. A. F. De Jong (who didn't tell me to stop). Frank Sinatra is singing in the Background.

I am also grateful to the City of Rotterdam. Having a free, air-conditioned work spot in the centre of Rotterdam at the Municipal Archives was great!

Schiedam, August 2017.

Table of Contents

0 General introduction	4
1 Introducing the research problem	5
1.1 Search strategy	8
1.2 Corpus	11
1.3 Introducing the theory: Kotter	15
1.4 Analytical strategy	16
2.0 Results.....	18
2.1 Some biographical facts on C.P. Tiele	18
2.2 Tiele's Social-financial status	21
2.3 An integrated approach towards the activities of C.P. Tiele.....	24
2.3.1 Tiele as a student in Amsterdam, and minister in Moordrecht (1848-1856)	24
2.3.2 The Rotterdam years 1856 - 1873	27
2.3.3 The Leiden Years 1873-1902	41
2.3.4 Kotter on Tiele	56
3.0 Reflection	64
Used Materials.....	66

Table of Illustrations

Picture 1.....	19
----------------	----

0 General introduction

This thesis on C.P. Tiele as Leader of Change was written as the concluding part of the Master of Religious Studies in Leiden.

In part 1 the theoretical framework on this thesis is discussed.

In part 2 the results of this research are presented.

In part 3 a reflection on the thesis is given.

The Used Materials give the materials that were used for this thesis (bibliography).

1 Introducing the research problem

In the course *Confronting Modernity*, part of the master program Religious Studies of Leiden University, my interest was raised in the subject of how modern people tried to cope with conflicting religious beliefs, for instance how people tried to combine, reject or accept the evolution theory with their religious convictions. Combining the evolution theory with other convictions is still a matter of concern in some countries, as the Turkish government plans to remove evolution theory from schoolbooks.¹

As this course was, rightly so, situated in a more international context, as a Dutch citizen I wanted to know what happened in the Netherlands at that time.

The same master program offered the course *East-West Confrontations*, this course focused on the "Sacred Books of the East". In this course students became acquainted with Max Müller's efforts of creating a science of religion.

In this course it turned out that Müller had a Dutch counterpart while creating this "new" science of religion, namely C.P. Tiele. It turned out that Müller had a more or less linguistic approach while looking at the development of religions, whereas Tiele stressed the historic development of religions.²

When looking closer at the person of C.P. Tiele, it turned out that he was not just a famous 19th century scholar, but also a "modern theologian" of some renown. To publish his views on modernism he had set up, with others, in 1858 the weekly paper *De Teekenen des Tijds - Weekblad aan de belangen der Godsdienst gewijd* (The Signs of the Times). In this journal the editors wanted to pay attention to modern developments in the religious and scientific field. The Signs of the Times did not want to take sides but aimed to inform the public. In 1859 the publication of the magazine was discontinued.³ Between 1856 and 1861, Tiele together with his friend P.A. de Génestet edited the *Christian Annual People's Almanac* (De Christelijke Volks-Almanak). With this publication Tiele, and his friend, also wanted to inform the people about religious matters. Orthodox critics called this

¹ www.nu.nl, Turkije wil evolutieleer Darwin uit schoolboeken schrappen, ("Turkey wants to get rid of Darwin's evolution theory"). Published 23-6-2017, consulted July 24th 2017.

² T. Masuzawa, *The invention of world religions, or, How European universalism was preserved in the language of pluralism*, (Chicago, 2005), 104-117 (*The Birth Trauma of World Religions*).

³ M. Buitenwerf-Van der Molen, *God van Vooruitgang. De popularisering van het modern-theologische gedachtengoed in Nederland*, (Hilversum, 2007), 63.

publication a Trojan horse. The publication of the Christian Annual People's Almanac ceased (for a couple of years) after the death of De Génestet in 1861.⁴

So it turned out that Tiele had many qualities: he was, or had been at some time, minister, writer, critic and had leading posts in different organisations, ranging from the Remonstrant Brotherhood, the Dutch League of Protestants ("Nederlandse Protestantenbond") and the Dutch Cremation Society ("Vereeniging tot invoering der Lijkenverbranding in Nederland"). Tiele also took charge of Leiden University in the years 1892-1893, 1899 and 1900-1901. In the years 1899 and 1901 he served as a replacement for unforeseen deaths of 2 rectors.⁵ In Otterspeer's *Bolwerk van de Vrijheid*, Tiele is mentioned only once. So the decision was made to leave this aspect of his life out of this research.⁶

When reading through the literature on Tiele it turned out that several of these aspects had been discussed already. Molendijk wrote on the scholarly activities of Tiele, whereas Cossee and Barnard among others wrote on the activities of Tiele as a modernist theologian and as leader (and professor) of the Remonstrant Brotherhood.⁷ What struck me was the fact that in much of this literature the roles of modern theologian and scientist were treated separately from each other. Cossee and Barnard looked at the religious aspects, whereas Molendijk looked at the more scientific aspects. This separation is even stranger when we take into consideration the fact that Tiele himself combined these qualities from the 1850's until his death in 1902. In his Rotterdam period he taught himself some ancient languages (for example Persian), and he also published his first thoughts on the science of religion. Tiele published not only in the *Gids* and other literary magazines, but also in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*. The *Theologisch Tijdschrift* became, in fact, one of the most important journals in the field of history of religions thanks to Tiele's publications in the period from 1867 to 1892.⁸

So Tiele did not wait with his more scientific work until he was promoted to the post of university professor in 1873. After 1873, he did not restrict himself to doing scientific work either. Van Leeuwen has pointed out that this mixture of roles has always been present in Tiele's career. Tiele reconciled religion and science.⁹

⁴ Buitenwerf-Van der Molen, 65.

⁵ A.L. Molendijk, Cornelis Petrus Tiele en de Godsdienstwetenschap, in: E.H. Cossee en H.D. Tjalma ed., *Geloof en Onderzoek. Uit het leven en werk van C.P. Tiele*, (Rotterdam, 2002) 23-40, 26.

⁶ W. Otterspeer, *Het Bolwerk van de Vrijheid. De Leidse Universiteit in Heden en Verleden*, (Leiden, 2008), Only listed on 155.

⁷ In Cossee, *Geloof*.

⁸ A.L. Molendijk, The Heritage of C.P. Tiele, in: *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 1, 78-114, 90.

⁹ Th. M. van Leeuwen, C.P. Tiele als modern Theoloog, in Cossee, *Geloof*, 41-50, 42.

But perhaps Tiele put more of his religious background in his scientific work than the other way round. This was, at least, the conclusion of the Catholic newspaper *De Tijd* in 1932: "Although Tiele was recently mentioned in *Het Volk*" (a Dutch socialist newspaper, AK), the *Tijd* wrote, "Tiele cannot be considered a good scientist in the matters of religion, because Tiele is a modern theologian".¹⁰ Buitenwerf-Van der Molen has traced a development in which modernists started in the 1850's with Scholten's belief in the law of nature, but after some time changed direction. Some of them, called the "ethisch-modernen" (ethical moderns) found themselves, in the latter part of the century, resisting these laws. They argued that the emotional side was also very important to believers.¹¹ Tiele *combined* these two aspects in his famous Gifford Lectures.¹² In the Gifford Lectures, Tiele paid attention to the (natural) laws of religion, and to its psychological aspects.¹³ Van Leeuwen, however, has stressed that Tiele was still ignoring the religious needs of the individual.¹⁴

So after a quick research on Tiele the conclusion was reached that Tiele was a multifaceted personality operating in an era of change, but the question remained whether we really need another publication on C.P. Tiele. It is a remark of Barnard that triggered the subject for this thesis. Barnard argued that the letters between C.P. Tiele and J.W. Bok would be a blessing for the historian and that they show that every important decision was precooked.¹⁵

This triggered the question in what ways the combination Tiele-Bok could be labelled as a leading coalition, according to the theory on leading change of Kotter.¹⁶ The question was raised if a 21st century theory on change could be used to explain events that happened in the 19th century, and which theory would be useful to raise the question of change? To tackle all the aspects of Tiele, a theory on modelling change had to be flexible enough to cover the whole domain Tiele was working in, because Tiele was not only working in organisations, but was also minister, editor, writer, and critic.

¹⁰ *De Tijd*, 15-01-1932.

¹¹ Buitenwerf-Van der Molen, 32-33.

¹² Otterspeer has also mentioned that Tiele was influenced by the ethical movement. Otterspeer, 155

¹³ For Tiele's views regarding religious development: A.L. Molendijk, *Religious Development: C.P. Tiele's Paradigm of Science of Religion*, *Numen*, Vol. 51, (Leiden, 2004), 321-351.

¹⁴ Leeuwen, 45.

¹⁵ In Dutch: voorgekookt. T. Barnard, *Tiele als leidsman van de Remonstrantse Broederschap*, in: *Cossee, Geloof*, 51-64, 59.

¹⁶ J.P. Kotter, *Leiderschap bij verandering* (21rd, Den Haag, 2015), 67-86.

1.1 Search strategy

Combining modern business models with historical research produced two kinds of challenges. The first one was to find the right business theory on change. A spark of inspiration, or in the religious field, some divine revelation, might not be enough to justify its choice in the academic world. The second one was the historical research: was there enough material at hand to answer the basic questions?

Let us begin with the search for historical source materials. The search strategy started with reading some literature on Tiele. Cossee, Molendijk and Barnard provided not only biographical information, but also showed that material was indeed available. Barnard hinted at the correspondence between Tiele and Bok, Molendijk did some extensive research on the archives of C.P. Tiele in the Leiden UB, so the task was to sift through the material and see if some of it was useful.¹⁷ In the case of Tiele it meant that letters in Dutch, French, German and English had to be read, and some background checks on the letters of the correspondents had to be done. The 19th century population registers of Leiden and Rotterdam proved useful in giving some background information so that some, but not all, questions on Tiele's biographical background and social status could be answered. The Koninklijke Bibliotheek (Royal Library) in The Hague has digitalized many newspapers, books and articles of the 19th century and offers that material on www.delpher.nl. It is through Delpher that Tiele's activities and the 19th century can be traced. DBNL, the Dutch Digital Library for the history of (Dutch) Literature not only provided information on Tiele's publications, but also the correspondence between C.P. Tiele and his very good friend P.A. de Génestet can be found there.¹⁸

Tiele had been a member of the National Board of at least three organisations that had their annual meetings published and have some kind of archive. The archive of the Dutch Cremation Society remained closed for investigation for this research, but according to the spokesperson of its successor (de Facultatieve), nothing could be found on Tiele anyway, since he had not been a part of the board of directors of the Dutch Cremation Society. This is actually not true, although Tiele was never part of the Daily Board of directors (Dagelijks Bestuur). It is through the "Berichten en

¹⁷ Molendijk, *Heritage*, 93-114.

¹⁸ Dbnl, *Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren*. Url: <http://www.dbnl.org/auteurs/auteur.php?id=tiel001>, consulted, July-August, 2017. In P.A. de Génestet, *Nagelaten Brieven* (1976). Url: http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/gene002cmve01_01/gene002cmve01_01_0098.php. Consulted July-August 2017.

Mededeelingen der Vereeniging voor Lijkverbranding (1874-1890)" ("Announcements of the Dutch Cremation Society") that Tiele's activities could be traced. Digitalisation of these publications in Den Haag made studying of these publications in Den Haag impossible. In Leiden this publication was only available until 1890. This was not really a big problem, since in 1890 Tiele resigned from a couple of activities, because he was "busy" (read: getting married).

The Dutch League of Protestants also had their yearly meetings published, so the annual "Verslag van den Staat en de Werkzaamheden van de Nederlandschen Protestantenvbond en Handelingen der Twintigste Algemeene Vergadering, ("Report on the Activities of the Dutch League of Protestants And Report of its Annual Meeting") was also consulted.

Barnard has done most of the work on Tiele's role in the Remonstrant Brotherhood, but in case of doubt also the "Handelingen van de Algemeene Vergadering van de Remonstrantse Broederschap" ("The Proceedings of the General Meeting of the Remonstrant Brotherhood"), and the correspondence between Tiele and his friend J.W. Bok were also consulted. Bok wrote extensively on the inner workings of the Remonstrant Brotherhood with Tiele between 1855 and his death in 1889. Tiele had, in his role as professor, a special position in the Remonstrant Brotherhood and Bok was secretary of the Daily Board of the Broederschap ("Commissie tot de Zaken der Remonstrantsche Broederschap", also known as Societeitscommissie).

For Tiele's role as a scientist Molendijk was a good source. When dealing with Tiele's role as a critic, publisher and modern theologian, this thesis has made use of the works of Buitenwerf-Van der Molen, Van Leeuwen, and (some) parts of his correspondence. Some of this correspondence gives revealing insights in this respect. In the case of his modernist views Tiele's thought on modern religion also had to be studied. Fortunately, Tiele published some sermons and a book about this subject.

So it turned that there were enough materials to work with, but what kind of model on change could be used? The literature on change management is vast, and shows many signs of being hyped, and possibly not very reliable. So how to find a reliable, and usable, model on change. Because Mintzberg was used in an abstract way in the course East-West-Confrontations¹⁹, his publication on strategy models was used to look for a usable model.²⁰ Mintzberg showed that Kotter had developed

¹⁹ A.J. Keemink, To WRP or not to WRP that's the question. Unpublished final assignment for the course East-West Confrontations, (Schiedam, 2016).

²⁰ H. Mintzberg, B. Ahlstrand, J. Lampel, Op strategie-safari. Een Rondleiding door de Wildernis van Strategisch Management. (Strategy safari. A Guided Tour Through the Wilds of Strategic Management), (Schiedam, 1999)

a model that could apply to change. Mintzberg showed, however, that Kotter's model is a top-down approach to change.²¹ Because of the fact that Mintzberg's *Strategy Safari* was published in the late 1990's it was possible that Kotter's model had turned out to be hyped as well. But it turned out that Kotter has continually refined his thoughts in "Leading Change", a book that had seen his 21st edition in 2015.

In *Leading Change* Kotter argues that, in order to survive, companies need leaders and not managers. It is true that *Leading Change* was written for companies who were entering the 21st century, a century in which change is the constant factor.²² In his opinion companies have to be more adaptable to change, a change that can be covered by using Kotter's transformation model.

Kotter believes that the 21st century is very different from other centuries. In comparison to the 20th century the 21st century is, in his opinion, more prone to technological change; is an era of more international and economic integration; has seen the saturation of markets; and has seen the fall of communist regimes, which results in a bigger capitalist world system. All of this results in new global markets and global competition. The new global market gives chances and risks for companies. Companies can no longer, as in the 20th century, sit back and wait but have to be more competitive than ever.²³

What Kotter tells us about the 21st century can also be said about last part of the 19th century. Technological change (industrialisation), international economic integration and saturation of markets (by means of Western colonisation); of course the 19th century lacked socialist and communist regimes, so they could not fall, but in the 19th century more parts of the world took part in the capitalist system, by means of the already mentioned colonisation.

So when it comes to change it could be argued that in this way Kotter's model for change could also be applied for 19th century companies.

Another argument not to use Kotter model is that Kotter wrote his book for profit-companies. The Remonstrantse Broederschap, or for this matter, the Dutch League of Protestants, the Dutch Cremation Society, or all the organisations Tiele was active in, cannot be labelled as companies that sold goods or services in order to make money.²⁴ Mintzberg has shown that another division between not-for-profit companies and profit companies is possible. Mintzberg speaks of

²¹ Mintzberg, *Safari*, 309-312.

²² Kotter, *passim*.

²³ Kotter, 31.

²⁴ Cambridge English Dictionary, dictionary.cambridge.org. Consulted 2-7-2017.

configuration types. Religious organisations can be labelled as a missionary organisation.²⁵ Of course it can be argued that the stages, which Kotter develops, for profit-organisations are not applicable to religious organisations. In order to tackle all the aspects of Tiele, Kotter's Leading change had to be expanded to the domains Tiele was working in. Because the activities of Tiele were analysed there was no need to keep the process, and its prescribed order, alive. The steps were renamed aspects.

1.2 Corpus

The corpus was more or less outlined in the previous chapter. Not all the material is presented here, as some of the literature used, like Van Dijk and De Vries only serves as additional material, material used to give more information on specific 19th century matters like the 19th century suffrage system in the Netherlands (De Vries), or the 19th century social stratification in Rotterdam (Van Dijk). In all instances www.delpher.nl and Tiele's correspondence in the Leiden UB was used.

The following basic materials were used:

- Theoretical model

The following literature provided the basis for the theoretical model:

H. Mintzberg, B. Ahlstrand, J. Lampel, *Op strategie-safarie. Een Rondleiding door de Wildernis van Strategisch Management. (Strategy safari. A Guided Tour Through the Wilds of Strategic Management)*, (Schiedam, 1999);

J.P. Kotter, *Leiderschap bij Verandering*. (Den Haag, 21nd edition, 2015).

- Biographical information

The Municipal Archives of Rotterdam, Amsterdam, and Leiden offered valuable additional information that was stored in its Population, Tax-register, and address books. Also Molendijk, Van Leeuwen, and Barnard offered valuable biographical information.²⁶ Cossee was used as a starting point.

²⁵ For a quick scan on configuration types, Mintzberg, *Safari*, 282-284.

²⁶ See their specific entries in this paragraph.

E.H. Cossee, Cornelis Tiele als Rotterdams Predikant (Cornelis Tiele as a Rotterdam Remonstrant Minister) (1856-1873), in: in: E.H. Cossee and H.D. Tjalsma, Geloof en Onderzoek. Uit het Leven en Werk van C.P. Tiele (1832-1902), (Rotterdam, 2002), (9-22).

- Dutch Cremation Society

Berichten en Mededeelingen der Vereeniging voor Lijkverbranding (1874-1890). ("Announcements of the Dutch Cremation Society") Through this publication it is possible to trace Tiele's activities in this organisation. Also the inner working of this organisation is getting clear. A bonus feature is that the reader gets an insight on the developments in European countries concerning cremation, but that aspect is beyond the scope of this thesis.

- Tiele and the Dutch League of Protestants

"Verslag van den Staat en de Werkzaamheden van den Nederlandschen Protestantenvbond en Handelingen der <<Number>> Algemeene Vergadering, ("Report on the Activities of the Dutch League of Protestants And Report of its Annual Meeting")

This Annual Report on the Dutch League of Protestants delivered a valuable insight on the inner working of the Dutch League of Protestants; it also showed the activities of Tiele in this organisation.

- Tiele and the Remonstrant Brotherhood

Barnard delivered the main literature on the Brotherhood:

T. Barnard, Tiele als leidsman van de Remonstrantse Broederschap. (Tiele as Leader of the Remonstrant Brotherhood), in: in: E.H. Cossee and H.D. Tjalsma, Geloof en Onderzoek. Uit het Leven en Werk van C.P. Tiele (1832-1902), (Rotterdam, 2002), (51-64).

T. Barnard, Van 'verstoten kind' tot belijdende kerk. De Remonstrantse Broederschap tussen 1850 en 1940 (From Abandoned Child to Professing Church. The Remonstrant Brotherhood between 1850 and 1940). (Amsterdam, 2006).

T. Barnard, Hoe Het Is, Hoe het Was en Hoe Het Zo geworden is. De Remonstrantse Gemeente Rotterdam van 1850 tot 2000 (The Rotterdam Remonstrant Brotherhood from 1850 until 2000). (How it is, How it was, and How it came to be), in: T. Barnard, E. Cosse, ed., Arminianen in de Maasstad. De Remonstrantse Gemeente Rotterdam. (Arminians in Rotterdam. The Remonstrant Brotherhood Rotterdam), (Amsterdam, 2008).

In cases of doubt the following material was used:

"Handelingen van de Algemeene Vergadering van de Remonstrantse Broederschap" ("The Proceedings of the General Meeting of the Remonstrant Brotherhood"), 1851-1902).

Like the "Annual" Material for the Dutch Cremation Society and the Dutch League of Protestant the Proceedings of the General Meeting provide the researcher with a very valuable insight in the working of the Remonstrant Brotherhood and give a splendid opportunity to trace the activities of Tiele.

- Tiele as a modern theologian

Besides Buitenwerf-Van der Molen²⁷ the following material was used:

Th. M. Van Leeuwen, C.P. Tiele als Modern Theoloog (C.P. Tiele as a Modern Theologian), in: E.H. Cossee and H.D. Tjalsma, Geloof en Onderzoek. Uit het Leven en Werk van C.P. Tiele (1832-1902), (41-50), (Rotterdam, 2002).

C.P. Tiele, Feestrede op het derde eeuwfeest van Leidens ontzet, den 3en October 1874 in de Pieterskerk gehouden (1874).

C.P. Tiele, De ware verlichting: toespraak gehouden in de Remonstrantsche Gemeente te Roterdam. (1868).

C.P. Tiele, De godsdienst der liefde geschetst (1868)

C.P. Tiele, De nieuwe geest des Evangelies in zijne werking en eischen: vijf preken. (1865)

²⁷ See their specific entries in this paragraph.

