

# JBTS

VOLUME 6 | ISSUE 2

JOURNAL OF  
BIBLICAL AND  
THEOLOGICAL  
STUDIES



HERMAN BAVINCK (1854-1921)  
A CENTENARY CELEBRATION

Encyclopedia Bavinck: The Case of the History  
of the Theological Encyclopedia  
*by Gregory Parker Jr.*

# Encyclopedia Bavinck: The Case of the History of the Theological Encyclopedia

GREGORY PARKER JR.

*Gregory Parker Jr. is a Ph.D. student in Systematic Theology at the University of Edinburgh, New College, Mound Place, Edinburgh, UK. He is a co-editor and co-translator of Herman Bavinck's The Sacrifice of Praise (Hendrickson, 2019) and Guidebook for Instruction in the Christian Religion (Hendrickson, 2022).*

## Introduction

A familiar scene in the kids' books *Encyclopedia Brown* is the arrival home of the befuddled chief of police, Mr. Brown. He is troubled by a case. His son Leroy "Encyclopedia" Brown takes up the case that is puzzling his father. The cases are often worked out on account of some sort of wide-ranging trivia type knowledge that Leroy has gathered. "Encyclopedia" Brown's encyclopedic knowledge is how he garnered his nickname. In modern parlance this is often how we think of the encyclopedia. It is a distended dictionary of sorts, swelling with far too much information. Alternatively, many think of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* sitting somewhere in their parent's homes sold to them by a travelling salesman years ago. This picture or understanding of the encyclopedia as strictly a set of information is novel to the twentieth century.<sup>1</sup>

In the nineteenth century, the theological encyclopedia was an indispensable tool in the toolbox of the student of theology.<sup>2</sup> Bavinck perceived the theological encyclopedia as a crucial component to the study of theology. He writes, "The encyclopedia must be practiced at the beginning and at the end of the years of study. First to orient us. Subsequently to pull everything together and thereby allow us to see the forest for the trees."<sup>3</sup> The theological encyclopedia was a crucial part of the development of the student of theology. The theological encyclopedia orients students to the field of theology.

1. In fact, it is the kind of encyclopedia Bavinck hoped would not develop for it would present knowledge atomistically. See Nathaniel Sutanto, *God and Knowledge: Herman Bavinck's Theological Epistemology* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2020), 97.

2. For an expansion on the importance of the theological encyclopedia in nineteenth century theological thought, see Zachary Purvis, *Theology and the University in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016).

3. See "Manuscript Encyclopaedie der Theologie," (unknown) Box 346, Folder 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck. Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands. §1. ("De Encycl. moet dus beoefend aan 't begin en aan 't eind des studiejaeren. Daarna om alles saam te vatten en om de boomen het woud niet voorbij te zien.")

Zachary Purvis argues that, in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, the theological encyclopedia was viewed as a “living” apparatus. It was a way for theologians to envision how the various components of theology related to one another. The issues of the organization of knowledge, the unity of theology’s various parts, and theology’s relationship to the rest of the traditional faculties were all problems facing theology. In Germany the collective name for these problems was the theological encyclopedia (*theologische Enzyklopädie*).<sup>4</sup> The same issue was prevalent in Dutch universities and the same theological tool was being utilized.<sup>5</sup>

Nineteenth century Dutch theologian and contemporary of Herman Bavinck’s (1854–1921), Abraham Kuyper (1837–1920), argued that the Encyclopedia was a systematic way of considering how various sciences related to each other. He wrote, “The idea of system became the chief aim in Encyclopedia; and from the material of each science so much only was taken as was necessary for the proper understanding of its organic life.”<sup>6</sup> In this manner, the encyclopedia became its own independent science. The idea of the encyclopedia, therefore, presupposed a relationship between the various parts of knowledge and strove to understand how they organically connect to each other.<sup>7</sup> It is this organic relationship which the encyclopedia investigates. For Kuyper, the encyclopedia was formed by first classifying the various areas of human knowledge, then burrowing down to collect the treasure of those various sciences. This was followed by placing these issues within the individual departments in relation to themselves. And, finally, all the various sciences are tied together so that the whole of science can be viewed in its organic unity.<sup>8</sup>

This essay provides a condensed unveiling of Bavinck’s narrative of the historical origin and development of the theological encyclopedia.<sup>9</sup> As well as providing a

4. Purvis, *Theology and the University*, 2, 80.

5. Eglinton, *Bavinck: A Critical Biography*, 86, 103; Joris van Eijnatten, “History, Reform, and Aufklärung: German Theological Writing and Dutch Literary Publicity in the Eighteenth Century,” *Journal for the History of Modern Theology/ Zeitschrift für Neuere Theologiegeschichte* 7, no. 2 (2000): 174. Van Eijnatten argues German theological writings were commonly and popularly translated and read in the Netherlands in the second half of the eighteenth century.

6. Abraham Kuyper, *Encyclopedie der heilige godgeleerdheid*, 3 vols. (Amsterdam: J.A. Wormser, 1894); portions of Kuyper’s *Encyclopaedia* are in English, as *Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology: Its Principles* vol. 2, trans. J. Hendrik de Vries (New York: Scriber, 1898); Kuyper, *Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology*, 10; James Eglinton, “The Reception of Aquinas in Kuyper’s *Encyclopaedie der heilige Godgeleerdheid*” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Reception of Aquinas*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 455. Eglinton puts forth a very clear summary of Kuyper’s encyclopedia project: “In the full-length original, volume 1 provides Kuyper’s retelling of the history of theology’s emergence as a distinct science. Volume 2 contains Kuyper’s constructive account of theology as an organized form of the knowledge of God. This is followed, in volume 3, by a distinctively Kuyperian application of the principle of theology as science, namely, that other sciences should be ‘Christianized’ by theology, leading to the creation of Christian philosophy, Christian literary studies, Christian art, Christian natural sciences, and so on.”

