

**PETTAZZONI IN TURKEY: SOME
REFLECTIONS ON PETTAZZONIAN
STUDIES IN TURKISH TRADITION OF THE
HISTORY OF RELIGIONS¹**

Prof. Dr. Mustafa ALICI*

Abstract: In this article we have tried to reflect ideas of Raffaele Pettazzoni (1883- 1959), Italian historian of religions considered by the modern Turkish academia in their surveys. As the most notable Italian historian of religions all around the World, Pettazzoni (1883- 1959) has effected mainly on the global culture of studies of religions. The Turkish historians of the religion, along with their western colleagues, are aware of this eminent scholar.

Pettazzoni has been welcomed in Turkey for so long time over half century by his ideas and effective researches such as the historical phenomenology, the concepts of the religion of liberty, the myth, the polytheism and especially his unshaken theory of the Supreme- being whom he had named as *The All- Knowing God* which he traced well in the early cultures of humankind. In so far as having been understood very well in Turkey, Pettazzoni will maintain to be a great value through his well-defined concepts and well systemized works to be translated and used by the Turko-phone academy of religions.

Key Words: History of Religions, Raffaele Pettazzoni, Monotheism, Phenomenology of Religion, Myth, Ethnology

**PETTAZZONİ TÜRKİYE'DE: TÜRK DİNLER
TARİHİ GELENEĞİNDE PETTAZZONİ
ÇALIŞMALARI ÜZERİNE BAZI DÜŞÜNCELER**

Öz: Bu makalede İtalyan Dinler Tarihçisi Raffaele Pettazzoni(1883- 1959)'nin görüşlerinin modern Türk akademisindeki yansıması ve etkileri ele alınacaktır.

Geliş tarihi: 05. 08. 2016

Kabul tarihi: 20. 08. 2016

1. This article is mostly produced from the text, namely, "Hosting "Romano" in the Eastern Territories: Some Reflections on Pettazzonian Studies in Turkey" presented in Bologna, Italy under the scientific meeting entitled as "Pettazzoni e la Studia dele Religioni- Incontri con gli Studiosi", held in 23- 29 September, 2009. Having me provide with the valuable materials on Pettazzoni, I have to thank a lot to Prof. Mario Gandini from the Fond of Pettazzoni in San Giovanni in Persiceto and his staff, and I am deeply grateful to Prof. Dr. Giovanni Casadio, from Salerno, Italy, who smoothes the hard humps in the achievements of the studies on Pettazzoni.

*. Erzincan Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi.

Modern dönemde küresel açıdan en ünlü İtalyan Dinler Tarihcisi olarak Pettazzoni, kendi döneminde dinler hakkındaki bilimsel çalışmalara büyük oranda etki etmiştir. Türk Dinler Tarihcileri batılı meslektaşları gibi bu göze çarpan bilimadamların farkındadırlar

Pettazzoni yaklaşık yarım asırdır Türkiye’de tarihsel fenomenoloji, özgürlük dini, mit, politeizm ve özellikle erken dönem kültürlerde izini sürdüğü tek tanrı anlayışı olan *Her Şeyi Bilen Tanrı* gibi özgün kavramlarıyla iyi bilinmektedir. Türkiye’de çok iyi tanınan biri olarak Pettazzoni Türkçe yazılan dinlerle ilgili Bilimsel çalışmalarda çok iyi systematize edilmiş eserleri ve iyi tanımlanmış görüşleriyle tanınmayı sürdürecektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dinler Tarihi, Raffaele Pettazzoni, Monoteizm, Din Fenomenolojisi, Mit, Etnoloji

Pettazzoni in Turco-Phone Academy

First let’s try to summarize the Turkish tradition of The History of religions: despite of the symbiosis of the peoples of various religious and ethnic peoples in the Ottoman Empire for many centuries, academic courses concerned with non-Islamic religions and cultures did not occur in the schools and other educational institutions. Likewise, it is only in 1859 when some courses which could be considered related to the ‘history of religions’ began, and these courses took place among the other courses of the *madrasahs* (the Ottoman high schools and universities) which were generally focused on Islamic disciplines like Qur’anic exegesis and Muslim oral tradition (*hadith*). The academic courses such as "tarihi umumi wa ilmi esatir al-awwalin" (the general history of world and science of myths of the ancient peoples) were also added to the curriculum of the Darulfünun Edebiyat Fakültesi (İstanbul University, Faculty of Arts) in Istanbul. After the declaration of the some series of the reform program of Westernization in the first decade of the 20th century, *tarih-i adyan* or the history of religions took place in the curriculum of this faculty as distinct from the theological aspects. From 1911 onwards, the courses on ‘history of religions’ were appeared in various *madrasahs*/ institutions in Istanbul until the foundation of republic of Modern Turkey in 1923 by Kemal Atatürk, who closed the imperial era with all its institutions after some years later and banned also the history of religions in the Turkish higher academy.

After the republican era, by the modernization (westernization) of the universities and their secularization especially in 1930s, the history of religions has started to become quite popular in Turkey. This is mainly due to the changing of Turkey’s traditional approaches and international policies which cause Turkey to become a much more mixed society of

various cultures and religions. Kemal Ataturk, the founder of the Republic of Turkey, called George Dumézil to teach our discipline and make folkloric surveys in Turkey's unexcavated lands during 1930s. But it can be said that the real new period era has started especially after the World War Second by the coming of another western historian of religions, a German lady, Annemarie Schimmel, who was appointed to the chair of the discipline in the faculty of theology in Ankara University from 1954 until 1959. Her lectures were soon published with the title of *Dinler Tarihine Giriş* (An Introduction to the History of Religions) as the first book on the history of religions in 1955. Schimmel was the supervisor of the first phd of the history of religions done by Hikmet Tanyu (1918- 1992), who was originally from the historicist school of Turkish ethnology, very effective, then and he became the ardent student of the history of religions by Schimmel's inspirations.

Turkish Association for the History of Religions (TAHR), founded in 1994, has undergone a developmental process of its own up until today. This study evaluates, based on scholarly theses, published articles and books, an academic mentality. It also classifies the studies in the field conducted in Turkey with examples and draws attention to the difficulties concerning the method employed. Our society, TAHR, was affiliated to the (International for The History of Religions (IAHR) by its Tokyo Congress in 2005 and to the EASR by Stander meeting in 2004. TAHR has over 100 members researching on religion up to their own methods belonging to over thirty faculties of theology in Turkey. According to its constitution, "The Turkish Association" aims at promoting, understanding and proliferating the culture of the History of Religions and its main ideas presented by the its leading scholars. Therefore under the academic curiosity of Turkish historians of religions, many eminent western scholars of religion such as M. Eliade, R. Pettazzoni, R. Otto, W. Wach, U. Bianchi, G. Parrinder, or others such as Weber, Durkheim, Jung etc. on religion have become popular especially after 1980s within the society.²

In Turkey the name of "Raffaele Pettazzoni (1883- 1959)", the most notable Italian Historian of Religions and the founding father of Roman School known as the Pettazzonian School in our field, can be seen one of

2. For more discussions about the history of study of religions in Turkey see; Abdurrahman Küçük, "Opening Speech", in Ali İsmail Güngör (ed.), *Sekülerleşme ve Dini Canlanma (Secularism and Religious Resurgence- A Joint Conference with IAHR)*, Ankara, 2008, 19- 27; Ali İsmail Güngör, "The Turkish Contribution to the History of Religions", *Numen*, vol. 54/1, 2007, 71-92.

the most effective western scholars of religions on the Turkish tradition.³ Even Hikmet Tanyu, the founding father of Turkish school of The History of Religions was aware of fame of Pettazzoni and cited him among the scholars “who have vital studies on the monotheism”, having mentioned about his book *Il Dio Omnisciente*.⁴

The first citation about Pettazzoni within Turkish academy was pronounced loudly by the mouth of a German scholar, Annemarie Schimmel in his era of the presidency of IAHR. In the journal of divinity of Ankara issued in 1954, Schimmel wrote a short review about a new journal named Numen and a brief information about the foundation of IAHR (then International Association for the Study of History of Religions- IASHR). She mentions also about Pettazzoni as “the scholar from Rome”, “the famous”, “well-educated” and “well -known in the western world because of his books filled by full of knowledge”. She cites that in the *Appercu Indroductif* of the journal, Pettazzoni tried to state the difference between the knowledge of the religion and the history of religions clearly.⁵

This introduction has shed light on the young generations of Turkish academy during that time, and it has given certain inspiration even for the researches of both the normative theological and non confessional secular circles; even in 1956, when Pettazzoni was still alive, Prof. Hüseyin Gazi Yurdaydın, a Turkish historian of Islam (therefore a normative scholar), translated and published the “Appercu Indroductif” in the Journal of the Faculty of Divinity of Ankara.⁶ That translated text belonging to Pettazzoni has been also the first known methodological work on the history of

3. Among the works of Pettazzoni are *The All-Knowing God: Researches into Early Religion and Culture*, trans. H. J. Rose, London, 1956; *Il Dio: Formazione e sviluppo del monoteismo nella storia delle religioni vol. 1, L'essere celeste nelle credenze dei popoli primitivi*, Roma 1922; *Italia religiosa*, Bari, 1952; *L'Essere Supremo nelle Religioni Primitive(L'Omniscienza di Dio)*, Torino 1957; *La religione primitiva in Sardegna*, , Piacenza 1912; *La religione di Zarathustra nella storia religiosa dell' Iran*, Bologna 1920; *Miti Africani*, Torino 1948; *Svolgimento, e carattere della storia delle religioni*, Bari 1924.