The works of Tiele himself gave valuable information on his own thoughts on religion.

- Tiele as a scientist

Molendijk delivered the main material on Tiele's role as a scientist.

A.L. Molendijk, *The emergence of the science of religion in the Netherlands* (Numen book series. Studies in the history of religions CV; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2005).

A.L. Molendijk, *Tiele on Religion*, Numen, Vol 46, (Leiden, 1999), 237-267.

A.L. Molendijk, *The Heritage of C.P. Tiele (1830-1902)*, in: *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 1, (2000 (80), 78-114.

A.L. Molendijk, *Cornelis Petrus Tiele en de Godsdienstwetenschap*, in: E.H. Cossee en H.D. Tjalma, *Geloof en Onderzoek. Uit het leven en werk van C.P. Tiele*, (Rotterdam, 2002), 23-40.

.

A.L. Molendijk, *C.P. Tiele's Paradigm of Science of Religion*, Numen, Vol. 51, (Leiden, 2004), 321-351.

- Tiele as an editor

M. Buitenwerf-Van der Molen: *God van Vooruitgang. De Popularisering van het modern-theologische gedachtegoed in Nederland (1857-1880)* (God of Progress. The Popularization of the Modern-Theological Ideas in the Netherlands (1857-1880)).

- Tiele as a critic

The role of Tiele as a critic is largely ignored. Reading all his critical work and placing that in the right context proved too big a task to do. Some aspects of his critical work will reappear in the sections on Tiele as an editor and Tiele as a scientist.

1.3 Introducing the theory: Kotter

Kotter wrote the first edition of *Leading Change* at the end of the 1990's. In Kotter's view the only fixed variable in the new global order was change. Companies had to be ready to be constantly changing in the interconnecting, speed-driven world. In order to survive companies had to work on leadership. As managers were only looking for short time results, and not ready to see the big picture, companies should look for leaders.²⁸ Leaders had the ability to see the big picture and could manage the change. An ideal situation, for companies, was a combination in which managers support leaders.²⁹

Kotter had the opinion that this situation was unique, but in fact the period 1850-1920 was in the Netherlands also an era of change. Modern techniques (telephone, railroads, industry) were introduced, and the Netherlands was more and more integrated into the world economy. Countries and also the Netherlands looked for new markets abroad. The Dutch East Indies were effectively colonized in the 19th century. Companies also had to change to survive, although perhaps not at the rapid speed of the 21st century.³⁰

Kotter introduced a model that consists of 8 steps to master change.³¹ In Kotter's eyes people underestimate the level in which change can be imposed on people, so that is why the 8 steps are necessary.³²

The first step is to introduce a sense of urgency. That means that people have to be made aware that there is a problem. The second step is to form a leading coalition. Changing a company is something that you do not do on your own. Leaders have to connect to other people in the company to get things done.³³ The third step is to develop a vision and strategy. Without any ideas the company will not have an idea which way to go to.³⁴ In the fourth step the message of change has to be communicated. If people are not informed how and why change is necessary, changing them will never succeed. Kotter thinks that change cannot be communicated too much.³⁵ In the fifth step obstacles in the process of change have to be removed and more support has to be created.

²⁸ Kotter, 6, 39, 44, 172.

²⁹ Kotter, 158.

³⁰ Kotter, 30-31.

³¹ Kotter, 32-190.

³² Kotter, 15.

³³ Kotter, 68-69.

³⁴ Kotter, 18, 88-91.

³⁵ Kotter, 20, 171.

In the sixth step success has to be celebrated. Without celebrations the change will not be visible and when success is not visible the opponents of the change, who are never asleep, will take the opportunity to stop, or impede, the process of change.³⁶ In the seventh step the change has to be consolidated, and more change has to be made possible. Because of the frailty of change, it should be carefully guarded, and companies should carefully introduce, by means of an implementation plan, more changes.³⁷ Finally, in step 8, the company culture has to be changed.

Kotter argues that these steps do not have to be fixed quantities. Also it is possible that multiple change processes are simultaneously running through companies, although that always causes a lot of problems.³⁸ If the aim of this thesis was to prove that Tiele successfully implicitly or more explicitly used this model in his own days an argument has to be raised in the subject of the order of steps. It could be argued that in religious organisations vision and company culture form an integrated part and that a religious organisation should not wait until the end to change the existing culture.³⁹ But the aim of this thesis is to see if Tiele was a leader of change in all his activities. Kotter thought people were very important for change, but put his major focus on companies and the kind of processes that are active in companies. In this thesis the process element, and therefore the order of steps could be left out, because the activities of one person in different fields were analysed. The steps were renamed aspects. The usefulness of Kotter's theory still needs to be proven.

1.4 Analytical strategy

At the end of the introduction part it is now time to devise an analytical strategy for the remaining part of this thesis. So it is now time to combine the elements described in section 1.1.

The central question of this thesis is the following:

In what way can C.P. Tiele be considered a leader of change while applying J.P. Kotter's elements of Leading Change?

To be able to draw some kind of conclusion the following sub questions have to be answered:

³⁶ Kotter, 23, 149.

³⁷ Kotter, 174.

³⁸ Kotter, 36-37.

³⁹ Kotter, 178-179, 187-190.

How can we label Tiele's activities in:

- The Dutch Cremation Society
- The Dutch League of Protestants
- The Remonstrant Brotherhood
- The field of modern theology
- The field of editing magazines
- The field of science

At the end of this thesis Kotter's elements will be applied to Tiele. So at the end of this thesis it will hopefully also be possible to conclude if 21st century thoughts on change could be applied to 19th century developments.

To get a good insight in the activities of C.P. Tiele the thesis was written in a biographical way. The results are presented in part 2.0. Part 2.0 has the following parts:

- Some biographical facts on C.P.Tiele
- Tiele's social-financial status
- An integrated approach to the life of C.P. Tiele
- Kotter on Tiele

A reflection on the thesis can be found in part 3.0.

2.0 Results

2.1 Some biographical facts on C.P. Tiele

Cornelis Petrus Tiele was born on 16 December 1830 in Leiden. He was the oldest child of the bookseller and printer Cornelis Tiele (1794-1847) and Maria Johanna van Kampen (1809-1846). If the old tradition of sons following the father and daughters following the mother is applicable to the Tiele household, then Tiele's mother must have been of Dutch Reformed origin and his father must have been a Remonstrant.⁴⁰

The reconstructed family card, available on www.erfgoedleiden.nl, lists no less than 9 children for the Tiele family.⁴¹ Three of them, Maria Johanna (1), Frederik and David Louis died before they were 1 year old. Tiele's mother died 5 days after the birth of David Louis, in 1846.⁴² Their uncle Van Marle took care of Tiele after their father's death in 1847.⁴³ The entry in the Amsterdam population register of 1853 makes it likely that his other brothers and sister were divided over other family members. His brother Pieter enters the Amsterdam residence of their uncle Van Kampen in 1847.⁴⁴ P.A. Tiele and his uncle P.N. Van Kampen wanted P.A. to work in the booktrade.⁴⁵

The whereabouts of C.P.Tiele between 1848 and 1853 are not really known. Molendijk mentioned "the Leidsche Straat at the Kerkstraat, living in the house of Mr Visser" as a possible location where Tiele lived.⁴⁶ The Amsterdam entry shows a short-lived registration for all the Tiele's. Probably they resided there for Tiele's marriage to Johanna Maria Henrietta Backer in 1853.

⁴⁰ www.archief.amsterdam.nl. Population Register 1851-1853. Tiele, Cornelis Petrus, 16-12-1830, Leiden, Singel KK 50, Singel 420. Fathers follow fathers is in *Handelingen*, 1862 26.

⁴¹ The nine children are: Cornelis Petrus, Nicolaas Godfried, Pieter Anton, Jacobus Johannes, Maria Johanna (1), Maria Johanna (2), Marinus Johannes, Frederik, and David Louis. Consulted 24-7-2017

⁴² Molendijk, *Heritage*, 79.

⁴³ Molendijk, *Heritage*, 80. Cossee, Cornelis Petrus Tiele als Rotterdams Predikant (1856-1873), in *geloof en onderzoek* 9

⁴⁴ See note 40.

⁴⁵ M. Nijhoff, *Levensbericht van Dr. P.A. Tiele*, in: *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde*, 1889. (1889) (136-180), 136.

⁴⁶ Molendijk, *Heritage*, 87 Note 49.

Tiele, Cornelis Petrus - 16-12-1830 - Leiden - Singel - Singel - KK - 50 - Singel 420 - student theologie - ongehuwd, Remonstrant - BRA05618000208										vorige	volgende	volledig	
Tiele	Anna Catharina	16 Dec 1830	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1831	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1832	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1833	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1834	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1835	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1836	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1837	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1838	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1839	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1840	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1841	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1842	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1843	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1844	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1845	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1846	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1847	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1848	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1849	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1850	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1851	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1852	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1853	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1854	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1855	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1856	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1857	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1858	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1859	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1860	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1861	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1862	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1863	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1864	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1865	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1866	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1867	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1868	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1869	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1870	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1871	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1872	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1873	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1874	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1875	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1876	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1877	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Anna Catharina	12 Jun 1878	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Agathe	23 Apr 1879	Leiden	J. J. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						
Tiele	Johanna	18 Jun 1880	Leiden	M. H. Tiele	H. Hoopgenne	backenbakker	no. 187						

Picture 1. The Tiele family in Amsterdam, 1853. Source: www.archief.amsterdam.nl.⁴⁷

Not much is known about the relationship between Tiele and his brothers and sister. The population register of Rotterdam showed that J.J. Tiele lived for a couple of months with his brother C.P. Tiele in 1867.⁴⁸ Some mixing-up took place. According to Baar, J.J. and M.J. Tiele were mixed up. Perhaps the fact that J.J. and M.J. were both tobacconists and art-collectors has something to do with this.⁴⁹ W.F. Warren, the first president of Boston University, wondered if he came close to meeting Tiele before, but as he mentions the fact of almost meeting a librarian (the librarian named Tiele), that must have been P.A. Tiele.⁵⁰ P.A. Tiele was a renowned librarian.⁵¹

To avoid confusion to which Tiele a possible street in Rotterdam was referring to, the Rotterdam City Council decided that this street should explicitly refer to C.P. Tiele, and so the C.P. Tielestraat was a fact.⁵²

⁴⁷ Consulted 24-07-2017.
⁴⁸ t' Boschje. Rotterdam population register index 1851-1880 card 225-3198.
⁴⁹ V. Baar, De collectie J.J. Tiele, (w.p., w.t.), 317-318, 319. Found on the internet, consulted 12-07-2017.
⁵⁰ Letter of W.F. Warren to C.P. Tiele, August 27, 1881. The librarian wasn't there....
⁵¹ For more information on P.A. Tiele check Nijhoff's Levensbericht, or: P.A. Tiele on <http://www.dbnl.org/auteurs/auteur.php?id=tiel002>, consulted August 2, 2017.
⁵² E.H. Cossee, Cornelis Petrus Tiele als Rotterdams predikant (1856-1873) in: E.H. Cossee and H.D. Tjalsma ed., Geloof en Onderzoek. Uit het leven en werk van C.P. Tiele (1830-1902), (Rotterdam, 2002), 19.

Tiele's family did not appear very often in the material that was used for this research. Apart from the Warren incident there are some brief remarks of J.W. Bok. Bok had met Tiele's sister at one time and thought that she was all right considering the circumstances. The "considering the circumstances".... gives an indication of her (poor) health.⁵³ Tiele's sister died, at the age of 42, after a long sickbed in 1882.⁵⁴ Johanna Backer, the first Mrs Tiele, met with the same fate and died in 1885.

In the letters of J.W. Bok to C.P. Tiele her condition is deteriorating fast in her last month. Tiele must have been convinced that her situation was pretty serious, because Bok is hoping that Tiele is wrong about her situation, but Tiele clearly is not.⁵⁵ This must have been one of the few times that Tiele gives a deeper insight to others, and even to Bok his life-long pen pal, of his personal situation, although he seems to have informed his friends. J. Estlin Carpenter is sorry to hear that his wife had died, although he did not really know her.⁵⁶

When his brother Pieter died, Bok inquired if Pieter had any children.⁵⁷ After 33 years of writing, Bok should have known, or Tiele should have told him.

In some other letters references are also made to lifetime events. Some happy events for instance the marriage to miss Ruyckhaver, some sad.⁵⁸ The historian Franz Heinrich Reusch, and the orientalist Carl Bezold sent their condolences after the death of P.A. Tiele.⁵⁹ James Ballingal, the English translator of "Vergelijkende Godsdiensten", told him not to hurry with the proofs because of his loss (of his sister).⁶⁰ Talking of death, P.A and C.P. Tiele shared a membership of the Leiden branch of the Dutch Cremation Society.⁶¹ Molendijk has a point with his remark that the biographical knowledge of Tiele remained limited.⁶²

⁵³ Letter of J.W. Bok to C.P. Tiele, November 14, 1881.

⁵⁴ Nvdd-kc, January 18-19, 1882. Maybe something went wrong in delivering the message to the newspaper, because according to this advert A.V.H. ter Meulen, born Tiele, died. M.J. Tiele is missing on this advert.

⁵⁵ Letters of J.W. Bok to C.P. Tiele, July 22 1885 and August 3, 1885. It is a pity that a letter directly after the death of Tiele's wife is missing from the correspondence between J.W. Bok and C.P. Tiele the letters of July 22 and August 3 are marked (with a pencil) 118 and 119 the next letter in the remaining correspondence is dated February 26, 1886 and marked 121.

⁵⁶ Letter of J. Estlin Carpenter to C.P. Tiele, August 31, 1885. Carpenter is shocked by her death and doesn't know that is a sudden death, or one caused by a long suffering. In the not dated letters 43 and 44 Estlin Carpenter is glad that the illness of Mrs Tiele doesn't prevent him from traveling to England. Letters from J. Estlin Carpenter to C.P. Tiele, 43 and 44.

⁵⁷ Letter of J.W. Bok to C.P. Tiele, January 24, 1889.

⁵⁸ Letter of J. Estlin Carpenter to C.P. Tiele, July 13 (without year).

⁵⁹ Letter of Franz Heinrich Reusch, January 30, 1889. Letter of Carl Bezold to C.P. Tiele, October 24, 1889.

⁶⁰ Letter from J. Ballingal to C.P. Tiele, January ? 1882.

⁶¹ Bijdragen, 1876, 56-57.

⁶² Molendijk, Heritage, 79.

According to Molendijk, Tiele is, probably, mainly referring to the death of his first wife in 1885, his childless marriages and the early death of his parents, when talking, in 1901, about his fair share of private grief and misfortune.⁶³ But some of this private grief might also have been caused by some other deaths in his family. His brother Nikolaas Godfried died at sea in 1866.⁶⁴ His sister Maria Johanna died, as mentioned before, at the age of 42, after a long sickbed in 1882.⁶⁵ Pieter Anton Tiele died, 55 years old, in 1889. His brothers Jacobus Johannes (1835 - 1911), and Marinus Johannus (1841 - 1924) Tiele did survive C.P. Tiele.⁶⁶ The relationship between Tiele and his other family members remains obscure. J.W. Bok trained one of Tiele's nieces (Bok does not mention her name) in the noble art of catechism. Not always with a big success as "her lips showed me", according to Bok, that she didn't believe a word of a particular subject.⁶⁷

In 1890 Tiele married Antoinette ("Net") Sophie Ruyckhaver (1840 - 1907). Miss Ruyckhaver was an old friend of the family.⁶⁸ He must have started his relationship with miss Ruyckhaver in 1886. For example Justus Bertand Wockatz, an old student of Tiele, asked Tiele in December of that year to give his regards to miss Ruyckhaver.⁶⁹ After Tiele's death Mrs Tiele donated the complete library of her husband to the university. Mrs Tiele also created the Tiele Foundation. This foundation wants to keep the library of Leiden University up to date, especially with regard to Old Persian, Babylonian, Assyrian, and Egyptian works.⁷⁰

2.2 Tiele's Social-financial status

After his student days Tiele was ordained as a minister in Moordrecht. In 1853 his basic salary was 1000 guilders a year. The congregation of Moordrecht was neither a big nor a wealthy one. The vicarage badly needed some repairs and the adjoining church of Nieuwkoop, the village Tiele likewise served, had the appearance of a cowshed.⁷¹ But later in life Tiele seems to have fond memories of his time in Moordrecht. Moordrecht was one of the subsidized churches of the Remonstrant Brotherhood. That means that this congregation had trouble staying financially healthy.

⁶³ Molendijk, Heritage, 83. Molendijk, Godsdienstwetenschap, 26.

⁶⁴ Rc, October 22, 1864. Nikolaas Godfried Tiele was captain of the vessel Gouverneur Schomerus.

⁶⁵ Nvdd-kc, January 18-19, 1882. According to this advert A.V.H. Ter Meulen, born Tiele, died.

⁶⁶ Nrc, December 12, 1924; Het Vaderland, December 13, 1924.

⁶⁷ Letter of J.W. Bok to C.P. Tiele, March 22, 1887.

⁶⁸ In the correspondence of C.P. Tiele "Net" Ruyckhaver is mentioned in the letters of P.H. Ritter sr. It is not clear to the author how these letters fit in Tiele's letter collection as they are obviously letters that are not addressed to Tiele himself. Letters from P.H. Ritter sr, February 7, 1882 and March 22, 1882.

⁶⁹ Letters of J.B. Wockatz to C.P. Tiele, December 28, 1886, Oktober 25, 1887, and February 18, 1888.

⁷⁰ Molendijk, Heritage, 85-86.

⁷¹ Handelingen, 1857, 10-11.

In 1856, Tiele moved to Rotterdam to serve the Remonstrant community in that city. The Rotterdam Remonstrant church was the biggest church in the relatively small Remonstrant Brotherhood. The Rotterdam congregation was also the richest one of the whole Brotherhood. When called for money, by the national board of the Remonstrant Brotherhood, the Rotterdam Brothers gave, most of the time, the largest amount. The congregation was not served by one, but by three ministers. With the position came the money. Tiele's income rose from 1000 guilders a year in 1853 to 2700 guilders in 1856. The government paid 1100 guilders of this salary.⁷² The Rotterdam believers paid the remaining part. This salary did not remain fixed. The Professor and the ministers of the Remonstrant Brotherhood got a yearly increase of approximately 33 guilders from the bequest of Professor Krigthout. In the 1850's calls for increasing the wages were not ignored in the Central Meeting. The plans to write out a loan did not succeed, but from 1862 on it was decided every year if a salary rise was possible, out of the church's own (collection) funds, and how much the yearly increase should be. In 1868 this increase was maximized to 200 guilders a year. In 1873 Tiele's salary had risen to 3634,50 guilders a year (1100 guilders of that sum still paid for by the state). A very modest sum according to the Rotterdam Church Council: "When related to the current needs, very modest, and hardly sufficient, improvement necessary, but not possible at this moment".⁷³

As money alone does not say much about Tiele's economic position in his Rotterdam era, this position could be made much clearer after checking his Rotterdam addresses. With this information it is possible to check the amount of money he had to pay for his direct taxes. Molendijk suggested that Tiele remembered a time that he was not eligible for the House of Commons (Tweede Kamer), but on the other hand, not many inhabitants of Rotterdam were in the 19th century.⁷⁴ Only male inhabitants who were older than 23 and who paid more than 100 guilders in the direct taxes (Land Tax, Patent Tax, and Luxury Tax, "Grond, Patent en Personele belasting) could vote. The census for the local elections was 50 guilders. Only Amsterdam had a higher tax level. Amsterdam voters had to pay 112 guilders in direct taxation.

⁷² All the reverends of acknowledged Protestant signature got money from the state from 1813 onwards. The ministry of (Reformed) Worship ("Hervormde Eeredienst") was responsible for the annual payment of this amount of money. In times of vacancies the churches had to apply for this. The state could end the allowance of a congregation until 1869. After 1869 the government seemed to fix the allowance. Congregations didn't have to apply to the ministry in case of a vacancy. Between 1813 and 1869 new congregations only could be formed by government approval, and in case of the Remonstrant Brotherhood by reorganising the other parishes. And then the government approval didn't seem to be certain. Talking about salary in the Central Meeting of the Remonstrant Brotherhood throughout the period complaints were heard that the Dutch Reformed reverends had a much higher salary, and, logically so, a higher state pension.

⁷³ Handelingen, 1873, 81 Appendix 1.

⁷⁴ Molendijk, Heritage, 87.