7. Kuyper, *Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology*, 11–12.

8. Kuyper, *Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology*, 27.

9. There are primarily four sources of Bavinck’s which to pull from to navigate his history

historical panorama of the origin and development of the theological sciences, this essay will provide a lens through which to approach Bavinck's own theological encyclopedia. The theological encyclopedia is an important aspect of understanding any nineteenth century theologian's theological system. Bavinck's theological encyclopedia is only accessible to those who have visited the Vrije Universiteit's Herman Bavinck archive.<sup>10</sup> It also provides insight into how Bavinck relates to his theological heritage and modernity. In this paper, it will become clear that Bavinck is interested in sourcing his theological encyclopedia from the reformed tradition, having it develop *theologically*, while also being comfortable utilizing modern encyclopedic grammar. In this manner, we get insight into Bavinck's encyclopedic program as concomitantly orthodox and modern.

In section §2 of Bavinck's "De Theologische Encyclopaedie" he sketches a history of the development of the theological encyclopedia.<sup>11</sup> He lays out the history in three broad periods: (1) Early Church to the Reformation, (2) "After the Reformation until Schleiermacher"<sup>12</sup> and (3) "Since Schleiermacher."<sup>13</sup> In section §3 of "Encyclopaedie der Theologie," he also outlines the progression of the theological encyclopedia. It follows a similar historical trajectory as the aforementioned encyclopedia but lacks any clear divisions, apart from a gap before the introduction of Johann G. Herder and Schleiermacher.<sup>14</sup> On account of this clear structure within

of the theological encyclopedia: (1) Bavinck's 1884–85 lectures, see "Manuscript Encyclopaedie cursus," (1884–1885) Box 346, Folder 43, Archive of Herman Bavinck, Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, Netherlands (hereafter, no. 43, Archive of Herman Bavinck); (2) his "De Theologische Encyclopaedie" ("The Theological Encyclopedia") manuscript from 1901–1902, see "Manuscript Theologische Encyclopaedie," (1900–1902) Box 346, Folder 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, (hereafter, no. 217, §); (3) his most polished "Encyclopaedie der Theologie" (Encyclopedia of Theology) whose date is unknown, see "Manuscript Encyclopaedie der Theologie", (unknown) Box 346, Folder 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck. (Hereafter, no. 187); and (4) "Dictaat of Herman Bavinck's Encyclopaedie d. Theol." by an unknown student (1902), Cameron Clausing's Private Collection, Christ College, Sydney, Australia. Eglinton, *Bavinck: A Critical Biography* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2020), 130. During his Kampen years Bavinck lectured on the theological encyclopedia.

10. Ximian Xu's dissertation is the only sustained interaction with the encyclopedic sources in English. Ximian focuses on the dissonance between Kuyper and Bavinck's understanding of the theological encyclopedia in relation to their differing starting points. My own dissertation hopes to draw more attention to Bavinck's theological encyclopedia. Ximian Xu, "Theology as the *Wetenschap* of God: Herman Bavinck's Scientific Theology for the Modern World" (PhD diss. University of Edinburgh, 2020).

11. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 1–16. ("Geschiedenis van de Theol. Encyclopaedie.")

12. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 3. ("Na de Reformatie, tot Schleiermacher.")

13. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 9 ("Sedert Schleiermacher"); Kuyper's *Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology: Its Principles*, I, 54–475. These three periods are similar to, but distinct from Abraham Kuyper's threefold division of (1) Up till the Renaissance, (2) From the Renaissance to the New Philosophy, and (3) The New Philosophy.

14. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. Rather than beginning with the development of Scripture it begins with Origen.; No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2. In the margins he does list an alternative fourfold historical division: (1) development of the canon, (2) dogmatic period, (3) growth of pietism and rationalism, (4) eighteenth century between orthodoxy and piety; rationalism and super-rationalism.

Bavinck's chronicle of the history of the theological encyclopedia these three phases will shape our retelling of his narrative.

In the first phase Bavinck inspects the early church for clues of the development of the theology and theological encyclopedia. In this initial stage, Bavinck perceives little development of encyclopedia. Although in germ the fourfold structure that is present in Bavinck's mature theology is identified as present. In the middle age's theology matures into a science. This development fosters both internal structure and external relationships. Bavinck gives the briefest attention to this time period.

In the second phase we will look at how the Reformation impacts the development of the theological encyclopedia up until the arrival of Schleiermacher. In the reformation Bavinck perceived a development of the theological encyclopedia alongside of the changing curriculum scene in Universities and the *historia literaria* (literary history). On account of the Reformation his analysis splits into a tri-part division: Rome, Lutheran, and Reformed. He gives little attention to Rome. For Lutherans another important thread is identified with Johann Gerhard's *Methodus Studii Theologici* whom desired for theology to develop *theologically*. Bavinck's own reflections on theology follow this path. Finally, while inspecting the Reformed Bavinck identifies five trends. Importantly, one can envision Bavinck's own four-fold theological encyclopedia as following the Reformed tradition.

In the third phase Bavinck identifies the main problem with the theological encyclopedia in the wake of Schleiermacher, that is it has allowed philosophy to take center stage. This is the case that Bavinck's theological encyclopedia seeks to solve. In the final analysis Bavinck suggests all modern encyclopedias as having this problem. Bavinck attempts to correct this line of thinking by returning theology to its proper location. In light of our synopsis of Bavinck's theological encyclopedia is any further clarity brought to orienting Bavinck's relationship to orthodoxy or modernity?<sup>15</sup> A historical perspective will pay dividends in our understanding of Bavinck's own encyclopedic writings and will allow us to see how Bavinck positions himself in relation to the tradition and his intellectual milieu. What we will find is a Reformed catholic thread in Bavinck's encyclopedia and an appropriation of modern grammar to overcome the problems he identifies. Special attention is paid here to Schleiermacher and Hegel.

15. Cory Brock, *Orthodox yet Modern: Herman Bavinck's Use of Friedrich Schleiermacher* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2020). This is not intended to reintroduce a binary in Bavinck scholarship, but rather to more closely consider Bavinck's relationship to both.