4. Hikmet Tanyu, *İslamlıktan Önce Türklerde Tek Tanrı İnancı (The Belief of One God of Turks in Pre Islamic Period)*, Istanbul, 1986, 204- 205.

5. Annemarie Schimmel, “Numen: International Review -for the History of Religions”, *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3 (3-4), (1954), 119-122.

6. Raffaele Pettazzoni, “Din İlminde Tarih ve Fenomenoloji (The History and Phenomenology in the Science of Religion)”, *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, vol. 5/1 (1956), 189- 191; (Rafella) Pettazzoni, *Tanrıya Dair*, trans. Fuat Aydın, Istanbul, 2002, 101- 106.

religions ever done in Turkey. Furthermore, this short text could be considered as the first study telling academically about the phenomenology of religion in Turkey. Again it is important also because Pettazzoni mentions by this article how to study the religion and all religious phenomena from the secular point of view apart from an archeologist or an ethnologist or even a sociologist having been intermingled with other humanitas.

As for the other Pettazzonian studies, we have to wait for the nineties. After the intensive efforts of the translation of Eliade's works during 80s and 90s, another significant scholar of the history of religions Kürşat Demirci from Marmara University (Istanbul) wrote about Pettazzoni in his effective booklet, *Dinlerin Dejenerasyonu*, (the degeneration of the religions) in 1996. Demirci traces back to the origin of the religion and the religious degeneration, discussing the evolutionist and monotheistic theories. In this booklet Demirci concluded about Pettazzoni as "the most effective and the biggest critic of Wilhelm Schmidt".⁷

Demirci in his other work named *Dinler Tarihinin Meseleleri* (The Problems of the History of Religions) gives more place to Pettazzoni than his earlier booklet. In his biography, he gives some other important Pettazzonian ideas to Turkish readers existing in other works of Pettazzoni, among which he reflects that Pettazzoni in his comparative method does not accept any attitude pushing away the religious phenomena far beyond time, and maintains that in turn he does adapt an understanding that gives wide pavement to the religious data already existed within both the historical background and the horizontal dimension as a whole.⁸

After these citations, the first translation from Pettazzoni in Turkish was made by Fuat Aydın, the historian of religions in Sakarya University, in 2002. In this booklet, Aydın has translated some urgent articles of Pettazzoni and collected them under a title of *Tanrı'ya Dair (On God)*. It has been seen so far as a unique book ever found in Turkey attributed to Pettazzoni as an author on the cover. Although Aydın mispronounced Pettazzoni's first name as *Rafaella* on the cover and again as *Rafaella* in the first page inside the work, his translation could be considered "quite sound". In the supplement, Aydın also gave place to the translation of an article written by Dr. Natale Spineto dealing with the correspondence between Eliade and Pettazzoni. We can note that however, the translator of

7. Kürşat Demirci, *Dinlerin Dejenerasyonu (The Degeneration of the Religions)*, Istanbul, 1996, 14- 23.

8. Demirci, *Dinlerin Dejenerasyonu*, 80- 81.

this article was another Turkish scholar, Huzeyfe Sayım, (from the faculty of theology in Kayseri, Turkey).

Another translator of Pettazzoni was Mehmet Aydın. He first mentioned about Pettazzoni his preface of the translation of *The Quest, History and Meaning in Religion* of Eliade. There Aydın introduced Pettazzoni to the Turkish academic milieu as “the encyclopedist historian of religions” along with Dumezil, on whose tradition Eliade has mainly traced.⁹

M. Aydın also was the editor of the translation of *The History of Religions: Essays in Methodology* (ed. Mircea Eliade and Joseph Kitagawa, University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London 1959) with the contribution of some other Turkish scholars in his faculty. Therefore the article of Pettazzoni on the Supreme Being was translated again.¹⁰ In the addendum there is a brief biography of Pettazzoni, though given an insufficient bibliography with many mistakenly titles of the books of Pettazzoni such as “kahiri” instead of Kabiri, “zaratusira” instead of Zarahustra, “misten” instead of misteri or “depression religioni” instead of storia delle religioni. Aydın describes Pettazzoni as “the instructor”. He admits that Pettazzoni’s comparative method must be considered as “the extraordinary one”, by which Pettazzoni had created many valuable studies. For him, Pettazzoni has criticized W. Schmidt’s theory of Urmonotheismus as “lack of historical root and evidence”, and he has defended the all-knowing God in all around his surveys. In addition, Aydın tells about Pettazzoni’s phenomenological approach in some short statements; for him, Pettazzoni has rejected the sharp distinction between history and phenomenology and stated that phenomenology cannot exist without history and historical sciences such as philology and archeology. In conclusion, for Aydın, Pettazzonian phenomenological approach gives valuable contributions to the understanding of the religious significance of the historical facts in favor of whom deals with the historical studies.¹¹

As for the direct works on Pettazzoni, we may start again with

9. Meymet Aydın, “İkinci Baskının Önsözü (The Preface of the second edition)”, in Eliade, *Dinin Anlamı ve Sosyal Fonskiyonu (The Quest, History and Meaning in Religion)*, Konya 1995, IV. In this traslation, the subtitle of “Pettazzoni ve Dinin Bütüncül İncelenmesi” (“Pettazzoni and the allgemeine religionswissenschaft”) is very attractive (pp, 37- 40).

10. Raffaele Pettazzoni, “Yüce Tanrı İnancının Fenomenolojik Yapısı ve Tarihsel Gelişimi”, *Dinler Tarihinde Metodoloji Denemeleri*, ed. trans. Mehmet Aydın ,M. Şahin, M. Soyhun, Din Bilimleri Publishing House, Konya 2003, 73- 81.

11. Raffaele Pettazzoni, “Yüce Tanrı İnancının Fenomenolojik Yapısı ve Tarihsel Gelişimi”, 80- 81.

Mehmet Aydın. In 2005 he has written out a thick tome of encyclopedic dictionary of religions. In the article of “Pettaz(z)oni, Raffaele”, again with mispronunciation, Aydın gives three pages (almost 3.5 columns) to Pettazzoni.¹² When we gaze at his biography, it is clearly understood that he utilized directly from the French sources to form up the article. He also gives a brief biography and bibliography of Pettazzoni.¹³

M. Aydın claims there that in 1908 Pettazzoni finished the school of Archeology and he taught the history of religions in Bologna. For Aydın the first researches of Pettazzoni points out to his orientation in future too; first of all, Pettazzoni set up some correlation between the history of religions and the socio-ekonomik, politic history. According to Pettazzoni, Aydın quotes, every philosophical position is subjected to be deleted when they met the historical structures. In this sense religion has got two inspiring dimensions; one comes from the spiritual life other is from the social life. The role of the societal life is annihilated by its effect on the official religiosity itself. Even he claims that when Pettazzoni discovered the importance of the ethnological elements of the ancient greek religion, he was to make himself direct to the Gnosticism and the basic soteriological problems in the religions.¹⁴

As the last conclusion Aydın take to the reader to a new decision about him: having used the results of the folklore, classical works, oriental studies and the ethnology, Pettazzoni has chosen the universalistic studies of the religions as the main target for the historical comparative surveys. According to him by doing so, Pettazzoni attempted to juxtapose the particular religious facts and other facts of the religions altogether, which are in historical relationship with both religious and irreligious events.¹⁵

Another historian of religions, Mustafa Ünal, wrote out a book on an outlined phenomenology of religion in the same year (1999).¹⁶ This work can be regarded as the first specific book in Turkey about the subject. In his bibliography it can be seen clearly that Ünal has utilized from Pettazzoni’s articles such as “the Essays on the History of Religions”, “Il Metodo Comparativo” (though Ünal does not know Italian!) and “the Supreme Being: Phenomenological Structure and Historical

12. Mehmet Aydın, “Petta(z)oni, Raffaele”, *Ansiklopedik Dinler Sözlüğü (Encyclopedic Dictionary of Religions)* Konya 2005, 611- 613.

13. Aydın, 611.

14. Aydın, 611-612.

15. Aydın, 613.

16. Mustafa Ünal, *Din Fenomenolojisi Tarihçe Yöntem Uygulama*, (The Phenomenology of Religion- History, Method, Adaptation), Kayseri, 1999.