De Vries calculated that in 1849 96,3 % of the Rotterdam (male) population paid less than 50 guilders in direct taxes. In 1859 93,5 % of the male inhabitants was taxed for less than 50 guilders. In 1879 the percentage was 95,5 %.⁷⁵ In 1849 only 1,3 % of the populace was taxed for more than 100 guilders. In 1859 it was 3,5%. In 1879 only 1,8% of the Rotterdam (male) population was eligible for the House of Commons. Van Dijk made up a social stratification of Rotterdam in the period 1810 - 1880. Part of this division found some resemblance with the view that existed in 1844 and that was used by Cossee, the so-called "Physiologie", but Van Dijk extended this view and based this division on a financial basis.⁷⁶ According to Van Dijk the Rotterdam society consists of 5 strata. The first stratum is the lower class people who did not pay any taxes. This group consisted of unskilled labourers. The second stratum is the intermediate group between lower class and middle class. Those people paid less than 20 guilders a year in Luxury Tax, or lived in a rental property with a rental value less than 100 guilders a year (in 1830-1840). This group consisted of small shop owners, skilled labourers and the like. The third stratum was the middle class. In this group one could find teachers, artisans, (bigger) shop owners. These people paid a Luxury Tax ranging from 20 to 49,49 guilders a year, or lived in a rental property with a rental value between 100 and 299,99. The fourth stratum is an intermediate group in-between middle and higher class. In this group one could find lawyers, doctors, merchants and clergymen who paid less than 100 guilders in Luxury Tax, or lived in a property with a rental value between 499,00 and 1000 guilders.⁷⁷ And finally there is the fifth and final stratum the upper class. This group consisted of merchants, bankers, the higher civil servants, academics and the like. Those people paid more than 100 guilders in Luxury Tax, or lived in a property with a rental value above 1000 guilders a year.

In his Rotterdam years Tiele lived on the following 3 addresses: Coolingsel 300, (1e)Lombardstraat 8, and 't Boschje 1001-5. Tiele's tax payments were found for the Lombardstraat and 't Boschje. In 1863 he was taxed for 62,98 guilders for living in 't Boschje. The household consisted of Mr and Mrs Tiele and 1 maid. When he was living in the Lombardstraat (1861), Tiele was taxed 75,06 guilders. The household consisted of Mr and Mrs Tiele and 2 maids.⁷⁸

So in his Rotterdam years Tiele may not have been eligible for the House of Commons, but he apparently did not have the ambition to serve in the municipal council.⁷⁹ His social position was certainly not weak. In Van Dijk's classification he can be found in stratum 4, the intermediate group

⁷⁵ B. De Vries, *Electoraat en Elite. Sociale Sociale Mobiliteit in Amsterdam 1850-1895*, (Amsterdam, 1986), 31.

⁷⁶ H. Van Dijk, *Rotterdam, 1810-1880. Aspecten van een Stedelijke Samenleving*, (Schiedam, 1976), 132-134.

⁷⁷ It is not clear why Van Dijk jumped from 299 to 499 guilders.

⁷⁸ Lombardstraat: Kohier A art 1 -1934 deel 1. 't Boschje: Kohier A 2e Part, Service Year (dienstjaar) 1863.

⁷⁹ The hits on Delpher didn't combine Tiele with local elections. www.delpher.nl, consulted, July-August, 2017.

between middle and upper class. In 1849 only 2,4 % the Rotterdam population was part of this group. In 1859 this was 3,0 % and in 1879 this was 3,7 %.

In Leiden Tiele was listed on the Gedamde Vestgracht 27 (1879), Rembrandtstraat 27 (1881), Rapenburg 43 (1890), and Stationsweg 23 (1897-1898).⁸⁰ Molendijk did a fine analysis of Tiele's social-financial situation in this town. As a remonstrant professor Tiele earned 3000 guilders (of which 2400 guilders was directly paid by the state and 600 guilders by the Remonstrant Brotherhood). Tiele renounced this supplement in 1877. In addition Tiele was paid 4000 guilders a year as a regular professor. Tiele's tax income was 8700 guilders in 1900. It comes as no surprise that Tiele was well to do. Only 237 persons in Leiden (population 53,000) earned more than 5000 guilders a year. Thirty-nine professors (out of 49) belonged to that group.⁸¹

2.3 An integrated approach towards the activities of C.P. Tiele

As mentioned above, the literature on C.P. Tiele is more or less divided over some of his activities. Whereas Barnard, Cossee and Van Leeuwen have written on his activities as a modern Remonstrant theologian, Molendijk has paid attention to the scientific part of his activities. Such a distinction is not wanted, or necessary, because his first biographer, De Ridder, already concluded that there was unity in the life and works of C.P. Tiele.⁸² It was, at this moment, not possible to reflect on all the activities of C.P. Tiele. The range of Tiele's activities was vast, and some parts still have to be uncovered. Some kind of division has been made in place and time. The first part is Tiele's life as a student and minister in Moordrecht and Nieuwpoort (1848-1856), the second part sheds light on his activities in Rotterdam (1856-1873). The third, and final, period concentrates on his years in Leiden (1873-1902).

2.3.1 Tiele as a student in Amsterdam, and minister in Moordrecht (1848-1856)

In 1848 Tiele finished his secondary education at the local Gymnasium in Leiden. Although he was, together with 4 other students, mentioned in the Leydsche Courant, he was not awarded a prize.⁸³ The next step in his life was studying at the Athenaeum Illustre and the Remonstrant Seminary in

⁸⁰ These listings were found in the Adressbooks of Leiden of the Years between brackets.

⁸¹ Molendijk, Heritage, 87.

⁸² Cited by Van Leeuwen, 42 (Van Leeuwen cited Cossee)

⁸³ They were given some advice, because they were going to enter the academic life. Lc, September 4, 1848.

Amsterdam.⁸⁴ Tiele clearly had the intention to become a minister in the Remonstrant Brotherhood, a small denomination in Dutch Protestantism. This church had its origin in a theological dispute that erupted during the Twelve Years Truce (Twaalf Jarig Bestand) (1609-1621). The Dutch government suppressed the Remonstrant Brotherhood until 1813. The "Handelingen van de Algemeene Vergaderingen" made it clear that the Brotherhood was, from 1848 onwards, getting back on its feet.

Not much is known about Tiele's student years in Amsterdam. Molendijk suggests that as the costs of studying are approximately 1000 guilders a year, Tiele's family must at least have had a middle class background. Molendijk also thinks that since Tiele was a member of the student fraternity "Het Amsterdamsch Studentencorps", he, or his family, must have had some money at their disposal. The 25th anniversary publication of the Amsterdamsch Studentencorps shows however that Tiele was more than an ordinary member, but must have been one of its founding fathers.⁸⁵ As frats nowadays always claim that in that period friendships for life are being developed,⁸⁶ it would be interesting to know what kind of friendships Tiele developed in this part of his life. Analysing the Handelingen it became clear that Tiele must have met people he worked with, or stayed in contact with, in later years, during his time in Amsterdam. This presupposition is based on the fact that the student numbers on the Remonstrant Seminary were rather small.⁸⁷

Combining the Handelingen with some other material, some of Tiele's student friends or at least acquaintances must have been P.A. De Génestet, J.W. Bok and J.H. Maronier. Tiele worked with, or stayed in contact with, them for the bigger part of his life, and they will therefore reappear in this thesis.

Tiele studied under the guidance of Abraham des Amorie van der Hoeven, Professor of the Remonstrant Brotherhood in Tiele's student days. Tiele must have been under the influence of some modernist thinkers during his studies, because C.W. van der Pot, Tiele's catechism teacher in Leiden, had to warn Tiele not to make his views on the Gospels publicly known.⁸⁸ He concluded his studies with a publication on the authenticity on the Gospel of John.⁸⁹

⁸⁴ Molendijk, *Heritage*, 80.

⁸⁵ *nvdd-kc*, August 31, 1895.

⁸⁶ Some of my friends are still busy with year clubs and the like.

⁸⁷ J. Tideman, the predecessor of C.P. Tiele as Professor of the Remonstrant Brotherhood, supplied the following information about the student numbers (numbers of proponenten, so the students who graduated it) 1846 2, 1851 3, 1852 2, 1853 3.

⁸⁸ Barnard, *Leidsman*, 54.

⁸⁹ E.H. Cossee, *Cornelis Petrus Tiele als Rotterdams predikant (1856-1873)*, in: E.H. Cossee and H.D. Tjalsma ed., *Geloof en Onderzoek. Uit het leven en werk van C.P. Tiele (1830-1902)*, (Rotterdam, 2002) 9-22, 10.

After his studies Tiele was called to serve the Remonstrant parish of Moordrecht.⁹⁰ This was a small parish combined with the parish of Nieuwpoort. Des Amorie van der Hoeven called it a wise decision to start in a small parish, and not in a big one. "For your health it is better to start in a small parish, so you can get used to preaching and the like", Van der Hoeven told Tiele in a letter.⁹¹ But, analysing the *Handelingen*, it was in that time quite normal for a candidate who finished the seminary to start in a small parish and to get promoted to a bigger one. Health issues seem to appear on a number of occasions in the history of the Remonstrant Brotherhood as cover-up for the real reasons, this with some exceptions of course.⁹²

The parishes of Moordrecht and Nieuwpoort were relatively small. In 1854 Moordrecht had 37 believers, and Nieuwpoort (and Schoonhoven) counted 39 Remonstrants.⁹³ It is unclear how many of these believers were active church members. Tiele might have had some fond memories of his small church in Moordrecht, but his vicarage needed some big repairs in the 1850's, and the church of Nieuwpoort had the "appearance of a cow-shed."⁹⁴ It is not surprising that Tiele had some time to start some other activities while working as a minister in Moordrecht.

Tiele used his spare time for studying, and writing. In 1853 Tiele, under the pseudonym Dr. Pronius, published the literary novel, *Augustus Berneman and Company (Augustus Berneman en de Zijnen)*. In 1856 Tiele published "The Gospel to John, considered as a source for the study of the life of Christ" (*Het Evangelie van Joannes, Beschouwd als bron voor het leven van Jezus*). Tiele used historical facts to prove that the Gospel of John was the most reliable of the four gospels. With this view he argued against the German author F.C. Baur who maintained the view that John's Gospel was the most unreliable.⁹⁵ In his entire career Tiele wanted to base his judgements on historical facts.

Another part of his time he spent as editor of the *Christelijke Volks-Almanak* (Annual Christian Peoples Almanac) with P.A. de Génestet. Tiele had asked De Génestet to become his co-editor in this yearly publication. De Génestet agreed, but with the stipulation that he did not want to have

⁹⁰ In Dutch someone was "beroepen" by a parish. (called to the office)?

⁹¹ Cossee, predikant, 10.

⁹² J. Tideman resigned as the Professor of the Remonstrant Brotherhood in 1872 due to bad health, but he still lived for about 18 years. Reverend Cohen Stuart also lived on for a number of years after his resignation. De Génestet is one of the exceptions here. De Génestet really had serious health issues since December 1859 until his death in 1861. De Génestet resigned from his parish in Delft late in 1860, but hadn't been doing a lot since 1859, also due to illness, and death, of his wife.

Barnard on Cohen Stuart: T. Barnard, *Hoe Het Is, Hoe het Was en Hoe Het Zo geworden is. De Remonstrantse Gemeente Rotterdam van 1850 tot 2000 (The Rotterdam Remonstrant Brotherhood from 1850 until 2000)*. (How it is, How it was, and How it came to be), in: T. Barnard, E. Cosse, ed., *Arminianen in de Maasstad. De Remonstrantse Gemeente Rotterdam. (Arminians in Rotterdam. The Remonstrant Brotherhood Rotterdam)*, (Amsterdam, 2008), (63-114) 75-77.

⁹³ *Handelingen, 1862-1870*, 26-27 (appendices are not numbered, my numbering) The *Handelingen* divided the believers in *lidmaten* (members) and *niet-lidmaten* (non-full-members. I've left out this division in the numbers.

⁹⁴ Tiele on Moordrecht, .Cossee, Predikant, 10. *Handelingen on Moordrecht* see note 71.

⁹⁵ Cossee, Predikant, 10. Baur wrote on the Gospels in 1847. *Buitenwerf-Van der Molen*, 19. The literary novel could perhaps also have been written in his student days.

anything to do with begging for material.⁹⁶ At the start it was Tiele's task to collect material, and keep in touch with the publisher, Tiele's uncle Van Kampen. De Génestet would edit the material and contribute poetry.⁹⁷ Until 1858 this division worked well.

In 1856 Tiele switched from Moordrecht to Rotterdam. The church council of Rotterdam had nominated Bok, Maronier, and Tiele for the vacant position of minister. In the end Maronier and Tiele had the same number of votes. According to the rules straws had to be drawn to decide which person should be elected. Tiele won and went to Rotterdam.⁹⁸

During his years in Moordrecht the Handelingen did not report a lot of activity on the side of Tiele in the overall meeting of the Remonstrant Brotherhood.⁹⁹

2.3.2 The Rotterdam years 1856 - 1873

To become minister in Rotterdam must have been a big promotion for Tiele. Rotterdam was the Jewel in the Remonstrant Crown. In the first place the Rotterdam parish was the biggest of the Remonstrant Brotherhood. In 1854 the Remonstrant Brotherhood had 27 parishes and 5210 members in total. The Rotterdam congregation provided for 26% of its membership (1375 members). Rotterdam and Amsterdam were the only congregations with 3 ministers. In membership numbers only Amsterdam came close to Rotterdam, with 1049 members.¹⁰⁰ The annual meetings of the Brotherhood were alternately held in Rotterdam or Amsterdam.¹⁰¹

In the second place Rotterdam contributed generously to the Remonstrant Brotherhood. In the annual offertories for the subsidy fund of the Brotherhood (a fund that was needed to support the parishes of limited means), and the offerings for the Dutch Missionary Society (DMS) (Nederlandsch Zendeling Genootschap), the Rotterdam offerings were usually the highest. After 1862, when the Brotherhood had decided on a yearly improvement of ministers' wages, Rotterdam should, in the

⁹⁶ Curiously enough one of the first things De Génestet started to do was to ask J. Tideman, Tiele's predecessor as Professor of the Remonstrant Brotherhood, for material and support for the publication. De Génestet, Nagelaten, Letter No 79, June 29, 1855.

⁹⁷ De Génestet, Nagelaten, Letter No 76, May 21, 1855.

⁹⁸ Maronier was furious, but he became reverend in Rotterdam between 1881. He resigned in 1893. Cossee, predikant, 10-11.

⁹⁹ Tiele is present. The Handelingen reported this presence. The Handelingen of 1854 informed the reader that Tiele did pass his exam. Some technical matters concerning his work in Gouda and Nieuwport were given in the period 1853-1855.

¹⁰⁰ Handelingen, 1862-1870. 1865 24-27 en 1853 22-23 (counting of parishes) Gouda had 425 members in 1854, Den Haag 327.

¹⁰¹ Most of the time the meetings were presided by a deputy from Rotterdam or Amsterdam, or by the Professor of the Brotherhood.

case that this raise could not be provided, supplement this shortage with the biggest sum.¹⁰² The Remonstrant community was also an important social and political community in the city of Rotterdam, in spite of only forming a small part of the population. The Brotherhood was strongly represented in the Rotterdam City Council, and in that way had a direct influence on city governance. In the 19th century suffrage was based on direct taxation, and only a minor part of the population could take part in the local, and in the national elections.¹⁰³ So the conclusion is valid that the remonstrant community was one of the richest groups in Rotterdam.¹⁰⁴

De Génestet was one of the first who noticed that the Rotterdam life had its effects on Tiele. Tiele was so busy with all kinds of things that De Génestet commented that he rather had hoped that Tiele had been called to the ministry of Delft instead of Rotterdam.¹⁰⁵ In his Rotterdam years Tiele participated in a wide range of activities. Some of these activities are beyond the scope of this thesis, but worth mentioning nonetheless. Thus, he gave lessons on the art of eloquence ("Welsprekendheid in Dutch), where ladies were allowed.¹⁰⁶ Tiele also participated in some literary activities: he became a member of the Dutch Literature Society (Nederlandsche Maatschappij der Letterkunde). He took part in some of its activities.¹⁰⁷

Tiele still participated with De Génestet in the publication of the Annual Christian People's Almanac. This collaboration was working well until July 1858. Around that time Tiele announced to De Génestet that he had a new plan. Influenced by the leading Dutch modernists Busken Huet and Allard Pierson, Tiele became one of the editors of *Teekenen des Tijds* (Signs of the Times) a weekly that propagated modernist views. De Génestet had some doubts about Tiele's plan. Not so much because of the subject, but because of the time-consuming aspect of running a weekly periodical. If you want to run a periodical, he told Tiele, you should not have anything else on your mind."¹⁰⁸ Soon it became clear that De Génestet did the greater part of the work. This took its toll on the relationship between Tiele and De Génestet. Matters became worse when the Almanac was no

¹⁰² Decision on raises, *Handelingen* 1862, 8-13.

¹⁰³ See above. Tiele's social-financial status.

¹⁰⁴ H. van Dijk, *Het negentiende-eeuwse stadsbestuur. Continuïteit of verandering*, in P.B.M. Blaas and J. van Herwaarden (ed.): *Stedelijke naijver. De betekenis van interstedelijke conflicten in de geschiedenis. Enige beschouwingen en case-studies*, (Den Haag, 1986), (128-149), 145.

¹⁰⁵ De Génestet, *Nagelaten*, Letter 226, August 18, 1860.

¹⁰⁶ Maybe Tiele was quite good at this, for a club in Sliedrecht called themselves C.P. Tiele. *Nvdd, Kleine Courant*, June, 6, 1885. Announcement on a meeting, with ladies, to be found in: *Delftsche Courant*, October 11, 1871. At Leiden University Tiele gave some lessons in the art of eloquence in the year 1877. *Ah*, October 10-1877.

¹⁰⁷ Member of Dutch Literature Society, *Nrc*, June 6, 1862. Participation in Literary Congress Brussels, *Rc*, August 23, 1861. Speaker on 8th Congress on Literature and Language in Rotterdam. *Ohc (Oprechte Haarlemsche Courant)*, September 13, 1865. *Ned Maatschappij der Letterkunde. nrc* 21-6-1862.

¹⁰⁸ De Génestet, *Nagelaten*, Letter No 151, September 5, 1858.

longer produced by Van Kampen, but by Kruseman. De Génestet wanted to say something unfriendly about the printing qualities of Van Kampen in the preface of the edition of 1860. Tiele objected strongly to that. De Génestet backed down.¹⁰⁹ Friendly communication possibly also came to an end when De Génestet told Tiele that he had sent back an edition of Teekenen, as we now should say, still in plastic (unread).¹¹⁰ De Génestet had earlier commented on the course Teekenen had taken.¹¹¹

In 1860 De Génestet had enough of the matter. Tiele was not providing and De Génestet had to cope with difficult circumstances. His wife died in 1860 after a long illness, and he was not feeling very well himself. De Génestet stepped down from his job as minister of the Remonstrant congregation of Delft, and had to provide in his livelihood by developing all kinds of activities. So the hostilities continued with De Génestet charging: what Tiele could do about the situation? A LOT!¹¹² In 1861 the two of them decided that things should change. But in July 1860 it became clear that both wanted to abandon ship. De Génestet argued that he did not want to do this kind of publications any more. Tiele seemed to have lost interest in the Almanac. A solution was needed if they wanted to keep the Almanac alive.¹¹³ The death of De Génestet in 1861 prevented a formal solution of these problems. Tiele was left on his own. The death of De Génestet prevented the continuation of the Annual Christian People's Almanac in 1861. In 1862 Tiele managed to get an edition out, but the edition of 1862 was his final one as an editor. The Annual Christian Almanac did not appear until 1866. In that year the People's Almanac was published again, this time with a different editor, and a different publisher. In the 1862 edition Tiele clearly told a little white lie when he told his readers that he was in the process of leaving all the work to his friend De Génestet.¹¹⁴ After his death Tiele played an important role in publishing the poems of De Génestet, ignoring the fact that their friendship had deteriorated in the last part of De Génestet's life.¹¹⁵

The publication of Teekenen had already stopped before the death of De Génestet. Money issues with the publisher were one of the causes why the publication failed. In the 19th century, as in the 20th century, running publications was a commercial enterprise, and publishers seemed not to so

¹⁰⁹ De Génestet, Nagelaten, Letter No 199 to A.C. Kruseman, October 26, 1859.

¹¹⁰ De Génestet, Nagelaten, Letter No 200, October 26, 1859.

¹¹¹ De Génestet, Nagelaten, Letter No 196, October 15, 1859.

Daarnaast had De Génestet nog met Cohen Stuart gesproken en De Génestet vond Cohen wel meevallen. In het briefverkeer tussen Bok, Tiele en Maronier werd altijd gesproken over Moses Cohen. De Génestet on Cohen Stuart, De Génestet, Nagelaten, Letter No 227, August 26, 1860.

¹¹² De Génestet, Nagelaten, Letter No 236, October 21, 1860.

¹¹³ De Génestet, Nagelaten, Letter No 219, Letter to A.C. Kruseman, July ?, 1860.

¹¹⁴ C.P. Tiele, De Génestet, in: Christelijke Volks-Almanak, vol 17, 1862, 1-24, 1.