## The History of the Theological Encyclopedia

### Early Church to the Reformation

In the first period Bavincck paints a broad foundation for the origin of the encyclopedia as beginning in 1 Timothy 3, the collection of the thoughts and life of Christ in the gospels, and initially taking flight with the formation of the canon.<sup>16</sup> After the emergence of the canon he perceives Origen, Clement, and the school of Alexandria as leading the way in beginning to distinguish the various disciplines within theology.<sup>17</sup> Summarizing the development of the encyclopedia in the early church, Bavincck writes:

Therefore, in the old church there was no such thing as an Encyclopedia yet. Nevertheless, the various theological skills are already thought to be necessary to form a scriptural point of view, which emphasizes the study of Scripture, and brings together the secular disciplines, and is generally accepted in four parts: study of Scripture, dogmatics and ethics, church history and practical theology.<sup>18</sup>

In germane form in Bavincck's account of the early church we have the fourfold division of the discipline of theology, which he embraces. Moreover, Bavincck hints at the role of theology in unifying all of the sciences. This initial summary should signal to us that Bavincck perceives his own fourfold encyclopedia as growing out of the tradition of the church.

In the Middle Ages, Bavincck perceives a more formal development in the encyclopedia. In both accounts, Isidore of Seville's *Originum sive Etymologiarum Libri XX* is mentioned,<sup>19</sup> as well as, Hugo St. Victor, who shifted theology under philosophy.<sup>20</sup> Hugo divided the task of theology through the exegesis of Scripture, literal (historical), allegorical (dogmatics), topological (ethics).<sup>21</sup> Thus there remained four divisions of theology. Though we might note that dogmatics and ethics are split

16. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavincck, §2, 1; Rübiger, *Encyclopaedia of Theology*, I, 19. Bavincck states to see Rübiger. Rübiger argues, "The germs of Christian theology are already discernable in the apostolic writings."

17. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavincck, §2, 1. He also mentions Chrysostom, Augustine, Ambrose, Josephus, and Eusebius as each playing a part in this early stage at beginning to distinguish the various theological disciplines.

18. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavincck, §2, 1. ("Dus in de oude kerk nog geen eigl. Encycl. Maar toch begint men de verschill. theol. kundigheden al von den geestelijk noodig te achten, legt nadruk op de Schriftstudie, horde samenhang met *disciplinae saeculares* vast, en krijgt al zoo ongeveer 4 deelen: Schriftstudie, dogma – eth. kennis, kerkgesch. and practical Theo.")

19. Compare with No. 187, §3, and No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavincck, §2, 1; W. M. Lindsey, *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX* (Oxford, 1911); Stephen A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach, and Oliver Berghof, trans., *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

20. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavincck, §2.

21. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavincck, §2.

into two separate parts here, unlike above. Bavinck points to Thomas Aquinas as an example of a theologian giving sustained reflection on what it means to do theology in the middle ages.<sup>22</sup> The scholastics also contemplated the enterprise of theology, under the whom “theology became its own science with its own object and end.” Moreover, theology was established “in relation to the other sciences.”<sup>23</sup>

In this initial time period, Bavinck perceives theology as developing a four-fold division. Although it does not begin to take upon itself a more formal structure until the middle ages. Alongside the development of theology as an academic discipline is the blossoming of the self-consciousness of the theological task. This scientific relationship generates relationships with the other sciences and internal structure. Importantly, we see the continued thread of Bavinck perceiving his structure as one within the tradition of the church.

### **Reformation to Schleiermacher**

In the second time period, Bavinck consciously notes the development of theology and theological encyclopedia alongside of the blossoming of the university. He is careful to note how the parts of the organism of theology are organized and progress. The Reformation and humanism were a further catalyst for sustained inquiry into the methods and grounds of theology, and the relationships between the disciplines. As the Reformation progressed so did the theological encyclopedia.<sup>24</sup> Bavinck detects the Reformation, as yoked with a reform of the theological curriculum, specifically by Erasmus, Melancthon, Ulrich Zwingli and Heinrich Bullinger.<sup>25</sup> As is typical in Bavinck’s works when he reaches the Reformation his analysis splits into a tri-part division: Rome, Lutheran, and Reformed.

In the 1900–1902 account, Bavinck lists several Catholic encyclopedias, but offers no comments. For the Lutherans, several figures are mentioned, but it is Johann Gerhard’s who receive the highest praise.<sup>26</sup> On Gerhard’s *Methodus Studii Theologici* Bavinck commented, “It is the best encyclopedia in three parts.”<sup>27</sup> In this treatise, Gerhard did not simply lay out the various loci, but rather he spent

22. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2. (“In de middelE. lette men ook op het caput de theologie voor de Dogmatiek. Zie bv. Thomas.”)

23. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2 (“In de Schol. werd de theol. [illegible] eigen wet. met eigen object, doel, in werd verhouden tot andere wet. bepaald.”)

24. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck §3.

25. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck §3; No. 217, §2, No. 3.

26. Purvis, *Theology and the University*, 27–28. Bavinck is not alone in his assessment of the work of Gerhard. Purvis demonstrates Gerhard as one of the more significant figures in the seventeenth century in the development of the theological encyclopedia.

27. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 4. (“Gerhard *Methodus studii Theologici* Jena 1620. de beste encycl. in 3 deelen”); Johann Gerhard, *Methodus studii Theologici: Publicis, praelectionibus in Academia Jenesi Anno 1617. Exposita* (Jena: Steinmannus, 1620).

significant space attending to the definition of theology.<sup>28</sup> Theology functions as the center of the various disciplines for Gerhard. The starting point is the study of Scripture, the midpoint is dogmatics, which is followed by church history, with the end of practical theology. Theology, is also developed under the guidance and surveillance of the church.<sup>29</sup>

Turning to the Reformed Bavinck underscores primarily four figures as significant: Andreas Gerhard Hyperius, Johann Heinrich Alsted, Petrus van Maastricht, and Gisbert Voetius.<sup>30</sup> It is enlightening to look at Bavinck in light of these four Reformed figures. Helpfully, Bavinck summarizes his thoughts on these figures in five points, which we will utilize to sketch this section. He notes first, that distinct from the others Voetius placed a strong emphasis on calling.<sup>31</sup> Nonetheless, Voetius does little to develop the discipline of theology, splitting it simply into eight parts. He divides into the following: didactics (dogmatics), practical, Scriptura, elentics, scholastics, Patristics, church polity, history.<sup>32</sup> This leads to Bavinck's second point, "The theology courses are simply placed next to each other; they still lack the principle of division and system. Nonetheless, gradually they group together, and the 4 parts appear (see Hyperius, Alsted, Voetius, and Maastricht)."<sup>33</sup> Bavinck is critical of his tradition here. He perceives it as having failed to develop a systematic unity around the theological courses. Nonetheless he extends the olive branch suggesting that despite the lack of formal development, the four parts become clear.