Development” and also from Bianchi’s *the History of Religions*. In the subtitle given to “the Historical Phenomenology”, Ünal evaluates Pettazzoni’s ideas and his approach in four pages.¹⁷ Ünal adds that unlike Wach and Eliade, Pettazzoni never went abroad Italy for the study, but he was made grown up by Italian rich cultural background and became the expert on religions in his own country and only after becoming the president of the IAHR in 1954, he gained his international fame.¹⁸

Yet, Ünal exalts Pettazzoni loudly just because of his capable of studying all the religious phenomena in early cultures as well as those in the high religions, and he gives Pettazzoni’s comparison between the spreading of Christianity within the Europe and that of Buddhism in the Far East as the best sample on the case of comparative method. Furthermore, Ünal writes that Pettazzoni has seen not only the deep distinctiveness between such far traditions but also he has seen the similarity of effects in their contexts. For instance Roman impact on Europe such as reformation, Renaissance and Romanticism, and Chinese impact on Japan such as three great movements namely pure land of Buddhism, neo-Confucianism and the revitalization of Shinto in Japan are considered such. Lastly Ünal cites that in this modeling comparison Pettazzoni points out to the Buddhist tolerance towards the other traditions and Christian intolerance against the paganism. And he concludes that this kind of comparison can be considered as a general one.¹⁹

Ünal concludes that Pettazzonian phenomenology teaches us that when the researcher takes into account the typology, history and culture, he/she is at home and in peace because this field disclosures all the religious facts correctly and exhibits them as they are, and defines what the religion is or its most close definition to it in structure.²⁰ But after all he thinks that Pettazzonian phenomenology does not consider the historical development of the events, of their affect and relationship within their existence.

Turkish historians of religions were also aware of the other prominent members of the Pettazzonian School too. For example, Mustafa Ünal has translated *the History of Religions* written by Ugo Bianchi (Leiden, 1975).²¹ This translation can be considered as the first

17. Ünal, 119- 123.

18. Ünal, 119.

19. Ünal, 122-123.

20. Ünal, 120-121.

21. Ugo Bianchi, *Dinler Tarihi Araştırma Yöntemleri*, trans. Mustafa Ünal, Kayseri, 1999.

methodological book in Turkey. Ünal, in his preface, talks about Bianchi as “one of the most favorite persons ever grown up in the Italian movement of the history of religions”. For Ünal this valuable and significant book is not just “a history book” but, on the contrary, a book of methodology dealing with the nature, the subject- matters and the problems of the history of religions, showing the ways how to solve them, exposing the approaches such as comparison and phenomenology appeared in the field. Ünal asserts that because of these vital matters held by Bianchi in his book, it can be understood that this work has been addressed to whom wishes to be expert in the history of religions too. Therefore Ünal hopes that this book will be referential source in order to solve the methodological problems as they are the one of the biggest problematic matters Turkish historians of religions.²²

After reading his translation, I myself did write also a long article on Ugo Bianchi²³ under the title of “The Insistence on the Ancient Religions and the Analogical Method in the History of Religions: Ugo Bianchi (1922- 1995)”²⁴ In this article I dealt with the matters under some titles like “Ugo Bianchi as One of the Leading Persons in the Pettazzonian School” and “his influence on the contemporary History of Religions”. Having mentioned about De Martino, Brelich, Lanternari, I had given the main subjects of Bianchian academic life and his researches on the ancient traditions which occurred in the wide spectrum such as his repeating trilogy consisted of “humanity”, “divinity” and “fate”. Hence, Bianchian analogical method which consists of logical *anologus*, the historical typology and the concrete universals insists on the inevitable historical

22. Mustafa Ünal, “Çevirenin Önsözü (The Preface of the Translator)”, Ugo Bianchi, *Dinler Tarihi Araştırma Yöntemleri*, V.

23. Before this article, I first mentioned about Bianchi and his great role in the methodology of the discipline in a series of meetings about “the problem of methodology in the Islamic and non-confessional religious studies” organized by a Turkish non-governmental organization in Istanbul in 2004. In the section of the methodological problems of the History of Religions, some 20 historians of religions belonging to the faculties of theology throughout Turkey have paid attention to my paper about the contemporary problems of the history of religions. Thank to my beloved colleague Giovanni Casadio, the notable disciple of Bianchi, I quoted some important Bianchian ideas such as “the problems of the definition of the religion” and “the importance of the identity of the discipline as the history of religions”; Mustafa Alıcı, “Dinler Tarihi’nde Çağdaş Metodolojik Problemler”, in Bedreddin Çetiner (ed.), *İslâmî İlimlerde Metodoloji (Usûl) Mes’alesi*, Cilt II, İstanbul, 2005, 1299- 1366.

24. Mustafa Alıcı, “Dinler Tarihi’nde Kadim Dinî Geleneklere ve Analojik Metoda Vurgu: Ugo Bianchi (1922- 1995)” *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, X/2, 2006, 175- 192.

approach in the discipline, by his approach Bianchi carries more strict historical views than his mentor, Pettazzoni; for me in fact what Bianchi thinks about “*historical concretes*” resembles very much to the Pettazzonian *genomenon* in their historical cultural context. In conclusion, I strongly insisted on the fact that he will be remembered by the historians of religions as a serious scholar who has researched on some certain matters deeply, having been avoiding from any generalizations. Lastly Bianchi gave serious efforts preventing from any harmful attempts to change the main road of the discipline to lead safely.

Because of the centenary foundation of the discipline in Turkey (1859), The Turkish Association for The History of Religions (TAHR) organized a national symposium named *The History of Religions in Turkey- Its Yesterday, Its Present and Its Future* in Ankara during 4- 6 December, 2009. Over 200 Turkish scholars gathered and discussed the agenda of the conference. There I presented a paper on notion of God in Tanyu and Pettazzoni with a phenomenological comparison. This presentation was based mainly on my paper held in the section of Raffaele Pettazzoni: An Italian Scholar in the International Context of the IAHR”, organized on behalf of the Società Italiana di Storia delle Religioni (SISR), The International Association of the History of Religions (IAHR) and The European Association for The Study of Religion (EASR) held in Messina, Sicily in 14- 17 September, 2009.

Both in Messina and in Ankara I discussed the Pettazzonian ideas and that of Hikmet Tanyu (1918- 1992), the first Historian of Religions in the Republican Era. Unlike other theorist of the origin of the early religions of mankind (the most of them anthropologists), as the historian of religions Pettazzoni having the concept of the *All-Knowing God* in his researches emphasizes on more concrete historical facts than others. In his productive work in particular Pettazzoni shows us the omniscience character of the Turkish Tengri too. By his fruitful work, Pettazzoni demonstrated the omniscience of the deity as universal as found in the perception of all human beings as well as in particular as perceived by individual systems such as Turko- Mongolian peoples. Turkish Tengri is very convenient to his concept of All knowing God as the sky god, along with other national sky gods. In addition, he traces the historical roots of the Tengri in later times into Budhist, Nesturian Babylonian, Zoroastranian and Mithraic and Islamic God.

Meanwhile, unlike other Turkish ethnologists, Tanyu tries to run after the early Turkish deity by his ethnological studies on the religious history of Turks; for him the Supreme Being of Turks in the past was so

called *Göktengri*. Therefore, Tengri is nor Chinese neither Mongolian in origin but Turkish in character by its all features. In the last analysis, though Tanyu has more particular and narrower approach than Pettazzoni and he looks upon Göktengri as somewhat monotheistic system having been existed long before Islamic monotheism he challenges that early Turkish belief of deity was very similar to Islamic concept of monotheism and the ancient Turks were so called Muslims.

But unlike other researchers, both Pettazzoni and Tanyu believe that the ancient Turkish belief of deity has come to preserve its main features. So, it is possible to see the impacts of that belief within later traditions belonging to Turkish peoples. Furthermore each of them believes that despite of the complexity in the religious history of Turks, *tengri* had preserved its own original character as being supreme god. They maintain the beliefs of some spirits along with Tengri but unlike the other scholars, especially Tanyu doesn't claim that Erlik or Ulgen were the separate gods along with Tengri but he admits them as the evil or the good gods respectively.

Eventually, other last two reflections about Pettazzoni and his school published in Turkey have come up rapidly one right after other by a young historian of religions, namely, Dr. Ramazan Adıbelli from Kayseri (of the central Anatolia). In 2009, the first article of Adıbelli has appeared with in the last months under the title of *Evaluation of Raffaele Pettazzoni, Angelo Brelich and Ugo Bianchi's Views on Methodology in the Context of the Italian School of History of Religions. History of Religions*, which was elaborated at the end of the 19th century as a scientific discip-line, despite a long time that has passed, has not gained a methodology agreed on by the majority of scholars.