¹¹⁵ Perhaps these letters had been thrown away but Tiele and De Génestet didn't seem to communicate between December 1859, when De Génestet's wife died and August 1860.

keen, as the translations of Tiele's works will show, to take big financial risks. And the market in which Teekenen operated was clearly not a big one. B.H.C.K van der Wijck was not very pleased with the disappearance of the Teekenen. The publisher was, indeed, to blame, but why was it, he argued, that every piece in this paper had to be paid for, so in other words: why could people not contribute on a voluntary basis. Now the dark side had won, Van der Wijck continued.¹¹⁶

After Teekenen, Tiele published articles in a number of periodicals, but seemed to have stopped being an editor. Things changed with the appearance of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* in 1867. Tiele would continue to contribute to this periodical until at least 1892, but that did not stop him from writing for other Dutch magazines, as Molendijk has shown.¹¹⁷

In his Rotterdam years Tiele wrote about a number of subjects he was still writing about at the end of his life. Some opinions can be found in his work as a (book) critic. One of the matters in which Tiele was interested was the history of religions. In 1859, with a sense of humour, he trashed Aart en Oorsprong der Christelijke Godsdienst. (About the nature and origin of the Christian Faith).¹¹⁸ This early review already shows that Tiele tried to support his views by using historical facts.

In 1860 he launched a devastating critique in *De Gids* on the teachings in the history of religion of Jan Hendrik Scholten, at that time the grandmaster of modern theology at Leiden University. In Tiele's eyes Scholten's approach was (also) not based on historical facts, and therefore un-scientific. Tiele called for a radical transformation of the program. Tiele even suggested, as a joke, that the current program was a test of how far the stupidity of the Dutch in the field of history would go.¹¹⁹

His interests in the origins and the history of religions made it inevitable that Tiele had to encounter the works of Max Müller. Nowadays Müller and Tiele are, internationally, regarded as the founding fathers of the science of the history of religion.¹²⁰ Although in Holland he was one of the leading figures in this field, he was one among many other Dutch scholars in this field.¹²¹

¹¹⁶ Van der Wijck was a Dutch philosopher. Letter from B.H.C.K van der Wijck to C.P. Tiele, No Date, 1860.

¹¹⁷ Molendijk, *Heritage*, 90.

¹¹⁸ C.P. Tiele, *Boekbeschouwing, Aart en Oorsprong der Christelijke Godsdienst. (About the nature and origin of the Christian Faith) Voor Nederlanders bewerkt door Titus (naar Dupuis). Met platen*, in: *Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen* (1859), 733-739.

¹¹⁹ Cossee, *Geloof* 18. Molendijk, *Heritage*, 89.

¹²⁰ T. Masuzawa, *The invention of world religions, or, How European universalism was preserved in the language of pluralism*, (Chicago, 2005), 104-117 (*The Birth Trauma of World Religions*). Tiele is at least considered to be one of the frontrunners in the science of the history of religions.

A.L. Molendijk, *Tiele on Religion*, *Numen* vol 46, (Leiden, 2005), 237-267, 237-238. Molendijk, *Emergence*, 1-3.

¹²¹ Molendijk, *Tiele on Religion*, 241.

In 1865 it was already clear that Tiele did not agree at all with Müller's method. Tiele made this clear in his review on Müller's Lectures on the science of language.¹²² When Müller touched on the origins of myths, Tiele admitted the inventiveness of Müller's arguments¹²³, but: "Although one has to listen, one forgets that you are listening to scientific heresies. Heresies one should be angry about".¹²⁴ And Tiele continues that Müller is a talented linguist, but a bad guide for the science of religion.¹²⁵ The difference of opinion between Müller and Tiele lies in the fact that Müller focuses in his writing on linguistic developments (read: meaning) whereas Tiele is interested in historical facts. Or, as Tiele would say, "We're not interested in what Greeks and Romans meant when talking about myths, we're interested in how these Myths (historically) developed".¹²⁶ Tiele also thinks that it was a huge misunderstanding to think that any kind of religion can be explained through a linguistic (mis)understanding of the imagery of the people's poets.¹²⁷ Tiele admitted that linguistic knowledge is important while studying religion, but the linguistic science should not govern the science of religion.¹²⁸ According to Molendijk it is difficult to classify the field of the (history of) the science of religion, but both Müller and Tiele were convinced that they started a new field of research.¹²⁹

This difference of opinion between Müller and Tiele existed throughout their entire careers. They most of the time communicated through their work. Other forms of contact seemed to be scarce. In the Leiden Special Collection only 3 letters can be found. In the Letters of Max Müller volumes I, and II, edited by his wife, Tiele is mentioned only once in the index.¹³⁰ Müller's first letter to Tiele was sent shortly after Tiele started a review on Müller's Lectures on The Science of Religion with a joke that was perhaps slightly over the edge. Tiele more or less started this review with the remarks that

¹²² C.P. Tiele, *De oorsprong der mythologie*. Max Müller, *Lectures on the science of language*. Second series. London, 1864. F.W.L. Schwartz, *Der Ursprung der Mythologie dargelegt an griechischer und deutscher Sage*. Berlin, 1860. F.W.L. Schwartz, *Sonne, Mond and Sterne, ein Beitrag zur Mythologie und Culturgeschichte der Urzeit*. Berlin, 1864, in: *De Gids*, Jaargang 29, 1865, 1-33. (the download showed 568)

¹²³ Tiele, *Oorsprong*, 4-5.

¹²⁴ Tiele, *Oorsprong*, 5. Free translation from: " Gij moet luisteren. Gij vergeet dat u hier wetenschappelijke ketterijen verkondigd worden, waarover het u betaamde uw verontwaardiging lucht te geven."

¹²⁵ Tiele, *Oorsprong*, 5.

¹²⁶ Tiele, *Oorsprong*, 5. Tiele, 18.

¹²⁷ Tiele, *Oorsprong*, 19.

¹²⁸ Tiele, *Oorsprong*, 20. Interesting, but out of scope, is the opinion of Chantepie De La Saussaye on this: 'It was the comparative study of language which threw light on the real relationship of nations, and thus supplied the principle means for a proper classification of mankind'. Cited from: Molendijk, *Emergence*, 18.

¹²⁹ Molendijk, *Emergence*, 20.

¹³⁰ Volume 1 475. But Tiele is not to be found on that page. M. Müller, *The life and letters of the right letters of the honorable Max Müller* edited by his wife in two volumes, (London, 1902).

when you think of the names of Müller and Schultze you might think about those two horrible Krauts, whose terrible jokes we have to deal with. In this case however we're dealing with very honourable Krauts.¹³¹ The German publisher C. Wilfferodt did not receive this joke very well.¹³² J. Estlin Carpenter, one of his English friends, had probably advised him to meet Müller face-to-face, because that would probably clear the air between the two. Tiele would meet Müller for the first time in 1879.¹³³

Tiele also fiercely defended his views on his scientific method while reflecting on P.K. Chantepie de La Saussaye's Methodological Contribution to the Research of the Origin of Religion.¹³⁴ Tiele did not agree with Chantepie that the origin of religion could not be explained by historical facts alone and that the researcher had to believe in God. This would mean that by writing about ghosts one had to believe in ghosts? Tiele found Chantepie's "inductive speculative method" completely wrong.¹³⁵ It is the same Chantepie de la Saussaye who wryly remarked that Tiele did not gather any followers with his scientific method.¹³⁶ The same can incidentally be said about Chantepie himself.¹³⁷

In his Rotterdam years Tiele did some scientific historical research as well. His activities resulted in the publication of two works in this period: *De Godsdienst van Zarathustra bij de oud-perzische volken* (1864), and *Vergelijkende geschiedenis van de Egyptische en Mesopotamische godsdiensten* (1869-1872). It was interesting to see that Tiele, who, as a critic, was used to criticising others, could not always handle criticism himself. When the famous Dutch orientalist Kern reflected on a piece on

¹³¹ My Translation doesn't do any justice to the original text, so for our dutch readers: Schultze en Müller - het is inderdaad mijn schuld niet, wanneer die twee namen onwillekeurig de wansmakelijke gestalten voor den geest brengen van die twee horribele Moffen, wier ploertige keukenzout-grappigheid ons tot walgens toe wordt voorgezet. Mijn Müller en Schultze, - want aan Müller komt hier als aan een oud-gediende op het veld der wetenschap de voorrang toe, - zijn geen Moffen maar Duitschers en van de edelste soort, en hun namen zijn hier juist gepaard als die van twee tegenstanders, vertegenwoordigers van twee zeer uiteenloopende theoriën, waardoor zij van een groot probleem in de godsdienstwetenschap een geheel verschillende oplossing geven...

C.P. Tiele, *Een probleem der godsdienstwetenschap*.

Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Religion*. Fraser's Magazine April-July 1870. Fritz Schultze, *Der Fetischismus. Eine Beitrag zur Anthropologie und Religionsgeschichte*. Leipzig, 1871, in: *De Gids*, Jaargang 35 (1871), (98-28), 98.

¹³² Letter from C. Wilfferodt to C.P. Tiele, March 24, 1871.

¹³³ Letter from J. Estlin Carpenter to C.P. Tiele, November 21, 1879.

¹³⁴ P.K. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Methodologische bijdrage tot het onderzoek naar den oorsprong van den godsdienst*. (Utrecht, 1871).

Molendijk thought that Tiele was, in reviewing Chantepie de la Saussaye, from a kind of patronizing kindness. Molendijk is referring to a later period I think.

A.L. Molendijk, *Tiele on Religion*, *Numen* vol 46, 237-267, 238.

¹³⁵ C.P. Tiele, *Het wezen en de oorsprong van den godsdienst*, in: *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 5, 1871, (373-406), 373. Molendijk, *Emergence*, 112.

¹³⁶ P.D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Levensbericht C.P. Tiele*, in: *Jaarboek*, 1902, (125-154), 136.

¹³⁷ H.M. van Nes, *Levensbericht van Pierre Daniel Chantepie de la Saussaye*, 9 april 1848 - 20 april 1920, in: *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde*, 1921 (1921), 68-85, 72. There is no love lost between Tiele and the family Chantepie de la Saussaye. Tiele also "trashed" Chantepie's father in an article in *De Gids*. C.P. Tiele, *Een pleidooi tegen de moderne richting. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, Leven en Rigting. Vier voorlezingen over godsdienstige vraagstukken van dezen tijd*. Rotterdam, 1865, in: *De Gids*. Jaargang 29, 1865 (1865), 227-244.

Zarathustra by Tiele, Tiele felt that he was treated like a schoolboy. "And although", Tiele uttered, "in the cases of linguistics and philosophy I cannot stand in his shadow, because of my upbringing I do not deserve this kind of treatment."¹³⁸

In Tiele's writings about religions sometimes one of Tiele's other interests appeared. When writing on the subjects on the 'Hindu religion' in the Dutch East-Indies Tiele touched upon the subject of missionary activities or, in other words, how to spread the Christian faith to other parts of the world. At the end of this article Tiele wanted to convert the people of Bali to the Christian Faith. If "we" would not convert the people of Bali, our Aryan brothers, they would fall victim to Muslim missionaries, and their life would become miserable.¹³⁹ Tiele's interest spreading Christianity to the East can be found in 1859, when De Génestet referred to a meeting on that subject in Rotterdam.¹⁴⁰ De Jong even claimed that Tiele had been a director of the DMS.¹⁴¹ Neither Cossee, Molendijk, Bernhard, and E.F. Kruijf mentions this fact.¹⁴² This omission would be remarkable.¹⁴³ Although Tiele did not participate directly in the DMS, he still wrote about some of its activities.

The DMS started in 1797. In the 1840's some kind of education was provided for its missionaries. This education was necessary because a bible alone was not enough to convince a member of the "natuurvolken" ("natives") to become a Christian. Tiele wanted the missionaries to have a scientific education and he was not very pleased with the current educational program of the DMS. Radical change was necessary he wrote, to provide for a better form of education. It would be best to tear the Rotterdam school building down, or sell the place.¹⁴⁴ The situation in the Dutch East-Indies must have mattered to Tiele. In 1866 he became a member of the Royal Institute for Land, Language and Ethnology for the Dutch East Indies (Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal, Land en Volkenkunde voor Nederlandsch Indie).¹⁴⁵

¹³⁸ C.P. Tiele, Literarisch Overzicht, in: Theologisch Tijdschrift 1869, 3, (86-91), 91.

¹³⁹ C.P. Tiele, De Hindusche godsdiensten in den Oost-Indischen archipel, in: Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen. Jaargang 1866 (1866). (819-846), 846.

¹⁴⁰ De Génestet, Nagelaten, Letter No 196, October 15, 1859.

¹⁴¹ C. De Jong, Twee eeuwen Nederlandse zendingsopleiding. Van NZG tot HKI 1797-1999, (w.p./w.d), 1-53, 22. Consulted on www.cfgdejong.nl, July 31, 2017.

¹⁴² E.F. Kruijff, Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Zendinggenootschap en zijne Zendingposten. (Groningen, 1894).

¹⁴³ In 1864 the clash between modernist and orthodox Christian entered that organisation. The result of that clash was that the modernist remained within the DMS and the more orthodox people left the DMS, and formed their own organisation (NZV). The reverend M. Cohen Stuart was one of the people have left, and one of Tiele's direct colleagues. While reading Ziektekiemen it is clear that it was written after the turmoil of the clash of 1864.

¹⁴⁴ C.P. Tiele, Ziekteverschijnsel en levensteeken.

Oude grieven en nieuwe bewijzen ten aanzien van de Evangelische zending, door S.E. Harthoorn, Oud-zending. Haarlem, A.C. Kruseman, 1864, in: De Tijdspiegel, Jaargang 21, 1864 (1864), 370-380, 380.

¹⁴⁵ De Locomotief, Samarangsch Handels en Advertentieblad, June 8, 1866. Ah, April 21, 1866. This angle of Tiele's activities deserves some more research. In 1865 Tiele had a presentation at the Dutch Bible Association (Nederlands Bijbel Genootschap) on the nations in the Dutch East Indies. Lc, November 29, 1865.

Tiele did not only write about the situation in the Dutch-Indies, he even wanted to do something about the poor situation the Javanese were in. The Cultuurstelsel, a Dutch governmental policy, had caused this situation.¹⁴⁶ The Society for the Advancement of the Javanese (SAJ) (Maatschappij tot het Nut van den Javaan) wanted to do something about this situation. This something was ill defined and instead of direct action the SAJ was only talking about the situation.¹⁴⁷ Janse, however, thinks that the SAJ was a new form of political pressure group meant to influence the public opinion.¹⁴⁸ The organisation structure was simple. There was a National Board (Hoofdbestuur), and local Branches. The main activities were organised on branch level. There was no such thing as a nationwide movement.¹⁴⁹

Janse mentions Tiele as one of its correspondents, but a letter of J.A. Fruin, a Dutch Lawyer in Utrecht, makes it clear that Tiele was a member of the Rotterdam board.¹⁵⁰ One of the tactics of the SAJ to get local support was to mobilize ministers. This was a strategic choice. Ministers had, and were used to having, an audience, and could call out for action.¹⁵¹ The majority of these ministers were of a modernist signature.¹⁵² It is unclear how successful Tiele was in this respect. At one time the Rotterdam Branch was labelled one of the laziest branches of all. The Rotterdam Branch had called in 1871 for more action, and the National Board could not deal with that kind of feedback. But when the conflict was over the National Board reported in its annual report of 1872-1873 that Rotterdam was one of the few branches that was still alive.¹⁵³

After 1871, with the end of the Cultuurstelsel, the Society lost its momentum. After 1871 the SAJ slowly faded away and finally left the scene in 1877.

Tiele's complaint about the educational program of the DMS was not the only educational program Tiele was complaining about in these years. In 1866 Tiele complained that the current science of Theology was not a science at all. In his eyes three factors hindered the current science of Theology. In the first place narrowness: the theologians did not look to other religions at all. In the second place these theologians did not know enough about the so-called "Heathen" religions. The third obstacle was the current speculative method. Tiele promoted a comparative form of the science of

¹⁴⁶ M.J. Janse, *De Geschiedenis van de Maatschappij tot Nut van den Javaan. (1866-1877). Waarheid voor Nederland, regtvaardigheid voor Java* (Utrecht, 1999), 2.

¹⁴⁷ Ill defined, Janse 28-29, 63. Just talking, Janse, 52.

¹⁴⁸ Janse, 23.

¹⁴⁹ Janse, 34.

¹⁵⁰ Janse, Appendix 3. Letter from J.A. Fruin to C.P. Tiele, Utrecht, October 19th 1867.

¹⁵¹ Janse, 39.

¹⁵² Janse, 77.

¹⁵³ Janse, 64-65.

religion, based on historical facts.¹⁵⁴ In Tiele's eyes a division had to be made between the scientific matters, which belonged to the universities and the matters that belonged to the denominations. Tiele called these matters "apologetics, polemics, and dogmatics".¹⁵⁵ Tiele wanted to transform theology into science of religion, is Molendijks opinion.¹⁵⁶ The new science of religion was expected, according to Molendijk, to fulfil (most of) the tasks of the old theology and to show the superiority of Christian religion.¹⁵⁷

In the Netherlands this division between what belonged to the universities and what belonged to the denominations was made in the Act on Higher Education of 1876, by introducing the so called "Duplex Ordo".¹⁵⁸ In 1868 Tiele commented on the design for the Higher Education Act ("Wetsontwerp op het Hooger Onderwijs").¹⁵⁹ He admitted that he was grateful for an article on the subject by "Prof. Tideman", but Tideman's article needed some additional remarks.¹⁶⁰

Tiele continued to share his opinion that science of religion had its rightful place at the universities. This matter could not be outsourced to denominations.¹⁶¹ Tiele did not think this would harm the separation of church and state. According to Tiele the study of religion was a form of science, and should have its rightful place at the university. If the science of religion would be banned from universities then this science was outlawed, in Tiele's eyes.¹⁶² Tiele also gave some outlines on the program of the science of religion. In this program there was room for Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, and Judaism.¹⁶³ Of course there should be room for the Veda's and the Egyptians, the Babylonians and the like. This would certainly be useful, but he did not want to make these subject a part of his program as yet. At this time not everybody was convinced of its usefulness, but that time would come...¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁴ Molendijk, *Godsdienstwetenschap*, 32.

¹⁵⁵ C.P. Tiele, *Theologie en godsdienstwetenschap*.

Ernest de Bunsen, *The hidden wisdom of Christ and the key of knowledge: or history of the apocrypha*. In two volumes. London, 1865, in: *De Gids*, Jaargang 30, 1866 (1866), (205-244), 243-244.

¹⁵⁶ A.L. Molendijk, *The emergence of the science of religion in the Netherlands* (Numen book series. Studies in the history of religions CV; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2005), X.

¹⁵⁷ Molendijk, *Emergence*, 24.

¹⁵⁸ Barnard, *Verstoten*, 43.

¹⁵⁹ Perhaps in the title the author wanted to show some of his discontent with the matter. Reading the title the (modern) reader reads lower education (*Lager Onderwijs*). C.P. Tiele, *Godsdienstwetenschap en wijsbegeerte in het jongste ontwerp van Wet op het Lager onderwijs*, in *De Gids*, Jaargang 33, 1869 (1869), 121-138.

¹⁶⁰ Tiele, *Lager*, 122.

¹⁶¹ Tiele, *Lager*, 123.

¹⁶² Tiele, *Lager*, 124-130.

¹⁶³ Tiele, *Lager*, 135.

¹⁶⁴ Tiele, *Lager*, 137.

Tiele's first real chance to do something about a curriculum, that of the Seminary of the Remonstrant Brotherhood, came in 1871/1872, when Tiele was part of the Committee of The Five Churches. This Committee had to investigate the future of this institution, because by the end of 1870 there was no student left at the Seminary. This sounds more dramatic than it was, because the Seminary never had a huge number of attendants. Tideman showed this at the central meeting of 1868. He even claimed that under his regime as Professor he did not do any worse than his predecessor, Abraham Des Amorie Van der Hoeven. The modernist camp in the Brotherhood nevertheless claimed that radical change was needed, and pleaded for a different, modernist, direction of the Seminary. The modernists also claimed that to become successful the Seminary had to be relocated to Leiden, the centre of the Dutch modernist movement. The modernists also claimed that Leiden had, as a city of science, a better reputation than Amsterdam, a city of commerce. In reality the modernists wanted to get rid of Tideman. Tideman did not give up without a fight, but in the end resigned in 1872.¹⁶⁵ Officially this was due to bad health, but Tideman lived happily ever after for about 18 years. The correspondence between Tiele and Bok shows that Tiele made a number of proposals, although, according to Bok, not all of his proposals could be found in the final report of the Committee.¹⁶⁶

Tiele's activities for the Remonstrant Brotherhood were not limited to that particular action, but this event can be used as a bridge to his core business in his years in Rotterdam, namely being a minister in the Remonstrant Brotherhood. In the 1860's Tiele thought about what it meant to be a modern Christian. This resulted in several publications of his sermons, and the publication of *De Godsdienst der Liefde Geschetst* (An Outline of the Religion of Love) in 1868.¹⁶⁷ It is important to reflect on these thoughts, because they would reappear in Tiele's later years, and they had consequences for his preaching activities.