Bavinck's third point is that "typically the theoretical subjects (Exegesis and Systematic Theology) are mentioned first, and then the practical subjects (History and Practical Theology)."<sup>34</sup> This trajectory is exemplified by Hyperius.<sup>35</sup> Johann Alsted's work *Encyclopaedia septem tomis distincta* (1630) also offers a clear

28. Juxtaposed to Bavinck, Gerhard denied that theology was a science (*scientia*) rather he preferred the term for theology as one of aptitude or habit (*habitus*). Gerhard's fourfold division has much in common with Bavinck. Rübiger, *Theological Encyclopaedia*, 45

29. Rübiger, *Theological Encyclopaedia*, 44–45.

30. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3.

31. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 8. ("Opmerking: 1. Op roeping, aanleg etc. propaedeutische studie wordt sterke nadruk gelegd zie bij Voetius die er echter veel bij haats was er niet bij hoort.")

32. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3 He writes, "In de theologie: a) theol. didactica (dogm.) b) theol. practica . . . c) theol. Scripturaria, d) elentica, e) scholastica, f) patristica, politia ecclesiastica, h) historica"; No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 7.

33. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 8. ("2. De theologie vakken worden eenvondig naast elkaar gesteld, missen nog deelingsbeginsel and systeem. Toch groepeeren ze zich allengs and komen de 4 deelen allengs te voorschijn. Zie Hyperius, Alsted, Voet, en Maest.")

34. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 8. ("Gewoonlijk worden de theoret. vakken [Exeg. & Syst. Th.] eerst, & daarna de practische vakken [Hist. en Pract. Th.] genoemd.")

35. Purvis, *Theology and the University*, 28. Purvis notes that nearly all major theological encyclopedias point towards Hyperius work as anticipating the four-fold division of biblical exegesis, systematic theology, church history, and practical theology.



identifying mark of the development of theological encyclopedia.<sup>36</sup> In Alsted's *Encyclopaedia*, Bavinck states, theology is sketched as the "first of the faculties of sciences and theology is divided into (1) natural theology, (2) catechesis, (3) didactics (dogmatics), (4) polemics, (5) caustics, (6) prophecy, and (7) morality."<sup>37</sup> Following, Luther, Alsted exhorts the theologian to *oratio, meditatio, tentatio*. However, both Bavinck and Kuyper give more attention to Alsted's earlier 1611 work *Methodus Sacrosancta theologiae*, which according to Kuyper gave a more organic point of view.<sup>38</sup> The *Methodus ss. theologiae* splits theology into (1) natural, (2) catechetical, (3) didactic, (4) soteriological, (5) prophetic, and (6) discursive theology.<sup>39</sup>

Bavinck's fourth point is both one of theological methodology and encyclopedia. He writes, "First one must be at home in the Scriptures, the doctrine of the church, with her proofs and proofs of the contrary, before they begin to study history and practical theology."<sup>40</sup> This trajectory progressively works through the various components of theology. One example of this division is that of Hyperius. In 1556 Hyperius published, *De recte formando theologiae studio*, which resembles his later and more extensive *De theologo, seu de ratione studii theologiae*.<sup>41</sup> This work situates theology among the other faculties, in which all other sciences prepare for the study of theology. Bavinck demonstrates that in *De theologo* Hyperius splits theology into three areas: (1) Scripture and its interpretation, (2) systematic theology or the *loci communes*, (3) historical and practical theology. This final section includes church history and the practical life of the church.<sup>42</sup>

In Bavinck's fifth and final point he connects the encyclopedia to the maturing *historia literaria* (literary history) genre. He said, "gradually the encyclopedia became

36. Johann Heinrich Alsted, *Encyclopaedia septem tomis distincta*, 2 vols (Herborn, 1630); Kuyper, *Encyclopedie der heilige godgeleerdheid*, I, 164–69; Abraham Kuyper identifies two foundation principles in Alsted's encyclopedia of Alsted, it is (1) a book which compiled, in brief, all the known sciences, and (2) it is a study of their mutual organic relations.

37. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 5. ("de theol. als de eerste der faculteits-wetenschappen en verdeelt ze in theol. naturalis, catechetica, didactica (dogm.), polemica, casuistica, prophetica, moralis.")

38. Kuyper, *Encyclopedie der heilige godgeleerdheid*, I, 164. ("Toch bevredigt reeds de indeeling, die hij in 1611 in zijn *methodus s.s. Theologiae* [ed. Hanau 1634] gaf, uit organisch oogpunt better.")

39. Johann Heinrich Alsted, *Methodus ss. Theologia I–IIX* (Hanoviae: Conrad Eifrid, 1634).

40. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 8 ("Eerst moet men thuis zijn in de HS. de leer der kerk, met haar bewijzen & met anderer weerlegging, eer men overging tot studie van hist. en pract. theol."); No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §8. This is in harmony with how Bavinck maps his own encyclopedia. Bavinck's own theological encyclopedia is arranged accordingly: (a) the principle [exegetical theology], (b) the subject [historical theology], (c) the object [dogmatic/systematic theology], (d) the goal [practical theology].

41. According to Muller Hyperius *De theologo* is "the most extended Protestant essay on the basic study of theology written in the sixteenth century." Muller, *After Calvin*, 107–108; Andreas Hyperius, *De Theologo, seu de ratione studii theologici, libri IIII* (Basel, 1559).

42. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 5. ("Hier dus reeds a] exeg. b] system c] hist. & pract. theol.")

connected with the development of literary history, but this posed a great danger to losing sight of the system of the encyclopedia.”<sup>43</sup> Bavinck’s concern was the loss of the system. The danger was the isolation of the various sciences from each other. The *historia literaria* summarized primarily three topics: the history of knowledge/literature, the knowledge of books, reviews of the literature and recommended reading.<sup>44</sup> This movement helped to summarize the state of the various sciences and facilitated future study. As Bavinck puts it succinctly, “Scholarship began to exist in book form.”<sup>45</sup> The *historia literaria* reveal the crucial nature of the theological encyclopedia in the life of the university. Lectures in the genre of *historia literaria* became a constant presence in the life of the university by the end of the century. They functioned as companions to the theological encyclopedia that helped students to navigate the terrains of their field, while also helping seasons scholars to push in constructive directions.