Adıbelli managed to write on Italian school although he does not know Italian sources about that. But he used other western languages and did not fail. Fo him the methodological debate within the framework of the Italian School of History of Religions, has managed to develop a tradition in the field. The idea of this essay is that the main cause of the differences between various methodological orientations is the difference of paradigms between those scholars who elaborate and those who use them. And this difference in turn arises in great measure from the criterion of reality/unreality attributed by the researcher to the metaphysical dimension which is the basic characteristic of religious phenomena. In other words, the main source of the methodological discussions in the History of Religions is the difference in the answers given to the question of "what is the ontological value of religion?". And these answers depend upon which

one of these categories the researcher belongs to: the category of *homo religiosus* or that of profane man.²⁵

The second article written by Adibelli was appeared again in the same issue of the journal of with the title of *The Debate between Wilhelm Schmidt and Raffaele Pettazzoni about Monotheism and the Supreme Being*. According to Adibelli, the issue of monotheism was reconsidered as a subject of the Science of Religions for a long time having been located in its own methodology. However, Adibelli is right about thinking that the discussions on the monotheism in the Enlightenment had led to different results just because of the lack of a common methodology; since, although the theological ethnologist Schmidt and the historical phenomenologist Pettazzoni claimed to approach the issues of monotheism and the Supreme Being in a scientific fashion, they both arrived at very different results raises up about the same questions. Further, Adibelli showed that if there is a conflicting situation between two scholars, it must be understood taking of consideration of either the nature of the issue or the the researcher or, very probably, of their approaches. Then Adibelli purposes to shed some light on the methodological problem in the through Schmidt's and Pettazzoni's views concerning monotheism and the Supreme Being, and their criticisms over each had leveled against each other. Moreover, Adibelli maintained that each provides some important clues about the ideological struggle which has been conducted in the West.²⁶

My Reflections on Pettazzoni and His School

As for my works on Pettazzonian Studies, to begin with, I realized that Pettazzoni has been, as "the inevitable phenomenon" the determining person of the classical times of religious studies and the granter for the well-designed and broadening new horizons of the methodological framework for the religions, this was which I was most concerned with.

In my book named *Dinler Tarihinin Batılı Öncüleri (Western Pioneers of The History of Religions)* published in Istanbul in 2007, I have selected ten leading scholars on the history of religions, respectively, Max Müller, Cornelius Tiele, Chantepie de la Saussaye, Gerardus van der Leeuw, William Brede Kristensen, Nathan Söderblom, Rudolf Otto,

25. Ramazan Adibelli, "İtalyan Dinler Tarihi Okulu Bağlamında Raffaele Pettazzoni, Angelo Brelich ve Ugo Bianchi'nin Metodoloji Hakkındaki Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 50/1 (2009), 71- 108.

26. Ramazan Adibelli, "Monoteizm ve Yüce Varlık Konusunda Wilhelm Schmidt ve Raffaele Pettazzoni Arasındaki Tartışma", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 50/2, (2009), 113- 152.

Fredrich Heiler, Joachim Wach and Raffaele Pettazzoni. Pettazzoni is chosen as the last scholar in the lines of the scholars just because I would like to imply that he has been the crossroad pioneer and the gate to both the classical approaches and to the modern progresses in our discipline especially appeared soon after World War II.

In so-called section, I tried to intense and look upon the changes and developments to be significant in his lifetime in accordance with his academic life densely. Tracing back to that matter, we can easily witness that ordinary life of a scholar is in the reconciliation with his or her academic life. For me the most urgent shift in his life might be observed in his stay in Bologna at the beginning of his early life as a university student. I think that during that time, under the intensive influences of the secular positivist movements, he had bugged on the history of religions without leaving his passion of the religion. In those early times he had believed strongly that this newly born science would support his studies of philology, archeology and especially ethnology. But this period had been really hard for him because in those days having been rejecting the autonomy of the religion and its anthropological views the Catholic Church was clearly opponent to the secular studies of religions and could not look upon them in the equal conditions, therefore she was startled of this new dreadful science, and in conclusion she considered the religions only as the individual preparations for the history of the salvation. Therefore for her the history of religions could be valid only on the base of its role in the sacred history of salvation realized solely through Jesus Christ²⁷

The year 1923 could be considered as the turning point for the Italian tradition of the history of religions since Giovanni Gentile, the idealist philosopher and the minister of the fascist regime intended to establish a chair for the history of religions in the university of Rome as the unique post for the discipline. Pettazzoni was preferred for that urgent chair when the pages of the calendar show the month of January in 1924 Along with many other things, there have been somewhat important lessons in the life to be of Pettazzoni that also effected the global academic environment of religion especially in his life after the Second World War. Firstly, by the collapsing of the Fascist Regime he started to expose his own socio-cultural ideas and projects for the humanity.²⁸

On the other hand by his great determination and with the great

27. Mustafa Aııcı, *Dinler Tarihinin Batılı Öncüleri (Western Pioneers of The History of Religions)*, 508.

28. Aııcı, 509- 510.

support of Leeuw, the history of religions owned a multi-national and a well-organized structure, IAHR in 1950. But soon after the death of Van der Leeuw in the same year Pettazzoni became its president until the last moments of his life. His presidency was very productive in some points; for, IAHR did give birth to an international voice namely *Numen*, which Pettazzoni himself gave its name and also “the Studies in the History of Religions”, as the supplement of *Numen*. In this new period, Pettazzoni did not forget his nation and striving for his country he founded Italian society of the history of religions, with valuable publications such as the journal of *Studi e Materiali*, deserving to be the founding father of a school to be known in later times as “the Pettazzonian School” or “Roman School”. Lastly he showed us that he was a moderate scholar by his approach known as “terza via” as well as by his personal life leading in two edges between exclusivist theology and atheist philosophy of history or agnostic anthropology.²⁹

In conclusion, Pettazzoni can be a guiding charismatic model and as his life can be a paradigm for the future historians of the religions by the two foci; firstly through his specific approach on which he always as well equipped means for all his researches, he could penetrate in enormous broadness and countless world of phenomena of religion fearlessly, and he encouraged his colleagues to behave like him without being fed up. Secondly during his lifetime, he always corrected, revised, check over and over the scientific results previously he had achieved.

First of all, I concerned with his idea on monotheism in early cultures and traditions and as the impulse point to start, I must say that his approach is all embracing one from the beginning to the other monotheistic systems scanning all the surface of the earth. For him also it is a most legitimate attitude. Unlike the other scholars who had a specific theory on the origin of religion or the early form of the religion, he used both celestial and terrestrial phenomena belonging to the supreme being by doing so he showed us his balanced behavior in his approach.³⁰

Pettazzonian Ethnology of Liberty and His “Religione Civile”

As for his additive efforts to the general ethnological researches

29. Alici, 510- 513.

30. Pettazzoni, *Il Dio: Formazione e sviluppo del monoteismo nella storia delle religioni vol. 1, L'essere celeste nelle credenze dei popoli primitivi*, Roma 1922; *The All-Knowing God: Researches into Early Religion and Culture*, trans. H. J. Rose, London, 1956; Pettazzoni, “Tanrının Sıfatları Üzerine”, *Tanrı'ya Dair*, trans. Fuat Aydın, Istanbul 2002, 37- 67.

which had been cumulated until him, I may try to make display them as the ethnological studies in the service of the mankind in general and his nation in particular, which can be considered as the most serious landmarks of his researches. Especially after 1950s in the new era he also insisted on the civil religion and its socio-cultural phenomena in the society. For his concept of civil religion, it is clear that Pettazzoni, with all his adequacy and scientific maturity, was aware of having an academic field to stand for the global as well as the local values of the humanity. This cognition led him to conclude that the phenomenon of religion has a part in liberating the religious civil man from all types of normative and ideological power as well as in forming the interreligious, intercultural relations, not undervaluing its relationship with the state. Rather, this idea led him to think of two groups of classification of religions such as liberalizing *religio liberans* / and restrictive *religio religans* and official *religion of the state* / popular *religion of ordinary peoples*. So, Pettazzoni does see the fact of religion not only a subject matter of the phenomenological researches but also the phenomena having multi-functional aspects and vital elements which effect on both the individual person and the society. In addition, since Pettazzoni considers the religion as the positive and fruitful factor for human life, he naturally presupposes that every society with all its organs could have made up their own notion of religion very convenient to their artistic, scientific and philosophical *explanandum*. In the context of the religious liberation, a further more step he takes and gives a way to the differentiations of religion under “the religion of people” and “the religion of state”. In order to set up this classification firmly, he trusts on his background of Roman Imperial experience in fullest sense. I must say that this division and its explanation also cover what we try to stress on the strong forces of religion in the civil social life with full senses of its cultural aspects.³¹

In my cited work, I have shown some aspects of his understanding of civil religion in the title of “The Relationship between Religion and

31. (Pettazzoni), “Gli Ultimi Appunti”, in Mario Gandini (ed), *Religione e societa'*, Bologna, 1966, 122; Pettazzoni, “Criteri per L'Ordinamento Scientifico del VII Congresso Internazionale di Storia delle Religioni”, *Atti delle Reale Accademia D'Italia*, XVIII (Giugno- Ottobre 1940), 1- 2; Pettazzoni, “Storia delle religioni e mitologia”, in Sonia Giusti (ed.), *Storia e mitologia: Con Antologia di Testi di Raffaele Pettazzoni*, Roma, 1988, 387- 398; Pettazzoni, “Il Metodo Comparativo”, in Mario Gandini (ed.), *Religione e societa'*, Bologna, 1966, 110; Guiseppe Mihelcic, 78; Pettazzoni, *Italia Religiosa*, Bari, 1952, 14; Pettazzoni, “ Italia Religiosa: Religione dello Stato e Religione Dell'Uomo”, in Mario Gandini (ed.), *Religione e societa'*, Bologna, 1966, 143- 147.