Tiele did not have any plans to leave his job (and/or lost his faith), as some of his modernist colleagues did, not at all. Tiele remained a religious man, and the Christian faith was for him the best faith, because it basically was free of dogma, and delivered complete freedom to its believers.¹⁶⁸ Although Buddhism offered, said Tiele, like Christianity, compassion and love, Christianity had a more sound and rational basis.

¹⁶⁵ Barnard, Verstoten, 38. Letter of J.W. Bok to C.P. Tiele May 29, 1872. In this letter Bok informed Tiele of Tideman's defense at a meeting of the Board of the Amsterdam Remonstrant Church.

¹⁶⁶ Letter J.W. Bok to C.P. Tiele, September 9, 1872. It seems that one of Tiele's proposals was to make the Doctoral Exam obligatory. Tiele must have asked for it was Rauwenhoff who suggested this. Letter from L.W.I. Rauwenhoff to C.P. Tiele, May 9, 1872.

¹⁶⁷ C.P. Tiele, *De Godsdienst der Liefde Geschetst*, (Amsterdam, 1868)

¹⁶⁸ Tiele, *Liefde*, 54. 113.

In comparison to Islam, Tiele continued, Christianity preaches also the love to God, but it has freed itself from activities like fasting or self-flagellation, Hadj, or preaching to God in a temple made by man.¹⁶⁹ The religion of Jesus, could, according to Tiele be reduced to the two concepts of loving God and loving one's neighbour as oneself.¹⁷⁰ These two concepts were so strong that Tiele had the opinion that, although some people thought that Christianity was at its end, Christianity would never die. It only needed a new impulse.¹⁷¹ And that impulse could be given, because there was nothing more that could put light people's fire than religion.¹⁷²

In the 19th century the origins of religions bothered (Christian/European) scientists a great deal. When talking about the bigger religions a distinction was made between Aryan and Semitic origins of religion. Roughly speaking the Aryan religions were the "good" religions, and the Semitic religions were the "bad" religions. These scientists had great difficulty with the fact that the Christianity had Jewish roots. Although they invented a work-around, which is (and has been) a topic for another kind of research, this meant that anti-Semitic tendencies could be found in their work.¹⁷³ Also Tiele can be labelled anti-Semitic in this sense. Tiele had no doubt that the Christian faith was a world religion. This religion had its roots in Israel and Jesus, and has no Jewish roots, Tiele wrote in 1864.¹⁷⁴

For Tiele, Christianity was clearly a religion of ideas, or at least one idea, the concept of Love. This concept did not need any outward devotion, in contrast to Catholicism. Catholicism still used old symbols, with lots of outward devotion.¹⁷⁵ Now was the time to get rid of all the old symbols, and try to use new ones.¹⁷⁶ Now was the time to work together with the modern science. Science was there to use. Religion should not be afraid of science, because man could not live without religion.¹⁷⁷ One should think that in this concept of religion churches were not necessary any more, but that did not

¹⁶⁹ Tiele, *Liefde*, 120.

¹⁷⁰ Tiele, *Liefde*, 125.

¹⁷¹ Tiele, *Liefde*, 106-112.

¹⁷² Tiele, *Liefde*, 92.

¹⁷³ Tiele classified Christianity as part of: The Old Semetic Religions. The Old Semetic Religions were divided in a Northern and Southern branch. Christianity belonged to the Northern branch. The Northern branch had 2 sub-divisions: the Western Branch and the Eastern Branch. In the Western Branch Christianity arose from the Religion of Israel and the Religion of Judah. In Tiele's opinion Christianity was a Semitic religions. He must have changed his views.

C.P. Tiele, *Religions*, 1-23, 6. To be found at: <http://www.1902encyclopedia.com/r/rel/religions.html>. Consulted, July 31, 2017.

¹⁷⁴ C.P. Tiele, *Een pleidooi tegen de moderne richting*. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Leven en Rigting*. Vier voorlezingen over godsdienstige vraagstukken van dezen tijd. Rotterdam, 1865, in: *De Gids*. Jaargang 29, 1865 (1865), 227-244, 244. (We must not forget that in the 19th century anti-semitism was quite normal in the Netherlands. See remarks on Semitic religions at note 174.)

¹⁷⁵ Tiele, *De Nieuwe Geest des Evangelies in zijne werking en eischen: vijf preken*, (Haarlem, 1865), 9.

¹⁷⁶ Tiele, *Nieuwe Geest*, 15 - 16.

¹⁷⁷ Tiele, *Nieuwe Geest*, 20-21.

come to Tiele's mind. There still was a Christian church, but all branches should work together. This was possible for all the Christian churches had one mind, one goal, and one vision.¹⁷⁸

In a more practical sense this meant that Tiele propagated abandoning old traditions like baptism and Holy Communion. Furthermore Jesus was presented as a wise teacher, and not as a Son of God. Not all members of the parish were attracted to these new ideas. Eldering, one of Tiele's successors in Rotterdam, reminded that even in 1912 he met some old ladies who had not set foot in the Remonstrant Church after Tiele changed his prayers and left out the words "we pray to you in the name of Christ".¹⁷⁹ Unfortunately the attendance rate of Tiele's sermons is unknown, but other sources suggest that the congregation went to a preferred preacher. At the moment that his more conservative colleague Cohen Stuart performed a service the Remonstrant, or more modern part of the congregation left the church. Their places were taken over by more orthodox, dissatisfied believers from the Dutch Reformed Church.¹⁸⁰

On a national level the 1850's and 60's was a period of consolidation for the Remonstrant Brotherhood. In this period the Brotherhood was thinking about a return to the ranks of the Dutch Reformed church, but this seemed nothing more than sweet-talk. Professor Tideman was right: if the Brotherhood returns to the ranks only a few Remonstrant congregations could financially survive (presumably Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Den Haag, Gouda and Leiden), while Rotterdam and Amsterdam would lose their current status and their presence would hardly be noted in the ranks of the Dutch Reformed Church.¹⁸¹ The Brotherhood decided not to expand the number of congregations in 1857, and 1868. Of course the always mentioned, but never taken seriously, possible return to the Dutch Reformed Church was used as an argument. Another argument against forming new congregations was the expected financial burdens for the Brotherhood. This would be too expensive.¹⁸² Considering the financial situation of the Brotherhood this was not a valid argument.¹⁸³ In this period the financial situation of the Brotherhood is sound. The Brotherhood was even helped by the government. It received a government grant, of 20.000 guilders a year.¹⁸⁴ After 1862 the brotherhood found the financial means to improve the salary of its ministers.

¹⁷⁸ C.P. Tiele, *Twaalf Preken*, (Amsterdam, 1873), 194.

¹⁷⁹ Barnard, *Armenianen in de Maasstad*, 58-59.

¹⁸⁰ J.J. van Oosterzee, *Levensbericht van Martinus Cohen Stuart*, in: *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde 1879* (1879), (105-136), 115.

¹⁸¹ The Remonstrant Brotherhood has a system in which the churches that are financially healthy survive, provide for the churches who are poor. For the very keen analysis of J. Tideman, *Handelingen 1868*, 25-30.

¹⁸² *Handelingen 1857*, 28. *Handelingen 1868*, 28-29.

¹⁸³ The equity of the Brotherhood in 1876 was 176.000 guilders. Approximated cost of building a church 8000 - 10.000 guilders. *Handelingen 1868*, 18. *Handelingen 1868*, 30. The Brotherhood just sold its church in Zegwaard for 6002 guilders, so financially there seemed to be no difficulties at all.

¹⁸⁴ It seems that the Brotherhood doesn't account for this grant in the Central Meeting, but I'm not a financial expert. *Handelingen 1863*, 10.

The modernist element was certainly present and not ignored by the members of the Central Meeting of the Remonstrant Brotherhood. Professor Tideman warned the brothers, at the Central Meeting of 1859, who spread the uncertain results of modern science to be careful with these activities, because believers without a firm belief could be harmed.¹⁸⁵ Barnard and Cossee think this warning was especially directed at Teekenen des Tijds, and therefore Tiele.¹⁸⁶ Also in Central Meetings it is clear that the developments in the outside world were in the front of the members' minds. In the opening speeches of the Central Meetings the chairman referred to modernist tendencies in the outside world.¹⁸⁷ The personal reference to Tiele was deliberately left out the *Handelingen*.¹⁸⁸

The old guard was able to keep the ranks closed until 1870. In that year, as mentioned above, the future of the Remonstrant Seminary was at stake. The modernists did not miss this opportunity to get rid of Tideman and gain a more prominent position in the Brotherhood.

On a national level, things changed after the year 1867. In that year a big change occurred in the electoral system of the Dutch Reformed Church. Male members of the congregation who were not eligible, because they did not pay tax, could from that moment on, directly, or through Electoral Committees (*Kiesverenigingen*), choose the minister of their choice.¹⁸⁹ Modernists were in favour of this change. They expected that more "modern" ministers would be called to the pulpit. But that was not the case. The less modern, or orthodox, element, gained ground in the Dutch Reformed church. Soon modernist reverends were rethinking their position. The big question was: should they stay in the Dutch Reformed Church, or should they go. Modern theologians, who were spread over a number of different denominations, tried to organise themselves. In 1866 modern theologians united themselves. They called themselves "De Vergadering van Modern Theologen". In its meetings the modernists not only put theological matters on the agenda. Political, social, and scientific matters were discussed.

In 1871, modern theologians who were living in the provinces of Friesland, Groningen, and Drenthe called the Dutch League of Protestants (DLP) into being. Its main aim was to improve the free development of religious life. This improvement should be realised inside and outside the

¹⁸⁵ *Handelingen*, 1859, 6.

¹⁸⁶ Barnard, *Verstoten*, 35. Around that time Tideman was having a discussion on modernism with Tideman in 1861? Tideman: we clearly can't agree on this subject. Letter(s) from J. Tideman to Tiele, unreadable date, 1861??.

¹⁸⁷ *Handelingen* 1863, 12. *Handelingen* 1864, 12. *Handelingen* 1865, 10-11.

¹⁸⁸ Barnard, *Verstoten*, 35.

¹⁸⁹ It seems that the voting system for general and local political elections was applicable in churches as well.

denominations. In the first years of its existence the discussions around the questions concerning the electoral position were paramount, but later on, the DLP concentrated on other activities like publishing songbooks, selling religious books, providing Sunday school education, delivering lectures and Sunday services.¹⁹⁰

Tiele was interested in both movements. In 1869 Tiele can be found in a meeting of modern theologians in Amsterdam. In this meeting Tiele gave a lecture on the subject "Why people fail to appreciate modernist thought".¹⁹¹

Tiele also had sympathy for the DLP. His actual involvement was, probably, of a later stage. In an official publication of the DLP Tiele is not remembered as one of its founding figures. Actually Tiele is not mentioned in this publication at all.¹⁹² His presence in the meetings is noted in 1873, when, he was appointed as a member of the National Board.¹⁹³

In retrospect the period 1862-1867 was, for Tiele, a period of construction. Tiele elaborated on a number of things. He was constructing his views on modernism, and the science of religion. In the Central Meetings of the Remonstrant Brotherhood his activities remained limited until 1865. He participated in a committee to discuss the future of the congregation of Moordrecht and Nieuwpoort.¹⁹⁴ He plays a small part in the meeting of 1857 and 1858 as part of the organising committee.¹⁹⁵ Tiele is presiding the meeting of 1861, but that has to do with the fact that the Central Meetings are, with the exception of one, alternately led by members of Rotterdam and Amsterdam.¹⁹⁶ Tiele is not present in the Central Meetings of 1862 and 1864. In 1863 Tiele reads a report; because his Rotterdam colleague Van Der Pot was absent.¹⁹⁷ From 1865 onwards this is changing. In 1865 Tiele was, for the first time, elected in an important committee: the one that is controlling the Remonstrant Seminary ("Het Collegie van Professor en Curatoren der Remonstrantse Broederschap").

After 1866/1867 for Tiele it was time for more action. For his scientific activities Tiele became one of the editors of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*. For his modernist activities it seemed time to turn to the

¹⁹⁰ Buitenwerf-Van der Molen, 30-31.

¹⁹¹ In this meeting 176 people (professors, preachers and candidate-preachers were present. *Provinciale Drentsche en Asser Courant*, April 15, 1869.

¹⁹² *De Nederlandsche Protestantenvbond 1870-1895. Uitgegeven door het Hoofdbestuur bij gelegenheid van het 25-jarig jubile van den Nederlandschen Protestantenvbond. (1895).*

¹⁹³ *Verslag der derde Algemeene Vergadering van den Nederlandschen Protestantenvbond. (1873), 17.*

¹⁹⁴ In the 1850's and '60 the congregation of Gouda seems to be struggling with keeping two reverends. In order to keep two reverends Gouda is putting pressure on the Brotherhood to enlarge its congregation by gobbling smaller congregations. Congregations like Nieuwpoort, or Bleiswijk. Interestingly enough Gouda's proposals were always rejected.

¹⁹⁵ *Handelingen 1857, 44. Handelingen 1858, 17.*

¹⁹⁶ Perhaps the modernist threat has vanished for the moment, because Teekenen disappeared in 1860.

¹⁹⁷ *Handelingen 1863, 33.*

outside world. Tiele became an active member in the Group of Modern Theologians. This group was thinking about modernism, and wanted to spread the modernist thought in the Netherlands. Tiele also joined the ranks of the Dutch League of Protestants in the early 70's.

Rotterdam remained his locus operandi. In 1867 Tiele was tempted to leave Rotterdam for Amsterdam. The Amsterdam congregation wanted him as a minister. After some deliberations Tiele decided to turn the offer down. Tiele gave a number of reasons why he could not leave the Rotterdam Congregation. He had his friends here, it was a nice congregation, and people would miss him. But perhaps, as Bok informed us, Amsterdam was not a promotion after all.¹⁹⁸ It is curious that in 1872¹⁹⁹ and 1877²⁰⁰ he also turned down offers to come and work in Amsterdam, not as a minister but as a teacher (1872), or as a university professor (1877) in the (at that time) new University of Amsterdam.²⁰¹ In 1872 however Tiele could not resist the temptation of becoming the successor of Tideman. Tiele from that moment on became Professor of the Remonstrant Brotherhood. In this position he became one of the most important figures in the Brotherhood. Tiele left Rotterdam after this appointment and went to live in Leiden.

2.3.3 The Leiden Years 1873-1902

In 1873 Tiele moved to Leiden to start as professor at the Remonstrant seminary. He remained an inhabitant of Leiden until his death in 1902. In his Leiden years he continued to do the same things he was doing in Rotterdam, with the exception of being a preacher. When he left the Rotterdam Brotherhood for Leiden he promised to deliver 5 sermons a year in Rotterdam, but in 1877 he wrote his Rotterdam brothers that he was no longer able to do this.²⁰² In 1877 Tiele was also appointed Professor of the History of Religion at Leiden University. Tiele was also invited to join the newly founded University of Amsterdam but he remained in Leiden.²⁰³ In Leiden Tiele, from 1877 onwards, held two positions until he retired as a University professor in Leiden in 1900.²⁰⁴ Tiele was Rector of Leiden University in the years 1892-1893. In 1899 and 1901 he also served temporarily in that

¹⁹⁸ Letter from J.W. Bok to C.P. Tiele, February 3, 1868. (This remark because I'm a proud inhabitant of 010 and not of 020.)

¹⁹⁹ J.P.N. Land asked Tiele in a letter if Tiele could be his successor, at the Atheneum Illustre, in Amsterdam, although Land knew that Tiele himself was nominated to go to Leiden himself. Letter of J.P.N. Land to C.P. Tiele, October 4, 1872.

²⁰⁰ Tiele received a confidential letter of one of his fellow editors of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, namely Ad Lomann. Letter of A. Lomann to C.P. Tiele, June 22, 1877.

²⁰¹ Chantepie de la Saussaye already wondered why Tiele didn't consider working in Amsterdam. He claimed that Tiele was too satisfied with himself. Tiele did consider but turned the offer down. In this whole piece it is clear that Chantepie wasn't too fond of Tiele. P.D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Levensbericht C.P. Tiele*, in: *Jaarboek, 1902 (1902)*, 125-154, 135.

²⁰² Letter from J. Hooykaas to C.P. Tiele, October 18, 1877.

²⁰³ See note 201.

²⁰⁴ Molendijk, *Heritage*, 82.

position. Two of his colleagues had died.²⁰⁵ He stayed on his post as a Professor of the Remonstrant Brotherhood until his death in 1902.²⁰⁶

In his last sermon to his Rotterdam audience Tiele told them that the main reason for him to go to Leiden was the possibility to spend more of his time on science.²⁰⁷ And so he did. In his Leiden Years he published a respectable amount of publications on the history of religion. His inaugural lecture on the meaning of Assyriology for the comparative history of religions was the starting point of this particular field in the history of the Dutch university system.²⁰⁸

In his Leiden years Tiele further elaborated on his views on the science of religion.

Tiele still was convinced that scientific research had to be built on historical facts. His differences with Max Müller were never resolved and kept recurring in his correspondence with his English friends Estlin Carpenter, Frazer, and Lang.²⁰⁹ Tiele also could not come to terms with Chantepie de la Saussaye.²¹⁰

It was Tiele's ultimate goal to outline the development of religion in mankind.²¹¹

Tiele spent a lot of time developing classifications of religions. That classification was accompanied with a developmental scheme. Religions developed, in his eyes, from Nature Religions to World Religions as Christianity, Islam and Buddhism.²¹² Among the World religions, Christianity was, Tiele was still a Christian reverend after all, the best. Tiele's view on world religions seem a bit outrageous for a 21st century human being, but it was not criticised as such in the 19th century. Some of his critics argued that his kind of history of religion was no real history at all. The biggest objection his critics had to his stages of development was that some later stages in the development were in fact remains of earlier stages.²¹³ Tiele's finest hour came when he was invited to give the so-called Gifford lectures. In these lectures Tiele combined the developmental, evolutionary, side of religion with an individual, emotional aspect.

²⁰⁵ Molendijk, Heritage, 83. It is unclear to me if this happened after his official retirement as a university professor.

²⁰⁶ As a 21th century man I fully agree with Tiele. In did way he could combine 2 jobs. The amount of students at the Seminary was, in my viewpoint, extremely low. It provided Tiele with 2 considerable sources of income.

²⁰⁷ Tiele, Twaalf, 254.

²⁰⁸ Molendijk, Heritage, 79.

²⁰⁹ That didn't prevent Estlin Carpenter to ask Tiele to consider Müller to write the introduction for Outline, but on the other hand, Müller might ask a fee. Letter from J. Estlin Carpenter, no date, numbered 33. Someone could really write a very funny article based on this correspondence.

²¹⁰ C.P. Tiele, (Boekbespreking), Het belang van de studie der godsdiensten voor de kennis van het Christendom. Redevoering uitgesproken bij de inwijding van den Leerstoel voor de Geschiedenis der godsdiensten aan de Unversiteit te Amsterdam, door Dr. P.D. Chantepie De La Saussaye, in: Theologisch Tijdschrift, 13, 1879, 418-423.

²¹¹ Molendijk, Religious Development, 347.

²¹² A quick introduction on his ideas are to be found in the article Tiele wrote for the Encyclopedia Britannica. Tiele starts his essay his bias on the philosophy of religion, but 'it was all but purely speculative'.

C.P. Tiele, Religions. To be found on : <http://1902encyclopedia.com/r/rel/religions.html>. Consulted, August 10, 2017.

²¹³ Molendijk, Heritage, 91.

In the Gifford lectures Tiele also gave his opinion about the church as an institute. In his eyes the church was a community of spirits, a place of souls who were searching and who belonged together. In this sense this meaning of the concept church combined perfectly with Tiele's idea's for the religion of love. The religion of love was, like Tiele's church, an idealist, spiritual religion. According to Tiele people would always need some kind of churches. People would always be searching for soulmates. These soulmates could be found in a church.²¹⁴

Tiele's efforts did not go unnoticed by his peers in the national and international field of the science of religion. In the Netherlands Tiele was installed as the first Professor of Comparative Religion (Vergelijkende Godsdienstwetenschap) in 1877. Molendijk already showed that Tiele contributed to a wide range of international scientific magazines. He wrote for the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, the *Zeitschrift für Ethnographie*, *The Theologischer Jahresbericht*, and the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, the first specialized journal in the field.²¹⁵ His contributions to the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 200 reviews and 26 articles, made it an important international reference organ in the field of history of religions.²¹⁶ A big part of his correspondence deals with questions from publishers if Tiele could write, or review an article.