In the second time period then Bavinck writes of the development of theology and the theological encyclopedia alongside of the blossoming of the university. First, with Hugo Victor and the blossoming of theology as a discipline, next with the Scholastics and the progression of theology as science. This was followed by the Reformation and the adjustment of the theological curriculum. Lastly, with the commencement of the *historia literaria* genre that spread alongside the development of the encyclopedia. He is careful to note how the parts of the organism of theology are organized and progress. His five points across the progression of the theological encyclopedia reveals continuity and discontinuity with and within the Reformed tradition.

### **After Schleiermacher**

In two of Bavinck’s archival narratives (folder no. 187, and no. 217) he gives credit first to J.G. Herder for the entrance of the new era of the encyclopedia and then turns his attention to Schleiermacher. He wrote, “A new age broke after Herder gave his delightful methodological tips in his *Briefe das Studium der Theologie* (1780) in Weimar, followed by D. Fr. Schleiermacher’s birth (Nov. 21, 1768) in Breslau in Silesia.”<sup>46</sup> Herder had previously assessed the state of the encyclopedia in his 1769, writing:

43. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 8 (“Allengs werd de Encyl. Verbonden met de Litteratuur gescheidenis, en vooruitgang, maar met groot gevaar om het system. der Enc. Uit ‘t oog te verliezen.”)

44. Purvis, *Theology and the University*, 34.

45. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 8 (“Geleerdheid begun te bestaan in boekennis”).

46. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. (“Eene nieuw tijd brak, nadat Herder heerlijke methodologische wenken en zijne *Briefe das Studium der Theologie* [1780] Weimar gegeven had, dan met D. Fr. Schleiermacher geb [21 Nov. 1768] te Breslau in Silzie”); No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2, 9. Dutch nearly identical; In this location Bavinck suggests Schleiermacher’s indebtedness to Schlegel; Johann Herder, *Briefe das Studium der Theologie betreffend* Vol. I–II (Weimar: Carl Rudolph Hoffmans, 1785).

Now encyclopedias are being made, even Diderot and d'Alembert have lowered themselves to this. And that book that is a triumph for the French is for us the first sign of their decline. They have nothing to write, and thus produce summaries (*abregés*), dictionaries, vocabularies . . . encyclopedias—the original works fall away.<sup>47</sup>

Herder's pessimistic outlook on the encyclopedia was both a statement of the staleness of the field, and a foreshadow to his own contribution. His primary contribution in his *Briefe das Studium der Theologie betreffend* was a clarion call for students to read the Bible as humanly and historical. Herder's encyclopedia is part of the historicism that develops in the eighteenth century of which both Schleiermacher and Bavinck are a fruit of in the nineteenth century.<sup>48</sup> After a brief mention of Herder, Bavinck moves to discuss the importance of Schleiermacher on the theological encyclopedia.

L. W. E. Rauwenhoff's lectures on the encyclopedia in 1876 at Leiden University opened with this statement: "In 1811 Schleiermacher's *Kurze Darstellung des theol. Studiums* (*Brief Outline of the Study of Theology*) came and worked a reversal."<sup>49</sup> This quote is pulled from Bavinck's student notes. It testifies to both the presence of Schleiermacher in the theology of the Netherlands and the importance of Schleiermacher's encyclopedia. The remarkable reimaging of the theological encyclopedia was performed by Schleiermacher in his *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology*. This was initially written in 1811 and expanded in 1830.<sup>50</sup> Schleiermacher's impact was large enough to warrant Bavinck perceiving all encyclopedias as living in its wake.<sup>51</sup> Purvis describes this time period for the theological encyclopedia like so, "[The] theological encyclopedia in this context underwent a dramatic recasting, from being an instrument for pedagogical and methodological reflection to a

47. Herder, *Journal meiner Reise im Jahr 1769 Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Bernhard Suphan (Berlin: Weidmann, 1877–1913), iv, 412.

48. See Cameron Clausing, "'A Christian Dogmatic does not yet Exist': The Influence of the Nineteenth Century Historical Turn on the Theological Methodology of Herman Bavinck," PhD diss., (University of Edinburgh, 2020).

49. Manuscript "Prof. Rauwenhoff Encyclopaedie," I–III (1876–77) Box 346, Folder 25, Archive of Herman Bavinck, [Hereafter, no. 25]. Oct. 2, 1876, inn 1811 kwam Schleiermacher's *Kurze Darstellung des theol. Studiums*. Dit bewerkte een omkeering; Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology*, trans. Terrence Tice (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011); Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums zum Behuf einleitender Vorlesungen* (1811/1830) ed. Dirk Schmid (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011).

50. Schleiermacher's 1831–32 lectures demonstrate his awareness that his threefold arrangement was distinct from the fourfold arrangement popular in Germany and subsequently the Netherlands (See Richard Crouter, "Shaping an Academic Discipline: The *Brief Outline on the Study of Theology* in *The Cambridge Companion to Friedrich Schleiermacher* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) 111–27, 120).

51. This is similar to Bavinck's assessment on dogmatics (See *Reformed Dogmatics*, I, 78).

comprehensive, “living’ apparatus of theology.”<sup>52</sup> This aligns well with Bavinck’s assessment of the period.

In folder 187, Bavinck identifies three groups of encyclopedists concurrent with and after Schleiermacher. First, the strict orthodox, which includes Gottlieb J. Plank<sup>53</sup>, Johann F. Kleuker<sup>54</sup>, Karl F. Stäudlin<sup>55</sup>, Gottlieb C. A. von Harless<sup>56</sup> and Johann A. H. Tittmann.<sup>57</sup> According to Bavinck, each of them structures the discipline of theology as (1) exegetical, (2) systematic, (3) historical, and (4) practical. The second group is the *Vermittlungstheologie* (mediating theology). Bavinck identifies two key figures, Karl Hagenbach<sup>58</sup> and Jacobus Doedes.<sup>59</sup> As with the strict orthodox encyclopedists, Bavinck categorises their work as ordering theology along (1) exegetical, (2) historical, (3) systematic, and (4) practical lines. The third group is the philosophical, which includes Karl Rosenkranz<sup>60</sup>, A. F. L. Pelt, and G. H. Kienlen.<sup>61</sup> This group follows the three-fold division of Schleiermacher. Nonetheless, each of these three groups has something in common.