Culture".³² We can easily observe that as an ethnologist he gives consideration to the culture as equally as to religion with their significant aspects. For him, all serious researches to be done for the religion can be adapted also to the surveys on culture as well as all the reactions or the tolerance can be given to culture just as what we could do in favor of the religion. According to his approach to the culture, culture itself possess some powerful forces granting for the individuals religious freedom even it can contain some forces that resist against the misuse of religion for the profane interests as well can prevent the persons from transforming some special victims for the profane affairs. This is the affirmative and productive dimension of the culture. Nevertheless, when the culture, *a dynamic genomenon*, rejects and denies religion in which even the culture itself was born once upon a time, then this kind of culture can be in trouble of perception of its own nation, its own civilization and even its history. This kind of culture for Pettazzoni is somewhat flawed, insufficient even misleading one for its own nation. Pettazzoni on the contrary of this fact defends for the liberating aspects of the religious culture. For him the *cultura liberans* opens widely its doors to all the frontiers of multi-dimensional and different thinking whereas it also accepts other types of traditions as concrete facts, and give them their praise worthy respect. But just at this point Pettazzoni expresses that every religious system has its own exclusive characteristics which provide with the fact that it is only the way of salvation for the human believing in it. Therefore according to Pettazzoni the religion from the antiquity to the present day national, based on the cultic basics is both as form and as value the one which realizes the civilisation and, is with its total power of the multi-cultural values, the one which arranges the inter human relations and makes them independent.³³

Pettazzonian Historical Mythology

Evidently, Giambattista Vico of Naples (1668-1744) had influence on the historical and mythical understanding of Pettazzoni deeply by his masterpiece, *Scienza Nuova* (1725).³⁴ For Vico, myth has always existed

32. Alici, 521- 523.

33. Pettazzoni, "Religione e cultura", in Mario Gandini (ed.), *Religione e societa'*, Bologna, 1966, 167- 172; Pettazzoni, "Introduzione alla storia della religione greca", in Mario Gandini (ed.), *Religione e societa'*, Bologna, 1966, 22-31; Pettazzoni, "Le due fonti della religione greca", *Proceedings of the Seventh Congress on the History of Religions, Amsterdam, 4 th- 9th September 1950*, Amsterdam 1951, 123- 124; Pisi, P., "Storicismo e fenomenologia nel pensiero di R. Pettazzoni", *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni*, 56 (1990), 245- 277.

34. Mihelcic, 34.

in the history of humanity and will exist in the future too. But the myth, as a tension, can never sovereign upon the logical rationale as well as it never works outside of this human faculty. The world of fantasy woven by myths is the integral part belonging to the internal personality of man and thus, has its autonomy along with religion.³⁵ In addition, Vico claims that solely myths are permitted to penetrate into the heart of the cultures and in this respect every culture have their own religions, therefore religious in character. By this religious sense, man is related to the society. The religions as the major factors that put the societies together are born from the myths. In this sense, man needs vehemently to the myths in order to be able to penetrate in the divine beings.³⁶

Beside Vico, Pettazzoni evaluates Müllerian Comparative mythology very well and approves of him on his consideration of Sanskrit language as the most important means for the comparative grammaticism as well as his regard of the Vedic mythology as the inevitable requirement for the general comparative mythology. Since for Pettazzoni the notion of the comparative mythology related to the historical method has always its own essences and limits linguistically and in that point, a comparison indulged in the mythological facts becomes the most vital approach for the proper phenomena linguistically. Yet, Pettazzoni justifies Müller who says that mythology is nothing than the ancient form of the language,³⁷ and considers his approach which emphasizes on the religious feelings within their rationality as distinctively unique in comparison with the evolutionist ethnologies of his time. In result according to Pettazzoni Müllerian Comparative Mythology must be considered important just because of its capability of penetration into widened subject matters although it is limited to the Indo-European peoples and primitive cultures.³⁸

Here we can abstract some principles of his historical mythology;

1. He considers the mythology as the discipline which provides with approaching the myths with sympathy which are the revived with the spirit of humanism and are made the common property of humankind and human

35. G. Bucaro, *Filosofia delle religione: forme e figure*, Roma, 1992, 151.

36. J. Ries, *I cristiani e le religioni: Dagli Atti degli apostoli al Vaticano II*, Brescia, 1992, 343-344.

37. Pettazzoni, “ Il Metodo Comparativo”, in Mario Gandini (ed), *Religione e Società*, Bologna, 1966, 102.

38. Natale Spineto, “Raffaele Pettazzoni e la comparazione fra storicismo e fenomenologia”, *Storiografia- rivista annuale di storia*, 6 (2002), 32.

signs.³⁹ For this matter as an example, he collected the verbal legends of illiterate peoples of African continent as an anthology in *I Miti Africani* (1948) and there he attempted to give samples of linguistic and cultural myths. Then Pettazzoni, in his *Dio*, shows us that the idea of man dealing with the supreme beings is essentially a product of mythology.

2. In Pettazzonian mythology, the myth is the historical fact that belongs to *mundus fantezia*, which is contradictory and contrary to the realm of the rationality but belongs to the sphere of gods believed by their confidants strongly. Thus, these heroic gods are legendary beings and in general resembled to men. Therefore the myths, in one respect, present us sacred histories. From this conviction, he claims that the myths are true and even sacred history. In other words, according to him the myths, as the cultic readings, make the man contacted with the sacred and the transcendent beings. In conclusion, the phenomenology of the myths understood is in close relation with the poetic function of the language of Martin Heidegger. In this respect, there are two causes for this: firstly, the contents of the myth carry true elements, secondly myths are the history in which some concrete and sacred forces have been functioning positively for their believers.⁴⁰

3. For Pettazzoni it is very meaningful to distinguish the supreme beings and the mythical beings since the attributes of the supreme beings are very clear: for instance, to be uncreated, to act creative activities, to be all-seeing and all-knowing or to be immortal and to have transcendental ethics. As for the mythical beings, they have lower labels such as to fulfill the tasks to be given by the divine beings or to carry on one of divine attributes accidentally as well as to have a display duller than those of gods.⁴¹

4. Since Pettazzoni who accepts the superstitious spurious stories of the peoples as well as the magic and myths as “the forms of religion”, therefore in the religious category he explains that myths can transmit both religious and magical events.⁴² Yet for him the myth, being positive and

39. Pettazzoni, "Myths of Beginnings and Creation-Myths" *Essays on the History of Religions*, trans. H. J. Rose, Leiden, 1954, 36.

40. Pettazzoni, "The Truth of Myth" in Alan Dundes (ed.), *Sacred Narrative: Readings in the Theory of Myth*, Berkeley, 1984, 94- 109.

41. Pettazzoni, *L'Essere Supremo nelle Religioni Primitive (L'Omniscienza di Dio)*, Torino, 1957.

42. Pettazzoni, "Verita' del Mito", in Mario Gandini (ed.), *Religione e Societa'*, Bologna, 1966, 12.

concrete value, reflects functionally the events of humanity of that time of the occurrence.⁴³ It may be said that this is what Eliade calls *illud tempum*. By this historical concern, Pettazzoni considers the myths, especially the superhuman institutional myths along with the cosmogonies, the theogonies and the stories about origin appeared in the history once as “the myths having the historical roots”.⁴⁴ Thus because of his emphasis on history in mythology, we may call his approach as “*the historical mythology*”.

***Pettazzonian Phenomenology at
The Integration of the Approaches***

The contribution of Pettazzoni (*metodo storico comparativo*) to the methodology of the history of religions is evidently inevitable. In the part devoted to his phenomenology (pp., 529- 544), I have insisted on the fact that Pettazzoni, as the vital crossroad for the appearance of an independent discipline, i.e., the History of Religions, strove to smooth the breaking points appeared within the theoretical frameworks of the history of religions during its history up to him, and managed to decrease the tensions and the theoretical serious problems occurred by the impacts of the other impressive pioneers and their schools such as Müller, Tiele, Saussaye, Söderblom, Kristensen, Otto, Leeuw etc., especially on the main disciplinary matters like “history”, “phenomenology”, “mythology”, “anthropology”, “the origin of the religion” and “supreme being”. By doing so, he also reconciled the Roman and Greek heritage as well as the inheritance of the Italian Renaissance, of the powerful Italian philosophy of Histories such as Varro, Vico and Croce as well as the legacy of German Idealists and all the achievements of the Scandinavian ahistoric approaches in the field, and also of the Anglo-Saxon school of the discipline and he managed to make a perfect synthetic integration of the ideas into a new, clear pot named “historical phenomenology”. So his approach can be regarded a paradigm- giving model or “terza via”, the third way, as seen by the Italian school in later (N. Gasbarro),⁴⁵ even or the moderate way between the radical historical approaches and the ahistoric approaches by

43. Pettazzoni, “Essays on the History of Religions, Studies in the History of Religions” *Supplements to Numen*, 1 (1967), 24-25.