From the 1870's on many of his articles were translated into the major European countries. Tiele's *Outlines of the History of Religion* was used as an influential handbook in German-speaking countries.²¹⁷ From his correspondence it is clear that it, probably, were rather limited editions and profit on these editions was small. Or publisher Trübner was not good for its authors. Trübner told James Ballingal that "*Vergelijkende Godsdiensten*", which Ballingal translated into "*Comparative History of the Egyptian and Mesopotamian Religions, Vol 1: History of the Egyptian Religion*", made no profit at all, and that Trübner was not going to publish Volume 2. This must²¹⁸ have been hard for Ballingal who translated *Vergelijkende Godsdiensten* on his own expenses, which seems to have been common practice in the Anglo-Saxon world.²¹⁹ Tiele had to rewrite it, because some parts of

²¹⁴ Barnard, 217. Molendijk, Tiele on Religion, 255.

²¹⁵ Molendijk, Heritage, 90.

²¹⁶ Molendijk, Heritage, 90.

²¹⁷ Molendijk, Heritage, 91.

²¹⁸ On August 9, 1882 Trübner said that *Vergelijkende Godsdiensten*, sold fairly well, but generated no profit as yet. Trübner asked Ballingal to go on with translating Volume 2.

But in June 1884 Ballingal wrote to Tiele that Trübner reported that *Comparative* didn't make any profit at all, and that they would think about publishing Volume 2. Ballingal had the impression they wouldn't. Ballingal was right.

Letter from J. Ballingal to C.P. Tiele, August 9, 1882, and June 13, 1884.

²¹⁹ In February 1881 Ballingal is looking for a publisher. Letter from J. Ballingal to C.P. Tiele, February 21, 1881. In other (European) countries translators sometimes were' paid in advance to translate a work.

the book might insult many people in England. For instance, the remarks Tiele made about the origin of Jahweh had to be altered.²²⁰

The case of *Outlines* also showed that Trübner was perhaps kind of a skinflint. Estlin Carpenter translated "Geschiedenis van den Godsdienst tot aan de heerschappij der Wereldgodsdiensten" in 1877. In 1880 Trübner told Estlin Carpenter that there were still 150 copies left, and the book sold at a loss.²²¹ In 1896 (!), *Outlines* saw its 6th edition and Estlin Carpenter was beginning to wonder how the book could be printed without making any profit. In 1897 Trübner paid Estlin Carpenter, so Estlin Carpenter could pay Tiele 25 pounds.²²²

His correspondence also shows that Tiele himself had to do a lot of work in the translating process. Many translators had difficulties in translating Dutch, because that was not their mother tongue. A number of translators had to learn Dutch by themselves.

In his Leiden Years Tiele was still involved with the modernist movement inside and outside the Remonstrant Brotherhood. In the Group of Modern Theologians Tiele was giving lectures on matters that were close to his heart. Tiele gave a presentation about the introduction of the new bill on higher education in the 1870's.²²³ In 1890 he informed his audience about the Dutch university system and the status of Theology in that system.²²⁴ Tiele also introduced his audience to the science of religion and its relationship with Christianity in 1879.²²⁵

In one of its meetings Tiele remained loyal to his own evolutionary thinking on religion. When asked if (and in what way) Buddhism could contribute to Christianity ("so that Christianity would have a bigger appeal for the higher developed...."), Tiele replied that Buddhism as such only was historically significant. As a religious-ethical community Buddhism was miles behind "our own" viewpoints on civilisation.²²⁶

The differences between the Group of Modern Theologians and the DLP were small. They shared the same audience. In 1875 this created some logistical problems. In 1875 representatives of both organisations discussed if they could have a joint meeting. The Group of Modern Theologians rejected that proposal. It would be interesting to see in what way Tiele was involved in these talks. In

²²⁰ Letter from J. Ballingal to C.P. Tiele, February 21, 1881.

²²¹ Letter from J. Estlin Carpenter to C.P. Tiele, April 5, 1880.

²²² Letter from J. Estlin Carpenter to C.P. Tiele, March 12, 1897. In 1900 another "meagre" 5 pounds followed. *Outlines* wasn't that popular anymore. Letter from J. Estlin Carpenter to C.P. Tiele, February 5, 1900.

²²³ Announcement: *nvdd*, April 2, 1874.

²²⁴ Announcement in: *ah*, April 11, 1890.

²²⁵ *Rn*, March 31, 1879. "wat belooft en geeft de vergelijkende godsdienstwetenschap voor de kenniswaardering voor het christendom".

²²⁶ *Ah*, April 24, 1884.

1875 he was chairman of the National Branch of the DLP.²²⁷ In 1886 there were no conflicting agenda's as Tiele both presided the Group of Modern Theologians and the DLP.²²⁸

The DLP was an interesting organisation, because it was not bound to one denomination. The boundaries between the regular churches were not always clearly drawn. This caused some problems in the 1870's and 1880's.

Tiele was elected twice to the national board of the DLP. He served in the periods 1874-1876 and 1886-1889.²²⁹ He started in 1874 as vice-chairman, but became chairman in 1876.²³⁰ In 1876 he left the National Board. Tiele re-entered the National Board in 1886.²³¹ In 1886 he again became chairman. Tiele presided over several meetings of the Central Meeting during his membership of the national board.²³² The central meetings of the DLP were combined with a National Protestant Day. On the National Protestant Day, several relevant topics for Protestants were discussed. It is probable that Tiele attended some of these meeting. He spoke at the National Protestant Day of 1875.²³³

In his first period in the DLP's National Board it is not really possible to discern some individual actions of Tiele. It would be nice to see, if would he have something to do with the acquisition of the magazine *De Hervorming*. This paper was bought without the consent of the central meeting, but the initial talks with *De Hervorming* started when Tiele was not a board member.²³⁴

In Tiele's second period his actions are clearer. In 1887 he wanted to stall a proposal of the department of Brielle. In Brielle the DLP, like many organisations of those days, wondered what they should do with the so-called "Social Question" (sociale kwestie), or what should the DLP do while facing social wrongdoings in the lower classes. Should the DLP actively do something about this matter, or should they leave this in the hands of other organisations. Tiele argued that, while no one would doubt the need of doing something about these urgent matters, this was not a matter the DLP should actively deal with.²³⁵ In his opinion the DLP was a religious organisation, not a social one.²³⁶

²²⁷ See below on Tiele's activities in the DLP.

²²⁸ Announcement, Group of Modern Theologians, April 26, 1886.

²²⁹ Tiele Leaving 1876, Verslag van den Zesden Algemeene Vergadering van Het Nederlandsch Protestantenvond, 1876 (1876), 25-26. Tiele leaving 1889: Kort Verslag van het Hoofdbestuur en van de Commissiën van het Nederlandsch Protestantenvond over het Jaar 1889-1890, 2.

²³⁰ Verslag, 1875, 17.

²³¹ The reports of the DLP's Central Meetings in the period 1877-1885 didn't show the presence of Tiele.

²³² In 1875 chairman Bergsma had to attend a meeting of the Dutch house of Commons.

Verslag van den Vijfde Algemeene Vergadering van de Nederlandsche Protestantenvond, 1875, (1875), 4. Tiele presided 1876, Verslag, 1876, 5. Tiele Presided in his role as chairman of the national board the meetings in 1886-1889.

²³³ Subject unknown. Bataviaas Handelsblad, November 23, 1875. He should have spoken in 1900 but Tiele had fallen ill.

Handelingen van den 30sten Algemeene Vergadering van den Nederlandschen Protestantenvond gehouden te Haarlem 30 en 31 October 1900. Kort Verslag van den Staat en de Werkzaamheden van den Bond en zijne Commissien, 10.

²³⁴ Verslag, 1875, 21- 25.

²³⁵ Verslag, 1887, 5.

Cossee, Molendijk, Barnard asked themselves why Tiele wasn't more active on political issues like the "Sociale Questie". They always mention the Boer War as the only case Tiele publicly spoke about. I don't think Tiele was politically ignorant.

Tiele suggested, on account of the national board, to install a committee to investigate the question if the DLP would deal with the social question. This with respect to the upcoming changes in the regulations of the DLP. However the central meeting did not want to support Tiele and supported Brielle instead.²³⁷ A year later the National Board did follow up on Brielle's proposal.²³⁸

A question of Mr Kielstra lay closer to Tiele's heart. Kielstra wanted, in 1887, the DLP to investigate the question in what way religious education was disrupted by de normal education (in the sense that schools did not pay enough attention to religious education). Tiele, and another member of the national board, went to Den Haag to get the approval for the investigation. As a true Dutch civil servant, the minister of Internal Affairs never answered the request for investigation, and that is why Tiele, and the DLP, did the investigation themselves, without government approval. It was a pity that the outcome of the investigation was inconclusive.²³⁹

When Tiele did his second term, he probably found out that the DLP of the 1870's was not the DLP of the 1880's. The DLP had grown bigger, and there was some kind of organisational change. Sub-committees were formed, and to get some form of collaboration between committees and the national board, board members had to preside over a committee. Tiele was chairman of the committee on Preaching and Religious Education.²⁴⁰ In 1888 he told the central meeting that he really wanted to resign, but his fellow board members had not allowed him to.²⁴¹

In the late 1880's the DLP wanted to appeal to a wider audience, as the growing focus on the Social Question had shown. In addition to *De Hervorming*, the DLP started with a magazine for the masses, *Nieuw Leven*. Tiele did not contribute to the creation of *Nieuw Leven*.²⁴² One year after the start

His English friends sometimes comment on political issues, so I presume that Tiele also talked about the political situation. On delpher I found a petition on behalve of Finnish People. The Russian Emperor should respect all the rights of Finnish People. A number of Leiden professors signed the petition. Tiele was one of them: *Leeuwarder Courant*, July 6, 1899. Cossee, Molendijk, Barnard mentioned the disdain in which Tiele talked about the lower classes. One example can be found in an article in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* of 1873. In that article Tiele explained why the lower classes are scientifically not interesting. His basis argument is that the religious views of the lower classes don't differ between religions. For real religious development one should study the higher classes.

C.P. Tiele, *Over de geschiedenis der oude godsdiensten, haar methode, geest en belang*, in: *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 7, 1873, (573-589), 585.

²³⁶ *Verslag*, 1886, 6.

²³⁷ *Verslag*, 1887, 51-58.

²³⁸ *Verslag*, 1888, 35-36.

²³⁹ *Verslag der Achttiende Algemeene Vergadering van den Nederlandschen Protestantenvbond*, 1888 (1888), 48-51.

Verslag, 1887, 48-41. *Verslag*, 1889, 27-33.

²⁴⁰ During his presidency that was the committee on: *Godsdienstonderwijs en Godsdienstprediking*. *Verslag* 1886, list of committees on cover.

Delpher shows several of appointments. It's scientifically not interesting to present them as a footnote.

²⁴¹ *Verslag*, 1888, 4.

²⁴² *Verslag*, 1886, 26. *Verslag*, 1889, 4.

Nieuw Leven was a success. De Hervorming suffered because of this success.²⁴³ In the DLP Tiele met some people who were also active in the Remonstrant Brotherhood. One of them was J.H. Maronier. In 1900 the Remonstrant Brotherhood counted roughly the same amount of congregations compared to 1873 (27 to 27), but things had considerably changed since 1873. A lot of these changes were caused by the inflow of dissatisfied members of the Dutch Reformed Church.

The number of Remonstrant Brothers had risen from 5000 to 12000.²⁴⁴ This growth was not caused by a growing birth rate in the ranks of the Brotherhood, but was caused by the inflow of dissatisfied members of the Dutch Reformed Church. It was mentioned before, but after 1867 the orthodox-element in the Dutch Reformed Church was stronger than modern believers expected. A few options were open to these kinds of believers. They could have stayed in the Dutch Reformed Church, and form their own groups within this Church, or they could leave and join, for instance, the Remonstrant Brotherhood.

Between 1873 and 1902 Tiele was an important man in the Remonstrant Brotherhood. Being the Professor of the Brotherhood is comparable to being the ideological leader of this organisation. In his role as Professor Tiele was always a member of the Committee that controlled the affairs of the Seminary the "Collegie of Professor en Curatoren." In this period Tiele was, most of the time, a member of the Daily Board of the Brotherhood, the "Commissie tot de Zaken, or Sociëteits Commissie" as it was alternatively called. The only years Tiele was not in the Daily Board, were the years he had to periodically resign. The Daily Board ran the day-to-day affairs of the organisation. Tiele's friends Bok (until his death in 1889), and Maronier could, most of the times, be found in Collegie and Commissie tot de Zaken. For Bok it mattered a lot who was in, or out these committees. An example of this is a letter of 1886 to Tiele in which Bok writes that he wanted to keep the Collegie "friendly", or other words, he wanted friends in high places.²⁴⁵ To have friends in high places was also the reason that Bok wrote a letter to Tiele, asking him if he would like to join the Daily Board in December 1872/January 1873. The decision of the location of the Seminary still had to be taken at that time.²⁴⁶

²⁴³ Verslag 1889, 18.

²⁴⁴ Handelingen, 1865, Appendix not numbered, gives 5210 members in total. Barnard subtracted the nominal members (niet-ledematen).
Barnard, Leidsman, 63.

²⁴⁵ Letter from J.W. Bok to C.P. Tiele, May 18, 1886.

²⁴⁶ Letter from J.W. Bok to C.P. Tiele, December 3, 1872.

In Tiele's Leiden Years the Brotherhood opened up to the outside world. In 1866 a proposal to start new congregations in for instance Arnhem, and Dordrecht, was turned down.²⁴⁷ The (lip service) argument of the possible re-uniting and the cost aspect, were the main reasons not to go through with expanding the Brotherhood. In the mid-70's things changed. In 1877 a number of Remonstrant Brothers in Doesburg, supplemented by a number of dissatisfied members of the Dutch Reformed Church, sent a cry for help to the Remonstrant Brotherhood.²⁴⁸ Their appeal was put on hold for a couple of years. Only in 1884 the congregation of Doesburg became an official member of the Brotherhood. This long waiting period was not so much caused by ideological reasons, but by the fact that the number of believers in Doesburg was not very high. In the 1870's and 1880's the Daily Board of the Brotherhood was closing down a number of rural parishes like Moordrecht and Hazerswoude, and had the intention to liquidate Schoonhoven.²⁴⁹ Viewed from a business perspective this was the right thing to do, but emotionally -ideologically it must have been hard. These old parishes had belonged to the Brotherhood from its beginning in the 16th century. Abandoning old small parishes and starting new small parishes could have raised some eyebrows. The request of Doesburg was not rejected, but was in 1877 made part of a bigger investigation on what to do with groups who wanted to join the Remonstrant Brotherhood. Between 1877 and 1884 Doesburg had an experimental candidate-status. A joint congregation of Doesburg and Lochem was being discussed, but did not succeed.²⁵⁰ Doesburg's status was being evaluated annually. In 1884 there were still some doubts about the financial soundness of Doesburg. Tiele summarized the situation in the right way that the only thing the Central Meeting had to do was to decide if the Central Meeting wanted the Doesburg congregation to join the Brotherhood. The majority of the members present were in favour.²⁵¹

In 1878 Arnhem, yet again, knocked on the door of the Brotherhood. This time a group of believers, united around the Dutch Reformed but modern, minister Slotemaker, wanted to become a member. The number of believers in Arnhem was considerably bigger than the number in Doesburg, but to avoid a discussion on financial matters, Tiele, Bok and others started what we nowadays would call a crowd-funding action. After considerable discussions, Slotemaker wanted not only to join the Brotherhood, but also wanted to have a rather high salary and wanted to be free from Sunday service 25 weeks of the year. The Central Meeting accepted Arnhem's membership in 1878.²⁵² The

²⁴⁷ Handelingen, 1866, 86-87.

²⁴⁸ Handelingen, 1877, 58-70.

²⁴⁹ Barnard, Verstoten, 48-42. E.H. Cossee, Zoo wij iets sloopen, het is niet de godsdienst. Cornelis Petrus Tiele (1830-1902) als apologet van het Modernisme, in: Jaarboek voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands Protestantisme na 1800, 1, 1993, 17-31, 27. Barnard, Verstoten, 65.

²⁵⁰ Handelingen, 1881, 30-33.

²⁵¹ Handelingen, 1884, 86.

²⁵² Barnard, Verstoten, 57-61.

Central Meeting also approved a proposal of Slotemaker, deciding that new groups, with more than 200 members, could join the Brotherhood. The Central Meeting would take the decisions on the financial matters.²⁵³ This opened the door for, for instance, Groningen, Meppel, Lochem, Hoogeveen, and Doesburg. Members of the Daily Board would welcome these congregations, when they became an official member of the Brotherhood. In practice this meant that the opening sermons would be attended by or held by members of the Daily Board.²⁵⁴

In the beginning of the 1880's the entrance of new parishes did not mean that the Brotherhood completely opened up for new members. The sentiments of "re-joining the ranks of the Dutch Reformed Church" remained strong, but although they were never more than lip service, this argument was always used. In the leadership of the Brotherhood some differences of opinion must have existed. These differences also came to light when addressing the Central Meetings. Whereas Bok expressed the opinion, in 1881, that growing was one of the most important things for the Brotherhood to do,²⁵⁵ Tiele had expressed the conviction that the Brotherhood was small and would remain small for the time to come.²⁵⁶

Until 1884 expansion was still viewed from a defensive point of view. The Brotherhood would only expand if people were coming to them. Collaboration with other religious communities was not one of the strengths of the Brotherhood. The Brotherhood was not looking for active co-operation with spiritual allies like the Vrije Gemeenten or the DLP (it must be said that the DLP was not looking for active collaboration with the Brotherhood either). The Brotherhood only looked to others when it suited them, but when it not suited him.... So the Daily Board did not have a problem with the local branch of Doesburg when, in 1881, they used a church from the Mennonite congregation.²⁵⁷ When, in 1882, the Den Haag Brotherhood also allowed the Mennonite congregation in Den Haag to use the Remonstrant Church, the Daily Board was furious. The Daily Board wanted to prohibit this kind of behaviour. Even Tiele called this a wrong kind of tolerance. Only the new members of the Central Meeting, Slotemaker (Arnhem) and Mosselmans (Groningen) did not disapprove of the behaviour of the Brothers in Den Haag.²⁵⁸

²⁵³ Barnard, Verstoten, 63.

²⁵⁴ Bok did Lochem, Handelingen, 1882, 24.

²⁵⁵ Handelingen, 1881, 12.

²⁵⁶ Handelingen, 1882, 16.

²⁵⁷ Barnard, Verstoten, 157-158.

²⁵⁸ Barnard, Verstoten, 155-157.

Although the Brotherhood was not "hunting for proselytes" as the expression would go, after 1884 the Brotherhood looked for financial and-nonfinancial, means to enter the religious-market of (non)-believers. This also meant that Brothers who were not a member of an existing parish were taken care of. At first they could become a general member. This meant a change from the past, for in the old days these Brothers were advised to join Dutch Reformed (or other) congregations of their choice. Also a committee for Remonstrant Brothers in the Diaspora was formed. Originally it was even the intention to form, if possible, new congregations from these Brothers, but this intention was not really put in an operational form.²⁵⁹

The main protagonists for a more aggressive style on expanding the Brotherhood were to be found among the new members from Groningen (Mosselmans) and Arnhem (Slotemaker), but also people like Maronier, and Bok did not reject outright growth either.

In the 1870's and 1880's the Remonstrant Brotherhood became attractive to dissatisfied modern believers because after 1879 the Brotherhood changed its mission statement of 1861. In 1861 the old statement still referred to the Scripture(s) and reminded the outside world that the Brotherhood was a church, but in the new statement these words were left out. From 1879 onwards it was the aim of the Brotherhood "to promote the religious life, in freedom and tolerance, based on the Gospel of Jesus Christ."²⁶⁰ This was a clear sign to the orthodox members of the Brotherhood that things had considerably changed. For the orthodox minister of Waddinxveen, Van der Pot, this new declaration of the mission statement was enough not to come to the Central Meeting for the remainder of his life. The fact that churches could independently operate from the Daily Board, or Central Meeting, restricted the measures that could be taken against Van Der Pot.²⁶¹

As one of the strategies not to estrange the old Remonstrant Brothers from the new ideological course, and to stay (or become) attractive for new believers, Tiele combined old and new. The Remonstrant Brotherhood was the place for modern believers who wanted to practise their faith in freedom (compared to the un-free situation in the Dutch Reformed Church), and it was this same (modernist) spirit of freedom the founding fathers of the Brotherhood had when they constituted the Remonstrant Brotherhood. Tiele argued that if the founding fathers had lived today, they, naturally, would have been modern. The search for freedom was the linking-pin between the founding fathers and the modern believers. Tiele expressed this feeling at the celebration of the 250-

²⁵⁹ Barnard, Verstoten, 159-165.

²⁶⁰ Barnard, Verstoten, 61-76, 74.