In the wake of Schleiermacher, Bavinck perceives all encyclopedias as having a common problem. The problem they share is that they orient the theological encyclopedia around philosophy. It is this weakness that Bavinck perceives his own encyclopedia as resolving. Bavinck attributes the swapping of theology for philosophy in the orrery of the encyclopedia at the foot of the philosophies of Johann G. Fichte, Friedrich Schelling, and Georg Hegel. He writes, “The Encyclopedia must be revised, it has been influenced through the philosophy of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel and not developed itself purely.”<sup>62</sup> This is the problem of the modern theological

52. Purvis, *Theology and the University*, 80.

53. Gottlieb J. Plank, *Einleitung in die Theologische Wissenschaften*, 2 Vols. (Göttingen, 1794–95).

54. Johann F. Kleuker, *Grundriss einer Encyclopädie der Theologie oder christlichen Religionswissenschaft*, vol. 2, (Hamburg: Friedrich Perthes, 1800–1801).

55. Karl F. Stäudlin, *Theological Encyclopaedia and Methodology* (Hanover, 1821).

56. Gottlieb C. A. von Harless, *Theologische Encyclopädie und Methodologie vom Standpunkte der Protestantischen Kirche* (Nuremberg, 1837).

57. Johann A.H. Tittmann, *Theologische Encyclopädie Wissenschaften* (Leipzig, 1798).

58. Hagenbach, *Encyclopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1851).

59. Jacob I. Doedes, *Encyclopedie der Christelijke theologie* (Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon, 1876); Interestingly, Doedes features more prominently in Bavinck’s first edition of *Gerformeerde Dogmatieks* section on “Encyclopaedische Plaats der Dogmatiek.”

60. Karl Rosenkranz, *Encyclopädie und Methodologie der theologischen Wissenschaften* (Halle: Schwetschke, 1845).

61. Kienlen, *Encyclopédie des sciences de la theologie chrétienne* (Strasburg, 1842).

62. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. (“De Encyclopaedie moet herzien, is door filosofie van Fichte, Schelling, Hegel geïnfluenceerd, heeft zich niet zuiver ontwikkeld”); No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2. Bavinck lists these same figures but adds a further breakdown. Under the influence of Schleiermacher (Hagenbach, Pelt, Harless, J.P. Lange, Rothe; Hegel: Rosenkranz & Noack; Schelling: Daub, Erhardt.

encyclopedia. In the next section, we turn to consider how Bavinck resolves this problem while still utilizing modern grammar.

### **The Case of the Placing of the Theological Encyclopedia in Bavinck**

An outline of Bavinck's narrative of the development of the theological encyclopedia provides three issues for consideration: (1) How does Bavinck respond to the problem of modern theological encyclopedias; (2) Bavinck is also "After Schleiermacher" (that is, post-Schleiermacher), so where does he fall in his own three-fold classification of encyclopedias after Schleiermacher (strict orthodox, mediating theologian, or philosophical); and (3) how might we consider Bavinck's relationship to this encyclopedic tradition?

First, how does he respond to the modern *philosophical* theological encyclopedia? He turns the theological encyclopedia back to its proper identity, theology. For Bavinck, much like how theology must develop *sui generis*, the theological encyclopedia must be allowed to develop *theologically*.<sup>63</sup> Bavinck's use of theology as the essence, principle, and purpose of the theological encyclopedia differentiates him from his philosophical sources. As Bavinck writes:

The concept of essence, principle, content, purpose and thus the divisions of theology, and thus also of the content, purpose, etc. of its subjects stands under that influence. It is necessary first to disengage from it, to work to purify philosophy, to allow theology to construct itself. Therefore, the foundations must first be properly laid. Then perhaps we can adopt good ideas from Schleiermacher, etc. and graft on our trunk of theology. The difference in division, the arrangement of the subjects, suffers in different views of theology. For it has become increasingly clear, the object of the Theological Encyclopedia is theology itself, her business is the development of Theology. So long as the view of theology differs (Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, Philosophical, etc.) so does the Encyclopedia.<sup>64</sup>

To carry Bavinck's own metaphor further, it is the Reformed theology trunk, that has grafted into it the branches that will help the organism to flourish. On the heels of

63. Eglinton, Bavinck: A Critical Biography, 137–38.

64. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2 ("De opvatting van wezen, beginsel, inhoud, doel en dus verdeeling der theologie, en dus ook van den inhoud, doel etc der enkele vakken staat on der dien invloed. Het is noodig, om zich daarvan eerst los te maken, positief te werk te gaan het filosofie uittezuiveren, de theol. zelve zich te laten construeeren. Eerst moet daarom de grondslag goed gelegd. Dan kunnen wij misschien later wel goede ideeën van Schlieierm. etc overnemen, en op den eigen stam der Theol. in enten: Het verschil in verdeeling, volgorde der vakken worstelt in verschillende opvatting der Theol. Want het is steeds duidelijker geworden: Object der Theol. Enc. is de Theol. zelf, haar zaak is de ontwikkeling der Th. Zoolang opvatting v. Theol. verschilt [Kath. Luth. Geref. Philos. etc.], verschill ook the. Enc.")



this extended quote, Bavinck differentiates it around this exact thing. According to Bavinck, Kant, Schelling, Hegel, and Schleiermacher each arrange the encyclopedia around philosophy, while Protestants arrange it in the Scriptures, “the essence of theology.”<sup>65</sup> An encyclopedia develops itself purely by developing itself according to its own object. For the “theological” encyclopedia this is theology; for him theology, not philosophy is must be the starting point of the theological encyclopedia.<sup>66</sup> Bavinck’s encyclopedia returns theology to its proper place. As Bavinck writes:

The theological encyclopedia can only be given by a theologian. The theological encyclopedia is a system of theology, so it does not have to go through philosophy, etc. but by [theology] becomes entirely determined. The encyclopedia is bound to her object, theology and this is also her home. The theological encyclopedia is the self-consciousness of theology.”<sup>67</sup>

Bavinck envisions theology as being a governing science over the organization of knowledge, but also theology is a theological-philosophical system in its own right. Theology must govern its own household, before it may extend its reign over all of the sciences. If the theological encyclopedia is ruled by philosophy the house and the kingdom are lost.