44. Pettazzoni, “The Truth of Myth,” 94-109; Bernhard W. Anderson, “Myth and the Biblical Tradition”, *Theology Today* 27/1 (April 1970), 2-10.

45. Nicola Gasbarro, “La terza via tracciata da Raffaele Pettazzoni” *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, vol. 56, 1990, 96- 106.

the same school (for example R. Nanini)⁴⁶ as well. Therefore in Pettazzonian phenomenology there exist two basic manifolds; on the one hand the historical values of the religious phenomena, on the other hand their values in the systematic comparison. In addition, he demands from the history of religions at dealing with phenomena to insist on their values within their “relative histories” as the constant elements, and to emphasize on the cultural similarities and differences when making comparison among them.

For him, since the religion is, from the first hand the historical phenomenon, the historical comparison is more important than the actual values of the religious phenomena; so he prefers the usage of the comparative method rather than the term phenomenology. Therefore, Pettazzoni like his favorite disciple Ugo Bianchi used to call the field the History of Religions in more stressing manner than other two pioneers such as Müller and Saussaye, and took pains not to cut off the link of the discipline with history, and he defended its traditional name as the history of religions zealously. Because according to him in the last analysis, history is inevitable fact of humankind being and in a sense it is “the life story of the mankind” or “the cumulative strives of human beings”.

At this point we may summarize some important principles from his historical phenomenological approach as a progressive manner from his first works until his last article on *metodo comparativo*:

1. *The most important feature for the Pettazzonian phenomenology is that history has inevitable value for the history of religions.* To read the life means to read history correctly. The religion is a historical phenomenon and the history is religious therefore the religious history is necessary: for that reason the historian of religions has to appraise all the religious phenomena within their contextual correlations to be found out. The religious history is also in the full sense of the word a universal history embracing all the religious traditions from the early cultures to the modern ones.⁴⁷

2. *According to Pettazzoni the term history in the history of religions cannot be understood only as the academician knowledge of the past.* The philosophies of the absolute historicism are not correct means for this discipline. Accordingly, the histories of the individual traditions are not the absolute history in the field. Moreover the historian of religions

46. Riccardo Nanini, “Raffaele Pettazzoni e la fenomenologia della religione”, *Studia Patavina*, 50 (2003), 377- 413.

47. Pettazzoni, *Svolgimento, e carattere della storia delle religioni*, Bari 1924, 10-21.

cannot regard history as a terror or horrifying calamity as seen by some historians of cultures but rather he/she must appraise it as the life-stories of the humankind, presenting their joys and hopes and in this sense he/she must evaluate the historical objects of the religions in their development.⁴⁸By this approach, he intended to create a paradigm to be fed by linguistics and ethnology, reading the history very well and “constitute” it in the correct way again otherwise he did not wish to establish a method of bare and simple comparison in order to discover a bare religious fact.

3. *Pettazzoni accepts that comparison of the religious traditions is an older human activity than scientific comparative study of religion and comparative mythology.* He reminds us the existence of *Interpretatio Graeca* on the gods of the ancient eastern religions and the existence of *Interpretatio Romana* on the foreign gods of Greeks, of Kelts and Germans. For him the ancient human mentality was accepting the fact that in spite of the different races and languages there had been still the same gods belonging to the humankind. For example the learned men of the ancient world know that Amun is the same as Zeus, Ra equals Helios, Isis is Demeter and Osiris is not different from Dionysos. So for the Pettazzonian approach the comparative method is historical human activity and undertakes to determine the religious patterns, wants to solve the same human problems and genres and in the last phrase aims to reconstitute the religious phenomena bringing them to the present without cutting off them from their times and contexts absolute.⁴⁹

4. *Pettazzoni maintains that comparative method is nor an ordinary and simple parallelism neither solely standing side by side of the facts but rather it is an absolute method that needs the certain history to show the mutual penetrations and the separate expansions of the phenomena or their unification in the one single term.*⁵⁰ Then for him the comparison is not done only for cultural point of view but also for the socio-historical point of view. Since historical comparative method is vital and specific approach of the history of religion, any search for an alternative way is in vain just because the identity of the field.⁵¹

48. Pettazzoni, *Svolgimento, e carattere della storia delle religioni*, Bari 1924, 3; Luigi Salvatorelli, “La Personalità Morale di Raffaele Pettazzoni”, *Problems and Methods of the History of Religions*, ed. Ugo Bianchi, Jouco C. Bleeker, A. Bausani, Leiden 1972, 4.

49. Pettazzoni, “Il Metodo Comparativo”, in Mario Gandini (ed.), *Religione e società*, Bologna, 1966, 101.

50. Pettazzoni, *Svolgimento, e carattere della storia delle religioni*, 10.

51. Pettazzoni, “Il Metodo Comparativo”, 103- 104.

5. Therefore *the Pettazzonian Comparative Method is not a bare anthropological approach which is in the last analysis so reductionist but rather it exists just for collection of specific phenomena compared and to bring up their real values.* Since the understanding of the phenomena can be possible just through history, the quest for the rationality in them or the performance of the bracketing method to understand them is not enough.⁵² Thus the historical process is very urgent and valuable for the present conditions of the phenomena as well as for their future. Furthermore, according to Pettazzoni, the events happened in the beginning is very necessary for the later events as the vital models. Therefore the events happening today carry the absolute and descriptive values for the events to be happen in the future.⁵³ For this reason in order to bring up unique samples of comparison, Pettazzoni while studying the historical development of religion comparatively, tended to research on the ancient Greek, Roman, German and Slavic religions in particular as well as the major monotheist traditions and especially via a real ethnographic points of view, he was interested in the primitive tribes. For example the Christianity can carry the unique events that never repeats again in history for its own faithful whereas in history it could live the same intermediary period as that of Buddhism when they were passing through the national forms to the beyond-national forms even though they can't be compared absolutely historically. Yet, for him since history cannot carry co-equal values to all religions here the comparison can undertake very important tasks when telling later the religious persons of the given religions in beyond national forms about the values in that period.⁵⁴

6. Thus Pettazzoni defends that while searching for the possibility of the comparison in the context of the historical process, it does not need to look for the unity of the origination among the religions. For example the pyramids in Egypt and in Mexico don't represent the common historical root but they can be compared each other. Right here the comparison of the civilization is to mean their distinctions from each other not to smooth away the obstacles encountered or not to get rid of the differences. Therefore every object belonging to the different civilizations must be appraised in "their appropriate contexts".⁵⁵

52. Pettazzoni, "Il Metodo Comparativo", 104- 105.

53. Pettazzoni, "Myths of Beginnings and Creation-Myths." ed. Raffaele Pettazzoni, *Essays on the History of Religions*, Leiden 1954, 26-36.

54. Pettazzoni, "Il Metodo Comparativo", 99- 113.

55. Angelo Brelich, "Commemorazione di Raffaele Pettazzoni", *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, XXXI, (1960), 130.

7. *We can read Pettazzonian survey texts from the reverse in following way: when Pettazzoni compares in searching for the archetype of a religious phenomenon he mentions about one single focus of orientation: the destination of the approach that does not neglect the history.* In other words, when comparison is done within the historical process, the reconstruction of the absolute essence can be realized fully and especially the lacking of the history belonging occurred to the phenomena could be eradicated.

8. *For him the religious phenomenology which insists on the essential essence determining the private value of religion is an indispensable field for the history of religions to run perfectly.* But he rejects Leeuwian phenomenology which does not enter in the field of the historical development of the phenomenon. Thus for him the comparative method in a sense is an approach to bring if the different structures within the plurality of the phenomena. Since for him the structures, the meaning, the positions of the phenomena received within time and place needs the historical process. Thus for him the phenomenology of religion is not restricted to some certain religions but it must be universalistic and historical phenomenological in character.⁵⁶

9. In this respect in general sense Pettazzonian phenomenology is not only a simple approach but rather a discipline that constructs the structures. *That is to say, the Roman historical phenomenology with having its own character does not limit itself to the verification or analyzing of any knowledge coming from one way means.* Rather, it can re-arrange the phenomena in order to fix up the contextual relationship among the phenomena and even it can strive to re-arrange the religious phenomena by comparing them with other secular datum or data in order to make the religious facts grouped in their real and proper correlations. Even, if these structures are based on the formal relations, the phenomenological discipline can classify them into various types. If these relations are in chronological order, then the phenomenology makes them successive series in more comprehensible way. According to Pettazzoni the phenomenology just because of its strive for the arrangement of these chronological relations and by its own consideration of every events, religious or non religious can reach at so very widened frontiers that it concerns with any art, poem, speculative thought. But however, for him the History of Religions must always seek for the contribution of the