²⁶¹ For Van der Pot, Barnard, Verstoten, 113-120.

year existence of the Remonstrant Seminary: freedom was the connection with the founding fathers.²⁶²

Some other orthodox members took a more realistic stand. Reverend De Ridder (sr) from The Hague argued that for him it was impossible to promote the Gospel of Jesus without using the Scriptures. For the Ridder talking about the Gospel of Jesus without using the Scriptures, was an impossible thing to do.²⁶³ The promotion of the religious life proved to be difficult in the Remonstrant Brotherhood. In some congregations the Brothers only wanted to hear a good sermon and would send their children to catechism and that was all. Some congregations took some measures, but an overall view was still lacking.²⁶⁴

The laws of 1879 declared that in every congregation the church council should provide for, at least once a year, the celebration of the Holy Communion. Baptism was not required for entering the Brotherhood. Groningen outright abolished Baptism and Holy Communion, but Lochem did keep the Holy Communion. This after a service held by Tiele.²⁶⁵ Lochem showed that even among the new members, differences in leaving old forms were evident.²⁶⁶ It also showed that Tiele did not object to the Holy Communion. But also in this respect, the complete picture still has to be drawn. It appears, by means of a quick scan, that some congregations tried to stimulate the formations of choirs, and the introduction of Sunday schools. This is understandable because in the religious field both orthodox and modern organisations (like DLP) were fishing in the pond of believers.

Most of the new congregations consisted of a number of dissatisfied Dutch Reformed believers and a couple of Remonstrant Brothers. In some of the new groups a (former) Dutch Reformed minister was the focal point of the group. These groups, and ministers, wanted to keep their Dutch reformed vicar. In theory (and practice) this was possible. The laws of the Brotherhood stipulated that, in the case of newly formed congregations, the reverend of choice did not have to be a Remonstrant (vicar, or student) at all. In Meppel that stipulation caused some problems in 1883. Meppel wanted Mr Heering as their preacher, after Mr Beyerman rejected Meppel's appeal. Meppel claimed that they could be considered to be a new parish, and that they therefore could, according to article 84, nominate Heering on the list of possible reverends. The majority of the Central Meeting did not agree with that interpretation of Article 84, paragraph 1, but decided that, on the basis of paragraph

²⁶² C.P. Tiele, *Gedenkrede bij het 250-jarig bestaan van het Seminarium der Remonstranten* uitgesproken op den 28 October 1884, (Leiden, 1884), 28-31.

²⁶³ Barnard, *Verstoten*, 77.

²⁶⁴ Barnard, *Verstoten*, 190-193.

²⁶⁵ *Handelingen*, 1882, 24.

²⁶⁶ Barnard, *Verstoten*, 185-190.

3, if the church council of Meppel would appoint Heering as their minister, Heering could be appointed. Meppel subsequently appointed Heering in 1883.²⁶⁷ In 1891 Groningen threatened to leave the Brotherhood, if they could not choose the minister they wanted.²⁶⁸ This threat showed that the newcomers had a different attitude towards the old Remonstrant Brotherhood.

More or less ideological issues did not always play a factor in the appointment of ministers from outside the Brotherhood. The fact of the old age of a number of reverend pastors at the end of the 1860's combined with the fact that the number of students at the seminary had been very low in the late 1860's and early 70's made the search for ministers outside the own brotherhood sometimes necessary. It was with the rise of the number of students, from the early '80s on, that the selection of new ministers was considered problematic for the students of the seminary. In 1892 the selection of new reverends from outside the Brotherhood was further restricted. In practice the selection of non-Brotherhood candidates was not impossible. In Gouda, four Remonstrant candidates turned down the appeal from the Gouda church council, so the possibilities for Gouda to recruit inside the Brotherhood were exhausted.²⁶⁹

Perhaps these restrictions had results because the growth of the seminary was put forward as the cause for the deficit in the budget for the Brotherhood in 1900.²⁷⁰ In Tiele's Leiden Years the Seminary was located in Leiden. The choice for Leiden, Tiele admitted in 1895, was motivated by the wish to get rid of Tideman. In the future, according to Tiele, the Seminary had to be relocated in Amsterdam. A place where it belonged.²⁷¹ THIS ACTUALLY HAPPENED IN 2013! Tiele was responsible for teaching at the Seminary, but after 1877 Tiele was not only teaching at the Seminary, but also at Leiden University. According to one of his students Tiele's true love was not the Seminary, but his scientific work at the university. In defence of Tiele, Barnard admits that the student in question was not of the same ideological disposition of Tiele.²⁷² In Tiele's defence also might be added the fact that the Handelingen in this period show that Tiele was on several occasions asking for student grants. For some students Tiele asked the Central Meeting for a number of years for their permission. The deficit of 1900 showed that Tiele was successful in this respect.²⁷³

The controversy surrounding the dismissal of Mr De Jong proved that Tiele perhaps was not too hard for his students. At his examination the exam-committee showed considerable doubts on the

²⁶⁷ Handelingen, 1883, 50.

²⁶⁸ Barnard, Verstoten, 126.

²⁶⁹ Barnard, Verstoten, 212.

²⁷⁰ Handelingen, 1900, 59.

²⁷¹ Barnard, Verstoten, 212.

²⁷² Barnard, Verstoten, 209.

²⁷³ Handelingen, 1900, 59.

intellectual capacities of the candidate. Tiele argued that De Jong should pass, basically because Tiele liked the student. Years later Tiele possibly regretted this decision. In 1897 the same De Jong argued, through a publication in the magazine *Uit de Remonstrantsche Bond*, that the modern religion based on the concept around the teaching of Jesus, was a constructed religion. This constructed religion, although worthwhile, was not, according to De Jong, Christian at all. De Jong wanted to abandon this concept and wanted to turn his direction to the love of God. De Jong's arguments caused some turmoil among the Remonstrant Brothers, and De Jong resigned from the pulpit. Tiele must have known about De Jong, but was not taking any measures. Tiele only comes into action after De Jong announced to continue preaching until a replacement had been found. According to Tiele this had to be prevented at all costs.²⁷⁴

This course of action might be considered to be of a *laissez-fair* style of leadership, it is also a consequence of his role as a Professor in the Brotherhood. It is the task of the leader to check if the members of the Brotherhood or the Brotherhood itself, are in compliance with its own rules. Therefore Tiele only can act if these rules were broken. In some discussions Tiele gives his advice how to interpret the rules. Another example in this respect is the discussion concerning the "real" name. In the Central Meeting of 1891 P. Heering raised the question if the name of a local branch of the Brotherhood was Remonstrant, of Remonstrant-Reformed. Tiele told Heering that the official name was Remonstrant-Reformed, and that he could not really be bothered about the name.²⁷⁵

In some cases reaction would not be effective. If the modernist movement was going to succeed, new rules had to be created. This happened in 1879 when the old mission statement of 1861 was drastically changed. Tiele and Bok can be considered to be the main authors of these new rules. The same can be said about the new rules concerning general members, and members in the Diaspora.

In this period a number of things changed in the Remonstrant Brotherhood. The Brotherhood definitively did choose a modernist direction. Old parishes were shut down, new parishes were welcomed into the Brotherhood. These new parishes were more "modern" than the old parishes. The new parishes wanted to get rid of older forms and were keener to bend the rules in their favour. It was Tiele's task to keep the Brotherhood together. In the long run he succeeded in doing so. Part of the success was the ability to make the Brotherhood attractive for "old" and "new" Brothers. For the "new", modern, believers the appeal to freedom, the freedom they could not find in the Dutch

²⁷⁴ Barnard, *Verstoten*, 174.

²⁷⁵ *Handelingen*, 1891, 85. Barnard, *Verstoten*, 220-223.

Reformed Church, was the main attraction. The "old" Brothers had to be convinced that the quest for freedom was what connected the founding fathers with modern day believers.

It is not necessary to separately discuss Tiele's activities on educational matters. His activities in this period have already been discussed.

It should be mentioned that Tiele was in his Leiden Years also a member of a number of Dutch, and Foreign, scientific organisations. In the Netherlands Tiele was a member of the KNAW (Royal Dutch Academy of the Sciences), since 1882.²⁷⁶ Tiele was also a member of the Hollandsche Maatschappij van Fraaije Kunsten in Wetenschappen. In 1889 this organisation was reorganised. The newspapers show that Tiele, and others, had formed some proposals for this reorganisation. The paper did not disclose the nature of Tiele's proposals.²⁷⁷

His interests in the developments in Asia still continued in this period. In his Leiden years Tiele was appointed by the Dutch Government to attend the International Congresses of Orientalists in Berlin (1881), London (1892), Genève (1894), Paris (1897) Rome (1899). In 1883 Leiden hosted this conference. Tiele was one of the organisers.²⁷⁸ Tiele may still have been interested in missionary activities in this period, but this did not get to the surface during this research.²⁷⁹

The odd one out in Tiele's activities seems to be his membership of the Dutch Cremation Society (DCS) ("Vereeniging voor Lijkverbranding"). Founded in 1874 its main aim was to promote the introduction of cremation by law in the Netherlands.²⁸⁰ The Burial Act of 1869 only allowed the burial of corpses, so people who would like to get rid of their corpse in another way had a problem. The realisation of the aim of the DCS took a long number of years. The first semi-legal cremation on Dutch soil took place in 1914, but only in the 1950's law allowed cremation. In 1913 the chairman of the DCS reflected at the end of its 38th annual meeting on its long history and had the following remark: "all the members of the National Board were cremated (probably in Germany, which was a common thing to do, AK) but one."²⁸¹ That one was most probably Tiele, because he had been member of the National Board of the DCS, was one of its honorary members, and was buried in

²⁷⁶ De Standaard, June 14, 1882.

²⁷⁷ Nvdd, Kleine Courant, October 8, 1889. Other members in this committee were mr. Perk, and mister Laurillard.

²⁷⁸ Nvdd: September 14, 1883 April 4, 1894; October 10, 1897. Ah, February 21, 1897. Staatscourant: November 8, 1886; September 16, 1892; November 11, 1894. Bataviaasch Nieuwsblad, May 2th, 1899. Rn, September 10, 1881.

²⁷⁹ A lucky google hit showed: De Egypte-Cent maandblaadje der Kinder-Zendingsvereeniging 'Egypte'... onder vaste medewerking van verscheidene godgeleerden (C.P. Tiele). But further research wasn't succesfull as yet.

²⁸⁰ Statuten, Algemeen Reglement en Tarief der Vereeniging voor Lijkverbranding (Den Haag, 1874), 3.

²⁸¹ Nvdd, Kleine Courant, 27-09-1913. Interesting enough Tiele didn't put down money in the fund reserved for cremation on the expense of the DCS. Although the names of their members were not given, the birth date of Tiele couldn't be found.

Leiden.²⁸² This to the dismay of the DCS who put at an obituary that Tiele used to be a warm promoter for its cause.²⁸³

In a predominantly Christian society of 19th century Holland, the burning of corpses was controversial. The presence, and membership, of a Remonstrant minister, at that time the Professor, and ideological leader, of a Christian denomination, was at least remarkable. How Tiele got acquainted with the DCS is unknown. Perhaps Tiele just joined some of his friends. The member list of 1879 showed some names of the Remonstrant part of the Rotterdam elite (for instance the Van Vollenhoven-family), whom Tiele must have known from his Rotterdam years.²⁸⁴ Or perhaps Tiele just joined his brother P.A. Tiele, who also was a member of the DCS, or at least its Leiden Branch.²⁸⁵ Or maybe his brother J.J. Tiele had something to do with it.²⁸⁶ The main reason for Tiele's joining may have been an aesthetic one, for the common thing to do is to cite his speech on the 1878 meeting. Tiele told the audience that he did not want to be buried, because he did not want to join the worms' feast. The horrific sight of worms that cover the half rotten body, their nibbling of the heart, their crawling out the eye-sockets, was disgusting in his eyes.²⁸⁷

Tiele was elected, as part of the, rather extensive, National Board in 1876, but he never was a member of the Daily Board of the DCS.²⁸⁸ The Tiele brothers may have been the founding fathers of the Leiden Branch in 1875, as P.A. Tiele took charge of its administrative affairs in 1875. The branch was officially recognized in 1876 and counted 68 members.²⁸⁹ Between 1876 and 1890 his presence on a national level is barely noticeable in the *Berichten en Mededelingen*. Tiele presided over the national meeting twice, in 1878 and 1887, but as in the Remonstrant Brotherhood every year different people were chosen.²⁹⁰ In 1878 Tiele also was part of the committee who had to select the winner in a prize contest concerning articles on the subject of cremation. This was an easy job. The committee received only one article..... No prize was given though, the article was, according to the committee, written in a style not suitable to raise the interest of a general public.²⁹¹ Tiele announced

²⁸² Molendijk, *Heritage*, 85.

²⁸³ Molendijk, *maar ook Berichten*, 1901, 41. (were printed in 1902)

²⁸⁴ *Berichten* 1879, 20 and onwards.

²⁸⁵ *Berichten*, 1876, 56-57.

²⁸⁶ *Berichten*, 1879, 26. All 3 were buried though.

²⁸⁷ Also in Molendijk, *Heritage*, 79, and *Berichten*, 1878, 14-15.

²⁸⁸ The first national board consisted of 18 members. *Berichten en Mededeelingen der Vereeniging voor Lijkverbranding*. Eerste jaargang 1876. Tweede jaargang 1877. (1877), Eerste jaargang 6-7.

²⁸⁹ *Berichten*, 1876, 56-57.

²⁹⁰ In contrast to the Brotherhood the president was chosen from the members of the National Board. *Berichten*, 1878. In 1887 Tiele opened the meeting in the Tiele style: He wanted to keep the introduction short and wanted to get on with it. *Berichten*, 1887, no 4, 82.

²⁹¹ *Berichten*, 1878, 21-24.

at the national meeting of 1878 that he did not want to be re-elected, and therefore left the Board in that same year.²⁹² In 1886, however, Tiele reappeared in the National Board. He presumably left the board in 1889 and was made an honourable member in 1890.²⁹³

Tiele still was an active member of the Leiden Branch until at least 1890. He was member of the Local Board, with the exception of a short period in 1883-1884.²⁹⁴ His activities seem to have been limited, but had perhaps nothing to do with Tiele himself, but with the activities of the DCS in its early stages. In 1878 The National Board was accused of being lazy. Perhaps the critics were right and the activities of the DCS in those days remained more or less limited to writing the yearly appeal to the King, to ask for a change in the Burial Act of 1869, and asking the members for their yearly membership fee. (Although the National Board replied they were also busy with collecting the necessary funds to be able to build a crematory).²⁹⁵ It was hard for the DCS to get a great number of followers. On a national and local level the number of members decreased in the 1870's and 1880's. In Leiden the number of members also dropped from 69 in 1876 to 25 in 1882. The level only significantly increased after a reduction of the membership fee (from 2 guilders to 1, 50 a year) in 1889.²⁹⁶

In retrospect the Leiden Years were the glory days of Tiele. He became a (inter) nationally respected scholar. Tiele also rose to prominence in the Remonstrant Brotherhood after his appointment as Professor of the Brotherhood in 1873. Tiele and his friends moved the Brotherhood into modernist directions. Outside the Brotherhood Tiele was involved in modernist movements like the Group of Modern Theologians and the DLP. Tiele was still interested in educational matters and matters in relation to the developments in the East. His interest in the affairs of the DCS was a new and, surprising, element in list of activities. Tiele was also an elected member in scientific and literary committees. Tiele was also still active as a poet. In this period some of his hymns were selected for the hymnal of the DLP. His literary activities are, however, a matter for another thesis.

2.3.4 Kotter on Tiele

²⁹² Berichten, 1878, 28.

²⁹³ Berichten 1890 wasn't accessible at the time of my research. Berichten, 1901, 41.

²⁹⁴ Tiele out: Berichten 1883, no 3, 68. Tiele in: Berichten, 1884, 3.

²⁹⁵ Berichten, 1878, 8-9.

²⁹⁶ Berichten, 1889, no 4. Increase to 168 members. (63 ordinary (gewoon), 105 extra-ordinary (buitengewoon)).

After presenting the life and activities of C.P. Tiele the time has come to ask the question if C.P. Tiele was Leading Change? Before this question can be answered the 8 elements of Kotter will be applied. Because Tiele's activities took place in a number of fields and organisations the steps are replaced by the term elements.

The first element: creating a sense of urgency

According to Kotter creating a sense of urgency is necessary to make people aware of the problems at hand. In some area's Tiele was certainly working hard to show people what was on his mind. Tiele discussed the matters of modernism, mostly in the 1860's, in articles in different kinds of magazines and in his own publications. Tiele did not stop at publishing only; in the 1850's he started the, short-lived, magazine Sign of the Times. In the Remonstrant Brotherhood Tiele worked, from the 1870's onwards, to keep modernism on the minds of his fellow Brethren. Tiele really struck a nerve in the late fifties by starting with Sign of the times. In the DLP, in his sermons²⁹⁷, and in his speeches in the Remonstrant Brotherhood Tiele, at times, told people that being modern was necessary. His activities in the Group of Modern Theologians need some more research.

In the field of science of religion Tiele also made use of publications. Not only by writing his own material, like Outlines, but also by discussing books in De Gids, or in the Theologisch Tijdschrift. From the 1870's onward Tiele also gained international respect, and was getting known. His work was translated, and published in books and international papers. Some people took the difficulty to learn Dutch in order to understand his work (and that of others in the Theologisch Tijdschrift). These publications took a considerable amount his time. Tiele also was invited to different kind of congresses. His invitation to the Gifford lectures was the ultimate reward for his scientific efforts. His installation as the first Lecturer in the Science of Religion in the Netherlands, in 1877, can also be considered as a success of his efforts.

Tiele also shared his views on education, mainly, by using publications. Perhaps his views on education and the publication of a concept-program on comparative religion led also to his installation as a Leiden Professor. It is hard to say something about the impact of Tiele's opinions on missionary activities in the East. In the DCL Tiele only spoke about the matter of cremation at the time he was presiding its annual central meetings. His activities as a member in the Leiden Branch of the DCL are to be researched.

²⁹⁷ Before 1873, because Tiele basically stopped being a preacher from the time he started to work in Leiden.

The second element: building a guiding coalition

In his circle, he appeared to be able to be the right man in the right place. In the Remonstrant Brotherhood he was considered a Remonstrant talent in his student years. Tiele moved from a relatively small congregation in Moordrecht to the most important congregation of the Brotherhood, Rotterdam. In the yearly Central Meetings of the Remonstrant Brotherhood he met his peers. In the 1860's his presence is really noted in the *Handelingen*. Things change from the 1870's onward. Tiele, together with people like Maronier and Blok (people he must have met in his student years), successfully steer the Brotherhood in a modernist direction.

In the late 1850's Tiele worked together with the leading modernists Busken Huet and Allard Pierson with the publication of *Teekenen* (Signs). Tiele stayed in touch with the developments on modernist thought by participating in the Group of Modern Theologians.

His publications on the science of religions led Tiele to the formation of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*. In this magazine leading scientists, for example Kuenen and Rauwenhoff, published their views on matters concerning the science of the history of religion. People he also later on met in the University. The international, European and North American, scientific community respected Tiele for his views. Through his publications and his correspondence Tiele was a leading figure in scientific discussions. Tiele was strong on his views. Tiele could not come to terms with Müller and Chantepie de La Saussaye. It is argued that Tiele's views were out-dated at the time of his death and that he did not have any followers (with regard to his scientific views). Perhaps it is interesting to follow up on this.²⁹⁸ Tiele's activities at the university, and his relationship to the other editors of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, were not part of this research.

Joining the boards of the DLP and DCS is also a sign that other people noted Tiele. Tiele does not seem to have been present at the meetings of the DLP when he was not a part of the national board. Most probably friends or acquaintances put him forward for this board.²⁹⁹ In the DCS Tiele also became part of the national board. Tiele certainly came in the position to form a guiding coalition, so this element is certainly present.

²⁹⁸ In what way was there a lasting influence on his students I wondered.

²⁹⁹ Kuenen, Rauwenhoff and Maronier also participated in the DLP.

The third element: developing a vision and strategy (initiatives)

On the element of vision Tiele was very strong in developing a kind of vision. The foundations of his thinking were laid in the (late) 1850's and 1860's. His modernist thoughts were shaped through articles and were finalized in *De Godsdienst der Liefde* (1868). His views on the science of religion started in the early 60's and were finalized in his Gifford lectures. Tiele also published his views on education.

Writing articles and/or starting magazines can certainly be regarded as an initiative in this sense. It is harder to look at the initiatives in organisations like the DLP, and the DCS. Researching this should require a follow up; checking the minutes of the Central Meeting(s) is not enough in this sense. Some of this has to do with the nature of the organisations Tiele worked for and in. Most of them consisted of a National Board and Local Branches. In these organisations the local branches were more or less independent, and the possibility for the National Board to change something was rather limited. His investigations concerning the state of affairs of religious education in the DLP showed that Tiele was willing to take some kind of activities. Tiele also showed this ability to have a vision and to take the initiative in the Remonstrant Brotherhood. According to Barnard he was one of the leading architects behind the modernist move of the Brotherhood. On a national level Tiele took the initiative when the laws of the Brotherhood were changed in the 1870's. Like the other organisations the power of the National Board of the Remonstrant Church was limited. The local Churches remained independent, and as the case of Waddinxveen showed, could not be forced to become a modernist congregation.