In turning to the second question, Bavinck’s encyclopedic work is also post-Schleiermacher, so where should he be positioned in his three-fold grouping? First, it should be noted that Bavinck spends significantly more space explicating the growth and divisions of the encyclopedia during the time of the Reformation and gives this time period credit for the development of the four-fold encyclopedia.<sup>68</sup> This is four-fold division of exegetical, historical, dogmatic, and practical theology Bavinck retains. He thus does not follow Schleiermacher’s three-fold division of philosophical, historical, and practical.

65. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §2 (“Protest. In de Schrift; [illegible] weze Theol. in de philos [v. Kant, Schell. Hegel, of Schleierm.]”) Bavinck’s contrast is not between Protestants and non-Protestants, otherwise, Schleiermacher and Hegel would muddy Bavinck’s distinction. But he seems to be using Protestants here to polemically capture the purity of his own articulation.

66. Bruce Pass, *On Theology: Herman Bavinck’s Academic Orations* (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 50. Bavinck writes of theology and philosophy as the *Universalwissenschaft*, “Dictaat of Herman Bavinck’s Encyclopaedie d. Theol.,” §5, 23–26. Bavinck writes of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel’s respective works orbiting the encyclopedia. Fichte adopts the ‘I’ as the starting place of the *Wissenschaftslehre*. Schelling shifts the ‘I’ to the Absolute in three stages (Father [eternal], Son [finite], Spirit [infinite]); Hegel adopts Schelling, but furthers his conception of reason.

67. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §5 (“Theologische Encyclopedia kan alleen gegeven worden door den Theoloog, de wijsgeer kan dat niet. De theologische Encyclopedia is systeem der theologie, moet dus niet door de philos. etc maar geheel door deze beheerscht worden. De. Ency. is gebonden aan haar object, de Theol. en haar dus ook in deze thuis. De theol, enc. is het zelfbewustzijn der theol.”)

68. “No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §6. Indeed, if one was to add to this argument in folder no. 217, Bavinck spends significant time developing the concept of the theology, in light of the theological encyclopedia in light of the propaedeutice of Petrus van Mastricht, another clear sign of his desire to align himself within Reformed orthodox.

The second, encyclopedic difference between the two is how they construe the ordering of the system. Bavinck perceives Schleiermacher's practical theology as informing his dogmatics; Bavinck discerns in his own project dogmatics as informing practical theology. It was believed by Bavinck that Schleiermacher "fixed the Encyclopedia as purely a formal science, without *realia*, and gave to practical theology the place of honor."<sup>69</sup> Accordingly, Bavinck argues this rests on two fundamental ideas: (1) theology is a positive science, and (2) whose parts are connected by the church.<sup>70</sup>

Christian Theology as a positive science for Schleiermacher simply means that it organizes in an orderly and rational manner the historical experience of Christians within a particular set of social circumstances in order to serve a specific practical function. Succinctly, it is the ordered reflection of the experience of God-consciousness among Christians. Christian theology is connected to the church because it is that community that is distinctly Christian. The three parts of theology intersect for Schleiermacher in the church because every facet of theology must come to bear on the life of the church. The church may then function "on the basis of a highly developed consciousness of history."<sup>71</sup> In other words, the individual self-consciousness finds its fulfilment in the community of the church.

As is the typical reading of the various parts of Schleiermacher's theology, Bavinck identifies, theology as unfolding under the umbrella of philosophical, historical, and practical. Bavinck employs the illustration of a tree to demonstrate his understanding of the various parts of Schleiermacher's encyclopedia and its subsequent shortcomings. The "philosophical (root) sketches the essence of the church: (apologetics and polemics)"<sup>72</sup>, "the historical (trunk)" includes "exegesis, church history, and statistics"<sup>73</sup>, and the practical (leaves): "method of church government: church service and church government."<sup>74</sup>

69. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. ("Schl. vaste de Enc. 't eerst als zuiver formeele wetenschap op, zonder realia, en gaf der pract. theol. eereplaats.")

70. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. ("theol. is positieve wetenschap, wier deelen verbonden zijn door betrekking op de kerk"). This is in harmony with Terrence Tice's reading of Schleiermacher's entire *Outline* as in germ in §1. (See Terrence Tice, "Editors General Introduction" in Friedrich Schleiermacher, *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology*, trans. Terrence Tice (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), xv-xvii, xv.

Theology is a positive science, the parts of which join into a cohesive whole only through their common relation to a distinct mode of faith, that is, a distinct formation of God-consciousness. Thus, the various parts of Christian theology belong together only by virtue of their relation to Christianity. This is the sense in which the word "theology" will always be used here. Schleiermacher, *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology*, §1.

71. Schleiermacher, *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology*, §8

72. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. ("a] philosophische [worstel] schetst 't wezen der kerk: apologetiek en polemiek.")

73. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. ("b] historisch [stam]: exegese. Kerkgesch. Statistiek.")

74. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. ("c] practisch: techniek der kerkregering: kerkdienst en kerkregering.") The word "leaves" is absent from Bavinck.

Nonetheless, all is not well in this forest. Bavinck gives three brief critiques, the first, “philosophical theology cannot be the root, the foundation of theology, that is the Scripture (exegetical theology)” [must be].<sup>75</sup> Schleiermacher places apologetics and polemics under philosophy, which Bavinck perceives as wrong-headed, “apologetics and polemics may not be detached from dogmatics”.<sup>76</sup> The second critique, the historical trunk is also suspect for Bavinck, because of the location of Scripture. “Exegetical Theology should not be under history.”<sup>77</sup> His critique goes one step further, “Dogmatics is not history = a referential science.”<sup>78</sup> Dogmatics for Schleiermacher is historical.<sup>79</sup> In the wake of Schleiermacher, Bavinck perceives the encyclopedia as having lost its foundation. A deforesting and replanting around the concept of theology is required.