56. Pettazzoni, *Il Metodo Comparativo*”, 103- 106.

phenomenology on the discovery of the conditional nature of a religious fact and its absolute meaning.⁵⁷

10. In *Pettazzonian Phenomenology*, since every phenomenon is one revelation of the Sacred or its some kind of experience they cannot be below the history, beyond the history nor can be in any character that excludes history. For, every phenomenon is a *genomenon*, a phenomenon having its own context or the levels and phrases of its own occurrence in history.⁵⁸

11. On the other hand, *Pettazzoni* rejects any radical historical approach that excludes the stable structures of the phenomena. In other words, according to him, any sort of radical philosophy of history can be unfamiliar with that kind of phenomenology that regards the religion as autonomous and perceives it as the unchangeable essential concept as well as it cannot emphasis sufficiently on the actual developments of the phenomena. For that reason, it is an absolute condition that there must exist a reconciliation or `a moderate way` between the phenomenology that has no historical strives and history that has no proper religious sensitivity. In result of this, *Pettazzoni* finds a balanced way between these two and open a new gate striving for the confirmation of the approach of the historical development and classical phenomenology and intends to turn the phenomenology of the general religionswissenschaft into a research-field of high-quality and all-inclusive way of the religious fact of whole mankind.⁵⁹

12. *Even though his phenomenological approach is deprived of the modern hermeneutic means, yet, it is wide open to any multi-dimensional ways in studying of religion deeply.* If we say in more comprehensible way, his method is open to any philological understanding that can gives the direct and the most perfect interpretation of a sacred text or to the archeology that aims to reconstruct the plan of an ancient temple or that aims to explain a mythical scene or a vital part of ancient theatral play, and open to the ethnology that provides with detailed lore about some certain sacred rites or practices belonging to an uncivilized, to the sociology that tries to bring up the ideas about the religious structure of a religious community as well as the ideas of its relationship with the profane world and lastly to the psychology that tries to perceive the religious experience of a believer. So by the contribution of these sciences,

57. Pettazzoni, "Il Metodo Comparativo", 102- 103.

58. Pettazzoni, "Il Metodo Comparativo", 107.

59. Pettazzoni, " Il Metodo Comparativo", 107- 108; Pettazzoni, *Essays on the History of Religions*, 215-219.

Pettazzonian phenomenology has profoundness both in latitude and longitude in order to discover the real condition of a religious phenomenon. But for him the phenomenology must never turn into absolute philology or the absolute psychology but rather it must maintain strongly as the discipline with its own multi-dimensional and composite characters.⁶⁰

In summary, to me, the Pettazzonian approach with its recondite knowledge is deserved to be called as “integrative approach” in the discipline. The main characteristics of the school can be listed as: a. the phenomena are divided into many parts then they are analyzed, interpreted again and lastly reconstructed in the context of their occurring time. b. The scientific results available for the scholars are compared systematically in the manner that could be also expanded toward to private cultural facts that every religious tradition has brought up to now. c. The relation of the religious data with the metaphysics or with sacred beings is ascertained well.⁶¹ Further, Pettazzonian approach as the intermediate one, softening and reconciling with the essential theoretical understandings occurred in the classical and modern periods. By creating his own approach, Pettazzoni has influenced in general the movements of the history and avoided himself from any reductionist approaches, and in the process of the tradition continuing from Leeuw to Eliade, he has followed a well-balanced point of view, preventing his school from any extremist outlook.⁶²

Conclusion

The works of Pettazzoni which I have considered in the researches by the modern Turkish scholars are the strong proof-giver finding for the sake of the universal recognition of the Supreme Being. Pettazzoni has collected all the relevant material and has estimated the importance of the sky god in every culture and for the whole of religious development. By his works whose outlook on religion is bound to be as world-wide as it is non-confessional as well as the historical phenomenological fact, Pettazzoni has no reason to refrain from speaking of early cultures as well as the present ones as may be most convenient in a scientific or even in a literary way.

As the Turkish student of religion, we also need Pettazzoni because

60. Pettazzoni, “Din İlminde Tarih ve Fenomenoloji”, *Tanrı'ya Dair*, der. ve çev. Fuat Aydın, İstanbul, 2002, 101- 102.

61. Nicola Gasbarro, “La terza via tracciata da Raffaele Pettazzoni” *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, vol. 56, 1990, 105.

62. Riccardo Nanini, “Raffaele Pettazzoni e la fenomenologia della religione”, *Studia Patavina*, 50 (2003), 377- 413.

of the rich cultural heritage of Anatolia waiting for coming to light academically. Furthermore, Pettazzoni is “a required learned one” for the future generations of Turkish academy of religions. His effective researches reflected to the Turkish bewareing minds show that with Furthermore his historical phenomenology he has been welcomed in Turkey which has the rich religio-cultural existence in the East as much as Italy has in the West. When understood very well, Pettazzoni will maintain to be a great value for Turkey when his other works are to be translated and used by the Turkish researchers.

With the great supports coming from other Italian historians of religions such as Sabbatucci, Turchi and De Martino, Pettazzoni has left a well- defined discipline liberated from the yoke of the church, and an organized society and an international association having some vital publications, as a great heritage delivered for his own country first and for the international environment of religious studies. His tradition which formed the one of the most effective academies and legacies was to be inherited the notable scholars and is called “*the Pettazzonian School*” or more globally as “*The Roman School*” today.

During his lifetime, he granted to the global scientific world some leading academicians grown up by him, and they got matured in his ideas and went far beyond. Among the so called prominent scholars known in the international arena are Ugo Bianchi from Messina, who was the outstanding expert of ancient religions and was the well deserved president of IAHR once, Angelo Brelich from Rome, who was to be known as the expert on Greek Mythology and Vittorio Lanternari from Bari, the prominent anthropologist dealing with the mythical aspects in the cult of Messiah. In addition, it is a great debt for us to remember the praiseworthy efforts of Mario Gandini, the fervent “*cronologista*” of the Pettazzonian School.

It is clear that today the Italian scholars belong mostly to the first generation created by Pettazzoni himself. The most important feature of this school is its ardent defensive feature of the traditional character of the discipline as “the comparative history of religions”. So the Italian school is, in a strong sense, “the guardian of the identity of the discipline and the remover of every kind of anxiety to come up in the future”. Especially Bianchi showed this at his period of presidency in a concrete manner at best. As the last word we may say that “the agnostic” Pettazzoni may be also a strong respond to the questions such as why we need either some secular or non-confessional academicians of religions in our beloved country if we can.

SOURCES

Allen, Douglas, "Din Fenomenolojisi", çev. Mehmet Katar, *AÜİFD.*, c. XXXV, 35 (1996), 437-465.

Adıbelli, Ramazan, "İtalyan Dinler Tarihi Okulu Bağlamında Raffaele Pettazzoni, Angelo Brelich ve Ugo Bianchi'nin Metodoloji Hakkındaki Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 50/1 (2009), 71- 108.

_____, "Monoteizm ve Yüce Varlık Konusunda Wilhelm Schmidt ve Raffaele Pettazzoni Arasındaki Tartışma", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 50/2, (2009), 113- 152.

Alıcı, Mustafa, "Dinler Tarihi'nde Çağdaş Metodolojik Problemler", in Bedreddin Çetiner (ed.), *İslâmî İlimlerde Metodoloji (Usûl) Mes'alesi*, vol. II, İstanbul 2005, 1299- 1366.

_____, "Dinler Tarihi'nde Kadim Dinî Geleneklere ve Analogik Metoda Vurgu: Ugo Bianchi (1922- 1995)" *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, X/2, 2006, 175- 192.

_____, *Dinler Tarihinin Batılı Öncüleri (Western Pioneers of The History of Religions)*, İstanbul 2007.

Anderson, Bernhard W., "Myth and the Biblical Tradition", *Theology Today*, 27/1 (April 1970), 2-10.

Aydın, Meymet, "İkinci Baskının Önsözü (The Preface of the second edition)", Eliade, *Dinin Anlamı ve Sosyal Fonksiyonu (The Quest, History and Meaning in Religion)*, Konya 1995, IV. In this translation, the subtitle of "Pettazzoni ve Dinin Bütüncül İncelenmesi" ("Pettazzoni and the allgemeine religionswissenschaft"), 37- 40.

_____, "Petta(z)zoni, Raffaele", *Ansiklopedik Dinler Sözlüğü (Encyclopedic Dictionary of Religions)* Konya 2005, 611- 613.

Bell, Catherine, *Ritual: Perspective and Dimension*, Oxford 1997.

Bleeker, C. Jouco, "The Contribution of the Phenomenology of Religion to The Study of the History of Religions", *Problems and Methods of the History of Religions*, ed. Ugo Bianchi, Jouco C. Bleeker, A. Bausani, Leiden 1972, 35- 45.

_____, "In Memoriam Raffaele Pettazzoni", *Numen*, VI, 2 (December 1959), 76.

Bianchi, Ugo, *Dinler Tarihi Araştırma Yöntemleri*, trans. Mustafa Ünal, Kayseri, 1999.