The fourth element: communicating the message

With regard to communication in general step one already showed that Tiele was communicating his messages on different subjects through speech, books, articles, reviews and the like. His international correspondence also shows that people Tiele reacted upon also reacted towards Tiele. Kotter also mentions in *Leading Change* that this element (or in his word step) is necessary to create an army of volunteers to support the change. This element was not researched. It would be hard to measure the influence of Tiele's communication efforts. Talking about the science of religions it is possible to research how his peers received his ideas. At first sight the outcome would be negative. The assumption is that Tiele's scientific ideas did not support any following, but this (still) has to be investigated.

The Fifth Element: Removing Obstacles in the Process of Change and Creating More Support

It is again through his publications that Tiele wanted to remove obstacles in the process of change. The quick disappearance of Teekenen showed that Tiele himself was not always successful in this respect. Perhaps the publisher was to blame, but the case of Trübner has shown that commercial publishers (presumably) only wanted to make money and were not interested in the idealistic background of the writers.

Tiele's activities in the Remonstrant Brotherhood showed that from the 1870's onwards he was trying to remove obstacles in his effort to create a modern denomination.

But Tiele was not always in favour of change. In the DLP Tiele at one time blocked the process of change. The DLP wanted to broaden its scope and also wanted to pay attention to the Social Issue (Sociale Kwestie). Tiele wanted the DLP to be a religious organisation, but he was not successful in his attempts. But, it must be said; a year later he showed that he listened to the majority who wanted the DLP to broaden its scope.

Tiele (and Bok) successfully removed two main obstacles in the Remonstrant Brotherhood. They relocated the Seminary to Leiden. With that move they connected the education of new ministers with modern points of view. The abolition of the mission statement of 1861 in the year 1879 made the Brotherhood more attractive for dissatisfied believers in the Dutch Reformed Church.

The Sixth element: Celebrating Success, and Generating Short Term Wins

The nature of the organisations Tiele was working for made it possible to celebrate success on a regular basis. Every year DLP, DSC and Remonstrant Brotherhood reflected on developments within these organisations. When he was presiding the annual central meetings it was his role to celebrate the successes (and failures) of the organisations. When Tiele was part of the Commissie tot de Zaken in the Remonstrant Brotherhood, or presiding the Committee of Professor and Curators, Tiele had to account for these failures or successes himself. In the Brotherhood Tiele held a speech on a number of special occasions. Tiele spoke for instance during the celebration of 250 years of the Brotherhood, or the installation of the parish of Arnhem as part of the Remonstrant Brotherhood.

The Seventh element: Sustaining and accelerating change

This element can in a more practical manner be found in Tiele's activities in the Remonstrant Brotherhood. In short it can be argued that Tiele sustained change the entire period he had a

leading role in the Remonstrant Brotherhood. In the 70's and '80 he had big influence on the modernisation of this denomination. Accelerating the change proved to be difficult.

In an abstract way Tiele was sustaining the views on the methods of the science of religion through his publications and communication with the outside world.

Kotter made an implementation part of the 7th step/element. The implementation plan is a 20th/21st century invention, and could not be part of the research.

In the Remonstrant Brotherhood Tiele both sustained and accelerated change, but also hindered radical change. Tiele certainly wanted the Brotherhood to be a modern denomination, but within limits. New groups could enter the Brotherhood, but the Brotherhood was not, in his eyes, going to hunt for proselytes. Tiele, and Bok, created the sub-class of General Members, but were not in favour of building new congregations out of the Brothers in the Diaspora. Tiele sustained the modern element, but hindered radical, accelerated, change.

The eighth element: Changing the culture

In Kotter's theory this step was meant to be the last step. For Kotter all other 7 steps had to be taken, before looking at cultural aspects. Even when this step is applied to business only, this is difficult to maintain considering the fact that Tiele was working in, or working for, organisations Mintzberg labelled as missionary organisations. In these organisations spreading culture was their main reason to exist. Only the fact that Kotter is used in a more abstract sense, and the steps are replaced by elements the order of elements shouldn't be worried about.

In modernism Tiele, at first, did not only want to change the culture of a company. It can be said that he wanted to change the culture of the land. He wanted to convince people that modernism was the only way for religion to survive in his day and age. In a sense the same can be said about the science of the history of religions. At first Tiele wanted to convince his peers that the only true science of the history of religion was the one that was based on facts.

Looking at the organisations Tiele was working in, or showed activities in, only something useful can be said about his activities in the Remonstrant Brotherhood. Tiele and his modernist friends actively wanted to change the self-contained-orthodox kind of denomination into a modern "community. From his rise to power in 1873 Tiele and his friends, successfully changed the culture of the Remonstrant Brotherhood. The Brotherhood became a modern community that wanted to get rid of old traditions (baptism, Holy Communion and the like). The change in company culture was accomplished by changing the regulations of the Brotherhood. In the 1870's the Brotherhood was no longer a Christian organisation in the old sense, but an organisation based on the teachings of Jesus. In theory the Brotherhood still was, as an organisation that promoted freedom of thought, open for more orthodox opinions, but that was only in theory. The orthodox element "died" with the death of reverend Van der Pot of Waddinxveen. This change of culture was also accomplished by stimulating the growth of the Brotherhood. In 1857 and 1868 the founding of new congregations was not allowed by the old guard, but in the 1870's the new guard actively sought expansion of the Brotherhood. They opened the organisation for groups who were not happy about the developments in the Dutch Reformed Church. As a result of this the Remonstrant Brotherhood got new congregations in Arnhem, Groningen, Meppel, and the like. This did not mean that the Brotherhood was overrun, in numbers, by the new parishes. The Brotherhood remained a small denomination. In 1863 the Handelingen showed 26 parishes. The Handelingen of 1896 showed the same amount of congregations. Six (24%) parishes were new, 6 parishes had disappeared. Some of the new parishes

were formed in places where Remonstrants had been asking to become a new community (Arnhem and Amersfoort). It is true that the number of Remonstrants grew from 5210 members in 1854 to circa 12000 in 1900, but the "old" parishes Rotterdam and Amsterdam showed the biggest growth rate.³⁰⁰

Leading Change?

Perhaps it sounds a bit hard, and strange, but in the end Kotter's theory made it possible to integrate (almost) all of activities of Tiele in one piece. It made it possible to look independently at Tiele. This meant in practice that it enabled to look at Tiele from a non-religious modernist Remonstrant viewpoint.

The question if, and in what way, Tiele is to be considered as Leading Change in the sense Kotter defined it, is difficult to answer. Tiele was particularly strong in creating and communicating his ideas. Tiele found himself in several leading coalitions. (Although in Holland these coalitions seem to have been restricted to the modernists).

The nature of the organisations he was working for made it possible to celebrate success on a regular (yearly) basis. Tiele certainly wanted to change the culture when talking about modernism. In his scientific work he wanted to change the scientific method.

His activities in the Remonstrant Brotherhood showed that Tiele was ready, on a national level, to remove the obstacles he was faced with. More support was created through opening up the Brotherhood for (new) modernist believers. In the Brotherhood Tiele sustained the modernist thought in the entire period 1873-1902. In the DLP Tiele at one time blocked the process of change. The DLP wanted to broaden its scope and also wanted to pay attention to the Social Issue (Sociale Kwestie). Tiele wanted the DLP to be a religious organisation, but he was not successful in his attempts.

Taking all matters in consideration the conclusion is granted that Tiele can be considered to be a man in favour of Leading Change, but in a moderate way.

³⁰⁰ When you look at the financial side of things one can argue that the amount of money that was generated by the Remonstrant Brotherhood didn't dramatically change. Perhaps the parishes opened up for the lower classes? Even the amount of money the old parishes generated didn't rise significantly.

3.0 Reflection

Implications for the theory/method used

Looking back on the project I still find it challenging to apply modern business concepts to historical problems. In this case it was the use of the 20th century concept of Leading Change on a 19th century person. The concept was adjusted a little so that Kotter's concept was not narrowed down to people successfully changing a company, but to, more or less, a domain in which change occurred over a long period of time. I think that adjusting a theory or concept is always a good thing. As a concept or a model is only a reflection on reality this reflection can always be altered. I also think it a good thing to use models from other disciplines into the field of religion (or vice versa) to (try to) enrich our knowledge. Furthermore I think it is wise to treat religious institutions just as any other (non)-profit organisations.

Doing historical research always implies the availability of the sources. Sometimes a researcher thinks that this is an era of information overflow (due to digitalisation of the sources), but at the end all the digitalised material sometimes really do not answer all the questions. In future education the skills of analysing the (non)-available overload data, and checking the reliability of the sources may become a problem. Time-management is certainly an issue here. And when digitalisation does not help one still has to rely on his or her social skills to seduce the employees of the archives to look even further. In the archives a big load of material has to be digitalized however. Using the municipal records proved to shed some light on basic questions of family life, social status and income. As an outsider in the archive world it is sometimes hard to discover that the different archives in the Netherlands are digitalizing their records in quite different manners. I think that, but I could be mistaken, more collaboration is useful.

Suggestions for further studies

On the subject of C.P. Tiele the complete analysis of his (international) correspondence might give a full insight of the strengths of Tiele's (international) network.³⁰¹ Molendijk gives a kind of overview of the Tiele letters that are available.³⁰² Tiele wrote to English Unitarian ministers, German Assyriologists, French and Dutch Theologians and the like. While reading (some of) Tiele's letters I found out that some people (for instance Rhys Davis) acted as an intermediary between the group connected with Max Müller and the group connected with Tiele. It would be interesting to see if there are sub-groups at work. The only challenge is that a researcher must have good eyes, lots of spare time, and must be able to read Dutch, English, French and German at the same time. But maybe as a collaboration project between researchers some tasks can be divided. Strenski wrote about Tiele's influence on the Révilles in France, perhaps Tiele's letters can highlight this influence even further.³⁰³

On the person of C.P. Tiele it would be nice if we could read his side of the story that means the return letters he wrote, that would things even more interesting. For we are really still talking about Tiele through the eyes of others and not through his own eyes. Perhaps another researcher has to go on a fact-finding mission.

³⁰¹ I don't claim to have read all Tiele's letters. Much is to be uncovered.

³⁰² Molendijk, *Heritage*, 93 and further.

³⁰³ I. Strenski, *Theology and the First Theory of Sacrafice*, Leiden 2003.

Used Materials

Archives

Erfgoed Leiden (Municipal Archive of Leiden)

Rotterdamse Archiefdienst (Municipal Archive of Rotterdam)

Stadsarchief Amsterdam (Municipal Archive of Amsterdam)

Sources

Berichten en Mededeelingen der Vereeniging voor Lijkverbranding (1874-1890)

Handelingen van de Algemeene Vergadering van de Remonstrantse Broederschap

Verslag van den Staat en de Werkzaamheden van het Nederlandschen Protestantenvbond en
Handelingen der <number> Algemeene Vergadering

www.Delpher.nl

Letters to C.P. Tiele from: W.F. Warren, J.W. Bok, J. Estlin Carpenter, F.H. Rausch, C. Bezold, J.
Ballingal, M. Müller, J. B. Wockatz

Adressbooks of Leiden

Teekenen des Tijds (1858-1859)

Christelijke Volks-Almanak (1856-1862)

Theologisch Tijdschrift

Newspapers

Haagsche Courant (hc)

De Standaard

De Tijd

Leydsche Courant (lc)

Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant (nrc)

Nieuws van de Dag, Kleine Courant (nvdd-kc)

Rotterdamsche Courant (rc)

Rotterdams Nieuwsblad (rn)

De Locomotief, Samarangsch Handels en Advertentieblad

Algemeen Handelsblad (ah)

Opregte Haarlemsche Courant (ohc)

Het Vaderland

Bataviaas Handelsblad

Literature

V. Baar, De collectie J.J. Tiele, (w.p., w.t.), 317-318, 319. Found on the internet, consulted 12-07-2017

T. Barnard, Tiele als leidsman van de Remonstrantse Broederschap, in: : E.H. Cossee en H.D. Tjalma, Geloof en Onderzoek. Uit het leven en werk van C.P. Tiele, (Rotterdam, 2002), 51-64.

T. Barnard, Van 'verstoten kind' tot belijdende kerk. De Remonstrantse Broederschap tussen 1850 en 1940 (From Abandoned Child to Professing Church. The Remonstrant Brotherhood between 1850 and 1940). (Amsterdam, 2006).

T. Barnard, Hoe Het Is, Hoe het Was en Hoe Het Zo geworden is. De Remonstrantse Gemeente Rotterdam van 1850 tot 2000 (The Rotterdam Remonstrant Brotherhood from 1850 until 2000). (How it is, How it was, and How it came to be), in: T. Barnard, E. Cosse, ed., Arminianen in de Maasstad. De Remonstrantse Gemeente Rotterdam. (Arminians in Rotterdam. The Remonstrant Brotherhood Rotterdam), (Amsterdam, 2008), 63-114.

M. Buitenwerf-Van der Molen, God van Vooruitgang. De popularisering van het modern-theologische gedachtegoed in Nederland, (Hilversum, 2007).

P.K. Chantepie de la Saussaye, Methodologische bijdrage tot het onderzoek naar den oorsprong van den godsdienst. (Utrecht, 1871).

E.H. Cossee, Zoo wij iets sloopen, het is niet de godsdienst. Cornelis Petrus Tiele (1830-1902) als apologieet van het Modernisme, in: Jaarboek voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands Protestantisme na 1800, 1, 1993, 27-51.

E.H. Cossee, Cornelis Tiele als Rotterdams Predikant (Cornelis Tiele's life as a Rotterdam Remonstrant Minister) (1856-1873), in: in: E.H. Cossee and H.D. Tjalsma, Geloof en Onderzoek. Uit het Leven en Werk van C.P. Tiele (1832-1902), (Rotterdam, 2002), (9-22).

H. Van Dijk, Rotterdam, 1810-1880. Aspecten van een Stedelijke Samenleving, (Schiedam, 1976),

H. van Dijk, Het negentiende-eeuwse stadsbestuur. Continuïteit of verandering, in P.B.M. Blaas and J. van Herwaarden (ed.): Stedelijke naijver. De betekenis van interstedelijke conflicten in de geschiedenis. Enige beschouwingen en case-studies, (Den Haag, 1986), (128-149),

P.A. de Génestet, Nagelaten Brieven (1976). Url:

http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/gene002cmve01_01/gene002cmve01_01_0098.php. Consulted July-August 2017.

Hoofdbestuur van de Nederlandsche Protestantenbond, De Nederlandsche Protestantenbond 1870-1895. Uitgegeven door het Hoofdbestuur bij gelegenheid van het 25-jarig jubile van den Nederlandschen Protestantenbond.(1895).

M.J. Janse, De Geschiedenis van de Maatschappij tot Nut van den Javaan. (1866-1877). Waarheid voor Nederland, regtvaardigheid voor Java (Utrecht, 1999).

C. De Jong, Twee eeuwen Nederlandse zendingsopleiding. Van NZG tot HKI 1797-1999, (w.p./w.d), 1-53, 22. Consulted on www.cfgdejong.nl, July 31, 2017.

A.J. Keemink, To WRP or not to WRP that's the question. Unpublished final assignment for the course East-West Confrontations, (Schiedam, 2016).

J.P. Kotter, Leiderschap bij verandering (21rd edition, Den Haag, 2015)

E.F. Kruijff, Geschiedenis van het Nederlandsche Zendinggenootschap en zijne Zendingsposten. (Groningen, 1894).

Th. M. van Leeuwen, C.P. Tiele als modern Theoloog, in: E.H. Cossee en H.D. Tjalma, Geloof en Onderzoek. Uit het leven en werk van C.P. Tiele, (Rotterdam, 2002), 41-50.

H. Mintzberg, B. Ahlstrand, J. Lampel, Op strategie-safarie. Een Rondleiding door de Wildernis van Strategisch Management. (Strategy safari. A Guided Tour Through the Wilds of Strategic Management), (Schiedam, 1999)

A.L. Molendijk, The Heritage of C.P. Tiele, in: Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis 1, 78-114.

A.L. Molendijk, Cornelis Petrus Tiele en de Godsdienstwetenschap, in: E.H. Cossee en H.D. Tjalma, Geloof en Onderzoek. Uit het leven en werk van C.P. Tiele, (Rotterdam, 2002), 23-40.

A.L. Molendijk, Tiele on Religion, *Numen*, Vol 46, (Leiden,1999), 237-267.

A.L. Molendijk, C.P. Tiele's Paradigm of Science of Religion, *Numen*, Vol. 51, (Leiden, 2004), 321-351.

A.L. Molendijk, *The emergence of the science of religion in the Netherlands* (Numen book series. Studies in the history of religions CV; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2005).

T. Msuzawa, *The invention of world religions, or, How European universalism was preserved in the language of pluralism*, (Chicago, 2005).

M. Müller, *The life and letters of the right letters of the honorable Max Müller edited by his wife in two volumes*, (London, 1902).

M. Nijhoff, *Levensbericht van Dr. P.A. Tiele*, in: *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde*, 1889. (1889) (136-180), 136.

J.J. van Oosterzee, *Levensbericht van Martinus Cohen Stuart*, in: *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde 1879* (1879), (105-136).

W. Otterspeer, *Het Bolwerk van de Vrijheid. De Leidse Universiteit in Heden en Verleden*, (Leiden, 2008).

I. Strenski, *Theology and the First Theory of Sacrafice*, Leiden 2003.

C.P. Tiele, *De oorsprong der mythologie*. Max Müller, *Lectures on the science of language*. Second series. London, 1864. F.W.L. Schwartz, *Der Ursprung der Mythologie dargelegt an griechischer und deutscher Sage*. Berlin, 1860. F.W.L. Schwartz, *Sonne, Mond and Sterne, ein Beitrag zur Mythologie und Culturgeschichte der Urzeit*. Berlin, 1864, in: *De Gids*, Jaargang 29, 1865, 1-33. (the download showed 568)

C.P. Tiele, *Feestrede op het derde eeuwfeest van Leidens ontzet, den 3en October 1874 in de Pieterskerk gehouden* (1874).

C.P. Tiele, *De ware verlichting: toespraak gehouden in de Remonstrantsche Gemeente te Rotterdam*. (1868).

C.P. Tiele, *De godsdienst der liefde geschetst* (1868)

C.P. Tiele, *De nieuwe geest des Evangelies in zijne werking en eischen: vijf preken.* (1865)

C.P. Tiele, *De Génestet*, in: *Christelijke Volks-Almanak*, vol 17, 1862, 1-24

C.P. Tiele, *Een probleem der godsdienstwetenschap.*

Max Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Religion*. *Fraser's Magazine* April-July 1870. Fritz Schultze, *Der Fetischismus. Eine Beitrage zur Anthropologie und Religionsgeschichte*. Leipzig, 1871, in: *De Gids*, Jaargang 35 (1871), (98-28).

C.P. Tiele, *Literarisch Overzicht*, in: *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 1869, 3, (86-91).

C.P. Tiele, *De Hindusche godsdiensten in den Oost-Indischen archipel*, in: *Vaderlandsche Letteroefeningen*. Jaargang 1866 (1866), (819-846).

C.P. Tiele, *Een pleidooi tegen de moderne richting*. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Leven en Rigting*. Vier voorlezingen over godsdienstige vraagstukken van dezen tijd. Rotterdam, 1865, in: *De Gids*. Jaargang 29, 1865 (1865), 227-244.

C.P. Tiele, *Ziekteverschijnsel en levensteeken.*

Oude grieven en nieuwe bewijzen ten aanzien van de Evangelische zending, door S.E. Harthoorn, Oud-zendingeling. Haarlem, A.C. Kruseman, 1864, in: *De Tijdspiegel*, Jaargang 21, 1864 (1864), 370-380.

C.P. Tiele, *Godsdienstwetenschap en wijsbegeerte in het jongste ontwerp van Wet op het Lager onderwijs*, in *De Gids*, Jaargang 33, 1869 (1869), 121-138.

C.P. Tiele, *Twaalf Preken*, (Amsterdam, 1873).

C.P. Tiele, (Boekbespreking), *Het belang van de studie der godsdiensten voor de kennis van het Christendom*. Redevoering uitgesproken bij de inwijding van den Leerstoel voor de Geschiedenis der godsdiensten aan de Universiteit te Amsterdam, door Dr. P.D. Chantepie De La Saussaye, in: *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 13, 1879, 418-423.

C.P. Tiele, Religions, 1-23, 6. To be found at: <http://www.1902encyclopedia.com/r/rel/religions.html>.

B. De Vries, Electoraat en Elite. Sociale Sociale Mobiliteit in Amsterdam 1850-1895, (Amsterdam, 1986)