Thus we can remove from consideration the third group which follows both Schleiermacher’s philosophical starting point and his threefold division. We are thus left with the strict orthodox or the *Vermittlungstheologie* (mediating theology). Resolving this question goes hand in hand with our third question, of how Bavinck relates to the encyclopedic tradition. In this respect, I believe Bavinck has more in common grammatically with the mediating theologians and more in common theologically with the strict orthodox.

For starters, Bavinck’s articulation of the theological encyclopedia reveals an indebtedness to modern grammar. That is he uses terminology such as self-consciousness (*zelf-bewustzijn*) and imagines the theological encyclopedia to be an organism.<sup>80</sup> Bavinck argues for the theological encyclopedia as the self-consciousness of theology. Interestingly, in the same set of notes Bavinck lists several philosophers and theologians (Doedes, Schelling, Hegel, Daubanton, Pelt, etc.) with what seems to be their contribution to the theological encyclopedia discussion. Next to Hegel is

75. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. (“de phil. theol. kan niet worstel, grondslag zijn der theol. dat is de Schrift, exeg. theol.”)

76. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. (“Apologetiek en polemieken mogen niet losgemaakt van dogmatiek.”)

77. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. (“Exeg. theol. mag niet opgenomen onder de history.”)

78. No. 187, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §3. (“Dogm. Is geen history. = refereerende wetenschap.”)

79. *GD2*, I, 27; *RD*, I, 47. Bavinck develops this further here; Schleiermacher, *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology*, §196–222.

80. “Dictaat of Herman Bavinck’s Encyclopaedie d. Theol.,” §5, 21 (“Vijfde beteekenis. In 18: en 19: eeuw wet. zette zeek voort op ongeloof. wijze. Aantal al vakken vermeerden van j. tot j. De wet. is haar geheel werd een brute chaos, niet te overzien. Vandaar behoefte om z. rekenschap te geven v.h. verband, dat tusschen al die vakken onderl. bestond. Alzoo werd enc. de wet, v.h. organisme der wetensch.,” translated as “Fifth meaning. In the eighteenth and nineteenth century science continued in an unbelievable manner. [The] number of subjects increased from year to year. Science as a whole has become a bolt of unforeseeable, chaos. Hence the need to take into account the link between all of these various subjects. Thus, *the Encyclopaedia* became *the science of the organism of sciences*.”)

“zef-bew. in theol.” (*self-consciousness in theology*).<sup>81</sup> This simple tip of the hat helps one to recognize how important this philosophical grammar remained to Bavinck’s encyclopedic system. While he refused to follow Hegel, Fichte, and Schelling down the road of constructing the theological encyclopedia around philosophy. He still recognized the strength of their proposal in recognizing the encyclopedia as a form of self-consciousness.

It is difficult to discern how far to take this appropriation and thus it is best to proceed conservatively. Hegel’s concept of self-consciousness is indebted to Fichte and Schelling. For it was Fichte who placed self-consciousness at the center of all things, as that which provided organization, development, and purpose.<sup>82</sup> And it was Schelling whose organic concept of nature pushed to overcome the dualism of subject and object. Hegel’s argument via Schelling was to overcome the dualisms of the subject and object through an animating life force, which was at different degrees of development and organization.<sup>83</sup> The identity of the subject and the object is realized in the self-consciousness. In this manner, the subject (theology) finds itself in the other (encyclopedia), which together are driven along by the *Lebensbeginnsel*, theology. If this appropriation of Hegel’s idea is the case then we might consider self-consciousness as the fruit of modern philosophy. In this manner, theological development is intimately connected to the development of the encyclopedia. The theological encyclopedia as the self-reflective development of doing theology. Hence why all theology must not only come to terms with Schleiermacher’s systematic theology, but also his encyclopedia according to Bavinck.<sup>84</sup>

If we must place Bavinck into one of his three categories, then we should position him amongst the mediating theologians. That is not to say he is a *Vermittlungstheologien*, but rather his encyclopedia is one example of his attempt to remain orthodox while harvesting the fruit of modern thought.

The structure of his framework is essentially that of his Reformed forefathers. Additionally, Bavinck differentiates himself from his modern sources by proxy of the object of his theological encyclopedia. For him the theological encyclopedia must develop *theologically* not philosophically. At once revealing him as being rooted in the soil of his own theological tradition, while also existing in the orchard of the modern age. Cory Brock and Nathaniel Sutanto’s remark, “His modern self is an aspect of his orthodox self, standing shoulder to shoulder” – holds true here.<sup>85</sup> The

81. No. 217, Archive of Herman Bavinck, §4.

82. Bieser, *Hegel* (New York and London: Routledge, 2005), 73–74.

83. Bieser, *Hegel*, 104–106.

84. *RD* I, 166. “All subsequent theology is dependent on [Schleiermacher]. Though no one took over his dogmatics, he has made his influence felt on all theological orientations – liberal, mediating, and confessional, and in all churches – Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed.”

85. Cory Brock and Nathaniel Sutanto, “Herman Bavinck’s Reformed eclecticism: On catholicity, consciousness and theological epistemology,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 70, no. 3 (2017): 314.

historical panorama of theological encyclopedia Bavinck positions himself in relation to the tradition and his intellectual milieu. This allowed us to identify the Reformed orthodox thread in Bavinck's encyclopedia and his indebtedness to his own tradition. While he attempts to utilize the categories of his own time.

### **Conclusion**

This essay provided a narration of Bavinck's chronicle of the historical origin and development of the theological encyclopedia. This historical panorama of the development and divisions of the theological sciences allowed us to briefly consider Bavinck's own theological encyclopedia. We noted that Bavinck utilizes modern grammar, while maintaining the content of Reformed orthodoxy. Bavinck attempts to overcome the problem facing the modern theological encyclopedia by returning theology to its rightful place within the system. In this manner, for Bavinck, theology through its encyclopedia does not have an existential crisis, but rather reaches self-consciousness as it remains true to its object.