Brelich, Angelo, "Commemorazione di Raffaele Pettazzoni", *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, XXXI, (1960), 130-133.

_____, "Perche' storicismo e quale storicismo (nei nostr studi)", *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, XXXII, (1970-1972), 7- 28.

Bucaro, G., *Filosofia delle religione: forme e figure*, Roma 1992.

Demirci, Kürşat, *Dinlerin Dejenerasyonu (The Degeneration of the Religions)*, İstanbul, 1996.

Gandini, Mario, "Pettazzoni, Raffaele", *Encyclopedia of Religion*, (2.nd Edition), ed. Lindsay Jones, c. X, New York- London 2005, 7072- 7077.

_____, "Raffaele Pettazzoni dalla libera docenza nell' Università di Roma all'incarico nell' Ateneo bolognese (1913-1914)", *Strada maestra*, 40 (1996), 63-205.

_____, "Raffaele Pettazzoni negli anni della prima guerra mondiale (1914-1918)", *Strada maestra*, 43 (1997), 65-173.

_____, "Scritti di R. Pettazzoni", *Religione e società*, ed. Mario Gandini, Bologna 1966, XII- XV.

Gasbarro, Nicola, "La terza via tracciata da Raffaele Pettazzoni" *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni [SMSR]*, vol. 56, 1990, 95 -106.

Guisti, Sonia, "Analogia Metodologica e Contrasti Teorici Fra Raffaele Pettazzoni e Ugo Bianchi", *Ugo Bianchi: Una Vita per La Storia delle Religioni*, ed. Giovanni Casadio, Roma 2002, 393- 400.

King, Ursula, "Historical and Phenomenological Approaches to the Study of Religion- Some Major Developments and Issues under Debate Since 1950", *Contemporary Approaches to the Study of Religion- I: The Humanities*, ed. Frank Whaling, Berling- New York- Amsterdam 1983, 29- 164.

Küçük, Abdurrahman, "Opening Speech", in Ali İsmail Güngör(ed.), *Sekülerleşme ve Dini Canlanma (Secularism and Religious Resurgence- A Joint Conference with IAHR)*, Ankara, 2008, 19- 27; Ali İsmail Güngör, "The Turkish Contribution to the History of Religions", *Numen*, vol. 54/1, 2007, 71-92.

Lanternari, Vittorio, *Antropologia Religiosa: Etnologia, storia, folklore*, Bari 1997.

_____, "La religione e la sua essenza: un problema", *Nuovi argomenti*, 49 (1961), 1-64.

_____, *Occidente e Terzo Mondo: Incontri di civiltà e religioni differenti*, Bari 1967.

Nannini, Riccardo, "Raffaele Pettazzoni e la fenomenologia della religione", *Studia Patavina*, 50 (2003), 377-413.

Mihelcic, Giuseppe "L' Idea di Religione in Raffaele Pettazzoni", *Una Religione di Libertà: Raffaele Pettazzoni e La Scuola Romana di Storia delle Religioni*, Roma 2003, 59- 126.

_____, "La Schola Romana in dialogo con la teologia", *Una Religione di Libertà: Raffaele Pettazzoni e La Scuola Romana di Storia delle Religioni*, Roma 2003, 247- 280

_____, "Raffaele Pettazzoni: Profilo e Contestualità" *Una Religione di Libertà: Raffaele Pettazzoni e La Scuola Romana di Storia delle Religioni*, Roma 2003, 31- 58.

Pettazzoni, Raffaele, *The All-Knowing God: Researches into Early Religion and Culture*, trans. H. J. Rose, London 1956.

_____, "Criteri per L' Ordinamento Scientifico del VII Congresso Internazionale di Storia delle Religioni", *Atti della Reale Accademia D' Italia*, XVIII (Giugno- Ottobre 1940), 1- 2.

_____, "Commemorazione del Socio Straniero Gerardus van der Leeuw", *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, 1951, vol. VI, 59- 63.

- _____, "Din İliminde Tarih ve Fenomenoloji", *Tanrı'ya Dair*, der. ve çev. Fuat Aydın, İstanbul 2002, 101- 106.
- _____, *Il Dio: Formazione e sviluppo del monoteismo nella storia delle religioni vol. 1, L'essere celeste nelle credenze dei popoli primitivi*, Roma 1922.
- _____, "Essays on the History of Religions, Studies in the History of Religions" *Supplements to Numen*, 1 (1967), 20-29.
- _____, "Gli Ultimi Appunti", *Religione e societa*, ed. Mario Gandini, Bologna 1966, 117- 137.
- _____, *Italia religiosa*, Bari 1952.
- _____, "Italia Religiosa: Religione dello Stato e Religione Dell' Uomo", *Religione e societa* , ed. Mario Gandini, Bologna 1966, 143- 154.
- _____, "La Scienza delle religioni e il suo metodo", *Scientia*, 7 (1913), 239- 247.
- _____, *L'Essere Supremo nelle Religioni Primitive(L'Omniscienza di Dio)*, Torino 1957.
- _____, "Le due fonti della religione greca", *Proceedings of the Seventh Congress on the History of Religions, Amsterdam, 4 th- 9th September 1950*, Amsterdam 1951, 123- 124.
- _____, *La religione primitiva in Sardegna*, , Piacenza 1912.
- _____, *La religione di Zarathustra nella storia religiosa dell' Iran*, Bologna 1920.
- _____, " Il Metodo Comparativo", *Numen*,(1959), 1-14.
- _____, " Il Metodo Comparativo", *Religione e Societa* , ed. Mario Gandini, Bologna 1966, 101- 113.
- _____, *Miti Africani*, Torino 1948.
- _____, "Mitin Hakikati", *Tanrı'ya Dair*, der. ve çev. Fuat Aydın, İstanbul 2002, 69- 84.
- _____, "Myths of Beginnings and Creation-Myths" *Essays on the History of Religions*, trans. H. J. Rose, ed. Raffele Pettazzoni, Leiden 1954, 24- 36.
- _____, "Religione e cultura", *Religione e societa*, ed. Mario Gandini, Bologna 1966, 167- 172.
- _____, "Storia delle religioni e mitologia", *Storia e mitologia: Con Antologia di Testi di Raffaele Pettazzoni*, Roma 1988, 387- 398.
- _____, "Tanrının Sıfatları Üzerine", *Tanrı'ya Dair*, der. ve çev. Fuat Aydın, İstanbul 2002, 37- 67.
- _____, " Tektanricılığın Oluşumu", *Tanrı'ya Dair*, der. ve çev. Fuat Aydın, İstanbul 2002, 15- 26.
- _____, "The Truth of Myth" in Alan Dundes (ed.), *Sacred Narrative: Readings in the Theory of Myth*, Berkeley, 1984, 94- 104.
- _____, "The Truth of Myth," 94-109: Bernhard W. Anderson, "Myth and the Biblical Tradition", *Theology Today* 27/1 (April 1970), 2-10.
- _____, "Verita' del Mito", *Religione e Societa* , ed. Mario Gandini, Bologna 1966, 7-14.

_____, “Yüce Tanrı İnancının Fenomenolojik Yapısı ve Tarihsel Gelişimi”, *Dinler Tarihi Metodoloji Denemeleri*, ed. ve çev. Mehmet Aydın, Konya 2003, 73- 81.

Pisi, P., “Storicismo e fenomenologia nel pensiero di R. Petazzoni”, *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni*, 56 (1990), 245- 277.

Ries, J., *I Christiani e Le Religioni: Dagli Atti degli apostoli al Vaticano II*, Brescia 1992.

Schimmel, Annemarie, “Numen: International Review -for the History of Religions”, *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3 (3-4), (1954), 119-122.

Spineto, Natale, “Raffaele Pettazzoni e la comparazione fra storicismo e fenomenologia”, *Storiografia- rivista annuale di storia*, 6 (2002), 27- 48.

_____, “Storici delle religioni italiani del ‘900- Notizie e osservazioni sugli studi recenti (1995- 2000)”, *Storiografia*, 3 (1999), 63- 82.

Tanyu, Hikmet, *İslamlıktan Önce Türklerde Tek Tanrı İnancı (The Belief of One God of Turks in Pre Islamic Period)*, İstanbul, 1986, 204- 205.

Terrin, A. N., “Storia delle religioni”, *Grande dizionario delle religioni*, Padova 1988, 2039- 2046.

Ünal, Mustafa, “Çevirenin Önsözü (The Preface of the Translator)”, Ugo Bianchi, *Dinler Tarihi Araştırma Yöntemleri*, V.

_____, *Din Fenomenolojisi Tarihçe Yöntem Uygulama*, (The Phenomenology of Religion- History, Method, Adaptation), Kayseri, 1999.

Waardenburg, Jacques, “View on a Hundred Years’ Study of Religion”, *Classical Approaches to the Study of Religion-I: An Introduction and Anthology*, The Hague- Paris 1973, 3- 78.

_____, “R. Pettazzoni”, *Classical Approaches to the Study of Religion-II: Bibliography*, The Hauge- Paris 1974, 209- 215.